

**MINUTES  
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL  
GOVERNMENT SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING  
MONDAY, MAY 23, 2016, 7:00 P.M.**

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

**Members Absent:** Aldr. Stellato, Aldr. Bancroft

**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; Tom Bruhl, Electric Services Manager; James Keegan, Police Chief; Joe Schelstreet, Fire Chief

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

**2. Roll Call**

**K. Dobbs:**

**Stellato:** Absent

**Silkaitis:** 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.**

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

**4.a. Update on the Active River Project Status.**

**Chris Adesso presented.** I would like to introduce Mr. John Rabchuk, Chairman of the Active River Project Task Force. He would like to address the Committee this evening and give a presentation. With that, unless there are any questions from me, I would like to introduce John Rabchuk.

**John Rabchuk, 914 Ash Street, St. Charles.** Thank you for allowing us to make a presentation to you this evening; the last time we were formally here in January, you identified some steps that you would like us to take and some actions as well as investigation. We think we have done that, and we would like to give you an update. I have provided all this information to your packet, but since the audience has not seen this, I will go through it briefly.

Presentation by John Rabchuk.

**Chairman Turner:** Before we take comments from the public, we will take questions and comments from the Committee first.

**Aldr. Krieger:** Have you talked to IDOT about narrowing Route 64 to two lanes?

**Mr. Rabchuk:** No, narrowing Route 64 is not part of our plan. That would be impossible to accomplish in this town. That was never part of our concept. I mentioned it in Greenville as one of the elements they did, but every town looks at what they have to work with and I don't think we have the opportunity to work with a two lane road down Main Street.

**Aldr. Krieger:** You mentioned Greenville and Columbus; their weather pattern is entirely different from us.

**Mr. Rabchuk:** No, Greenville is almost the same because it's in the mountains, so their weather pattern is not much different; it's about three weeks different in terms of warmer weather.

**Aldr. Krieger:** I have relatives living in Greenville and they don't have as much solid freezing weather like we do.

**Mr. Rabchuk:** They don't have the amount of snow that we do, but they have ice storms. Certainly in those ice storms and during the months of December, January and February, you don't want to be outdoors at one of their restaurants.

**Aldr. Krieger:** How much money has the Active River Project raised to help fund this feasibility study?

**Mr. Rabchuk:** We have not allocated any money toward the feasibility study at this point in time. What we have done, however, is that normally an engineering firm such as WBK would have charged to put together this kind of estimate because it is very complex. They agreed to do it because they believe that Active River is a viable and essential project for St. Charles.

**Aldr. Krieger:** But you have not raised any money for this particular study?

**Mr. Rabchuk:** We raised money for the initial concept study; we have put \$20k into the Bob Leonard Walkway as well as many other projects along the river.

**Aldr. Krieger:** I'm talking about the Active River Project; I know about the Bob Leonard Walk.

**Mr. Rabchuk:** As part of the Active River Project, we are doing this enhancement to the Bob Leonard Walkway and our next project which we intend to try and fund by ourselves, and I can't speak for the board, but our next project that we want to look at is to enhance the east side of the river from Prairie Street down to the Wastewater Treatment Plant. We have some concept ideas there on how we can approve the riverbank which is eroding and that we could also improve storm water management off of Route 25.

**Aldr. Bessner:** If this feasibility study moves forward and is successful, will any of the money that is invested in the study carry over to the next step which is the dam modification study? I'm trying to determine if we would see added benefits from not only the study at the north side of the trestle but either requirements that the Corp might want from us or if some of the money invested will cover some things for the dam modification part of it.

**Greg Chismark, WBK Engineering, 116 West Main Street:** The study and the values that you have seen are characterized as draft for this conversation. I've worked with John on the issues that you have all wrestled with, trying to find answers. It's a challenge in terms of the final study for this will be a significant investment, so how do we begin to answer questions without incurring that significant investment up front. There is some data collection in the scope. I believe you received an estimate of man hours and a fee that we put together and I'm going to tell you that is a draft for conversation purposes, for your review and comment. The estimate includes a variety of tasks, one of those being data collection and survey. We will be leveraging the River Bottom Survey that the Corp of Engineers recently performed. We will be able to utilize some of the data collected in this first step for future steps as well.

**Aldr. Bessner:** Will the Corp require this step in general, to even talk about any kind of modification?

**Mr. Chismark:** It's hard to have that conversation with the regulatory agencies until we can tell them what we are really talking about and define it geometrically, physically and

in a way that we are comfortable with and is feasible. This study will prove that it is feasible. The more definitive we are in approaching them, the better feedback we are going to get so they can define a process for us.

This is a limited study. There are some elements that we left off purposely, i.e. the sediment survey and environmental impacts. We didn't think it warranted the expense at this point until we can define it.

**Aldr. Lemke:** To Aldr. Krieger's point; I have traveled for business a lot and I would regularly go to the mountains of North Carolina for about seven years. I never recall having been in an ice storm, I think that is an event that they have once every 20 years. I think the weather is going to be better there than it is here on any given day. I think we need to cast the net a little wider and see if there are some places where it didn't work and why. I also think we need to look at the length of the runs if this going to be a whitewater experience.

**Aldr. Gaugel:** Over the last few months, we have talked about cost. You have now presented to us what a feasibility study would cost. This is 10% less of what was initially thought. I do not have any problem right now going forward with spending that; I think we should. I think this is something we need to move forward with, and as a Committee, we have asked the questions and got the answers. Now it is up to us to go the next step.

The \$112,000; is that a fixed price if we were say to go for it? Is this something we can get done for that? I know you said it's just an estimate right now, but how firm of an estimate is it?

**Mr. Chismark:** Typically with our contracts we would enter into an hourly not to exceed, so that would be the maximum cap and as long as the scope remains the same, then that is the guaranteed maximum price unless there is a scope change.

**Aldr. Gaugel:** I'm not a fan of a not to exceed contract because it doesn't guarantee us that we will get a finished product. If you run out of money and we are only 60% done, do you come back and ask for that other 40%? I would be very in favor of supporting this at some level with the caveat that the other participating agencies such as the Park District would also match or pledge their support for it financially as well, as opposed to the City holding the financial bag for the whole thing. I personally don't have a problem with that, but I have a feeling it would be a tough sell to my Committee members.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** I agree, but I also know that a couple months ago when Mr. Rabchuk presented, we gave him a task. He did what we asked him to do and I see this whole thing improving our downtown jewel – the river. Not just by water sports, by improving it environmentally and improving our town economically; I think it's up to us to take the lead and take the first step.

**Mr. Rabchuk:** When we talked to the high school students about doing the water testing, the one comment we get back from them most often is that if we had this, the

students would come back here to live after college. As it is now, they don't want to come back here.

**Aldr. Silkaitis:** I'm still 100% for this project, but I would like to see the feasibility study done. Are you asking this body to pay the whole \$112,000 or is the Park District going to participate?

**Mr. Rabchuk:** I can't speak for the Park District and I can't speak for the River Corridor Foundation; we would have to go to both those boards. As an alternative tonight, perhaps you would feel more comfortable to direct Mark Koenen to enter in discussions with the Park District and River Corridor and see if there is an amenable allocation of that \$122,000 cost between those three bodies.

**Aldr. Silkaitis:** That is what I would like to see.

**Mr. Rabchuk:** If we got that motion, then we would start those discussions. I think Mark and Holly Cabel of the Park District have had many discussions about a wide variety of issues and they can sit down. I'm not sure it is understood the amount of money the Park District has already spent above and beyond what was spent for the concept plan. I see a conversation between Mark and Holly as a way to move forward and see if there is an allocation mechanism that would fit for all the parties.

**Aldr. Krieger:** I move that we send this analysis to Staff and have them give their feedback on the scope of the work while Mark, John Rabchuk, the Park District and the Forest Preserve put their heads together and see who is going to pay what, when, where and why.

**Aldr. Silkaitis:** I second that.

**Aldr. Lewis:** This proposal is just for the study of the river, just that one little component?

**Mr. Rabchuk:** It's not the river; it's the river park and whether this can be built and not have negative impacts.

**Aldr. Lewis:** So it's the river park that we are talking about?

**Mr. Rabchuk:** Yes, we are not talking about the bike trails, under the bridges or anything else like that.

**Aldr. Lewis:** I also think the study needs to be done, and I agree with my fellow Council members that the cost needs to be shared by other entities. I'm not so sure it's up to us to figure out who those other entities are; I think that is up to you to figure out who they are and bring them to us. I think we can put in a certain dollar amount and have that matched by the other entities.

**Aldr. Lemke:** If there is a cost sharing, it can work for me.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** We as a City are casting the vision. When it comes down to figuring out what part is recreation, what part is economic development – that's when we will share. I agree, there is a percentage to be had, but I don't think it needs to be equal necessarily; we need this piece of paper to go out and get funding and grants.

**Mr. Rabchuk:** We cannot move forward without this study. The City has to step forward; I'm not saying the Park District and River Corridor won't participate, but I think it's wrong to arbitrarily say that everyone should pay 1/3 of the cost. I think Mark and I will sit down Holly and come back to you with a firm proposal. But if you buy into the vision and you think that there is even a 50% chance that this can succeed, it's well worth the investment. This is much bigger than anything else we can do for Downtown St. Charles.

**Aldr. Lewis:** My understanding is everyone is in favor of going forward with the study; I don't feel that they're not. There is no money budgeted for it at this point in time, so that would have to be decided as to where the money could come from to do this out of this year's budget. I think it's just a matter of how much can we spend that is not budgeted for this at this point in time.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** We need to trust staff to do the leg work on that and have the conversations as John is recommending.

**Chairman Turner:** Is there a member of the public who would like to speak to this?

**Jean O'Sullivan, 1603 Riverside Avenue, St. Charles:** I want to say that John Rabchuk is an excellent salesman. I think St. Charles is already a very special place and I think that we have to look at the Fox River as our jewel, concrete is not going to become the jewel. Right now, it provides recreational activities. I live near the river and this past weekend, there were dozens of kayakers enjoying the river and there were plenty of bikers as well. What we have is a very slow moving, very flat river. We are not Colorado; we are not even South Carolina. What you see above ground is what you see on the river bed. We have a very flat river - you can walk across it at most places. The reasons the dams exist is to give enough water for boating and fishing. There are hundreds of fishermen who love the Fox River. The Fox River is the best fishing south of Canada and there are plenty of resources I can show you to prove that.

The river flows at about 300 cubic feet per second, up to 5,000 cubic feet per second but could be as slow as 100 cubic feet per second. Low flows happen in the summer. This proposal by Mr. Rabchuk should be considered in the light of our river. Any kind of concrete and turbulence and whitewater effects will be very local. If you want 100 foot piece of turbulence, you have to have 100 feet of concrete. Are we going to create a kiddie ride here? Do we really think we are going to build new hotels because there is a kiddie ride? Most people who come here to use their river in their kayaks probably

brought their lunch with them, so let's get a little realistic; let's not get too carried away with the vision.

The project that is being proposed does have serious consequences. There are issues of sediment and you mentioned this feasibility study wouldn't even talk about sediment. Sediment can destroy that fishery. If you look at the picture I passed around that was taken last year on the Fox River in Batavia; that is a 75 year old musky. Those are the breeders. If we do something irresponsible and send sediment down the river, we could kill the fisheries that we have so that should be taken into consideration.

I went to the meetings given last summer by Mr. Rabchuk and most of the public were concerned about safety and they wondered if they could still ride in their canoes with their children or if the white water causes safety issues. In the summer when we have the low flows, there might not even be enough water to cover the concrete and that was even discussed last year. I think the aldermen have to be good stewards and have to recognize the responsibility you have to represent the people of this town, the tax payers and the river.

At 5,000 CFS, you don't know what could happen to those concrete structures. I don't know what the price would be to build a gigantic whitewater feature, but I do know that 5,000 CFS could dislodge a concrete structure. In fact, the concrete steps that have been put into the river are already showing scouring, so there are maintenance costs to this project. Do the aldermen really want to be responsible if this project turned into a catastrophe; would you really want that to be the legacy of St. Charles? I know we all want the best for St. Charles and we can do things with the river to make it better. It's already wonderful and beautiful and a lot of people enjoy it.

There could also be flood issues; Marseilles, IL did something with their dam and for the first time in its history the town has had flooding issues. Also, it does disturb me that Mr. Rabchuk is a Business Development Director for concrete companies.

**Mr. Rabchuk:** No, I am not.

**Ms. O'Sullivan:** Maybe you are not now, but I will bring you the website that talks about Villareal in Louisiana. There is a profit motive here and that is of concern. He is talking about a concrete project going to the wastewater treatment plant; my understanding is that it a big raised concrete bike path. I agree, we need to fix that part of the river, but instead of spending for a feasibility study, maybe we should spend that \$100,000 to restore that side of the river. I'll finally say that we have world class river experts at the University of IL at Urbana Champagne. They are willing to do whatever we ask them to do. They have already done studies; they have done all kinds of river restorations. In fact, in 2003 when Batavia was considering removing their dam and the voters voted 62% to 38% against that, the Director of the Hydro Systems Laboratory in Civil Engineering at the University of IL has a laboratory where they have done model studies.

If you want a feasibility study, why not give it to the University of IL? They don't have a profit motive. As I say, they are the very best experts. I have serious concerns about the profit motives behind this.

**Chairman Turner:** Ms. O'Sullivan, I think you brought up some really good points, but I think this committee wants to move forward on the feasibility study and you brought up a lot of really good issues that we are going to have to face down the road. One of them is that we know the focus groups want this, but we don't know if the community wants this. There are several things that are going to be discussed if we want to change the demographic of St. Charles and that will have to come from the residents of St. Charles going forward. Thank you for the suggestion on the University of IL, but we are going to go with what we have here.

**Ms. O'Sullivan:** In Batavia, an engineering firm did a \$1 million study, but they went to the University of IL who had already done studies that they charged the State \$250,000 for and then they turned around and charged the State \$1 million for it. As far as the demographics, you could easily spend that \$100,000 on a PR Program to let the people in Chicago know what a beautiful river we have here. There are plenty of ways to do it without putting millions of dollars' worth of concrete in the river and enriching engineering firms and concrete companies.

**Chairman Turner:** Thank you; that is a long way off and as we move forward I would like to see you here. Okay, we have a motion and a second....

**Aldr. Lewis:** What was the motion?

**Chairman Turner:** To direct the staff to talk to the Park District and River Task Force about funding this project.

**Aldr. Krieger:** And have the staff look at the scope of the project and give us their feedback regarding whether or not we'll get the information that we truly need.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** What does that mean by "scope of the project", Jo; the bigger project or this portion?

**Aldr. Krieger:** This portion.

**Chairman Turner:** Okay, we have a motion and a second.

No further discussion.

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

**Motion carried**

**4.b. Consideration of Installation of Floating Dock on the Fox River and Attachment to City Property for the St. Charles Rowing Club.**

**Peter Suhr presented.** I'm here this evening to represent the St. Charles Rowing Club (SCRC) who would like you to consider the use of City property to install a privately owned removable floating dock to access the Fox River for the purpose of launching their competitive non-motorized rowing boats. The SCRC, who is represented tonight by Director Chris Meldrum is a St. Charles based, not for profit 501©3 organization who support a competitive Juniors Rowing Program for teenagers between the age of 15-18 and also a reintegration program for the Wounded Warrior Program. You may have noticed them practicing on the Fox River especially if you crossed the Red Gate Bridge lately. Chris is available tonight to answer any questions you might have about the organization.

I have photographs tonight to explain exactly what is proposed with this floating dock, specifically where it is proposed to be located. This is a floating dock, approximately 50 ft. long and about 8-10 feet wide. The dock sits flush to the water, its plastic with a non-slip surface on the top. The proposed dock is generally located on the east bank of the Fox River, directly under the Red Gate Bridge and would be attached to City owned property. The SCRC has an arrangement with the property owner, Mr. Larry Johnson, who is also in attendance tonight who is directly north of this City property. Mr. Johnson's property is located in the Village of Wayne and may be familiar to you because it used to be the Alpaca Farm.

The SCRC currently accesses the Fox River by picking up the boats from Mr. Johnson's property and proceeding to walk it across property owned by the Village of Wayne. Chris Meldrum and the SCRC is seeking a permanent, safer and convenient way to launch the boats, hence the request to use the City of St. Charles property to the south. There is an access gate on the general location of Mr. Johnson's property onto City property to access the dock location.

Other considerations are in regard to legal and liability exposure. I have reviewed the proposed plans with John McGuirk and also with Chris Minick. In general terms, they are not too concerned about the proposed dock. As discussed, the proposed plan is to have a private use (the dock) attached to public property (the land). This not an unfamiliar arrangement to the City of St. Charles; the Jones Law Office, the Visitors Bureau display in the parking garage and also the Arts display, which is also located in the parking garage, come to mind of past agreements that I have been involved with recently.

From a legal perspective and also reflecting back on those public/private agreements, one consideration was that if the private function provided a public benefit. In this case, for the SCRC, perhaps the public benefit is the rowing program itself. It certainly supports local kids from the community, and the SCRC has also offered the dock for public use, specifically to City organizations and perhaps even the park district and other public

entities. For example, in talking with the Fire Department, they may utilize this dock for training. From a liability perspective, Chris Minick said there may be very slight increases to our general liability insurance premiums, but again, this is not an unfamiliar situation to the City of St. Charles and would be very similar to the liability that we have for the Frank Gorham Canoe Dock just outside of the Municipal Building.

If the committee desires, Staff would certainly negotiate a License Agreement with at least the following terms and also any terms or considerations that you would desire. As identified, we would ask for an Indemnification Clause to minimize liability which would be extended also to the Park District and Forest Preserve if they so choose. We would want to define the actual site of the location with a Plat of Survey. SCRC has agreed to allow the City and Park District to use the property and we would also define what private ownership really means in this circumstance. For example, if there is any permitting required by the IDNR, the SCRC will be solely responsible. They would likely also be responsible for safety, maintenance and all costs associated with the dock. This would be no financial burden to the City of St. Charles. We would also define a limit on this agreement; perhaps one year makes sense for the first year to make sure that everything runs smoothly with an exit clause in case it does not.

City staff does not have a strong recommendation tonight; we are looking for feedback so we can continue to negotiate with the SCRC. Some suggestions are that we can deny the request tonight, if you need more information that we cannot provide to you tonight we can research that and bring it back to you, or, if you desire, we can certainly negotiate a License Agreement with the SCRC to be considered and approved at a future committee meeting.

I would like to introduce Chris Meldrum, and if you have any questions for Chris or me, we will try to answer them.

**Chris Meldrum**, 618 Timbers Court, St. Charles.

**Aldr. Lewis:** What are the hours that you would normally be using this?

**Ms. Meldrum:** Generally from sun up till 8:30 a.m. There might be one afternoon/evening program that I do with my veterans, but generally we do early morning rowing to stay out of boat traffic on the river.

**Aldr. Lewis:** So this is just for practice?

**Ms. Meldrum:** Yes, absolutely.

**Aldr. Lewis:** There won't be shows, etc?

**Ms. Meldrum:** Not yet; we have a long way to go before we reach that.

**Aldr. Lewis:** If I'm in a boat going down the river, can I pull up and dock and walk around?

**Ms. Meldrum:** No; there are no cleats to adhere boats to. This is a rowing specific dock, so there is no way to tether a boat. This is just a flat surface to launch competitive rowing shells.

**Aldr. Silkaitis:** Have you approached Wayne? Why don't you go through the narrow section of their property?

**Ms. Meldrum:** We have had a brief discussion with Wayne, but we felt it best to launch under the bridge where the water is calmer and safer.

**Aldr. Silkaitis:** Did they give you any response?

**Ms. Meldrum:** It was a very brief conversation; there was no movement with them.

**Aldr. Silkaitis:** In looking at the insurance that the property owner has I see there is \$500,000 liability? That is not enough. I have a problem with this; as you said, no other boats can pull up to it – I don't see a benefit and I also see a downside for the liability if something should happen. Without more information, I will not agree to this at all.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** I'm very familiar with this area and there is a sandy beach area; I don't understand why that area wouldn't be a preference. It appears to be very calm – I see children playing there and pontoon boats going out without any effort.

**Ms. Meldrum:** We need a certain depth to put the boats in. The fin aka the skag, on the bottom of the rowing shell is about 11 inches, so not only do I have to clear the weight of the rowers, but I have to clear the skag to go through the water and it's just too shallow right there.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** Peter, did anyone contact Wayne to see what their concerns were?

**Mr. Suhr:** No, we did not contact Wayne.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** Chris, are you are saying that Wayne didn't say no?

**Ms. Meldrum:** Wayne didn't say no, they didn't say yes. They were non-responsive.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** I would like to see if they have any concerns with it.

**Aldr. Krieger:** Where are you going to park cars?

**Ms. Meldrum:** If the kids have a car, they are parked at the dog park. They ride their bike, use scooters or jog over. The kids actually have to exercise to get the location.

**Aldr. Gaugel:** I don't have a problem with this; I think it would be great. I would like to see what effect it would have on our liability insurance and I agree with Aldr. Silkaitis that \$500,000 liability isn't enough insurance. However, I think this is great and I support it.

**Aldr. Lewis:** How many cars are parked at the dog park?

**Ms. Meldrum:** Most of the kids ride their bike or scooter, maybe 4 or 5, if that.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** It looks treacherous to get the boat to the river from where it's stored. Where do you usually go in to the water?

**Ms. Meldrum:** It's not treacherous; it's easy. We were launching directly in front of the property but that waterway is getting congested, so now we are launching off the south end of the property; it's calmer water and much more conducive to launching.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** So right now you are doing it on the side of the property?

**Ms. Meldrum:** Yes, the south side.

**Chairman Turner:** Is there a preference of the Committee? What is the issue for us; liability?

**Aldr. Payleitner:** Liability and a I would like Staff to make a phone call to Wayne to see if they have an issue. Maybe they know something we don't know about that particular area.

**Aldr. Krieger:** What would happen if Mr. Johnson sells his property?

**Ms. Meldrum:** Then we would vacate the property. That is our agreement.

**Aldr. Krieger:** Is there any other spot along the river, Ferson Creek, perhaps?

**Ms. Meldrum:** No, there is no access to the river; it's marshy and soft.

**Chairman Turner:** So what is our preference? Make a motion to approve this with the stipulation of the insurance and a phone call to Wayne?

**Aldr. Payleitner:** So moved.

**Aldr. Lemke:** Second.

**Aldr. Lewis:** As Peter suggested, should we direct staff to go back and put together a License Agreement with the phone call and liability issue and then take a vote?

**Chairman Turner:** I thought that's what we were doing.

**Mr. Suhr:** I will certainly make sure that all your points get in the agreement. If they are not able to be in the agreement, I will explain why.

**Chairman Turner:** Okay, so option three has been moved and seconded with stipulations of higher insurance and phone call to Wayne.

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

**K. Dobbs:**

**Lemke:** Yes

**Bancroft:** Absent

**Krieger:** Yes

**Gaugel:** Yes

**Bessner:** Yes

**Lewis:** Yes

**Stellato:** Absent

**Silkaitis:** No

**Payleitner:** Yes

**Chairman Turner:** Motion passes; I will be voting yes on this also.

No further discussion.

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

**Motion carried**

**4.c. Recommendation to award the Bid for Mechanical Systems Maintenance and Service Contract.**

**AJ Reineking presented.** The Public Works Department maintains a centralized contract for HVAC maintenance and repair services at all of its facilities. On May 9, the City opened bids for the maintenance and repair of the building mechanical systems. The program is laid out with a two year base contract with optional pricing for up to 3 additional years. Being a maintenance and repair contract, the basis of award factored the routine preventative maintenance as well as the bid labor and material mark-up rates.

We received five bids for the work with Geostar Mechanical of Rockford, IL, being the lowest responsive and responsible bidder. Geostar Mechanical does other work for municipal clients and public entities as well as other multi-site organizations and they received very favorable feedback from the reference verification.

It is my recommendation to award the bid for building and mechanical systems maintenance and service to Geostar Mechanical, Inc. in the submitted bid amount.

**Aldr. Krieger:** How quickly can they get here in an emergency?

**Mr. Reineking:** The bid called out a two hour maximum response time, so they have to meet that.

**Aldr. Silkaitis:** In looking at the bids, there is a bid discrepancy in prices; something doesn't look right. I'm not comfortable with this company.

**Mr. Reineking:** I saw that and had several very frank conversations with the owner, and we went through line by line and I explained the discrepancy between the next lowest bid and he told me that he bid the maintenance contract at his cost, so he is really hoping to make his money in any repair of the facilities. He said he stands by his numbers and he is firm with it. We are going to keep an eye on him and hold him to it.

**Aldr. Gaugel:** That point is right on, and that is the same thing I saw as well. Since we have option years, we don't have to exercise the option years which is one way to get out of the contract if we don't get good service. The other question I have is if the quality of his service fails after six months, do we have an out clause? Do we have a termination for convenience?

**Mr. Reineking:** We can terminate the contract at any time at our written notice.

**Aldr. Gaugel:** That is our answer. He is on the hook for performing to this schedule. If he doesn't, we'll pull the plug and you'll be back in front of us with the second bidder, Service Mechanical.

**Aldr. Lemke:** I have a similar concern and any time we see one of these line items exceed their bid, it should cause us to have concern.

**Mr. Reineking:** I will also note that their references were glowing, which also helped ease my apprehension.

**Aldr. Gaugel:** For clarification; we did go back to Geostar Mechanical and asked them to clarify the items that were out of line and we made sure their numbers were correct?

**Mr. Reineking:** Yes.

**Aldr. Gaugel:** I have a fine level of comfort going with them because we have the out clause, we gave them a second chance with the numbers and the references so far have panned out. I'm comfortable.

**Aldr. Silkaitis:** Who was our provider before?

**Mr. Reineking:** The second lowest bidder, Service Mechanical.

No further discussion.

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

**Motion carried**

**4.d. Recommendation to Waive the Formal Bid Procedure and approve Purchase Order for Janitorial Services Agreement.**

**AJ Reineking presented.** Similar to the HVAC Bid, the Public Works Department maintains a centralized contract for Janitorial and Custodial services at all our occupied facilities with the exception of the Fire Departments which are maintained by the Fire Fighters. We issued an RFP to perform this work; the RFP was sent to select area vendors who inquired about the contract in the past, but it was also posted publicly on the City's website. We received four proposals. In reviewing the proposals, we were looking for vendors who worked with similar organizations that maintain multiple facilities and with heightened security requirements like we have at our police facility and with our IS Departments.

The two vendors highlighted similar experiences, only one of those was determined to be a responsive and responsible contractor, that being DuKane Contract Services of Batavia. DuKane is our current janitorial service provider. After reviewing the market rates for these services, we negotiated a rate with DuKane which makes them the lowest responsive and responsible proposer in the first year of the contract and it also represents a 12% reduction from their current rates for the same services.

In my experience working with DuKane over the last year, they have been responsive to any operational changes that we have requested or any issues that we brought to their attention. It is my recommendation to waive the formal bid procedure and approve a three year contract with DuKane Contract Services in the submitted bid amounts.

**Aldr. Gaugel:** They were not the low bid; the phrase I'm not familiar with is "responsive and responsible bidder" what is it that disqualified the lowest bidder?

**Mr. Reineking:** I called the only two municipal references that they had and neither of them had anything nice to say about the services they were provided with. Communication is an issue with them; just in reading their proposal, I could tell the communication would be an issue. I don't have a strong comfort level, especially given the touchiness of custodial contracts, it's a hard contract to maintain at the various facilities as it is and to have 11 different staff members that didn't receive favorable results in other communities, I was apprehensive.

No further discussion.

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

**4.e. Recommendation to award the Bid for Street Sweeping Services.**

**AJ Reineking presented.** The City utilizes contractual services to perform a City wide street sweeping program. The program includes eight complete street sweeping cycles on residential streets which includes approximately 272 curb miles per cycle. On April 27, the City publically opened bids for the provision of these services. Hoving Clean Sweep was the only contractor to submit a bid for residential sweeping work. The bid was publically advertised and sent to previous bidders as well as potential contractors that I identified via internet search. Hoving has been our previous contractor for this work and has been responsive to corrections that we brought to their attention. Their bid this year is approximately \$2,000 less than their bid in previous years.

In addition to residential sweeping services, we also requested pricing for the downtown parking lots. For these services we received three bids with Hoving being the lowest qualified contractor. However, after reviewing the bids and discussing the program with our Police Department, we determined these services may best be performed by the Community Restitution Group pending their availability.

It is my recommendation to award the bid for residential street sweeping services to Hoving Clean Sweep in the amount of \$74,881.44 and approve their hourly rates and parking lot rates on an as needed basis. I will note that we will be having a joint meet prior to kicking off this season to go over our expectations with all their drivers. We are going to be giving a Public Works radio to their lead driver so anytime they are in town, we are going to be in constant communication with them and we are going to be checking in with them, particularly on non-curbed streets several times throughout the day.

**Aldr. Lewis:** In the past, I've received videos from constituents showing how fast they drive. I myself have complained and I've been pleased with their response to the complaints. However, I'm amazed that only one company bid. Do you have any idea why?

**Mr. Reineking:** I went to the previous bids and directly sent it to anyone who previously bid it and I tried to find additional contractors to supplement that list.

**Aldr. Lewis:** They came in \$2,000 less, and we are demanding more of them – we have high standards and expectations. Do you think they are going to be able to step up?

**Mr. Reineking:** I think Hoving values this relationship and they are going to do whatever they can to keep us happy and that's why they have been so responsive to corrections.

No further discussion.

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

**4.f. Recommendation to Waive the Formal Bid Procedure and award Purchase Orders for Tree Pruning and Removal Services.**

**AJ Reineking presented.** Tree trimming and removal is a very important component of proper management of a city's urban forest as well as reliability of our Electric utility. The Electric utility and Public Services groups have different reasons why we do tree work, but we want to do it in the most cost effective and responsible way possible. Last year we requested 3 year hourly rate price proposals from qualified contractors to perform the work. We received six responses.

To allow for continuous operations of both groups – Public Services and Electric and to provide necessary redundancy in emergency situations, the contract was split between the two lowest responsive and responsible proposers being DeMar Tree Service and Skyline Tree Service. The prices that the two companies proposed are very competitive and created a diverse operational advantage for both the Electric and Public Service operations. While we didn't have any significant wind events last year, the ability to draw from both resources was advantageous for both divisions as we were able to run the companies in parallel based on our operations.

It is my recommendation to waive the formal bid procedure and authorize a purchase order with DeMar Tree Service and Skyline Tree Service in the amount not to exceed \$100,000 each for urban forestry maintenance and for electric line tree trimming services.

**Aldr. Gaugel:** How do we decide who gets what job? Do we give everything to DeMar until we are out of money and then we go to Skyline? Or do we do 50/50?

**Mr. Reineking:** The Electric Utility has used DeMar, and Public Services has used Skyline. However, I will say that during ice storms over the winter, we were calling DeMar. I think we will be looking to utilize them more this year as we are getting out of EAB and more tree trimming and maintenance programs.

**Aldr. Gaugel:** The reason I ask is it's more cost effective for us to use DeMar. I understand the logic between having two companies and you want to make sure both of them stay happy, but I would say give 2/3 to DeMar until we run out of those funds and then move over to Skyline. We should default to DeMar when there is a question on who to call.

**Mr. Reineking:** I will talk with my Division Managers to make sure they are certainly worked in.

No further discussion.

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

**4.g. Recommendation to Waive the Formal Bid Procedure and approve Purchase Order for Sidewalk Maintenance.**

**AJ Reineking presented.** The City sidewalk maintenance program is three pronged. We do removal and replacement of severely deteriorated sidewalk sections; some sunken sidewalk sections are mud jacked, and raised sidewalk sections (generally due to tree roots) are ground down. Concrete grinding in this application is a specialty field. The City has utilized the services of Safe Step for the last six years. They are the only known vendor in this area that does this type of work. Safe Step has held their municipal rates for the last several years as the economy has been slow. This year their municipal price reflects a 2% increase from the previous years.

In addition to sidewalk grinding, Safe Step also GPS locates all of their repairs and prescribes any different repairs that they encounter while they are doing their work. If they see a mudjack or remove and replace at a location, they'll let us know so we can dispatch those repairs as necessary. In this regard, they are a very responsive contractor and their documentation has been very useful during trip and fall claims.

It is my recommendation to waive the formal bid procedure and authorize a purchase order with Safe Step in the amount of \$26.25 per inch/foot of sidewalk.

No further discussion.

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

**4.h. Recommendation to approve Construction Contract for the 2016 Street Rehabilitation Program.**

**Karen Young presented.** The locations for this program were presented earlier this year; bids were opened for this project on May 3. We received six bids with the Engineer's estimate at approximately \$2 million. We are continuing to see lower prices on our asphalt projects. The low bid was received from Schroeder Asphalt Services in the amount of \$1,761,733.65. Schroeder Asphalt Services was our successful contractor for last year's Street Program and we were happy with the work they provided the City. The construction schedule for this project is yet to be determined but we anticipate the project starting in June with our substantial completion date is August with final restoration in September. We are currently working on the notifications and press releases.

It is my recommendation to approve the construction contract with Schroeder Asphalt Services, Inc. for the 2016 Street Rehabilitation Program in the amount of \$1,761,733.65.

**Aldr. Lewis:** Seeing as you came in under budget, are there extra projects you could possibly do?

**Mrs. Young:** We are currently evaluating that. If we determine it is something that's feasible, we will be back with a recommendation.

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

**K. Dobbs:**

**Lemke:** Yes

**Bancroft:** Absent

**Krieger:** Yes

**Gaugel:** Yes

**Bessner:** Yes

**Lewis:** Yes

**Stellato:** Absent

**Silkaitis:** Yes

**Payleitner:** Yes

No further discussion.

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

**4.i Recommendation to approve Resolution with the Illinois Department of Transportation for the 2016 Street Rehabilitation Program.**

**Karen Young presented.** This compliments the approval for the street program; portions of the street program are paid for with Motor Fuel Tax funds so this is a Resolution with IDOT to appropriate the MFT funds which will be allocated to the project for this year. It is my recommendation to approve the Resolution with IDOT in the amount of \$1,267,086.65.

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

**K. Dobbs:**

**Lemke:** Yes

**Bancroft:** Absent

**Krieger:** Yes

**Gaugel:** Yes

**Bessner:** Yes

**Lewis:** Yes

**Stellato:** Absent

**Silkaitis:** Yes

**Payleitner:** Yes

No further discussion.

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

**4.j Recommendation to Recommendation to approve Construction Engineering Services Agreement for the 2016 Street Rehabilitation Program.**

**Karen Young presented.** This is also related to the 2016 street program. This project will require full time construction engineering services, typically handled by in house staff. Our staff member who completed this work for the City for many years recently retired. With that, to fill the void for this year's construction season, we are seeking approval to hire WBK for construction engineering services for this project.

WBK's team has extensive experience with street rehabilitation work and also will be utilizing our same engineer for some of our other projects who also has experience being that he is a former IDOT employee. Staff negotiated a price with WBK in the amount of \$99,944 for a lump sum fee not to exceed contract. The scope of work, number of hours and hourly rates proposed for the construction engineering services are consistent with the type of work, our scope of work and the timeline for the work.

It is my recommendation to approve the construction engineering services agreement in the amount of \$99,944 with WBK Engineering, LLC., for the 2016 Street Rehabilitation Program.

No further discussion.

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

**4.k Update on the Red Gate Road LAFO Resurfacing Project – Information only.**

**Karen Young presented.** This is information only; no action is required. As with the other projects, we continue to see savings on our roadway projects in this area as well. Bids were opened by IDOT for this project on April 22; eight bids were received. Our engineers estimate was approximately \$270,000. The low bid was received by Geneva Construction Company in the amount of approximately \$200,000. IDOT is currently in the process of awarding the contract and we are anticipating work to be completed by August, before school starts.

No further discussion.

**4.l Recommendation to Waive the Formal Bid Procedure and approve Purchase Order for the Red Gate Road Drainage Improvement Project.**

**Karen Young presented.** We have determined that repairs are necessary to the drainage swale along Red Gate Road between the road, the water tower and our electric facilities. We have experienced erosion in this area that has caused sediment to travel down that drainage ditch onto the Fox River Bike Trail towards the river. The work that is proposed includes stabilization of the erosion banks and appropriate restoration. Proposals were received from three contractors who have had experience with this type of work.

The lowest responsive and responsible proposal was received by W.F. Johnston in the amount of \$46,295. This contractor is also the same contractor that is going to be doing the earthwork for the water tower so it will be one contractor in the same location performing all the work out there. The construction will take place as part of the water main restoration work which is in June and July this summer.

Staff recommends waiving the formal bid procedure and approving a purchase order for the Red Gate Road Drainage Improvement Project with W.F. Johnston in the amount of \$46,295.

**Aldr. Lemke:** What is the difference between the base bid and the alternate bid?

**Mrs. Young:** The scope of the work in the base bid includes leaving the soil on site. Instead of hauling it off, we were able to incorporate it into the earth work with the water tower to keep the soil on site instead of having to haul it off site.

**Aldr. Lemke:** Is that going to be the alternative bid?

**Mrs. Young:** It is; we bid two. We wanted to see what our options were.

No further discussion.

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

**4.m Recommendation to Waive the Formal Bid Procedure and approve Purchase Order for a Sanitary Sewer Trailer Pump.**

**Chris Adesso presented.** As many of you may recall, over the last five years we have been purchasing new six inch trailer bypass pumps as part of a phase in program to replace our old equipment. Five years ago, Public Works made the decision to go with Godwin pumps for many reasons, but mostly because they are reliable, consistent and our staff is trained with them.

Over the last five years, we have made a significant investment in parts associated with those Godwin pumps, for that reason, as part of our last pump purchase we did obtain a quote from Xylem/Godwin who is the only pump distributor in Illinois that would be able to sell us a pump similar in nature to the ones that we already own and received a quote back with the same price that we received last year with no increase.

I would like to make a recommendation to Waive the Formal Bid Procedure and approve a Purchase Order for a Sanitary Sewer Trailer Pump from Xylem Godwin in the amount of \$50,274.40.

No further discussion.

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

**4.n Recommendation to Waive the Formal Bid Procedure and approve Purchase Order for the purchase of a Lightnin Mixer Motor.**

**Chris Adesso presented.** This is for a Mixer Motor for the sludge storage tank located at the Main Wastewater Treatment Plant. For those of who are not familiar with what that tank does, it stores about 83,000 of digested sludge and is a key component to the bio solids processing that takes place at the Main Plant prior to entering the centrifuges. Essentially it stores sludge that comes out of the digesters before it is spun and dewatered so we can haul it away.

This mixer motor is important to us because it keeps odor at a minimum and it keeps the sludge at a consistency which we can pump it up into the centrifuges. Because the system we have is more than just the gear motor, the only option for us to replace the aged gear box is a Lightnin Motor, who is the manufacturer that we currently have. We requested a quote from the manufacturer and received one in the amount of \$39,958 and we would like to purchase said motor.

With that, I would like to make a recommendation to Waive the Formal Bid Procedure and approve a purchase order to buy a replacement Lightnin Mixer Motor in the amount of \$39,958.

**Aldr. Lemke:** Does this give us the flexibility to vary the speed?

**Mr. Adesso:** At this time, this motor is a direct replacement and we don't have the capability now. As part of the digester improvement project, we are considering a different mixer and tank enlargement which would allow us to be able to run the mixer backwards which would give us an advantage to provide maintenance, so if something gets tangled up in the mixer, we can run the motor backwards and untangle it. But right now, we only have one speed and one direction.

No further discussion.

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

**4.o Recommendation to approve an Ordinance Authorizing the City of St. Charles to borrow funds from the IEPA Water Pollution Control Loan Program for Phosphorus Removal and Digester Rehabilitation Projects.**

**Chris Adesso presented.** As part of the four year Capital Improvement budget, the Wastewater Utility had four key projects identified as possibility to be funded through an IEPA Low Interest Loan. Those four projects are the Phosphorus Removal Improvements at the Wastewater Treatment Plan; a Three Phase Digester Rehabilitation Project for the two egg shaped digesters at the Main Wastewater Treatment Plant and the Rehabilitation of Two Lift Stations – one at 7<sup>th</sup> and Division and the other at Country Club Road.

It was identified by our Engineering Consultants and by the EPA that it would be in the City's best interest to include all four of these key projects in a project plan that could be used to submit application for a low interest loan to finance these projects. We are here this evening to ask for your approval to record an Ordinance which would allow the Mayor to sign a document to execute those loan agreements. One thing I would like to note is that the recording of this Ordinance will not commit the City in any way to securing the funding for these individual projects, but will allow us the ability to submit the project and start the paperwork being generated.

This is a large amount that we would like to submit as part of the project plan; the four projects over five years total a little over \$17,000,000; we will apply for a project plan in the amount of \$17,000,121.

**Aldr. Silkaitis:** The Phosphorus Removal project; this is mandated by the government, correct?

**Mr. Adesso:** That is correct.

**Aldr. Silkaitis:** We don't have a choice in the matter?

**Mr. Adesso:** Unfortunately not; we must do it, or be in violation of our permit.

**Aldr. Lemke:** Will we get competitive rates on this low interest loan?

**Mr. Adesso:** The rate right now is 1.86%. In discussions with Chris Minick and Julie Herr, typical bonding rates are around 3-3.5%, so it is anticipated that the rate may actually drop a bit more by the time our loan is secured. Chris Minick is very confident that it is in the City's best interest to apply for the low interest loan vs. securing an independent bond.

If there are no other questions, I would like to make a recommendation to approve an Ordinance authorizing the City of St. Charles to borrow funds from the IEPA Water Pollution Control Loan Program for Phosphorus Removal and Digester Rehabilitation projects.

No further discussion.

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

**Motion carried**

**5. Executive Session.**

None.

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

**Aldr. Lemke:** Do we have any International Harvester trucks and engines doing our snow plowing that you are aware of?

**Mr. Adesso:** Yes, we do have some International Trucks in our Fleet, especially in regards to snow plowing. The exact amount, I'm not sure of, but I can think of at least six. The Electric Utility also has International chassis and motors for their equipment.

**Aldr. Lemke:** We have had some catastrophic failures where I work, so I wonder if maybe further discussion on the side is necessary.

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

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