



Minutes
Village of Glen Ellyn
Capital Improvements
Regular Meeting
March 10, 2020
7:00 PM
Glen Ellyn Civic Center, Room 301

Board or Commission: Capital Improvement
Meeting: Regular
Quorum: Yes

Date: March 10, 2020
Called to Order: 7:01 p.m.
Adjourned: 9:47 p.m.

MEMBER ATTENDANCE:

Michael T. Lane	Chairman	Present
Joel Baldin	Commissioner	Present
Adam B. Biggam	Commissioner	Absent
Joshua J. Cattero	Commissioner	Absent
Arthur F. Foerster	Commissioner	Absent
Michael M. Lindquist	Commissioner	Present
Steve Neurauter	Commissioner	Present
Steve Szymanski	Commissioner	Present
Rocco J. Zuccherro	Commissioner	Absent
Richard Daubert	Professional Engineer/Staff Liaison	Present
Steve Thompson	Village Trustee/Trustee Liaison	Present

Also Present:

Christina Coyle	Glen Ellyn Finance Director	
Dan Anderson	Historical Society	
Dave Buckley	Glen Ellyn Assistant Public Works Director	
Dawn Bussey	Glen Ellyn Public Library Director	
Dawn Smith	Glen Ellyn Chamber of Commerce Executive Director	
John Magill	CivilTech Engineering	
Katie Crudele	Glen Ellyn Zoning Board of Appeals	
Matthew Jones	Glen Ellyn Zoning Board of Appeals	
Mark Franz	Glen Ellyn Village Manager	
Marv Ritter	540 Duane Street, Glen Ellyn	
Michelle Covington	Glen Ellyn Zoning Board of Appeals	
Mike Folkening	CivilTech Engineering	
Kristin Kalitowski	CivilTech Engineering	
Phil Hutchinson	CivilTech Engineering	
Terri Smith-Pfeiffer	540 Duane Street, Glen Ellyn	
Tom Topor	Senior Civil Engineer	

A. CALL TO ORDER

The March 10, 2020 meeting of the Capital Improvements Commission was called to order by Chairman Lane at 7:01 PM at the Glen Ellyn Civic Center.

B. PUBLIC COMMENT – None

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM February 12, 2020 MEETING

MOVE TO APPROVE MINUTES from 2/12/2020

RESULT: Unanimous

MOVER: Commissioner Lindquist

SECONDER: Commissioner Szymanski

D. CURRENT BUSINESS

1. *CBD Streetscape Paving Materials & Streetscape Elements Presentation:* Kristin Kalitowski from CivilTech outlines the meeting objectives: Tonight we will specifically covering decorative paving options, crosswalk material options, planter curb materials & railing design, and alternative options for planter curbs. To recap: *Materials Decision Making Process:* The technical advisory committee selects 3 material options so that Public Works can install the samples. Once the sample installations are completed we will have a *Materials Outreach Strategy*. This strategy will be led by Muse and will capture public feedback through website voting, in-person meetings, social media, and newsletters. *Material Selection Process:* To date we have done an exposed aggregate evaluation. We have revisited the 2013 Concept Plan. We have considered historic features and have revisited the use of pavers. Tonight we want to narrow down our material options and get the input from the CIC so that we can move forward on sample installation, public outreach and ultimately a final material decision.

John from Civiltech presents the History of GE Streetscape Design: We consulted with Liz Paterson on the history of Glen Ellyn. We wanted to establish of sense of place and a vibe of Glen Ellyn. We pulled out elements from Hotel GE, McChesney, Glenbard West High School and the Civic Center. The elements that were pulled from these locations were limestone, red brick, and patterned brickwork. We also looked at precedent streetscapes (what other communities are doing).

Phil Hutchinson from Civiltech presents the Streetscape Design Elements: We looked at a number of materials for the decorative pavement:

1. Standard Concrete - low cost, easy to install, unobtrusive aesthetically, not decorative or inspiring.

2. Stamped Concrete – can mimic the look of brick, low cost, limited to one color, for future repairs it can be hard to match the color, susceptible to damage, textures hold water and can freeze, minimal benefit to cost
3. Exposed Aggregate: textures and colors are highly customizable, low cost relative to brick pavers \$14/sf, color and texture hard to recreate for future repairs, requires highly skilled labor, can crack, more susceptible to damage from salt and ice, not a historic material.
4. Fire Clay Brick Pavers: historic material, classic look, durable, does not fade, can be simple or complicated patterns aesthetically, high cost \$24/sf, limited sizes and shapes. Maintenance: does not need to be sealed, power wash, spot repairs, joint sand replacement, service life span lasts for generations, must use rubber tipped snow plows or brushes.

Commissioner Neurauter asks if we would secure extra pavers for future repairs. Hutchinson replies yes, it is called attic stock and we would build that into the cost of the materials.

Engineer Daubert asks if efflorescence is a problem with pavers. Hutchinson replies it does occur but the pavers can be cleaned of it; we haven't seen it as a problem, but will ask the manufacturer.

Hutchinson presents the finishes on the Fire Clay Brick Pavers. There are 2 options beveled edge and tumbled edge. The tumbled edge is a straight cut paver and it is put in a machine to tumble and rough it up a bit.

Hutchinson presents design options and shows each mockup perspective with varying materials (see attached presentation). Stamped concrete, exposed aggregate, Fire Clay Brick Option A herringbone pattern (4"x12"), Fire Clay Brick Option B – closer to 2013 plan herringbone pattern (4"x8"), Fire Clay Brick Option C – running bond field with 4"x8" diamond accent. We can engrave the 12" square pavers with info for historical landmarks.

Hutchinson presents the decorative sidewalk costs: Plain concrete: \$224K, Stamped Concrete: \$480K, Exposed Aggregate: \$448K, and Fire Clay Pavers: \$768K. Engineer Daubert adds we are also looking closer at lifecycle costs, once we have those we will bring it to the CIC. Also if costs become an issue we can dial back in other areas of the project (ie, planters, decorative curbing, furniture etc.). Hutchinson adds with respect to lifecycle, depending on weather, exposed aggregate should last about 20 years and Fire clay brick lasts about 40 years. So depending on what you choose you could incur more costs on the backend. Commissioner Baldin adds as part of the analysis we should consider the salvage value of pavers as they can likely last beyond 40 years. Baldin adds that we should also consider the use of an aggregate base under pavers in lieu of concrete. Concrete is preferential but adds significant cost and an aggregate base may still suffice.

Chairman Lane asks how many square feet of decorative materials are we considering. Kalitowski replies 32,000 sf.

Hutchinson adds historical plaques are an opportunity to add and incorporate in

any of the designs. The CIC likes the idea of historic plaques.

Hutchinson presents Crosswalk Decorative Material Options (see attached presentation) Concrete – \$11/sf long service life (\$165K), Stamped asphalt (5yr lifespan)- \$20/sf (\$300K), MMA (10-20yr lifespan) - \$34/sf (\$510K), Fire Clay (30+yr lifespan) - \$38/sf.(\$570K). Total square footage for crosswalk 15,000.

Mark Franz – Village Manager asks in terms of decorative crosswalks, what about doing the 6 prime crosswalks on Main Street and in key areas only. Commissioner Lindquist adds then we aren't treating the whole downtown as part of the project. Matthew Jones adds if you want to expand your tax base then you need to expand your downtown and consider use of decorative treatments throughout the downtown. The CIC saw value in both perspectives with continued analysis and discussion needed with the Village Board.

Civiltech presents the Planter Curb and Railing Designs (see attached presentation). Planter Curb material options: Granite & Cast in place concrete. Granite: Durable, classic, elegant aesthetic that communicates a feeling of permanence, low maintenance, expensive material - \$70/LF for a 6" curb. Concrete - Low cost - \$25/LF for a 6" curb, simple & functional, low maintenance, cracking can be hard to control, minimal aesthetic value, quality is dependent on installer's experience.

Commissioner Baldin adds something to think about if using granite; you should consider using standard size pieces when constructing the planters. It will be more cost effective than custom cut pieces. Alternative use of exposed aggregate curbs such as those utilized in Wheaton could also be considered.

Civiltech presents the 3 concepts for the Raised Seat Wall Planters (see attached presentation). Concept A - Window forms inspired by the Hotel Glen Ellyn, Concept B - Corner details inspired by the Civic Center, Concept C - Medallion details inspired the Civic Center. All options will be comfortable to sit on and very durable.

Civiltech asks if there are any questions or comments.

Chairman Lane states we should choose a planter design that gives the best opportunity for trees to thrive.

Commissioner Neurauter adds we should consider having uniformity within the entire downtown area.

Upon completion of the presentation, Kristen Kalitowski asks the CIC which material option they prefer. The CIC likes the Fire Clay Brick Paver Option A. Commissioner Baldin adds that Option C is creative but may be too busy. The pattern could also be interrupted by streetscape elements. Baldin suggests the design team also consider a basketweave pattern. The CIC asks the public for their comment. The public likes the Fire Clay Paver material.

Katie Crudele, (Zoning Board of Appeals) – likes the good, better, best option approach. If you had to cut costs, exposed aggregate would be a better option than plain concrete.

Commissioner Neurauter motions for a recommendation to mock up Fire Clay Brick Paver Options A & B, and Exposed Aggregate material. Commissioner Szymanski seconds the motion.

MOVE TO RECOMMEND MOCKUPS OF FIRECLAY BRICK PAVER OPTIONS A & B AND EXPOSED AGGREGATE MATERIAL

RESULT: Unanimous

MOVER: Commissioner Neurauter

SECONDER: Commissioner Szymanski

Chairman Lane adds Main Street needs to be done right. If costs need to be cut, don't cut Main Street.

Commissioner Szymanski adds we are giving you a license to prioritize Main Street and scale back on other areas if need be as well as framing the downtown. You will have a family of items to use throughout the downtown area.

Civiltech presents Historic Plaques. These plaques will fit into any design and it will set the downtown apart from others. The CIC likes incorporating historic plaques into the plan.

Commissioner Baldin asks about Place making items and gateways. Hutchinson reports that the 2013 plan included ideas of this for GE brand identity. These are items that would be considered instagrammable. Items such as fire features, festoon lighting that creates a ceiling and nice ambiance as well as flex street concepts. Flex street concepts are where the sidewalk and street are at the same level. It gives more pedestrian space. They have a curbless design and are great for special events and closing off streets.

Commissioner Baldin adds flex streets will be more money but would be worth studying. Engineer Daubert states we will look into but notes that Main Street, where the design may be contemplated, is a Federal Aid Route and that the design will require IDOT approval. One of the concerns will be associated with safety and the use of angled parking with the curbless design may not be acceptable. Civiltech adds we love the flex street concept but it is very expensive to do.

Mark Franz – Village Manager, adds we've had meetings about needing a spot for event space. We have a business community that does not necessarily want to close off streets. Perhaps we can do this at a different location in Glen Ellyn.

The CIC thanks Civiltech for tonight's presentation.

E. TRUSTEE'S REPORT – Trustee Thompson reports the parking garage design has been passed by the Village Board.

F. OTHER BUSINESS – None

G. PUBLIC WORKS REPORT – No report.

H. PROJECT REPORT – See attached report.

I. Adjournment & Next Meeting – Commissioner Szymanski motions and Commissioner Neurauter seconds to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 9:47 p.m.

The next CIC meeting is scheduled for April 14, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.

Submitted by Elisa Pollina, Recording Secretary

Reviewed by Richard Daubert, Professional Engineer