

**MINUTES  
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL  
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, MARCH 12, 2018 7:00 P.M.**

**Members Present:** Bessner, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner, Bancroft, Gaugel, Vitek, Lewis

**Members Absent:** Stellato

**Others Present:** Mayor Raymond Rogina; Mark Koenen, City Administrator; Rita Tungare, Director of Community & Economic Development; Russell Colby, Community Development Division Manager; Ellen Johnson, City Planner; Matthew O'Rourke, Economic Development Division Manager; Bob Vann, Building & Code Enforcement Manager; Fire Chief Schelstreet, Asst. Chief Christensen

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was convened by Chairman Bessner at 7:00 P.M.

**2. ROLL CALLED**

Roll was called:

Present: Bessner, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Bancroft, Gaugel, Vitek, Lewis, Turner

Absent: Stellato

**3. COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

- a. Plan Commission recommendation to remove a Special Use for PUD and approve a Preliminary Plat of Subdivision for Cityview Subdivision.

Ms. Johnson said a PUD was approved for the site in 2016 which involved a 7 lot single family subdivision and extension of Keller Place, that project did not move forward. John Henry Builder Developer has now requested removal of the PUD and is proposing to subdivide the property into 4 lots meeting the requirements of the underlying RT-2 zoning districts. The lots will front Mosedale and a detention basin will be placed at the northeast corner. Plan Commission held a public hearing and recommended approval subject to resolution.

Aldr. Payleitner asked what the homes would look like and what the price point would be. Ms. Johnson said the building elevations are not required to be submitted for plats of subdivision, so the elevations themselves will be reviewed at the time of building permit.

John Czebrinski-John Henry Builder Developer-said he'd like to do 4 ranch homes with a price range in the mid to upper \$500,000s; all homes will have walkouts and 2 car garages. He said there was some concern with the elevations with the rear of the homes so he is going to take more care in the design as he gets into the process. He did meet with Mr. Andersen who was concerned about the wall near his home, which will be diminished to virtually nothing and meet his grades to clean it up. The walks going up to the front doors will work down toward Rt. 31 so you'll have retaining walls on all the walks, most of them being 2-3ft. He noted that he was also building the homes on Cutler St., and these would be the same type of profile with 2 bedrooms, but if someone wanted to they could finish the basement and add a bath. They tried to keep the footprint as small as they can to offer a master with a nice kitchen, no living room and no dining room; they'd be big dinettes looking out. Aldr. Lewis said she really likes it, it's just what these neighborhoods need and she likes the ones on Cutler.

Aldr. Lemke asked if they'd be full basements. Mr. Czebrinski said yes, people don't do crawlspaces anymore, they are also looking into composite material for the decks to help the views off the back, it'll be a walkout right from the lower level.

Aldr. Silkaitis asked about Keller Place. Ms. Johnson said its right-of-way north of the site, the previous development that was approved contemplated the street extending through the site to use as public right-of-way, but now Keller Place only serves access to the property to the north. Public Works has stated interested in vacating that right-of-way since it doesn't really serve a purpose; the developer has indicated that if the city were to vacate it he may be interested in acquiring some of that land. Per state statute the right-of-way would be split in 2 and split between the adjacent property owners, if they're agreeable. That is under discussion.

Chairman Bessner asked for the homes square footage. Mr. Czebrinski said about 2,300 sq. ft.

**Aldr. Turner made a motion to remove a Special Use for PUD and approve a Preliminary Plat of Subdivision for Cityview Subdivision. Seconded by Aldr. Silkaitis. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion Carried 8-0.**

- b. Recommendation to Approve a Corridor Improvement Agreement for 423 S. Second Street (Ryan Corcoran - Corcoran Commercial Real Estate).

Mr. O'Rourke said this is the old Fox Title building at Prairie St. and Rt. 31; they plan to renovate that building into their office for their brokerage; the grant they've applied for is for some landscaping materials visible from both Prairie and Rt. 31 to soften the view and break up some of the asphalt in the parking lot. The amount they're proposing is \$18,100; the city's share at a 50/50 match would be \$9,050. Corridor Commission reviewed the proposal on 3/17/18 and recommended approval.

**Aldr. Turner made a motion to approve a Corridor Improvement Agreement for 423 S. Second Street (Ryan Corcoran - Corcoran Commercial Real Estate). Seconded by Aldr. Vitek.**

Aldr. Payleitner said she has concerns in funding all sides of this building, when only 1 side is actually on Rt. 31 which is the corridor. She is hoping that staff is out there making people on the east side aware of the money available; she'd rather not be spending it on stuff we don't need

to be spending it on. She doesn't mind offering Corcoran money to redo the front, but she's not sure about the rest of it. Mr. O'Rourke said Corridor Commission discussed that and the program reads that anything between the right-of-way and the front of the building; in this case there's that "L" shape in the building and you can see all that screening wall from Rt. 31, they considered that part of the visible extension of that setback in front of the building. To be clear they are only paying for the landscaping and the walls that are visible from Rt. 31 and Prairie, both would meet the guidelines of the program, they're not paying for the pergola structure or paving. Aldr. Payleitner said it says rear patio area; where is that. Mr. O'Rourke said there were some 3D renderings submitted and they are paying for the boxes that create a screening wall to the patio, they are also assisting with some asphalt removal. In the estimate it does say rear patio area, but the Commission specifically agreed to the boxes, plants and some brick column work; all things that can be seen from the right-of-way. Aldr. Payleitner said she doesn't doubt we should do it, she just doesn't think it falls in the purview of the corridor, doing the sides and the back. Ms. Tungare suggested staff gather more information to be sure it meets the criteria. Aldr. Payleitner said she would like that if it's okay with Chairman Bessner. Aldr. Lewis said she agreed; it's a good idea to send it back to be reevaluated because she can think of other buildings where you can see both fronts and sides from approaches and we need to be careful here that we stay within the ordinance. She said if we'd like to change that we can amend it and change the ordinance.

**Aldr. Turner amended his original motion to postpone this item to the next Planning & Development meeting on April 9, 2018. Seconded by Aldr. Vitek. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion Carried 8-0.**

Applicant-Ryan Corcoran arrived late; Chairman Bessner updated him on the reasoning for the item being postponed until the April Planning & Development Committee meeting.

- c. Plan Commission recommendation to approve a Preliminary Plan for First Street Building #3 Streetscape and Riverwalk Design.

Mr. Colby said final plans have been drawn for the Riverwalk and streetscape improvements to be installed around First St. building #3. These plans have been revised based on comments received from Plan Commission and Committee last October. In terms of changes, the planter bed and paver brick layout has been refined to have a more consistent shape and to also increase the size of the planters at the south corner of the building. Staff is currently reviewing these final plans and the developer is working on obtaining a cost estimate to install these improvements, and all of this will be finalized when the plan is presented to Council for approval; but the goal is to work within the amount that's budgeted in the redevelopment agreement. Plan Commission recommended approval 8-0 with a few comments on increasing the number of trees, shrubs and number of landscape beds; staff is working on some updates to the plan to incorporate those changes. When this was discussed back in October, both Plan Commission and Committee recommended conducting an engineering analysis of a potential pedestrian crossing of Illinois St., which would connect this section of Riverwalk to the Bob Leonard walk to the south. WBK analyzed the crossing and they found there's adequate site distance but not adequate gaps in the traffic for there to be a safe crossing without other measures being taken, such as signage, lights or refuge island, so it requires further analysis to determine the most appropriate way to create a safe crossing. Staff is seeking a recommendation tonight on the Riverwalk and streetscape plan, as well as direction from committee whether they'd like to continue to study the pedestrian

crossing. It's not something that could be installed with this plan based on the timing for the project, but maybe something that could be part of a future project for improvements to Illinois St. in the next coming year or two.

Aldr. Lewis asked if we could have less plantings but maybe ones of greater size. Mr. Colby said one of the comments from Plan Commission was that the plan shows quite a few perennials for the beds and these beds are large enough to fit trees or taller ornamental shrubs; which might be better scaled to the building. Plan Commission also said they like to see more shrubs or some evergreens to have more shape during the winter; so we will be looking into that to have more substance there, rather than the flat perennials. Aldr. Lewis said that's a pretty big building and if it's in the budget she's in favor of larger plantings. Mr. Colby said there is opportunity to do so.

Aldr. Payleitner said she doesn't remember the stairwell shown. Mr. Colby said that is a location for the future stairwell down to the lower Riverwalk that will continue to the north, that location is there because the river walls constructed previously identify that location for the stairs. For this portion of the project we are constructing the improvements around that stairwell, but the actual stairwell wouldn't be constructed until we design what will occur at the lower level. Aldr. Payleitner said she thought the lower level would somehow continue out around that building. Mr. Colby said at the corner of the building the lower Riverwalk and the wall curve all the way in and intersects into the wall, so there is a breakpoint there where you can't walk any further to the south. Aldr. Payleitner said why bother with the crossing if it's not going anywhere. Mr. Colby said this is just the first phase, these improvements will continue to the north to connect to the east plaza to have the ability to keep walking along the upper wall to the east plaza and First St., or continue down these stairs and along the lower level. Aldr. Payleitner said if you're on a bike or have limited mobility, it limits you; you can't take the stairs. She's very disappointed that it's not connecting the walk that's in front of the Brownstones. Mr. Colby said there will be a connection with an ADA ramp further to the north where there's additional room where the plaza will intersect the river walk, depending on how the plaza is designed it may be sloped down or there may be stairs; it hasn't been determined. But at this location it's a fixed narrow access point where only stairs can be accommodated; we have to work around the river wall that was already installed with the earlier phase of the project. Aldr. Payleitner said she likes the river wall, she just thought the walkway would continue; why bother with the crossing if it doesn't go anywhere. Aldr. Lewis asked a ramp was needed to be wheelchair accessible. Mr. Colby said there will be a ramp further to the north in the next phase of the project, all that's being done here is the area around the stairs to stabilize the surface, you have to provide access to the building, but the actual stairs will not be constructed now because the access to the lower area will not be open until the later phase. Aldr. Payleitner said but you won't be able to get to Illinois to the Plaza. Mr. Colby said you will, along the upper Riverwalk; it will connect from Illinois to First St. at the Plaza, all at one level, if you took the stairs down you'd be at a lower level and you could continue on that level to connect back up, or you can stay on the upper level and continue at one surface level from Illinois to First St. You will be able to get from Illinois to the Plaza on one level. Ms. Tungare said there are certain structured elements that were already committed from 2006, so we are working around those as well as defined areas, such as the location of the stairs and the parameters of the upper river wall.

**Aldr. Turner made a motion to approve a Preliminary Plan for First Street Building #3 Streetscape and Riverwalk Design. Seconded by Aldr. Bancroft. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion Carried 8-0**

Mr. Colby asked Committee for some direction as to whether staff should continue to pursue the Illinois crossing or not.

Aldr. Lemke said you don't have very far to walk to a lighted intersection, especially with the engineering study stating it's a tough place to get a platooning of traffic and gaps. He'd be concerned now and he thinks it's a matter of if we find a lot of foot traffic there with some conflict with the street traffic; that could then be pursued later. **Committee agreed that it could be looked at later.**

- d. Plan Commission recommendation to approve a Plat of Vacation and Final Plat of Subdivision for First Street Building #2.

Mr. Colby said these two plat document would modify the shape of the First St. Building #2 lot in order to follow the building plans that were approved in November 2017. A small section of the street would be incorporated into the building lot and a small section of the building lot would be made part of the street. The plats were drawn based on final architectural plans submitted for building permit review and Plan Commission recommended approval of the subdivision plat.

**Aldr. Bancroft made a motion to approve a Plat of Vacation and Final Plat of Subdivision for First Street Building #2. Seconded by Aldr. Gaugel. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion Carried 8-0**

- e. Discussion regarding amendments to the Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 17.28 "Signs".

Mr. Colby said the sign code was last significantly updated in 2006 and over the past few months staff has identified certain issues with the code that may warrant a more significant update since adopted. The regulation of temporary signs is limited, only certain types are regulated, and this has created difficulties regulating signs that don't fall under defined categories within the ordinance. Secondly, there was recent Supreme Court ruling regarding regulation of content on signs; historically the content displayed on signs has been considered protected under the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, which places limits on the regulation of sign content allowable under a sign code. Recently the court found that classifying signs by type, based on what's displayed on the sign, and is a regulation of content which may violate the First Amendment. It was also ruled that setting different sign standards for different types of land uses or businesses could be considered a content-based regulation. Staff has identified issues where our sign code may not be in compliance with these recent rulings and in order to address these staff proposes to modify the sign code with the following goals:

- Regulate all temporary signs with standards for size, number and placement; regardless of what's displayed on the sign.
- Eliminate any sign regulation by category where we refer to the function of the sign, ex. Garage sale signs.
- Eliminate references to certain types of businesses or land uses in the code; the Supreme Court found this may be unconstitutional.

- Changes to some of the terminology in order to comply with the Supreme Court ruling; essentially keeping the existing regulations for permanent signs in terms of size, setbacks and height.
- Clean up and simplify the code wherever possible, since we will not identify signs by type, we can simplify definitions; since the types of signs wouldn't be as detailed, it would make the regulations simpler.

Staff is looking for direction to file a General Amendment application which would go through the normal review process with a public hearing before Plan Commission with a recommendation, before coming back to Committee; if the Committee has an interest in amending the code for those issues.

Aldr. Lewis said she has interest and thinks this will talk to those businesses that put up a banner and leave it there for 2 years; would those be considered a temporary sign. Mr. Colby said yes, any type of temporary sign, depending on how the ordinance is structured, could fall under the same parameters. We aren't necessarily proposing to change the time limits, but that could be adjusted if there's an interest in doing so. Aldr. Lewis said yes, time limits, and she'd also like to see it enforced, otherwise nothing is solved. Chairman Bessner asked the time limit for a temporary sign. Mr. Vann said there are different types of temporary signs; for sale or rent signs are regulated differently timewise, those can stay up until the space is rented or sold. Temporary signs are up for 14 days and they get 3 or 4 times per year to re-up those.

Aldr. Vitek thinks it's a good idea to clean up some of the language to make it more user friendly; even to those who are just reviewing it.

Aldr. Payleitner asked what other types of temporary signs there are out there. Mr. Colby said there are temporary signs posted that don't necessarily fall under a category, such as a high school graduation sign, so it isn't specifically regulated now. The Supreme Court states that codes shouldn't be defining the regulations by category anyway. Aldr. Payleitner asked if there is any wording about the condition of signs. Mr. Colby said there could be regulations that address maintaining a sign at a certain condition; it would be difficult to do, but we'd have to define what characteristic would define a deteriorated sign; but there might be a way to do it.

Aldr. Payleitner asked how many "for sale/for rent" signs per property; that's probably more the issue. Mr. Colby said that could be regulated.

**Committee agreed they were in support of Staff moving forward with the general amendment application.**

#### **4. FINANCE DEPARTMENT**

- a. Recommendation of Funding Amount of the Greater St. Charles Convention and Visitor's Bureau (GSCCVB) Funding Request of \$503,382 for Fiscal Year 2018/2019.

Mr. Koenen said Tom Donahue-President and interim Director DeAnn Wagner for the CVB were present that evening to go over the details for the proposed budget for Fiscal Year 2019. The presentation tonight will address goals from last year as well as goals for this year. The CVB is in a transition right now looking to stabilize their organization, their past director

resigned and are fortunate that a prior CVB employee came back to stabilize the group. At the end of the presentation and after any questions we'd like to think there'd be a positive recommendation to take this to City Council for approval for the next fiscal year.

Tom Donahue thanked the committee for the additional time to prepare their presentation; he then showed a PowerPoint presentation on behalf of the Greater St. Charles Convention and Visitor's Bureau which covered the following topics:

- Funding Request-Fiscal Year 2019 (\$503,382) down slightly from 2018 (\$256,500). Current space we rent will finish up in January 2019-eliminating the remaining months of that fiscal year.
- Who we are and what we do-Mission is to enhance the economic impact to our community through increased tourism, spending and hotel guest room utilization. We will achieve that by marketing to tourists, soliciting to visit, stay and spend in the destination, prospecting for sales opportunities and leads, serving as a conduit for tourism leads to hotel partners to respond to RFPs, cooperating with tourism colleagues and fellow CVBs and competing against other Illinois CVBs.
  - Room nights generated and booked had a nice bump up in 2017 and is currently doing quite well.
  - Leads generated and booked are trending down from 2017 and we're not happy with that, but it's still doing quite well.
  - Visitstcharles.com Unique Visitors 2017 was down so we rebranded but 2018 has a nice bump up and we're looking to redesign our website as well.
  - Scarecrow Fest.com is trending in the right direction.
- Fiscal Year 2019 Marketing/Communication Plan-the rebrand highlights our rich history and architecture within the community while using the phrase "actively authentic" to tell stories about the people, businesses and community and convey those through various electronic devices. The 5 steps to their plan:
  - - 1. Set goals
      - Boosting visitor volume through digital marketing. The ability was not there in the past, we're a little behind on this, but will be much better with rebranding and the new website in 2019.
      - Drive more volume to meetings, conventions, sports and training facilities.
    - 2. Diversify Income Base
      - Future plans to implement partner programs. He feels the Downtown Partnership has been very successful in finding sponsorship, raising money and awareness; we plan to work with them in the future.
    - 3. Define Core Audiences/Targets
      - Leisure, Meeting, Training, Conventions, Weddings and Sporting events- No business is bad business.
    - 4. Establish Geo-Targets
      - Push the envelope to get information out to people in surrounding drivable states that may flow through our area.

- 5. Highlight Strengths
  - Arts & Hands-on Experiences, Outdoor Rec. Museums & Historic Places
  - Entertainment Venues
  - Festivals & Events
  - Unique dining
  - Sports Marketing
  - Meetings & Corporate Events
  - Group Tours

Future focuses include spending advertising dollars on: Google Ads, Facebook newsfeed Ads, Social Media posts and Print and online strategy.

Mr. Donahue shared some slides covering the State of Illinois Tourism and Chicagoland local hotel trends over the state of Illinois.

- Operating results
  - Pros:
    - The CVB introduced a new brand that was long overdue, it was well done and we're starting to get traction that will sever the ties of some of the drop off.
    - 2017 Scarecrow fest was very successful; we're always tweaking it to remove any friction with the local community or businesses.
  - Cons:
    - Inability to execute multiple strategies, we have a lot do with a small staff, it takes a lot of effort but we have to do a better job.
    - Staff turnover can be good, but not when there's multiple people leaving for a variety of reasons; this also certainly slow things down.
    - Slow response to implement new sales database which then caused us to struggle a bit to see our results. We now have the software up and running and is the same program being run by many CVB's across the county; going forward we will have better reports and information to share.
    - Year-over-year sales results were lower than we wanted them to be; we have to do better as far as prospecting calls, site tours, room nights and leads generated.
- Future Priorities:
  - Attending shows and conferences most likely to attract target audiences with viable leads.
  - Enhancing sales team accountability and results tracked through new sales database.
  - Collaborating with hoteliers to hold quarterly meetings; advance and close shared leads, showcase the community.
  - Continuing to market the destination.
  - Developing and implementing new website in 2019.
  - Enhancing partnership with IL Office of Tourism.
  - Diversifying income sources and identifying future funding models.

- DSCP / GSCCVB
  - Leveraging combined talents and resources to drive additional value.
  - Shared Common Mission: Drive economic growth to make the St. Charles community a destination where people, businesses and tourism thrive.
  - “St. Charles first” mentality.
  - Greater efficiency and effectiveness via coordination and collaboration.
  - Enhancing communication with City personnel, businesses, organizations and the community.
  - Increasing value for our constituents, community and state tourism partners.

Aldr. Turner said he feels they did a great job considering the situation over the past year, he’s very, very pleased with the CVB working with the Partnership to have 1 common mission and he thanked them for driving that home and for continuing to do so. Mr. Donahue said he appreciates that; he believes it’s the right answer.

Aldr. Lewis said it was a really good presentation and she appreciates the humility in presenting to Committee with some of the things that they haven’t been able to do, we don’t usually hear that; she appreciates the forthrightness. She asked who “we” is during his presentation. Mr. Donahue said our board as well as our small staff, who cannot do everything. When he realized we didn’t have an executive director he did a matrix of all board members and their talents, he assigned them all with their willingness to take those assignments. He told DeAnn when he brought her that we need to accomplish our goals and objectives and the board is going to help us; they’re not off the hook just because DeAnn is here now. The board has to become more active and accountable.

Aldr. Payleitner said she very much appreciates the transparency. In speaking of the leverage and the 2 organizations coming together to share a goal; when will we see that subsequent economy of scale, because both are asking for money. Mr. Donahue said at the point of the initial conversation between the 2 groups we spent a lot of time before the holidays just trying to understand each other’s missions and more about one another, we came to the conclusion that the Chamber may not be in the position we are right now, but the Partnership and the CVB think we are in a great position to leverage this stuff and he feels there’s tremendous opportunity there. Right now we just have to work on some of the legalities because you have to have separate organizations to get our funding from the state. Aldr. Payleitner asked if the funds would be better spent giving us something in St. Charles to sell it with, instead of looking for stuff; give them a reason to come as in tourism, or book your meeting here because we offer this. Sometimes she feels the money we give organization could be better spent on project or attractions to draw people here. Mr. Donahue said the city has extraordinary things going on over the last 10 years and the more those move forward, the more he can tell those visiting the Q Center to visit downtown. Since the economic downturn in 2009 everybody pulled back, but economy has picked up, and in the last 5 years we (Q Center) have tripled our marketing and sales. The competition out there: Chicago, Rosemont and Schaumburg have done things with some of the laws that give them even more funding; he can either cry about it or he can convince

the owner that we need to spend more money to continue to get the word out there. Regardless of the funding going forward it's imperative for us to continue to have the CVB, or some type of organization in the future to talk about St. Charles on a regular basis; to the people we need to talk to. Aldr. Payleitner said that's particularly true with our sports offerings, which is a big draw and is word of mouth; she understands that part of it. She asked about the mention of sponsorship and what that meant because she was alarmed by it. Mr. Donahue said it just came up in talking about different funding models, there not sure yet, but he thinks they need to listen and talk to more people to figure it out. Aldr. Payleitner said she worries that our businesses get hit up a lot for sponsorship, but if it's to their advantage in advertisement then that's okay; it's about value.

Aldr. Lemke said he thinks we're dealing with the Chicago Metro area or 3-4 county areas with oversupply of hotel rooms, he wondered how that's working in this market and if there are occupancy issues, or are there places where we're reducing our bed count or availability. He asks because after the parade on Saturday he went to Pheasant Run and 1 of the wings was half dark, however Pheasant Run itself was doing very well. He wondered what their room availability is. Mr. Donahue said it wouldn't be fair for him to speak about them (Pheasant Run), but their general manager is on the CVB board and they have a different business than the Q Center, Pheasant Run does more than group business.

Aldr. Gaugel said it was a very good, thorough presentation, but the one thing that became clear to him over the last couple years is the responses to RFP's; we need an organization to respond in a professional matter to get those groups and events to come through here. To Aldr. Payleitners point, something like having the active river corridor alone doesn't promote St. Charles, and while some of us are familiar with it, taking the \$500,000 to invest it into attractions to attract those that don't know anything about it. The fact that they are here speaks volumes to the community but it doesn't orient somebody who is unfamiliar with our area to those attractions. He thinks this group and the value of having a professional organization respond to these RFP's really does drive how we're viewed and our ability to attract new people to this area year after year. Aldr. Payleitner suggested maybe giving it to the hotels themselves to market what they offer, maybe the smaller hotels dwell more on sporting tournaments; but they have their own organizations within their corporations to sell themselves. Aldr. Gaugel said it's a valid point and something to potentially look at but he thinks it would vary greatly from organization to organization. Everybody's perception of how they're selling St. Charles is different and he doesn't think we'd get the same bang for the buck for each individual dollar as if we were to distribute it; however it's a valid point. Aldr. Payleitner said we'd have to figure out the how, but she feels nobody could see the Q Center quite like the Q Center. Aldr. Gaugel said with that said he feels the vehicle we have established now is an excellent option that has proved over the last few years to significantly benefit.

Aldr. Payleitner said last year the presentation included the "total rooms booked" by the CVB which cost us almost \$70 or more; in her head she thinks maybe that money could be better spent.

Aldr. Vitek said she thinks there's a consistency in the message and the brand that this group can bring that the individual hotel chains may not bring. In general the value of a group like this the message goes out to attract large and small groups with the consistency of the brand and message. When the active river project happens what better group than this one to be able to sell it consistently in a broader way. Aldr. Payleitner said she sees that she just wonders about the \$500,000 price tag. Mr. Donahue said there are 12 hotels in the community; every hotelier is left to their own devices to promote their hotel only. This is an opportunity that you've given the CVB to tell the story of St. Charles and everything in the community; you can reduce it and the message may thin but we cannot afford that.

Aldr. Lemke said when he books a convention he goes to the hotel that responds to the RFP, but that doesn't mean he only had guests stay at that hotel, there were others around it, as well as substantial bus trips, 30-40 miles away. As well as substantial restaurants, not always at the hotels, sometimes across the river or an evening even at an adjacent facility. All very well received but you had to have somebody to coordinate it, which is what we bring together in a CVB. Mr. Donahue said that experience is what every CVB should be doing. Aldr. Payleitner said she has a sports experience that is not the same.

Aldr. Payleitner said the "total room nights" of 4,622; did we get \$113 per room night economic benefit as a city out of that, because that's what it cost us. Aldr. Lemke said he and his visitors spend a lot more than just the hotel night in town because there was a quick response and a number of places to visit; easily spent more than \$113 per guest. Aldr. Payleitner said that seems high to her, for this area.

Mr. Koenen said the CVB, as an animal, is very common to our nation. In the Chicago land area we have ½ a dozen of them, sometimes it's very hard to put a finger on the value of them which he thinks we are struggling with here, but he thinks every year we are getting better at defining that. It is something that is recognized in the tourism industry and he feels we only realize their value if they're not doing their job, and as Mr. Donahue stated tonight "we're doing a pretty good job, but we have goals to do better". That's what we need to strive for along with working with the Partnership, will only make us a more efficient organization to improve that return on investment we are making today.

Aldr. Lewis asked if we are still reducing requests by 10%. Mr. Koenen said from last year its down about \$25,000, that accommodates what they had in the current fiscal year, they reduced it by \$25,000 because their rent payments will be over as of February, 2019; they're still using that 90% value and then lowered on top of that. Mr. Donahue added that they've also had a reduction in the state grant from \$240,000 to \$220,000.

Mayor Rogina said he found great value from the conversation that took place before the holiday. They've been low keyed because they wanted it that way, there was a lot to work out as Mr. Donahue suggested. The leadership of the 2 organizations is impressive in how they've come together and spoken very frankly to find efficiency, and he believes they are talking on a

regular basis. He talked to parties from both, it's definitely a change but he's confident it will continue to evolve with 2 very professional board presidents.

Aldr. Payleitner said if she were to vote no, it has nothing to do with the professionalism, she's very impressed, and this report and presentation, even though a scramble, was the best yet. She just doesn't see the economies of scale in the rate of return for our tax dollars.

Aldr. Lemke said if there were several groups creating visitor brochures and disconnected websites he doesn't think we'd have the same economies of scale, the group push and the coordination that's needed to bring large groups here for a variety of events all year. He thinks we want 1 consistent visitor's bureau brochure and website to have that consistence and coordinated those in the course of the year. Aldr. Payleitner said she's not voting for the abolishment of the CVB, she just feels they have a role.

Aldr. Lewis said this is different than prior years, we've never voted on the dollar amount that we'd give to these organizations, until we voted on the budget. Now these organizations are coming in front of us and we're voting independently as to what to put in the budget. She's not sure we should even take a vote, she think the budget gets put together and it's then presented, then we vote on the budget like we've always done. She's not sure why we're taking these votes before. Aldr. Payleitner said she thinks it's so they know what they have, moving forward.

Aldr. Lewis said this was discussed at the retreat; so basically we're having that discussion now, with them here.

Mr. Koenen said he's somewhat confounded with this conversation, the reason we brought it here tonight was to have an advanced conversation about the requests from outside agencies before the budget was approved. There is a contract we will enter into with the CVB, as far as performance, and what the budget amount is and how the money is doled up throughout the year. We've always had that conversation and presented that contract to the Council after the budget was approved; this year presentations are being done earlier than we ever did them in the past. If Council likes what they've heard tonight we'd like a nod to have us proceed with going forth with the budget pursuant to the request that the CVB has asked for, which will then be in the budget accordingly. We will then come back with a contract for Council's formal presentation, as we do for any contract for any work that's included in the budget.

Aldr. Payleitner asked what we are approving. Mr. Koenen said to put that value (\$503,382) in the budget, the contract will then come back at a later date, likely in May, to pursue the approval. We are not writing any checks tonight.

**Aldr. Turner made a motion to approve a Recommendation of Funding Amount of the Greater St. Charles Convention and Visitor's Bureau (GSCCVB) Funding Request of \$503,382 for Fiscal Year 2018/2019. Seconded by Aldr. Vitek.**

**Roll was called:**

**Ayes: Lemke, Turner, Bancroft, Gaugel, Vitek, Silkaitis, Lewis**

**Absent: Stellato**

**Recused:**

**Nays: Payleitner**

**Motion carried 7-1**

**5. ADDITIONAL BUSINESS**

**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.**

Mayor Rogina stated that we're working toward a new and improved economic scale, at this point we're still trying to construct things, but approval will be needed down the line.

Aldr. Turner said in his experience in business it takes 2-3 years to wheel through, that's when you'll see your savings.

- 8. ADJOURNMENT- Aldr. Payleitner made a motion to adjourn at 8:30 pm. Seconded by Aldr. Turner. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion Carried 8-0.**