

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2016**

1. Opening of Meeting

The meeting was convened by Chairman Stellato at 7:30 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Members Present: Chair. Stellato, Ald. Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner, Krieger, Gaugel, Bessner and Lewis

Absent: Ald. Bancroft

3. Omnibus Vote

None

4. Community & Economic Development Department

a. Recommendation to approve chair placement on public property for the Chair-ity promotion.

Rita: Lynne Schwartz the Executive Director of the Downtown St. Charles Partnership is here to present information regarding the Chair-ity event which was held last summer. This event generated quite a bit of activity and brought people to our downtown. We have heard quite a bit of positive feedback from this event. On a personal note: I was emotionally upset to see the chairs being removed from the riverfront last year.

Lynne Schwartz, Downtown St. Charles Partnership, 2 E. Main Street. The Downtown St. Charles Partnership is currently making plans for a Chair-ity 2 for the summer of 2016. We're here tonight seeking approval to place Adirondack chairs on City property for the purpose of this activity.

We will once again be inviting participants from the community to purchase and decoratively paint Adirondack style chairs to be placed throughout Downtown St. Charles. The program will essentially run the same as last year with some small modifications based on some experiences from last year. We're seeking approval to place chairs in the same locations as last year. We have a map showing the suggested locations with each dot representing a chair. It's not to scale; there will be some room in between the chairs. It gives you an idea of where we are looking to place them. Approximately the same number and the same locations as last year depending on how many entries we receive.

We will of course continue to ensure that the chair placement conforms to all local, State and Federal laws and does not interfere with any City projects. We will be encouraging business owners to place chairs on their own property during the event. We had a number of

businesses place chairs on their property, inside their businesses, and we've also received permission from the Park District to place chairs once again in Lincoln Park and Baker Park. We will be placing more chairs in Lincoln Park this year due to the popularity of the event; we have the approval to place approximately 10 chairs there.

Participants will have the option to donate the chair for an online auction. People have the chance to bid on the chairs for the duration of the activity. Last year the funds were earmarked for enhancement of the Volunteer Plaza. We worked with City staff and determined that proceeds from the 2015 event will be used for additional seating in the area just north of the Municipal Building. We've also agreed that the proceeds from the 2016 event will be put towards an enhancement on the East Plaza on First Street when that project is completed. We will work with staff to determine the best use of those funds at the appropriate time.

I mentioned that we have some modifications to the program based on our experiences from last year. This year the program will once again kick off Memorial Day weekend. The chairs will be placed on Friday, May 27. However, we will conclude the program on August 12. We wanted to shorten the program because there was considerable wear and tear on the chairs. If we're auctioning them off we want to make sure they are in good shape. We selected a date that coincides with the District 303 back to school. We found that most of the activity ceased at that time in the summer. One enhancement to the program will be a Facebook contest. This will not only help the program as it will give an additional way to participate in the program.

Finally, our volunteer Chuck Parr came to us with an idea last year and has created a replica of the White Sox chair from last year and is donating it to the auction for the event this year. We have it here this evening. There is another opportunity to bid on the White Sox chair. This chair received the highest bid last year bringing in \$365.00. It will be used in the meantime to promote the activity leading up to the event and will have a special place near the Municipal Building starting Memorial Day weekend. I'm happy to answer any questions you might have.

Chair. Stellato: The request tonight is to get permission from us to put these on public property.

Lynne: Correct.

Ald. Krieger: What will the chairs cost?

Lynne: The participants pay for the chairs. Ace Hardware on the east side of town has them offered at a discount of \$40.00. It's reasonable.

Motion by Ald. Turner, second by Krieger to recommend approval of chair placement on public property for the Chair-ity promotion.

Voice Vote: Unanimous; Nays: None. Absent: Ald. Bancroft. Chairman Stellato did not vote as Chairman. **Motion carried.**

5. Finance Department

a. Mid-Year Presentation by St. Charles Convention and Visitor's Bureau – Updates to 2016 Activities.

Chris: They have asked for this item to be deferred until the next committee meeting which is Tuesday, February 16. One of the presenters is ill and they won't be able to present tonight.

Chair. Stellato: Is there a motion to table this item?

Motion by Ald. Krieger, second by Bessner to table Mid-Year Presentation by St. Charles Convention and Visitor's Bureau – Updates to 2016 Activities to February 16, 2016 Government Operations Committee.

Voice Vote: Unanimous; Nays: None. Absent: Ald. Bancroft. Chairman Stellato did not vote as Chairman. **Motion carried.**

b. Seeking direction regarding a supplemental request for funding assistance from Riverfest for the 2015 event.

Ald. Bessner: *I will be recusing myself from the conversation.*

Chair. Stellato: Please let the record show that Ald. Bessner will be recusing himself from the discussion.

Chris: As the committee will recall back in late summer, early autumn, we received a request from the organizers of the RiverFest event relating to the 2015 event. The City had sent them a bill for City services in the amount \$11,421.62. The organizers at the RiverFest event have requested relief of that particular City invoice. As the committee will recall there was some very inclement weather conditions that occurred during the weekend in June when the 2015 event was held. That had a severe adverse financial impact to the results of RiverFest for the 2015 event.

Subsequently, we discussed the request at a couple Government Operations Committee meetings in September and again in November. The direction was to discuss the item once the budget discussions had started in 2016. We are prepared to have that discussion tonight. I can tell you that currently no final decision has been made, as the Committee is aware, to include the funding for RiverFest in the 2016/17 budget. Right now we are working our way through the draft and the final decision will come as the Committee and ultimately the City Council votes on that budget during April of 2016.

There were some questions raised at the November Committee meeting regarding the amount still owed to other entities. We have received an updated list from RiverFest and we did provide that to the Committee on Friday afternoon.

At the November meeting there was discussion and questioning of the previous three years financial results for RiverFest. I did have occasion to go back into the records and look at the

last three years. The 2014 event recorded a net loss of \$5,276, the 2013 event incurred a loss of \$9,356, and the 2012 event had a net income of \$10,500 dollars.

Tonight we will be seeking direction as to how the Committee would like to handle the \$11,421.62 that is currently outstanding and the subject of discussion. We have 3 basic options and then we can speak about the variations from these 3 basic options:

1. Deny the request and seek payment in the amount of invoice in full \$11,421.62.
2. The Committee could recommend accepting the request, and forgiving the payment.
3. The Committee could do a hybrid, suggesting that we would accept the request, forgive the payment for the 2015 event, and reduce the amount of funding that might be provided for the 2016/17 funding request.

Chair. Stellato: Any questions of Chris before we turn it over to the RiverFest Committee?

Ald. Turner: Did they give us a figure for next year already minus this \$11,000?

Chris: We have not received a formal application for the 2016 event as of this time. We have received some indications that they do plan to have a 2016 event, but as of this time we have received nothing in writing. Staff has not been able to review any kind of a formal application or any specifics of the event.

Ald. Payleitner: Years 2013 and 2104 had a loss. Were there any bills that went unpaid?

Chris: To the best of my knowledge no. We have not received any complaints nor have we heard any reports of that. Perhaps the representatives of RiverFest could verify that.

Vanessa Bell-Lasota, 1610 Howard St., St. Charles: Tonight the executive board of Pride of the Fox comes before you with a new vision, new leadership and a primary goal of moving forward with a new focus on one venue for RiverFest; the Dragon Boat Races, and one theme, our community heritage. We propose to produce a near weather proof, re-branded event which will suffer no financial impact from inclement conditions as have some fests in the past. The 2015 negative outcome proved to be a positive opportunity to re-tool the mission of this kick-off of a summer event. Included in our mission is to carry on the tradition of the Dragon Boat Races sanctioned by the American Dragon Boat Racing Association. We have that contract in hand. That event is turn-key. Our volunteer and boat competitor himself, Mr. Paul Rasolsen, has run the event all these years. It turns a profit on average of \$5,000. It is a no-fail event with a non-refundable fee and the dragon boats consistently fill their schedules with local and Chicagoland teams. We have perspective sponsors of the Water Ski Halftime Show on the river. That would generate \$10,000 - \$12,000. The goal is a modest \$10,000.

We propose to rebrand the event to Festival of the Fox, Dragon Boat Race Days. The biggest asset to the event is Potowatomie Park. We propose to shrink the footprint of the event from the 9 -5 venues that you've seen over the past years to one in Pottowatomie Park. Limited family friendly activities, like the acrobatic dog show, a local team rowing event, The Park Foundation Memorial Sculpture event, and local entrepreneur food vendors can complement the races.

Eliminating all but one venue would trim expenses erratically. We do suggest one option for you to consider. Would the Committee consider keeping the carnival which is also a reliable source of at least \$5000 in revenue rain or shine?

From 2016 this event can be developed further as a compliment to the active interest in our river corridor. At this time with 4 months lead-time on the event the Pride of the Fox is proposing this change.

Chair. Stellato: It's going to be at Potowatomie Park and just feature the dragon boat races?

Ald. Lewis: There would be no bands, no entertainment?

Vanessa: The option is to use that open stage next to the pavilion for free events. Low entertainment cost.

Ald. Lewis: Do you see these crowds filtering into our downtown using our stores or restaurants? Is it just going to be in the park?

Vanessa: It's going to be in the park and of course there will be other activities as deemed workable by Council. The other events, the Canine Capers by Anderson Animal Shelter, the water ski show half-time event, and getting the teens involved with the new rowing clubs. That would be more of the river up north down into the area. In terms of other venues that's it. No sand sculpture, no Lincoln Park, no First Street.

Ald. Lewis: No Art.

Vanessa: No craft show, you mean? Craft shows are now turn-key coming in as Scarecrow fest has. We don't have that. We could consider that, but again it all depends on what you advise in this financial situation going forward. We do need, and John will speak to the need, some operating capital.

John Olson: I have a CPA practice at 303 N. Second Street. The issue we have is when the old St. Charles Festival Committee decided to transfer it over to a partnership and the partnership decided that they weren't ready at that stage to take over; we wanted to make it small and what happens is it's a snowball going down a hill. The more that snowball goes the more we become exposed to weather. That is what has happened to this festival. The board has decided that if we can find our way through this financial situation we are going to keep the footprint small. I can tell you what has happened with the bands, etc. when I have done my analysis on the financials, it's because we have so many ideas, Lincoln Park, etc. and then we get rained out for one or two days and the cost goes right down to the bottom line and we lose money. We would like to have a lot more, but we're at a point where we think we need to go back to the basics.

Ald. Gaugel: You had indicated it will generate \$10,000 - \$12,000. Is that profit or in total?

Vanessa: We're confident in the dragon boats' figure that it will cover itself and generate \$5,000. We will have the addition of dragon boat team sponsorships that are sold at \$1,000 each. The water ski show, we're confident we have a sponsor for that. If the carnival is approved a very conservative estimate averages \$5,000 in profit. It covers itself and gives us a good \$5,000. That's where these numbers come from.

Ald. Gaugel: The \$10,000 - \$12,000 is total revenue, not profit, correct?

Vanessa: No, that's profit.

John: We don't know quite honestly. We haven't put everything to a budget. We need to do that if in fact we get the right direction to move forward. We have an organization that is at a crossroads. We think that with the numbers we have and what the dragon boats have produced in the past, last year \$5,000 was the best we ever did on dragon boats. Dragon boats have always made money. Basically \$2,000 - \$3,000. When I say make money they contribute to fixed cost. As we keep one event, the dragon boats, we have to cover some fixed costs too so we have to price that out. We think that possibly the dragon boats plus additional working capital from the City will allow us to be successful this year if we keep it small and don't let the snowball get out of hand, we can get back to having a reserve of \$8,000 - \$10,000. I can't tell you for sure because we haven't put pen to paper to see how the numbers come out.

Ald. Gaugel: Do you have a ballpark on what that budget is you need in order to make this new event?

John: \$25,000, compared to every year in the past \$200,000, it has to be all volunteer. It cannot be paid people. Major changes for this festival.

Ald. Gaugel: At the beginning you said there is new leadership. Are these all new people?

Vanessa: There is a combined 30 plus years of experience with RiverFest with the Board as it is.

John: New leadership is that this event, at least in the last 5 to 6 years, was run by an executive director and a Board but with an executive, paid, director. I think prior to that when it was St. Charles Festival Committee it had a paid executive director. Part of what we are proposing now is to go back to a total community volunteer operation. That will save. Outside of last year, if I go back 4 years before that and took out the executive director salary this event made money. Bottom line.

Ald. Gaugel: Clarify that for me. You are taking that executive director position out?

John Olson: Yes, the executive director will not have a position. If we do have an executive director they will not be paid. The Pride of the Fox Board is going to go back to make this a total volunteer organization.

Ald. Krieger: Where would you hold the carnival?

Vanessa: The same place.

John: Many years ago we talked at length about where we could put the carnival that's now right in Tom Anderson's parking lot. There is no other place to put it that is close enough to downtown. At times we toyed with the idea of putting it by the fairgrounds. As Vanessa has said, the deal we had in the past with the carnival is it's a turn-key operation. They give us a flat dollar amount up front and for us it was \$10,000 guaranteed; once they hit \$40,000 of revenue we get 20% of every dollar after that. It's a money maker for us; that's the only reason we would hope to have the carnival.

Ald. Krieger: Have you talked with the Park District about the boat races and do you have their permission and use of the park for that weekend?

Vanessa: You can't submit an application without payment. We do not have an application for the park. It is being reserved for us, but it's unofficial.

John: We owe them.

Ald. Silkaitis: What is your total outstanding debt for the whole event last year including what you owe the city?

John: About \$56,000.

Ald. Silkaitis: How are you going to pay that? I don't want to have another festival when you have outstanding bills. That's not going to work.

John: Let me put that into perspective. We're truly liable to pay approximately \$56,000 - \$57,000. If we take out what we owe the executive director, and take out what they owe me for accounting services, not my time, but my people's time as well as one other board member and the City. Remove those four people from the \$56,000 the number becomes a little over \$16,000. I think you have a sheet for that. Of that \$16,000 we had one account receivable outstanding of \$5,000. That gets it down to \$10,000 - \$11,000. If in fact we get to a point where we can say that over the next couple of years we can pay them back; we're hoping those people will work with us. As for John Olson, Kevin Call and our former executive director, the Board has not made a decision except that we do know that they get the last, if anything, when it's all said and done.

Ald. Silkaitis: Have all of the outstanding bills been paid 100%?

John: No. What the Pride of the Fox Board agreed to do, when we didn't have all the numbers in yet; the people who performed services, the small vendors, we paid them 100%. That left us with X dollars and of those X dollars we decided to exclude the City, Olson, Call, the executive

director and we paid \$.60 on the dollar. When I said we owed \$16,000 that number is 40% of those other items.

Ald. Silkaitis: Do you owe money to the Park District?

John: Yes, we do.

Ald. Silkaitis: Are they contemplating renegotiating the debt?

John: I don't know. The \$4,000 that they charged us last year was a negotiated deal with them. They had a unique structure on how they charge for the park.

Ald. Silkaitis: They have not been paid yet?

John: We paid them 60%.

Ald. Silkaitis: 60%. And now you're going to ask them to sign another contract. As a business man I wouldn't sign an agreement.

Ald. Payleitner: What are you asking us for exactly?

Vanessa: As you can see in the Executive Summary; one thing that might not be clear is that with the 10% reduction the amount we would get, if all things were considered and we had not owed the City, would be \$27,000. We don't expect that, and again we're down to one venue so the costs aren't as high. One of our hopes is that \$11,421.62 would be deducted from that \$27,000 and we would get some part of that balance. That would be ideal for us. We would be able to pay off the park, create the contract with the park, the contract with the American Dragon Boat Association, pay the rental for the dragon boats, and the insurance that we need for that main event. That would reserve the weekend, we would not lose RiverFest weekend. I know this is a minor issue, but the reason we are not calling it RiverFest is there's an expectation with that. This is a great opportunity for us to rethink, rebrand and go forward.

Ald. Payleitner: You're asking for the same amount as before when there were 4 or 5 different venues that were incorporated in our downtown. Now we're just having a venue that's only in the park. I'm going back to what Alderman Lewis was asking; besides a nice party for our town, what advantage do you see this bringing to St. Charles, our downtown, our City? I see an advantage for the park, you're using the park.

Vanessa: Less the amount we own the City. RiverFest as a community event is in its 34th year. The advantage to saving that weekend is it's geared for our community, for St. Charles. Give up that weekend, another community will take it, and it will become a tradition elsewhere. We lose the opportunity. This is just our rethinking to try to save that weekend and make the best of this as we can to get some kind of continuity and move into the future. We know that if we were to receive a decision tonight we're poised to start tomorrow to execute and complete the task for this year to create an event for the community. The dragon boats audience

is local, but is also Chicagoland. The other events would be to create a family friendly atmosphere in the center of town on that weekend.

Ald. Payleitner: At Pottawatomie.

Vanessa: At Pottawatomie.

Ald. Lemke: The smaller footprint makes sense. I had the opportunity to work an event the week after 911. People were staying home. It was a \$200,000 event and I was the accountant and over time we continued to pay back those vendors and that's what I hear going on here. I also hear some flexibility if we have something in our budget for the current year to say a portion of the current year would be to reduce your liability to us and give you something so you can upfront the Park District for this year. I hope I'm right and that's what I'm hearing.

Ald. Turner: I think the action I would go at this time is to accept the request, forgive the payment and reduce the amount of funding for next year.

Chair. Stellato: I have a question procedurally with staff. I don't know how much time you have spent with this group Chris?

Chris: To date we have not received any formal plan or application. There is a special events application and there is a process that goes through staff and a committee that meets, evaluates and, if necessary, comes before this particular body to discuss the special event. We have not had an opportunity to go through any of that process or procedure.

Chair. Stellato: We are putting the cart before the horse. We probably need to get that done and put that application together. I think our choices are either we forgive the \$11,421.62 for this year on top of that would be \$16,000 our total commitment is still \$27,000 this year. In 2017 do you envision the funding being around \$15,000 - \$16,000 again? I think the next question is going to be what happens next year.

John: The application process we haven't gone through yet. We as a board are trying to figure out what's going to happen. We have to have an indication from the Council about whether or not they will support the notion of funding for this to go forward. If not, there are consequences we as an organization have to take. We have debts well in excess of our bank balance. This is just me talking, but I would think that if I was sitting on the Council starting in 2017 I would go back to how RiverFest used to be funded. That was an \$18,000 loan and if the festival made money we pay back up to the \$18,000. In the past, when that was the methodology, there were payments back.

Chris: That's correct.

Ald. Stellato: We are in a dilemma because to take a vote we would need that process with the permit. All you're going to get tonight is an opinion.

John: The opinion should be enough to go back to our Board to say either yay or nay on the application.

Chair. Stellato: The question tonight for us as a Committee is that if this gets through staff and proper procedures as they come back to us would you consider waiving the \$11,421.62, giving them \$16,000 for this year.

Ald. Lewis: Do you foresee needing Public Works or the Police Department? Last year on top of that there was another \$1,000.

John: Public Works, if the carnival is held in the City parking lot. Outside of that the rest of the Park District fee covers the set-up.

Chair. Stellato: That brings up another question. Would you support the Carnival or not?

Ald. Lewis: I really commend you for going back and trying to figure out how to do this. I know how fun the dragon boats are for a lot of people. I would be willing to go with accepting the request and forgiving the payment. I don't know how the carnival would connect with the other side of the park but I would go along with that.

Ald. Gaugel: I have a hard time with this. The last 3 years have all been negative. I know you said new leadership, but it's the same people in different roles. I commend reducing the scope, which I think is essential. It just seems like we're just going to keep adding on to the existing problems. I would have a very hard time supporting forging the \$11,421.62 right now.

Ald. Krieger: Like everyone else has said this is tough. Given the financial dilemma that the State may be putting the City into, until we have more information I can't forgive this. I'm sorry.

Ald. Turner: I still like the 3rd option the best. Reduce it off next year's budget.

Ald. Lemke: Accept the request, forgive the payment, and reduce the amount of funding sounds like it's similar to what others have said.

Ald. Payleitner: I love the idea of a community event. Thank you for putting that back on the table. You're saying that there is a revamping. The Board has a different name, different leadership.

Vanessa: There is no different name. We're the Pride of the Fox. We're just working without a paid executive director. It's purely volunteer.

Ald. Payleitner: That's the part that's gone. I hate to get a bunch of new people on board.

Vanessa: There are five of us.

John: We are going to become a volunteer organization.

Ald. Payleitner: I like foreseeing in the future that it goes back to what it was; an \$18,000 loan and we're all gearing to work towards a profit. It's tough. You can't fill out paperwork if you don't know what money you're going to have. Some of us aren't comfortable with agreeing to money when we don't know what we're committing to. Could we add that in?

Vanessa: With a stipulation that we itemize. We have an itemization we are just putting numbers to it. The essential service, expenses, we do have a list that I have here. The rebranding, marketing, sanitation services, very little. We could provide, if you would like to add that.

Ald. Payleitner: What about the sanitary? Are they going to be able to do it without being paid from last year? I see they are on the list.

John: We are going to have to negotiate and convince them we are real and have support. If we don't have support it's not going to work. We don't know that answer. We don't know how many port-o-potty's we need, etc. That would be the next step if we decide to go forward.

Ald. Payleitner: I commend your hearts for this project and the plan going forward, if that's the goal. Maybe with that in mind; I can maybe do option 3.

Ald. Silkaitis: If we do loan you the money and forgive the debt you're going to give it to the Park District to pay them off. Correct? We are paying the Park District for something we had no control over. I have a problem with that. They won't even participate in doing what we're doing for you. You haven't even spoken with them about it. That bothers me that you haven't asked them. You're asking us, but you haven't asked them.

Vanessa: We have made overtures, but there are very strong expectations from the park. We don't know that we have any negotiating room. We got that indication. If that amount is the deal breaker, again because we are going to make some profit, you could put that stipulation of some repayment to the City.

Ald. Silkaitis: I don't like the fact that we have to cover it and they're not expected too.

Vanessa: It's not that their not expected to. There is just no negotiation.

Ald. Silkaitis: We are negotiating and they are not. You keep coming to us for the money. I understand your situation. Don't get me wrong. I just have a problem with that.

John: I share some of that, but there has been no negotiation. There is probably a difference which is the City of St. Charles last year was a sponsor of this event. That's what you signed up for. There is a contractual arrangement that you were the sponsor. The Park District was a vendor. There is a difference between the two. That's my personal opinion.

Ald. Silkaitis: I consider it a sponsor, but I consider it a bank then too. We loaned you the money. If you're going to reduce the scope of it, which is an excellent idea, I think it's an excellent idea to go back to your roots. I can't see you drawing a lot of people to the carnival because you're not going to have many people coming down to it. I'm not in marketing, but my common sense says you won't get the crowds you had before. The other problem having it at Pottawatomie is how is that going to benefit the downtown like it has before. Our sponsorship is yes we spend the money, but we're bringing in consumers to businesses in St. Charles. I can't see it bringing as many in because you are moving north of town.

Vanessa: I'm sure John will have an answer, but if I could preface before. I would say that Pottawatomie is an asset to the City. We're doing the best we can to make use of that as the key focus to what would make this work. Numbers drawn to the City, of course with fewer venues there is going to be less traffic. Then again, a significant portion of residents also are of the opinion that they stay home during festivals like this because it's so crowded. Perhaps we will have more support for residents than ever. We do know we can handle this pared down event with the volunteers and the Board we have. We can make it weather proof, reliable and get an effective, successful event on the river this year saving that weekend for St. Charles. That much we know and that's what we're working with.

Ald. Silkaitis: Don't get me wrong. I appreciate all the work you've done. I have no problem with that. Look at it from the taxpayers who I'm responsible for. I think sometimes we just have to say enough, we have to be careful. I have trouble supporting any of the options.

Ald. Payleitner: Would we again have the role of sponsor? No. Okay, thank you.

John: Well, you could if you wanted to. I think that was part of the issue.

Chair. Stellato: I think this is a year that we're going to test and see how you can survive. It's a survival year. I think the Dragon Boat Races are a wonderful event. I try to go down whenever I can and watch them. I think it's something we should continue. Based on that, I'm okay with trying this for a year. No guarantees on my part, speaking personally, it's what happens after this. I'm not in favor of the carnival, but I'm okay with the downsized event. Let's try for a year. When we get the numbers back let's see what happens. That's my opinion and we've heard from everyone else.

Mayor Rogina: I want to commend the group for trying to reduce this footprint. I know all of you at one time or another has had a conversation with me about some of the problems associated with RiverFest in the past relative to the large size and some of the issues associated with neighborhoods. I think given the fact that they have to come forward with an application you have time to think about it. To your point Ald. Stellato, on the fact that the Dragon Boat Races, they have been an institution ever since I've been here. I hate to see that leave the community on that particular weekend. As a starting point, I think that's important to consider.

Yes, there is \$11,000 on the table that we would forgive and an additional \$16,000 expenditure. I think that Director Minick would tell us that minimally over the last 3 or 4 years our outlay has

been at least \$30,000. You're in a position to cap it at whatever you want to cap it at. It would be less money in the future budget than we have spent in previous years. Something to think about. I appreciate the conversation and I also appreciate them for coming back with a downsized event that perhaps is more realistic and makes more sense. Save the Dragon Boat Races.

Chair. Stellato: You two will meet with Mr. Minick. You've got input from us. No vote taken tonight. Any last minute comments or questions?

6. Police Department and Public Works Department

a. Update on Police Facility Project – Information only.

Peter: Police Chief Keegan and I are here tonight to present the findings of the Police Facilities Study we've been working on for over a year now. After recognizing several building and operational deficiencies with our current facility the City Council authorized a comprehensive study of the structure, the site, and also a full review of the operational needs of the Police Department. Staff hired the architectural firm of FGM to assist with the completion of the study. They are experts in the field. They are here this evening as well to answer any questions if needed.

Throughout the process we have continued to keep you updated of our progress and most current findings. Tonight represents the conclusion of the study and will focus on the recommended solutions based on all of the information we have gathered to date. We will briefly review some of the data that we shared in the past to build a bridge to today, but we will really try to focus and highlight on the most recent information including the concept plan, cost estimates and final recommendation.

The next couple slides represent a check list that we prepared to identify the strategy to this study and the things completed to date. The first thing we worked on is an Exterior Conditions Report. That report revealed some conditions of the current facility. The facility is in need of some repair. In particular, new roof, new windows, some parapet walls have structural concerns. In the report that was done 2 years ago, the time line was a 5-year window to get some of those major repairs complete.

We also completed an Interior Conditions Report. On the inside of the building, although staff has maintained the interior of the building in regards to paint, keeping the carpet cleaned and ceiling tiles repaired, there are some major considerations on the inside. Some of the things we've shown you in the past include floor settlement, some pictures of concrete that has settled in the building. We know there are several ADA accessibility issues within the building. Probably the most expensive costs are mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems that are out of date and need to be replaced.

We also did an indoor air quality and environmental review. I'm happy to say the air quality of the building is good, however the report did identify that we should be doing one of these reviews on an annual basis because of the condition of the roof and the mechanical systems.

That's a bit beyond what we would do for a normal building in the City. We met with the Historic Preservation Commission a few times. They've classified this building as non-contributing, regarding architectural, environment, or significance in the downtown. That doesn't mean that they wouldn't be involved if we did a renovation. They would want to see the details. They also said that if it was elected to demolish the building it would not be a significant historical contribution to the downtown area.

We have the Engineering Site Survey completed and we know there are several major conditions there as well. It's adjacent to the river and more importantly the 100-Year Flood Plain. Current standards regulate that a building of this type or any building needs to be 3 feet above the 100-Year Flood Plain. Our current elevation is 1foot 3inches above the flood plain. It doesn't meet the current standard. There needs to be a 50-foot buffer between the river and the edge of the property which we're well within right now. We've seen the pictures of the utility mess that we know is under the ground that surrounds this site as well.

Some other things we did as part of the study in regard to planning and design is to establish some project goals. We have a slide coming up that represents those. We did a Space Needs Assessment as well. That is an assessment of the current space that is owned in the building and compared that space to what a modern facility for police activity should be. We know that we have 30,500 sq. ft. in our building now. The assessment suggested that we should have in today's environment 40,000 sq. ft. of required space to operate efficiently as a police department. The assessment also included a 10,500 sq. ft. covered parking garage as well.

We were able to get out and tour some other police facilities. We got the police staff one day and took a bus and went and saw some of the other local communities' stations. We had a site and building appraisal. This building sits on a 2.13 acre site. It's zoned CBD1, Commercial Business District. The market value for the site came in at \$2.325M.

We have spent the last few months developing concept plans moving forward and cost estimates to represent those studies. From a public works perspective we are looking for a department that is sustainable and a building that's sustainable. From the police perspective they are looking for a building that is functional. We want to be conscious about cost, build a structure that is respectful to its neighborhood, and is cost effective. This is a building that is for the community and we don't want to lose focus of that.

Our team has kept these goals posted in front of us as we have gone through the process. You will hear Chief Keegan tonight expressing that our recommendations really are based on these goals. Before getting into the options I wanted to say that we considered up-front what options we have:

1. We can do nothing. I think we have talked as a group and this isn't a feasible option. We have existing condition reports and studies that suggest we've got some building and operational deficiencies. We think it's irresponsible to keep the building the way it is recognizing we have those conditions.
2. We can remodel the existing facility. We'll show you a plan that does that.

3. We can demolish a part of the facility and construct a new addition. We'll show you a scheme that does that.
4. We can demolish the entire existing facility and construct a brand new facility on its current site.
5. We could construct a new facility on an alternative site.

On the next slides you will see a site plan that represents a drawing that our architects have created that is the type of building that could fit on the site. I show the option on the top and the associated dollar amount that it would cost to do this particular option, \$6.24M. That represents the median. Our bigger study includes a range of costs. We took the median costs so you get a sense of the magnitude of cost. We've identified the options as either a short-term, mid-term, or long-term solution.

In this particular site, the plan represents the building the way it sits today. There is no change. It's a remodel to the current plan. The footprint of the building stays the same. Some of the benefits are that it's an existing location. Folks are familiar with the location, the identity of the building wouldn't change. From a public works perspective the \$6.24M solves the building conditions. We get new roofs, new windows, and new mechanical systems. However, from an operational perspective it doesn't solve any of them. The floor plan doesn't change in this option therefore the operational needs within the facility don't change. There would be no addition and no additional space as the assessment told us. You have the automatic site constraints that I mentioned. We're considering this a short-term plan 10 to 15 years.

Option 2 is a remodel and addition. These are new site plans. We are suggesting in this option to demolish a portion of the building and keep some of the existing building. The price is \$20,000,621.00 as a median. Again, you have the familiarity of the existing location. This particular option we've got a mixed use, a new building combined with the old buildings. That could be a positive or a negative depending on how you look at it. We solve the building conditions for public works with this particular solution. We get new roofs and new mechanical systems. It is one of the higher cost options. It solves most of the important operational concerns that the police department has. We still end up with problematic site constraints. We consider this a mid-term plan 20 to 30 years, perhaps.

Option 4 is a brand new building. \$21.8M median cost for this solution. Use the existing location, new building, therefore a new identity and image on this option. It solves our building condition issues and most of the operational concerns as well. This also solves most of the problematic site constraints, especially the flood plain conditions. This particular design pushes the building away from the river. It provides a buffer and also gets us out of the flood plain to that 3-foot elevation that's needed. This would be considered a long-term plan, a 50-year solution.

Option 5 is to create a new building on an alternative site. The site we're presenting today is on the northwest corner of IL Rt. 31 and Red Gate Road. The reason we chose this site is because it happens to be a site the City owns. It was originally dedicated for a 4th fire station. We have this identified as a combined facility, police and fire, if that is needed in the future. I will note that

the dollars associated and considerations are really only for the police portion of the design. It does not include the fire portion of the site. This is a way for us to get and apples to apples comparison to a current site. It is a real site we know we can build on and we wanted to know if the project would fit on the site, its 3.2 acres. We have a potential improved location. It's still up for debate whether an off-set location is an improved location. I think the Police Chief will tell you that a main route address is a benefit in his eyes. We get that with a road like Rt. 31. It's a new building identity, optimum functionality and operational. It's a 50-year solution, brand new building on a new site.

With this particular alternative we have a potential profit of reuse of the existing police site. The Police Department will move out of its current site and into this building. Therefore we have that building and site available to us. This is potentially the lowest cost new building out of the options we've showed and it meets standards and codes.

Chair. Stellato: Can you go back to option 3 or 4 either one of those. Have we done soil tests to determine what's underneath that ground? Is there soil that could support that?

Peter: That would be the next phase of the project. We've done projects in this area. We know the conditions.

Chair. Stellato: So your quote anticipates some conditions and it's in the number.

Peter: I think that's reasonable to say. Also, as we have said before the utilities that are under this area, it takes that into consideration.

Chair. Stellato: Option 5. The number of \$18M, does that include taking the \$2M out that we get for the old site?

Peter: That does not.

Chair Stellato: Potentially it could be \$16M if we sold the existing facility for \$2M.

Peter: That's correct.

Ald. Krieger: You did not look at the possibility of adding on to the current Public Works. I understand you can go for a third floor on that building and there is a lot of City land down there.

Peter: That is correct. It is an option. We did not go as deep as this particular site in regards to investigating it. It's certainly an option that we can consider as an alternative site.

Ald. Turner: There was discussion about the Valley Shopping Center. Was that considered?

Peter: That is another alternative site that we've looked into. We've taken it as far as that conversation. We know it's potentially available and it seems to fit what we're looking for in

regards to area for the site and also off of a main route, if it's the Committee's wish to move forward with an alternative site option. That is certainly one we could look at in the future.

Chief Keegan: I'll walk you through the last few slides. What houses a 21st Century Police Facility? We sat with our architects and did some interviews with our staff. What are some things we use the facility for?

- **Administrative Offices** – Me, the Deputy Chief, the Command Staff, staff that aren't responsible for answering calls for service are housed at the police station, social worker, administrative assistants, training, and investigators.
- **Break/Lunch Room**
- **Evidence Processing and Evidence Vault** – All the evidence we take in, there are certain protocols that the Illinois State Police and CALEA, our accreditation module, has on how evidence is processed, stored and maintained.
- **Investigations** – Detectives are housed at the police station.
- **Locker Rooms**
- **Exercise Facility**
- **Records**
- **Temporary Lock-up** – Typically prisoners are transported to the Kane County Jail, but often times they are processed at our local facility and housed until bond is met.
- **Training/Community Meeting Room** – we want to be a focal point for the community to use our facility. Homeowners groups, neighborhood watches. We want folks to come and feel safe in our facility and gain that relationship with the police department and forge those relationships. That's important to us.
- **Police Vehicle and Equipment Garage** – What we see now-a-days is the officer squad cars are really their offices on wheels. We have just as much equipment as far as dollars and cents inside the car than the car its self. Between mobile computers, video systems, radar units, electronics, radios, lights, etc. Those vehicles need to be stored and stored appropriately so we don't have the undo wear and tear on electronics.

How do we respond today? St. Charles was incorporated in 1834. We've come a long way, especially in our police responses. St. Charles is divided into quadrants or beats. There are four police beats that we typically use, two east of the river and two west of the river both north and south. Officers respond from their assigned beats to calls for service and emergencies. Unlike the Fire Department, it's rare for officers to respond from the Police Station. They are encouraged to stay in their beats. Our dispatch center has GPS locators that are utilized and the officers are seen in real time on a city map and the closest car is often times dispatched to that emergency.

What do people come to the police station for? Officers call people to the station to release either their vehicle or a piece of evidence. Often times they come in to bond out someone with a traffic violation or a criminal offense. We get a lot of people coming to the station looking for copies of police reports. If it's not an emergency situation they might come into the station to file a station report.

What's the purpose and functions of the police department? What am I looking for as your Chief of Police? The Police Department must be identifiable as a police station. Right now we have six different entrances on our building. We don't have a clearly identifiable vestibule or moniker of our police station. We have an address off the beaten path, 211 N Riverside. That creates confusion. We're not located on a major thoroughfare. With the use of cell phones and people being mobile, often people are driving to the station and walk up traffic has greatly been reduced. A lot of the people who visit our police station are walking along the river or Pottawatomie Park. It needs to be accessible, convenient to visit, and a safe haven for the community. We encourage people who are involved in divorce proceedings or have custody issues use our lobby for exchanges. We don't want a volatile situation to take place in the home or outside in the community. We encourage folks who are uneasy about Craig's List transactions or any kind of meet and greet to come to our lobby or parking lot. Once again, lobby complaints are few and far between. Many of our responses are out in the field. If the officers come into the station the closest car is going to be called.

Where does our recommendation lie today? We'll open it up for questions. Mr. Suhr went over the four goals of the study and after we looked at this with our team and architects. After a comprehensive study and analysis considering long-term sustainability, cost and 21st century policing needs, staff recommends the following:

- We want a sustainable, usable, cost-effective, and community orientated police facility.
- We think a new police facility meets those goals.
- One that gives us a 50-year shelf life, that's responsible in cost.
- We feel based on our recommendation with the architects and my team, that an offsite location is the recommendation I will make on behalf of the Police Department.

Ald. Silkaitis: I've always thought we should keep it downtown. It's always been there. I understand the logic of having it on a main thoroughfare. I'm not sure with Rt. 31. It seems out there. I like Ald. Krieger's point about the Public Works complex. I don't know if it's even possible to put on a third floor. The old Valley Shopping Center, I'm sure that would add a lot of significant cost to the process. That's my only concern about that idea. Under the right circumstances I could probably see moving it from down here, reluctantly, but I'd like to look at the Public Works complex and do some more research on that if you would please.

Ald. Payleitner: I agree that it should be relocated outside of the current location. Listening to your presentation I couldn't agree more that the police station is a safe haven. It gives off a community presence. Any town you go to the first thing you know is where the police station is. Whether or not they use it they know it's there. I like that it would have visibility to the community. With that in mind having it on the outskirts of town defeats that purpose. I understand we own the property. Perhaps we will need it in the future for a fire station. I think the cost would be worth it to have it in a location similar to the Valley Shopping Center. That's where I would like to see it go, but for sure start from scratch and get a new place built.

Ald. Lemke: There is difficulty in temporarily relocating out and then moving back. I see some problems with the existing site. We've bandaged it a lot and it needs more bandages. Some of the things we have talked about and we get every day is police and fire reports. We see that

there are a number of issues that are reported. Maybe an officer has to come down there. As an accountant in my day job; I think a 50-year site is a good investment in the community. The depreciation per year is relatively small for a site on Rt. 64. The thing that's never been discussed is that the site on 31, almost out of town, is saleable. When you consider the idea that you might be able to sell that location; I think it makes other locations in town a lot more viable financially. I was encouraged when someone talked about the Public Works garage. We're talking about a lot of vehicles and maintenance. Having two maintenance staffs, just like if we had five fire stations. The cost isn't so much to building, but staffing all of these people and you have a second set of maintenance and they have to communicate. Rt. 64, Rt. 25, those are agreeable to me. I don't think we've considered everything. I think we talked about a Peck Rd. site. You talk about a lot of the interplay between yourself and Kane County.

I had once suggested, given to your comment, that you would like to have it visible in the center of town; that tends to be a little more secretive of a site. It's hard to make that the visibility you say you want. Valley Shopping Center, Public Works, something out on Peck, maybe there is something we didn't consider yet. All of these are central.

Ald. Turner: Cost wise I really like Rt. 31/Red Gate. You want a safe haven. It's my preferred, but I think if you really get down to it, a safe haven and what the community wants I would say 1a) Red Gate and 1b) Valley Shopping Center.

Ald. Krieger: Originally I thought the 31 site would be good. Then when you think about people going to the station, that's a long way for them to travel and the police cars will travel farther to get to the station. I really think it should be downtown. I think you should have a new department, demolish and rebuild. I don't think the old buildings are worth saving. I would prefer it be downtown and, if not, certainly look at the city garage, Public Works area. I'm kind of disappointed that it wasn't looked into. Those would be my two choices. I think Valley Shopping Center would be way too expensive. It would be nice. That would be my 3rd choice. I think 31 and Red Gate is just a little too far northwest for the rest of the community to take.

Ald. Gaugel: Shortly after I became an alderman you gave me a tour of the facility. There is no question that I think we need a new facility. As far as the site, I don't think I'm convinced on any one of them. I think they are all viable options. The one that seems to be talked about a couple times tonight, which would be the Public Works facility, I think has merit. I would like to caution against ending up with the same situation that we're currently in. Using the same existing building to add on or repurpose. Maybe that's not a 50-year fix and only a 20-year fix. Is there enough land there to put a whole new building? I'm not saying no; I'm saying I would like to see the full study or proposal on that. I'm open to anything. I do think we need a new facility.

Ald. Bessner: A 50-year plan is the way to go. That's the way I see it. It's just going to put us in a good position for the future so we don't have to keep adding on and annexing on the current station. You showed a plan with a \$6M build-out cost. You said it would weather proof the current facility, but it wouldn't be any better operationally. If you could make it better is there a cost attributed to that or it can't get any better?

Peter: There may be a plan between that one and the next option, remodel and demo of a portion of the building. I think what we'd find out is that the cost would almost reach the same price. Once you get into an existing building and gut that building to change interior walls, make it the way you want it to function operationally. Sometimes you spend more money doing that than leveling it and starting over. The architect might be able to help me define that a little bit more, but from my experience that's exactly what you run into. It's certainly something we can dig into a little bit more.

Ald. Bessner: I was trying to see if those costs added up to an \$18M to \$20M new facility.

Peter: It think it would be pushing that limit. There might be a savings on that once we dig into it, but I don't think it would be a significant savings.

Ald. Bessner: I agree with Ald. Turner. I like the 31 and Red Gate Road area because it is kind of a buffer zone; it's now where our water tower is. It does kind of fit there, but at the same time trying to be more visible, it is center of town if you look east and west. I would say 1a) for Red Gate and 1b) for Valley Shopping Center.

Ald. Lewis: There is a lot to think about. I agree we need a new police station. I agree with the 50-year plan. I do not support the Rt. 31 location. I think if we want it to be a visible community asset it sits right across from the County limits and South Elgin. I don't think it has a presence of St. Charles and I don't see St. Charles growing in that direction any more. There is also no public transportation to that location. People who might need the police station would be depending on some sort of public transportation, walking or riding a bike. My preference is with Ald. Silkaitis and Ald. Krieger to keep it downtown. It seems to make sense to me to have a campus here. If that's not the option I would support the Valley Shopping Center. I think Public Works doesn't have the visibility. As it is you can't even see Public Works when you go down 7th Avenue. If we want a presence I'm not sure that place does it either. Maybe we have some studying to do, but I think we all know that we want something new. It's just where.

Chair. Stellato: I'm comfortable with it not being in the location it's in today. Trying to build on the existing site, knowing the conditions of potential bedrock and bad soils, I think we have to abandon that idea. We need to get a new facility. I will defer to whichever site is cheapest. That makes sense to me. I think what you've heard tonight is everybody is okay with saying the existing site is not going to work. Go out and find another spot. I don't know if there is any more feedback you need from us tonight. It's got to be a new facility.

Chief Keegan: We studied the space needs of the police operations in today's market place. We didn't hone in on specific sites outside of where we are currently located. We used the demonstration of Rt. 31 and Red Gate, it's just that, a demonstration, because it's City owned. There is multi-use purpose at that site if we were to build with a fire department. What we wanted was direction from the Council to go back to our architects and hone in on sites outside of where we are currently located. We did our due diligence between the survey, the appraisal, the mechanicals, and the exterior/interior analysis. Now the next step with the architects is to

look at some of the sites that were brought up here from the Council. We'll take that back and hopefully come back to you with some costs and solutions moving forward.

7. Inventory Control

- a. **Recommendation to approve an Ordinance Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk of the City of St. Charles to Approve the Award of a 2016 Chevrolet Tahoe to Don McCue and Approve Selling Replaced 2011 Chevrolet Tahoe Vehicle #1870.**

Mike Shortall: On behalf of the St. Charles Police Department I'm seeking approval to purchase the 2016 Chevy Tahoe from local low quote Don McCue Chevrolet. This vehicle has been approved through the City Fleet Committee and also through budget. Additionally, I'm seeking approval to sell its replacement 1870 via PublicSurplus.com the online auction service for the City.

Motion by Ald. Turner, second by Krieger to recommend approval of an Ordinance Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk of the City of St. Charles to Approve the Award of a 2016 Chevrolet Tahoe to Don McCue and Approve Selling Replaced 2011 Chevrolet Tahoe Vehicle #1870.

Voice Vote: Unanimous; Nays: None. Absent: Ald. Bancroft. Chairman Stellato did not vote as Chairman. **Motion carried.**

- b. **Recommendation to approve an Ordinance Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk of the City of St. Charles to Approve the Award of a 2016 Ford Utility Police Interceptor to Zimmerman Ford and Sell Replaced 2010 Ford Crown Victoria Vehicle #1718.**

Mike Shortall: Again on behalf of the St. Charles Police Department I'm seeking approval to purchase a 2016 Ford Utility Police Interceptor from low quote and local vendor Zimmerman Ford. It has been approved through budget and through the City Fleet Committee. Additionally I'm seeking approval to sell its replacement 1718 via PublicSurplus.com as well.

Motion by Ald. Krieger, second by Turner to recommend approval of an Ordinance Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk of the City of St. Charles to Approve the Award of a 2016 Ford Utility Police Interceptor to Zimmerman Ford and Sell Replaced 2010 Ford Crown Victoria Vehicle #1718.

Voice Vote: Unanimous; Nays: None. Absent: Ald. Bancroft. Chairman Stellato did not vote as Chairman. **Motion carried.**

- c. **Recommendation to approve an Ordinance Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk of the City of St. Charles to Approve the Award of a 2016 Ford Utility Police Interceptor to Zimmerman Ford and Sell Replaced 2011 Ford Crown Victoria Vehicle #1842.**

Mike Shortall: Item 7c is an exact copy of item 7b except I am seeking approval to sell the replacement vehicle 1842 via PublicSurplus.com.

Motion by Ald. Turner, second by Krieger to recommend approval of an Ordinance Authorizing the Mayor and the City Clerk of the City of St. Charles to Approve the Award of a 2016 Ford Utility Police Interceptor to Zimmerman Ford and Sell Replaced 2011 Ford Crown Victoria Vehicle #1842.

Voice Vote: Unanimous; Nays: None. Absent: Ald. Bancroft. Chairman Stellato did not vote as Chairman. **Motion carried.**

8. Fire Department

a. Recommendation to approve the Sixth Amendment to the TriCom Intergovernmental Agreement.

Chief Schelstreet: In June 1976 the TriCom Consolidated Dispatch Agency was formed by IGA between St. Charles, Geneva and Batavia. Since that time there have been five amendments to the IGA to reflect the current practices at the time. What is before you is the 6th amendment to the IGA and it is intended to bring TriCom up to current standards in regards to being open for further consolidation? We have always been in favor of consolidated agencies as a way to decrease cost and increase service. What we are requesting tonight is the approval of the 6th amendment to the TriCom IGA and authorization of the Mayor or sign the same.

Ald. Turner: I have been on that board for 11 years. There is a change in the voting here. They are going to have our contract agent. These are not going to have one vote. If somebody comes in of a certain population they will also get a vote. This has not happened before. The voting has always been between St. Charles, Geneva, and Batavia. We will still have a majority. There really isn't any politics on this Board. The only goal with TriCom is public safety. We're just going to give them a little bit more voice. Elburn, Sugar Grove, Waubensee College and North Aurora, give them a little bit more say.

Ald. Krieger: What about South Elgin.

Ald. Turner: We are probably in discussions back and forth with them. Nothing has really been finalized. A city of that size would get a vote.

Chief Schelstreet: The intent of the IGA is open to anybody who would want to come and as Ald. Turner explained anyone who has 8% calls per service or above will receive a vote. The rest of the agencies will be consolidated into a one voting block.

Motion by Ald. Turner, second by Krieger to recommend approval the Sixth Amendment to the TriCom Intergovernmental Agreement.

Voice Vote: Unanimous; Nays: None. Absent: Ald. Bancroft. Chairman Stellato did not vote as Chairman. **Motion carried.**

Chair. Stellato: We are at the end of our agenda. Are there any questions or comments from the Committee members or anybody from the audience? Is there a motion to adjourn?

9. Executive Session

- Personnel
- Pending Litigation
- Probable or Imminent Litigation
- Property Acquisition
- Collective Bargaining
- Review of Minutes of Executive Sessions

10. Additional Items from Mayor, Council, Staff or Citizens.

11. Adjournment

Motion by Ald. Krieger, second by Bessner to adjourn meeting at 8:56 p.m.

Voice Vote: Unanimous; Nays: None; Absent: Bancroft. Chrmn. Stellato did not vote as Chairman. **Motion carried.**

:tt