

**MINUTES  
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL  
GOVERNMENT SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING  
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2017, 7:00 P.M.**

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

**Members Absent:** None

**Others Present:** 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; AJ Reineking, Public Works Manager; Tim Wilson, Environmental Services Manager; James Keegan, Police Chief; Joseph Schelstreet, Fire Chief; Chris Minick, Director of Finance; Larry Gunderson, Director of Information Services

**1. Meeting called to order at 7:00 p.m.**

**2. Roll Call**

**K. Dobbs:**

**Stellato:** Present

**Silkaitis:** Present

**Payleitner:** Present

**Lemke:** Present – Arrived at 7:06

**Turner:** Present

**Bancroft:** Present

**Krieger:** Present

**Gaugel:** Present

**Bessner:** Present

**Lewis:** Present

**3.a. Electric Reliability Report – Information only.**

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

**3.c. Tree Commission Minutes – Information only.**

**4.a. Presentation and Recommendation to Select a Project Site for the New Police Facility.**

**Peter Suhr presented.** Chief Keegan and I have prepared a presentation to continue the discussion from the January 23, 2017 Workshop in regard to selecting a new site for our new Police Station. I would like to review what was discussed at the Workshop, including review of the two potential sites that we have most recently considered, including pros and cons of each of those sites; cost considerations and also options for providing a police presence in Downtown St. Charles. Chief Keegan will then reiterate how their police operations work in today's environment and share some data as it relates to current walk-in activity. We will then open it up for questions and discussion.

**Chairman Turner:** After your presentation, I will take public comment and then questions from the Council.

Presentation by Peter Suhr and Chief Keegan.

**Aldr. Bessner:** If someone has their car towed, do they have to go the Police Station to pay the fee?

**Chief Keegan:** It depends, often times no, but if a vehicle is impounded during an arrest, they have to come in and make the payment first.

**Aldr. Bessner:** Is it the same for bonding out a prisoner whether at our facility or the County facility?

**Chief Keegan:** Typically if they are at the County facility and bond is posted there, then we would prefer for them to go to the County facility. But if it's a misdemeanor or traffic charge and they are bringing in bond on an arrestee that would take place at our current location.

**Aldr. Bessner:** I like the Substation idea; I like the name, I think it reinforces that you are there for a reason. Can you talk about the hours it would be open and also if someone would be on staff?

**Chief Keegan:** As we move forward, that is something we can refine as we get closer. It could be anything from extended office hours or a CSO or EMA official manning the post. Each of the fire houses have courtesy phones that rings straight to the dispatch center.

**Aldr. Bessner:** Do you envision anyone being there for a certain amount of time during the day, every day?

**Chief Keegan:** I would be more than happy to entertain a schedule moving forward. There are much larger communities that do not utilize Substations. However, if we want

to look at our lobby activity, we can go from there, but I am not opposed to staffing it at least on a trial basis.

**Aldr. Lewis:** Thank you for presenting this, but I was expecting a bigger police presence; I had something bigger and staffed in mind. I know you do other things like training and the police academy; the Police station seems like a nice central location to bring people in. Can you talk about how often you do those things?

**Chief Keegan:** We do host the Youth Academy for one week in the summer and then we have the Citizens Police Academy one night per week for ten weeks in the spring. We also do tours with the Brownies and Cub Scouts; we probably host a tour two or three times per month.

**Aldr. Lewis:** I think there is a lot more that goes on at there, rather than just people walking in which is why I like a Police presence in the Downtown area rather than out on Rt. 31. But I do appreciate you trying to put something together.

**Vanessa Bell La Sota, 1610 Howard Street, St. Charles:** There was an impact study several years ago done on Red Gate Road to help the residents and staff evaluate the traffic concerns that the high school was grappling with. Has there been an initial traffic impact estimate? There are three historic properties on Red Gate Road and two of them are horse breeding farms. When Seven Oaks submitted their Kane County Historic qualifications, they had to submit documents that show that there was already harm being done to the horses and their breeding cycles. My concern is for ongoing impact to those farms.

In addition, there has been preliminary community work on declaring Red Gate Road a Rustic Road, and I wasn't sure if the Committee was aware of that.

We have an opportunity to develop an eyesore on the west side; it is a beautiful idea to invest in what happens to be in an area of the City that has the highest rental residential.

A Substation sends a confusing message to me as a resident; I don't know what that would be for. Yes, we have the building at Red Gate, but what would it cost in staff and building? Did you quantify the value of such a clear presence in our community at the Valley Shopping Center site? It is no doubt a real statement the City would make that we are invested in town; it would be clear and much more visible than Red Gate and Rt. 31.

**Phillip Lewis, 1321 Ash Street, St. Charles:** I am the elected representative on County Board District 13. The Police Department is in District 13. I'm here to speak on the location of the Police Department. The key issue is does this body of elected officials reinforce the concept of public safety which is critical. Public safety to a citizen is the Fire Department and the Police Department. This body has chosen to co-locate them and I agree with that 100%. You are the management team; you have to think about how these units of our public safety intermingle. I would dare say that 50-60% of the time that a fire engine is on site, there is a police presence. There is a little yellow house for

sale on the north side of State Street. The City of St. Charles should buy it, tear it down and build their police station on vacant land. Get an architect to pull the two units of safety together for the future of St. Charles. Cyber Security is on the horizon and the IT Department happens to be on the third floor of the Fire Department so they are automatically included in this solution.

If that isn't an option, what about the west side mall? There are issues there; you as a public body know that a TIF is in the future. Those are public dollars that are going to be spent on that land. This public body is going to be spending money on the west side. That would be choice two.

Choice three is the Red Gate location. I am opposed to this for the following reasons; I casually estimated the amount of miles associated with getting in a squad at the current location and patrolling the City of St. Charles as compared to travelling the three miles from Red Gate to get to that location and then patrol the City. That is about \$700,000 - \$800,000 in mileage. If you take the time to get to the center location for 20 years it's about \$14 million in staff time. Owning the land at Red Gate and Rt. 31 should not drive the location of one of the most vital services this community provides its citizens. I encourage you to reflect upon the management decision in regards to the kind of cooperation, the kind of intergovernmental organizational involvement that you can encourage by the continued co-habitation of your very fine Police, Fire and Information Technology Departments. Thank you.

**Tom Bumgarner, 723 Fellows Street, St. Charles:** I'm a 37 year veteran of the Sheriffs Police Department. I'm totally in favor of building a new Police Department in St. Charles, but I'm very concerned about the location. The only location that myself and my neighbors would consider would be at the Valley Shopping Center. We have to consider that for the people who don't have motor vehicles, there is no possible way they are going to get to Red Gate and 31. If it's at the Valley Shopping Center, everyone who lives here knows it is easily accessible.

**Connie Bumgarner, 723 Fellows Street, St. Charles:** I'm totally in favor of the new Police Station, but at Valley Shopping Center. I would also be concerned that if someone else had a contract on this property, I would hope that it would not be more apartments. If it were at Valley, it would be on a four lane highway, which the site at Red Gate cannot offer. I cannot imagine making an arrest and then having to drive the prisoner to Red Gate; never mind the fuel costs. Aurora did not build their new station in their downtown area, but they built it in an area where they had the most calls. I would urge you to go with the Valley Shopping Center.

**Chairman Turner:** We have been talking about this for 16 months now, I would like to entertain a motion one way or the other and get final statements from members of the Committee.

**Aldr. Bancroft:** I move to accept the recommendation of Staff.

**Aldr. Stellato:** I second that.

**Chairman Turner:** The motion is moved and seconded. This item is open for discussion.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** Thank you Peter for your presentation. I did get a sneak peak of it, but I would have liked to have seen it in its entirety a week ago when I was first planning for tonight's meeting. I would argue that the Red Gate Road location is a prominent location; I don't see how that can be in anyone's mind – it is not. I was at the Workshop, I was willing to be swayed because of the thought that the Satellite office might work. There is a perception that the Police Department needs to be in St. Charles. What I see in your presentation for a Satellite Office is no more than what we have downstairs; we have a receptionist, we have a phone – that isn't a police presence to me. I thought we would see a working office, perhaps our Special Events Committee could be there, but someone just sitting there is not a productive use of space or time.

Our conversation at the Workshop also included that Valley Shopping Center is off the table for a lot of reasons; it is not available for sale, the environmental issues, etc. In retrospect I would have like to have more options. I have since found a few more that I would like to have entertained, all within a bike ride or a walk from downtown. Anyone who lives downtown has an expectation that they can walk to a store, school or their city services. I'm disappointed that the precinct option is lacking; it's no more than a receptionist.

**Aldr. Bessner:** With the current location, what are the hours of operation?

**Chief Keegan:** Currently we staff the lobby from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, 7:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. on Saturdays and closed Sundays and Holidays. There is a courtesy phone like at the fire houses 24 hours a day.

**Aldr. Stellato:** We talked about coverage for the police department early on. My house is probably the furthest away from the location on Red Gate and it doesn't bother me a bit. You educated me enough in the beginning to let me know if I make a 911 call, an officer is dispatched from their vehicle, not from the police station. That's different from the fire department, which is why we have multiple fire stations.

In the end, it will come down to money. This is a business question, and that's why my first choice was Valley Shopping Center. I thought it was the best location for many reasons brought up tonight, but I have to agree that is off the table now. There are so many other issues with environmental and the time, it's just not going to work. If there are other options out there we don't know about or it's not available to us. But while we have been discussing this, the clock has been ticking. Money needs to be spent to repair the current police station, and it's not a small number. The police station cannot stay on the site it is on because when it was built, it was built around a well. Taking all those factors into consideration and the fact that we own this property, I still believe this is the

best choice as it sits in front of me today. That is why I'm supporting this recommendation.

**Aldr. Silkaitis:** My first choice is to keep it where it is, but that's not going to happen. My second choice is the Valley Shopping Center, but I have trouble justifying spending over \$1 million, and that doesn't include the environmental; we have no idea how much that is going to be because we don't know what they are. We can't get on the property to do anything. I don't want to support Red Gate, but I don't see a choice looking at the dollars. As the Police Chief has stated, literally every squad is a station. I'm not thrilled with Red Gate, but I have to look at how we spend our taxpayer's money and \$1.5 million is a lot of money to spend.

**Aldr. Lemke:** If we decided not to use the Red Gate Site we have the opportunity to sell it, so there is an opportunity that is lost if we go there. I really thought that we weren't going to be forcing this conclusion tonight. If we had to vacate the downtown site and make it available for sale, it couldn't be a straight parcel because of the well access. I understand there are problems with the Valley Shopping Center. The request that was put out was to consider other sites and I have insufficient information. We are talking about a 50 year life so that money is relatively small when you amortize it over 50 years. I'm not averse to considering the Red Gate site after we have properly done some analysis of all the options.

**Aldr. Lewis:** We have talked about this for a while, and I have not changed my opinion through any of the conversation; I have been on record from the beginning that I believe just because we own the property is not the proper reason to build the station in that location. That was the location that was chosen and given to us as the first choice. For these last 18 months we all have different opinions; at the Workshop we asked to have a plan for a police presence delivered to us. I thank you for trying to put something together, but a 15x15 square foot room in the fire station makes no sense.

The compromise seemed to be the Valley Shopping Center and I still think that is the best compromise. I'm disappointed there wasn't more information in the packet that was put on line. I've talked with neighbors and friends in the community and no one seems to know anything about this. The residents who back up to the property don't know anything about it. I think there needs to be a pause and not a decision made tonight to let the community voice their opinion. This is being built for the community; this training center could be the community center in a part of town that needs it. It's too excluded over there. I understand you don't dispatch from the station and I agree with Aldr. Stellato, but that is only one part of what you do. There is so much other good that you do that needs to be seen in this community. I would like us to take a pause tonight and not make that decision to get more community input. I agree with Aldr. Lemke that over 50 years it won't be that much money. Everyone agrees that we need a new police station; that isn't even the issue, but we have to get it right.

**Aldr. Bessner:** I was in favor of the Valley Shopping Center location as well and I don't want to dismiss an additional \$1.5 million for land, but at the same time, my greatest

concern is as Aldr. Payleitner stated as well is we don't own the land at the Valley Shopping Center, we don't know if we can buy it and there is a big unknown as to the environmental issues, so it could be one to three years in addition to the cost. With that said, I would be in favor of Red Gate Road but I would absolutely be direct in stating that I would like to see a Substation that is manned with a consistent level of hours that mirrors what the current police station does.

**Aldr. Krieger:** As everyone knows, Rt. 31 and Red Gate is the last site I want to support; but if the main reason is using it for the main station, we own a piece of property on Main Street that is further down on the discussion list tonight. We own it; why not make that the satellite station.

**Chairman Turner:** Nothing is set in stone here. I suggested that if we go ahead with this, a year before that, they give us a plan and we have a year to hash it out.

**Aldr. Gaugel:** My initial site that I favored was Valley Shopping Center for all the reasons stated. But that ship has sailed for all the reasons stated as well. The other piece to that is the duration of time as Aldr. Bessner indicated. If we are looking for a couple years for the remediation, there is an opportunity cost for our existing police station. It needs work; we have heard it time and time again. If we look at our current options as they have been laid out to us over the past year, I would support the Rt. 31 and Red Gate facility. The other thing that hasn't been mentioned is the existing police station; that is an asset to the City and what is the highest and best use for that.

**Aldr. Bancroft:** First, I completely reject the idea that this is a safety issue and any incantation that this is a management decision that if we make the wrong one that we make the City of St. Charles unsafe in some fashion. I have the utmost confidence in our leadership of both the Fire and Police Departments. This recommendation would not be sitting in front of us if they didn't believe it was a non-issue. They are the ones I put my faith in and they are the ones I trust so I reject it – outright.

Second, with respect to the relationship between the Fire Department and the Police Department, I will tell you that it starts at the top and we are the luckiest people in the world because they have a great relationship that trickles all the way down to every level of each department. I do not think that whether you are across the parking lot or located in a different facility that makes a hill of beans difference. To me, that relationship will continue to foster and it's because of the people we have. It has very little to do with physical proximity.

With respect to this presence in the downtown area; what I didn't hear was all those people that I rely on saying they had to have a police station downtown. I hear it as an accommodation; I hear it as a cost. The truth is, Staff doesn't believe it makes us less safe; they don't believe it makes us less effective, and they think this plan is going to work. They are the ones we are putting our faith in. To me, at the end of the day, it becomes this perception thing again – we are putting in a satellite because Council thinks

we should, not because the Police Chief says we should...not because it makes us more safe; but just because we THINK that is the way it's supposed to be.

Finally, I challenge that you say the neighbors don't know anything. They know. I sat down with one of them who so happens to be a member of the Housing Commission, who started to talk to me about the Red Gate property. I explained the Police Station may happen there and he was elated that we were actually going to make use of this land. I don't think it's fair to say they don't know.

**Aldr. Lewis:** I didn't find anyone that did know.

**Aldr. Bancroft:** I just gave you one.

**Aldr. Lewis:** I can give you so many who don't. There wasn't even anything in the packet. We always have minutes in the packet. This was such an incomplete packet. We have to make a decision based on one piece of paper in this packet tonight and that bothers me.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** There should have been more at least for public input, if nothing else.

**Chairman Turner:** I have to agree with Aldr. Bancroft on everything he said. I do know the people up there know about this. Something that hasn't been mentioned is that the current station is unacceptable. To say that we are going to extend this for another four or five years doesn't show that we care about our officers.

**Aldr. Bancroft:** We are in analysis paralysis.

**Chairman Turner:** We have had more than these two sites; we have looked at Public Works, the other one on Main Street, so don't give me the excuse that we only have looked at these two sites. If we don't do this quickly it's going to cost a lot of money and I don't want to see our morale suffer because we are dawdling when everyone on our force knows there is a spot to put that station and we should be doing it.

**Aldr. Lewis:** I have more faith in our Police Department that their morale will not suffer.

**Chairman Turner:** I think our Police have got it right because they recommended it.

**Aldr. Lemke:** No one is disputing that we need a new station, that is not the issue and you are framing it as such. I'm surprised because I was asked just hours ago if there were any other sites and I get only this one sheet of paper now. There has been nothing mentioned about another site, only that the alternative is not suitable. I don't think we have considered all our sites and that is not going to take two years.

**Aldr. Bancroft:** It's taken 18 months so far.



**Aldr. Payleitner:** As a public body, when did we have a conversation about the Police Department? Yes, it was discussed at a couple retreats and the workshop, but when did we discuss it up here with public input? We were not told we would discuss it, we were told this is the layout. Peter, what will take 2 ½ years to build this?

**Mr. Suhr:** That is the schedule we received from our architect; there will be about 10 months design and construction documents completed so we can go out to bid, there is a three month bidding phase and then it takes a year plus to get the site ready and actually construct a building like this.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** I ask the question because in February 2016, Glen Ellyn had a drawing of their new police station and it's going to open this summer. I know there was a lot of stuff leading up to that, but I was just wondering what takes that long.

I agree with Aldr. Lemke that once Valley Shopping Center was removed from the list, I requested additional sites be presented as options to us as well and nothing came of it.

**Chairman Turner:** This has been moved and seconded. Kristi, please call a roll.

No further discussion.

**K. Dobbs:**

**Silkaitis:** Yes

**Payleitner:** No

**Lemke:** No

**Bancroft:** Yes

**Krieger:** No

**Gaugel:** Yes

**Bessner:** Yes

**Lewis:** No

**Stellato:** Yes

Motioned by Aldr. Stellato, seconded by Aldr. Gaugel. Approved 5 to 4 by roll call vote.

**Motion carried**

**4.b. Presentation by MetroNet to Consider Alternative Fiber Optic Communication Services, Including High-Speed Fiber Internet, Phone and IPTV to St. Charles.**

**Peter Suhr presented.** Kathy Scheller from MetroNet is here to present to you this evening; Kathy and her team met with several members of our staff recently to introduce their company to us. MetroNet is a fiber service provider who is interested in providing their services in St. Charles. After the presentation, staff would like to understand your interest in the concept so that we may or may not continue to work with MetroNet on furthering this opportunity for St. Charles.

**Kathy Scheller, I am with External Affairs with a Fiber Optic Company called MetroNet located at 3701 Communications Way, Evansville, IN 47715.** I would like to introduce you to our organization and what we are doing as far as fiber optics go for the entire region.

Presentation by Kathy Scheller.

**Chairman Turner:** Peter, is the basis of this to decide if we will allow a third internet provider in the City?

**Mr. Suhr:** Ultimately yes, that would be the decision. We recognize this is the first time you are seeing this tonight, so all we are looking for tonight is either a thumbs up to continue to work with MetroNet and bring back more information at a future date. They are looking to move quickly so we might be back as early as 30 days from now to have further dialogue.

**Aldr. Silkaitis:** I would like to see this discussion continue further. We need more information, but I think the more competition, the better.

**Ms. Scheller:** Correct; this provides your residents the opportunity to have a choice in a provider.

**Aldr. Lemke:** I would suggest you consider expanding to other areas, not just the Fox Valley area.

**Ms. Scheller:** To your point, we have been talking with Kane County about their fiber, as well as Northern Illinois University to continue partnering and connecting with them as well.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** You said your company will have no contract; that was true of all our current providers initially but eventually they do require contracts. Are you saying there will never be a contract?

**Ms. Scheller:** We have been around since 2004 and continue to expand in Indiana and we never have a contract for residential customers. We do work with business customers on a contract because we do end up bringing in a lot of fiber to them, but I can honestly say we have not had any residential contracts at this point and do not anticipate it in the future.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** Is there a rollout cost for St. Charles?

**Mr. Suhr:** I don't believe so. We have met with this organization a couple times, and from my understanding they take care of everything and there would not be a cost to St. Charles.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** Will they pay rent on the poles?

**Mr. Suhr:** Hopefully.

**Chairman Turner:** Is there a decision from the Committee to go forward with this and continue discussions?

**Committee as a group:** Yes.

No further discussion.

**4.c. Recommendation to approve Contract with Trotter and Associates, Inc. for Phosphorus Project CE.**

**Tim Wilson presented.** The Public Works Department is recommending approval for the bidding and construction services for the Phosphorus Removal and Digester Improvement Projects to Trotter and Associates. The contract for this phase of the project is a firm not to exceed \$816,000 which was negotiated with Trotter's team. As a reminder, last June the City decided to combine the Phosphorus and Digester projects together in an effort to gain some economy of scale in construction costs and escalate the schedule to meet the EPA guidelines set in our last permit.

The EPA compliance for the phosphorus portion of the project is June 2018. Another benefit of combining the two projects of the City was the ability to reduce the costs of engineering services, both the design and project phase by \$80,000. The City was also receiving additional savings in the construction phase of \$107,000. The agreement that we are discussing tonight includes 18 months of construction oversight to support the City. The primary duties of the Trotter team are general construction oversight, site layout, quality control, contract documentation, and code and contract compliance. They would also be responsible for holding weekly construction meetings, covering topics such as project progress and work change directive.

In conclusion, staff has determined that the proposal fee for construction and engineering services is 6% of the full construction cost is fair and reasonable based on several factors. Other factors were other IEPA loan projects. Over the last several years, the construction engineering fees for the average project was about 7.2% of total construction costs. For our project, the construction engineering fees are approximately \$170,000 in savings, less than the average IEPA loan.

Staff's final recommendation is to approve a Professional Services Agreement with Trotter and Associates for bidding and construction engineering phase of the Phosphorus Removal and Digester Improvement Project for a firm fixed fee of \$816,000.

**Chairman Turner:** I would like to say that there is a new Federal EPA Administrator and he is going to put out his new rules, but we don't know what they are going to be.

Just in case we don't have to do the EPA part of this, we are not obligated to pay for that, correct?

**Mr. Wilson:** Correct. This agreement is a firm, fixed fee, so we still pay an hourly rate. As a reminder, this project is 50% compliance and 50% digester rehab. The digester rehab absolutely has to move forward, even if the compliance issues don't happen. But if we don't have to do the phosphorus portion, we will not pay for the construction oversight portion of that project.

**Aldr. Stellato:** What is our deadline? If we find out the EPA makes a determination and they lower their threshold for phosphorus removal, when do we need to know so that we still meet some compliance deadline down the road and don't get penalized if they don't change it?

**Mr. Wilson:** One suggestion is if they make adjustments, we can negotiate a timeline for the phosphorus removal. The actual schedule itself is June 2018 when the phosphorus portion of the project has to be up and running. We are tackling the phosphorus portion first so that we can meet the compliance deadline. The issue is that we are on a tight deadline; we have a loan Public Hearing on March 6 for the loan portion of the project. Final design will be done in March and we will be out for bidding in April, award a construction contract in June/July with final completion in 2018.

**Aldr. Stellato:** When do we have to spend dollars on the phosphorus?

**Mr. Wilson:** We do not spend any money until the contract is awarded and work is actually completed. So 30 days after the work is actually completed is when we start spending money.

**Aldr. Stellato:** When are we awarding the contract?

**Mr. Wilson:** June/July 2017. We are talking late fall before we have to do anything which gives us time to see what the Feds are going to do and then gives us time to ask the EPA what the project ruling on it is.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** What is the EPA hearing on March 6 all about?

**Mr. Wilson:** As part of the loan process, we have to hold a public hearing which allows the public 10 days to send their comments or concerns to us or the State. At the Public Hearing, we will present the total project costs and what the environmental impacts are.

**Aldr. Gaugel:** I have made it known in the past and when we spoke last week as well that I'm concerned about this vendor based on the past two large jobs that he has done, and I still remain concerned.

No further discussion.

**Chairman Turner:** Kristi, please call a roll.

**K. Dobbs:**

**Silkaitis:** Yes

**Payleitner:** Yes

**Lemke:** Yes

**Bancroft:** No

**Krieger:** Yes

**Gaugel:** No

**Bessner:** Yes

**Lewis:** Yes

**Stellato:** Yes

Motioned by Aldr. Lemke, seconded by Aldr. Stellato. Approved by voice vote. **Motion carried**

**4.d. Consideration of Renovation or Demolition to City Owned Building at 107-109 East Main Street (Former George's Sports).**

**Peter Suhr presented.** The City purchased the former George's Sports Building located at 107 and 109 Main Street in 2012 with the intent to utilize the building or the land as a compliment to the adjacent Arcada Theater. You may also know that the condition of the George's location has continued to deteriorate over time. With that being said, the Public Works Department retained a local architect and construction company to help us evaluate the structure and determine possible solutions including cost estimates for your consideration.

Tom Tristano, President of Prairie Forge Architects is here with us tonight to help us present that study which we have just concluded. You may recognize Tom and his team from our recent Award Winning Municipal Tower Lighting Project and Weather Tightening Project that was completed a couple years ago. Tom has been involved with the George's Project almost since the time that we purchased the building, so the Public Works Department has certainly relied on him and his team to be our partner in evaluating this through the years. With that said, Tom will get us started and I will be back to talk about comments from the Historic Preservation Committee for your consideration.

Presentation by Tom Tristano.

**Mr. Suhr:** As I mentioned, Tom and myself met with the Historic Preservation Commission to get their feedback on proposals and options. They saw this same presentation and had the following comments:

Without a doubt, they would prefer the weather tight renovation. At this particular time, they would not support demolition of George's. They suggested the existing shell of the

building is more attractive to a developer than a vacant lot. They also reminded us about the Preservation Ordinance that should be adhered to. In addition to that, the City should set an example by keeping the building intact; they already reminded us that “Heritage” is part of our City mission.

Their comment was that the building is what forms the vista of Main Street and asked us to think of it as a set of teeth; in their opinion, with a vacant building, we are missing a “tooth” out of the vista of Main Street. They also suggested the price was not significant enough to make the decision to demo the building.

At this time, they will not support demolition, but that came with a caveat; the reason they say that at this particular time is because there is no future plan or expansion for the Arcada Theater. It doesn’t mean that they wouldn’t support demolition if there was a plan in place for the Arcada or another development to come in and they understood the timeline that the building would be vacant. That being said, they were not in favor of the empty space in our downtown; it is not desirable in their opinion and they do not support the plaza concept on this property. While they recognize the plaza concept is important to the City of St. Charles, they felt like one between the two buildings on a main thoroughfare in downtown does not provide opportunity.

I hope I represented their position accurately, but some of the Historic Commissioners are here tonight to correct my words; I have also provided the meeting minutes in the packet so you can see the exact dialogue that was suggested.

I would like to thank Aldr. Lemke who was at the Historic Commission Meeting, and also a thank you to the Historic Commissioners for hosting us a couple weeks ago; we had a very nice dialogue and received their feedback which was helpful in us preparing this presentation.

**Aldr. Bessner:** How much have we spent to maintain the building over the last few years?

**Mr. Suhr:** I would say it is insignificant; we have virtually spent nothing on this building.

**Aldr. Bessner:** How much time do we have with the building the way it’s at? Can this wait until a developer comes along or until we know what’s happening with the Arcada?

**Mr. Suhr:** Maybe the best way to answer that is to say I’m thankful we didn’t have a heavy snow load this year on the building.

**Aldr. Stellato:** Good presentation. I will dispute the Commission comment that the existing shell is more attractive to a developer over a vacant lot. I do this for a living and I will tell you that is not true. In this case, the existing shell is a liability; it’s easier to start new. On the building demolition, the plaza concept was there for the sole purpose to tie to the accessible parking on Walnut. That’s why the easement that leads to the

parking which would allow someone to park on Walnut and walk safely to the Arcada or Main Street shopping. Aldr. Bessner asked what we've spent to maintain and that ties into what we need to spend to continue to maintain it. If we spend \$1.1 million, I'm guessing we would still have an unsafe building inside so for that reason, I don't think \$1.1 million is enough. Unfortunately, if we are going to keep it and if we agree with the Historic Commission that the existing shell is more attractive, then we are going to open that up to a developer and we are not going to get any interest the way the inside is; we are going to have to do more than \$1.1 million. I think the disparity is greater than what we are showing because the \$1.1 million is only to stop it from deteriorating.

**Aldr. Lewis:** Have you tried to market it to anyone, or has anyone come to you with interest?

**Mr. Suhr:** To my knowledge, no one has come to us with interest.

**Mr. Koenen:** There was a developer who was interested in putting a complimentary entertainment/lounge area there a year ago but that went to the wayside. And of course, Mr. Price is always interested in acquiring it as part of the Arcada building. Mr. Onesti, who is the lessee of Mr. Price is interested in whatever we do to the site because he believes there is a complimentary use that he would have on that particular property for some sort of use; either as an indoor facility or an outdoor plaza center.

**Aldr. Lewis:** Before we demolish it I think it should be looked into more. I thought I heard conversation about saving the façade so that it would still look like it was there – was that ever explored?

**Mr. Suhr:** We did discuss that at one of our retreats with this group and there wasn't a lot of interest to save the façade. It was a topic that was brought up at the Historic Commission meeting as well and quite frankly, as they discussed that option further, they came to the unanimous conclusion amongst themselves that was not a preferred solution; so that's why we didn't mention that tonight.

**Aldr. Lewis:** It's shocking to see that picture of it; it makes me think of neighboring city that spent a lot of money to do something that didn't have community approval.

**Aldr. Bessner:** Can a façade be created, whether through a wrought iron type of material or something like that?

**Mr. Suhr:** Certainly; we could do any façade that we would like.

**Aldr. Gaugel:** I'm in favor of getting rid of the building. The whole point of this was to assist the Arcada. I feel like we are coming up with ideas and then asking if Mr. Price would like them but it doesn't seem like he is fully engaged with us. If our goal was to help him, I don't see how putting \$1 million into this is going to help. If he truly isn't interested or if that \$10 offer is still out there, take it with the condition that he needs to

do something complimentary to the Arcada and we walk away saving \$1 million. I don't see how either one of these options is the right direction to go.

**Aldr. Silkaitis:** I think we should try to sell it. I'm not saying sell it to Mr. Price, I'm saying sell it on the market with the condition that they have to do something with it. We have been very generous waiting with the Arcada and now it's time to say we are going to sell it. If he wants to buy it, it will be with our conditions and price. If not, put it on the open market. We have time to do that before we have to deal with next winters problems.

**Aldr. Stellato:** If you look at the Arcada now, it's really half of a building; the goal was to find someone who would take down George's and rebuild another Arcada from the other side, match the materials, design and window line. I'm fully in agreement with an RFP and if someone comes along with a plan that looks like that, I would be happy.

**Aldr. Bancroft:** We can hope, but we have to have some realism. There is nothing to sell that is good. We can try to sell it, but it's not going to happen. The reality is the site becomes much more marketable the minute you take it down.

**Aldr. Gaugel:** So take it down for \$900,000 and then market it?

**Aldr. Bancroft:** Yes.

**Aldr. Lewis:** Is this in a TIF? Can we offer a developer that?

**Aldr. Stellato:** A developer can come in and get some type of financial assistance in helping them recreate our vision.

**Aldr. Lewis:** We could try that to make it attractive to someone.

**Chairman Turner:** We have to go back and ask ourselves why we bought George's originally, which was to spur on the revitalization and enhancement of the Arcada.

**Aldr. Stellato:** If we are going to put it on the market and leave it as is, we need to have some decision made by winter; either it's purchased, knocked down or water tight.

**Chairman Turner:** So Staff needs direction on the Committee's desire to save it, put it on the market or talk to Onesti first.

**Aldr. Lemke:** We could see if we get a proposal; I don't think it's a good assertion that people will walk through this to some on street, single level parking when you have a parking garage that is multi-story. If we could sell it recognizing with full disclosure there are issues need to be remediated by the purchaser.

**Chairman Turner:** So the Committee's desire is to try to sell it?



**Committee as a whole:** Yes.

**Mr. Suhr:** I will be back in 30 days with the Business Terms.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** We must not have the intention to drag this out; six months at most. Right now, we are not being a very good example as land owners downtown.

No further discussion.

**4.e. Recommendation to award the Bid for an Electric Three Reel Trailer Replacement.**

**Chris Adesso presented.** The Electric Division has been operating an outdated three reel trailer. Recently Purchasing issued bids and received three bids to replace that trailer. One of the bids was disqualified due to it not be galvanized and not meeting the bid spec. However, one of the bids did meet the bid spec and was under budget.

Unless there are any questions, Staff recommends awarding the bid for a three reel trailer to Sauber Manufacturing Company in the amount of \$55,545.

No further discussion.

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

**Motion carried**

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

**Karen Young presented.** City staff is looking to apply for two grants to provide opportunities for funding for future projects we have proposed in FY 17/18 budget. The first project being 1336 Geneva Road which is the culvert extension and sidewalk connection between the City of St. Charles and the City of Geneva which also includes some streambank stabilization. The second project is to further our efforts with the 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue Creek Project with the design of the maintenance improvement projects proposed at the Public Works Facility culverts under 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

We have had some success recently with grants through Kane County. I feel these two projects provide opportunity to help further our funding mechanisms for these projects. Both of these projects we are proposing to apply for \$100,000 for each of them. The project cost would be the City share which we have included in our budget plan for this year which you have all recently seen. Unless there are any further questions, I make a recommendation to approve a Resolution to authorize the application to Kane County Riverboat Grant and authorization of all necessary documents for both the 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue Creek and the IL Rt. 31 Culvert Extension projects should the City be awarded funding.

**Aldr. Silkaitis:** This is for designing what we are going to build in the future?

**Mrs. Young:** It's the design of one of the projects; as you may recall we had eight priorities laid out that encompassed a variety of projects throughout the corridor and this would be for the first project priority which is the replacement of the dual box culverts under the entrance to Public Works on 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue and also the repairs and lining to the culvert underneath 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Both have been identified as part of the true maintenance project that needs to be done regardless of what direction we go with the 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue Creek project.

**Aldr. Silkaitis:** But they are being designed with the 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue Creek in mind?

**Mrs. Young:** Yes, absolutely.

No further discussion.

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

**Motion carried**

**5. Executive Session.**

None.

**6. Additional items from Mayor, Council, Staff or Citizens.**

**Aldr. Payleitner:** With all due respect to the Chairman and my Committee colleagues, I wish to get on the record my disappointment that a vote was taken and in my opinion rushed on an agenda item that had no posted packet items. Aldr. Bancroft contends there was enough public discussion prior to this meeting, and while the minutes from our Workshop were available, the retreat minutes and presentations were not, so if we wanted to refer to any of that, they were not available for us. As well, I feel the request that came from the Workshop and Retreat for additional sites and a function of a satellite option were not heeded.

**Aldr. Lemke:** I would add that we were told commissioning the architect would not force us to do this immediately.

**Chairman Turner:** And this also has to go through Council and there has to be another vote on this.

**7. Adjournment from Government Services Committee Meeting.**

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