

CITY OF BATAVIA

DATE: March 5, 2019
TO: Committee of the Whole (CS) – March 12, 2019
FROM: Chris Bong, P.E.
Engineering Department
SUBJECT: Discussion: New Sidewalk Policy “100 Year Plan”
Resolution 19-30-R Authorizing Approval of the New Sidewalk Policy “100 Year Plan”

For fiscal year 2019, \$100,000 was budgeted for new sidewalks. “New sidewalks” is described as “filling-in” gaps in public sidewalk and placing sidewalk where none currently exists. In rough numbers, if \$100,000 is budgeted per year, it would take approximately 100 years to install all the current missing sidewalk throughout, hence the “100 Year Plan”.

As part of the recent safe routes to school (SRTS) grant funding application, staff developed a system for locating and prioritizing the filling of gaps and missing sidewalk in the City’s public sidewalk network. This system focused on the missing sidewalk within a 1½ mile radius of elementary and middle schools. While preparing the SRTS application staff noticed there are many locations throughout the City with missing sidewalk beyond the limits of just the SRTS zones. It was contemplated that this scoring system could be expanded and applied throughout the City to locate and prioritize all sidewalk connection opportunities. The scoring system uses multiple factors such as, distance to destination, road type, street layout, engineering feasibility and the number of potential pedestrians served. This system has been incorporated into a new sidewalk policy.

Attached for review and approval is the proposed New Sidewalk Policy “100 Year Plan”

Recommended Action:

Staff recommends the Committee of the Whole approve the following:

1. Resolution 19-30-R Authorizing Approval of the New Sidewalk Policy “100 Year Plan”.

CITY OF BATAVIA, ILLINOIS

RESOLUTION 19-30-R

**AUTHORIZING APPROVAL OF THE CITY OF BATAVIA NEW
SIDEWALK POLICY “100 YEAR PLAN”**

WHEREAS, the City of Batavia has allocated specific annual funding for new sidewalk;
and

WHEREAS, there are many locations with missing sidewalk throughout the City; and

WHEREAS, the City has developed a scoring system to prioritize missing sidewalk locations;
and

WHEREAS, this system will be incorporated into a new sidewalk policy;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY
OF BATAVIA, KANE AND DUPAGE COUNTIES, ILLINOIS, as follows:

SECTION 1: That the Mayor and City Clerk are hereby authorized to approve the City
of Batavia New Sidewalk Policy “100 Year Plan” attached hereto as **EXHIBIT A**.

CITY OF BATAVIA, ILLINOIS RESOLUTION 19-30-R

PRESENTED to and **PASSED** by the City Council of the City of Batavia, Illinois, this 18th day of March, 2019.

APPROVED by me as Mayor of said City of Batavia, Illinois, this 18th day of March, 2019.

Jeffery D. Schielke, Mayor

Ward	Aldermen	Ayes	Nays	Absent	Abstain	Aldermen	Ayes	Nays	Absent	Abstain
1	O'Brien					Salvati				
2	Callahan					Wolff				
3	Meitzler					Chanzit				
4	Malay					Stark				
5	Uher					Theelin Atac				
6	Cerone					Russotto				
7	McFadden					Brown				
Mayor Schielke										
VOTE:		Ayes	Nays	Absent	Abstentions					
Total holding office: Mayor and 14 aldermen										

ATTEST:

Ellen Posdleni, City Clerk



CITY OF BATAVIA

JEFFERY D. SCHIELKE
Mayor

March 8, 2019

New Sidewalk Policy “100 Year Plan”

Introduction

For fiscal year 2019, \$100,000 was budgeted for new sidewalks. “New sidewalks” is described as “filling-in” gaps in public sidewalk and placing sidewalk where none currently exists. In rough numbers, if \$100,000 is budgeted per year, it would take approximately 100 years to install all the current missing sidewalk throughout, hence the “100 Year Plan”.

As part of the recent safe routes to school (SRTS) grant funding application, staff developed a system for locating and prioritizing the filling of gaps and missing sidewalk in the City’s public sidewalk network. This system focused on the missing sidewalk within a 1½ mile radius of elementary and middle schools. While preparing the SRTS application staff noticed there are many locations throughout the City with missing sidewalk beyond the limits of just the SRTS zones. It was contemplated that this scoring system could be expanded and applied throughout the City to locate and prioritize all sidewalk connection opportunities. The scoring system uses multiple factors such as, distance to destination, road type, street layout, engineering feasibility and the number of potential pedestrians served. This system has been incorporated into a new sidewalk policy.

Current Sidewalk Program

Engineering currently has a policy and criteria for repairing *existing* sidewalk panels. This plan is outlined in detail on our web site www.cityofbatavia.net/sidewalk . The following policy would go one step beyond this in that it would outline a policy for connecting existing gaps where no sidewalk currently exists.

New Sidewalk History

The City budgeted funds for a similar program in the 1990’s and 2000’s to finish incomplete or unpaved sidewalks within the sidewalk network. This work involved bridging the gap between 1 or 2 lot wide missing sidewalk segments or placing hardscape surface over existing paths that were established and heavily traveled but unpaved. Most of those simpler sidewalk connections have been completed. The remaining gaps are typically longer and more difficult to engineer and construct, but would provide a positive benefit for pedestrians.

Statistics

- Based on current GIS information, there are approximately 444,000 feet of missing sidewalk out of 1,350,000 feet of total possible public sidewalk locations, or about 1/3 missing sidewalk.



- At a minimum, sidewalk would need to be on one side of the street
- \$100,000 was budgeted in FY 2019 for new sidewalk. In rough numbers, if \$100,000 is budgeted per year, it would take approximately 100 years to install the missing sidewalk, hence the 100-year plan.

Proposed New Sidewalk System

1. This system applies points to the following sidewalk usability factors to prioritize missing sidewalk locations. The factors are in order from highest to lowest score:

- Distance to Destination
Scoring is based on distance to destination. Shorter distance is scored higher. Any overlap would be additive.
 - CBD, Schools, Parks, Trails, Bus stops (School and PACE)
- Road Functional Classification
Major roads get a higher score since they are considered more dangerous and in need of sidewalk
 - Arterials
 - Collectors
 - Local
 - Cul-de-Sac
- Missing Sidewalk Length
Shorter sidewalk gaps receive a higher score.
- Street Layout
Safety of the road profile/cross-section. Curbed streets are considered safer because the curb creates a barrier. Hills and curves on roads are generally considered less safe than straight roads.
 - Curves, Hills
 - Rural
 - Curbed
- Engineering Feasibility
The more feasible the project the higher the score.
 - Steep slopes, Drainage ditches, ROW availability, Obstructions
- Number of Homes/Pedestrians Served
Quantify total upstream homes/pedestrians served.

2. Other Scoring Factors

- Requests from the public are highly valued
- If sidewalk is currently on the other side of street, this segment should be taken out of consideration unless a compelling reason exists
- Cross-check against future City projects and potential development projects



3. Scores are totaled and sidewalk locations are ranked

See the attached SRTS example chart

Path to Implementation

1. Fine-tune the inventory of missing sidewalk locations. Staff noticed there are some gaps not shown in our GIS system. (80% completed) Keep GIS updated as future and ongoing projects are completed.
2. Run the system to determine rankings
3. Select highest ranking locations for year's budget
4. Detailed Engineering
5. Public Notification
6. Construction Bidding Process
7. Repeat on an annual basis

School	Street	distance to school, closest point	distance to school, farthest point	distance to school, closest point2	distance to school, farthest point3	distance to school, average	Length	Criteria A Distance to School	Criteria B Road Functional Classification	Criteria C Partially Constructed Sidewalks/Fill Gaps	Criteria D Street Layout/X-Section Type	Criteria E Engineering Feasibility (5 very feasible, 1 difficult)	Homes Served	Homes Served Score	Total Points (Based on Criteria)	# of Driveway Crossings	Total Driveway Cost	Retaining Wall/Grading Length	Retaining Wall/Grading Cost	Total Cost Method 1 - Itemized	Total Cost Method 2 - Formula based on Feasibility Score	Method 1 Cost Per LF	Method 2 Cost Per LF	Method 3 Detailed Preliminary	Notes																		
Storm	Republic Rd (Illinois to North) East Side	0.1	0.7	528	1056	792	900	5	2	1	1	5	18	1	15	8	\$ 7,680.00	0	\$ -	\$ 43,680.00	\$ 50,400.00	\$ 48.53	\$ 56.00	\$ 51,227.00	East Side																		
JBN	Foxglove Dr. (Just east of Violet to Kirk)	1.1	1.3	79	28	920	920	1	2	1	1	3	100	5	13	12	\$ 11,520.00	300	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 63,320.00	\$ 56,426.67	\$ 68.83	\$ 61.33	\$ 78,083.00	South side may be best, may need some retaining walls																		
JBN	Trillium Ct (Woodland Hills to just east of Johnson Woods Dr) North side	1.2	1.4	6336	7392	6864	900	1	2	1	1	2	60	5	12	9	\$ 8,640.00	500	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 69,640.00	\$ 61,200.00	\$ 77.38	\$ 68.00	\$ 79,726.00	Retaining walls needed mid block, trees on S. side, do north side																		
JBN	Woodland Hills Rd. (East side, E. Wilson to Bluebell)	1.5	1.6	7920	8448	8184	2000	1	2	1	1	3	20	1	9	15	\$ 14,400.00	400	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 114,400.00	\$ 122,666.67	\$ 57.20	\$ 61.33	\$ 130,994.00	Corridor is mostly clear, may need some short retaining walls on north half and tree removal																		
AGS	S. Jackson St (Morton to Blaine)	0.5	0.6	2640	3168	2904	270	3	2	3	2	5	30	2	17	2	\$ 1,920.00	0	\$ -	\$ 12,720.00	\$ 15,120.00	\$ 47.11	\$ 56.00		Overlaid c&g, utility poles, but otherwise feasible, do both sides?																		
LW	Church St N side (Hamlet to East End)	0.5	0.6	2640	3168	2904	500	3	1	4	3	4	15	1	16	6	\$ 5,760.00	100	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 30,760.00	\$ 29,000.00	\$ 61.52	\$ 58.00		Rural X-section, but ditches shallow and sidewalk fits north of ditch																		
LW	Madison St (North Side Prairie to East End)	0.2	0.5	1056	2640	1848	1100	4	2	2	2	3	34	3	16	13	\$ 12,480.00	300	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 71,480.00	\$ 67,466.67	\$ 64.98	\$ 61.33		East of College is rural																		
Storm	Maple N side (Rt. 31 to Cypress)	0.3	0.7	1584	3696	2640	3000	3	2	1	2	3	39	3	14	20	\$ 19,200.00	500	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 164,200.00	\$ 184,000.00	\$ 54.73	\$ 61.33		Curbs with some horizontal curves, very long stretch, some obstacles along way, retaining walls required toward Rt. 31.																		
LW	N. College St (E. Side - Franklin St. to Spring St.)	0.6	0.7	3168	3696	3432	250	2	2	4	1	4	7	1	14	2	\$ 1,920.00	0	\$ -	\$ 11,920.00	\$ 14,500.00	\$ 47.68	\$ 58.00		Measured east side, but could possibly do west side instead																		
JBN	Locust St (South Side Van Buren to east end)	0.4	0.3	2112	1584	1848	800	4	1	1	2	3	30	2	13	7	\$ 6,720.00	500	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 63,720.00	\$ 49,066.67	\$ 79.65	\$ 61.33		Rural x-section east of prairie, c&g west of prairie, some trees in way.																		
JBN	Webster St (College to Prairie)	0.3	0.5	1584	2640	2112	950	3	2	2	1	4	15	1	13	13	\$ 12,480.00	300	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 65,480.00	\$ 55,100.00	\$ 68.93	\$ 58.00		1 lot of existing sidewalk on north side utility poles on North side. Lots of trees and grading on south side so North may be better																		
LW	Hamlet St. w side (Lake to North Cul-de-Sac)	0.4	0.5	2112	2640	2376	300	3	1	3	1	4	13	1	13	4	\$ 3,840.00	100	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 20,840.00	\$ 17,400.00	\$ 69.47	\$ 58.00		Some trees in the way																		
AGS	S. Harrison St. (Carlisle to north end cul-de-sac)	0.2	0.3	1056	1584	1320	1000	4	1	1	3	1	25	2	12	11	\$ 10,560.00	2000	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 150,560.00	\$ 88,000.00	\$ 150.56	\$ 88.00		Ditches on both sides, would be difficult, possibly storm sewer??																		
Storm	Carriage Dr (West Side Shabbona to Maple)	0.3	0.5	1584	2640	2112	1000	3	2	1	1	3	20	1	11	9	\$ 8,640.00	100	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 53,640.00	\$ 61,333.33	\$ 53.64	\$ 61.33		Most likely on west side, quite a few trees in way, some grading & ret. wall necessary																		
																						Average =																					
																						\$ 936,360.00		\$ 871,680.00																			

EXAMPLE