

Minutes
Village of Glen Ellyn Board of Trustees
Workshop Meeting
September 16, 2013

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by President Demos.

Present: President Alex Demos; Trustees Clark, Ladesic, McGinley (arrived at 7:54 p.m.) and O'Shea. Village Clerk Galvin, Village Attorney Mathews. Staff present: Village Manager Franz (arrived at 7:06 p.m.), Assistant Village Manager Stonistsch, Police Chief Norton, Finance Director Wachtel, Professional Engineer Minix, Glen Ellyn Volunteer Fire Company Chief Bodony and First Assistant Fire Chief Chris Clark.

Trustees Elliott and Friedberg were excused.

Agenda Item 4 - Lenox/Linden Improvements Project – Professional Engineer Minix

SUMMARY

Various design issues associated with the pending roadway improvements project on Lenox and Linden near Lake Ellyn Park have been considered by the Capital Improvements Commission in 2013. The crux of the issues are twofold: First, parking on Lenox Road north of Hawthorne is consistently and heavily used throughout the year by park users and high school students; should the roadway and parking configuration be modified to promote easier travel through the corridor and, if so, to what extent? Second, what should be the coverage of new sidewalk on the east side of Lenox and the south side of Linden? The CIC recommendations include widening Lenox Road between Hawthorne and Essex by 3 feet and maintaining parallel parking; new sidewalk on the east side of Lenox (favoring a curbside alignment) in Lake Ellyn Park; no new sidewalk on the east side of Lenox between Essex and Oak; and new sidewalk on the south side of Linden between Main and Lenox (again favoring the curb side of the parkway).

ISSUES

Rehabilitation of Lenox between Hawthorne and Oak and Linden between Main and Lenox is scheduled for construction in 2014 as part of the newly expanded Chidester-Elm-Lenox-Linden (CELL) project. The project design engineers are RHMG Engineers of Mundelein. The consultant began work on the Lenox and Linden corridors in the fall of 2012.

The proposed Lenox-Linden project provides an opportunity for installation of additional improvements such as new sidewalk as well as an examination of modifications to the existing parking configuration adjacent to Lake Ellyn Park, owned and managed by the Glen Ellyn Park District. The timing of the roadway project designs overlaps the development of a new Lake Ellyn Park master plan and the Park District team has provided direct, timely and definitive input into the Lenox Road design process. Project issues of significance include the proposed roadway width on Lenox; parking configuration on Lenox, particularly adjacent to Lake Ellyn Park; and new sidewalk on the east side of Lenox Road and the south side of Linden Street. Various additional design elements or considerations include materials of construction, stormwater management, traffic calming, utility undergrounding, sidewalk connections and street lighting.

Earlier this year, the Capital Improvements Commission conducted a sequence of meetings focusing on various design issues associated with Lenox and Linden and developed a series of recommendations. The purpose of this memorandum is to present the CIC recommendations with associated background information and summary of commissioner discussions for each.

BACKGROUND

The proposed project scope of work includes reconstruction of Lenox with the removal and replacement of the entire road cross-section and enhanced resurfacing of Linden featuring new curb and gutter, new driveway approaches and new asphalt surface on top of the existing roadway base. The existing roadway width on Lenox is 25 ft. from back-of-curb to back-of-curb. Parallel parking is permitted only on the east side of Lenox between Hawthorne and Essex with parking prohibited between 10:00 PM and 6:00 AM and limited to three hours on school days between 8:00

AM and 5:00 PM; north of Essex, parking is allowed on both sides of the street with no time-of-day restrictions. Linden is 21 ft. back-to-back with no parking allowed on the north side of the street between Forest and Lenox and on the south side of the street in a short mid-block segment between Park and Lenox. Parking in the entire corridor is also prohibited between 10:00 PM and 6:00 AM and limited to three hours on school days between 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM. Both roadways are designated as Snow Routes. There is no public sidewalk on the east side of Lenox between Hawthorne and Oak. On the south side of Linden there is no existing sidewalk except for a short stretch immediately east of Park.

Starting last year, the CIC discussed various aspects of the Lenox-Linden improvements project. The September and October 2012 and January 2013 meetings were substantially devoted to Lenox Road design issues. The commissioners reviewed preliminary Lenox Road layouts for parking and sidewalk. The Park District provided presentations at the September 2012 and January 2013 meetings. Interested residents also participated, appearing at all the meetings (including November 2012) to present various viewpoints and offer input. The CIC required three meetings – February, March and April 2013 – to work through the various issues and to develop and refine their recommendations.

In conjunction with the CIC, Village staff and consultants produced preliminary layouts of three possible Lenox Road roadway/parking alternatives including a parallel parking option with a street width of 28 ft. back-to-back; a 60 degree angle parking option adjacent to Lake Ellyn Park incorporating a pod concept and a street width of 21 ft. back-to-back in locations without parking stalls; and a 45 degree angle parking option, again with a pod concept and a street width of 21 ft. back-to-back in non-parking bay areas. The CIC recommendations for Lenox Road street configuration and new sidewalk between Essex and Oak were formulated in February 2013. New sidewalk plans were initially developed and assessed primarily at the March 2013 meeting, with CIC comments incorporated into modified sidewalk plans that formed the basis for the April 2013 sidewalk recommendations.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS COMMISSION FORMAL CONSIDERATIONS

At each of the February – April 2013 Capital Improvements Commission meetings, the commissioners heard a staff presentation on the various issues, asked questions and discussed project particulars with staff, took input from audience members and began deliberations. The approved minutes from the three CIC meetings where formal deliberations took place provide a detailed summary of the roadway and sidewalk discussions and citizen interactions from those evenings.

The **staff presentation** provided an overview and background on the issues and CIC process. To summarize, Public Works staff supported:

- ❑ Roadway improvements that improve two-way traffic flow on Lenox, particularly between Hawthorne and Linden, but does not diminish the parking inventory
- ❑ Sidewalk on the east side of Lenox between Hawthorne and Oak
- ❑ Sidewalk on the south side of Linden with the caveat that sidewalk benefits must be weighed against disruption to a corridor with short setbacks, mature trees and home-owner maintained landscaping areas in the parkways.
- ❑ Close adherence to the recommendations of the Glen Ellyn Park District where practicable and appropriate. Please note that staff does not categorically support each and every suggestion of the Park District, but essential compatibility with the Lake Ellyn Park master plan is very desirable.

Stakeholder comments included concerns regarding safety impacts of angle vs. parallel parking; lack of need to increase street width (“good to be narrow and slow”); need for traffic calming measures; pedestrian safety; little apparent support for new sidewalk; position of the sidewalk; negative impacts on landscaping, trees and drainage; and setbacks from existing homes (Linden sidewalk).

CIC deliberations resulted in the development of four parking / roadway and three sidewalk recommendations for the various corridors of Lenox and Linden, as well as an overall recommendation to postpone the rehabilitation of Lenox and Linden from the original 2013 timetable to 2014 instead.

CIC RECOMMENDATIONS / MOTIONS (all passed unanimously)

1. Lenox Roadway from Hawthorne to Linden (February 2013): **From Hawthorne to Linden, the width of the roadway be 28 ft. wide from back-of-curb to back-of-curb with parallel parking and using an asphalt paving surface**

The deliberations of the commissioners focused on the appropriate parking configuration and street width. The angle parking options were not favored by any of the commissioners, so a consensus to maintain the parallel parking on the east side of Lenox was readily achieved. A three-foot widening of the roadway was generally favored by the commissioners as a number of them mentioned that with the heavy parking load, the street felt very cramped and two-way travel significantly inhibited. The 28 ft. width would provide an 8 ft. parking lane and two 9 ft. travel lanes on the roadway.

2. Lenox and Linden Intersection (February 2013): **At the intersection with Linden, do not raise the pavement surface, but provide an alternate bid item for modular pavers in lieu of an asphalt paving surface**

In addition to the major issues of parking and street width, the commissioners deliberated the merits of various paving materials, traffic calming elements and decorative treatments. The intersection of Lenox and Linden was a focal point of these discussions that included possible installation of a speed table at the intersection as a traffic calming device; use of pervious pavers in the parking lane, for new sidewalks in the park or in the intersection for improved stormwater management; and providing an intersection treatment in pavers or some other form of stamped concrete or asphalt as a focal point / entry enhancement to Lake Ellyn Park. The CIC recommendation reflects support for an upgraded intersection treatment if fiscally prudent. There was no support for a traffic table at the intersection or the widespread use of pervious pavement materials for the whole or a portion of the roadway; hence the reference to the asphalt paving surface in many of the recommendations. It was felt that sidewalk material upgrades in Lake Ellyn Park should require Park District financial participation.

3. Lenox Roadway from Linden to Essex (February 2013): **From Linden to Essex, the width of the roadway be 28 ft. wide from back-of-curb to back-of-curb, with width adjustments at existing tree locations conforming to professional arborist recommendations, and parallel parking using an asphalt paving surface**

While it was noted that the parking load adjacent to Lake Ellyn Park was generally less on Lenox between Linden and Essex and that there was no compelling reason why the roadway width could not vary along the corridor, the commissioners nevertheless recommended widening in this section of the street. This section contains the most valuable of the parkway trees along the park, a grove of oaks and hardwoods about 200 ft. in length, which would be buffered by reducing the street width through that zone based on the recommendations of a certified arborist, with likely some loss of parking.

4. Lenox Roadway and Sidewalk from Essex to Oak (February 2013): **Between Essex and Oak, no change in roadway width and no new sidewalk installed on the east side of the roadway where none currently exists**

The engineering concept plan proposed for the section of Lenox between Essex and Oak offered a configuration of a reduced street width of 4 ft., with the former street area utilized for the installation of public sidewalk adjacent to the east curb. This alternative was developed in response to the degree of homeowner landscaping in the existing parkway, with the subsequent lack of a suitable corridor to install a new sidewalk. The commissioners struggled with this compromise configuration and ultimately decided against roadway narrowing and new sidewalk installation.

5. Lenox Sidewalk from Hawthorne to Essex (April 2013): **The revised configuration of the sidewalk on the east side of Lenox between Hawthorne and Essex as discussed at the April 9, 2013 meeting proceed to the next step of engineering for a 2014 project**
6. Linden Sidewalk from Main to Lenox (April 2013): **The revised configuration of the sidewalk on the south side of Linden between Main and Lenox as discussed at the April 9, 2013 meeting proceed to the next step of engineering for a 2014 project**

The March and April CIC meetings were devoted to the new sidewalk issues in the Lenox and Linden corridors that were not deliberated on during the February meeting. The March meeting included input from stakeholders and various discussions, resulting in direction to staff to make various alignment modifications to both the Lenox and Linden sidewalks so that the commission's intent on the proposed sidewalks could be clearly conveyed. The commissioners wished to maximize the utility of the Lake Ellyn Park / Lenox Road sidewalk for the benefit of parkers. The Linden sidewalk would serve as a useful conduit to a Lake Ellyn Park destination, but should be positioned to limit impacts on residents on the south side of the roadway. Revised drawings were prepared and presented at the April meeting; both the sidewalks on Lenox and Linden favor the curb as much as possible. The commissioners clearly favored the installation of new sidewalk in both corridors and approved the revised drawings as a blueprint for the ultimate layout of the sidewalk in the project design documents.

ACTION REQUESTED

The Village Board is requested to review the material included herein and consider the Capital Improvements Commission recommendations for the Lenox and Linden corridors. Area residents have been invited to appear at the September 16, 2013 workshop to provide direct input to the Board. Public Works staff will be present at the upcoming Board workshop to provide the lead-off presentation and to answer any questions. Members of the Capital Improvements Commission will be invited to attend to assist with the presentation and, of course, answer any questions.

Comments

Dave Harris, Executive Director, Glen Ellyn Park District approached the Board and stated he is not here to advocate for angled parking. Late summer 2012 the Village asked the Park District for suggestions at the same time the Park District was working on their Master Plan for Lake Ellyn Park. The Park District also attended Capital Improvements Commission Meetings. Director Harris stated they heard loud and clear that the residents want to reduce the speed of traffic on Lenox.

Director Harris expressed concerns about making the streets narrower, protecting mature trees while utilizing more effective and efficient parking. Director Harris expressed his concerns to the previous Village President, Board of Trustees and Capital Improvements Commission members. Director Harris further stated his respect for the process, his support of the

Capital Improvements Commission, public sentiment and the Park District advocates tree protection and sustainable water retention.

Director Harris added that specific materials are identified in the Lake Ellyn Master Plan such as permeable pavers. The Park District would consider paying the difference and possibly maintain if materials were used in accordance of Green Street Guidelines.

Trustee O'Shea expressed concerns regarding the safety of carriage sidewalks. Trustee O'Shea asked about a winding trail all the way around that meanders and is not straight. Craig R. Pryde, Capital Improvements Commission member responded this could conflict with the Park District and their design plans for Lake Ellyn Park. The Park District can always connect their trail system from the sidewalk.

Trustee O'Shea asked Director Harris how the CIC plan affects the Lake Ellyn Master Plan. Director Harris responded that the Park District would prefer a meandering path, but they are willing to compromise. Mr. Pryde also responded that the CIC does not disagree with the Lake Ellyn Master Plan.

Trustee Ladesic asked why the CIC backed off supporting angled parking on Lenox. Mr. Pryde responded it was a more aggressive plan for removing trees. Trustee Ladesic responded that he is open to the prospect of losing some trees in the efforts of safety.

Trustee O'Shea asked Police Chief Norton about safety issues and concerns. Chief Norton responded that they do not like islands, as they create an additional obstacle.

Village President Demos thanked Director Harris for his comments and remarked that this is an outstanding example of intergovernmental cooperation. Trustee O'Shea asked if Lenox Rd. would be striped. Engineer Minix responded that the road would not be striped.

President Demos asked if pavers would be used. Engineer Minix responded that pavers would be used, they need to be incorporated more and they add an aesthetic element. President Demos also asked if anyone was aware of plans to install a parking structure at Glenbard West High School at the lower lot. Village Manager Franz, Chief Norton and Engineer Minix were not aware of any plans.

Dr. Carolyn S. Oesterle, 645 Lake Rd., Glen Ellyn approached the Board and previously submitted comments to be entered into the minutes. Dr. Oesterle's statement is as follows:

"My name is Carolyn Oesterle. I live at 645 Lake Road and have lived there for 30 years. Both of my children graduated from Glenbard West. I have not been active in village issues until Oct when I learned about the plans for reconstructing Lenox road at a meeting of the Park District about Lake Ellyn Park. I walk in Lake Ellyn Park daily and care deeply about the park. My immediate reaction to the plans for widening Lenox and possibly putting in diagonal parking was that it was an unnecessary intrusion on park space and could make the road less safe by increasing speeds. Once green space is lost, it is lost forever. However, I talked with a commissioner on the CIC, Pat Brugh, and with Bob Minix who felt the road was congested at times. I felt I should study Lenox more thoroughly. I spent the next few weeks measuring road widths in Glen Ellyn near Lake Ellyn Park, near other parks, and the main residential streets that are through roads. I also observed the traffic and parking on Lenox and videotaped traffic at the beginning and end of the school day.

'Most purely residential roads in Glen Ellyn allow for parallel parking but are not wide enough to let two cars pass the parked car at the same time. This gives us the chance to exhibit Glen Ellyn manners as we wait to let a car pass

before we move forward down a residential road. This is life as usual in Glen Ellyn. It has the benefit of keeping speeds down on the residential roads. For two cars to pass a parked car takes about 24 feet—8 feet a car. As you can see from the chart (to be presented at the meeting), Lenox is one of the wider roads near Lake Ellyn Park. I measured the flat surface of the road which Bob Minix explained is called curb face to curb face. Lenox is 24 feet (25 ft back-of curb to back-of curb) and just wide enough to allow for two cars to pass a parked car at the same time. The cars must drive slowly, however. Driving slowly is a good thing especially near a park with children playing. Widening Lenox to 28 Ft would put in two unobstructed lanes so traffic can move freely by the parked cars. This will cause traffic to move much faster. Lenox is also near Glenbard West and the teenage students like to drive fast. Anything that encourages this, like a wider road, is not a good thing. Bob Minix, the Glen Ellyn civil engineer, told me that traffic tables (like extended speed bumps) used to slow traffic would not be put in because of snow plowing concerns. This means that the open, unobstructed lanes will encourage an increase in speed, especially with high school students. I spoke with Deputy William Holmer who stated that Lenox had not had serious accidents at its present width. Before we change a road configuration that has worked well, I think we need a very good reason.

I also measured other roads that are similar to Lenox. There is student parking on Park Row and Willis and they are the same width as Lenox—24 feet. Two cars can pass, but must go slowly. There is frequently a line of parked student cars on these two roads as there is at the south end of Lenox. This is a good configuration to keep traffic slow near a high school. I also measured roads around the other two nearby parks. Around Newton Park, there is no street parking except on Nicole Way which is very busy as a cut through road to Roosevelt. Newton Park has several parking lots. Sunset Park also has parking lots, but has street parking. Both Fairview Ave and Sunset have a lane painted for parallel parking. The spaces are 20 ft. by 8 ft. Fairview is a busy through street for east-west traffic. It is 27 ft. 6 inches wide if you count the parking lane. Sunset is a through street that goes from Roosevelt to Turner just west of the Main Street Recreation Center and Main Street and is much more heavily traveled than Lenox. It is 28 feet along Sunset Park to accommodate the parking lane. South of Sunset Park, Sunset narrows to 19 ft. 10 in. Both of these roads are different from Lenox which is not a through street at all and only a residential street next to a park. Lenox has much less traffic than Fairview or Sunset. It is not a through road and does not need to accommodate traffic in two unobstructed lanes which would increase traffic speed. However, Lenox is near Glenbard West High School and narrow lanes are beneficial to slow traffic. Based on the measurements of nearby roads and similar use roads, Lenox is really “Glen Ellyn Standard” width for a purely residential road that may have a row of parallel parked cars at times—24 feet to allow cars to pass slowly by a parked car.

There are special events in Glen Ellyn where many people come to the Lake Ellyn Park area. These include the Cardboard Boat Regatta, the Fourth of July fireworks, and Art Fair. At these times of heavy parking needs, Lenox is made one way, as are the other roads in the area. There is no need to widen Lenox for these times as the one way road takes care of most congestion and a wider road would make little difference.

If the Village Board decides to widen Lenox despite the above concerns and resident objections, I would like them to think of Lenox in two sections. South of Linden, there is high school parking and the road is used more heavily. Widening it one or two feet and keeping the parallel parking would be more than enough. North of Linden there is much less parking. There are also many trees in the north areas of the park close to the roadway. These trees would be at significant risk if the road is widened at all. There is absolutely no reason to consider widening Lenox north of Linden. It usually has few or no parked cars and is 24 feet wide--more than enough.

In summary, Lenox Road as it is now has worked well to allow adequate parking for Lake Ellyn Park with parallel parking and has worked well to keep speeds slow on the street with its 24 foot width. The majority of the year most

of the road has little traffic and little congestion. Lenox Road has also won awards as one of the most beautiful streets in DuPage County. A beautiful road should be cherished for its own sake. There is no need to widen Lenox.

Thank you for letting me present this and for your attention.”

Dr. Oesterle presented the Board a petition signed by 197 residents supporting her position.

Dan Hopkins, Superintendent of Parks and Planning, Glen Ellyn Park District stated they were currently in danger of losing 9 oak trees at Lake Ellyn Park, one more is so-so.

Ms. Eleanor Saliamonas, 626 Newton Ave., Glen Ellyn addressed the Board. Ms. Saliamonas has lived in Glen since 1969 and is against street widening since it increases a non-permeable area. Street widening should only be done when necessary as it can aggravate the flooding at Lake Ellyn. Ms. Saliamonas concluded her remarks by stating that the Trustees have listened before, she hopes they listen this time as well.

Ms. Gloria Shonkwiler, 646 N. Park Blvd., Glen Ellyn addressed the Board and stated her concerns about carriage sidewalk safety. Ms. Shonkwiler has lived in Glen Ellyn for 60+ years, over 25 years at her current address. This plan would personally affect her property and cause her to lose parking space in her driveway. Almost every tree on the parkway would be affected and she would lose an Oak tree, an Evergreen, some Maples and an American Hornbeam. Would these trees be replaced? If you take her trees, you take her landscaping; this will destroy the ambience and create a hardship for parking on her property. Part of her patio is on the parkway, which would be affected as well.

Trustee Ladesic asked for clarification regarding part of the patio being on the parkway. Ms. Shonkwiler stated it was that way when she purchased her home in 1988. Engineer Minix confirmed that this is a previous existing condition.

Mr. Reis Kayser, 721 Lenox R., Glen Ellyn, approached the Board. Mr. Kayser has lived on Lenox for over 30 years. He has attended meetings of the Park District and the CIC and has observed many compromises regarding this project. Mr. Kayser stated there is no benefit for a sidewalk on that side of Lenox. With snow you would not have a sidewalk available anyway, the overall value is minimal.

Ms. Christa Mannion, 715 Lenox Rd., Glen Ellyn addressed the Board. Ms. Mannion is a 21 year resident and lives near Mr. Kayser. She hopes the Board follows the CIC guidelines and leaves the width at 25 ft. Utilizing pavers at Linden and Lenox is a great idea but widening is totally unnecessary. Ms. Mannion expressed concern over loss of trees and green space.

Mr. Sergei Prokudik, 645 N. Main St. addressed the Board as a new resident who moved in 2 months ago. Mr. Prokudik was recently made aware of the issue and inquired about safety.

Engineer Minix stated they try to find corridors that least impact trees and they try to make alignments as straight as possible. Trustee McGinley asked how long he has been installing sidewalks. Engineer Minix responded 22 years. Trustee McGinley asked if there is data on damaged trees. Engineer Minix responded there is not a definitive study. Superintendent Hopkins, Glen Ellyn Park District commented that oaks, as a species do not like construction.

Ms. Shonkwiler responded in 1990 when Linden was last redone she lost a huge oak due to construction. Three years later Park Blvd. was redone and she lost another.

Ms. Donna Jennings, 725 Lenox Rd., Glen Ellyn addressed the Board. Ms. Jennings stated if you widen the road, than put up a Park District speed limit. Ms. Jennings added the more sidewalks, the fewer trees, the more problems with flooding and power outages. More money should be spent on power outages. Ms. Jennings also stated that she hopes the sewers are really big, we have some major floods.

Mr. David Rennard, 621 Linden St. addressed the Board. Mr. Rennard and his neighbors do not want street widening and sidewalks since this is not a main artery. An effective safety plan is already in place for busy events as it becomes one way and streets are closed. There are 182 school days a year; there is not a lot of foot traffic on Linden. A sidewalk will change the nature of the homes and trees, it will look more urban, it will have considerable cost and there is not a demonstrated need. This sidewalk will hurt the neighborhood.

Trustee McGinley inquired about the bushes on Mr. Rennard's property. Mr. Rennard responded that the bushes surrounding his property were the result of a 1993 Village channel project.

Mr. David Allen, 655 Oak St., Glen Ellyn addressed the Board. Mr. Allen expressed concern over the use of permeable pavers. Mr. Allen cited unevenness and buckling, cost and maintenance.

Ms. Kathy Cornell, 678 Forest, Glen Ellyn and current Commissioner, Glen Ellyn Park District addressed the Board. Ms. Cornell is a 35 year resident. Her primary interest is saving trees and creating more green space. Ms. Cornell suggested Lenox permanently be one way, northbound. The stop at Lenox and Linden would force drivers to maintain a slower speed. By making Lenox one way, it would create green space, protect trees and cost less.

Manager Franz asked if Ms. Cornell if this was discussed at any of the Lake Ellyn Master Plan meetings. Ms. Cornell responded it was discussed but there was no interest.

Mr. Chris Murtaugh, 660 Lenox, Glen Ellyn addressed the Board. Mr. Murtaugh stated there is a heavy burden on those who want street widening and sidewalks to prove to those who do not want it of the need. Mr. Murtaugh has lived on Lenox since 1985. If you want this change, show why it is absolutely necessary, he does not believe that the case has been made yet.

Engineer Minix concluded his presentation by stating staff is looking for direction from the Board for this proposed 2014 project. President Demos responded they are not prepared and do not have a full Board present, but they will work to find a common ground.

Agenda Item 5 - Volunteer Fire Company Funding Concerns –Village Manager Franz and Chief Bodony

Glen Ellyn Volunteer Fire Company Chief Bodony gave a presentation to the Board regarding funding concerns. The concerns focused on the financial future of the GEVFC, based on the current funding model. Chief Bodony stated that 80% of the geographical United States received Fire Protection from volunteers.

Currently the GEVFC has 60 members and five probationary members. There is a waiting list. They provide a complete annual physical, training and equipment. Protective equipment costs \$2,500 per set and lasts approximately 7 years.

Training includes recruit training, advanced training, officer development and continuing education. Training opportunities have been reduced, many through the Fire Chief's Association due to lack of funds. Chief Bodony commented that lack of training can stifle ambition.

In recent years the GEVFC has had a Day Engine Company Program to keep the fire stations manned from 6:30 a.m. – 6:30 p.m. weekdays. They provide additional assistance to EMS. The members of the Day Engine Company Program also conduct building inspections, map critical places, handle minor calls and conduct school and preschool visits. During these hours when the fire pagers go off, all of the volunteers are called.

Regarding equipment and apparatus, two of the pumpers are over 20 years old and are in need of replacement. They were scheduled to be replaced in 2012; the replacement cost is \$500,000 per pumper. The goal is to replace while there is still some resale value, they have already been refurbished. Tower 62 was purchased in 1989 and Squad 61 was due for replacement in 2010. Identical pumpers are always purchased. In addition to cost savings, it is helpful to the Firefighters to have identical equipment at both Fire Stations.

Chief Bodony expressed concerns over the lack of administrative support. They are in need of a full time paid Administrative Assistant. This has always been the responsibility of the Chief and has worked well over the years. However FOIA's can be a problem since the filing system is not the best.

There is no staff; there is no financing for staff. One or two part time positions would help. This is estimated to cost \$50,000-\$60,000 annually.

Trustee O'Shea asked if there was a reason why the Village cannot help. Chief Bodony responded that I.T. is a great help and that MUNIS has helped manage the money. Public Works does a great job maintaining the equipment.

Manager Franz responded the Village is responsible for payroll, workman's comp, facilities management and liability insurance. Manager Franz also remarked that they do not have sustainability; we need to get them administrative support.

Chief Bodony commented on the revenue. For 2012-13 the fund drive brought in \$303,000 and the Village donation was \$105,000. Chief Bodony commented that they do not get a great response from the fund drive, donations are flat and they cannot meet their obligations.

Air quality at both stations due to diesel fumes needs to be addressed. These are the only Fire Stations in DuPage County that have not addressed air quality. An exhaust extraction system can be acquired at \$80,000 per station.

Costs were addressed regarding having paid firefighters, the startup costs and the pension liability if the GEVFC cannot become sustainable.

In addition, Chief Bodony stated that both stations are deteriorating.

Chief Bodony pointed out that volunteer does not mean free.

Chief Bodony pointed out that the GEVFC consists of neighbors protecting neighbors.

President Demos asked for a consensus of the Board to look into creating a funding source for the GEVFC. Trustees Clark, Ladesic, McGinley and O'Shea were all in agreement. President Demos remarked that the Board needs to move forward with this. The alternative could turn into a four million dollar annual alternative.

Adjournment

Minutes
Village of Glen Ellyn Board of Trustees
Workshop Meeting
September 16, 2013
Page 10

At 10:33 p.m. Trustee Clark moved and Trustee Ladesic seconded the motion to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Galvin,
Village Clerk