



**NAPERVILLE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD
MINUTES OF DECEMBER 1, 2012**

Call to Order

8:00 a.m.

A. Roll Call

Present: Benson, DiGiovine-Gehrs, Floegel, McIntosh, Polites, Preissig, Chairman
Wencel
Student Representatives: Lundy, Samuels

Absent: Amberg, Collins, Nye

Staff Present: Project Manager Jennifer Louden, Sergeant Lee Martin, Sergeant Al Trotsky

B. Minutes

Approve the minutes from the November 3, 2012 Transportation Advisory Board meeting.

Motion to approve.

Motion by: Benson

Second by: Floegel

Approved, 6-0

Wencel abstained, not present for the November 3, 2012 meeting.

C. Public Forum N/A

D. Old Business N/A

E. Public Hearings N/A

F. Reports and Recommendations

F1. City Council Report

Polites noted there were no transportation-related items on the November 5, 2012 City Council agenda.

F2. Police Department Report

Sergeant Martin introduced Sergeant Trotsky and informed the board that Sergeant Trotsky will represent the Police Department at Transportation Advisory Board meetings going forward.

F3. Washington Street Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study

Project Manager Jennifer Louden presented the feasibility study, including an overview of the project purpose, process, and alternatives being considered.

Public Testimony:

Kevin Clifford, 56 Rock River Court

- The existing bridge is dangerous; focus of the project needs to be on safety, with access to the park and DuPage River Trail to the north being second.

- Consideration should be given to providing a shared access for pedestrians and bicyclists, similar to other bridges on Bailey, Hobson and Gartner.

Tom Craighead, 2261 Remington Drive

- Project has been discussed by Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) for a decade.
- Important to provide a barrier between the pedestrian way and vehicle lanes; a wider width to accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists should be provided.
- This project will cause pedestrian and bicycle traffic to increase along Washington Street; consideration should be given to lowering the speed limit from the current 45 MPH.

Transportation Advisory Board Questions/Discussion:

Board Member Preissig

- Attended the public meeting for the project and it was very well attended; shows that good advertising was done for the meeting
- Asked why adding sidewalk on only one side of the bridge was eliminated as an option. Loudon responded that widening on both sides would not be that much more challenging than widening on one side and this provided a balanced look at the alternatives.
- Noted that residents want this done as soon as possible and asked what can be done to shorten the schedule. Loudon responded that the schedule allows for uncertainty in obtaining grant funding. The project is in the Capital Improvement Program, however currently only this feasibility study is funded. Staff could have discussions on balancing priorities to determine if this project could be recommended for local funding, however at this time a conservative timeframe is estimated for this project because grant funding will be sought.

Board Member Floegel

- Stated that the project is a great idea.
- Asked which option would allow pedestrian traffic to be maintained if the roadway was under major rehabilitation. Loudon responded that a separate structure from the roadway bridge could potentially allow pedestrian traffic to be maintained while the roadway bridge is under heavy construction.

Board Member McIntosh

- Asked if any studies been done to determine if there are any gaps on Washington Street and if the bridge is only constructed on one side, how people will get across. Loudon responded that if a bridge is constructed on only the northeast side, that a gap would exist on the other side and that people would have to travel south to Washington and Naper to cross the roadway.
- Asked if the widening of the bridge included barriers, would people feel safe. Loudon responded that the public comments received indicated that the barriers would be needed for people to feel comfortable walking along the sidewalk on the widened roadway.
- Asked if counts of people's opinions were taken. Loudon responded that written comments were received by 19 people. Ten preferred Alternative 1, widening the bridge to provide sidewalk on both sides (53%), seven

people preferred Alternative 2, providing a separate structure (37%) and two had no preference and would be satisfied with either (10%).

- Asked if the Washington Street bridge would ever need to be widened to six lanes. Louden responded that widening of Washington Street is not expected nor included in the City's Roadway Improvement Program.

Board Member Polites

- Stated that the project should be done as soon as funding allows.
- Asked why the option of providing a separate structure removed from the roadway bridge was not being considered. Louden responded that this was eliminated because it would be more useful for recreation and not meet the transportation goals of the project, therefore people would still cross along the roadway. In addition, the parks that it would connect are passive and the Park District does not have plans to pave the trails in the parks.

Board Member Benson

- Asked if the barriers along the proposed sidewalk would be similar to what was installed at Jefferson Avenue when the bridge was replaced. Louden responded that this is similar to what would be considered for the Washington Street bridge.
- Asked if maintenance of the bridge is planned for the near future. Louden responded that the bridge is in good condition, as indicated by the most recent inspection. Major repairs or replacement of the bridge are not currently programmed in the City's capital plan.
- Stated that it is important to have sidewalk on both sides of the bridge. Continuous sidewalk on the southwest side would provide a full connection to the DuPage River Sports Complex.

Board Member DiGiovine-Gehrs

- Asked if there have been any studies to indicate which would be a safer alternative based on the speed of the roadway. Louden responded that either accommodation would be equally safe, it would depend on people's comfort level. Comments received indicated that people want some type of physical separation whether barriers or a separate structure.
- Stated that the project needs to be done, with sidewalk on both sides.

Student Representative Lundy

- Asked if the bridge was widened on both sides, could the northeast side widening be multi-use width. Louden responded that it could be considered and that additional evaluation is needed to determine if that is feasible and if so what the width could be.

Student Representative Samuels

- Asked if providing a separate structure on one side and providing sidewalk on the other side at a later date, will work to the substructure be required. Louden noted that widening on any side of the bridge would require work to the substructure. Providing a separate structure would not require work to the roadway bridge.

Chairman Wencel

- Stated that the project should be done.
- Stated that a good connection needs to be provided for the residents to the north and east going up Naper Boulevard; these neighborhoods do not have a good connection to the bike path and therefore downtown now.

- Asked if six feet on either side would constitute a shared-use. Louden responded that it would not because the six feet on either side of the road would still serve two-way traffic and therefore wouldn't meet the intent of a shared-use width to accommodate both pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Asked if a 12-foot path is built on the northeast side, would it be a feeder into the DuPage River Trail or be considered the path itself? Louden responded that it would not be considered an extension of the DuPage River Trail. If the separate structure is provided, because sidewalk is provided to the south of the bridge, the City would have to evaluate where it would make sense to widen out to a shared-use width. The Bicycle Implementation Plan does not include a path along Washington Street because the DuPage River Trail serves the bicycle needs in this location. The City would likely not extend the path all the way to Naper. Wencel further noted that if a bridge is provided it would need to be made clear that bicyclists cannot take that path or sidewalk on a bicycle all the way to Naper
- Stated that a separate structure upstream would serve residents north and east because they could travel through the park instead of coming down all the way to Naper and Washington.
- Asked how the trail through the park would be maintained in winter. Louden responded that the Park District removes snow from only half of the trail and leaves the rest covered for cross-country skiing. In addition, the trails are not the top priority for snow clearing; programmed facilities are addressed first. The Park District wishes to keep the park passive and not pave the trails.
- Stated that separation between the pedestrian way and roadway is necessary, particularly due to the angle in the roadway.
- Stated that it is important to provide accommodations on both sides of the roadway. Assumes there is more pedestrian traffic on the northeast side, therefore if one side has to be done first this side should be the focus. Louden agreed that there is more pedestrian traffic generated by the northeast side.

Continue the Washington Street Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study to the February 2, 2013 Transportation Advisory Board meeting.

Motion by: Polites

Approved, 7-0

Seconded by: Benson

G. Correspondence

G1. Open House: Washington Street Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility Study

- Louden provided a summary of the correspondence item; no TAB discussion.

G2. Overnight Parking Enforcement

- Benson requested data on enforcement efforts going forward. Benson inquired how exemptions will be permitted and what information will be required from residents requesting exemptions. Sergeant Martin responded that police department staff will have a real-time database to track exemption requests and residents will have to provide the license plate number for the vehicle.

G3. Canadian National (CN) Railroad Quiet Zone for Northern Naperville

- Wencel asked if the at-grade crossings of the Illinois Prairie Path have been addressed. Louden responded that they have.

G4. All-way Stop Policy and Naperville Heights Cut-Through Traffic

- Wencel asked if the All-Way Stop Warrant worksheet is used for all requests in order to have consistent evaluation. Louden responded that this worksheet is used for all requests whether stand-alone or part of a larger study such as Naperville Heights.
- Wencel noted that the memo also speaks to the issue that all-way stops are not effective in uses that they are not intended for such as speed control. Louden responded that is correct; stop controls are only used to assign right-of-way.

H. New Business

H1. Forthcoming City Council Meeting Summaries

- December 4 - Preissig
- December 18 – Wencel
- January 15 – Amberg
- February 5 – Benson

I. Adjournment

Motion by: McIntosh
Seconded by: Floegel

8:50 a.m.