



Village of Weston, Wisconsin MEETING NOTICE

Meeting of: **COMMUNITY LIFE AND PUBLIC SAFETY (CLPS) COMMITTEE**

Commissioners: **Lopes-Serrao {c}, Ermeling {vc}, Clark, Czerwonka, Kamke, Kern, & Olson**

Ex officio: **Maloney, Gebert, Hunt, Finke, Maguire**

Staff: **Jami Gebert, Administrator**

Date/Time: **Tuesday, September 2, 2025, 5:00 p.m.**

Location: **Weston Municipal Center (4747 Camp Phillips Road) – Board Room**

Agenda: **The agenda packet will be sent out at least 3 days prior to the meeting.**

Attendance: **All Village officials are encouraged to attend. Commissioners, Committee members, Department Directors, and guests, please indicate if you will, or will not, be attending so we may determine in advance if there will be a quorum by sending an RSVP to the assigned Administrative Support person:**

RSVP: **Valerie Parker, Committee Secretary**
(715) 241-2613
vparker@westonwi.gov

Questions: **Jami Gebert, Administrator**
(715) 359-6114
jgebert@westonwi.gov

This notice was posted at the Municipal Center, 4747 Camp Phillips Road, Weston and was e-mailed to local media outlets (Print, TV, and Radio) on 08/25/2025.

A quorum of members from other Village governmental bodies (boards, commissions, and committees) may attend the above-noticed meeting in order to gather information. No actions will be taken by any other board, commission, or committee of the Village, aside from the Village CLPS Committee. Should a quorum of other government bodies be present, this would constitute a meeting pursuant to State ex rel. Badke v. Greendale Village Bd., 173 Wis.2d 553,494 N.W.2d 408 (1993).

Wisconsin State Statutes require all agendas for Committee, Commission, or Board meetings be posted in final form, 24 hours prior to the meeting. Any posted agenda is subject to change up to 24 hours prior to the date and time of the meeting. All final agendas will be posted on the Village's website at www.westonwi.gov and a hard copy posted at the Village Municipal Center.

Any person who has a qualifying disability, as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act, that requires the meeting or the materials to be in an accessible location or format, must contact the Weston Clerk's Department, by 12 noon, the Friday prior to the meeting, so any necessary arrangements can be made to accommodate each request.



VILLAGE OF WESTON, MARATHON COUNTY, WISCONSIN
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA OF THE COMMUNITY LIFE AND PUBLIC SAFETY (CLPS) COMMITTEE
Weston Municipal Center - Board Room
4747 Camp Phillips Road, Weston, WI 54476

Tuesday, September 2, 2025, at 5:00 p.m.

Some or all of the members of the Committee, applicants, or members of the public, may participate in the meeting remotely by teleconference or videoconference via the Zoom links listed below.

Join Zoom Meeting by Computer:

<https://zoom.us/j/5445915099>

Join Zoom Meeting by Phone:

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

Meeting ID: 544 591 5099

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

1. Meeting called to order by CLPS Chair & Village Trustee Lopes-Serrao
2. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag
3. Roll Call and declaration of quorum by Secretary – Luis Lopes-Serrao{c}, Barb Ermeling{vc}, Katrina Clark, John Czerwonka, Kirk Kamke, Mark Kern, and Brent Olson

Mission Statement: *The Community Life and Public Safety Committee evaluates and makes recommendations to the Village Board on matters related to safety, welfare, and livability within the Village and their impact upon Village of Weston residents.*

PUBLIC COMMENT

(Please be advised per State Statute Section 19.84(2), the information will be received from the public. It is the policy of the Village that there be a five-minute time-period, per person, with time extension, per the Chair's discretion; be further advised that there may be limited discussion on the information received, however, no action will be taken under public comment.)

MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

4. [Minutes from July 7, 2025, Regular Meeting](#)

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED

ACKNOWLEDGE REPORTS FROM DEPARTMENTS

5. [Code Enforcement Update](#)
 - a. Update on Raze or Repair Order for Aspen Street Apartments located at 4911, 5003, 5007, 5011, 5103 & 5107 Aspen Street
 - b. Update on 3020 Mount View Avenue's property maintenance issues and County's tax delinquent property acquisition progress

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

6. [Discussion and/or action on proposed amendments to Chapter 50 Nuisances](#)

NEW BUSINESS

7. [Discussion and/or action on neighbor request for Please Slow Down for Children Playing signage on Flambeau Street and Amanda Drive](#)



**VILLAGE OF WESTON, MARATHON COUNTY, WISCONSIN
OFFICIAL MEETING AGENDA OF THE REGULAR MEETING AGENDA OF THE
COMMUNITY LIFE AND PUBLIC SAFETY (CLPS) COMMITTEE**

8. Discussion and/or action on request for Right Turn Only Signage at Camp Phillips Road and E Jelinek Avenue

ANNOUNCEMENTS

REMARKS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

ITEMS FOR NEXT AGENDA

- a. Next Regular Meeting Date – Monday, November 3, 2025, at 5:00 pm
 - i. Proposed amendments to Chapter 42 Law Enforcement
 - ii. Electric Bikes – Popularity and Safety Concerns

ADJOURNMENT

A quorum of members from other Village governmental bodies (boards, commissions, and committees) may/might attend the above-noticed meeting to gather information. Should a quorum of other government bodies be present, this would constitute a meeting pursuant to State ex rel. Badke v. Greendale Village Bd., 173 Wis.2d 553,494 N.W.2d 408 (1993). No official actions other than those of the Community Life & Public Safety Committee shall take place.

In accordance with the requirements of Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), the Village will not discriminate against qualified individuals with disabilities on the basis of disability in its services, programs or activities. If you need assistance or reasonable accommodations in participating in this meeting or event due to a disability as defined under the ADA, please call the Village Clerk at 715-359-6114 or clerks@westonwi.gov to discuss your accessibility needs. We ask your request to be provided a minimum of 72 hours before the scheduled event or meeting. If a request is made less than 72 hours before the event the Village will make a good faith effort to accommodate your request.

This Agenda was posted at the Village Municipal Center, on www.westonwi.gov and transmitted to media partners on 08/27/2025. Questions can be directed to the Administrator at 715-359-6114

**Village of Weston, Wisconsin
OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE
VILLAGE COMMUNITY LIFE AND PUBLIC SAFETY (CLPS) COMMITTEE MEETING**
held on Monday, July 7, 2025, at 5:00 p.m., in the Board Room, at 4747 Camp Phillips Road

AGENDA ITEMS.

1. Meeting called to order by CLPS Vice Chair and Village Trustee, Barb Ermeling, at approximately 5:00 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

3. Roll Call and Declaration of Quorum by Secretary Parker.

Roll call indicated seven (6) CLPS members present.

<u>Member</u>	<u>Present</u>
Vacant {Chair}	-----
Ermeling, Barbara {Vice Chair}	YES
Clark, Katrina	YES
Czerwonka, John	YES
Kamke, Kirk	YES
Lopes-Serrao, Luis	YES
Olson, Brent	YES

Village Staff in attendance, in-person: Gebert, Higgins, Maguire, Hunt, and Parker.

Village Staff in attendance, via Zoom: None

Board of Trustees Members Present in the audience, in-person: None

Board of Trustees Members Present in the audience, via Zoom: None

Audience Members in attendance, in-person: There were 4 audience members present, in-person.

Audience Members in attendance, via Zoom: There were no audience members present, via Zoom.

PUBLIC COMMENT [0:00:54 Zoom Meeting Recording]

None.

MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS [0:1:06 Zoom Meeting Recording]

4. Approve Minutes from May 5, 2025, CLPS Meeting.

Motion by Lopes-Serrao, second by Czerwonka: to approve the May 5, 2025, CLPS meeting minutes.

Yes Vote: 6 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

<u>Member (PC)</u>	<u>Voting</u>
Vacant {Chair}	-----
Ermeling, Barbara {Vice Chair}	YES

Clark, Katrina	YES
Czerwonka, John	YES
Kamke, Kirk	YES
Lopes-Serrao, Luis	YES
Olson, Brent	YES

**WRITTEN
RECEIVED**
None.

COMMUNICATIONS

ACKNOWLEDGE REPORTS FROM DEPARTMENTS [0:01:35 Zoom Meeting Recording]

5. Code Enforcement Update

Maguire referred to the RFC in the meeting packet, which summarizes the status on active enforcement cases, along with lists the various cases out there.

Motion by Clark, second by Olson: to acknowledge the Code Enforcement Update Report.

Yes Vote: 6 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

<u>Member (PC)</u>	<u>Voting</u>
Vacant {Chair}	-----
Ermeling, Barbara {Vice Chair}	YES
Clark, Katrina	YES
Czerwonka, John	YES
Kamke, Kirk	YES
Lopes-Serrao, Luis	YES
Olson, Brent	YES

a. Update on 3020 Mount View Avenue’s property maintenance issues and County’s tax delinquent property acquisition progress.

Maguire stated this house has been vacant for about 8 years, which has since accumulated unpaid taxes from County along with fees from the Village for mowing the property. Maguire and Higgins have had several conversations with the County, regarding this property, as the County is planning to take possession of this property in August, due to unpaid property taxes. Maguire stated, since his conversation with the County, he was able to speak with the closest relative to the deceased property owner. He stated she is fine with the County taking the property. He stated there is a substantial medical lien placed on the property.

Maguire stated that Mountain Bay Metro is currently seeking an individual of interest for the missing key that gets into the structure. Due to lack of communication between family members, a squatter took possession of the key and was in the house for a period of time, and now Mountain Bay Metro PD is trying to track that individual down.

Maguire stated that once the key is located, they will be able to get into the property and do an internal assessment of the structure, and determine if they need to proceed with razing the property or if it can be repaired, where the County can then have the house listed.

Maguire stated that since the County is taking the property and how the Village will no longer get reimbursed, through taxes, for lawn maintenance, rather than contract with Riverview to do the mowing, our Parks Department will maintain the lawn through the end of this summer.

Lopes-Serrao questioned if the neighbors have been communicating with the Village. Maguire stated the property owner immediately to the west had approached us about 1 month ago, to inform us of someone on property. The property owner directly behind is who has been filing complaints on the lawn.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

6. Update on Raze or Repair Order for Aspen Street Apartments, located at 4911, 5003, 5007, 5011, 5103, & 5107 Aspen Street [0:08:00 Zoom Meeting Recording]

Maguire commented that the new ownership has a traditional handyman that is currently working on repairs on that property. Maguire has not been back on site this summer yet. He stated the new owner is working to get the necessary repairs taken care of. He stated the new owner also owns Stillwater Landing which is now under new management.

Czerwonka questioned the mold issues. Maguire stated he can work with the owner to make that a higher priority.

Gebert questioned if Christiansen has been back to note any improvements on fire issues. Maguire stated he is not aware.

7. Discussion and/or action on proposed amendments to Chapter 50 Nuisances [0:11:00 Zoom Meeting Recording]

Gebert stated we did split the chapter in half on potential amendments. Tonight we are covering Sections 100 – 102. She stated we cut a lot of redundant language out, and limited this down.

Olson stated this is much easier to read and understand.

Gebert stated we will bring the other sections next time, and then once all parts of this Chapter are good, will bring to Board for adoption.

Motion by Olson, second by Clark: to recommend approval of the ordinance amendments to Chapter 50 Nuisances to the Board of Trustees.

Yes Vote: 6 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

<u>Member (PC)</u>	<u>Voting</u>
Vacant {Chair}	-----
Ermeling, Barbara {Vice Chair}	YES
Clark, Katrina	YES
Czerwonka, John	YES
Kamke, Kirk	YES
Lopes-Serrao, Luis	YES

NEW BUSINESS**8. Discussion and/or action on neighbor concerns regarding the maintenance of the Village-owned parcel at 3006 Foxtail Court [0:14:38 Zoom Meeting Recording]**

Gebert referred to her RFC in the packet.

In attendance to speak on this topic were:

Jeff Fochs, 150992 Stonecrop Road, Wausau, who is the property owner of 3002/3004 Foxtail Court

Cody Kremsreiter, who is the tenant in 3002 Foxtail Court

Jarod Musel, who is the tenant in 3004 Foxtail Court

It was noted that the property owner, Barbara Bolton, of 3102 Foxtail Court, who is the other party involved in this case, was not present in the audience or on Zoom.

Gebert pointed out the property, at 3006 Foxtail Court is Village owned, as it provides access to a stormwater drainage area in the back of that ½-acre parcel. She also pointed out this parcel is only mowed by the Village twice per summer, as time allows, to keep any woody vegetation out of the property, and is not required to be regularly mowed due to it being an undeveloped lot (per Municipal Code). She explained that the Village does not have issue if residents who are adjacent to undeveloped Village properties want to mow the property, as they can get to it more often.

Gebert explained that the neighbors on either side of this parcel (3002 and 3102) have had some differences on the mowing of the Village-owned property. She stated the resident at 3002 would like to see it mowed, and the resident at 3102 would like to see the property not mowed, and more natural, for the purposes of wildlife and pollinators. Through our discussions with both parties, we offered an agreement to them where 3002 can mow half of the lot that is adjacent to him, and that the other half would stay natural. Since this is not acceptable to 3102, we informed the parties that we would bring this issue before CLPS, and come up with a determination on how to proceed.

Fochs stated that he has owned 3002/3004 since 2011. He stated that for the past 14 years, his tenants have been mowing part of 3006. He stated that this spring when Kremsreiter parked his trailer on 3006, that is when all the issues started with Bolton. He stated how his opinion is that Bolton does not like “renters” in the neighborhood. He stated that when she had her house 2-unit condominium built, she was under the impression that all the new homes being built along this roadway would be occupant-owned condominiums, not rentals.

Kremsreiter stated the situation started when he initially moved in 1 year ago, where he started mowing what had already been mowed. He stated he was weedwacking some of it to keep the rag weed down as he and his daughter are allergic to it. He stated when he started to mow, instead of coming out and talking to him, Bolton came out yelling obscenities at him. He stopped what he was doing and got in contact with the Village and ultimately was given permission to mow part of 3006, and that his trailer could sit on part of that property. He stated he told the Village he would not claim any liability on the Village if anything happened to him while mowing, and he was not expecting any compensation, and would pay for the gasoline needed to mow that property. He stated since this spring, every time he starts mowing, Bolton has been calling Mountain Bay Metro PD on him for mowing the lawn. He stated that she is also calling Mountain Bay Metro PD about his kids being out in the cul-de-sac. He stated that he feels the properties around him should look nice, which is one reason why he mows 3006.

It was explained that the permission to Kremsreiter to mow was given last year from Wodalski. Gebert stated while this neighbor-dispute situation is ongoing, we asked Kremsreiter to leave the lot alone until we could get a determination tonight.

Kremsreiter pointed out how Bolton is technically mowing 15 feet into the Village property as well. It was pointed out there is a small tree on the Village's property that she has chicken wire around to keep the rabbits and deer off of it. It was also pointed out that the trees along the west side of Bolton's lot are all technically on the Village's property, and how it appears she planted those.

Kremsreiter commented on how now the mosquitos are really bad coming from the Village's property, now that it is not mowed at all.

Musel stated that he thinks the 50/50 option is fair, and commented how his biggest concern is when the police department shows up because Bolton calls them every time they are mowing. He also commented how Bolton is always out there filming them and their children, while they are mowing and their children are outside playing, and how he is not comfortable with that.

Lopes-Serrao confirmed that all parties involved, including Bolton, were made aware of this agenda item. Gebert stated that all parties were copied in on the e-mailed announcements of the agenda and meeting packet. She stated that Dustin Gessert, of Planning & Development, also made contact with the parties to let them know this. She stated that we had not received any feedback from Bolton and how we did encourage all parties to attend.

Lopes-Serrao questioned what the purpose of the Village owning this lot, and if it was just to provide access to the stormwater pond. Gebert stated it is for access to the stormwater pond.

Lopes-Serrao questioned if this is Village-owned, should it be rezoned? He also asked if this vacant parcel was sold, if the property owner would be required mow it. Gebert stated that it does not need to be rezoned, and being an undeveloped lot, it is not required to be mowed.

Luis stated he personally has no issue with allowing neighbors to maintain a Village-owned lot. He is in agreeance on the 50/50 option. He stated that as far as the neighbors frustrations about the Police Department being called on them, that is something that needs to be brought up to the Police Department.

Olson commented that in reading the comments in the reports, it sounds like Bolton is just upset with having neighbors, and how this is more of a neighbor dispute. He stated since Bolton is not here, all we can do is take the impression we get from the records provided. He feels it is not unreasonable to allow the neighbors to mow.

Clark commented that with this being in a residential neighborhood, it is best if the vacant lots don't get overgrown, and appreciates the concerns for the weeds that are spreading. She stated that typically in a residential neighborhood, there is also the assumption that things are going to be more manicured, versus out in the rural areas. Clark pointed out that recently, Bolton posted a message on Nextdoor stating that she is moving. She stated especially with that information, and with Bolton not being here, that if someone wants to maintain our lot, we let them maintain the lot. She further commented that they could mow the entire lot, not just 50% of it.

Ermeling agrees that we should allow the neighbor to mow, and how it would keep down on small rodents. She stated she also has concern that there are trees planted on the parcel.

Lopes-Serrao stated that his concern with the neighbor mowing the entire lot, is if the lot lines are not completely clear to Bolton, she may think that the neighbor is mowing onto her land, which could create more calls to the Police Department.

It was discussed that the trees are on the Village's property, so the neighbor could mow up to the trees. Higgins stated that there is a drainageway easement along the property line between the Village's and Bolton's properties.

Hunt suggested that the Village contact a surveyor and have the parcel boundaries re-staked so that it is obvious where the property lines are. Then we come up with something like a 20-foot buffer for Bolton, to make things easier. Once that is done, then we give permission to the neighbors to mow the lot.

Hunt stated as far as video recording the neighbors, there is nothing legally they can do, as it is not illegal.

Higgins stated Bolton has been filing complaints about different neighbors in her area since 2013. Gebert stated Bolton recently attended a Parks Committee meeting, where she talked about the pollinators, and as noted in the police report has had contacted with Trustee Weiland.

Ermeling recommended the property be re-surveyed and staked and then work with the property owners. Higgins stated she can contact Vreeland. Gebert stated that this will not be done as a policy

or code change, that this is a specific situation to this Village-owned property, and how we will give him permission to mow without any liability on the Village. She reminded that this property is not required to be mowed. She stated if the residents some day decide not to mow any more, or move away, it can then grow up naturally, and the Village would just maintain it a couple times a summer to keep the woody vegetation from growing.

Motion by Olson, second by Clark to direct staff to have a surveyor come out and re-survey and stake the property lines at 3006 Foxtail Court, and to notify both property owners in writing (via email or U.S. mail) of the decision, we will allow the neighbor to mow a reasonable amount across the lot.

Yes Vote: 6 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

<u>Member (PC)</u>	<u>Voting</u>
Vacant {Chair}	-----
Ermeling, Barbara {Vice Chair}	YES
Clark, Katrina	YES
Czerwonka, John	YES
Kamke, Kirk	YES
Lopes-Serrao, Luis	YES
Olson, Brent	YES

Kreimsreiter asked if Weston could come out with their brush hog to clear the lot (or knock it down), so that it is manageable for him to start mowing again, as it is quite long since he was told to stop mowing it. Gebert will talk to Wodalski about having that done.

Fochs stated when he originally purchased land there, the Village purchased it back for a retention pond in 2013. Higgins stated there is a memo in our Plat file that details this.

ANNOUNCEMENTS [0:48:40 Zoom Meeting Recording]

Gebert commented on the new acoustic music series that is going on at Machmueller Park, every Tuesday night, from 7pm – 8:30pm, during the months of July and August. She stated there is a food truck option at each of these events. She explained there is a Weston resident, who is a musician who has organized all of these events. She stated if we experience inclement weather, the event will get moved to Kelly Club. Parker offered to email an announcement to all officials tomorrow.

REMARKS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS [0:49:30 Zoom Meeting Recording]

Lopes-Serrao questioned if we should wait 2 months for the next meeting. Gebert stated it would be helpful for staff, if we wait an extra month. Lopes-Serrao stated he is fine waiting until September.

Olson commented, that while we will plan to wait the extra month, if issues, such as what was heard tonight, come up for CLPS discussion, then we should still hold a regular meeting, and not wait the extra month.

There was brief discussion on the fireworks that were happening in Weston on the 4th. The Committee thinks it may have come from Arrow Bar.

ITEMS FOR NEXT AGENDA [0:52:37 Zoom Meeting Recording]

Gebert pointed out the 1st Monday in September is Labor Day. She suggested we consider either August 25th or October 6th, or we can hold the next meeting on a Tuesday, September 2nd.

The Committee would be fine with meeting on Tuesday, September 2nd, at 5:00 p.m.

- a. Next Regular Meeting Date – Monday, August 4, 2025, at 5:00 p.m.** [note adjustment above]
 - i. Proposed Amendments to Chapter 42 Law Enforcement

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Clark, second by Olson: to adjourn at 5:54 p.m.

Barb Ermeling, Village Trustee and CLPS Vice Chair
Jami Gebert, Village Administrator
Valerie Parker, Recording Secretary

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION

Public Mtg/Date: CLPS, September 2, 2025

Description: Monthly Code Enforcement Report

From: Jennifer Higgins, Planning & Development Director/Zoning Administrator
Roman Maguire, Building Inspector
Travis Meverden, Building Inspector/Property Inspector
Mountain Bay Metro Police Department

Question: Item is on the agenda for informational purposes only as an update to Code enforcement case progress over the past month.

BACKGROUND

As of 08/26/25

- There were 63 open and active code enforcement cases. (See attached list)
- In July 2025, 26 cases were created, 12 cases were closed.
- 15 of the overall 63 active cases have been referred to Mountain Bay Metro PD and are in various stages of enforcement proceedings (Citations/Municipal Court/Circuit Court). There are a number of cases that are being monitored as the properties have been cleaned up but they tend to be habitual.
- Staff started the non-summary abatement process on the Holly Avenue fence this past month to get the hole in the fence fixed. The entire fence needs maintenance as staples are loose, and boards broken and/or missing throughout the length of the fence so all property owners were notified that repairs were needed to be done. The hole was fixed last week but there are still some areas that need maintenance as boards are still missing or broke.

Attached Docs: Active Enforcement Case List

Committee Action: None

Fiscal Impact: TBD.

Recommendation: Staff recommend the Committee acknowledge the report and place on file.

RECOMMENDED LANGUAGE FOR OFFICIAL ACTION

I acknowledge the report as presented and direct staff to place the report on file.

ADDITIONAL ACTION: None

ID	Complaint Date	Case Address	Case Number	Type	Status	Assigned To	Created On	Created By
6497	4/30/2025	4401 W RAYBELLE DR, WESTON	CV-202500067	Nuisances	Monitoring	CodeEnforcem	4/30/2025	dgessert
6544	6/24/2025	1726 LAGUNA AVE, WESTON	CV-202500114	Zoning-Driveways	In Violation	CodeEnforcem	6/24/2025	statro
6556	6/26/2025	5807 TRICIA AVE, WESTON	CV-202500126	Nuisances	In Violation	CodeEnforcem	6/26/2025	dgessert
6598	8/11/2025	1803 ROSSENBACH AVE, WESTON	CV-202500168	Building Code	Pending	CodeEnforcem	8/11/2025	Code Enforcement
6599	8/11/2025	5411 LINDA ST, WESTON	CV-202500169	Business Licensing	Pending	CodeEnforcem	8/11/2025	Code Enforcement
6600	8/11/2025	1728 MONTEREY AVE, WESTON	CV-202500170	Parking	In Violation	CodeEnforcem	8/11/2025	rmaguire
6612	8/25/2025	7103 SCHOFIELD AVE, WESTON	CV-202500182	Nuisances	Pending	CodeEnforcem	8/25/2025	Code Enforcement
6601	8/11/2025	4709 HOLLY AVE, WESTON	CV-202500171	Vegetation	Pending	jhiggins	8/11/2025	rmaguire
6488	4/17/2025	5408 WESTFAIR AVE, WESTON	CV-202500058	Zoning-Signs	In Violation	jhiggins	4/17/2025	vparker
6540	6/23/2025	2805 SCHOFIELD AVE, WESTON	CV-202500110	Zoning-Signs	In Violation	jhiggins	6/23/2025	Code Enforcement
6571	7/8/2025	5014 ASPEN ST, WESTON	CV-202500141	Zoning-Land Use	Pending	jhiggins	7/8/2025	vparker
6503	5/12/2025	4509 through 4811 Holly Ave (18 properties)	CV-202500073	Zoning-Fence	In Violation	jhiggins	5/12/2025	dgessert
6123	6/27/2023	5902 STELLA AVE, WESTON	CV-202300063	Zoning-Permits/Approvals	In Violation	jhiggins	6/27/2023	aanklam
6284	6/18/2024	5707 MOYER AVE, WESTON	CV-202400062	Parking	Monitoring	jzwicky	6/18/2024	Code Enforcement
6514	6/9/2025	5707 MOYER AVE, WESTON	CV-202500084	Parking	Monitoring	jzwicky	6/9/2025	Code Enforcement
6524	6/12/2025	4602 FULLER ST, WESTON	CV-202500094	Nuisances	In Violation	jzwicky	6/12/2025	dgessert
6435	1/22/2025	5107 ASPEN ST, WESTON	CV-202500005	Zoning-Motorized Vehicle Storage	Monitoring	jzwicky	1/22/2025	jhiggins
6350	8/16/2024	1310 POST AVE, WESTON	CV-202400128	Nuisances	Monitoring	jzwicky	8/16/2024	Code Enforcement
6400	11/11/2024	3404 STERNBERG AVE, WESTON	CV-202400178	Zoning-Accessory Buildings	In Violation	mloveless	11/11/2024	tmeverden
6430	12/31/2024	4717 MESKER ST, WESTON	CV-202400208	Nuisances	In Violation	mloveless	12/31/2024	vparker
6450	2/17/2025	1818 HIGHLAND AVE, WESTON	CV-202500020	Nuisances	In Violation	mloveless	2/17/2025	Code Enforcement
6470	3/28/2025	2215 SCHOFIELD AVE, WESTON	CV-202500040	Zoning-Land Use	In Violation	mloveless	3/28/2025	vparker
6477	4/8/2025	5011 PINE ST, WESTON	CV-202500047	Nuisances	In Violation	mloveless	4/8/2025	Code Enforcement
6217	12/5/2023	3609 WESTON AVE, WESTON	CV-202300157	Zoning-Motorized Vehicle Storage	In Violation	mloveless	12/5/2023	aanklam
6594	8/5/2025	5505 RICHFLEX ST, WESTON	CV-202500164	Junked Motor Vehicles	In Violation	mloveless	8/5/2025	Code Enforcement
6597	8/6/2025	4206 AUGUSTINE AVE, WESTON	CV-202500167	Junked Motor Vehicles	In Violation	mloveless	8/6/2025	tmeverden
6610	8/22/2025	8407 LEEDS CT, WESTON	CV-202500180	Nuisances	In Violation	mloveless	8/22/2025	schibeya
6611	8/25/2025	8401 LEEDS CT, WESTON	CV-202500181	Parking	Pending	mloveless	8/25/2025	Code Enforcement
6573	7/10/2025	3811 MICHAEL DR, WESTON	CV-202500143	Zoning-Driveways	Pending	rmaguire	7/10/2025	Code Enforcement
6575	7/14/2025	5211 ROSS AVE, WESTON	CV-202500145	Building Code	In Violation	rmaguire	7/14/2025	Code Enforcement
6539	6/20/2025	5007 LEE AVE, WESTON	CV-202500109	Zoning-Permits/Approvals	In Violation	rmaguire	6/20/2025	dgessert
6397	11/1/2024	5912 BUSINESS HIGHWAY 51, WESTON	CV-202400175	Building Code	In Violation	rmaguire	11/6/2024	rmaguire
6547	6/25/2025	3104 ROSS AVE, WESTON	CV-202500117	Nuisances	In Violation	rmaguire	6/25/2025	dgessert
6223	1/4/2024	4104 SHOREY AVE, WESTON	CV-202400001	Building Code	In Violation	rmaguire	1/4/2024	aanklam
6410	11/18/2024	5107 ASPEN ST, WESTON	CV-202400188	Building Code	In Violation	rmaguire	12/10/2024	rmaguire
6411	11/18/2024	5103 ASPEN ST, WESTON	CV-202400189	Building Code	In Violation	rmaguire	12/10/2024	rmaguire
6412	11/18/2024	5011 ASPEN ST, WESTON	CV-202400190	Building Code	In Violation	rmaguire	12/11/2024	rmaguire
6413	11/18/2024	5007 ASPEN ST, WESTON	CV-202400191	Building Code	In Violation	rmaguire	12/11/2024	rmaguire
6414	12/11/2024	5003 ASPEN ST, WESTON	CV-202400192	Building Code	In Violation	rmaguire	12/11/2024	rmaguire
6415	11/18/2024	4911 ASPEN ST, WESTON	CV-202400193	Building Code	In Violation	rmaguire	12/11/2024	rmaguire
6433	1/16/2025	3613 SCHOFIELD AVE, WESTON	CV-202500003	Zoning-Permits/Approvals	In Violation	rmaguire	1/20/2025	jhiggins
6434	1/22/2025	3020 MOUNT VIEW AVE, WESTON	CV-202500004	Building Code	In Violation	rmaguire	1/22/2025	rmaguire
6585	7/21/2025	5605 MOYER AVE, WESTON	CV-202500155	Parking	Pending	statro	7/21/2025	Code Enforcement
6577	7/15/2025	4810 STERNBERG AVE, WESTON	CV-202500147	Zoning-Permits/Approvals	In Violation	tmeverden	7/15/2025	Code Enforcement

6580	7/15/2025	5308 S TIMBER ST, WESTON	CV-202500150	Nuisances	In Violation	tmeverden	7/15/2025	Code Enforcement
6564	7/2/2025	5302 FULLER ST, WESTON	CV-202500134	Zoning-Accessory Buildings	Neighbor Dispute	tmeverden	7/2/2025	vparker
6566	7/7/2025	5408 CAMP PHILLIPS RD, WESTON	CV-202500136	Zoning-Pools	In Violation	tmeverden	7/7/2025	Code Enforcement
6396	11/4/2024	5310 JACOB ST, WESTON	CV-202400174	Building Code	In Violation	tmeverden	11/4/2024	cedmondson
5971	9/8/2021	6202 ROSS AVE, WESTON	CV-202100084	Nuisances	Monitoring	tmeverden	9/8/2021	Code Enforcement
6067	2/14/2023	1710 ROSSENBACH AVE, WESTON	CV-202300007	Nuisances	In Violation	tmeverden	2/14/2023	aanklam
6118	6/16/2023	5810 BUSINESS HIGHWAY 51, WESTON	CV-202300058	Building Code	In Violation	tmeverden	6/16/2023	aanklam
6535	6/18/2025	7511 FEITH AVE, WESTON	CV-202500105	Zoning-Accessory Buildings	In Violation	tmeverden	6/18/2025	Code Enforcement
6422	12/13/2024	6406 HUBERT AVE, WESTON	CV-202400200	Nuisances	In Violation	tmeverden	12/13/2024	Code Enforcement
6264	6/4/2024	4506 HOLLY AVE, WESTON	CV-202400042	Zoning-Driveways	In Violation	tmeverden	6/4/2024	tmeverden
6286	6/20/2024	7804 SERVICE LN, WESTON	CV-202400064	Zoning-Parking Lot	In Violation	tmeverden	6/20/2024	cedmondson
6287	6/20/2024	3913 ROSS AVE, WESTON	CV-202400065	Building Code	In Violation	tmeverden	6/20/2024	jhiggins
6313	7/16/2024	4501 RIVER BEND RD, WESTON	CV-202400091	Right-of-Way	In Violation	tmeverden	7/16/2024	tmeverden
6424	12/18/2024	3910 SCHOFIELD AVE, WESTON	CV-202400202	Refuse and Recycling	Monitoring	vparker	12/18/2024	vparker
6425	12/18/2024	3806 SCHOFIELD AVE, WESTON	CV-202400203	Refuse and Recycling	Monitoring	vparker	12/18/2024	vparker
6426	12/18/2024	4002 SCHOFIELD AVE, WESTON	CV-202400204	Refuse and Recycling	Monitoring	vparker	12/18/2024	vparker
6405	11/15/2024	4020 SCHOFIELD AVE, WESTON	CV-202400183	Refuse and Recycling	Monitoring	vparker	11/15/2024	Code Enforcement
6557	6/27/2025	5888 DELIKOWSKI ST, WESTON	CV-202500127	Refuse and Recycling	In Violation	vparker	6/27/2025	dgessert
6558	6/28/2025	4020 SCHOFIELD AVE, WESTON	CV-202500128	Refuse and Recycling	Monitoring	vparker	6/28/2025	Code Enforcement

Case Closed Count by Category

Date From 7/1/2025 and Date To 8/26/2025

Case Type	# Cases
Animals	1
Building Code	1
Junked Motor Vehicles	9
Nuisances	13
Parking	1
Refuse and Recycling	6
Utilities - Wells	1
Vegetation	3
Vegetation - Weeds	2
Zoning-Accessory Buildings	1
Zoning-Motorized Vehicle Storage	8
Zoning-Permits/Approvals	2
Zoning-Recreational Vehicles	1
Zoning-Signs	2
Zoning-Tall Grass	9
Total Cases	60

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION

Public Mtg/Date: CLPS, September 2, 2025

Description: Discussion and/or action on proposed amendments to Chapter 50 Nuisances

From: Jami Gebert, Administrator

Question: Review potential draft amendments to Chapter 50 Nuisances.

Background

Apologies, the months of July and August moved too quickly! There is not an additional amendment to review for Chapter 50. Staff did work to further refine Sections 100-102. We will keep the item on the agenda to ensure continued progress on the entire Chapter and bring back any additional updates at the next CLPS meeting.

Attached Docs: None.

Committee Action: TBD.

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

Recommendation: None.

Recommended Language for Official Action

No action needed.

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION

Public Mtg/Date:	CLPS, September 2, 2025
Description:	Discussion and/or action on neighbor request for <i>Please Slow Down for Children Playing</i> signage on Flambeau Street and Amanda Drive
From:	Jami Gebert, Administrator
Question:	To review a request for two <i>Please Slow Down for Children Playing</i> signs on Flambeau Street and Amanda Drive.

Background

The Village received a request for the placement of two *Please Slow Down for Children Playing* signs on Flambeau Street and Amanda Drive. Attached to the RFC is communication with resident Mary “Jody” Apfelbeck regarding the request. As noted in the emails, Mountain Bay Metro Police Department (MBMPD) did complete a review of the area and attached are the department’s findings.

Further, in discussion with our Staff Engineer and research of other Wisconsin municipalities *Children at Play* or similar signage, is not recognized in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) by either the State or Federal Highway Administration. Interestingly, it’s been found implementation of a community-wide initiative has been much more effective than signage. Attached is the Transportation Synthesis Report, *Effectiveness of “Children at Play” Warning Signs*, in addition to an example policy from the City of Two Rivers adopted July 21, 2025.

Questions for discussion at the meeting:

- If not recognized by the MUTCD, can any municipal signage be installed on the roadway?
- Should the community consider a Special Needs Child & Children at Play Signs Policy?
- Whether or not a policy is considered, is there a community-wide initiative the committee, staff, and MBMPD could coordinate to implement? Both the Village & MBMPD have communication methods if a community initiative was developed. The Village does some communication regarding back-to-school awareness, which we could expand and coordinate with the Community Service Officers on posts, videos, etc. educating on pedestrian safety tips.
- Could a community initiative include support for private, temporary signs, such as A-frame signs, like what crossing guards use, during periods when children are present in the area.

I recognize this might be a sensitive topic, as we all may have differing views on the best safety method. However, I'm genuinely looking forward to a constructive and thoughtful conversation, that may stimulate a positive community movement.

Attached Docs:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Email RE: Request For “Please Slow Down for Children Playing” Signs on Amanda Drive- Mountain Bay Metro PD Extra Patrols Report- Transportation Synthesis Report, Effectiveness of “Children at Play” Warning Signs- City of Two River Special Needs Child and Children at Play Signs Policy example
-----------------------	---

Committee Action: TBD.

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION

Fiscal Impact: TBD.

Recommendation: None.

Recommended Language for Official Action

I move to

From: [Jody](#)
To: [Jami Gebert](#)
Subject: Re: Request For "Please Slow Down for Children Playing" Signs on Amanda Drive
Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2025 11:26:39 AM

Hi Jami,

Subject: Neighborhood Traffic Safety

Thank you for arranging MBMPD patrols in our neighborhood. It was reassuring to see the squad cars, and drivers noticeably slowed down while they were present. I truly appreciate the officers' efforts, even though—as we all know—the effect is strongest when patrols are visible.

Most neighbors already drive with care and slow down for the children, but a few do not. Additional signage could serve as a helpful reminder for everyone. Right now, there are at least 11 children, ages 2 to 10, living within just two or three blocks, and I've noticed more young kids on bikes this year than in the past.

I plan to attend the upcoming CLPS meeting and will encourage my neighbors to do the same. Please send me the agenda and meeting packet when they are available.

Thank you for your attention and commitment to keeping our community safe.

Mary "Jody" Apfelbeck
5805 Flambeau St, Weston, WI 54476
Cell: 715-355-4595

On Tue, Aug 12, 2025 at 8:52 AM Jami Gebert <jgebert@westonwi.gov> wrote:

Hello Ms. Apfelbeck,

I wanted to follow-up further on the below. I did communicate with the Mountain Bay Metro P.D. (MBMPD) about monitoring the below and completing a report on traffic observations in the area. I would be interested if you have noticed any improvements since the late July timeframe? Regarding the signage placement, the Village has a Community Life and Public Safety Committee (CLPS) that would review signage requests such as the below.

The next CLPS meeting is Tuesday, September 2nd (due to the holiday) at 5 PM. I would add the request for the *Children at Play* signage to the agenda. MBMPD would share their observations from the area since July. The CLPS committee is comprised of seven Weston residents. The meeting is held in the Municipal Center, 4747 Camp Phillips Road, and are open to the public, plus a virtual option is available. I can forward the meeting agenda and packet the Wednesday before the meeting. The committee would discuss and evaluate the sign placement in the area, considering the information collected by the MBMPD and likely also hearing from our Staff Engineer regarding placement if recommended for approval.

Let me know how traffic has been in the area and I will keep you in-the-loop on the upcoming

meeting agenda and packet.

Thank you,

Jami Gebert

From: Jami Gebert

Sent: Thursday, July 17, 2025 4:54 PM

To: Jody <jodya509@gmail.com>

Subject: RE: Request For "Please Slow Down for Children Playing" Signs on Amanda Drive

Hello Ms. Apfelbeck,

Thank you for the email message. I will forward to the Mountain Bay Metro P.D. also, as they like to be knowledgeable on requests such as the below.

I will be back in touch after completing some further research.

Thank you,

Jami Gebert

From: Jody <jodya509@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 17, 2025 12:58 PM

To: Jami Gebert <jgebert@westonwi.gov>

Subject: Request For "Please Slow Down for Children Playing" Signs on Amanda Drive

Dear Administrator Gebert,

Several weeks ago, I submitted a request to the Village regarding the need for "Please Slow Down for Children Playing" signs on Amanda Drive, but have not received a response.

There are currently seven young children regularly playing outside on this short, curving street, with another expected in September. Although parents provide close supervision, drivers must still be reminded to slow down and remain alert. Neighbors and I have observed frequent speeding and reckless driving, particularly near the curve where Amanda Drive meets Flambeau Street.

We respectfully request two signs:

- One facing west at the curve on Flambeau Street where it meets Amanda Drive
- One facing north at the south end of Amanda Drive

Note: I believe it's important to include the word "Please" on these signs.

While police patrols are helpful, signage offers a consistent visual reminder to drivers. We hope the Village can help us take this small but important step toward keeping our neighborhood children safe.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Mary "Jody" Apfelbeck

5805 Flambeau St, Weston, WI 54476

Cell: 715-355-4595

Extra Patrols for Violations and Children near the Street:

FLAMBEAU STREET and AMANDA DRIVE

Date	Time	Traffic Stops	Violations	Observation Notes	Misc
8/5/2025	12:19 am-1:00am	0	0	n/a	
8/5/2025	8:25am-10:19am	0	0	fastest speed 19mph - 3 cars - 1 ups truck -- no children in area	
8/5/2025	7:09pm -7:39pm	0	0	6 vehicles fastest was 20 mph- observed kids riding bikes but accompanied by adults	event 25101774
8/5/2025	9:10pm-9:30pm	0	0	no vehicles or people on the roadway in this area.	
8/9/2025	4:45P-5:36	0	0	Saw 2 vehicles 1 adult, top speed 21mph no children present	
8/9/2025	8:25p-9:00p	0	0	1 vehicle observed at 17mph	
8/10/2025	4:56p-5:26p	0	0	1 car backing in driveway, 1 car pulling in, 1 car at 24mph. 2 kids on bikes.	
8/10/2025	8:40pm-9:10pm	0	0	1 truck/trailer 18mph. One kid on electric scooter drove through area at 8:50 & 8:52PM.	
8/11/2025	9:53a-10:23a	0	0	1 student walking, 4 vehicles, highest speed 16mph	
8/11/2025	2:50p-3:30p	0	0	8 cars, 3 kids playing on or near road. 22mph highest. No reckless driving seen.	
8/12/2025	10:30a-11:15a	0	0	2 cars, 1 pulled into driveway on flambeau, top speed 23mph, no pedestrians on or near road	
8/13/2025	8am-8:30am	0	0	no vehicles seen	
8/13/2025	4:30p-5:15p	0	0	2 kids biking on flambeau, 10 vehicles 1 was ups truck top speed 23mph	
8/14/2025	1:55p-2:45p	0	0	7 vehicles, 1 ups truck. Top speed of 30mph.	
8/18/2025	7:45a-8:19a	0	0	no vehicles or children	

Complaint:

There are currently seven young children regularly playing outside on this short, curving street, with another expected in September.

Although parents provide close supervision, drivers must still be reminded to slow down and remain alert.

Neighbors and I have observed frequent speeding and reckless driving, particularly near the curve where Amanda Drive meets Flambeau Street.

We respectfully request two signs:

[One facing west at the curve on Flambeau Street where it meets Amanda Drive](#)

[One facing north at the south end of Amanda Drive](#)

Dept. Action:

Monitor traffic for violations (speed, reckless driving) and children near the roadway.

Findings:

No citations issued, vehicles do appear they are going fast on the curve, but radar shows they are not.



Effectiveness of “Children at Play” Warning Signs

Prepared for
Bureau of Highway Operations
Traffic Engineering Section, Traffic Design Unit

Prepared by
CTC & Associates LLC
WisDOT Research & Library Unit
September 25, 2007

Transportation Synthesis Reports are brief summaries of currently available information on topics of interest to WisDOT staff throughout the department. Online and print sources for TSRs include NCHRP and other TRB programs, AASHTO, the research and practices of other transportation agencies, and related academic and industry research. Internet hyperlinks in TSRs are active at the time of publication, but changes on the host server can make them obsolete. To request a TSR, e-mail research@dot.state.wi.us or call (608) 261-8198.

Request for Report

WisDOT is engaged in an effort to reevaluate and update its policies regarding roadside warning signs related to children, such as “Children at Play,” “Blind Child,” “Deaf Child,” etc. We were asked to review research on the effectiveness of these types of signs to better ground WisDOT’s policy decision.

Summary

There is no evidence that special warning signs of this sort reduce driver speeds or crash rates. This is the unanimous conclusion of the many credible sources we located on this topic. This claim is supplemented by a number of often-cited “common sense” observations that such signs do not give clear and enforceable guidance to drivers, provide a false sense of security to parents and children that may increase risk, expose the government to liability, give the false impression that areas without such signs do not have children, represent an unnecessary cost that then propagates as additional signs are requested and violate the principle that signage should be based on engineering, not political, decision making.

These arguments are used most frequently against Children at Play signs, and many of them—such as the arguments that CAP signs encourage playing in the street and that if in one location with children they should properly be in all locations—do not apply to Deaf Child, Blind Child, Handicapped Child or Autistic Child signs. These latter signs receive much less explicit discussion in the sources we located.

The **National Research and Guidelines** section of this TSR presents positions on child-related traffic warning signs with papers by U.S. DOT, FHWA, NCHRP and the Institute of Transportation Engineers. Though these all discourage the use of such signs, none of them cites specific research demonstrating that these signs are ineffective, and one source, the ITE *Design and Safety of Pedestrian Facilities* entry below, implies that no such studies exist, stating that “No accident-based studies have been able to determine the effectiveness of warning signs.”

State and Local Research and Practices contains a brief representative sampling of state and local positions on this topic. While many areas make use of these signs, we located no explicit defenses on

engineering grounds for their use. A common theme is the ongoing struggle to explain to members of the public that their requests for these types of signs are based on faulty assumptions about their effectiveness.

Many of the sources we located refer generically to multiple “studies” that have shown special warning signs to be ineffective, but despite extensive research we were unable to identify any specific projects meeting this description.

National Research and Guidelines

FHWA Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (2000)

http://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/kno-millennium_06.14.01.htm

A search of the MUTCD found no instances of “CAP,” “watch for children,” “slow children,” “blind child” or “deaf.” Related guidance includes the following:

- From Section 2C.02, Application of Warning Signs (<http://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/HTM/2003r1/part2/part2c.htm#section2C02>): “The use of warning signs should be kept to a minimum as the unnecessary use of warning signs tends to breed disrespect for all signs.”
- From Section 2H.03, Regulatory and Warning Signs (<http://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/HTM/2003r1/part2/part2h.htm#section2H03>): “All regulatory and warning signs installed on public roads and streets within recreational and cultural interest areas shall conform to the requirements of Chapters 2A, 2B, and 2C” (the chapters on general, regulatory and warning signs).
- CAP or other message signs are not specifically prohibited as long as they conform to the standard shape (diamond) and colors (black letters on yellow background) and as long as no symbols are used. Some state-specific MUTCD supplements (such as in New York) present the option of a CAP or similar sign.

Institute of Transportation Engineers: Traffic Control Devices Handbook (2001)

Paper copies are available from the WisDOT library.

Page 444 states that “Agencies should avoid the use of CAUTION – CHILDREN AT PLAY or SLOW CHILDREN nonstandard signs since such signs may imply ‘that the involved jurisdiction approves of streets as playgrounds, which may result in the jurisdiction being vulnerable to tort liability.’” (This quote is reproduced and expanded in *FHWA Course on Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation: Pedestrian Signing and Pavement Markings* at http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped_bike/univcourse/swless14.htm.)

To determine the original research basis for these claims, we noted that this source cites ITE’s *Design and Safety of Pedestrian Facilities* (below) for the claim that using CAP signs “may result in the jurisdiction being vulnerable to tort liability,” whereas this latter source, in its comments on CAP signs, refers back to this one.

Page 444 also states that “there are conditions where selected traffic control devices may be considered, such as around parks, or conditions where children may have disabilities and drivers need to take extra care.” This implies that Blind/Deaf/Handicapped/Autistic Child signs may be appropriate in some circumstances, though no evidence is cited on the effectiveness of these devices.

ITE: Design and Safety of Pedestrian Facilities (1998)

http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/PED_BIKE/docs/designsafety.pdf

Chapter 4, Pedestrian and Motorist Signing, states (page 42 of the PDF): “No accident-based studies have been able to determine the effectiveness of warning signs. However, this is understandable because of the complex nature of events leading into each accident.” Of the 41 agencies responding to a questionnaire used in preparing this report, four reported that “all types of pedestrian-related signs and pavement stencils were helpful,” while some agencies “responded that they use these devices in the hope that they will provide some benefit to pedestrians.” (See page 39 of the PDF.) Also on page 39: “Signs should only be installed when they fulfill a need based on an engineering study or engineering judgment. In general, signs are often ineffective in modifying driver behavior, and overuse of signs breeds disrespect and diminishes effectiveness. Unnecessary signs and posts represent a hazard to errant motorists and may cause an

obstruction to pedestrians and bicyclists. Furthermore, unnecessary signs are a waste of taxpayer dollars, represent an ongoing maintenance cost, and are a source of visual blight.”

NCHRP Synthesis of Highway Practice No. 139: Pedestrians and Traffic-Control Measures (1988)

Paper copies are available from the WisDOT library.

This report, quoting an earlier version of the *Traffic Control Devices Handbook* than the one listed above, says “Nonuniform signs such as ‘CAUTION—CHILDREN AT PLAY,’ ‘SLOW—CHILDREN,’ or similar legends should not be permitted on any roadway at any time... the removal of any nonstandard signs should carry a high priority.”

NCHRP Synthesis of Highway Practice No. 186: Supplemental Advance Warning Devices (1993)

Paper copies are available from the WisDOT library.

This report gives examples of numerous related signs currently in use. A specific example of a CAP sign is given on pages 38-39: “The device is not considered effective, but installation of the sign satisfied parent and political leaders. Generally, the residents and homeowners’ organization must pay to have this sign installed. The use of this sign and its variations has been discouraged by many agencies because the message implies that it is acceptable for children to be playing in the street. It is nonstandard due to the use of a symbol not contained in the MUTCD.”

U.S. DOT Message Points (February 11, 2002)

Paper copies are available from the FHWA. Please send a request to Fred Ranck, fred.ranck@fhwa.dot.gov.

This communication states U.S. DOT’s position on CAP signs, which is to conform to MUTCD standards. Highlights include:

- Studies of the effectiveness of CAP signs by ITE, TRB and FHWA to date do not demonstrate a reduction in crashes involving children nor a reduction in speeds. (Note: ITE and FHWA staff were unaware of any studies.)
- From an ITE “traffic tips” series that answers residents’ commonly asked questions about signs, etc.: “...studies made in cities where (CAP) signs were widely posted in residential areas showed no evidence of having reduced pedestrian crashes or vehicle speed.” Several cities report that measured speeds on residential streets experienced no decrease after the installation of CAP warning signs. Further, several cities reported no decrease in the incidence of traffic crashes involving a child hit in the street after the installation of CAP warning signs.

Fred Ranck of FHWA also states that “Children at Play” is not an appropriate message for a warning sign; rather “Watch for Children” is an appropriate message consistent with other warning sign messages.

State and Local Research and Practices

We have included some comments on CAP and other signs by state governments; state DOT research programs, including tech transfer efforts; and communities. Most sources agreed with the information from national sources. We have presented such exceptions as we were able to locate. We did not find any references to research supporting the use of these signs or other cogent arguments against the national stance regarding these signs.

Multiple States

More or less identical arguments repeating the national points made above appear in a number of state DOT tech transfer documents, including Massachusetts

(http://www.ecs.umass.edu/baystate_roads/newsletters/2001_fall.pdf),

New Hampshire (<http://www.t2.unh.edu/spring02/pg4.html>), California

(www.techtransfer.berkeley.edu/newsletter/05-1/signs.php) and Minnesota

(<http://www.mnltap.umn.edu/publications/exchange/2001-1/atplay.html>).

This source states that “most collisions involving children are not actually caused by driver behavior (which this sign has very little demonstrated effect on), but by unsafe, erratic actions by children... The CHILDREN AT PLAY sign may well be understood by kids and families as a suggestion that it is acceptable for children to play in the street, and thus, by producing a false sense of security, be

counterproductive. Furthermore, CHILDREN AT PLAY signs tend to propagate through neighborhoods, popping up on every block that has a child living on it. Signs lose credibility with motorists when they appear too often. Instead of being extra diligent, drivers tend to ignore the signs, particularly if no children are playing near the CHILDREN AT PLAY signs. When these signs appear too often, they raise questions like: If there is no sign does that mean there are no children present and no need to watch for children?"

Alaska

Municipality of Anchorage, Alaska, Traffic Department FAQ

<http://www.muni.org/traffic/FAQ.cfm>

This FAQ asks: "Are there any guidelines for the installation of Children at Play signs?" Alaska DOT answers: "Yes. Children at Play signs are typically posted on neighborhood streets directly located off higher speed roadways." This approach may bypass many of the national arguments against the use of these signs.

Colorado/Wyoming

2006 Section Activities Report: Colorado/Wyoming Section of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (2007)

<http://www.ite.org/elected/Colorado-Wyoming%20Section.pdf>

This report states that "nonuniform signs such as 'Caution—Children at Play,' 'Slow—Children' or similar legends should not be permitted on any roadway at any time," presenting the national reasons and citing the FHWA 1983 *Traffic Control Devices Handbook*. According to the *ITE Journal*, May 1988, "Children at Play signs may make parents feel more secure but they don't work and they carry no enforcement value."

Colorado LTAP Newsletter, Spring 2004

http://ltap.colorado.edu/newsletter/Newsletter_Spring04.pdf

On page 3, this newsletter addresses the Web site question, "What does MUTCD say about 'Children at Play' signs?" It repeats the national arguments and gives the additional argument, drawing from the TRB report *Maintenance Management of Street and Highways Signs* that deviating from the MUTCD (which does not include Children at Play and similar warning signs) is a bad idea because "about 29 percent of tort liability lawsuits against highway departments are related to traffic signing."

Florida

Florida Technology Transfer Traffic Information Program Series (TIPS), from the Florida Section (District 10) of the Institute of Transportation Engineers

<http://mctrans.ce.ufl.edu/transportationTopics/tips.htm>

Two TIPS are relevant to this TSR:

- **"Won't a Children at Play sign help protect our kids?"**
(<http://mctrans.ce.ufl.edu/transportationTopics/tips.htm#4>) This tip states that "studies made in cities where such signs were widely posted in residential areas show no evidence of having reduced pedestrian crashes, vehicle speed or legal liability. In fact, many types of signs which were installed to warn of normal conditions in residential areas failed to achieve the desired safety benefits. Further, if signs encourage parents with children to believe they have an added degree of protection—which the signs do not and cannot provide—a great disservice results... . Specific warnings for schools, playgrounds, parks and other recreational facilities are available for use where clearly justified."
- **"Why are traffic engineers reluctant to install Deaf Child or Blind Child warning signs?"**
(<http://mctrans.ce.ufl.edu/transportationTopics/tips.htm#74>) This tip gives the following reasons against using nonstandard, highly specific signs of this sort:
 - A Deaf Child or Blind Child sign does not describe where the child might be. Most streets within a residential area have children who react in the same way, and each driver must be aware of all children in a neighborhood environment.
 - These signs provide parents and children with a false sense of security that their children are safe when playing in or near the street.
 - When the novelty of such a sign wears off, the signs no longer attract the attention of regular passersby.

- Unique or unusual warning signs are a target for vandals and souvenir hunters and have a high replacement cost.
- Unique message signs have no legal meaning or established precedent for use in basic traffic engineering references. Their use is discouraged because of both the lack of proven effectiveness and undesirable liability exposure.
- Many traffic engineers feel that special warning signs are warranted at a location adjacent to a school for the deaf or for the blind, and have considerably more merit than those at a location where a deaf or blind person may only cross occasionally.

Maine

3.6.3 “Special” Warning Signs: “Children At Play,” “Deaf Person,” “Disabled Person,” “Horse Crossing,” etc.

<http://www.maine.gov/mdot/working-with-dot/section3.php>

This regulation states that “...the driving public does not react favorably or positively to these signs in most cases. In the late 1990s, the MaineDOT changed its policy on the installation and maintenance of these signs. It is virtually impossible for the MaineDOT to keep track of every handicapped person, playing child and crossing horse in every town along all state roads.... Knowing that these signs are generally ineffective, MaineDOT does NOT advise the use of these signs because allowing one sets precedence and generates many more requests and creates a new financial burden on the municipality.”

Michigan

Speed Control in Residential Areas

<http://www.ite.org/traffic/documents/tcir0053.pdf>

Page 24 of the PDF states: “Special warning signs such as ‘Children at Play,’ ‘Watch for Children’ or others that warn of normal conditions are not effective in reducing speeds in residential areas,” among other of the standard national arguments against these signs. It continues: “The MMUTCD provides standards for signs warning drivers that they are approaching recreational facilities such as parks and playgrounds. However, there is not enough evidence to determine the effect of these warning signs on vehicle speeds.” (Reference: Michigan Department of Transportation and the Michigan State Police, *Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices*, 1994 edition.)

City of Troy, Mich.: “How about a ‘Children at Play’ sign?”

<http://www.troymi.gov/TrafficEngineering/Children%20at%20play.html>

According to this document, “Studies made in cities around the nation where such signs were widely posted in residential areas show no evidence of having reduced pedestrian crashes, vehicle speed or legal liability.” According to research in the City of Troy: “Studies in the City of Troy have also shown very low effectiveness of the sign and therefore have not installed them in the past several years. Before and after studies showed no reduction in speeds.”

Minnesota

Frequently Asked Questions, Office of Traffic, Safety and Operations

<http://www.dot.state.mn.us/trafficeng/faq/faq-signing.html#m>

Question: “I would like to have a ‘deaf child/blind child/slow children at play’ sign installed on my street/highway near my home. How do I get this accomplished?”

Answer: “Mn/DOT does not install this type of sign on state highways since it is not enforceable (it is a warning sign) and it can lead to a false sense of security. If you are requesting signing on a city street, contact the city offices.”

North Carolina

Traffic Engineering Policies, Practices and Legal Authority Resources

NCDOT will install these signs upon receipt of a formal written request meeting certain criteria:

- Blind Child Area Signing: http://www.ncdot.org/doh/preconstruct/traffic/tepl/Topics/B-10/B-10_p.pdf
- Autistic Child Area Signing: http://www.ncdot.org/doh/preconstruct/traffic/tepl/Topics/A-18/A-18_p.pdf

- Deaf Child Area Signing: http://www.ncdot.org/doh/preconstruct/traffic/tepl/Topics/D-02/D-02_p.pdf

This strategy seems typical of a number of states. According to http://www.ncdot.org/doh/preconstruct/traffic/tepl/Topics/C-05/C-05_mm.pdf, “Children Playing warning signs are not approved for use on the state highway system right of way. These signs tend to promote a false sense of security for the children and encourage them to actually play in the roadway, since traffic is warned of their presence.”

Ohio

Slow Children at Play Signs

http://dot.state.oh.us/dist1/planning/TrafficStudies/children_at_play_signs.htm

According to this policy, “These signs are not used by Ohio Department of Transportation on the rural state highway system and ODOT discourages others from using them.”

This text is repeated in the *Office of Traffic Engineering Traffic Engineering Manual*, page 19 of the PDF: http://dot.state.oh.us/traffic/Publication%20Manuals/TEM/Part_02/part_02_complete%20for%20072007.pdf

Virginia

A Look at What Some States are Doing. “Deaf Child Area” Signs Available in Virginia (1988)

From AASHTO QUARTERLY, Vol. 67, No. 4, p. 13.

Paper copies are available through the transportation library system.

VDOT officials have developed a policy that allows the use of Deaf Child Area warning signs. Parents of hearing-impaired children can request these signs through the VDOT residency for the area where the sign is desired. The request must be supported by medical certification of the child’s hearing loss. The signs will be allowed on nonlimited access roadways of the primary or secondary system. Jurisdictions maintaining their own streets and highways are encouraged to use similar guidelines for the use of these signs.

West Virginia

Traffic Engineering Directive 225: “Children at Play” Signing (1999)

<http://www.wvdot.com/engineering/Manuals/Traffic/TED/TED225.pdf>

This directive states that “since the other signing alternatives convey to motorists specific regulations or warning or more permanent roadway conditions rather than conditions that may exist at unspecified times, Children Present signs should only be installed after all the other alternatives have been considered.”

CITY OF TWO RIVERS



TWO RIVERS
WISCONSIN

SPECIAL NEEDS CHILD & CHILDREN AT PLAY SIGNS POLICY

ADOPTED July 21, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page Number</u>
I. PURPOSE	1
II. BACKGROUND	1
III. RATIONALE	1
IV. CRITERIA	2
V. INSTALLATION LIMITS	3
VI. PROOF OF RESIDENCY	3
VII. PROCEDURES	3
VIII. SPECIFICATION	4
SPECIAL NEEDS CHILD SIGN APPLICATION REQUEST FORM	5
POLICY STATEMENT	6
FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS	7

**CITY OF TWO RIVERS SPECIAL NEEDS CHILD
&
CHILDREN AT PLAY SIGNS POLICY**

I. PURPOSE

To provide a City-wide policy governing the installation and removal of special needs (e.g. blind, deaf, autistic, or otherwise disabled) child signs and children at play signs.

II. BACKGROUND

On occasion the City has received requests from residents to install “CHILDREN AT PLAY” (CAP), handicap/disabled, deaf child, blind child, and autistic child signs or signs with similar messages. As yet, the City does not have a written policy regarding these signs, and upon occasion has allowed the installation of CAP or SLOW CAP signs with limited basis, plan, or follow through.

III. RATIONALE

Neither federal nor state standards, Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), directly recognize the placement of these types of signs. The latest and most comprehensive research on this issue was a Wisconsin Transportation Synthesis Report (WisTSR) “Effectiveness of “Children at Play” Warning Signs”. The report found:

There is no evidence that special warning signs of this sort reduce driver speeds or crash rates. This is the unanimous conclusion of the many credible sources we located on this topic. This claim is supplemented by a number of often-cited “common sense” observations that such signs do not give clear and enforceable guidance to drivers, provide a false sense of security to parents and children that may increase risk, expose the government to liability, give the false impression that areas without such signs do not have children, represent an unnecessary cost that then propagates as additional signs are requested and violate the principle that signage should be based on engineering, not political decision making.

These arguments are used most frequently against Children at Play signs, and many of them—such as the arguments that CAP signs encourage playing in the street and that if in one location with children they should properly be in all locations—do not apply to Deaf Child, Blind Child, Handicapped Child or Autistic Child signs. These latter signs receive much less explicit discussion in the sources we located.¹

The Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) also addressed this issue with the release of Circular Letter 2011-08. They didn’t prohibit their use, but they didn’t recommend their installation either.

Other word message warning signs dealing with children such as "Autistic Child," "Blind Child," "Deaf Child", or "Children at Play" are not recommended. These types of warning signs:

- Do not describe where the child might be;
- No longer attract the attention of motorists after initial installation;
- Have no legal meaning;
- Provide parents and children with a false sense of security;
- Are often left in place after the child is grown or moved away;
- Lack established procedures for engineering judgment or study; and

- Have proven ineffective.

The MUTCD provides the following support for the function of warning signs:

Warning signs call attention to unexpected conditions on or adjacent to a highway, street, or private roads open to public travel and to situations that might not be readily apparent to road users. Warning signs alert road users to conditions that might call for a reduction of speed or an action in the interest of safety and efficient traffic operations.²

The City policy will be to continue to prohibit CAP, SLOW CAP or any other AT PLAY (AP) signs, but to allow requested special needs child warning signs that meet certain criteria and documentation. The basis for the prohibition is summarized as follows:

1. Children, whether special needs or not, should not play in or near the street. Signs of this type give the impression that it's safe for children to play in or near the street. Streets are not a safe place for children to play. There are plenty of parks and other open spaces where it is safe for children to play.
2. The signs have little to no effect on driving behavior. They do not reduce driver speeds, accident rates, legal liability nor do they protect children.
3. The same reasoning also applies to special needs signs: "BLIND CHILD", "DEAF CHILD", "AUTISTIC CHILD" and "DISABLED CHILD". However, there is an important difference between these signs and the CAP, SLOW CAP and other AT PLAY (AP) signs. Use of a horn or the sound of an approaching vehicle may not be sufficient to warn a deaf child. Similarly, the visual aspect of a vehicle may not be enough to alert a blind child. Autistic and disabled children also may not be able to realize an approaching vehicle presents a danger. Installation of a special needs signs can help warn motorists of these situations.

Public Works performed an internet search for policies on the subject and found municipalities either prohibited the special needs warning signs outright or allowed their installation under certain conditions. In cases where certain signs were permitted; a resident was required to complete an application with proof of a deaf or blind child and documentation that ensured the sign would only be posted as long as the special needs child lived in the home. The MUTCD offers guidance on the application of warning signs:

The use of warning signs should be kept to a minimum as the unnecessary use of warning signs tends to breed disrespect for all signs. In situations where the condition or activity is seasonal or temporary, the warning sign should be removed or covered when the condition or activity does not exist.²

IV. CRITERIA

A sign request will only be granted for those children who are impaired to the extent that they are unable to hear, see, or otherwise comprehend oncoming traffic. The City reserves the right to deny any request found not to meet the criteria or overly burdensome requests, as determined by the City in its sole discretion. The child must be over the age of two (2) and under the age of sixteen (16) at the time of the request.

V. INSTALLATION LIMITS

The special needs sign shall be placed approximately 150 feet from the property line where the child lives but no less than 100 feet. This will provide enough advance warning for any motorist. A maximum of one (1) sign per approach will be installed for each situation. Sign locations will be determined by the Director of Public Works (“Director”, and such term shall include the Director’s designated agents).

Signs will only be installed on residential streets with a posted speed limit of 25 mph or less. Signs will not be allowed on arterials or major collectors as identified by the Director. All special needs signs will be installed within the City right of way, not on private property. The request for special needs sign will not be approved if its placement blocks or interferes with other required signs.

Streets special needs signs will not be considered for the following roadways:

- Mishicot Road
- Forest Avenue
- 45th Street (CTH VV): Mishicot Road to Tannery
- 22nd Street: Forest Avenue to Lincoln Avenue
- 22nd Street: Lincoln Avenue to Sandy Bay Road (CTH O)
- Lincoln Avenue: 22nd Street to 43rd Street
- Washington Street: 12th Street to 22nd Street
- Madison Street: Memorial Drive (STH-42) to West 14th Street
- 16th Street: West Twin River to Washington Street
- 14th Street: Madison Street to Hawthorne Avenue
- Hawthorne Avenue: 14th Street to Columbus Street
- Columbus Street: Memorial Drive (STH-42) to Hawthorne Avenue

VI. PROOF OF RESIDENCY

Proof of residency by the applicant (copy of driver’s license, property tax notice or utility billing) and proof of continued residency by the child who is the subject of the sign (sworn statement invoking the penalty of perjury) must be submitted at the time the sign request is made and on a yearly basis (January 1, of each year thereafter) to the City Public Works Department, 1717 East Park Street, Two Rivers, WI, 54241. If verification is not received, a personal contact will be attempted. If contact cannot be made, the sign will be removed.

VII. PROCEDURES

Residents shall fill out an application requesting installation of a special needs child sign. See Special Needs Child Sign Application Request Form. The Director of Public Works or designee will review the application to determine if the criteria are met for installation. If approved, the Director of Public Works or designee shall determine the location of sign placements and notify the applicant of the requirement for them to provide Public Works with “Proof of Residency” documentation prior to January 1st of each year. Public Works shall be also notified of the sign locations, and an electronic copy of the application shall be saved in the Public Works database. Public Works will then order the sign and install it as soon as practical. The Director of Public Works will report out to the Public Works Committee along with the full City Council on the status of initial applications and annual submission of required “Proof of Residency” documentations.

Following initial approval and installation of the sign, if the applicant does not provide “Proof of Residency” prior to January 1st, a notice shall be sent to the latest filed address of the previous applicant stating that the special needs sign will be removed promptly if proof is not received within 30-days.

Existing non-conforming signs identified in section II. BACKGROUND, above, shall be removed and replaced with the appropriate sign specified in section VIII. SPECIFICATION, below. Prior to replacement, Public Works shall verify that the criteria has been met for each address affected and the Special Needs Child Sign Application Request Form with supporting documentation has been provided. Public Works shall promptly remove all signs not meeting the specified criteria or without a properly completed Form or supporting documentation.

VIII. SPECIFICATION

All warning signs shall be 30" x 30" diamond-shaped (square with one diagonal vertical) with a black legend and border on a fluorescent yellow-green background. Warning signs shall be designed in accordance with the sizes, shapes, colors, and legends contained in the "Standard Highway Signs and Markings" (MUTCD) book (see Section 1A.11). Only the following text for the black legend will be allowed for each appropriate sign:



BLIND CHILD



DEAF CHILD



AUTISTIC CHILD



SPECIAL NEEDS / DISABLED CHILD

**CITY OF TWO RIVERS SPECIAL NEEDS CHILD
&
CHILDREN AT PLAY SIGNS POLICY STATEMENT**

The City receives requests from residents to install “CHILDREN AT PLAY” (CAP), handicap/disabled, deaf child, blind child and autistic child signs or ones with similar messages. While residents may believe these signs provide protection for their special needs child, studies have shown CAP and similar signs to be ineffective, giving parents a false sense of security. They may also lead to disrespect for other regulatory and warning signs. There are no studies that show the special needs children (blind, deaf, autistic or disabled) signs are either effective or ineffective.

The purpose of the City’s policy is to govern the installation and removal of special needs (blind, deaf, autistic or disabled) child signs and children at play signs. It’s our goal to assist residents in their request for special needs child signs that can warn drivers to situations that might not be readily apparent.

City policy prohibits CAP, SLOW CAP or any other AT PLAY (AP) signs, but allows requested special needs child warning signs that meet certain criteria and documentation. These signs include: BLIND CHILD, DEAF CHILD, AUTISTIC CHILD and DISABLED CHILD. A sign request will only be granted if it meets the following criteria:

- The child is impaired to the extent that they are unable to hear, see, or otherwise comprehend the dangers of oncoming traffic.
- A completed application.
- The child is over the age of two (2) at the time of the request.
- The child resides within the corporate limits of the City of Two Rivers and lives on a residential street with a posted speed limit of 25 mph or less.
- Applicant provides proof of residency (copy of driver’s license, property tax notice, utility billing or other documentation) for the applicant and the child.
- Applicant agrees to provide proof of residency prior to January 1st of each subsequent year and, if such proof is not provided, the sign will be removed by the City and will not be re-installed unless a new application is submitted.
- Applicant agrees the sign will be removed upon the earlier date of the child’s sixteenth (16th) birthday or when the child no longer lives at the subject address.

The City reserves the right to deny any request found not to meet the criteria or which is overly burdensome, as determined by the City in its sole discretion.

**CITY OF TWO RIVERS SPECIAL NEEDS CHILD
&
CHILDREN AT PLAY SIGNS POLICY
FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS**

- How can I get a deaf, blind, autistic, or disabled child sign on my street?

An application can be obtained from the City or online (print using Adobe Acrobat). Provide yours and the child's proof of residency information. These signs will be posted only on residential streets with speed limits of 25 mph or less.

- Can I get a "CHILDREN AT PLAY" sign on my street?

The City does not permit the use of these or similar signs on City streets because they give the impression that it's safe for children to play in or near the street and they tend to give parents and children a false sense of security. All children should be supervised and encouraged to play well away from the street. Two Rivers is fortunate to have numerous parks and recreational facilities throughout the City where it is safe to play. Also, drivers need to watch for children at ALL times, not just in areas with these signs.

- Won't "CHILDREN AT PLAY" signs help protect our kids?

One might think that "CHILDREN AT PLAY", "SLOW CHILDREN" or other similar signs would provide protection for children playing in a neighborhood, but they do not. It's the unanimous conclusion from many reliable studies in municipalities where these warning signs have been installed that there is no evidence that the signs reduced driver speeds or pedestrian accidents.

Furthermore, these studies have shown that "CHILDREN AT PLAY" type signs are usually more dangerous than no sign at all. This is because they tend to create a false sense of security and a false impression that areas without signs don't have children. If parents and children believe these signs are helping to protect them, when in reality they are not, children are put at greater risk. We are essentially doing a disservice to our residents and their children if we install these types of signs, and they are an unnecessary cost.

All children should be supervised when playing outdoors. They should not play in or near the street, but instead be encouraged to play in nearby parks and open areas safely away from traffic. These types of signs have long been rejected because they are a direct and open suggestion that playing in or near the street is acceptable behavior. In addition, their use could open the City to legal liability for somehow suggesting that children should be allowed to play in the street, based on the signs.

Typically, the City gets requests for these signs because a resident observed speeding in the neighborhood. Regrettably we usually find the residents in that area are the ones speeding. Use of these signs does not reduce vehicle speeds. Enforcement and education have shown to be effective tools. Therefore, any speeding should be reported to the Police Department.

For the above stated reasons, the City can no longer provide nor allow the use of generalized "CHILDREN AT PLAY" signs along public streets. Any existing City signs with the words "AT PLAY" will be removed and replaced with a special needs sign if applicable.

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION

Public Mtg/Date:	Community Life and Public Safety – 9/2/2025
Description:	Turn Movement Restrictions at the E Jelinek Ave and Camp Phillips Rd/CR-X Intersection
From:	Michael Wodalski, Director of Public Works
Question:	Does the Community Life and Public Safety Committee endorse restricting left turn movements at the CR-X/Camp Phillips Rd and E Jelinek Ave intersection?

Background

During the design process for the E Jelinek Ave reconstruction project it was discussed if there was a need to change the signage at the intersection of CR-X/Camp Phillips Rd and E Jelinek Ave. The Public Works Committee had made a recommendation to sign the E Jelinek and CR-X/Camp Phillips intersection as a right in/right out intersection.



As we were in the process of getting signage up for this intersection there was further discussion at the Village Board about restricting turn movements off of CR-X onto E Jelinek as well.

The purpose of restricting left turns in general is to reduce the likelihood of severe crashes at the intersection due to cars crossing two lanes of traffic. Also, E Jelinek Ave has historically been used as a “cut-through” street for people who are driving to/from STH 29 and Schofield Ave further to the east. Restricting that left turn movement would reduce the likelihood of people wanting to utilize E Jelinek as a cut-through. However, if E Jelinek is limited, motorists are then more likely to utilize the other side streets in the neighborhood such as Randy

Jay, Rodney and/or Kirk St to get to Douglas Ave or eventually Barbican Ave to turn onto Camp Phillips Rd/CR-X.

Staff did ask the Police Department to provide crash data at the E Jelinek and Camp Phillips/CR-X intersection and the number of crashes is shown below:

- 2024 = 4 crashes
- 2023 = 1 crash
- 2022 = 4 crashes
- 2021 = 2 crashes
- 2020 = 2 crashes

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION

Over the past 5 years there has been 13 crashes or 2.6 per year on average. The data received did not indicate the type of crash or severity. It also did not indicate if a turning movement was the cause or if it was some other factor such as weather. We did request if additional information regarding the crashes could be obtained and if we receive it before Monday we'll share that ahead of time with the committee as well.



Staff is seeking further input as far as the Committee's opinion on restricting turn movements to right in/right out at the above intersection.

Attached Docs: - Minutes from Public Works Meeting

Committee Action: - N/A

Fiscal Impact: - TBD

Recommendation: Staff is looking for any feedback on turn movements at the E Jelinek and CR-X/Camp Phillips Intersection

Recommended Language for Official Action

I move to _____

Or, Something else

Additional action:

10. E. Jelinek Ave and Von Kanel Street Reconstruction 60% Plan Design Discussion

Wodalski explained the design plan to the Committee.

Wodalski and Zeyghami discussed the design slope of 3% versus 2 %.

Wodalski advised the Committee of the complaints from residents with people speeding on E. Jelinek. Discussed the intersection of E Jelinek and Von Kanel options of fully mountable traffic circle, barrier curb traffic circle, or removable rubber speed table.

Lopes-Serrao asked what the data is from the speed trailer when it is by the electrical substation on E. Jelinek, what is the average speed, what is the high speed, and truck traffic. Wodalski replied the 85th percentile speed was about 37 mph which is 12 over the speed limit in that area.

Discussed the increase of police presence from Everest Metro Police Dept.

Zeyghami questioned the intersection of E. Jelinek and Camp Phillips. Wodalski stated it's a full intersection, we could add signage to limit left turns at given times from E. Jelinek onto Camp Phillips. Zeyghami and Mumper agreed.

Hartinger recommends changing stops signs from west to east rather than north to south. Wodalski confirmed stop control on E. Jelinek in place of Von Kanel.

Lopes-Serrao recommends installation of a 4-way stop at the intersection of E. Jelinek and Von Kanel.

Motion by Lopes-Serrao, second by Hartinger move to approve the cross sections as designed with the inclusion of a 4-way stop at Von Kanel and signage for a right in/right out at Hwy X and E. Jelinek.

Yes Vote: 4 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

<u>Member</u>	<u>Voting</u>
Zeyghami, Hooshang {Chair}	YES
Hartinger, Jasper {Vice Chair}	YES
Hubbard, Tom	---
Lopes-Serrao, Luis	YES – VIA ZOOM
Mumper, Roy	YES