

**Minutes**  
**City Council Fall Retreat**  
**September 14, 2019, 8:00 AM**

**1. Call to Order**

Mayor Rogina called the meeting to order at 8:00 am.

**2. Roll Call**

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

**Others Present:** M. Koenen, R. Tungare, L. Gunderson, J. McMahon, J. Keegan, J. Schelstreet, P. Suhr, C. Minick, B. Nielsen and T. Conti

---

**3. Welcome Remarks**

Mayor Rogina went over the agenda for the day and introduced Ben Nielson, City Administrator Intern.

Chief Keegan mentioned that the Police have moved into their new facility and the opening day is September 16, 2019.

Mark Koenen explained that Jeff Hartman is no longer with the Community Foundation of the Fox River Valley, the organization that assists with the St. Charles Initiative, and that the City will be working with another individual at the foundation. Mark informed the group that the City is going to be receiving a grant from Exelon in the amount of \$600,000 to be devoted to One West Main Street (1<sup>st</sup> Street Plaza- East). The Mayor offered his congratulations to both Mark and Ald. Vitek for their great work.

Mayor Rogina brought up the Municipal Center and said that the citizens would like the building preserved. He noted that it's a historical landmark and will be protected. However, the building could be used differently and much more by citizenry. The Mayor said if the Council decides to keep the Municipal Center in the same location the building needs a major security update.

Mayor Rogina reminded the Council Members that when the date for the winter retreat is posted they should do their best to be available.

**4. Citizen Comment**

Steve & Lisa Case joined the meeting and addressed the Council Members regarding Eric Ericson.

Mr. Case explained Mr. Ericson has signs up in his yard, a small airplane (in pieces) in his backyard, as well as an abandoned vehicle. Mr. Case said he understands the City has decided not to do anything because his mother lives there. Mayor Rogina said that it's inaccurate to say that the City decided not to do anything. Mr. Case indicated that he and his wife have been dealing with Mr. Ericson for over three years and he asked what he has to do to get help from the City. Mayor Rogina explained that the City Council is behind him, but that things have to be done according to legal process and that takes time. Mr. Case, asked Ald. Bancroft (Attorney Bancroft) if it's possible to foreclose on a lien? Ald. Bancroft said he's not familiar with the case enough and doesn't know the strategy and can't comment. Ald. Bancroft told Mr. Case that the Council supports them. Mayor Rogina said that staff will move forward on this Monday and try to start a process towards a resolution.

## 5. Open Forum

### Utility Rate Discussion



Utility overview slides  
final 09122019.pdf



Utility handouts  
09122019.pdf

Chris Minick explained that there is a rate study being done for all three of the utilities. Some preliminary results have been received and a finalized report will be received in the next several weeks. This provides an opportunity to review the trends being seen in the utility funds and what the rate study suggests is likely to happen if all the programs, policies and capital projects identified within the study. Chris also told the group that he will be discussing the Roadway Program. He explained that the goal of his presentation is education. He said he will be reviewing the costs contained in the utilities (capital costs), and the projections and trends suggested in the rate study, the water softening project and the east side sewer. Chris said there is a significant project that may require moving the flows from that general location to the wastewater treatment plant. This would have some impact on rates we charge our customers.

Chris indicated that direction is needed on water softening and if that's a project the Council would like to see move forward. There are several projects budgeted in the next fiscal year that are dependent on that decision. Chris said there are 5 scenarios that will be discussed regarding water softening showing the impacts to the residents.

Chris reviewed the City's philosophy and how we apply and utilize a rate study. He said it's used as a guideline. Every year Council has directed that staff undergo an analysis of the utilities individually and collectively looking at the financial position and circumstances of the utilities.

Chris said that the Cost of Service Analysis suggests that we're going to need a series of fairly aggressive rate increases over time. Chris said that over the next 10 years the electric utility will rate will increase 2%, water will increase 7%, and sewer will increase 5%. This is an annual increase of \$110 based on the current billing rates, and compounded over time.

Chris said we need to start replacing our water mains, and the utility billing software and meter reading equipment is well past the end of life. He also indicated that there are some capacity projects on the water side that have a high price tag. There is also a need for additional wells to keep up with growth. These items have been incorporated into the rate study. What have not been incorporated in the study are the soft water options. Chris further explained that money needs to be put into the sewer mains, lift station replacements and anticipated additional mandates from the EPA. He said that the next phase of improvement and expansion of the west side wastewater treatment plant is going to be taking place.

Ald. Stellato asked if the talk in Washington about backing off on the standards put in place for wastewater tolerance level is true, and what the impact would be. Peter answered that it changes regularly and 6 months from now it could be completely different. Peter said that the numbers include some of those regulations, but the majorities are not regulated assumptions.

Ald. Bessner said that he noticed a lot of projects in the 4 – 5 million dollar range as well as roadways. He asked if everything is happening all at once a "perfect storm". Chris explained that maintenance projects were deferred in order to bring a balanced budget. There are some projects that don't make it to the final draft of the budget each year. Chris said he thinks these are all starting to catch up; the age of the infrastructure is part of the problem. The infrastructure is 30-40 years old.

Ald. Payleitner asked if other municipalities handle this through the Enterprise Fund vs. General Fund. Chris said most all handle it as part of the Enterprise Fund.

Chris discussed the utility rates. He went through several different scenarios based on the utility rate study. He went over past, current and projected rates (over 10 years) for the utilities. He also went over the projections, including Nano water softening, and explained that there would be an increase of \$50 per month to residential customers.

Ald. Vitek asked if a credit could be issued to customers if they get a softener. Chris said that could be done and would most likely spend less overall.

Ald. Turner said we should do what is best for the majority of the population. In his opinion the extra cost won't matter to the residents coming to St. Charles.

Ald. Vitek said that residents will most likely still purchase a water softener even if the water softening is done because the water still won't be soft enough.

Ald. Bancroft said he's met with residents upset with brown water. He said that residents want to do what Geneva does and Geneva softens their water.

Ald. Stellato asked if there is a way to isolate and treat only the area with the water issues. Peter said that it can't be done that way. The only way would be to treat the water for the entire City. Peter said that rusty water is due to the underground pipes and that goes to the water main replacement program identified over the next 10 – 15 years. That will bring better water quality. Soft water can't be tied to clear water although it would help. Lake Michigan water would be an option but is double the cost of Nano softening.

Ald. Stellato mentioned that residents will be paying for soft water if they want it or not. He said that a lot of residents don't care about water softening and asked that this be kept in mind as decisions are made.

Ald. Lewis said she thinks that the quality of the water should be the focus. She said that water softening sounds like an unfunded mandate imposed on the citizens.

Ald. Turner said that right now Geneva is paying over \$1000 a year for water if not more and will have to raise rates. He said we would still be cheaper than Geneva, and with water softening residents will save money on bottled water, softening systems, filters, etc.

Mark said the city of Geneva has soft water and it is due to the water having radium. The softening process treats the radium in the water. He said their decision wasn't motivated by anything other than that.

Chris continued by going over the projections for the East Side Sewer Capacity Project, and projections if both the Nano and east side projects were done.

Ald. Payleitner asked if the east side improvement is based on infrastructure or development. Peter said that it's based on capacity.

Mark said that part of the reason for the discussion of the east side trunk sewers is the redevelopment of the Charlestowne Mall. With the inclusion of residential at the Charlestowne Mall site it would require an increase in capacity.

Peter said that other developments tied to this project are Silverado, Charlestowne, Pheasant Run, AJR Filtration Expansion, it's beyond the mall.

Ald. Silkaitis asked this project would be bonded. Chris said yes, the bonds would finance the infrastructure and the rates increase over time to finance the bonds. Ald. Silkaitis asked what happens after 20 years when the bonds fall off. Chris answered that there will probably be additional maintenance needs.

Ald. Turner said he would do both right away to keep costs as low as possible. He said a vast majority of the residents can afford it.

Mayor Rogina asked for a show of hands as to how many of the Council Members would like to move ahead with some type of water softening in the budget. Informal vote: 2 in favor 8 against

### **Roadway Program**



FINAL Road  
09122019.pdf

Chris explained that this information is based on a presentation that Karen Young presented in 2018. The report was based on the 2017 Pavement Evaluation done by Infrastructure Management Services. It looked at all roadways in the system and graded them on a 100 scale. Chris said that the results indicated our roads were in overall good condition, but that the average roadway rating in St. Charles would fall to a 61 (fair) if we did not increase spending. It further noted that over 50% of the roadways would grade at 60 (poor or very poor) by 2022. The projection was that we would need to spend \$12M per year over the next 5 years to maintain the score of 71.

Staff discussed the idea of spending \$60M over 5 years and it was not realistic. Public Works put together a pavement management program. The goal of that program was preventative maintenance on our roadways. Chris said that we will be updating to this particular program in 2020.

Chris explained the cost and funding sources for the program including the State fuel tax, Local fuel tax, reserves, general operations and capital funding. Chris went over the road lifecycle costs and the road funding gap. Conclusion being there is a gap, and significant expenditures will be necessary either in preventative maintenance or reconstruction. Chris reiterated that we're going to need to be spending on infrastructure moving forward.

Ald. Lemke said that as roads deteriorate if maintenance isn't done the problems become greater.

Ald. Lewis asked if we're still using the same formula as we did 15-20 years ago or have there been new products introduced. Peter said that there are some higher quality materials, and with those come cost. You won't get a longer lifecycle by using higher quality materials.

*Break - 9:28 am*

*Return - 9:39 am*

## Downtown Overlay District



Fall Retreat Dwtwn  
Overlay Dist.pdf

Rita discussed the Downtown Overlay District. She explained that it's part of the zoning ordinance and allows only retail businesses to occupy first floor storefronts within the downtown area. Rita went over the location of the district, the exemption process, the criteria of the exemption process, as well as the office certification process. She explained that the office certification process grants some flexibility to the overlay district allowing the generation of pedestrian activity and that it's compatible with a pedestrian oriented shopping area. There are limitations to the Main Street environment which are the physical barriers (the river and busy streets), the retail area is not connected and banks no longer want storefronts. There seems to be more interest in entertainment and experiences. Rita asked the Council Members for their feedback on the Downtown Overlay District, if the overlay makes sense in the current environment, should it be modified, should we consider loosening up the office certification process, or eliminate the district all together. Rita told the group that if they decide to modify the Downtown Overlay District it would require an ordinance to change the retail zoning ordinance.

Mayor Rogina asked what the roll the City plays when businesses come in, vacate, etc., and if business licenses should be considered. He asked the Council Members to consider business licenses when giving their feedback.

Ald. Lemke said he would not want to eliminate the district without receiving input from the St. Charles Business Alliance. *Ald. Lemke requested staff to reach out to the Alliance.*

Ald. Payleitner said the purpose of the Downtown Overlay District was for businesses to generate pedestrian traffic. We've heard from residents that Main Street is not pedestrian friendly. She asked why pedestrian friendly businesses couldn't be applied to 1<sup>st</sup> Street, or businesses that back up to a plaza.

Ald. Bessner asked with the possibility of cannabis being sold, as well as vaping, and tobacco if it is possible to not allow visuals (signs) in the windows with either a special use or prohibited use in the downtown overlay area; where it's restricted for tobacco as a whole?

Rita explained that it's the Council's prerogative to prohibit certain businesses but it's not a zoning issue. She said the way to approach this is not through a special use. She said that if the Council were to, for example, not want to allow vape stores in our CB1 and CB2 zoning districts it could be broken out into a separate use category allowing it in our commercial zoning districts but not in downtown.

Ald. Bessner said what he is looking for is an ordinance to cover cannabis, vaping, tobacco, for signage.

Chief Keegan said that he thinks there are some opportunities there but we should talk to Nick Peppers to find out more.

Ald. Bancroft said he agrees with the approach but that it's not worth the time. He said that we have something in place that is being imposed on property owners who are trying to lease their space and generate income and we're requesting that they limit their use to something that in the last 15 years has changed. It not fair to the property owners. He said we should talk to the Alliance and see if there is a smaller area to do this, but the problem is what we want to exist there doesn't exist anymore.

Ald. Lewis said that she thinks it was put in place to generate sales tax. She asked if there has been an influx of businesses wanting to be on the first floors, but it's not allowed.

Rita confirmed that there have been some inquiries from businesses.

Ald. Lewis said we're losing out on sales tax. Ald. Lewis continued by mentioning that when we consider signs, there should be a limit on the number of neon signs allowed downtown as well.

Ald. Stellato said that over the years we've had people wanting to move downtown, and the ALE Solution situation was the pinnacle. It made us look very anti-business. It was so bad that the Chamber and the Partnership were having discussions with ALE trying to keep them. We needed a spark to get 1<sup>st</sup> street going and to get the retail focus off of Main Street and on to 1<sup>st</sup> Street. That's done. I think this has served the purpose.

Ald. Turner suggested that we make the Downtown Overlay District more of a mixed use area to bring in more housing.

Ald. Stellato said that he likes the idea of being more specific. However, if we make all businesses in town get licenses we're punishing all for one segment.

Mark summarized the discussion regarding the Downtown Overlay District:

- Reconsider the Downtown Overlay District
- Shrink the Downtown Overlay
- Not applicable anyplace else
- Signage and licensing as it relates to tobacco or unwanted uses.

Ald. Turner asked if we would like to establish more residents downtown.

Mayor Rogina said he's not against it.

Rita said that housing can be processed as development proposals come forward.

### **Former Police Station Site**



Fall Retreat former  
PD Site.pdf

Rita explained that the Downtown Comprehensive Plan process looks at both the east and the west sides of the river. The primary interest was the police station site. Rita mentioned that an open house was conducted in May, 2019 and received some good feedback. The feedback received was brought before the Planning and Development Committee on Monday, September 9, 2019. Rita went over the comments provided at the Open House and the direction received from the Plan Commission at their meeting on September 3, 2019.

Feedback from Open House:

- Riverfront should be open, green, publicly accessible

- Mixed use fronting on the river, upper floor hotel or residential
- Building height in 3 story range, set back from river
- Parking/parking decks on interior blocks
- Transition to residential neighborhoods

#### Plan Commission Direction

- Generally consistent with Open House comments
- More flexibility with building height – existing zoning or PUD
  - Allow developers to present something and decide
- Open space needs change with Active River Project
  - Could have an impact one way or another on the land planning component for the former police station site as far as the RFP process. Rita asked for direction from Council to find out if this is a project that they would like to plan for in the short term, long term, or not. That will help guide the RFP process.
- Master Planning might be beneficial

Rita went over the timeline for the site.

Ald. Lewis asked how long the project will take.

Rita answered that it will take a couple years or more.

Mark spoke about the RFP solicited for lot's 6, 7b and 8 on 1<sup>st</sup> Street. He said staff with Council input included criteria that should be included in the RFP. It gave the development community a sense of where we were headed. He said that staff needs guidance on how the Active River Project impacts this project. Including Active River allows for a bit more land that may be developable on the adjacent shores. If Active River is not included it can still be built on but we would have to sensitive to flood waters. There would be an impact on the developable area. The question needs to be answered or we will move forward with an RFP that doesn't contemplate the Active River at all.

Ald. Turner said he would like to see a park on the site and asked why we would want to get rid of the water area from the dam to the trestle. He said it's the only place downtown where people can go to relax and recharge.

Ald. Vitek asked if the Active River Project and the Riverfront project now one in the same. She said she considers them one project, a redevelopment project on the river and it should include walkability and biking. People are hung up on zip lines and whitewater rapids but the market didn't tell us that's what is wanted. The Active River Project did. She said we should have developers give us ideas around the river, the PD, and the Municipal Center. That's the whole redevelopment project. It's no longer Active River, no longer PD, but the River Development.

Ald. Bancroft mentioned to make the RFP effective you have to include everything; you won't get meaningful responses if people don't understand the cost involved. Second, if you think the Active River Project dictates this project, don't waste the time now because we're years away. Whatever comes of a river project could be dealt with by someone who wants to develop the site. Ald. Bancroft suggested that we give a disclosure, the engineering information, the problems with the site, and the Active River Project.

Mayor Rogina mentioned that developers will submit proposals, and there will be more than one to choose from, assuming the RFP is carefully crafted. The Mayor said the faster we get to a resolution the faster we

reach the timeline of 2021, or it's going to sit in a prime area of our community.

Mayor Rogina said that from what he understands from a majority of Council is that we want a partner or partners for Active River, or we don't move forward.

Ald. Lewis said that she's not in favor of removing the dam. Whether the dam is there or not could change things. She said she agrees that both sides of the river can be more active with pedestrian walkways. Ald. Lewis said she walked it and it's in desperate need of repair. She said it's hard for her to think we wouldn't receive a lot of proposals for this project, and we can be specific on what goes there.

Ald. Stellato said we want to give them a guide, but don't want to be too specific.

Ald. Bancroft said he believes the proposals will come, it will not be the most lucrative site, and there is a lot of infrastructure that needs to be dealt with and buildings that need to come down. We are going to need help, support and will need to incentivize to get a project we will be proud of.

Ald. Lewis said the site, other than the buildings, is a nice site. People enjoy it and love the open space. The community wants open space and it needs to be incorporated.

Mark referred back to the 1<sup>st</sup> street project and said there were only 2 proposals received at that time. He said he hopes there will be more than 2 proposals for this project, but isn't quite as optimistic.

Rita showed the group the boundaries of the project area and asked for feedback on what land should be solicited in the RFP. She brought up the Municipal Center and said it's a national landmark but it's not limited to specific use. It is limited to the structure and what can be done to the outside of the building. There are ways to reuse historic structures. Rita asked the Council Members if they would like to include the Municipal Center building in the RFP.

Ald. Lemke said that in the area immediately east of Riverside there are some historic houses. We looked at the possibility of deck parking, south of the radium building. That's one thing we talked about and hadn't heard anyone say no.

Ald. Turner said he does not want to move City Hall off the river. Instead of building an entirely new campus he said he would rather see a redesign of the interior of the building to make it user friendly.

Ald. Silkaitis said that he agrees with Ald. Turner and he would like to keep the campus downtown. He said it's an icon in St. Charles. His concern is parking and that no one will be able to park when they go to City Hall. He said until a deck is built he'd like to keep the parking.

Ald. Stellato said that it's very expensive to reuse buildings and it's a challenge. He cautioned on the reuse of the building and said it would be more expensive than building another facility. He said that we should look at both options when budgeting.

Mayor Rogina asked if the best approach is to retrofit the municipal center building or include it in the RFP. He asked if Council would entertain a conversation about including it in the RFP.

Ald. Bancroft said that he thinks it should be included in the RFP. He said that he thinks that with the risk of redoing it, it's possible we will be stuck with it; no redeveloper is going to want to take it on.

Ald. Payleitner said that the sentimental value of the building is huge to the citizenry. This building was a gift to the City. There were stipulations when we accepted that gift and why we support the museum. That was part of the stipulation.

Ald. Vitek asked if there are other options that could be there that would benefit the citizenry better than the municipal building. There may be a better use.

Mayor Rogina said that the chamber is void of the opportunity to attend meetings remotely, and to take us into the future as a modern municipality. The Mayor said the building is under-utilized with respect to the public. He agreed that it's the symbol of St. Charles and that it will stay.

Ald. Payleitner said it's the symbol because it's the people's house.

The Mayor answered said that unless they are paying a utility bill, or going to a meeting, the residents are void of knowing that it's the Municipal Center. The residents don't go in and enjoy the beauty of the building. He asked if it could be enjoyed more by the residents if it were a public/private partnership, drawing people in to enjoy the building.

Ald. Stellato said that when you walk in City Hall everything to the left (west side) is part of the original structure, the tower, etc. The buildings to the right were not part of the tower building. A developer may be interested in the buildings to the right.

Ald. Bancroft said that he's concerned about saying that the building has to be in play. He said he isn't opposed to having a discussion with that as an option because they may have an idea we haven't thought of. He said that if we made the whole site what was in play with the Municipal Center he's afraid that would have a detrimental effect.

Ald. Lewis said that she sees both sides, but doesn't think this is the time. She said that in 20-30 years it may be different, but right now is not the time.

Ald. Silkaitis asked if we have funds in the budget to demolish the existing buildings on the police station site, and asked if we would do that first or have the developers look at the site as is.

Mark said he'd like to take it down and make it as attractive as possible.

Ald. Silkaitis agreed.

Mark summarized the key points of the discussion regarding the police station site:

- Go ahead with the RFP.
- Include Cedar Avenue north in the redevelopment area.
- We will not close the door when talking about other elements of the project including:
  - The Active River Project – makes sure people know it exists and how they may choose to use that at a function of their redevelopment proposal
  - The Municipal Center – Icon Structure to the South
  - Include Parking
- Demolish the former police station Site
- Let the market respond to what we're looking for but give the development community some criteria in terms of purpose, scope and height.

Mayor Rogina said that the majority of the Council would not want to move forward on the Active River Project without a partner. The Mayor said that an RFP would be brought back to Council to be looked at

before it went public, and that staff would have input.  
Rita asked if the Council is open to offering incentives.

Ald. Lemke said that the incentive is that we will propose to take the police station down if there is a proposal to develop the site.

Ald. Turner said if we receive a proposal for a building that's 5 – 6 stories, we could lower the price to keep it to 3 -4 stories.

Ald. Pietryla said that he would be open to incentives.

Ald. Silkaitis suggested selling them the property for \$10.00 and be done. With incentives you just never know, the amount is variable.

*11:01 – break*

*11:10 - return*

### **Executive Session**

Motion by Ald. Lemke, second by Ald. Turner to discuss collective bargaining as permitted by state statutes.

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

Motion by Ald. Lemke, Second by Ald. Silkaitis to exit executive session at 11:41 pm.

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

### **Cannabis Discussion**

Ald. Payleitner asked about the Public Hearing and Plan Commission meetings on Tuesday, September 17. She wanted to know if they are going to be limited to the findings and facts.

Rita said that with General Amendment they are not strictly limited to the findings and facts which are pretty broad. They have been provided the findings and facts generated by staff.

Ald. Payleitner verified that the Plan Commission is deciding if this will be allowed as zoning.

Rita agreed. She said the premise the Plan Commission is working on is if recreational marijuana were to be allowed which zoning districts it would be appropriate to allow it under.

Ald. Lewis asked if we have a motion that already states where it can be allowed.

Rita said direction was given from the Council and it's been incorporated into the proposed General Amendment. Rita said that an amendment has been prepared for the Plan Commission to consider and have taken advisement that direction will be received from the committee. The Plan Commission could limit them to that direction, forward a recommendation to Council Committee again, or may choose to broaden the scope of the recommendation. If they choose to broaden outside of where the Council Committee

recommended then the Planning and Development Committee would be advised and the Public Hearing would have to be re-noticed. The Plan Commission is not a decision-making body and can talk about other locations. They can forward it as a recommendation. However, they aren't a decision-making body, only a recommending body.

Ald. Lemke asked what the BC and BR are?

Rita answered the districts are predominantly outside of downtown. It's limited for example, to Randall Rd., Kirk Rd. those corridors.

Mark mentioned a drawing that was shared and said that it could be sent out to the Council Members.

Ald. Bessner said that we should earmark all this money before January 1, 2020.

Mayor Rogina asked if it got to Council, or in Committee, that process could be done easily to earmark funds from recreational cannabis for specific causes.

Chris indicated that can be done at any point during the process or as part of the budget process.

Ald. Bancroft said after having several conversations he thinks that 70% in favor, 30% not. He said one thing made him upset. He had a conversation with a resident and the resident said that she talked to someone on the Council and that Council Member said that we were "fast-tracking" this vote to allow retail sale, and insinuated the motive was because we didn't want people to know we were doing it.

Ald. Turner said he agrees with the percentages Ald. Bancroft mentioned. He said what bothers him is the implication from people that the Council is responsible for their kids using drugs. Ald. Turner said parents need to start taking responsibility. It's not the Council's responsibility to keep their kids off drugs.

Ald. Payleitner responded by saying that the message the Council is delivering is that this is okay. Not that we're responsible for kids using drugs, but that we're delivering a message as a City that it's okay.

Ald. Turner said he agrees but even if we don't have the stores here it will be here anyway.

Ald. Payleitner said she wanted to clarify her position. She said she received an email expressing disappointment in learning of Ald. Payleitner's early vote against bringing responsibly managed commercial cannabis sales to St. Charles. Ald. Payleitner said that's not her position and she's sorry that's being communicated. She said that her position is that it's not being responsibly managed; the State of Illinois is changing by the minute. She said because the rules are changing so rapidly she can't cast a vote to subject St. Charles to the uncertainty. She said her opposition is the State of Illinois. She said by agreeing it says we trust the State of Illinois and whatever happens, happens. That's a message she doesn't want to deliver to her constituents. What's our hurry?

Ald. Turner said that he does not trust the State of Illinois but is responding to covering the bases on the tax.

Ald. Lewis said she doesn't know if she's for or against having recreational marijuana, but that she does wonder why we're so rushed. Once the door is opened we can't go back. She said that she doesn't think all things are in place to make the right decisions. She said that one establishment at this time would be fine.

Mayor Rogina said he was against the law as a State statute. The community is reacting to an unfunded mandate. He said this is something we have to deal with. The Council will come to a decision and if it's yes, he won't veto, he supports the council either way. He said if there was a tie he does have his own

position.

Ald. Silkaitis said that just because we can make money shouldn't be a reason to bring this branding into our town.

Motion by Ald. Turner, second by Ald. Silkaitis to adjourn the meeting at 12:03 pm.

**6. Executive Session**

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

**7. Additional Items from Mayor, Council, Staff, or Citizens.**

**8. Adjournment**

Motion by Ald. Turner, second by Ald. Silkaitis to adjourn the meeting at 12:03 pm.

**Voice Vote:** Ayes: Unanimous; Nays: None; Mayor Rogina did not vote as Mayor.

**Motion Carried**

:tc

---

Charles Amenta, City Clerk

CERTIFIED TO BE A TRUE COPY OF ORIGINAL

---

Charles Amenta, City Clerk