

**MINUTES  
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL  
GOVERNMENT SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING  
MONDAY, JULY 25, 2016, 7:00 P.M.**

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

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

**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; AJ Reineking, Public Works Manager; Tom Bruhl, Electric Services Manager; Tim Wilson, Environmental 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:** Present  
**Silkaitis:** Present  
**Payleitner:** Present  
**Lemke:** Present  
**Turner:** Present  
**Bancroft:** Absent  
**Krieger:** Present  
**Gaugel:** Present  
**Bessner:** Absent  
**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 of the Sanitary Sewer Capacity, Management, Operations and Maintenance (CMOM) Plan – Information only.**

**Timothy Wilson presented.** I would like to introduce myself to you; my name is Tim Wilson, I'm the new Environmental Services Manager, the position formerly filled by John Lamb. I appreciate the opportunity to serve St. Charles. At the June Government Services, we had a discussion about sewer back up and you asked Staff to bring additional information to tonight's meeting. In November 2015, we contracted with Engineering Enterprises, Inc. (EEI) to complete a Capacity Management Operational and Maintenance Plan, also known as CMOM. This is a result of the wastewater EPA Permits Special Condition that required the City to implement and submit a CMOM plan to the EPA.

The plan requires measurable activities the City will need to perform to maximize the efficiency and capacity of its sanitary sewer collection system, lift stations and wastewater treatment facilities. It also addresses sanitary sewer overflows, provides an assessment of the sewer collection system and identifies deficiencies in the system.

Our presenters this evening are named Jeff Freeman and Steve from EEI; Jeff is a Civil Engineer and Vice President of EEI. He has a strong background in water resources, environmental engineering and construction administration. As Vice President, he is responsible for project management, planning and design for water supply improvements as well as drinking water and wastewater treatment improvements. Steve is the senior project manager of EEI Environmental Firm. He has been with EEI for 10 years and is also very active in Illinois Environmental Water Association.

Power Point Presentation by Jeff Freeman, Engineering Enterprises, Inc., 52 Wheeler Road, Sugar Grove, IL.

**Chairman Turner:** Thank you very much for the presentation.

No further discussion.

**4.b. Presentation of the 10<sup>th</sup> Street/Millburn and Westfield Park Subdivision Sanitary Sewer Issues.**

**Chris Adesso and Peter Suhr presented.** Thank you, Jeff, for the very comprehensive presentation on a topic we think is very important. I would like to acknowledge that we have residents here this evening. I will give some background based on what we discussed last month and then after we will move forward with discussions on specific areas, focusing on the same topics that Jeff mentioned earlier.

I'm going to give you a brief history of what is going on in two specific areas and details about those residences, followed by a brief discussion about the local sanitary sewer collection system. We will also talk about factors to basement backups and then if the

Muckian's will allow me to, I'll use their residence to discuss how things happen in the system. At that point, Peter is going to take over and talk about what the City is doing currently, the magnitude of this issue, possible solutions and feedback.

As you may recall, a couple residents came to Government Services in June and addressed the Committee. Both Tom and Marnie Muckian are here this evening, they live at 1231 S. 10<sup>th</sup> Street and Tavia Tawney and her husband, Michael Cohen who live at 1242 S. 11<sup>th</sup> Street. Both homes are single family homes with basements and both homes have experienced sanitary sewer backups over the last several years. The Muckian's had an open Homeowners Sewer Assistance Program request that staff has been working with them over the past year to discuss some private improvements that they might be able to fund through the Homeowners Assistance Program, which we touched on as part of our City code.

One important thing to note is that the Muckian's residence is part of the Westfield Park Subdivision, Unit 1 and Millburn Subdivision Unit 1 through 6. That is going to become important as we move through our agenda tonight. I have the actual plans from when this area was constructed and they are dated 1966. The area we are talking about was constructed in three phases as part of the Kehoe's Heath Park Subdivision, between Horne and Prairie. Essentially they designed the subdivision with offsite sanitary which would be considered an interceptor sewer at the time, past South 11<sup>th</sup> Street and down the future Fellows, past Davis School.

Power point presentation by Chris Adesso.

Recently we have been working with these residents to install backflow preventers on the service lateral, or the private service from the house to the main which will prevent a back-up from occurring and getting into the house. In their particular situation, the Muckian's have an isolation valve in their basement, so when they turn the valve, there is an isolation effect by the valve essentially blocking the sewer line. The difficult part about that is that you have to be home to do it, and you have to time it right; you also have to make sure it is operating correctly and maintain it. They also put a three foot stand pipe into their floor drain which basically extends the elevation of the flow, so if there is surcharge above the floor elevation, it's in the stand pipe and not on the floor. It is my understanding that they did experience back-ups utilizing both of those solutions.

**Mr. Suhr:** Last month the Committee asked us to bring forth information regarding what we are currently doing to solve the sanitary problems that we know about. You want to know what the financial impacts are and what some of the possible solutions are moving forward. In regards to the City commitment to our sewer collection system, I'll outline the backbone of our plan for sanitary sewer collection to our residences and businesses. Simply stated, that is the CMOM program that Jeff Freeman did a great job talking about. We have laid out a 17 year plan for accomplishing the CMOM program in a three step process. This represents the dollars that we have budgeted currently to accomplish that CMOM program.

In 15/16 we budgeted \$57,000 for the CMOM plan per the IEPA and in 16/17 we have \$75,000 budgeted for sub basin 1 which is in the 10<sup>th</sup> Street area that we are talking about. In 17/18 we have \$175,000 which gets us from the first sub basin to the second sub basin and in 18/19 we have about \$500,000 dedicated to the CMOM program. This is all in our current budget. Beyond that for the next 17 years, we plan to spend about \$500,000 per year allowing for inflation which gets us up to about \$800,000 for years 15-17.

Some other things that we are doing; we have the Homeowners Sewer Assistance Policy and we increased the reimbursement rate from \$2,500 to \$3,500 just this past March. We have an annual budget of about \$15,000 for that program. One may wonder if that is enough, but we budget on demand. We have had this program in place since 2010 and we only get one to three applications annually. We can certainly budget more if there is a greater need, and perhaps it is necessary to put a marketing campaign in place. Public Works is committed to our sanitary sewer system; we have seven staff for sewer collection and they are designated to that job only. We have a \$1,000,000 in an annual operational budget; this is a daily commitment to our sewer program and it will continue. We designate about \$325,000 annually to do pipe and manhole lining which takes care of the I/I piece that we have talked about today. We have 176 miles of sanitary sewer which roughly equates to 1,000,000 linear feet; you can see that takes care of less than 1% of the entire system on an annual basis.

Lift station rehab and maintenance happens annually; every time the Engineering Department works out the annual MFT Street Rehab Program, a portion of those dollars are associated to repair of the sanitary system. We do spot repairs, we have the flushing and televising program and we have the Vactor and Vac-Con machines which help us do sewer cleaning on a weekly basis.

In summary, I would represent our program as being fairly robust and multi-faceted. Last month the Committee asked us what the magnitude of this project was, and that is a difficult question to answer; however, I thought I would provide you with some figures so you can see the magnitude. If we are just talking about the 15-17 year CMOM Program, we would spend \$9-\$12 million in 17 years to take care of the entire city. That breaks down to about \$500,000 per sub basin. That gives you a sense of the magnitude in regards to cost and time, not to mention our annual Wastewater Capital and Operational Budget that we utilize for maintenance.

Some possible ideas to start the conversation; we can increase our Homeowners Sewers Assistance Policy as well as a marketing campaign for that program. We can fast track the CMOM; we laid out a 17 year plan, but perhaps you want to do it in 10 years or less, recognizing the costs associated with that. The most important from staff and our consultants' perspective is that we need continued support of our annual operations and capital budgets. We present a very robust program and we are thankful for the support of the budgets on an annual basis. Perhaps we consider additional financial assistance to residents on a case by case basis. We have two families who are represented here tonight and they have specific problems within their homes and perhaps there is an opportunity to

look at this on a case by case basis and whether we want to offer any support above and beyond our current programs.

**Aldr. Stellato:** Are we really talking about a 15 year commitment? When we find whatever is causing the increase on the east side along this process, do we have to continue per the EPA mandate or can we stop? My resistance on fast tracking this is that I would like to take it a step at a time, helping the homeowners along the way. I have no problem with doing that if there are individual case by case basis.

**Mr. Suhr:** In general terms we are going to have assessment points along the way, specifically budget. We are going to have to consider those on an annual basis. We are going to get information on an annual basis; five years from now it could be a different story than it is today. This is our proposal at this time, recognizing that in 17 years it can look a lot different than it does today. When we look, we are going to find things, and we are going to have to have discussions when we do to determine how to deal with those.

**Mr. Freeman:** In regards to the IEPA mandate, the IEPA does not think that we are going to get out every bit of I/I; they want to see milestones of where your City is at. The program is set up across the whole system and there are basins out there that have very little I/I. Now, will that continue forever? Maybe not, but in some instances when you get some of the newer basins where you have plastic pipe, it's in better shape, better construction techniques were utilized, so you won't have to go through as much of this. Overall, the goal is to prioritize this and if you were going to consider abstracting, for one you would go after the basins where you have documented proof of issues (SSO's) and you could spread those out over a couple years. Your point is well taken that it may not be worth doing too much because you might run into places where you are spending and didn't really have to.

**Aldr. Silkaitis:** We are dealing with these two homeowners right now. What is causing their problem in these two homes? Is it something upstream from them? Is it a neighborhood problem, or is it distinctly these two homes?

**Mr. Adesso:** The problem is not at the point of these homes; if you think of the collection system as a large collection system with a tributary, there is flow coming from areas upstream. We know that they experience a back-up because the sewer discharges at a certain elevation outside their home; that flow comes from upstream. Can we quantify the tributary that is contributing to it? I'm not sure we have all that data right now.

**Aldr. Silkaitis:** With the information you have, how do you correct the problem for these two homeowners? What are the options? Is this a City main issue or is it on the private side?

**Mr. Adesso:** There are a few options for folks who want to protect their property on the private side, and that is what the Homeowners Sewer Assistance Policy is for. Residents can take that into their own hands and the City will reimburse them up to \$3,500 to essentially protect their private property from what is surcharged in the City owned main.

Those processes are things like backflow preventers, valves, installation of overhead sewers, etc.

As to whether this is a City problem or not, the thing is multi-tasking. It's definitely the City's main that is surcharging and backing up into their residence, but as everyone is starting to understand, the flow that is contributing to that surcharge is coming from many sources and that is what we are trying to quantify.

**Aldr. Silkaitis:** So the Homeowners Sewer Assistance Policy is essentially fixing the symptom, not the cause at the moment, correct?

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

**Aldr. Silkaitis:** So to fix the actual cause, you have to determine the I/I problems?

**Mr. Adesso:** I think we need to determine where we have I/I and as part of the program and verify sewer capacity.

**Aldr. Silkaitis:** They have been dealing with this problem for years, just like the flooding on 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue Creek. My point is for both sides of town, we need to somehow address these issues. I don't want to say "fast track" but we need to fix the problems for our residents, however we have to do it. We need to fix the cause, not the symptom.

**Mr. Adesso:** That is exactly what the CMOM is intended to do.

**Aldr. Silkaitis:** I don't want to fast track it, but I want to go faster than what we are doing right now. It's time to take care of these residents on both sides of town.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** Regarding the CMOM process; phase three is the sanitary sewer rehab. It seems to me the money budgeted is not enough. Is that going to be an average?

**Mr. Adesso:** That is correct. It is also intended to be a compliment to the existing lining budget.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** In regard to the two residents that we are talking about; the slides show that the pipes were in good shape, so that's why it's a flow issue?

**Mr. Adesso:** We have inspected the pipes in this area several times and they are in good condition for their age. They are old, but they are in good condition.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** I know of two people who have an issue and they called Public Works and they were told that the residents own from the street to their house. One person was going to live with it until they can afford to fix it and the other one did a huge job out of pocket. I don't remember either of them mentioning the Sewer Assistance Program. If someone calls Public Works to inquire about whose responsibility it is, are they told about this?

**Mr. Adesso:** We definitely don't keep this a secret, but there are qualifying factors. One of the qualifying factors is NOT a basement backup due to blocked private service. Also, the repair has to contribute to the greater good of the system by eliminating clear water inflow or something along those lines. That is all documented in the policy.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** So chances are if they made a call, your office would have referred them to this document, hopefully?

**Mr. Adesso:** We would always direct people toward the Sewer Assistance Program if we think it can help them. We also review it with people if they have questions. Sometimes there are projects that can be done in conjunction with other projects that will qualify, so of course we tell them about that too.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** I have a neighbor where that was the case. In the case of the person I know in the Westfield Park neighborhood, if they didn't know about this, can they get money now if they qualify, or not?

**Mr. Adesso:** The application process is such that a resident applies for the assistance program and that application is approved prior to doing any work, so the problem is quantified as part of the application. Then the applicant will get quotes for the work and City staff will approve the chosen quote and then we reimburse up to \$3,500. Currently the policy doesn't allow for retroactivity, but that can always be amended.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** I'm thinking of my two people; I know one called your office and one didn't, because they knew it was their problem, so they didn't even bother with the phone call. I'm just wondering if that neighborhood isn't loaded with those situations.

**Aldr. Lemke:** It seems as though you want to be able to look at situations as they evolve, and the plan allows you to do the same thing in three year cycles for each tributary area. My sense is when we get out to the far end of the cycle we should be having a lot less of the inflow. From the numbers you showed from last week there is a very sudden surge in the numbers and that says to me that there is probably some severe inflow. I agree with Aldr. Stellato's comment, it seems like we might be able to do something almost on a priority basis to get in front of this problem.

**Mr. Adesso:** Certainly flow testing will be part of our investigation. I would agree that some of the data you saw tonight certainly suggests that inflow is categorially a stronger problem than infiltration.

**Aldr. Krieger:** If this was happening in my basement, I would want the City to do everything possible and that is my recommendation; that we focus on these two homes and find an answer to their problems. Let's go do it.

**Aldr. Gaugel:** I agree with Aldr. Krieger, and to add to that; the amount we have budgeted for the Homeowners Assistance Program is great, but if we do a marketing

campaign and we were to publicize it more, I imagine we would be flooded with applications. In theory, though, if we go through each one of the basins and correct the problems and we got the I/I down to 0, would the Homeowners Assistance policy go away? It really should, because it's designed to be a band aid fix for what is a larger problem. I'm thinking budget wise. We would have to fund this to a much greater extent if we did promote it, but in the long run it would be fairly negligible, right?

**Mr. Adesso:** I think that goes along with Aldr. Stellato's original question; if we go through priorities, there are certainly opportunities to learn lessons and likely as we start to get our arms around some of the basins that have larger I/I problems and address those problems, we would we would be able to do less. I think that the Sewer Assistance Program is a different animal in that the program is there to support the residents protect their private property. It won't help the greater good of the system right away, but if we were to get hundreds of them, that is certainly something that would help over time.

**Aldr. Gaugel:** From my perspective, the Sewer Assistance Program is a funding. So if we increase the funding now, we could potentially decrease the funding in the long term because by going through basin by basin, we could drop the number of applicants we have to get the assistance program, potentially.

**Mr. Adesso:** I'm not sure we will see a drop in applicants because that is only to rehab private service.

**Aldr. Gaugel:** Over the span of 15 years, though, at the end of the 15 years, it should be significantly lower. Is that accurate?

**Mr. Adesso:** As Peter mentioned earlier, we are not seeing a lot of applicants right now, but yes, at the end of 15 years, in theory we should see less.

**Aldr. Lewis:** We have been talking about this for years, so this isn't something that just started. Do I understand correctly that we are fairly confident that there is not a problem in their private service?

**Mr. Adesso:** As I understand it, the Muckian's did have their service inspected by a reputable plumber and they found it is in good condition.

**Aldr. Lewis:** So I think there is more burden put on the City to help these two homeowners with this problem at this time. I want to be clear that I'm not trying to set a precedence that this is what we will do in every case, but it seems like this is what we need to do for this case. We usually do lowest bid, so whatever the lowest bid would come in, I think we can help them with that amount. If they wanted something more expensive or a higher type of fix, that would have to be out of their pocket book. As far as replacing shrubbery and landscaping, I'm not sure that is something that the City would need to get involved in. I think we need to strictly focus on the sewer. My recommendation would be to help both of these homeowners with the cost of getting their problem fixed at the lowest bid.



**Chairman Turner:** The Muckian's have an application in and they also have three quotes. The other residents do not so we cannot give them any money until they get their quotes. Mrs. Muckian, wasn't your lowest quote about \$8,000?

**Mr. Adesso:** It was somewhere in that neighborhood. I can work with the residents and come back to Committee to take direction and work with them up to a certain amount.

**Aldr. Lewis:** Is there any connection between their two homes? It seems odd that they are back to back; could they get a cost reduction if they were both fixed at the same time?

**Mr. Adesso:** That is certainly a conversation we could have with the vendor.

**Chairman Turner:** The question before us is do we want to provide them with any financial assistance above and beyond the \$3,500?

**Aldr. Stellato:** Yes; and Chris' suggestion of going back and working with the homeowners is great. I don't want to lose any more time, though. I don't want to wait until the next Government Services Committee Meeting to do this, and I was going to suggest that if you come back with a recommendation on the City Council floor in a week, we are all educated enough now on the issue that we can make a determination if that amount works. I agree, lowest bid makes sense and if it solves their problem, I'm ok with it.

I do have a question, though; do the responsibility of the homeowner end at the parkway or the street?

**Mr. Adesso:** The City code is to the point of connection. In this situation, this home is connected on the side yard so it's not connected at the street.

**Aldr. Stellato:** This is a general question, not related to this. If there is a tree in the parkway that is owned by the City and it has infiltrates the sewer lines, causes a back-up or a problem, because it's in the parkway, it's not yet quite to the street, what happens in that case?

**Mr. Adesso:** Are you talking about root infiltration from a City owned tree into a private service? If we can determine that accurately enough, I suppose we would assist that homeowner, perhaps split it. I'm not sure we could quantify that.

**Aldr. Stellato:** We want to define that at some point. As these communities begin to age, we have a lot of parkway trees and the sewers are right there.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** I'm confused; I thought we just determined that this wasn't an individual issue, it was a City issue.

**Mr. Adesso:** I think what Aldr. Lewis is suggesting is that she would like City staff to

work with the homeowners to identify private infrastructure improvements that would protect them under the auspice of the Sewer Assistance Program and an additional contribution due to the special conditions that occurred.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** So you're not fixing the problem.

**Mr. Adesso:** What she is suggesting is that we are going to help them take action immediately to protect their property but it won't solve the problem outside the manhole.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** So it wouldn't it be much efficient in the big picture if we fix the problem outside, or no?

**Chairman Turner:** Yes, but that's three years away.

**Mr. Adesso:** It would be more efficient, but it is a project on a much larger scale and a much longer duration of time.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** What are you suggesting?

**Mr. Adesso:** A suggestion would likely be to install overhead sewer for added protection.

**Chairman Turner:** So we want them to come back with a number next Monday night to City Council?

**Aldr. Stellato:** I would make a motion to instruct Staff to work with the homeowners to come back with a formal proposal by the City Council Meeting next week so that without going to Committee again we can vote out on the floor if we so choose.

**Aldr. Lewis:** I second that.

No further discussion.

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

**4.c. Recommendation to approve Agreement with WBK, LLC for Professional Engineering and Surveying Services for the Active River (River Park) Concept Feasibility Study.**

**Chairman Turner:** Chris, we have seen all the slides; we all know what we are doing here and that is - do we or do we not want to fund the feasibility study.

**Chris Adesso presented.** Correct; I do have something to add that is related to the budget. If the City were to engage in the study for the River Corridor concept, it would require a General Fund Budget addition in the amount of \$73,000. The Park District has

committed to making a contribution to the study in the amount of \$35,000 and the River Corridor Foundation has committed to \$5,000 for the sum of the proposal of \$113,000.

**Aldr. Stellato:** I just want to say thank you to the River Corridor Foundation for finding funding to share the burden. I'm much more comfortable now; I'm ok with this.

**Aldr. Krieger:** When we have presented other organizations and groups with larger sums of money, we have always had their financial reports. I've never seen one for the Active River or for the River Corridor Fund. I think we should look at the dollars before we start giving them out. I want to know where this is really going and who else they are getting money from.

**Mr. Adesso:** The River Corridor received two grants recently; one from a Community Donation in the amount of \$12,000 and they have also been the recipient of a Kane County River Boat Grant in the amount of \$17,500. They have also had several donations. We can certainly ask them for balance sheets for both River Corridor Foundations. I don't think the Active River Task Force is a consolidated group, it's more of an advisory group that uses the River Corridor Foundation as a mechanism to do business.

**Aldr. Krieger:** Ok, but I would like to see that before we approve the funding.

**Aldr. Lemke:** Regarding the discussion this morning about River Park; was that as a result of a vote? Because the way I read the materials for tonight was that there has not been a vote on that yet. In other words, I want to see a commitment and quite frankly, if it's a park as you describe it, I don't see why there isn't a 50/50 sharing on that.

**Mr. Adesso:** So that I understand....

**Aldr. Lemke:** I want to see if there is a vote by the Park and how much it is. My sense is, if this is a park as we have talked about – a River Park Concept, I'm in favor of all the other things in the Master Plan, but I'm leery about this one being recreational and the City is somehow taking the lead on this. Until I hear a vote from the Park, I'm not committed.

**Mr. Koenen:** The River Corridor Foundation did canvass their board and they have approved the \$5,000 contribution. Also, I talked to Holly Cabel, who is my peer at the Park District. They have had conceptual conversations about this project and to formalize the agreement, we would enter into a Tri-Party Agreement with the Park District, the River Corridor Foundation and the City to define the scope of the funding. We would take the lead to facilitate that, and that will be the next step in the formal process.

**Chairman Turner:** Why would we be the lead agency when this is a park?

**Mr. Koenen:** That is the label that it has been called, but at this point in time, it's really a feasibility study. We have the strongest staff available with our engineering team and our environmental team, so it made sense for us to take the lead on this element of the project. It is not intended to be precedence and say that we are going to be the lead on all future phases, but this one does make sense due to the technical aspect of this project. It was my suggestion to the Park District, actually.

**Aldr. Gaugel:** I just don't understand the hesitation. We asked time and time again for them to come back with numbers. They came back with numbers and it was 10% of what the initial estimate was. If we balk at this, we are sending the message this is not something we are interested in. Is that really the message we want to send? I don't see any hesitation with approving this immediately. We have hashed this out time and time again. I am a proponent; I know other members on the Council are proponents as well.

**Aldr. Payleitner:** I agree; they did what we asked them to do. We are just looking to see if there is a possibility of moving forward.

**Chairman Turner:** I have to agree. There are two reasons why we did the concept plan and should do the feasibility study, because anything that has come out about this park, it's going to involve the east bank of the pond which is municipally owned, and a future Council is going to have to make a decision about that at some time. To my knowledge from what staff has told me, the DNR has never removed or partially removed a dam without the consent of the local government. So again, a future Council is going to need that information. Is the feasibility study going to answer all the questions? I can't answer that – there may have to be another one after that.

**Aldr. Stellato:** I think to build on what Aldr. Payleitner said; a few months ago, we said let's do the study. Everything is done in phases and we will take a look at it after the study is done. I wanted buy in from them and I saw it. I would make a motion to approve this contingent upon the plan that they have presented tonight and with sharing the cost amongst the other parties as the break down is \$35,000 from the Park District, \$5,000 from private donations and the rest from the Community Foundation and move forward immediately.

**Aldr. Gaugel:** I gladly second.

**Aldr. Lewis:** I just have an observation; we are splitting hairs when we say the Park District or the City is paying – in the end, it's all the same tax paying dollars, whether the majority is from the City or the Park District to the Community, it's still all their dollars.

**Aldr. Stellato:** I think we'll know more about that after the study. To understand the breadth of this with dollars for the tax payers, we'll know that; if it's way too much money and it doesn't work then we have a decision to make at that point. I think we need to at least dip our toe in the water.

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

**K. Dobbs:**

**Bancroft:** Absent

**Krieger:** No

**Gaugel:** Yes

**Bessner:** Absent

**Lewis:** Yes

**Stellato:** Yes

**Silkaitis:** Yes

**Payleitner:** Yes

**Lemke:** No

**Chairman Turner:** Motion passes and moves to Council with the rest of the Committee items to figure out Monday night.

No further discussion.

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

**4.d. Recommendation to approve a Kinetic Sculpture Project on behalf of the River Corridor Foundation.**

**Chris Adesso presented.** The River Corridor Foundation, in partnership with the Active River Task Force is requesting to install three kinetic sculptures that will be donated by the Anderson Family, on the City owned Right of Way at the east dead end of State Street, adjacent to the river, between the Carroll Towers parking lot and the City owned Parking Lot just to the north.

There are a few details to be vetted through, but the Active River Task Force and the River Corridor Foundation would like to request approval of the concept and funds expenditure to investigate this new site in lieu of the originally planned location on "Johansen's Island". Staff is asking for relocation of the existing \$40,000 that is budgeted in the current fiscal year to be used in association with the design engineering work for the sculpture installation.

Unless there are any questions, Staff recommends approval of the Kinetic Sculpture Project on behalf of the River Corridor Foundation.

No further discussion.

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

**4.e. Recommendation to approve the Bob Leonard Walk Site Improvement Project on behalf of the River Corridor Foundation.**

**Chris Adesso presented.** The River Corridor Foundation, in partnership with the Active River Task Force is requesting to complete the Bob Leonard Walk Site Improvement Project on Phase II of the Bob Leonard Walk, between Indiana Street and Prairie Street.

The project consists of installing new bench seating along the walk and in the gathering area near the “If I could but fly” sculpture, together with new trash receptacles. Landscaping additions and improvements consist of more perennials and trees consistent with the design that is present on the site today. Also, future public art locations are identified on the site plan, although at this time no installation of new art work is planned.

The financing behind this project is being provided through grants from the Community Foundation and Kane County River Boat with matching funds provided by the River Corridor Foundation of St. Charles.

The River Corridor Foundation and Active River Task Force are not asking for any financial contribution from the City; they are merely asking for your support and authorization to use the property. Once it is finished, Public Works will take over maintenance responsibilities.

**Aldr. Krieger:** Will this help eliminate the flooding under the Prairie Street bridge on the walkway?

**Mr. Adesso:** No, this is purely installation of furniture and waste receptacles.

**Aldr. Lewis:** What is the cost of maintenance on a yearly basis?

**Mr. Adesso:** Very little; the benches will need to be painted every five to eight years, so we will put those into our maintenance program of other benches throughout the City. The trash will be picked up by restitution the same as the existing cans that are already out there.

No further discussion.

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

**Motion carried**

**4.f. Recommendation to award Contract for Design Engineering Services for Digested Sludge Storage and Digesters Rehabilitation Project.**

**Timothy Wilson presented.** The digested sludge tanks and digesters are located at the main waste water treatment plant and are key components of the bio-solids process. Both components are in need of significant repairs and therefore have been included in this year's budget for design phase engineering.

The digested sludge storage tank was constructed in 1951 as a clarifier but was repurposed in 1973 for sludge holding. Additional storage is needed to meet expected increase sludge loading from phosphorus removal and to increase plant flexibility.

The digesters were constructed in 1991. Much of the equipment associated with the digesters has reached the end of their useful life. In order to maintain safe operations and to continue to meet EPA bio-solids regulations, the digester rehabilitation project is needed.

In May staff sent out Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for design phase engineering services to six engineering firms. Out of the six firms, three declined due to the complexity of the project. The City received a total of three RFQ submittals. A committee of five staff members reviewed the submittals independently based on five competencies. These competencies had numeric values used to calculate scores for the firms. In addition to evaluating the proposals on these competencies, staff met to discuss general topics such as each firm's strengths and weaknesses, advantages, disadvantages, staff's comfort level with the firms and scheduling of project.

As a result of the evaluation staff recommends awarding a contract to Trotter and Associates. At this time staff recommends awarding the design engineering phase of the project at the negotiated fee of \$480,000. The budget amount is \$492,000. Staff has determined that the proposed fee of 5.6% of the construction cost to be fair and reasonable based on several factors. For example, in comparison to IEPA interest loan project data from the past several years the average design fee is 6.9%. For our project, the difference is approximately a \$40,000 savings. The Trotter standard agreement has been reviewed by legal counsel and found to be acceptable.

At this time, Staff recommends approving only the design engineering phase of this project and the negotiated fee of \$480,000; the budgeted amount of \$492,000. Staff will seek committee approval of construction engineering services at a later date, recognizing that phase of the project is budgeted in fiscal year FY17/18.

Staff recommends award of contract to Trotter and Associates for Design Engineering Services for Digested Sludge and Digester Rehabilitation Project in the amount of \$480,000.

**Aldr. Gaugel:** Is the \$480,000 a firm, fixed price? Meaning, will we get a finished product if we award a contract for \$480,000. There will be no over runs?

**Mr. Wilson:** We will get a finished design project; this is the design phase only.

**Aldr. Gaugel:** Which is what we are approving tonight; just the design phase only for \$480,000. You won't be back in front of us asking for more money if it takes longer than anticipated?

**Mr. Wilson:** No.

**Aldr. Gaugel:** You received three proposals back. Where was the price on the other two proposals?

**Mr. Wilson:** Trotter and Associates matched the lowest proposal and the third proposal was almost \$100,000 more.

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

**K. Dobbs:**

**Bancroft:** Absent

**Krieger:** Yes

**Gaugel:** No

**Bessner:** Absent

**Lewis:** Yes

**Stellato:** Yes

**Silkaitis:** Yes

**Payleitner:** Yes

**Lemke:** Yes

No further discussion.

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

**4.g. Recommendation to award the Bid for Sanitary Sewer and Storm Sewer Lining Program.**

**Timothy Wilson presented.** A key part of the City's EPA CMOM plan is to control inflow and infiltration. The sanitary sewer lining program is an ongoing program to decrease the amount of inflow and infiltration. I'm here to make a recommendation to award the bid for our Sanitary Sewer and Storm Sewer Lining Program of 2016. This program also repairs points of service within the sanitary system. The storm sewer lining



program is to maintain the structural integrity and ensure maximum flow of the storm water system.

For bidding this year, the City teamed up with the Cities of Geneva and Batavia. This is the first year of the combined bidding; we will review the overall performances, management and benefits after this year's program to see if the combined bidding is beneficial to continue in the future. The bid opening was on July 14<sup>th</sup> 2016 and five companies bid on the project; the low bidder was SAK Construction.

Staff recommends awarding the bid to SAK Construction for Sanitary and Storm Sewer Lining in an amount not to exceed \$402,051.

**Aldr. Stellato:** I'm very familiar with this process; will they show a video of the line after this process so we can be sure it's done?

**Mr. Wilson:** Yes.

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

**K. Dobbs:**

**Bancroft:** Absent

**Krieger:** Yes

**Gaugel:** Yes

**Bessner:** Absent

**Lewis:** Yes

**Stellato:** Yes

**Silkaitis:** Yes

**Payleitner:** Yes

**Lemke:** Yes

No further discussion.

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

**4.h. Recommendation to approve Resolution with the Illinois Department of Transportation for the Red Gate Road Resurfacing (LAFO) Project.**

**Karen Young presented.** A portion of the Red Gate Road Resurfacing (LAFO) Project will be paid for with Motor Fuel Tax (MFT) funds. The attached Resolution for Maintenance of Streets and Highways by Municipality under the Illinois Highway Code is an agreement with the Illinois Department of Transportation. It specifies the street to be constructed and details the amount of Motor Fuel Tax funds appropriated for this project for construction. The total appropriation includes the total cost of the project

award and only the final amount spent on the contract is what will be the final appropriation from the MFT fund.

Staff recommends approval of a Resolution with the Illinois Department of Transportation in the amount of \$59,196.13 to be used for the Red Gate Road Resurfacing (LAFO) Project.

No further discussion.

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

**Motion carried**

**4.i. Recommendation to approve Design Engineering Services Agreement for the IL Route 31 Project.**

**Karen Young presented.** The City has been working with the property owner at 1336 Geneva Road to secure additional right-of-way for the extension of the culvert and wingwalls under IL Route 31 to facilitate a pedestrian path as well as mitigate erosion at the invert of the culvert directly downstream and at the headwall of the culvert impacting the pavement of IL Route 31. The property owner has been cooperative and has dedicated to the City the necessary property to complete this work. This future proposed work will allow for the extension of sidewalk along the east side of IL Route 31 from the City of Geneva termini south to the existing sidewalk in the City of St. Charles. This is a key sidewalk connection point.

The next stage in the project includes the design and permitting for this work. WBK Engineering, LLC has been working with both the City of St. Charles and City of Geneva regarding the preliminary and land acquisition stages of this project. Due to the scope of work and permitting requirements it is necessary to hire a consultant. Staff has worked with Wills Burke Kelsey Associates (WBK) on a number of structural design and permitting projects, including the Illinois Bridge Repair Project. WBK's team has extensive knowledge of the IDOT and appropriate permitting requirements. Staff negotiated a fee for this work in the amount of \$75,000 for a not to exceed contract.

**Aldr. Lewis:** I'm pleased to hear there is going to be a sidewalk in this area.

No further discussion.

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

**Motion carried**

**4.j. Recommendation to approve Consulting Engineering Services Agreement for the Watershed Plan for 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue Creek.**

**Karen Young presented.** The next stages of the 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue Creek project includes the development of a Watershed Plan in accordance with the nine elements as established in the guidelines of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). A Watershed Plan summarizes the overall condition of the watershed and provides an integrated, holistic framework to effectively and efficiently restore water quality. The nine elements will; identify causes and sources of pollution, estimate load reductions expected, describe management measures and targeted critical areas, estimate technical and financial assistance needed, develop and information and education component, develop a project schedule, describe interim and measurable milestones, identify indicators to measure progress, develop a monitoring component. In addition to identifying environmental opportunities, this study when approved by the IEPA will allow the City to apply for Section 319 Grant Funding for construction of future projects within the 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue Creek watershed.

During earlier research and coordination with the IEPA, it was determined that there is an approved watershed plan for the Ferson/Otter Creek Watershed. The IEPA has suggested that the City prepare an addendum to this existing plan to include the 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue Creek, which would minimize the costs.

City Staff applied for the Kane County Riverboat Grant funding for the Watershed Masterplan for the 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue Creek Project. Kane County has notified the City that they are recommending this project be awarded \$61,482 in grant funding. The remaining \$13,928 will be paid for out of the overall budget for the 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue Creek Project.

**Aldr. Lemke:** Before we go to Council, I would like to know who the subcontractors are on this project.

No further discussion.

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

**Motion carried**

**4.k. Recommendation to approve Consulting Engineering Services Agreement for State Street Creek Stormwater and Watershed Plan.**

**Karen Young presented.** As part of the McDonald's Development at 1915 W. Main Street, the City received fee in lieu funding, which is required to be utilized in the State Street Creek watershed area. Portions of the State Street Creek watershed experiences flooding during heavy rainfall events. Staff has identified the best use of this funding would be to complete both a Watershed Plan and Stormwater Plan for this watershed.

The State Street Creek Watershed Plan portion will be completed with the 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue Creek Watershed Plan at a minimal additional cost of \$6,286.

The purpose of the Stormwater Plan is to provide the City with a roadmap to identify the existing flooding problems; costs estimate and recommended prioritization of Capital Improvement Projects for flood reduction, flood protection, water quality and habitat restoration. This information will be utilized to continue to help staff develop a 10-year (and beyond) capital improvement plan for the stormwater utility infrastructure throughout the community.

Staff negotiated a fee for this work in the amount of \$131,620 for a not to exceed contract. The budgeted amount for this project is \$125,000. The foundation of this study will be based on the existing storm sewer system. Upon further investigation into the data currently available it was determined that portions of this watershed will require further data collection to accurately represent the current conditions to ensure that the final stormwater plan accurately reflects the current conditions. The remaining \$6,620 will be paid for through remaining funds available in the budget. HR Green has successfully completed Stormwater Plans for other communities and City staff has been pleased with the work they have performed on the 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue Creek Project.

**Aldr. Krieger:** There is a section of that creek which runs along 6<sup>th</sup> Street. There is an area where a particular homeowner has been told he can't mow and can't remove tree branches; will that property at least be able to be cleaned up a little bit?

**Mrs. Young:** If I can get the exact location from you, I can look into that.

**Aldr. Lemke:** Again, if there are different subcontractors, I would like that to be presented before it goes to Council.

No further discussion.

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

**Motion carried**

**4.1. Recommendation to approve Change Order No. 3 with Martam Construction and Contract Addendum No. 1 with Trotter and Associates for the North 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue Watermain Project.**

**Karen Young presented.** Staff is requesting approval of Project Change Order No. 3 with Martam Construction, which is a deduction in the amount of \$247,647.33. This amount includes the final approved construction quantities and a \$300,000 deduction assessed to Martam Construction for Liquidated Damages. The amount was arrived at through negotiation with the contractor. The City Attorney was consulted during this process.

Staff is also requesting approval of Contract Addendum No. 1 with Trotter and Associates for additional services. They have incurred additional expenses of \$285,000 due to the ongoing delay in construction completion.

It should be noted that this project is being funded by an IEPA Loan and a reimbursement from the Collins Property (future development) for work completed under this contract. The final funding balance after all of these negotiations includes a credit to the City in the amount of \$466.95.

Staff recommends approval of Change Order No. 3 with Martam Construction in the amount of (-) \$247,647.33 and Contract Addendum No. 1 with Trotter and Associates in the amount of \$285,000.

**Aldr. Gaugel:** From the beginning, I have had a problem with this. We paid a contractor to handle the oversight of this project and we are now doubling the amount we are paying him. Fundamentally I have a problem with that. I have said this to everyone in this room, along with staff and fellow Council members. I cannot look at the people of the 4<sup>th</sup> Ward who ask me what happened on this whole project and tell them that we got a good deal. It was delayed, it was nothing but problems; there were months when nothing happened. I just don't think it is right for us to only go after Martam and their sub, and I cannot justify approving the increase in Trotter's contract based on the service that we received.

**Aldr. Lemke:** It would be helpful to know more about what happened with the connections, but I'm expecting that will be forthcoming.

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

**K. Dobbs:**

**Bancroft:** Absent

**Krieger:** Yes

**Gaugel:** No

**Bessner:** Absent

**Lewis:** Yes

**Stellato:** Yes

**Silkaitis:** Yes

**Payleitner:** Yes

**Lemke:** Yes

No further discussion.

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

**4.m. Recommendation to award the Bid and approve Purchase Order for the Public Works Roof Rehabilitation Project.**

**AJ Reineking presented.** The Public Works facility has been built up overtime as the community has grown. The original expansion, which represents about 1/3 of the entire facility, is over three decades old and the roof has developed several prominent leaks. As these leaks have developed, we've made several attempts over the years to have them patched, caulked or sealed, but each year new issues arise as old ones are put to bed.

On July 6, the City opened bids for the rehabilitation of this 34,000 (170' x 200') sq. ft. section of roof.

The project includes:

- Removal of 62 fiberglass skylights and replacing them with sheet metal panels,
- Replacing all loose fasteners,
- Sealing all seams and fastener penetrations,
- Cleaning and coating the entire roof with a weatherproof urethane material

The City received eight bids for this project with J.L. Adler Roofing and Sheet Metal of Joliet, IL being the lowest responsive, responsible bidder.

Adler Roofing has performed numerous roof rehabilitation projects on public buildings as well as other commercial/industrial facilities, and their references have provided favorable feedback.

Staff recommends awarding the bid for the Public Works Roof Rehabilitation to J.L. Adler Roofing and Sheet Metal, Inc. in the amount of \$266,650.00.

**Aldr. Lewis:** It seems from the lowest bid to the highest bid, there is almost \$200,000 difference.

**Mr. Reineking:** Yes, a lot of these companies are doing school buildings right now, and as soon as school starts, it's a matter of who has work and who doesn't, so we might have gotten numbers from people who are really busy right now and didn't really want the job.

**Aldr. Lewis:** Okay, but we are getting the same quality of work with a \$200,000 difference?

**Mr. Reineking:** We called them and talked about it with them, and they are comfortable with their pricing.

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

**K. Dobbs:**

**Bancroft:** Absent

**Krieger:** Yes

**Gaugel:** Yes

**Bessner:** Absent

**Lewis:** Yes

**Stellato:** Yes

**Silkaitis:** Yes

**Payleitner:** Yes

**Lemke:** Yes

No further discussion.

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

**Motion carried**

**4.n. Recommendation to award the Bid and approve Purchase Order for the Stuarts Crossing Basin 106C Shoreline Stabilization Project.**

**AJ Reineking presented.** Basin 106c is located at the intersection of Stuarts Drive and Foxfield Drive (just north of the Jewel Grocery store on Kirk Road). It was installed as part of the Stuarts Crossing development to receive Stormwater from that subdivision and adjacent commercial properties.

The shoreline of Basin 106c has severely eroded on all sides. In some areas there are nearly vertical drop offs in excess of three feet. Such a slope makes landscaping impossible, and poses a potential hazard for individuals who are walking around or attempting to fish the pond.

On June 28<sup>th</sup> the City opened bids for a shoreline stabilization project of this basin. The project will include grading the entire perimeter to provide a safe, stable slope, rip rap around the inlets to allow for stability around the structures and native planting around the entire shoreline. Native, prairie-style plants have deep root systems that will hold the soil in place and prevent future erosion; they'll also add a nice aesthetic element to this area.

This project includes 3 years of maintenance of the landscape to ensure that the natives survive and aren't pushed out by invasive species, similar to the approach taken with the native landscape on the Bob Leonard Walk.

V3 Construction Group of Woodridge was the lowest responsive, responsible bidder, and they have done other similar projects in the area, some of the projects were highlighted in their bid and are included in your packet. They have a good reputation in the industry and we believe they will provide a successful project for us.

SSA 21 was established for maintenance associated with this development, including Basin 106c. Special Assessments from that SSA will be used to fund this project.

Staff recommends awarding the bid for the Stuarts Crossing Basin 106c Shoreline Stabilization to V3 Construction Group, Inc. in the amount of \$263,423.90.

**Aldr. Lemke:** There are two ponds there; one to the north of Foxfield and one to the south. North looks comparably much better; why was this one allowed to go so long? It will require more work because there has been more undercutting.

**Mr. Reineking:** It's true the other ponds are better, but I can't explain why it happened the way it did.

**Aldr. Lemke:** It looks to me like there was never any rip rap as some of the other ones along Foxfield, particularly along the spillway. This needs to get done, and the firm seems well qualified.

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

**K. Dobbs:**

**Bancroft:** Absent

**Krieger:** Yes

**Gaugel:** Yes

**Bessner:** Absent

**Lewis:** Yes

**Stellato:** Yes

**Silkaitis:** Yes

**Payleitner:** Yes

**Lemke:** Yes

No further discussion.

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

**Motion carried**



**4.o. Recommendation to Waive the Formal Bid Procedure and approve a Purchase Order for Supplemental Concrete Restoration.**

**AJ Reineking presented.** Beginning in July and throughout the duration of the summer, Public Services staff transitions from concrete work to asphalt repairs as the hot, dry weather is most conducive to work with asphalt materials. However, new concrete restoration work is continuing to be identified which requires immediate attention. Some of these areas are trip hazards identified by staff, while the majority of the work is performed in conjunction with driveway/parking lot replacement projects

In addition, several locations have been identified throughout the community that are in need of concrete restoration requiring technical ADA grading, or covering large areas beyond the scope of our in-house resources.

The City is currently under contract with Geneva Construction for the South Tyler Road Construction project. Since this construction project was competitively bid earlier this year, staff felt there would be a time and cost savings by negotiating a contract with Geneva Construction Company directly for this project and use the appropriate unit prices as bid with the Tyler Road project. Geneva Construction has agreed to hold their unit prices from their Street Program Contract for the above projects, as well as others that exceed the material requirements or specialization to be completed with staff resources.

Staff recommends waiving the formal bid procedure and approval of a Purchase Order for Concrete Restoration with Geneva Construction Company in an amount not to exceed \$60,000.

No further discussion.

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

**Motion carried**

**5.a. Recommendation to approve Street and Parking Lot Closures and Amplification for the 2016 Scarecrow Festival.**

**Police Chief Jim Keegan presented.** This special event application was submitted on May 17, 2016. The special event committee met on June 30<sup>th</sup> to discuss the event with members of the St. Charles Convention & Visitors Bureau and Ravenswood Events.

The 2016 Scarecrow Festival will be held on October 7-9, 2016. The event continues to be sponsored by the St. Charles Convention and Visitors Bureau, with the coordination being handled through Ravenswood Event Services. Both have made application through the special events process and met with the City's special events committee.

Attached are the requested day/dates for parking lot and street closures. Please let the record reflect that the changes have been made to street parking per Alderman Krieger's request. In addition, the Park District is requesting temporary "no parking by police order" signage to be installed from Thursday thru Sunday along the following routes:

- Second Avenue between Park Avenue and North Avenue;
- Second Avenue between North Avenue and Iroquois Avenue;
- North Avenue between Second Avenue and Fifth Avenue.

Event coordinators are also requesting permission to use directional signage on the public parkway and use of sound amplification during the event. The Police Department requests authorization to modify the planned use area where it is operationally necessary.

No further discussion.

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

**Motion carried**

**6. Executive Session.**

None.

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

**John Rabchuk:** Aldr. Krieger, I just sent Mark Koenen the financial statements you requested. I would be happy to show you the last ten years of financial statements if you desire. The other point is that during the last 18 months through the Active River Project, we have raised \$350,000 for improvements in the river and along the river's edge which has all been done by volunteers.

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

Motion by Aldr. Stellato, seconded by Aldr. Silkaitis. No additional discussion.

Approved unanimously by voice vote. **Motion carried.**