

**MINUTES  
CITY OF ST. CHARLES  
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, MARCH 5, 2018**

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was convened by Chairman Bancroft at

**2. Roll Call**

**Members Present:** Chairman Bancroft, Ald. Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner, Gaugel, Vitek, Bessner, Lewis

**Absent:** None

**Ald. Payleitner:** I'd like to make a comment on tonight's committee agenda along with a request for moving forward. I've made this request before, and I'm making it again. I'm 100% certain this isn't the case, but fear it hints at a lack of transparency when we list agenda items by the non-descript ordinance wording as with 4a and 4c. Unless someone digs into the packet they would have no idea we're looking to add another liquor license classification or are having a discussion on video gambling, which is one of the hottest most decisive topics this Council has seen in my 7 years. I would like there to be descriptive language and if necessary site the ordinance to be discussed, as it is in the case of item 6a and 6b on the agenda. Thank you.

**3. Omnibus Vote**

**a. Budget Revisions – February, 2018**

Motion by Ald. Turner, second by Gaugel to approve the omnibus items as presented.

**Voice Vote:** Ayes: Unanimous; Nays: None. Chrmn. Bancroft did not vote as Chair. **Motion Carried.**

**4. Police Department**

**a. Recommendation to approve an Ordinance Amending Title 5, Entitled “Business Licenses and Regulations” Chapter 5.08, “Alcoholic Beverages”, 5.08.090, “License - Classifications”, Section 5.08.100, “License Fees; Late Night Permit Fees; Fees Established, and Section 5.08.130 “License-Hours of Sale” of the St. Charles Municipal Code.**

**Chief Keegan:** There are three subsections to this ordinance, creating the new D-9 license class, the fee schedule, we've asked the Council to consider \$500 per year, and the hours of operation which we have initially codified at 7 am – 12 pm, consistent with other B and C licenses. The applicant is here.

Besides the three elements I just discussed, the other two things that were the options of the liquor license. One of which is the special event license would allow a licensed caterer from the City of St. Charles, licensed as either B or C, and the other license, as a small event venue, is to proceed with the BYOB. They can't be co-mingled, you can't have the renter bringing their own alcohol in addition to having a licensed caterer.

We had John McGuirk take a look at the language. There were some concerns from the Council in reference to the ability to sell alcohol. The licensee, the D-9 applicant, will not be purchasing alcohol from a licensed distributor, therefore they can't sell it. Obviously if someone brings it in, it would be a caterer, or as an open bar, or cash bar. I believe this has been vetted appropriately. This is consistent with ordinances we've seen in Sycamore and Elgin.

**Ald. Lewis:** I thought I read that with a D-9 license a manager has to be on premise at all times.

**Chief Keegan:** A bit of both; not only does it cover that there has to be someone on premise at all times, it also addresses the alcohol upon delivery, whether it's the BYOB or the caterer has to be basset trained, have dram shop insurance, and someone has to be on site at all times.

**Ald. Lewis:** I hope it's clear that food has to be predominant.

**Chief Keegan:** That's codified as well.

**Ald. Silkaitis:** I appreciate that you listened to my comments and eliminated the sale.

Motion by Ald. Silkaitis second by Ald. Lemke to recommend approval of an Ordinance Amending Title 5, Entitled "Business Licenses and Regulations" Chapter 5.08, "Alcoholic Beverages", 5.08.090, "License - Classifications", Section 5.08.100, "License Fees; Late Night Permit Fees; Fees Established, and Section 5.08.130 "License-Hours of Sale" of the St. Charles Municipal Code.

**Roll Call:** Ayes: Stellato, Silkaitis, Lemke, Turner, Gaugel, Vitek, Bessner; Lewis; Stellato; Silkaitis; Payleitner; Lemke Nays: None Bancroft did not vote as Chair. **Motion Carried**

**b. Recommendation to approve a Proposal for a New Class D-9 Liquor License for 210 Cedar, LLC, to be located at 210 Cedar Avenue, St. Charles, Illinois 60174.**

**Chief Keegan:** Once again Karen Ramella is here to answer any questions. This would be to approve the D-9 license itself.

Motion by Ald. Turner second by Silkaitis to recommend approval of a Proposal for a New Class Liquor License for 210 Cedar, LLC, to be located at 210 Cedar Avenue, St. Charles, Illinois 60174.

**Voice Vote:** Ayes: Unanimous; Nays: None. Chrmn. Bancroft did not vote as Chair. **Motion Carried.**

**c. Recommendation to approve an Ordinance amending Ordinance 2015-M-47 of the St. Charles Municipal Code.**

**Chief Keegan:** We are here to discuss our video gaming ordinance as it relates to the sunset clause initially adopted by City Council on October 19, 2015. This sunset clause mandates the automatic repeal of our video gaming ordinance, which was supposed to go into effect on April 30, 2019 unless reauthorized by ordinance and enacted by City Council.

Some highlights of this program and ordinance outside of the trial period and sunset clause include the following:

We initially passed an ordinance in 2010, Ordinance M-14, prohibiting video gaming within our city

limits. Currently, 20 out of the 23 villages in Kane County allow video gaming, with Campton Hills, and Geneva abstaining. Although we opted in, and repealed our initial ordinance in 2015 we did not initiate gaming going live until September 2016, because a covenant within our ordinance tied to the State's budget and the video gaming tax rate.

We currently have 13 locations licensed in the City of St. Charles, 55 total machines. Three more locations are pending within the State's application portal. In addition 4 locations have either closed or eliminated video gaming since the ordinance went live.

Some nuances of our ordinance as a home rule community that are different or more restrictive than state law is the following:

- We do not allow advertising or signage.
- We mandate that a liquor license must be held and operated for 12 continuous months before a video gaming license is obtained.
- The fee schedule; we currently mandate a \$1000 initial licensing fee followed by a \$500 renewal fee. Each individual terminal is licensed at \$100 per year.

We are here to consider the sunset clause. From a law enforcement perspective I offer the following for your consideration:

During the last 18 months we have not brought any violations to the attention of the St. Charles Liquor Control Commission. We have not documented any concerns with video gaming or had any associated police reports during this trial period. Additionally, I brought monthly financial reports as requested.

My action item this evening is consideration by the committee to repeal section 6 and section 7 of the original ordinance as approved, Ordinance 2015-M-47, subsection 6 says that this ordinance shall be automatically repealed on April 30, 2018 unless reauthorized by ordinance enacted by the City Council. Subsection 7 says that this ordinance shall be in full force and effect at such time the State of Illinois budget that contemplates municipalities receiving a 1/6 share of the revenue attributable to video gaming.

**Ald. Silkaitis:** I'm still not in favor of this. To me it's not right for St. Charles.

**Ald. Payleitner:** Thank you for the information, it was very helpful. All my arguments remain the same, probably more so. The biggest being I take my role as a City father seriously. I feel we must take great pride and responsibility for the decisions we make; we must at all cost avoid any decisions that may cause harm. The Chief mentioned there was no crime per say, but unlike alcohol, there are laws that protect from the over use of alcohol, we don't for gambling. Last year \$1,923,794 was lost gambling in St. Charles. If it's truly disposable income being used, as has been argued, I'd venture to mention how much better those dollars could have been spent. The City's take, just under \$100,000 is a far cry from the \$250,000 promised by video gambling proponents last time this was up. I strongly feel no dollar amount brought in by video gambling to the city is can justify the detriment to even one family in St. Charles. This is not anecdotal, this is real, the projections made when this came to pass now have St. Charles names and faces on them. I say shame on us! It's been said that it's good for our local businesses. I think we have quite a few in the audience that will concur. I've yet to see promised business improvements or the plethora of jobs promised. I counter that it's even more profitable for the video gaming operators.

I've heard video gambling is the same as playing the lottery or a friendly game of poker. Ignoring the social ills of the science of the addictive, destructive behavior caused by video gambling doesn't make it less. Some say as long as we don't see the signage and lights often associated with video gambling in our town, the town's image won't be hurt. If it's okay, why are we hiding it? It's because deep down we know it's not good for our image. I believe this is an issue that causes us to vote our conscious; I'll be voting mine.

**Ald. Vitek:** There have been no violations from the business establishment perspective. City council just approved the contract for AID, for another year of mental health services for the City of St. Charles. These are services for the residents of the City of St. Charles to receive mental health counselling.

**Chief Keegan:** Yes, our social worker program does a lot of things. One of the things we look out for are folks that are in need of intervention. It could be alcohol, drugs, gambling, etc.

**Ald. Vitek:** Our ordinance has been in effect for 18 months. Over that period of time have you had or been advised of any calls for individuals seeking those services?

**Chief Keegan:** We have not. I did a search through our records management system associated with gaming that may have come in a police report. I did not see anything.

**Ald. Gaugel:** This is a difficult decision. We as a Council and a City should be independent of the State. We have many conversations revolving around the State of Illinois and reducing our dependence from the State. That said, at this time, and after this program has been in place for 2 years. I think it has been managed well, its aided the businesses in town, there have been little to no problems as reported by Chief, I think we'd do more harm than good by removing it at this point. I would vote in favor of continuing to keep it.

**Ald. Bessner:** I'll vote in favor of keeping as well. Keep the signage restrictions in place.

**Ald. Keegan:** The signage is status quo, nothing has been changed from the original ordinance.

**Ald. Lewis:** The last time this was discussed, was that we were going to extend the sunset clause, not remove it. I'm surprised to it being recommended for removal completely. I was left with the idea we were going to extend it another 3 years. I could go along with that. This is the first I've seen that section 2 was being removed. The 1/6 of the revenue, to remove it from the ordinance; I would think if the State starts taking more money away we would need some protection left. Why was that taken out?

**Chief Keegan:** Since the State law has been enacted that 1/6 share hasn't changed from the State's perspective. We did tether our ordinance to the State's budget and part of that budget discussion was that they were going to reduce municipalities' share of the tax rate. That has not changed.

**Ald. Lewis:** If it doesn't change we can leave it in.

I have ribbons who anyone who might want them. March is national problem gaming awareness month. This was sent to me by the Renz center. I served 12 years on the Mental Health Board, if you have an opportunity to serve as a liaison on the Mental Health Board, you should. They receive money by special tax. They just got done distributing over \$500,000 to about 16 different agencies. Once of them is Renz Center. With that money, and it needs to be spent on St. Charles residents, they are giving

out free assessments this month. Just call the Renz Center. You don't see the ravages of gambling as you might alcohol. We tax our residents and give the money to residents to help with addictive behavior, and we put in gaming. It seems completely backwards to me.

**Ald. Turner:** Chief you said this was a discussion item, but sounds like we're going to vote on this tonight.

**Chrmn. Bancroft:** Yes, we're voting.

**Ald. Payleitner:** How do we get our money, who do we get our money from?

**Chris Minick:** We get a wire transfer from the state monthly.

**Ald. Payleitner:** We're still dependent on the State of Illinois. What kind of crimes are we looking for here? In reference to Ald. Vitek's question; what would show up on a police report?

**Ald. Vitek:** I was referring seeking mental health services. I called the Renz Center to find out what their case loads are like. I spoke with a specialist, didn't seem like there has been a substantial increase seeking services.

**Ald. Payleitner:** You were just looking for services.

**Ald. Vitek:** Yes.

**Chrmn. Bancroft:** I appreciate the conversation and respected each other's views. I agree with the comment made by Ald. Gaugel. This has been managed very well Chief. If this goes to council I would vote in favor of it as well. From the standpoint of the discussion here:

1. The Signage issue, from my perspective, I saw that a lot more as an accommodation. Restricting the signage was important to everyone, and to the people who oppose this.
2. I'm not sure what crime you would look for because it's not a crime.

I'd like to open this for public comment.

**Linda Litchfield:** 1002 S. 5<sup>th</sup> Street, St. Charles. Many of you know me from a couple of years ago when I spoke to you in opposition of this because of what I went through personally. Before you start high-fiving yourselves and patting yourselves on the back and being happy of how well this has been managed and you haven't had any problems. How do you know there haven't been any problems? The problems are not at the establishments. I was a coach to someone about 6 months ago. This person is a relative of someone who works at an establishment that has video gambling. It's gambling, not gaming. This worker gambled on breaks, before work, after work, put his family in financial ruin. This person asked how this is allowed to happen. The supervisor of this person was approached and asked why he didn't stop him. The supervisor said because he was on his own time. At minimum there should have been a conversation with this person. There is no hotline or social worker that was called to intervene. I got a call from a Chicago Tribune reporter today doing an article on Cities in Illinois that have lifted this. Decatur is looking to limit their licenses or take it away. Why would you want to wait 8 – 10 years before you see the damage? Do the moral, ethical, and prudent thing now. That situation I told you about is not isolated. Why are the GA meetings quadruple the attendance? You don't think it has anything to do with this? Of course it does. I wish St. Charles would say enough is enough. You are

elected to protect the people. You don't need it here.

**Steven Bryant:** 708 South Avenue, St. Charles. I've been a resident for about 7 years. When we go out to eat we make St. Charles a priority. Gaming has been a big topic the last few months and is something I rarely notice. To me it makes no difference. I've never used these machines. It doesn't make any difference to me if this passes. When I think of all the incremental money our businesses would lose, and St. Charles would lose it does concern me. I hope we keep the gaming.

**Bob Karas:** 646 Lakeridge Drive, South Elgin. I Own Rookies and Alexanders Café here in town. Our experience has been positive as far as our financial situation. Haven't seen any adverse effects in our place or from customers. We haven't watched people lose money; we don't really pay attention to what people are doing. Some seem very private about that. Without gaming, specifically Rookies wouldn't be here today. The Valley Shopping Center is in bad shape. The way our business was we didn't have the means to improve. Our goal now is to purchase the building, and is in negotiations to do that. If this doesn't pass we would forgo that. We own 10 restaurants, two more coming down the road, without video gaming I don't think we would have those 10 restaurants. This is a difficult business. Costs are out of control. We try to manage it the best we can. It's something we need to survive. Everyone's concern is the social part. I don't see any difference from gaming, alcohol, gun control, legal marijuana. The list goes on and on. We all love America and its freedoms. It's up to us to manage what we do in our lives. We'd like to invest in rookies, we've been there 22 years, we're proud of it. We wouldn't survive without it at this point.

**Rick Brown:** 816 Crossing Way, St. Charles. 17 years. I own Alley 64. The money we generate from gaming allows us to give back to the community. We do a lot with charity's and Special Olympics, MS. Everything we get to do with this extra money helps us to give back. In today's society we label everything we do as harmful. We have kids going and shooting up schools. I understand what being said here. We're talking a lot about the negative. Has there been an increase of people with gaming issues. We are making judgements on people that can have a cocktail, but they can't game. It's another opportunity for entertainment. We're private in St. Charles, we aren't advertising, it's an alternate means of entertainment while inside.

**Jim Buenrostro** – 240 Culvert Ave, Batavia. I'm the Treasurer and Administrator of the St. Charles Moose Lodge. Video Gaming has helped us a lot; it allows us to give our hall free of charge for fundraising, and repair our building. I think if you don't do this, we'll lose business. Members will go to other lodges. Our machines, we have 5, we pay the City \$1,000 year. I haven't seen anyone sit for hours at a time. If the machines go away, food business goes away. I think it would be a great asset to keep it.

**Meagan Hageman and Linda Hageman** – 441 Stewart Street, Batavia. There are negative things about this. We brought an event to Alley 64. One of the big things is that these bars are getting involved. There are different pieces that go into it, but one of the big things I'm seeing is bars like Alley 64 that are taking the extra tickets and donating every single cent. When it comes down to it, these people are giving back to the community just as much as the community gives back to them.

**Linda Hageman:** I grew up in St. Charles. I've watched St. Charles grow and change. People are going to gamble. They will go outside of St. Charles. When you walk into Riverside, Rookies, Alley 64, those people are there, having dinner with family and friend, they may spend \$20 in a machine. You don't see people sitting for hours at the machines. People have to be responsible for themselves and make their own decisions. As a representative for Special Olympics can honestly say Alley and

several other business have donated money back to our cause and many others with money they get from gambling. We think it's a benefit, it's not hurting St. Charles, and it's bringing more people into your community.

**Ald. Lemke:** With respect to the state lottery. My losses have been infinite. If we didn't sell lottery tickets in St. Charles. I would put that money somewhere else. Fortunately I know when to stop. Could we revisit this issue without the sunset clause?

**Atty. McGuirk:** You can always revisit.

**Ald. Lemke:** I'm inclined to do that if the State takes any of our share. It's certainly not as punitive as the lottery and it does help our businesses.

**Ald. Turner:** If we recommend this we're taking away the sunset clause, and are we taking away anything else?

**Chief Keegan:** Yes, and for the purposes of this evenings discussion we did remove the 1/6 share that was tied to the state's budget.

**Ald. Turner:** I remember that being brought up at the very end because the State was in crisis. As a sort of compromise we weren't going to activate these licenses until the State passed the budget. There wasn't anything that said the State has to do that it came out of the discussion as it rolled forward.

**Chrmn. Bancroft:** I think that's correct.

**Ald. Turner:** If we make a vote for approval on this we also eliminate that part of the ordinance also.

**Chief Keegan:** That's correct.

**Ald. Turner:** This would be all in one motion, correct.

**Chief Keegan:** Yes.

Motion by Ald. Turner, second by Vitek to Recommend approval of an Ordinance amending Ordinance 2015-M-47 of the St. Charles Municipal Code.

**Ald. Lewis:** Thank you for the discussion tonight. I think we are all aware there are problems. I appreciate the civility of the conversation. I had the opportunity to hear former Governor Jim Edgar speak. He talked about compromise. He said compromise, but not your principles. Most things we talk about here are policy not principles. As a leader you need to find compromise and move on. I'll move on, but I'm finding it hard to compromise because of my principles.

**Ald. Payleitner:** Ms. Litchfield you said that Gamblers Anonymous meeting locally has quadrupled.

**Ms. Litchfield:** Correct.

**Ald. Payleitner:** That says there is a problem. It makes me really sad that your business survives on gambling and you wouldn't be here without gambling. We have laws that will counter over drinking, marijuana, gun usage; we don't have laws in place for over gambling. Please don't put those all in the

same bucket because they're not.

**Ald. Turner:** I think Art made a good point. If this does become a visible problem, or we see more things coming to the social worker at the Police Department, that would be a red flag. We can, anytime we want, revisit this.

**Atty. McGuirk:** You can address it at any point.

**Roll Call:** Ayes: Turner, Gaugel, Vitek, Bessner, Stellato, Lemke Nays: Lewis, Silkaitis, Payleitner. Chrmn. Bancroft did not vote as Chair. **Motion Carried.**

## 5. Public Works

### a. Recommendation to Approve Resolution Authorizing Application to Kane County Grant Program.

**Peter Suhr:** Last year the City received a \$71,000 Kane County Riverboat Grant for the 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue Creek storm water project, and also an additional \$61,000 grant the previous year. Building on that success we are requesting permission to apply for the same grant this year for the same purpose. We will be seeking the maximum \$100,000 to offset the cost of a culvert repair project proposed in next year's budget. To do so we're asking for approval of the resolution found in your packet.

Motion by Ald. Stellato, second by Silkaitis to Recommend Approval of a Resolution Authorizing Application to Kane County Grant Program.

**Roll Call:** Ayes: Turner, Gaugel, Vitek, Bessner, Stellato, Lemke, Lewis, Silkaitis Nays: Payleitner. Chrmn. Bancroft did not vote as Chair. **Motion Carried.**

## 6. Finance Department

### a. Recommendation to Approve a One Year Proposal with Sikich, LLP to Perform the City's Financial Statement Audit for the Fiscal Year End April 30, 2018.

**Chris Minick:** Included in the packet tonight is a proposal from Sikich, LLC to perform the City's audit for FY ending April 30, 2018. The contract with Sikich expired at the end of the fiscal year 2017. Staff approached Sikich about the possibility of a one year extension for fiscal year 2018 audit. Sikich agreed to hold prices steady. It is the intent of staff at the conclusion of the audit cycle to do a full RFP process for fiscal year 2019.

**Ald. Gaugel:** What is the budgeted amount?

**Chris Minick:** The cost would be approximately \$89,000.

Motion by Ald. Stellato, second by Lemke to Recommend the Approval of a One Year Proposal with Sikich, LLP to Perform the City's Financial Statement Audit for the Fiscal Year End April 30, 2018.

**Voice Vote:** Ayes: Unanimous; Nays: None. Chrmn. Bancroft did not vote as Chair. **Motion Carried.**

### b. Recommendation to approve an Ordinance providing for the issue of not to exceed \$22,900,000 General Obligation Corporate Purpose Bonds, Series 2018A for capital project purposes and not to exceed \$4,800,000 Taxable General Obligation Corporate

**Purpose Refunding Bonds, Series 2018B for refunding purposes, authorizing the execution of a bond order and escrow agreement, providing for the levy of taxes to pay said bonds, and authorizing the sale of each series of bonds to the purchaser thereof.**

**Chris Minick:** These are capital projects the City has contemplated as part of the budget process over the last couple years. Primarily related to the construction and site acquisition related to the Police Station. Last week at the Government Services committee meeting we went through a detailed presentation of the Police Station Project and the status. This ordinance provides the next \$17M in funding. We have some reserve money already on hand. In addition there is approximately \$4.3M in funding related to land acquisition for flood mitigation projects related to 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue Creek as well as some electric system improvements, some water and wastewater system software improvements for the City.

If the ordinance is recommended for approval and ultimately approved by City Council I do expect that we would take deliver on those bond proceeds in about 60 – 90 days. Also included in the ordinance is the ability to issue refunding bonds \$4.8M. These are bonds that were issued series 2010-A. Each time we go to the bond market we look for potential bonds that can be refinanced and take advantage of lower interest costs. There is a slight advantage right now to potentially refunding the 2010-A bond series. However, the market conditions are not favorable enough to make that transaction feasible right now. We did include it in the ordinance in the event bond markets conditions change between now and the closing on the bonds so we can take advantage of that opportunity. If we did meet the minimum threshold of 3% of refunded par savings that would save the City about \$88,000 in interest costs between now and 2030.

**Ald. Turner:** You have on here reimburse the City for 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue Creek property purchases. Can you explain that?

**Chris Minick:** We accelerated the purchase of some properties for the 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue Creek Project that the public works department had advanced over time. We were always planning to bond for that. This reimburses us for the proceeds expended in that regard.

**Ald. Lemke:** If we don't have the cash flow immediately there is probably a surplus in the City treasury, what happens to that?

**Chris Minick:** We invest the proceeds of the bond issue until needed. We earn interest on those and roll the interest proceeds back into the project for which the bonds were taken out.

**Ald. Lemke:** I wanted to make sure it was clear we invest the proceeds that we receive.

**Chris Minick:** We absolutely do invest in interest bearing accounts.

**Ald. Lewis:** Page 3, C, having some trouble with including but not limited to street and roadway improvements, water sewer improvements, police station, electrical improvements, etc. all the things we might be able to do but aren't listing. Can you explain how most of the money is earmarked and is for over runs?

**Chris Minick:** The ordinance is what enables the City to borrow money for the various projects. One of the IRS regulations is we identify the purposes for which we would consider borrow for. Typically ordinances such as this are worded broadly. That's the language you see reflected in section C. This

allows for flexibility in the event that the identified projects come in under budget. In the event a project would come in lower than we anticipate we would still have the money available within the account. We earmark all of the bond proceeds for those specific projects as well as the cost of issuance. A bond is a lot like a mortgage, many closing costs are rolled into the mortgage itself. We identify approximately \$21.3M of projects and there is an additional amount of bond issuance cost to get to the \$22.9M. In the event we have money left over we would need to bring it forward to Council before we spend it on other items.

**Ald. Turner:** Do you have any idea what the interest rates are?

**Chris Minick:** They have been creeping up lately. They may a little more.

**Ald. Lemke:** I noticed there are roadway improvements. I drove Anderson Blvd. Geneva redid it about the same time we did. We're not holding up as well. With that improvement being about 20 years old and not holding up; I would want to have us look things like that.

Motion by Ald. Turner, second by Stellato to Recommend approval of an Ordinance providing for the issue of not to exceed \$22,900,000 General Obligation Corporate Purpose Bonds, Series 2018A for capital project purposes and not to exceed \$4,800,000 Taxable General Obligation Corporate Purpose Refunding Bonds, Series 2018B for refunding purposes, authorizing the execution of a bond order and escrow agreement, providing for the levy of taxes to pay said bonds, and authorizing the sale of each series of bonds to the purchaser thereof.

**Voice Vote:** Ayes: Unanimous; Nays: None. Chrmn. Bancroft did not vote as Chair. **Motion Carried.**

Motion by Ald. Stellato, second by Silkaitis to enter into Executive session to discuss land acquisition and collective bargaining at 8:05 pm.

**Roll Call:** Ayes: Turner, Gaugel, Vitek, Bessner, Lewis, Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke; Nays: None. Chair. Bancroft did not vote as Chairman. **Motion Carried.**

#### **7. Executive Session**

- Personnel – 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(1)
- Pending Litigation – 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(11)
- Probable or Imminent Litigation – 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(11)
- Property Acquisition – 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(5)
- Collective Bargaining – 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(2)
- Review of Executive Session Minutes – 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(21)
- 

Motion by Ald. Stellato, second by Turner to come out of executive session 8:47 pm.

#### **8. Additional Items from Mayor, Council, Staff, or Citizens.**

#### **9. Adjournment**

Motion by Ald. Stellato, second by Turner to adjourn the meeting at 8:47 pm.

**Voice Vote:** Ayes: Unanimous; Nays: None. Chair Bancroft did not vote as Chair. **Motion Carried.**

:tc