

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
GOVERNMENT SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2016, 7:00 P.M.**

Members Present: Chairman Turner, Aldr. Silkaitis, Aldr. Payleitner, Aldr. Lemke, Aldr. Bancroft, Aldr. Krieger, Aldr. Gaugel, Aldr. Bessner, Aldr. Lewis

Members Absent: Aldr. Stellato

Others Present: Ray Rogina, Mayor; Mark Koenen, City Administrator; Peter Suhr, Director of Public Works; Chris Adesso, Asst. Director of Public Works - Operations; Karen Young, Asst. Director of Public Works -Engineering; A.J. Reineking, Public Works Manager; John Lamb, Environmental Services Manager; Tom Bruhl, Electric Services Manager; Dave Kintz, Deputy Police Chief; Joe Schelstreet, Fire Chief

1. Meeting called to order at 7:02 p.m.

2. Roll Call

K. Dobbs:

Stellato: Absent
Silkatis: Present
Payleitner: Present
Lemke: Present
Turner: Present
Bancroft: Absent
Krieger: Present
Gaugel: Present
Bessner: Present
Lewis: Present

3.a. Electric Reliability Report – Information only.

3.b. Active River Project Update – Information only.

4.a. Presentation of Switchgear Location along IL Rt. 31 between Horne and Roosevelt – Information only.

Tom Bruhl presented. We are here this evening to discuss switchgear that was placed as part of a recent reliability project along IL Route 31.

I would first like to describe what a pad mounted switchgear is; it is a standard distribution item for underground areas. Its electrical function is that it is a junction box where cables come in and then get spread out to different areas. There are approximately 250 on the system, so this is not a rare item. They are most commonly found in areas that are all underground and it is approximately a six foot cube.

We have a reliability project that started in 2014, but it is based on a number of outages that date back to 2011 where large tree limbs have fallen along IL Rt. 31 and taken wires down. It caused a major outage for everyone south and west of there. The original plan for the reliability improvement was to install tree resistant Hendrix Overhead Cable System. The scope of the project extends north of Mosedale to Roosevelt. This was a budgeted project, so in 2014 we were working on engineering for the overhead work and identified there was not enough shoulder for the trucks to get off and work the poles from the shoulder, so that means that every day, trucks would be blocking the southbound lane of Route 31 with traffic and flaggers for six to eight weeks. This was at the same time that Route 25 was down to one lane, so there was a lot of angst with regard to doing that work. We talked to IDOT and the City Engineering Department and neither was very supportive of doing that and they asked if there was anything else we could do instead of the overhead work.

In early 2015, we designed a complimentary alternative with using underground cable instead of rebuilding the overhead with poles and in March 2015, to get a feel for the scope of the alternative costs between underground and overhead would be, we actually bid out the Hendrix work to a contractor to see what it would cost us to do that in order to have a good baseline for what the underground comparison would be. Those costs came back and the underground was very close to, if not less than the overhead and we had better reliability with underground and less traffic impact on Route 31. We feel underground is better because it removes the wires from the poles, it is more reliable, even compared to the Hendrix Cable System, it is much better in terms of safety for our crews and the general public, it moves all of the operations to the ground which is much safer than having to be in buckets and the switchgear replaced the function that a pole would normally have in the electrical system.

In August 2015, we submitted to IDOT and received a permit to do the work along Route 31 and then it started in November/December. The location we are talking about is west of the sidewalk between Horne and Roosevelt directly east of the back of The Oaks. There was an existing junction box there where cables came off of a pole, hit a junction box and then split off so that from an electrical standpoint it was an obvious place to put a junction of the same electric component.

We looked at easements to make sure we had legal rights to put the switchgear in that spot. This is not an easy area to work in and I mention this because later I will talk about an opportunity to move it about 100 feet north, but with converging sewers it makes it a little more challenging. We did our due diligence before we started; the Plat of Survey for The Oaks dates back to 1975 and there is easement language that provides for placing electric apparatus that are necessary for the purpose of providing that subdivision and adjacent properties with telephone and electric.

In this area, there are two tiered retaining walls with landscaping that was disturbed as part of the switchgear placement. There is another switchgear in the area, but that was there; we did not place that one as part of this project. This two tiered retaining wall and landscaping was a recent change for The Oaks. Some of the changes that they have made actually increased the visibility from the residents to the switchgear; obviously there was some opposition to the aesthetics and they have asked for us to move it 100 feet north.

The area in question had a number of trees that in 2013 might have blocked some of the view to this spot; today the trees are cleared so you can see the green switchgear box next to the two tiered retaining wall. The alternative location is about 100 feet north between sewer and if we couldn't get between the sewers, we might have to go slightly west. I'll admit that the coordination here was unfortunate in terms that they had just recently planted the landscaping when we started digging. I went back and reviewed when I interfaced with The Oaks plans that were turned in. Those plans came in in 2012/2013 prior to any of this work being designed. At that time, I reviewed them, we didn't have any conflicts and I let those plans go without comment. So while this work was designed in 2014/2015 – about the time they were constructing what they had designed in 2012/2013. I will say that I didn't have the foresight at the time in 2012/2013 to tell them that they shouldn't put anything in the first 20 feet behind the sidewalk. In hindsight, we could have done that so they didn't do the landscaping.

We had a couple good meetings with folks from The Oaks and we proposed landscape screening to the north, south and west so the residents and motorists wouldn't see it as much. We offered to use their same landscape company so the landscape design was complimentary with what they already put in the rest of the development. Our normal access would be to come in from the north or south, but because we would now put landscape there, we would install a gate in their fence at our expense.

We also looked at moving the switchgear; it is definitely possible, but there is increased potential conflict because the sewers come together and we might have to move it to the west. We would have to extend all the conduits that are in the junction now 100 feet north and some of the cables would come north and come right back south so there would be some doubling back. We don't favor having a lot of splices in our cables from a reliability standpoint, and also it seems that we would just be moving this into view for different residents. The cost of moving the switchgear is about \$40,000. If it was \$200, we wouldn't be here today, but it's about \$40,000 in directional boring and cable to move the gear 100 feet.

We acknowledge the perspective that the residents have at this box. They are not used to the big switchgear boxes because they have always had overhead along the road. With that, we are seeking the Council guidance as to whether we should move it or leave it be.

Chairman Turner: Let's take comment from Council, we will start with Aldr. Lewis and after Council has spoken, we will take comments from the public.

Aldr. Lewis: I don't think there is anybody who would disagree that the underground is preferable to the poles. I also don't think anyone disagrees that you have absolute legal right to be there; we are all on the same page with that. You did a very good presentation in favor of moving the box, actually. I do have a question about moving it from one view to another view; is anything being gained by the residents? I'm not sure where the electricity comes in to when Hillcroft starts getting built. How does that tie in? Would it be better to have it farther north?

Mr. Bruhl: Hillcroft is not going into that box.

Aldr. Lewis: If it were moved, would they go into that box?

Mr. Bruhl: No.

Aldr. Lewis: I've been involved in this since November and I saw the work starting down by Mosedale. When it finally got to The Oaks, they told me they had no idea that this project was happening and that their landscape just got put in. I think if we had a conversation with them during the time of construction, they might have been willing to move it then.

Mr. Bruhl: We acknowledge that.

Aldr. Lewis: This is in my ward and I sympathize with what is going on. They put \$2 million of their own money in. They originally came to us wanting an SSA and that was not the way to go, so the 75 townhomes have taken on this over \$2 million project on their own to make a beautiful gateway to the City of St. Charles. It is a sad situation, and I'm in favor of doing all we can for them.

Aldr. Bessner: I won't repeat everything Aldr. Lewis said, but I will say that it is fairly obtrusive as you drive by. I do have a question regarding the two retaining walls; are either of those walls on an easement?

Mr. Bruhl: Yes, they both are.

Aldr. Bessner: So was there communication from The Oaks to the City on the fact that there is a wall built there and at the same time on the part of the City to The Oaks telling them we were going to install the box?

Mr. Bruhl: That is the incoordination at the time. If their plans would have come in at the same time we were designing the underground, we certainly would have coordinated. But I last looked at those plans in 2012 before I had any idea we were going to be doing this and I didn't tell them not to put anything in the easement. This was a 2015 design relating to the plans I looked at in 2012. In a perfect world, we would have had this design on the table the same time they had their design, we certainly would have coordinated.

Aldr. Bessner: Then you stated about splicing and the reliability of the transformation of power with splices made. But you also said if it cost \$200, we wouldn't be having this conversation; do you still stand by the fact that if this was a \$200 move the reliability would be fine?

Mr. Bruhl: Yes, I would stand behind that. The splices are less reliable, but they are definitely not uncommon on our system. I think the issue is that it is an expensive move just for aesthetics.

Aldr. Bessner: With that said, I would agree with Aldr. Lewis in that we have two projects happening – we have a City project and a residential subdivision project and for whatever reason, they just didn't match up. It could have had a lot to do with the brush that was cleared and the aesthetics before and after. This could be a lesson learned moving forward, because I talked with Public Works and they made the comment that it's not standard protocol to necessarily communicate in regards to easement issues. But with the understanding that someone came back and built retaining walls on an easement somewhere in that area, this should have all been correlated, but I understand it was a three year project as well. Again, I agree with Aldr. Lewis that I would like to see the switchgear moved if it is the Committee's will.

Aldr. Gaugel: Is there any other alternative to the 6x6 box? Is there something lower profile that could stay at that location at less of a cost that would also be hidden by that wall?

Mr. Bruhl: There is a below grade option but it is \$140,000, rather than \$40,000. We have two of them on First Street; one in the Blue Goose parking lot and one by the parking deck so we have firsthand experience with them and we know what they cost.

Aldr. Gaugel: I think this is unfortunate; I've driven by it and noticed it. I would love to see a happy medium on this one. I don't like the fact of us spending \$40,000 to move it, but with that said, we ask our residents to be good neighbors by way of any changes they make with building permits and zoning variances and we ask them to come forward, and we should do the same. I think the whole thing is just unfortunate. I don't think there was any intention to mislead; I don't fault anyone on this one, it's just a bad situation. The cost to move it for aesthetics bothers me; I wish there could be a happy medium with the homeowners association that we could work out, but if the rest of the committee sees fit to move it, I would go along with that.

Aldr. Krieger: It is an unfortunate situation but, I agree with Aldr. Gaugel; \$40,000 is a lot of money and will the residents where you are going to move the box to be unhappy and want it moved from their view? I think the best thing to do is to heavily landscape it and consider it a lesson learned.

Aldr. Bancroft: I couldn't say any more than Aldr. Gaugel and Aldr. Krieger. I agree with them.

Aldr. Lemke: If it ends up in someone else's yard, we are still going to end up heavily landscaping it, so I would be in favor of an agreeable landscaping plan to minimize the vision.

Aldr. Payleitner: Would this \$40,000 have been saved if there was a conversation with the homeowners association?

Mr. Bruhl: The work is extra pipe and cable which would have been spent extending the system one way or another.

Aldr. Payleitner: So it still would have cost \$40,000 extra to move it.

Mr. Bruhl: Yes, because that junction was already there; instead of extending it, we just put the switchgear on top of the junction box.

Aldr. Payleitner: I would like to think that if there was going to be work on the easement behind my fence, the City would be knocking on my door. It sounds like that's not what happened here, correct?

Mr. Bruhl: Correct.

Aldr. Payleitner: Okay, so they weren't given the courtesy of a conversation. We have seen a lot of projects in town that neighbors ask what the City is going to do for them. These residents took this upon themselves and I want to honor that. There was a lot of planning, heartache and conversations that went into it and I think it's a great thing that they did. I look at this as it is our error, it is our expense. We spent nearly this to move a warning signal out by Wal-Mart, right Mark?

Mr. Koenen: Yes, it was a siren.

Aldr. Payleitner: Especially hearing that the \$40,000 is what it would cost us even if we had talked to them, I would like to see it moved if that is what the residents want.

Aldr. Silkaitis: My concern is that the weakest part of a circuit is a splice. We did this to prevent any kind of electrical problems and now we are going to potentially induce a failure with the splice. I drove by this, and what I think of it is my personal preference, but I have trouble spending \$40,000 to move it 100 feet and potentially induce more

problems down the road for any area served by that box. Could it have been handled better? Maybe. But I still think we would have ended up in the same place. I have no problem landscaping it, but I have a problem with agreeing to move it.

Chairman Turner: I would like to say that I agree with Aldr. Krieger and Aldr. Bancroft. I don't want to see this box moved, but you do have landscaping options. I have seen where these can be landscaped decently. I'm personally a little surprised that you built fences and terraces a City easement; you took a great chance because in the future who knows what work the City is going to need to do on that easement. The City has offered to landscape this for you with your own landscape company and that's where I'm headed. I don't think we are taking a vote tonight; you are looking for guidance. My suggestion would be to sit down with Public Works because we are pretty evenly split at this point that I would think we would have to get to a compromise here. Get your landscaping company involved and see if we can come up with a price to get this thing screened. Does anyone want to add anything?

Aldr. Lewis: In regard to the weakest point of the splice; do you find that this to be a big problem? Are you servicing them a lot?

Mr. Bruhl: Well, it's not a big problem. The first place you look at a cable fault is the splice. The number of insulation failures in a run is 1 out of a 100. The problems always end up at the termination or at the splice. So where you have disrupted the cable, you've cut the insulation and you've made a connector which creates electrical stress and space for water or anything else to get in there. It's not something that happens every day, but that's where it is going to eventually fail 40 years from now. Whenever end of life comes, that is likely going to be where the failure is.

Aldr. Lewis: So this isn't something you are going to see happen every year; you are looking out into the future.

Mr. Bruhl: Correct; that will be the suspect spot when this goes bad.

Aldr. Krieger: Those splices will be underground?

Mr. Bruhl: Correct.

Aldr. Krieger: So, you could potentially be digging holes in the landscaping to locate the splices so you would be better off leaving it alone.

Mr. Bruhl: The cables were there in a below grade box from the pole originally and we just placed the box there and took the cables and landed them on the gear.

Aldr. Krieger: But if you start moving it around, you are going to damage the landscaping anyway.

Mr. Bruhl: For right now, the landscaping has been wiped out, so under any circumstance we would be re-landscaping what we destroyed as part of just doing the job.

Aldr. Krieger: Do you think perhaps the barren landscape at this point makes it stand out that much more?

Mr. Bruhl: The landscaping that was taken out was to the north and the south of the gear and I personally would see the biggest aesthetic issue would be for the residents looking out the back of their property. There was no landscaping on the upper tier of the retaining wall that we would have touched.

Frank Esposito, 64 White Oak Circle: I am the President of the Homeowners Association at The Oaks. I would like to give you the history of this situation. In 2014, The Oaks of St. Charles began a storm water management project. The project included a storm sewer system to eliminate basement and garage flooding in addition to eliminating serious erosion and sedimentation onto Route 31 and other downstream properties. Driveways were reinforced and thicker asphalt was installed. The sidewalk around White Oak Circle was replaced and made ADA compliant. White Oak Circle, which is a private street was totally reconstructed. Street lights and walkway lighting were replaced with energy efficient LED lighting. Three additional street lights were installed for added safety. A retention basin was installed to accommodate the collection of storm water so as to not overburden the downstream properties.

Terracing and decorative retaining walls were installed along Route 31 to stop soil erosion. Ornamental fencing was installed to replace the nearly 40 year old perimeter fence to enhance the City's southern street scape. Extensive landscaping was undertaken; trees were trimmed or removed, grass replanted which was required due to the amount of excavation work that was done. Landscaping along Route 31 fence line was planned per City code. A \$1.7 million conventional loan was obtained to finance the project. Problems always develop in projects like this; we now have over \$2 million invested in this project.

The City of St. Charles code requires that we plant specific landscaping along the fence line along Route 31. We had just finished planting upwards of \$15,000 worth of trees, shrubs and plants in October 2015. In November 2015, without any notice, the City's Electric Department had a contractor bury the electric lines that were on the street poles along Route 31. The contractor dug up much of what had just been planted and disturbed the growth of other species. Had the City contacted us during its planning for the electrical improvements, we could have delayed our planting. It would have saved the City the cost of replacing everything since the Electric Department has agreed to restore everything. Then in December 2015, a switchgear box was installed in the middle of our new terracing along Route 31. We have been informed that a gate will need to be retrofitted into our new fence to provide access for maintenance. If the City had contacted us, they would have learned that there is already an 8 ft. section of the fence near the north end retention basin that could be easily opened for maintenance to the detention basin. It would therefore be a better place to install the switchgear to begin

with. As stated previously, we spent \$2 million of our money to improve the property with the expectation of increasing property values. It is our fear that the switchgear box detracts from our property values. The homeowners that live behind this box are extremely upset; they look down on this big ugly green box. In addition, City code required that we set back our fence line five feet from Route 31. This required that many of our trees had to be removed. We are very disappointed in the lack of communication from the City. What we were doing wasn't a secret; there were numerous permits and inspections required. Many City departments had personnel on our property during construction. We are a noble component of the southern gateway to the City and have spent a great deal of time, effort and expense to improve the appearance on our part for the City.

We have 75 families that take great pride in what they have been able to accomplish for the community and for the City. Therefore, we ask the City to do the following: move the switchgear box closer to the detention pond and replace all landscaping that was destroyed. We would also ask that the City institute better communication in the future because we probably are not the only ones to face something like this. Our plans go back five or six years so this is nothing new. Everyone knew we were doing this and we could have accommodated this switchgear somehow, but to install landscaping to screen it – there is nothing that will look as though it fits in with what has been put there to this point. So yes, you can put screening up, but it is going to stand out just as much as that green box does.

With me tonight are Carol Patterson, who is our association Secretary and John Thornhill, a homeowner in The Oaks and the main person who lead our storm water project; without him, we wouldn't have been able to do it.

John Thornhill, 44 White Oak Circle: I want to emphasize that we appreciate the work the City is doing to upgrade its infrastructure; it can become obsolete if you are not attentive to the needs of your residents. We are very glad to see the overhead wires go underground; that is a very positive thing and I'm confident that the outages will be minimized even further.

As Mr. Esposito mentioned, this project got underway in 2009. The board committed \$60,000 at the time for planning. A big problem that we had along the east side of Route 31 was erosion. We had a very difficult time getting grass to grow because there was no topsoil left. We felt that the terracing would be the only way to control that problem. The other issue that came up was screening to maintain privacy that the homeowners along that area had before the project. We considered a wall at one time; many of the folks that were invested in this project did not want the wall. Furthermore, we did not go about this issue with the fence unadvisedly. We checked with Bob Vann and told him we were considering a wall; he told us we couldn't have a wall because the post would be in the public utility easement and we agree with that. We went with the least intrusive facility we could find as a barrier to provide privacy, aesthetic enhancement and still give the residents sound attenuation from the traffic on Route 31.

We felt we accomplished all of those objectives and the last thing we considered was that the City would put in a switchgear box in that location. What makes this particularly out of place is the uniformity of the wall and the fence; we have no other trees to screen it. It's a very unique situation and we have considered many options and screening was one of them. Had we known about this project a year ago, we could have re-graded that area so it could be installed lower. Now, it's really too late because the wall is already built. The only way to resolve this issue is to relocate it.

I have examined that area myself about 110 feet north. There is an area that is about 20 feet from the opening in the fence that we already have that we installed so we can maintain the basin. That same panel of fence can be removed very easily to provide access for the City. In spite of the fact that we didn't know anything about this, we can still accommodate it, but only if it's in the northern end of the property where the terrain is much simpler. In that area, we can screen much more effectively than we would along Route 31 where it is now. I would hope you can consider all these issues very carefully; we are confident this is going to be a detriment to our property values and the goals we have set to enhance our values.

Mr. Esposito: I have photographs of the way the property looks right now. Can I approach to give this to you?

Aldr. Lewis: Yes, please. The issue has been raised that we are talking about moving this from one location to another location where someone else will be unhappy. Can you address that?

Mr. Esposito: It shouldn't affect anyone else. If you look at the third photograph I gave you, you can see that it is far enough away from the houses that it should not be of any concern.

Aldr. Lewis: Have you heard from those homeowners about relocating it there?

Mr. Esposito: I personally have not, but at least it will be out of the general eye line.

Aldr. Lewis: But they are not aware of it?

Mr. Esposito: Not that I'm aware of. Mr. Thornhill; have you talked to them?

Mr. Thornhill: I have not, but almost everyone in The Oaks comes and goes through the entrance from Roosevelt Street and nearly every one of them notices this box. There is a big difference if we move it to the proposed location because most people will not notice it there because it can be screened more effectively. It can be set back thoroughly from the street as well. There is a sanitary sewer and storm sewer that would be on each side of the facility to be relocated and there is about 10 feet distance between those two facilities.

The sketch that I gave you is a copy of our survey with the existing location of the switchgear and where we believe it could fit much better.

Chairman Turner: This meeting was for information only; what is our next step besides more conversation, or is someone going to propose a motion? Tom, why don't you try to take one more stab at a compromise with screening or give us better costs?

Aldr. Lewis: I would be happy to make a motion, but I obviously don't want to make a motion that is going to fail, so I would rather keep the conversation going than do that. I don't know what kind of compromise we could come to; I do prefer it to be relocated, but maybe we can come to a compromise on cost sharing. I would think if we do move it, the landscape screening would be up to The Oaks in the new location; I don't think that would be the City's obligation to screen it at the new location. I think we could have further conversation but it doesn't have to be solved tonight.

Mr. Bruhl: Well, we are trying to finish the project and get all of the overhead wires relocated to underground, so if we are going to move it, we would rather move it before we energize it. Right now we are waiting to take the overhead wires down pending this decision because if it's going to move, we are going to leave the overhead until we get it moved. So from that standpoint, there is a reason to make a decision sooner rather than later.

Chairman Turner: Why don't we table this until next month and make a decision then.

Mr. Bruhl: I can bring it as a budget addition to the March Government Services and then ask for approval for the budget addition and let you react to that, assuming we don't come to a compromise. I'm going to be honest; I don't think we are going to come to a landscape agreement. We have gone down that path. It's not an emotional issue for us, it's what we think would be a reasonable, least cost solution to this unfortunate location. I don't think any landscaping option is acceptable to them at this point.

Carol Patterson, 58 White Oaks Circle: I would like to address the issue about the landscaping. If you will notice, the homes behind the switchgear box are up high. No amount of landscaping is going to hide that from those people. That is their main floor and everyone along there looks down on that box. As Mr. Thornhill stated earlier, no amount of landscaping is going to hide it, in fact I think it is going to draw more attention to it because it doesn't fit in.

Chairman Turner: Tom, why don't you bring this back to us at the March Government Services Committee Meeting for the cost of this.

Mr. Bruhl: For the budget addition to move it?

Chairman Turner: Yes, for the budget addition to move it; but I would also say that if this budget addition fails, the ground for a compromise goes away also and we are just going to replace what was there. We are divided 50/50, but that's what you are looking at; if the budget addition does fail, we are just going to replace the landscaping and that's it - just as information for The Oaks.

Aldr. Bancroft: Depending on what happens over the next month; one thing I think the association should do is make sure if they are coming back and asking for that vote to happen here that with absolute certainty, this move will not create any ill will with other residents who don't know about it. I think the association has got to be in a position that they can say they have talked to those residents and they are fine with it.

Aldr. Krieger: I agree; I would like to see a letter acknowledging that in writing.

Mr. Esposito: Would it be okay if we produced a petition just like we have done with other situations?

Aldr. Bancroft: Yes, to me the mechanics are not important; it's just having the knowledge in writing.

Chairman Turner: Thank you for coming, and for the information and the photos; it was very helpful.

No further discussion.

4.b. Presentation of Status of Tree Commission and Possible Reorganization into a Natural Resources Commission.

Chris Adesso presented. This item has to do with the status of the Tree Commission and their interest in possibly reorganizing into something a little different that is commonly known in other communities as a Natural Resources Commission. The Tree Commission was established by ordinance in 1998 and that section of the City Code is attached is your packet. Basically they were established to serve as an advisory commission to this committee through the Public Works Office. That committee was established in Chapter 12 of the code.

Recently the tree commissioners have expressed an interest in expanding their purview beyond trees. Obviously the urban forest here in the City of St. Charles is comprehensive and influences things other than trees such as ground water and air quality. That has naturally drawn people with a lot of expertise to the tree commission; we have a commissioner that works for the Forest Preserve District and one for the Park District. Over the last several months we have been discussing this at Tree Commission meetings and they asked me to present this idea to you to gauge your feelings on this topic. Just to give you an idea of some of the topics that a Natural Resource Commission may be interested in pursuing would be things like invasive species infestations, sustainable

landscapes, water quality, water conservation and other social and educational programs mostly centering on sustainability and improve ecology around the City.

With that, I would like to open it up to any questions you might have. We are not asking for a motion tonight; we are here to ask your opinion and answer any questions you might have and inform you about the discussions that we have been having at Tree Commission over the last few months.

Aldr. Krieger: What will happen to the function of the Tree Commission?

Mr. Adesso: The focus of the Natural Resources Commission will remain the same in regard to forestry. They would still be the same group to provide guidance to Public Works in terms of matters of forestry; they are just interested in expanding that to other areas.

Aldr. Gaugel: I would imagine the new name, Natural Resources Commission, could encompass many things. Will there be a defined mission statement or scope that the new committee will undertake? Will it be clearly stated what it is as opposed to just the "Natural Resources Commission" so that when something doesn't fit, it will just get pushed over to them? I think this is a good idea, but I'm concerned that if it is not clearly defined it is going to end up as either a dumping ground or a place to over reach authority.

Mr. Adesso: I think one of the first missions, if the concept is deemed appropriate and acceptable from this group will be to identify just that – what is the mission of a commission such as a Natural Resources Commission. The current chairperson, as well as some commissioners have done a lot of leg work and reached out to other communities to get an idea of what they are doing and they realize that this concept is much bigger than the nine of them can tackle. They know that it is deemed a good idea to expand the purview of the group that they are going to have to come up with a mission statement and identify scope as to what they are really interested in.

I will say that I know a lot of them are interested in educational programs and how they relate to sustainability and ecology.

Aldr. Bancroft: What are the other communities doing?

Mr. Adesso: We reached out to Wheaton, Glen Ellyn and Geneva. They all have Natural Resources Committees, although Geneva's is not an official part of their city. Glen Ellyn's is very active; they have a student liaison and an elected official liaison on their commission. If you are interested in more information, check out their website; you can get a lot of information there. This is the new trend with communities expanding their commissions to broader reaching topics.

Aldr. Lewis: I like the idea; one of the concerns I have is the size of the committee. Is it going to get larger? There was talk about sub-committees under committees.

Mr. Adesso: They haven't settled on a number, but one thing they did agree on was that they don't want to have a large 20 person commission. They are more interested in adding two people; they would really like to add a student liaison, and someone with experience that they don't have.

Aldr. Lewis: I read in the past minutes that they have gone away from sub-committees?

Mr. Adesso: That is correct.

Chairman Turner: I agree with Steve; I think it needs limits.

Mr. Adesso: Thank you for the feedback; I will bring this back to the commissioners so they can put together exactly what this idea is for them.

No further discussion.

4.c. Recommendation to authorize the use of City Property located at the Bob Leonard Walkway for Grant Applications.

Chris Adesso presented. This request is to authorize the use of City Property located adjacent to what is commonly known as the Bob Leonard Walkway. The River Corridor Foundation needs this authorization to make grant applications. The River Corridor Foundation is proposing to engage in an improvement project in a section of the Bob Leonard Walk from the Indiana Street dead end where the pedestrian bridge is, south to Prairie Street. Generally the project consists of the addition of benches and trash receptacles that are consistent with City standards throughout Downtown and additional landscaping. There is also a potential public art component to the project that hasn't been fully vetted, but is certainly in the mix.

There are two grants they are interested in pursuing; one is the Community Foundation and the other is the Kane County Riverboat Granting Program. Both need permission from the property owner before a grant application can be submitted. The River Corridor Foundation has asked me to ask the City for the permission to authorize the grant application. This is in no way authorizing the project; the project will come back through this Committee for approval.

Aldr. Krieger: Has anyone contacted the family that has placed the tree on the island?

Mr. Adesso: Yes, they have, recently. Tammy and Lance Honeyman were contacted and are aware of the project and they want to stay in the loop. They are aware, but they don't have any concerns that I'm aware of. We offered to replant the tree on the shore and put signage up because there is no signage now that it is a memorial for a family member. They thought that was great and would be a better spot to place the tree.

Mr. Adesso: One thing that just sparked my memory; the River Corridor Foundation representatives have also reached out to the Brownstone Homeowners Association for feedback from that group.

Aldr. Lemke: Is this east or west?

Mr. Adesso: This is the west side, the portion that was completed about two years ago. This proposed project is to finish it.

No further discussion.

Motioned by Aldr. Silkaitis, seconded by Aldr. Gaugel. Approved by voice vote. **Motion carried**

4.d. Status of AT&T Pole Attachment Agreement – Information only.

Tom Bruhl presented. The City and AT&T entered into an agreement in 1984 that allowed AT&T to attach to City owned poles. Within that agreement, there were a number of things that we have not been able to come to terms with AT&T about, namely what they should pay each year for that right to attach to our poles and also the fact that they are not transferring from the old pole to the new pole in a timely fashion.

With regard to the pole transfers, it has been a two year project for me to try and get them to perform transfers. That obviously is a customer service issue, but more importantly, the liability for that old pole that we removed our cable from is because it is rotted and about to fall over and then two years later, it's still there with AT&T and when it falls on to something, it is still the City's pole.

In working with the City attorney, we did send AT&T a notice of default which gave them two 30 day windows to resolve, which they did not. This last week we met with them and notified them that the agreement has been terminated and we are in the process now of renegotiating those clauses which are of specific conflict for us. The three clauses that are on the table are the timely transfer of poles which we have recommended that if they don't transfer in 60 days, they own the pole and therefore they own the pole with all the liabilities. They will not want to do that because then they have the responsibility to remove the pole so that costs them extra money to not transfer in 60 days.

We are working through a number of Federal Communications Commission issues with what we are allowed to charge them, so we are working through those issues with respect to what is fair and allowable to charge them each year. The other issue is that we would like them to participate when we want to remove the poles and do an overhead to underground; we wish them to participate in that project.

Those are the three issues we are negotiating with them and I think it will probably be April before we bring a renewed pole attachment agreement for your consideration.

Aldr. Lewis: How long is this pole replacement program going to last? Is it just ongoing? It seems like all of a sudden there are poles everywhere.

Mr. Bruhl: Poles have a life of 30 – 40 years, so it is on a continual basis.

Aldr. Lewis: But you are saying the poles you did last year are still up.

Mr. Bruhl: They made a concerted effort to do many of them, but they certainly did not complete them all.

Aldr. Gaugel: I want to thank you very much; you kept me in the loop on this. This is important and I think this is a good thing long term for the City, so thank you.

Aldr. Payleitner: Are these phone or cable lines?

Mr. Bruhl: Telephone.

Aldr. Silkaitis: AT&T is located in St. Charles, so I don't see an excuse as to why they can't do it. If they can't do it, we take them to court.

Mr. Bruhl: I'm not here because they were one pole, for 61 days. The letter that they got from the City attorney had a number of poles that were up for years. I personally notified them four times about the poles to the point where they were complaining that I keep sending duplicates that were already in their system. Hopefully we will be able to negotiate some terms that Council can accept moving forward.

No further discussion.

4.e. Presentation of ComEd Reliability Report – Information only.

Tom Bruhl presented. We continue to meet with ComEd after every outage and also on a quarterly basis. Every single outage that happens in St. Charles, they dispatch a person to find the root cause. If that root cause results in something that needs to be repaired, they take that action, so I can't be anything but complimentary.

That said, they still are the number one cause of customer outage minutes for us, so we continue to work with them to improve, but when things happen, we do get a good response. We keep track of all of their historical cyclical reliability programs; tree trimming, thermal scanning, visual inspection. They are always up to date on all of those projects.

No further discussion.

4.f. Recommendation to approve Resolution Authorizing Application to Kane County Riverboat Grant Program.

Karen Young presented. The City is looking to apply for a grant for the 7th Avenue Creek Project. Each year, Kane County puts out funds through Riverboat Grant Funding to help improve quality of life in Kane County. We have been successful in the past in receiving funds for the Bob Leonard Riverwalk and the Municipal Center Parking Lot.

This year we are proposing a grant for the 7th Avenue Creek Project, specifically for the Watershed Master Plan which is an item that we have proposed in the budget this year and we are looking to supplement the City's budget with a grant. A Watershed is basically an area that drains to a creek and what this plan will do for us is show us where we can make improvements for water quality problems in the watershed; propose solutions and create a strategy for putting the solutions into action. That project would include public involvement, fact finding and analysis of proposed improvements for this area.

An added benefit to this is that a Watershed Master Plan is also required for the IEPA 319 Grant which we have talked about as part of our initial meetings for the 7th Avenue Creek Project. So getting the Watershed Master Plan approved through the EPA would make us eligible for that funding as well.

Staff recommends approval of a Resolution authorizing the application to Kane County Riverboat Grant and the City Administrator to be authorized to execute all necessary documents.

No further discussion.

Motioned by Aldr. Krieger, seconded by Aldr. Bessner. Approved by voice vote.

Motion carried

4.g. Presentation of Proposed 2016 Roadway Projects.

Karen Young presented. This is for information only; these are the projects we are proposing for road construction throughout the community in 2016. In the past, we have brought to you just the MFT Projects. This year we want to show you everything we have planned for 2016 in terms of roadway projects for both our Motor Fuel Tax Funding projects and other roadway projects. One of the projects is the Red Gate Road resurfacing which will be funded with a LAFO funding grant that we received. Another major project is South Tyler Road; we are going to reconstruct half of south Tyler Road and resurface the remainder of that project. Kautz Road is going to be resurfaced also.

In terms of timelines, we are wrapping up the design of plans now and we are looking to have projects out to bid and awarded in April or May with construction to start sometime after June. These projects will be on different timelines and we will be sending out

notifications to residents impacted by the proposed construction and will also be providing information on our website as well. In addition to the resurfacing and reconstruction projects we have planned for this year. Our Public Services Division is also going to be working on patching locations that don't require full resurfacing.

Aldr. Payleinter: Mr. Pavella is here from the 2nd Ward and he would like to make a case that his road is due for resurfacing ahead of any of these that are offered.

Mr. Pavella: Jim Pavella, 2506 Dunham Woods Court. Our cul-de-sac is between Dunham Road and Kirk Road, just south of Royal Fox. We contacted Karen in June because we saw our neighboring street, Squire Lane, was recently resurfaced in 2014. The condition of our road is as bad as Squire Lane was, so my first call to Karen was to inquire when our road was going to be resurfaced. At the time, Karen came out and mentioned that our road was not on the list, so we asked for our street to be put on for 2016.

I just became aware that it wasn't on the list for this year; I took some pictures this evening and sent them to Aldr. Payleitner and Aldr. Lemke. We met with both of them to understand what our concerns are and we respectfully ask that greater consideration be given to resurface our small road. We take great pride in terms of upkeep of our property and we are all relatively older so we are net givers to the City when it comes to taxes and when you look at uses of resources of the City, we are generally a net provider rather than a net user of City services. Thank you for your time.

Aldr. Payleitner: Karen, when did you last look at Dunham Woods Court?

Mrs. Young: I actually drove all 166 miles of our community this summer and evaluated every single location. We have a couple different programs going, and I wanted to get a firsthand look at everything in our community to put my eyes on it firsthand because sometimes when looking at roads, it's not just the condition of the road, there are many factors that go into it. I also looked at our IMS data.

I did a ranking of the streets in town; very good, near term resurfacing and immediate need. That location fell into the middle tier. In the coming years it will need to have resurfacing done, but at this time could be addressed with patching in comparison to some of our other locations. When we look at roadway projects, we look at the community as a whole and we are trying to get to a tiered approach of patching in areas where we can to increase longevity of roads in addition to other things that we look at holistically and then surfacing and reconstruction.

Aldr. Payleitner: The road does look like it has deteriorated since you looked at it last so I'm just wondering when the next evaluation will be.

Mrs. Young: We are working now on patching locations and that is one of the locations we have identified. Once projects get out for this construction season we will be creating

a longer tiered program to identify roads for several years out and that's encompassing patching, resurfacing and reconstruction.

Aldr. Payleitner: So you have it on your schedule now to look at it and see what the current status is? It looks like it did go downhill since August.

Mrs. Young: When I was out there I was evaluating it for patching.

Aldr. Payleitner: As I look at the list, I noticed the 2nd Ward have three of the 15 streets as well. Is that a coincidence?

Mrs. Young: There are streets that need attention in that area for sure, yes.

Aldr. Lewis: How does this compare from year to year?

Mrs. Young: This year, we are doing a little more, taking the whole picture into consideration. Kautz Road is a significant length and very wide roadway, so I would think we are do more square footage. I don't have that exact number, but I can bring that for comparison when I bring the projects back.

Aldr. Lewis: So because that is a bigger, longer road that takes away from some of the smaller neighborhood type streets?

Mrs. Young: No, we look at things holistically, if you have been on Kautz Road, you will understand why we are resurfacing it, it is in horrible condition.

Aldr. Lewis: I understand, I'm just saying that if you weren't doing Kautz Road, you might have more money to do more neighborhood roads.

Mrs. Young: Certainly, but it is a road within our area that needs to be addressed.

Aldr. Lewis: I understand; I'm not questioning if you should do it, I'm just wondering how it compares from year to year. Are you getting the same amount of Motor Fuel Tax dollars every year?

Mrs. Young: Our Motor Fuel Tax dollars are going down slightly, but Kautz Road is actually a supplemental program. The areas you see in red are what the MFT Program is paying for. Everything in blue is what is being paid for with a grant or supplemental City funds.

Aldr. Gaugel: When these are bid out, are they bid out as a whole or an individual job basis?

Mrs. Young: The Red Gate Road LAFO project was bid out independently because Federal Funding has specific requirements and a specific process with IDOT to receive Federal Funding. Tyler Road is going to be bid out separately because it's a

reconstruction project and the process with IDOT. Everything else on the map in terms of our MFT in red and Kautz Road were bid together to get economy of scale.

Aldr. Gaugel: To follow on with Dunham Woods Court. In your opinion, is it not even a consideration to do it at this point, or if you added it as another location to see what the pricing comes in at, and if it's within budget it would be a consideration, or is that not even a consideration at this point?

Mrs. Young: Right now, the streets we have identified are what is within our budget. Certainly that is an option that you could make that decision. It was not our recommendation to include that location for this year's program, based on the overall picture of all the streets.

No further discussion.

4.h. Recommendation to approve Resolution with the Illinois Department of Transportation for the 2014 Street Rehabilitation Project.

Karen Young presented. This is a housekeeping item with IDOT; the original Resolution was approved in 2014 and the Council had determined to do additional work and approved that work, but the Resolution wasn't appropriate at the time. This Supplemental Resolution in the amount of \$128,531.63 will complete the project closeout with IDOT. This is not a change order, just paperwork closeout for IDOT.

Staff recommends approval of a Resolution with IDOT in the amount of \$128,531.63 to be used for the 2014 Street Program.

Chairman Turner: Kristi, please call a roll.

K. Dobbs:

Stellato: Absent

Silkaitis: Yes

Payleitner: Yes

Lemke: Yes

Bancroft: Yes

Krieger: Yes

Gaugel: Yes

Bessner: Yes

Lewis: Yes

No further discussion.

Motioned by Aldr. Bessner, seconded by Aldr. Krieger. Approved by voice vote. **Motion carried**

4.i. Recommendation to approve Illinois Department of Transportation Letter of Understanding for ADA Improvements on IL Rt. 38.

Karen Young presented. IDOT is proposing completing some American with Disability (ADA) Improvements on Route 38 within the City limits. The work includes sidewalk and curb removal and replacement, installation of detectable warnings to complete ADA standards and other associated work. IDOT is managing this contract and the City is required to maintain this sidewalk as we have in the past.

Staff recommends approval of a Letter of Understanding with IDOT for ADA sidewalk improvements on IL Rt. 38.

No further discussion.

Motioned by Aldr. Krieger, seconded by Aldr. Bancroft. Approved by voice vote.

Motion carried

4.j. Recommendation to award the Bid for City Hall Elevator Modernization.

AJ Reineking presented. The elevator equipment located at City Hall was installed and last updated in 1994. Over the last several years the reliability of the elevator has been inconsistent. In most instances, our staff had been able to do a hard reset of the elevator and it will go back into normal function immediately. This has happened several times in the past year, the most recent case being just this morning. Our maintenance contractor has not been able to identify this issue.

The scope of this work is to modernize the control systems, which is a hydraulic improvement to the pumps and motors. There will be a new button panel, telephone system and emergency lighting in the car and new call signal buttons in the lobby area.

We received two bids to complete this work; Colley Elevator of Bensenville, IL was the lowest responsive and responsible bidder. Colley has performed numerous, similar modernization projects in the past and provided a list of favorable references to utilize and open platform control system that will allow the City to solicit competitive maintenance contracts. Both bidders indicated there will be a 2-3 week service disruption while the work is being performed. I'm going to work with Colley to try to minimize downtime during public meetings.

Staff recommends awarding the bid for the City Hall Elevator Modernization to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, Colley Elevator, in the amount of \$79,042.

No further discussion.

Motioned by Aldr. Krieger, seconded by Aldr. Lewis. Approved by voice vote. **Motion carried**

5.a. Recommendation to approve the Closure of Parking Lot J from 7:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. on April 9 2016 for the Fire Department Monument Dedication.

Fire Chief Schelstreet presented. The Fire Department would like to host a monument dedication ceremony on April 9, 2016. The ceremony will start at 10:00 a.m. We are requesting closure of Parking Lot J starting at 7:00 and it will be open by Noon.

No further discussion.

Motioned by Aldr. Krieger, seconded by Aldr. Gaugel. Approved by voice vote. **Motion carried**

6. Additional Business.

None.

7. Executive Session.

None.

8. Adjournment from Government Services Committee Meeting.

Motion by Aldr. Krieger, seconded by Aldr. Bancroft. No additional discussion. Approved unanimously by voice vote. **Motion carried.**