



MINUTES

President and Board of Trustees
Village of Arlington Heights
Committee-of-the-Whole
Board Room
Arlington Heights Village Hall
33 S. Arlington Heights Road
Arlington Heights, IL 60005
August 12, 2024
7:00 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. ROLL CALL

President Hayes and the following Trustees responded to roll: LaBedz, Tinaglia, Schwingbeck, Bertucci, Shirley, Baldino, Dunnington, and Grasse.

Also present were: Randy Recklaus, Cris Papierniak, Briget Schwab and Becky Hume.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposed Windsor Drive Road Diet & Resurfacing Update

Mr. Recklaus said the proposed Windsor Drive Road Diet was presented to the Board in March. After some questions from the Board and residents, more research was done with follow ups sent to the Board in April and May. Stakeholder interviews, online surveys and an existing condition report were conducted.

Briget Schwab, Village Senior Civil Engineer, summarized the history of the project as part of the Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan going back to 2013. Public meetings were held in April of 2017 through September 2017, after which the Plan was adopted by the Village Board. Some of the Windsor Rd. Diet project was identified in the Bike Plan and it was noted as a high priority project by the Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission in July of 2019. The Village Board set strategic goals to pursue projects that improve walkability and enhance life friendly initiatives. Staff then went to the Bicycle & Pedestrian Commission and in October 2019 the Commission made a

recommendation for Village Staff to pursue Phase I funding for it in the 2021 Budget. In 2022 the Board approved an application to cover the 20% local match for the Illinois Technical Enhancement Program Grant, which we successfully received. Later, we found out this project, along with the resurfacing project, was awarded funding.

Ms. Schwab showed mapping of the current bike route framework and how the Windsor path would connect to it. Staff used Strava data as part of its planning efforts for the bike plan which showed that it was heavily used by cyclists. The Community Survey also showed that there was a lot of public interest this. In the online survey, residents said they want to see bikes here, but many said they can't travel here because of the Palatine Road hazard. The Village was denied Bike Friendly status, and one of the biggest takeaways from that application process was that we don't have a way to get across Palatine Rd. safely. That's why this was a high priority project for the Bike Commission.

Most recently the Village received a \$480,000 Community Congressional Spending grant to pursue a ComEd bike path connection that has been in the Plan since the 1996 version. This is the closest we've ever been to actually building it so this corridor would be a direct connection to a regional bike connection. This connection allows cyclists to get all the way from Mount Prospect to Deer Grove.

Future traffic projections do not support a four-lane highway on Windsor. Traffic counts of 20 - 25,000 vehicles require four lanes. Windsor is well below that threshold. Historically, minutes from a Finance Committee meeting in 1988 estimated traffic to grow on Windsor exponentially. At that time, the traffic count was 9,100 vehicles per day, there's been a very slight increase since then to 10,000. From this data, those traffic projections were not supported. People noted in the Community Survey that they want to get to Lake Arlington, but don't want to cross Palatine Rd.

Ms. Schwab described the lane tapering, the left-hand turn lane and the queuing at Rosehill Dr. The lanes will taper just north of Rosehill Dr. She said staff looked at other roadways that taper down from 4 lanes. Data was gathered on Euclid Ave. and Kensington Rd. Euclid had no major crashes caused by the taper. There was a total of 82 accidents along the entire corridor and there were only four crashes related to merging in four years. Those accidents were minor there was no major injuries or damages reported. Kensington didn't have anything notable related to merging either.

The Board asked staff to look at the potential option for a shared use path. The way the project is being proposed, that would create a wider sidewalk, not a design for bikes. If it's going to be a shared use path, we would have to provide cross section design data for the horizontal and vertical alignment and there are many other steps that we would have to go through in order to make that happen without including the road changes. The current sidewalk would have to be widened to the full 8 feet. This idea would mean the loss of the Valley Lane upgrade and a turn lane. The Village would add 12 months to

the project timeline. The Village would not be able to keep the funding, but we could reapply for the ITEP grant for a shared use path. That application is due September 30th if we change the scope. Right now, a grant is paying for Phase II but the Village would have to pay for it if we changed the plan in order to keep the STP money, as we have to stay on the timeline for that funding.

Ms. Schwab presented the five options staff developed:

Option #1 – Proceed with submitting the PDR to IDOT that reduces the number of vehicular lanes from four to two to provide on-street bicycle lanes, and have Staff begin the selection process for Phase II and Phase III consultants. Estimated construction is late 2026 or early 2027. Total estimated total cost of the project for Option #1 for all phases is around \$4,600,000. Village total participation is estimated near \$900,000.

Option #2 – Eliminate the road diet specific elements of the proposed project. Leave Windsor Drive a four-lane roadway, with no dedicated on-street bicycle facilities, but provide a consistent 8-foot shared-use path on both sides of Windsor Rd. This option does not include a west leg crossing at Palatine Rd or RRFBs at Crabtree Dr and Suffield Dr. We would have to rescind the ITEP and TAP-L grants and approve Supplement # 4 in the amount of \$130,914 to complete the necessary Phase I work efforts for the off-street shared-use paths on the east and west side of Windsor Dr, and Phase II would be all locally funded. Staff would seek new grant funding, with consultant assistance, for the construction costs of the shared use path. Construction could start in late 2027 or early 2028, but that schedule is dependent on the additional Phase I approval timeline. Total estimated total cost of the project for Option #2 for all phases is roughly \$4,300,000. Village total participation would be \$1,400,000, if the Village has a successful ITEP application, or approximately \$2,800,000 if the Village does not receive ITEP funds.

Option #3 – Maintain the existing cross section with no road diet elements, but still include the west leg pedestrian crossing at Palatine Rd and the RRFBs at Crabtree Dr and Suffield Dr. This option leaves Windsor Drive a four-lane roadway, maintains the existing variable width (five to eight feet) sidewalk, and does not include on-road or off-road bicycle accommodations. Staff would proceed with resurfacing, ADA ramp improvements as outlined in the STP grant application, and pursue the design and installation of the west leg pedestrian crossing at Palatine Rd and the RRFBs at Crabtree Dr and Suffield Dr. Due to the project scope change, we would have to rescind the ITEP and TAP-L grants. Some additional Phase I funding may be needed to adjust the Project Development Report, and Phase II would be all locally funded. Construction would start in late 2027 or early 2028, but that schedule is dependent on the additional Phase I approval timeline. Total estimated total cost of the project for Option #3 all phases is roughly \$3,000,000 Village total participation is estimated at around \$1,500,000.

Option #4 – Is a hybrid and would eliminate the road diet specific elements

of the proposed project. It leaves Windsor Drive a four-lane roadway, with no dedicated on-street bicycle facilities, but provides a consistent 8-foot shared-use path on both sides of Windsor Rd. It would also include the west leg pedestrian crossing at Palatine Rd and the RRFBs at Crabtree Dr and Suffield Dr. The Village would need to rescind the ITEP and TAP-L grants and approve Supplement # 4 in the amount of \$130,914 to complete the necessary Phase I work efforts for the off-street shared-use paths on the east and west side of Windsor Dr, and Phase II would be all locally funded. Staff could seek new grant funding, with consultant assistance, for the construction costs of the shared use path. Construction could start late in 2027 or early 2028, but that schedule is dependent on the additional Phase I approval timeline. Total estimated total cost of the project for Option #4 for all phases is roughly \$4,600,000. Village total participation would be \$1,500,000, if the Village has a successful ITEP application, or approximately \$3,200,000 if the Village does not receive ITEP funds.

Option #5 - Staff proceeds with resurfacing and existing ADA ramp improvements only, as outlined in the STP grant application. This option would not include on-road or off-road dedicated bicycle facilities. There would be no west leg of Palatine pedestrian crossing and RRFBs would not be installed at Crabtree Dr. and Suffield Dr. The Village would need to rescind the ITEP and TAP-L grants, and approve local funds in Phase II. Estimated construction is late 2026 or early 2027. Total estimated total cost of the project for Option #5 for all phases is around \$2,200,000. Village total participation is estimated at near \$700,000.

Mr. Recklaus said the road was widened in anticipation of a traffic increase in the late 80's related to what the retail world was doing. The traffic patterns that were anticipated never really materialized. We're not seeing a fundamentally different amount of traffic now than what we saw prior to the widening being done. The big news is that we got the grant to facilitate the ComEd bike path which is going to be a significant bike path for the region and it is immediately adjacent to this property. Staff thinks that helps make this project a little bit more compelling, but we know that there are tradeoffs and considerations.

President Hayes asked if the \$480,000 for the ComEd path was contingent on the Windsor Road project. The answer was no. A deadline may exist for building the path, and Ms. Schwab said she will report back on that. President Hayes asked if under Option #2 where there was a shared pathway, would that be delineated between pedestrians and bicyclists. Ms. Schwab said that striping has not been planned right now, but could be looked at in Phase II. We are just looking at it as a wider sidewalk. Mr. Recklaus said it is designed as a shared wider sidewalk. President Hayes noted that Option #1 separates bicyclists and pedestrians for safety purposes, he likes the separation.

Trustee Tinaglia asked if we do this exactly as you propose, and it doesn't work out like we expected, would we have to rebuild the road, or could we just restripe it? Ms. Schwab said it could be restriped except for the raised

medians and the pedestrian refuge islands. Those would have to be taken out to put it back to a four-lane road. The signal at Valley Lane would have to be redone too.

Trustee Shirley asked for clarity on the curbs. The curbs of the road are not changing. The striping and crosswalk are the changes at Palatine Road. He said he didn't think it would become safer for people getting to Lake Arlington. Palatine Road is eight lanes and it's intimidating for good reason. He is struggling to see how the bikers are going to be safer crossing Palatine Rd. Ms. Schwab explained that as a driver you're alerted that there's a biker potentially around you because of the striping which changes your thoughts when you're driving. You most likely would go slower and proceed more cautiously. There will be an enhanced crosswalk which alerts the driver that there are other users in this walkway.

Trustee Shirley asked if the path along the parkway would preclude bikers, because he didn't think families and children would use the street bike lanes. He saw the bike lanes for professional bikers. No responsible person would put their family on the street, he thinks this project caters to a very slim group of people who are professional bikers. With the two lanes now, they already have safe passage.

Trustee LaBedz asked for more information on the pedestrian refuges at the crosswalks. Ms. Schwab said a pedestrian space in the median would be cut out so if you're a pedestrian and started to move across, and there were cars coming in the other direction, you could make it halfway across the road. Trustee LaBedz said she liked the idea of having some dedicated bike lanes, shared lanes are a problem. She believes it enhances safety. There are a variety of types of bikers that would use this.

Trustee Bertucci said crossing Palatine Road is an issue. He liked the addition of an extra signaled crosswalk on the west leg of Palatine that options #1, #3 and #4 have.

Trustee Dunnington said she was in support of Option #1 as it follows the Complete Streets Plan which makes our roadway safer for everyone and offers the most from a financial perspective. She said the Village would get the greatest number of improvements in the area and actually costs \$900,000 whereas in Options #2, #3 and #4 the Village would be spending a lot more money. The only one that is less is Option #5 but that doesn't give us the improvement on Palatine Rd. She said staff showed that the traffic volume isn't there on Windsor, so it makes sense to decrease the lanes, and we know that by decreasing the lanes it's also going to make the traffic calmer. At the March meeting people said there was a lot of excess speeding, so this is going to calm the traffic and lower the speed on that road. It's the best option for the environment and meets the Board's strategic priority for more biking paths.

Trustee Baldino asked about the Strava data which indicated how much bicycle traffic we have in this area. He didn't really get a sense of which

streets the bicycles were using, is it the cross streets or are they actually using Windsor? Ms. Schwab said the data indicated that and Windsor Road was where many people were going, via Dryden and Douglas.

Trustee Baldino said he was struggling with how much is this bike lane was going to get used. He was curious if there's any information that indicates this is a main thoroughfare for the professional bike riders. He didn't think it made sense that kids and families who are going to Lake Arlington are going to use it. He said he was undecided. What is the problem we are trying to solve? Mr. Recklaus said there aren't a lot of places people can ride their bikes safely. The space needs to exist in order for people to use it. The recommendation is being made not based solely on current bike traffic, it's out of anticipation of there's going to be more. More people are interested in these bike friendly areas. Trustee Baldino said he would not be in favor of any option include doesn't include enhanced bicycle access. Whether that's widened sidewalks for shared use, because most of the traffic is small kids and families, or if there's a lot of dedicated cyclists that want to use this passage. That's his struggle.

Trustee Schwingbeck asked if is it just striping that is separates the bikes from the cars. The answer was yes, there's no raised pavement. He said he gets concerned riding a bike or running up to Lake Arlington with cars right next to him. He said he didn't see a lot of road bikes here like you do at Busse Woods. He said he sees more people using the sidewalk. The ComEd path could potentially add to the bike traffic. If there's going to be a bike path that people can connect with from Lake Arlington, then it might be an "if we build it, they will come" situation. The road diet seems to improve safety. Options #2, #3 and #4 don't gain us a whole lot but add a tremendous amount of cost to what we would have to pay. He said he was focusing on #1 and #5. He doesn't like getting cars that close together because drivers don't pay attention to bikers.

Trustee Schwingbeck asked if we could do a test for a period of time to see the impact of the backups on Windsor turning onto Palatine. Cris Papierniak, Director of Public Works, said it is something we could do. The traffic modeling is clear that we are not close to the volume for 4 lanes. It's clear that cars go slower with fewer lanes and you get less cars through when you go slower which will cause back up, but it's not because of the volume. Since we are not changing the curbs, it could be resurfaced.

Trustee Grasse said she trusts the traffic research and data. There was probably not as large a community of people who biked in the 1980's. Our world is changing and she really appreciated the ways that the Board is trying to adapt with their strategic priorities. She said the recent Village surveys show increased public desire for pedestrian and bicycle accessibility.

Trustee Bertucci asked for more clarification on how the bikes and cars merge approaching Palatine Road. Ms. Schwab explained how the bike lanes flow to in-between the right turn lane and the through lane. This is so cars turning right (drivers looking left for traffic) will not hit cyclists on their

right-hand side. It is a design requirement, is best practice in the industry, and approved by IDOT. We would forgo some grant funding if we did not do it this way. Signs will be looked at in Phase II. Trustee Bertucci warned that many people will not know what the green markings mean. He said it reminds him of the crisscross of the I-90 merge at Cumberland which he thought was dangerous.

Trustee Shirley questioned the safety difference between #1 and #4. Ms. Schwab said #1 is safer for road bikes because you are providing a space for them. They are traveling at a higher rate of speed than pedestrians making it complicated on a shared sidewalk. The design recommendation is to be on the street because of drivers backing out of their driveways. Drivers don't anticipate bikes on the sidewalk, but do look for traffic on the street. The impact factor of the driveways is a serious issue for the cyclists.

The following residents spoke in support of the project: Richard Lenski, Jurgen Juffa, Michael Scheffler, Anne Marie Lundstrom, Brian Larson, and Gabriel Nagy. These residents noted the reduction in traffic speed, safety, better access, and getting bikes off the sidewalk.

The following residents spoke against the project: Alan Kaminsky, Donna Campobasso, Rich Brunner, Brian Chicoine, Herb Stefan, Kelly O'Neil, Jon Raslawski, Dave Wunderle, Barbara Whiteside, Karen Doran, Carl Nito, Joy Alberti, Jack Morrissey and Ray Geise. These residents were concerned about: the traffic back up blocking Rosehill Drive, increased traffic, truck traffic, skate boards and electric scooters on the path, driver insensitivity to cyclists, delivery trucks blocking the roadway, and the safety of bikes on the streets.

Trustee Tinaglia said the biggest disaster is that we have this massive highway which runs right through the middle of our community making it really hard for anybody to get across. So now you throw in the idea that maybe it's a good idea to move forward with a society that wants to do more than just drive cars. We want to bike and have a safe way to do it. This is not about family biking, everyone in this room understands this is about bikers riding at faster rates. These are serious focused bikers that are not on a casual ride. We want to have a space for them somewhere so they can move in that fashion separate from the moms and dads who are pushing the strollers on the sidewalks. This is a pathway to connect riders up further to continue on their trek. Commingled uses are unsafe. How can residents make that left hand turn from the subdivision if they're aren't two lanes anymore? He said he was completely unsure of the way forward. Is this the right place? What's going to happen with the truck stop up north? How are these folks that live in this neighborhood actually get in and out to work every day? He said he could not vote on this when there is too much at stake.

Trustee Shirley said he didn't support Option #1, but supports option #4 because it offers quite a bit of safety features that are necessary when it comes to crossings and pedestrian movements. Improving the left leg of Palatine Rd. makes good sense. The two legs each direction affords the

professional bikers plenty of safety to be on the pavement next to the curb. It's still within the keeping of the strategic goals and meets some of the goals of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Commission.

President Hayes said he supports Option #1 for all the reasons that the staff has enumerated in terms of the Strategic Plan and the recommendation of the Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission. He sees the safety reasons as one of the primary benefits from this is the traffic calming. He also sees the benefit of reducing the number of lanes in order to reduce speeds on Windsor Dr. There will be a benefit to for safety for bicyclists and pedestrians as well because they will not be commingled.

Trustee Dunnington moved to direct staff to pursue Option #1 and to proceed with submitting the Project Development Report to IDOT that reduces the number of vehicular lanes from four to two to provide on-street bicycle lanes, including the addition of the rectangular rapid flashing beacon at Suffield Dr., and have staff begin the selection process for Phase II and Phase III consultants, for an estimated total cost of \$4,600,000 for all phases of Option No.1 with the Village total participation estimated near \$900,000. Trustee Grasse seconded the motion.

Trustee Schwingbeck said without truly understanding how it's going to affect this neighborhood he couldn't support Option #1. There are a lot of good reasons to support Option #4, if we could get that ITP grant because he wouldn't want to spend \$3.2 million.

Trustee Bertucci said he agreed with Trustees Tinaglia and Schwingbeck. He does not like the bikes crisscrossing with cars and coming into the street. He's seen some of those drivers on Rosehill trying to get onto Windsor and doesn't think the situation is being accounted for. He will vote against Option #1. He would like further study of the situation to develop a better option.

Trustee Grasse said there is one unifying theme, and that is the need for safety for the bikers, walkers and drivers. She said she heard it's hard to maneuver getting out of the streets even without this. She suggested the Village can look into solving that issue. Regardless of which Option is chosen, it sounds like there's a problem. She said she supports Option #1 because of the safety factors. She has seen other areas where there has been a road diet and it has a calming effect. It will make it easier crossing to Windsor with the diet. She said she supports increased pedestrian and bicycle pathways saying our world is changing. She said she believed the data of the traffic engineers regarding the location of the bike path crossing. For children, it's best to use the sidewalk. She said she trusts staff to figure out a response that can help with the egress issue at Rosehill.

Trustee LaBedz said she supports Option #1. She thinks, although difficult, this is a good change. The fact that young families and children can still ride on the sidewalk is helpful. As a pedestrian and one who lives in an area where there's a lot of sidewalks and near the downtown, a lot of people ride bikes on the sidewalks. It doesn't exactly make it easier for pedestrians. She

thinks this is a good proposal and would like to see it happen. She realizes there'll be people are shaking their heads and saying no but that's what they said about a lot of stuff that's happened here in Arlington Heights.

President Hayes called for the vote to be taken.

Ayes: Dunnington, LaBedz, Baldino, Grasse, Hayes
Nays: Tinaglia, Schwingbeck, Bertucci, Shirley

The motion: Passed

President Hayes recognized those in the audience who were dismayed by the outcome, and thanked staff for their hard work.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Melissa Cayer asked for the light at International Plaza be deactivated as the Plaza has been demolished. She also said there is a similar bike lane as was discussed this evening on Central Road near Oakton Community College that works very well.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Trustee LaBedz moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:24 p.m. Trustee Baldino Seconded the motion. The motion passed and the meeting was adjourned.

Becky Hume
Village Clerk