

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
GOVERNMENT SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2012, 7:00 P.M.**

Members Present: Chairman Stellato, Vice-Chairman Turner, Aldr. Monken, Aldr. Carrignan, Aldr. Payleitner, Aldr. Rogina, Aldr. Martin, Aldr. Krieger, Aldr. Bessner, Aldr. Lewis,

Also Present: Mayor DeWitte, B. Townsend, M. Koenen, R. Gallas, J. Lamb, P. Suhr, G. Amburgey, T. Bruhl, Chief Lamkin, Chief Mullen, Chris Minick

1. Meeting called to order at 7:00 p.m.
2. Roll Call

K. Dobbs:

Stellato: Present
Monken: Present
Carrignan: Present
Payleitner: Present
Turner: Present
Rogina: Present
Martin: Present
Krieger: Present
Bessner: Present
Lewis: Present

3.a. Electric Reliability Report, January 2012

Information only.

3.b. EAB Control Efforts

Information only.

4.a. Recommendation to approve an Ordinance Authorizing the City of St. Charles to borrow funds from the IEPA Water Pollution Control Loan Program.

Chris Minick presented. Included in the packet tonight is an ordinance requesting authorization to participate in the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency's (IEPA) Loan Interest Loan Program. We will be utilizing the proceeds of this particular loan to finance the renovation and reconstruction of the Biosolids Building at the Main Wastewater Treatment Facility. This project was contemplated and included in projections from the Rate Study that was completed approximately one year ago, as well as the budget and the capital plan for the wastewater utility. The Ordinance, as structured, authorizes the financing vehicle for the project, not the project itself. In order to undertake the project, we would still need to go out for competitive bids and at the appropriate time, award a bid for the project through the City Council.

Even after we would enter in to a contract to construct the project, we would not be obligated to take the proceeds of the loan and participate in the low interest loan program. Should a more advantageous financial vehicle be available at that particular point in time, we would be able to utilize it to achieve the financing for the project.

The passage of the Ordinance tonight is merely a step to be considered in that low interest loan program. A couple other steps would need to happen before we could qualify and be awarded the low interest loan. We would need to hold the public hearing regarding the project itself, the IEPA would need to make an eligibility determination that our project is eligible and that they have funding available to extend the loan to us and then they would extend the loan agreement to us. Once we execute that loan agreement, we would then be obligated to take the loan and complete the project. The Ordinance enclosed tonight authorizes the maximum loan amount for the project of approximately \$9.6 million. The amount of the final loan would be determined once the project was completed and the IEPA went through all the documentation of the various eligible costs after construction. The principal and interest payments on the loan are payable solely from revenues of the wastewater utility system. This loan would not be a general obligation of the City. As structured, it is a 20 year loan with a fixed interest rate. That interest rate is currently 2.295%. That rate also locks in once the project is finalized. For comparison purposes, a general obligation rate is running below 3% under the current market conditions and a revenue bond, which is the most applicable comparison to this type of a loan due to the fact that we pledge only system revenues is running about 3.3%. Based on the comparative interest rates, we do anticipate that we would recognize an interest savings cost of about \$62,000 annually by participating in the low interest loan program. That equates to about a \$1.2 million savings over the life of the loan.

The IEPA loan is the city's lowest cost option to finance the project. Staff recommends approval of the Ordinance.

No further discussion.

Motioned by Aldr. Carrigan, seconded by Aldr. Rogina. Approved unanimously by voice vote. **Motion carried.**

5.a. Recommendation to approve an Ordinance Amending Title 10 "Vehicles and Traffic" Related to Parking Restrictions.

Chief Lamkin presented. Over the winter months, we have been anticipating the construction that is to be starting on East Main. One of our concerns, knowing there would be a variety of closures, was to look at a way to better facilitate the needs we may have with regard to working within the construction zone, and also some carry over traffic that can flow into the neighborhoods where we may need to restrict turns or limit movements. In conjunction, Police, Public Works and Economic Development have been working together to come up with the best way to efficiently handle this. This Ordinance is modeled to what other cities are using, on the advice of Attorney Tom Good.

We are proposing the Ordinance that is in front of you to be put in to place, which will help us better facilitate this and future construction projects.

Aldr. Stellato: These are just temporary measures, giving the police the opportunity to do what they need to do to keep the area safe. I think at some point there was something about 90 days if it's a temporary fix, unless it makes sense to make it long term. Otherwise, instead of having them come back each time when they want to add a stop sign, this would facilitate the process much quicker.

No further discussion.

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

6.a. Recommendation to award contract to Visu-Sewer of Illinois, LLC for Stormwater Televising and Cleaning Services and a Resolution authorizing the mayor and City Clerk to execute same.

Peter Suhr presented. Last year, city staff solicited vendors to assist with stormwater televising and cleaning services. A request for proposal for these services was issued to six separate contractors. This is the second year of a four year commitment to investigating our stormwater mains in the downtown area.

Visu-Sewer of Illinois, LLC. was awarded the contract last year. Since they met expectations last year, staff recommends continuing the contract with them again this year. The contract will not exceed the \$55,000 budgeted this year.

Staff recommends approval of the RFP based on a cost per linear foot as shown on your attached cost sheet.

Aldr. Turner: You are saying their bid is \$38,624?

Mr. Suhr: That's correct. That is their base bid, based on linear feet of work that they actually do. Our budgeted amount is \$55,000, which is the most we will spend on this project.

No further discussion.

Motioned by Aldr. Turner, seconded by Aldr. Rogina. Approved unanimously by voice vote. **Motion carried.**

6.b. Recommendation to award contract to United Septic, Inc. for Storm Sewer Catch Basin Cleaning Services and a Resolution authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute same.

Peter Suhr presented. City staff solicited vendors to assist with storm sewer catch basin cleaning services. A request for proposal was also issued for these services to five separate contractors. This project is the first of a four year commitment to preventative maintenance cleaning of our storm sewer system in the central core of our city. In the first year we were focused on the northeast quadrant. United Septic, Inc. is the most cost competitive and most qualified contractor according to the RFP. United Septic has recently completed work for many local communities such as Wilmette, Mt. Prospect, Glen Ellyn, Arlington Heights and Lyons. They have the proper equipment to complete the work and meet all the specifications required in the RFP. Their base bid was a total of \$60,586. Their contract will not exceed the \$65,000 which is budgeted.

Staff recommends approval of the Request for Proposal based on a cost per quantity of storm structure cleaned or checked as shown on your attached RFP result sheet and not to exceed \$65,000.

No further discussion.

Motioned by Aldr. Carrigan, seconded by Aldr. Turner. Approved unanimously by voice vote. **Motion carried.**

6.c. Recommendation to award contract to Eagle Concrete Inc. for the Fox Glen Creek Spillway Restoration and a Resolution authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute same.

James Bernahl presented. This item is specific to rehabilitation to an existing storm sewer spillway in the Norton Creek Northern Region, which is near Fox Glen Drive. During the major rain events that we had, the section of the creek had experienced severe erosion. There is a future project to rehabilitate that entire stream way that will be coming up in the future. For now, due to the severe erosion we need to stabilize that spillway. A copy of the exhibit showing how we are going to be rehabilitating that is included with your packet.

This is very specialized work. It's a concrete foundation type repair with reinforcement in it. For that reason, we approached a few firms who specialize in that type of work to give us a price. We received two bids back; Eagle Concrete was the lowest bidder and we feel they are qualified to do the work.

Staff recommends awarding the contract to Eagle Construction.

Aldr. Stellato: So this is a budgeted item?

Mr. Bernahl: Yes, it is.

No further discussion.

Motioned by Aldr. Monken, seconded by Aldr. Turner. Approved unanimously by voice vote. **Motion carried.**

6.d. Recommendation to approve Bob Leonard Walkway Monthly License Agreement with River Corridor Foundation and a Resolution authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute same.

Richard Gallas presented. Recently, the River Corridor Foundation approached city staff with a proposal to develop a small area with natural plantings in an area commonly referred to as the Bob Leonard Riverwalk. Specifically, this area is just south of Illinois Street near the area of Bistro One. There are three primary considerations that go along with this license agreement. All costs for the installation and planting would be donated by the River Corridor Foundation. All maintenance for the next years would be the primary responsibility of the River Corridor Foundation, in conjunction with their partners including Pizzo, who is the vendor who brings the expertise to this project, as well as a consideration to bring some civic groups such as the Pottawatomie Garden Club or other like groups to do that maintenance over a period of time.

There is a License Agreement before you that is our standard terms and conditions that has been reviewed by legal counsel, and we have come to agreement on those terms. Before I take any questions you might have, I want to take the opportunity to give a special thank you to Jennifer Biddle and the River Corridor Foundation for making this generous donation proposal that you have in front of you tonight. Jennifer put a lot of work and energy into this as did the rest of the folks with the River Corridor Foundation.

If you have any additional questions about the content, they are here this evening to take any questions you might have regarding this License Agreement.

If there are no questions, city staff recommends authorizing this License Agreement.

Aldr. Stellato: To echo those comments, Jennifer, thank you! This is all done in honor of a great man, a great friend and a great friend to the city. Good job!

No further discussion.

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

6.e. Recommendation directing Staff to prepare a policy regarding “Sidewalk Approach Type” walks.

Mark Koenen presented. In October, at our Government Services Committee meeting, there was a conversation about sidewalk approach walks. To remind people, a sidewalk approach walk is the walk which extends between the curb or street and the public sidewalk and generally crosses the public right-of-way or parkway area. At that meeting, there were a variety of questions and comments that were offered. Staff was directed to go back and follow-up on specific issues. We have gathered the requested information, and have put together a presentation that begins to look at this. Topics for discussion will include a service sidewalk update; Peter Suhr will lead this and talk about the condition, costs and the numbers of units of approach walks that are out there. Rich Gallas will follow-up on the city’s liability based on the current code that this is a private improvement and what other communities do. Jim Bernahl is going to talk about Americans with Disabilities Act and what that means in light of the improvement being private today, and if we should consider that to be a public improvement in the future. Lastly, I’ll talk about history and there will also be a staff recommendation.

Power Point presentation by Peter Suhr.

Aldr. Carrigan: Do we know who installed these walks? Do we have any way to link these to either the city or the homeowner?

Mr. Koenen: Actually, I would say that we don't know. They were done by private vendors, they were done by the city as a repair operation, but I don't think we know who did which ones. There is no record at City Hall to show who did them.

Mr. Gallas: It's not recorded with the County. As we move forward with the next part of the conversation, that is where a lot of communities have gone to get to the question you have asked.

Aldr. Stellato: Now that we know about this, there is some liability out there as well, now that we know there are walks in poor condition, so we probably have to address those at some point tonight as well. The ones that are still in good condition might physically be in good condition, but they might not be ADA accessible. So this leads to the question of when you said a reasonably safe manor, are you suggesting as well that those that are in fair and good condition all have to be upgraded to ADA accessibility as well, or at this point we leave those alone and we are okay there?

Mr. Gallas: I'll let Jim speak further to ADA in an upcoming part of the presentation. I'm also saying that because our code indicates these are private pieces of property that we don't have any responsibility to them.

Power Point presentation by Richard Gallas

Aldr. Stellato: And that ties into the ADA. At that point, you would require that would be an ADA accessible service walk, correct?

Mr. Gallas: I have to let Jim speak to that. There are a few other items to mention; new service walks – people could put in a new service walk if we chose to allow them to do that and again, they would have to get a permit to do that. We would then want to record that as well so we know when, where and how.

Aldr. Rogina: Did I hear you say that under current policy, if we say we have a good service walk and the city does construction there and damaged it, is the homeowner responsibility to pay the city to fix that under the current policy?

Mr. Gallas: Under our current policy, if we have damaged a service walk, we would have either replaced it as a function of that project and in some cases it may have been ripped out as a function of that project because the homeowner said they didn't want it anymore.

Aldr. Carrigan: Relative to getting the permit, how do we ensure that it is titled when that house is sold and stays with the house and does not refer back to the city?

Mr. Koenen: We record it. It's with the Kane County Recorder and it stays with the property.

Power point presentation by Jim Bernahl.

Mr. Bernahl: In regard to the question about recording the work; the caveat we use is a Hold Harmless Agreement. Because it is considered a private item in the parkway, you make the homeowner sign a Hold Harmless Agreement which is recorded with the county.

To answer your previous question, the city's understanding is that these are considered private walks and for that reason, they do not need to be ADA compliant. It's when you make the switch that it becomes public, should the city chose to take ownership of these items, that the ADA regulations kick in.

Power Point presentation:

Mr. Koenen: As I mentioned earlier, most of these sidewalk approach walks were constructed in 1965 or earlier. They generally relate to homes that had rear garages and alleys or perhaps no garage at all, so these locations are generally in older neighborhoods. As has been mentioned tonight, our practice to date has been that if we damage an approach walk, we replace it if the homeowner wants us to. That's what we are here to discuss tonight; who is going to maintain these in the future if it isn't damaged from a city construction project.

Also, at the last meeting, there was some conversation about handrails that were installed in the mid to late 1990's. The city put up handrails, particularly at corners where there is the public sidewalk system and we started doing that on the northeast side of the community where there is a lot of stairs because we have a lot of grade in that neighborhood that expanded into some private locations at that same time frame. That was a bit of a stretch at what we should have been doing as a staff, but in fact, we did do it and that is not being done today.

We would maintain as a staff that the status quo continues. That is to say, sidewalk approach type walks and the maintenance of them are considered private. However, we would add that we believe the Council should direct staff to prepare a policy that would state that the city would remove existing approach walks in one of two

conditions; 1) when there is a request from a property owner to remove it and we would remove the walk and restore the area with black dirt and turf and 2) if we have a sidewalk approach that is in poor condition, of which we have approximately 50. We would put the property owner on notice and ask them if they would like it removed and restored to turf at no cost to them or if they would like it maintained, the property

owner will be required to get a permit and do the appropriate repair, which would be completed at the homeowner's expense. We would obviously give the property owner notification on that and a timeline to complete the repair that would be consistent with something they can work into their family budget.

Aldr. Turner: What does the request from an adjacent property owner mean? Can a neighbor say they want a homeowner to remove the walk?

Mr. Koenen: No; the intention is that these are private benefit approach walks and that they serve the property for whom the sidewalk leads to the front door. Generally they are opposite the front door in most cases or there is a front entrance walk that leads from the front door to the main sidewalk that again leads from the main sidewalk to the street.

Aldr. Turner: So adjacent actually means the owner of the property.

Mr. Koenen: Yes.

Aldr. Lewis: The city owns the sidewalks that are parallel to the street, is that correct?

Mr. Koenen: Correct.

Aldr. Lewis: If that were in poor condition and the service walk was in poor condition, would that be something that was done all at the same time or would the person with the poor service walk have to repair that while the poor sidewalk is still there?

Mr. Koenen: You are talking about a process approach. How we do it today is if we are doing a sidewalk repair in the public walk, we will repair that public walk. We will not repair the private walk unless we damage it. So we would probably saw a joint at the common line between the public walk and the private walk and remove the public walk and make the repair. If in fact, when we are doing the saw cut, we damage the service walk, we then do a repair. But normally that is not expected to happen.

Aldr. Lewis: But you wouldn't make them repair the service walk and then do the sidewalk two years later.

Mr. Koenen: That could be the case. Let's say we are doing a public walk and the service walk was in poor condition. We would give the homeowner notice, letting them know they need to repair their service walk and give them a pre-determined amount of time to accomplish the repair since they are paying for it, we want to give them the time to get the money together. So it would be done as a separate activity from when we were there doing the public walk.

Aldr. Lewis: Could they choose to tie that all in one and pay the city to have it done?

Mr. Koenen: If we had a vendor out there doing it, we would have a unit price from the vendor that we would extend to the property owner, but we would not have our staff engage in that activity if we were doing it in house.

Aldr. Lewis: My only comment is that I get several e-mails from people who want sidewalks who don't have sidewalks. When you live in an older neighborhood and the sidewalk stops in the middle of the street and they want the sidewalk to go all the way to the curb, I think we should focus on completing our sidewalks before we focus too much on these service sidewalks.

Aldr. Carrignan: If someone has a service walk that is in disrepair, we are going to send them a notice and at that point, they are going to have apply for a permit to bring it back up to code.

Mr. Koenen: Correct, unless they ask us to remove it and then we would do it for no charge and put turf down.

Aldr. Rogina: We can still maintain the policy that if it's our construction that causes damage to a good service walk, we'll repair it no cost.

Mr. Koenen: No. Let's say, for example, there is a watermain break right underneath the service sidewalk. In that particular condition, we would repair the watermain and we would ask the property owner if they would like us to leave the sidewalk approach out or if they would like to replace it on their own as a function of a private improvement.

Aldr. Rogina: Theory being that we are willing to take out the private walks at no cost to them, but not willing to rebuild them.

Aldr. Stellato: Because of liability. Whatever way we go with this, Mark, is there any way to get this on the website? I think this is very informative.

Aldr. Carrignan: You are looking for guidance to move forward to develop a policy?

Mr. Koenen: That is correct. Staff recommendation is to leave the Ordinance as it, however, prepare this policy which directs how to operate within the framework of the Ordinance.

Aldr. Carrignan: I make a motion to direct Staff to develop a policy to handle service sidewalks within the City of St. Charles.

No further discussion.

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

6.f. Discussion of Traffic Concerns Regarding Red Gate Road at St. Charles North High School

Aldr. Stellato: This item was put on the agenda tonight at the request of the Homeowners Association from Reserve. I thought we would start by having Mark Koenen make his presentation and I know there are representatives from the Homeowners Association who want to speak afterwards. I would like to ask that after Mark is done, if you are going to come up and give testimony, please give us your name and address for the record before you speak.

Mark Koenen presented: I would like to provide background. There has been conversation taking place for 6 to 10 years that focused on traffic and speed on Red Gate Road and cut through traffic through the subdivision which is immediately north of St. Charles North High School known as Rivers Edge. To that effect, the issues we are going to talk about tonight are somewhat precipitated by the plans for the city to build the Red Gate Bridge, so this has been highlighted most recently, but these prompts have been around for a while and they still exist today.

Power Point presentation by Mark Koenen.

In your packet this evening, there is a letter from the traffic engineer represented by the firm of KOLA. For your information, the City of St. Charles is familiar with KLOA. They have been before you, the Planning Commission and Staff presenting proposals for private improvements and they do have a good reputation. Having said that, they went through all the alternatives we offered and they basically came back and said the striping makes sense, the proposal for the right turn lane along Red Gate Road for entrance into the high school makes sense, and the traffic signal is a good improvement to put at the intersection of the high school and Red Gate Road. To that effect, they acknowledged that we can't do it now because we don't meet traffic warrant. But they did go so far as to look at projected traffic that was done in conjunction with the Red Gate Bridge Proposal. They recited that they felt in the year 2030, traffic warrant would be met for a traffic signal at this location. They also made an additional recommendation; they felt that between now and the time that a traffic signal could be installed that the City would consider some sort of police assistance at the intersection of the high school and Red Gate Road to facilitate movement of vehicles and pedestrians. This is another part of the conversation that the city and the school district need to entertain. That's a dialog that has been initiated, but has not developed sufficiently.

Resume Power Point presentation.

Aldr. Turner: For a point of reference; when there was a right turn lane constructed on Campton Hills eastbound by Peck Road – wasn't that a joint venture between the Park District and us when they opened the aquatic park? Or did they pay for that by themselves?

Mr. Koenen: In terms of whether they built it or it was built by the developer, I would have to check the plan.

Aldr. Turner: I thought I remembered somewhere that it was a joint venture between the city and the Park District, but I know we didn't pay for the whole thing.

Mr. Koenen: We did some work out there last summer with crosswalks, and the park district and the city shared in that expense, but that, I believe, was at Springfield and Peck Road.

Aldr. Turner: I just wanted to make sure that in the past we have shared the cost with another taxing body on a situation like this.

Aldr. Rogina: On the four way stop signs; the \$9,200 expenditure. You indicated to put a stop sign there, warrants would be required.

Mr. Koenen: They would be required, and they are not warranted today.

Aldr. Bessner: Is this unique to this school, in regards to congestion, traffic concerns, etc.? I'm in a situation where I take my daughter to Wredling and when I turn on Foxwood and turn onto to Red Haw Lane, that's always backed up in the morning. I just don't know if this is just the way it is, or if this is something we can actually fix?

Mr. Koenen: I think whenever you have a common start time at any kind of public facility with any kind of major activity, you'll have congestion. You don't build a roadway for that peak condition, so you are always going to have congestion. I do remember a time when there wasn't a traffic signal at Fox Chase and Dunham and there was not a traffic signal at Kirk and the entrance to St. Charles East on the east side of the school; those signals were built after the fact when warrant was met for a traffic signal. They had to wait for traffic volumes to get to the point where signals could be installed.

Aldr. Bessner: Are we getting calls about concerns in other schools?

Mr. Koenen: No. I am not receiving any calls.

Chairman Stellato: We will take comments from the audience now. Anyone wishing to speak, please come up and give us your name and address for the record.

Joe Segobiano: My name is Joe Segobiano and I live at 4155 Meadowview Road. I am the president of the Rivers Edge HOA. To address your point, St. Charles East has five points of entrance and they are all full entrances and one is signalized. St. Charles North has one point of full entrance. Also, that site was intended to be a middle school and not a high school so there is a big difference.

I would like to read a prepared report and then take questions. First, we'd like to thank you on behalf of the Rivers Edge HOA for giving us the opportunity tonight. We are not here to discuss the bridge, I think that has been a misconception. That is not what we are here for. What we are here for is to discuss the operation and safety of the intersection at Red Gate Road and River Ridge, and the entrance to the high school. We are most concerned about the impact of the additional traffic. One thing that Mr. Koenen left out was what the project volumes are, and I will speak to that tonight.

What we are requesting tonight is that the city commit to putting these in part of the bridge scope. With all due respect, I don't think we can go with a handshake in saying that we'll get around to the warrants when they meet it. I think we need to have a commitment from the city to make these improvements, and as part of the Red Gate Road Bridge Scope.

I was before the Mayor in 2008 and I met with him, along with our board. We discussed these safety issues at that time. I was before the Committee in November 2010 to discuss these issues again, and I'm back here over a year later and we still have no commitment from the city. One of the things we noticed early on is that the Red Gate Road Bridge report did not include this intersection. Because it did not include this intersection, we requested information from the city's data on the intersection. We did not receive that data. We requested it in March, and again in April 2011. In July 2011, we informed staff that because we had not received the data, we were going to retain our own engineer to help us come to some conclusions. We retained KLOA who is a very well respected engineering firm in Chicagoland. We met with the city on August 12, 2011 to review the alternatives developed by the city. At that time, we asked again for additional information. We had not received any information from the city with regard to the current counts of that intersection or what the projected volumes were. The engineer did receive an internal draft; the warrant study on August 16. The accounts were from April 4 and April 5. Our engineer reviewed that document and requested additional information from the city because "the report was inadequate and incomplete". Our engineer came back to us in November having not received any information again and asked if we would like him to go out and conduct counts at that intersection. We did proceed and approve him to go ahead and conduct the counts.

The completed report from KLOA was delivered to Alderman Rogina and staff on January 24, 2012.

I want to clarify the report. The purpose of the report was to focus on the intersection of Red Gate Road and Rivers Ridge High School entrance. The report examines the operation of the intersection. The operation refers to the ability of traffic to efficiently flow through the intersection and the management of the flow so that the intersection is safe. The report evaluates existing operations and future operations after the opening of the bridge.

Manual counts were taken at the intersection from 6:00 to 9:00 a.m. and from 2:00 to 6:00 p.m. on Friday, November 11, 2011. Peak for Red Gate Road was 597 cars between 6:30 and 7:30 a.m. and 273 between 4:15 and 5:15 p.m. Peak for Rivers Ridge High School entrance was 250 between the a.m. hours and 342 in the p.m. peak. Cars that made a turning movement onto or from Red Gate Road was 723 cars within an hour. That's one car every five seconds making a turning movement in that intersection. The p.m. peak was 451 cars or 1 car every 8 seconds. Pedestrian traffic was 13 during the a.m. peak and 29 during the p.m. peak. There were 59 buses during the a.m. peak and 51 during the p.m. peak. 70% of the southbound traffic on River Ridge goes into the school in the a.m. peak hour. That is 100% due to cut through traffic that still exists. It comes off of Rt. 31, comes through the neighborhood and comes out on River Ridge.

According to the report, the short westbound left turn and lack of eastbound right turn causes vehicles to block through traffic on Red Gate Road. Then our report looked at the projections; the report we received from the city did not. The report took the same projections that were used in the Red Gate Road bridge report and assumed the projections to be accurate. The glaring concern here is the through traffic. According to the Red Gate Road Bridge report, the through traffic on Red Gate will increase from 75 vehicles to 439 vehicles during the a.m. peak. During the p.m. peak it will increase from 114 vehicles to 400 vehicles. That means on Red Gate Road, a.m. peak will be 961 vehicles, which we believe will be much sooner than 2030 and 961 will warrant signals. The p.m. peak will be 559. One of our concerns is the projected traffic from the bridge report and the accuracy of the projections. The report indicates an increase of traffic on Red Gate Road from 4800 average daily trips for the 2030 no build scenario to 11,100 average daily trips for the 2030 build scenario.

This represents an increase of 130% on Red Gate Road, yet the increase in p.m. according to the Red Gate Road Bridge report is from 540 on the 2030 no build to 610 for the 2030 build which is only 12% increase. Yet they are saying the average daily trips are going to increase 130%, but yet the peak traffic is only going to increase 12%. It gets worse for the a.m. The a.m. 2030 no build was 710, 760 for the build, so there is only an increase of 7% of peak traffic, although there is going to be 130% in average daily trips.

Also, please note in the KLOA a.m. peak report, it's already at 597. The city's report was at approximately 300. What the report suggested and not too far from what Mark said, there is the initial three lane cross with the left turn lane into the school for westbound. Eastbound left turn onto River Ridge, the eastbound right turn lane into the school, a traffic signal when warranted, and we do agree 100% that it's not warranted at this time. However, we feel it can be put in the plans that when the number is warranted, it will be installed. The next option is the traffic officer. This comes straight from KLOA; "traffic cop during the a.m. p.m. peak upon opening of the bridge to assist in the movement of the traffic. Because of the several hundred movements that take place in the center section every morning and afternoon, it is recommended a traffic cop be placed at this intersection". Without this, traffic will be trying to flow through the intersection while other vehicles are attempting to make a turn. We feel these improvements could have been, and still can be easily incorporated into the bridge plans. With this in mind, we forwarded the report to staff so it can be placed on the Council agenda. Mr. Townsend did respond to the report. We thought the report did not adequately address the concerns and we expressed this to Mr. Townsend. I then notified Aldr. Rogina, who said that he and Aldr. Turner agree with Mr. Townsend. At that point, we requested to be put on the agenda and Aldr. Stellato agreed and placed us on the agenda this evening.

Based on the data collected and conclusions we have provided we request the city respect the safety of the residents and commit to these improvements as part of the bridge scope. You have the authority and it appears you have the funds to do so. We ask you do the right thing and make sure the conditions of the intersection are safe.

Aldr. Rogina: I assume your homeowners association has also entered into a dialog with School District 303?

Mr. Segobiano: We feel very strongly that these issues should have been taken care of. According to Mr. Townsend, that lane should have been put in as part of the school improvement. It wasn't, the city didn't have a chance to review those plans. We do not have an issue with the School District.

Aldr. Rogina: So you are suggesting the School District has no liability?

Mr. Segobiano: That's between you guys and the school. We aren't saying they are not responsible, but we are saying that our responsibility as tax payers is to the City of St. Charles.

Aldr. Rogina: If we entered into conversations with the School District, you don't want any part of that?

Mr. Segobiano: As long as our traffic report is represented, no.

Aldr. Rogina: You don't want to be actively involved?

Mr. Segobiano: As long as the traffic report is represented, no. What we are concerned about is this bridge is going to begin construction again in March and we are just now addressing these issues, even though they were raised four years ago. These are life safety issues. I think that's our biggest frustration. This could have been easily taken care of with the school district when the bridge was being discussed five or more years ago.

Chairman Stellato: Is there anyone else in the audience who wants to make any statements or comments? No? Okay. It sounds to me like we've accepted a lot of testimony tonight. Joe, I would like to get a copy of your prepared statement if you have a chance to send it over to us so we can look through that. We've got a lot of choices to consider. Mark, you mentioned that we have begun discussion with the school district, or where does that stand right now with our ongoing talks with the school?

Mr. Koenen: Brian Townsend has had a conversation with the school superintendent and Jim Bernahl and I have had conversations with John Baird who is our primary contact for operational issues. Chief Lamkin has had conversations with John Baird as well. So conversations have been initiated, yes.

Aldr. Carrignan: In looking at these costs, are they directly tied to the bridge? If they, can we put them in the bond as part of the improvements?

Mr. Koenen: I have not seen the draft of the bond. I have suggestions, though. Option 1 is already in the proposal, so that's finished. Options 2 & 4 which totals \$12,000 is something we can do right now, this summer. Option 3 is something that can be done with the school's cooperation, perhaps this summer. Same with Option 6. But Options 8, 9 and 10 aren't on the table because Option 10 is already completed, and Options 8 & 9 we don't meet warrant for. The big ticket item is Option 3.

Aldr. Carrignan: Are these bondable if we go in that direction?

Mr. Minick: Right now we are putting together some of the documents for the bonding. The issue would be the timing. Assuming Option 3 could be done fairly soon, we would not run the risk of any IRS regulations regarding the expenditure of the bond proceeds.

Aldr. Carrignan: Take Options 1, 2, 3 and 4. Those are all bondable?

Mr. Minick: I believe they would be as improvements to the infrastructure and roadway if deemed necessary.

Aldr. Carrignan: The others are warrant driven. Mark, I have a question relative to warrants regarding stop signs vs. signalization. What is the order of magnitude larger from a stop sign to a signal?

Mr. Koenen: The Police Department does stop signs, and Engineering does signals. For the signal, the warrant that was looked at by KLOA where they used the 2030 traffic volumes was based on peak hour delay. Typical warrants for a traffic signal, you have so many cars that go through an intersection for 8 hours of a 24 hour duration on the major leg and 8 hours on the minor leg.

In this particular location, aside from St. Charles North High School, there are not a lot of hours per day where there is heavy traffic on the minor legs of the intersection. Where you are going to meet warrant is probably in peak hour, which is what KLOA did for 2030 traffic.

Chief Lamkin: We do warrants for stop signs the same way.

Mr. Koenen: The disadvantage of stop signs is they are up there 24 hours/day, 7 days a week, so everyone is going to have to stop every time they go through.

Aldr. Turner: When you meet a warrant, it's over an 8 hour time frame, not 2 or 3 hours?

Chief Lamkin: It's all over an 8 hour time frame.

Aldr. Rogina: Bill made a good point before about the sharing of costs with other government agencies, and while I understand where Aldr. Carrignan is coming from and would support that, I think it's imperative given what Mr. Koenen has outlined, the fact that there is a right-of-way issue here, there is property owned by the school district here; to me this is the first step. I would certainly invite the HOA to participate. If they chose not to, that's their business. I'm ready to make a motion now to direct staff to continue with plans for discussion with District 303 representatives and report back to this committee at a future date. In fact, I will make that motion.

Aldr. Carrignan: I'll second.

Aldr. Stellato: Thank you for the motion, Ray, but just as point of order, the March GSC is cancelled, so it will have to come to another Committee so we don't lose any time here, either Planning & Development or Government Operations.

I would also like to add on to the motion, besides directing staff to do that, I'd like to direct staff to find out the bonding options for being able to finance these improvements.

Aldr. Carrignan: I agree.

Aldr. Stellato: Do you want to pick a date for the next meeting?

Aldr. Carrignan: Can you have it ready by the 12th?

Mr. Koenen: I think the 12th might be tight because I don't know what the school district schedules are, either. The 19th might be better, I know we are tentatively planned for a budget meeting that night.

Aldr. Stellato: We'll give it a shot for the 19th. So for anyone in the audience, it looks like we'll have more information on March 19th. We'll be working on two parallel paths; one is financing the project, second is discussions with the school district and how to move forward on these recommendations.

No further discussion.

Motioned by Aldr. Rogina, seconded by Aldr. Carrignan. Approved unanimously by voice vote. **Motion carried.**

6.g. Presentation of current EAB Policy and Recommendation to direct Staff regarding Funding for FY 12/13 budget.

Peter Suhr presented. Because of recent and projected increases in the Emerald Ash Borer activity, the Public Works Department is anticipating an increased financial burden to keep up with the spread of EAB over the next few years. We are here tonight to review our current EAB Policy, reflect on the EAB impact to our city so far, share EAB projections and anticipated cost and to discuss future considerations for our policy. In addition, there is a new interpretation from the Department of Labor about prevailing wage rates for tree type services which will affect costs moving forward.

Power Point presentation.

Mr. Suhr: We are here tonight seeking direction. Option A is to continue with the current policy and stay the course. That means it's a \$350,000 increase to FY12/13 budget. That includes the prevailing wage increase that I just talked about. It's about a 55% increase.

Option B would be to modify the existing policy and consider some of these alternatives. The action item to that would be that we take your suggestions and perhaps in the next 30-60 days come back with a new policy to suggest how that lays out with the funding and the timeline that you suggest.

Aldr. Lewis: Are your contracts year to year or do we have multiple year contracts with this wage increase? Will that take effect immediately even if we are in the middle of a contract?

Mr. Suhr: That is a good question and we are looking to council for that advice right now. We currently have a contract in place, it is a year to year contract and we are assuming this would be part of a new contract. That is one way we may be able to avoid this temporarily is to continue our existing contract. Again, I think this is going to play itself out with not only our community but all the communities that are dealing with this issue in Illinois, and I think time will tell if this sticks or not.

Aldr. Bessner: In regard to the timeline; if you were to extend this from 3 to 5 or 8 years, that number of trees you stated earlier, 5,400 - that's not going to change is it?

Mr. Suhr: 5,400 is the number of trees that we own and that will not change.

Aldr. Bessner: So over time, it would be deferring the cost as you stated over a longer length of time, but it's not going to affect the possibility of spreading this back to the newer trees that are planted?

Mr. Suhr: No.

Aldr. Bessner: Is there a priority list that could be put in place if the timeline like that was implemented so that safety concerns of larger trees would be addressed?

Mr. Suhr: That's exactly it. Our priority would be just as we have done in the past. The worst condition trees would be our priority.

Aldr. Bessner: Regarding Option B, if a property owner does not chose to participate in that program, you will still take the tree down at the cost of the city, but just not replant it?

Aldr. Krieger: What are we going to do about the private property trees? I've been asking that for over a year.

Mr. Suhr: It is a valid question, but I don't know that I have that answer right now. I think the stance right now from Public Works' perspective is that it is a private tree.

Aldr. Krieger: What if it's posing a hazard?

Mr. Koenen: A tree on private land is the responsibility of the private property owner. If the tree is a hazard and the property owner is ignoring it, there is an adjudication process that puts the property owner on notice of the hazard which is against public ordinance and they come before the adjudication officer if they don't deal with it and they are given some motivation to get the tree removed.

Aldr. Krieger: They were amused by the damage to my garage.

Mr. Koenen: We should follow-up on that specifically, because if it has EAB and it is a hazard, they need to deal with it.

Aldr. Carrigan: We currently have contracts with someone to take trees down. I think we want to get these people under contract as quick as possible. I think we need to swallow the medicine and get this done as quickly as we can. From a public safety standpoint, I advocate that we get the trees down and drag out the replacement process. But where does the money come from? Chris, I'm thinking about the reserve fund. We are floating above the mandate by ordinance, correct?

Mr. Minick: Correct. Currently the level of reserve required is 25% as you well know. I believe we are close to or right at 40% currently.

Aldr. Carrigan: Maybe we take a percentage of the reserve fund over a 3-4 year period and dedicate that to removal? I'm concerned about the public safety side of it. I'd rather get the trees down. I think this is something we want to look at.

Mr. Minick: I believe Mark talked of a preliminary budget presentation on the 19th. That could be something we have as an option and evaluate that impact in conjunction with the other assumptions in the budget.

Aldr. Carrigan: My concern is focused on removal.

Aldr. Monken: Once infested, they'll continue to grow?

Mr. Suhr: Yes. That is what we have been learning at these conferences. Fort Wayne, IN, was a perfect example. Year 1, 2 and 3 for them it was a steady increase. Year 4 it progressed more rapidly around that time.

Aldr. Monken: So the sooner they are removed, the less cost per unit.

Aldr. Stellato: So you are going to be removing even healthy ash trees. You were talking about taking all of them down? I need to make a comment. I'm not for the

50/50 or 100% planting. I don't want to put anymore burden on the citizens. However, if you remove them all and we delay installation, if someone did want to pay to get it done sooner, that I don't have a problem with. If you force them to do it no matter what, I have a concern about that. Then you have to decide who gets what trees first.

Mr. Suhr: The easiest way is to replace them in the order they are removed.

Aldr. Payleitner: What is our commitment as a city to replacing these trees?

Mr. Suhr: None. It's based on budget and available funds.

Aldr. Payleitner: If we have to take down a tree for safety, are we bound by law to have a tree there?

Aldr. Stellato: No, but we currently are doing that. Is there a cost difference between different size trees?

Mr. Suhr: We could offer that. It's about \$350 for a 2 ½ inch replacement and half that cost for a 1 inch replacement.

Aldr. Carrignan: I had a 2 ½ inch in my parkway that didn't make it. How many are surviving? What are the survival rates between 1 and 2 inch?

Mr. Suhr: With the 2 ½ inch it's pretty good. You are going to get a dozen a year out of a planting. But it's not significant.

Aldr. Carrignan: But the hit rate on 1 inch would be significantly higher. I don't think I want to look at 1 inch. Stay at 2 inch as a minimum and go forward. I need to reiterate that we get the trees down and cover that cost. We can spread out the replacement over 5 or 10 years and spread that out and be able to keep it within budget constraints.

Aldr. Lewis: Can you clarify for me; we are going to take all the healthy trees down, too. There's no hope for the ash trees at all? They are all going to get this disease?

Mr. Suhr: I wasn't coming into this presentation suggesting that all the ash trees were going to come down at once. I think we are still going to evaluate an ash tree based on it's condition. Once that condition got to the point where it's infected and ready to be removed, that's when we suggest removal only.

Aldr. Lewis: Are we thinking in the next four years every tree will be diseased?

Mr. Suhr: We think every ash tree will be confirmed with EAB by 2014. Timeline on confirmation to removal varies based on the tree. How healthy can a tree that is

confirmed with EAB stand and be safe? We are seeing that's about 6 to 18 months. I would suggest in the next five years we are going to be looking at these trees being ready for removal.

Aldr. Lewis: I have an extremely health ash tree in front of our house. You are saying at some point in time it's going to get the disease?

Mr. Suhr: It's likely. Is there a percentage that may survive this? Yes, there could be.

Aldr. Lewis: But we aren't going to take that chance. We are going to take them all down on public property.

Mr. Suhr: That certainly could be a recommendation.

Aldr. Stellato: Because of the lateness of the hour, what direction are you seeking from us tonight? I don't know if we are ready to make a solid choice on this yet.

Mr. Suhr: We are looking for input based on budget. We are that time of the year where we are trying to project increases. If you suggest the budget for next year is "X" we can come back and pick maybe option B with some alternatives to get to that budget amount.

Aldr. Stellato: If we got just the infected trees down this year, not touching the healthy trees yet - save those for later; can you come back at us with a number on what that would cost to get rid of all those today.

Secondly, knowing we have to do all the healthy trees next year, I'd like to see that number and how it fits in, whether or not we have to dip into reserves to pay for it.

Aldr. Carrigan: Anything that has a purple dot on, let's get rid of it. To me, let's do it as fast as we can, as economically as we can. I think there are reserve funds to do this. Let's find out what the numbers are.

Aldr. Stellato: I know the chart in your Power Point presentation is if we anticipate knocking them all down. I just want to know for this year, how many definitely qualify to be knocked down no matter what; they aren't able to saved. Do you have that already?

Mr. Suhr: I think the projection in the red bar in FY 12/13 is \$250,000 to removals only. Now that is suggesting not all of the ones confirmed, but the ones that are ready for removal. That's the difference. If we wanted to suggest all EAB trees that are confirmed, more than half our trees are confirmed already. We've only removed 30% of those, so that adds two different conversations. One is remove all Ash trees and one is

to remove ash trees that we feel are a safety risk. You are going to get two different numbers.

Aldr. Stellato: That's good. That helps. Are you looking for a motion or just some direction?

Mr. Suhr: At this point we are asking for a motion, if it was simply to move with option A and stay the course. However, it doesn't appear that is the direction you are leading, so I would suggest direction as far as budget is concerned. Our current budget is \$364,000 for FY 11/12 and we are anticipating the entire removal and replacement cost to be an additional \$350,000 to that number considering prevailing wage rate. So that gives you the two extremes.

Aldr. Turner: I'd like a cost on just removal and option B.

Aldr. Carrigan: We have to see the numbers. I don't know how much this is going to cost. I don't know if I want to make a motion, but I would instruct staff to show us options relative to a more aggressive tree removal program for FY 12/13, 13/14, 14/15 with a longer roll out of replacement and then let's understand what that difference is going to be. Better to ask Chris...do we take 5% of the reserves a year and dedicate it to that? Again, Mayor, this is your budget. I'll defer to you.

Mayor DeWitte: This might be an easier conversation to have 30 days down the road because we are seeing reasonably significant savings with snow removal this year and the Red Gate Bridge financing package is just starting to come together. I think we are going to have options, which is key in this situation. Putting this on that list of things that we might have a change to look at in another 30 days or so would make sense.

Aldr. Carrigan: To that point, though, we are not having a Government Services in March. If you want to put this on the April P&D, that would expedite this.

Mr. Koenen: We will have information from the contractors in the next 10 days which will help us answer your questions.

Aldr. Carrigan: Give us something we can put our teeth into. This is informative, but not enough.

Mr. Suhr: We've asked our contractors to provide us quotes with prevailing wage and without prevailing wage so we'll have comparisons.

Aldr. Stellato: Ok. April P&D then. No more questions? Thank you, Peter.

No further discussion.

6.h. Recommendation to adjust monthly fee for Landscape Waste Services.

Richard Gallas presented. Last year I came before this Committee to discuss the appropriate fee for our leaf and brush collection programs. At that time, I asked for an increase to that monthly fee that residents pay in order to secure those services. At that time, I requested a \$3.35 per month fee, which was \$.14 more than we had previously been charging.

At that time, I indicated we would annually come back to seek an approval to make sure the costs of this program are consistent with the fee we charge the residents it applies to. This evening, I'm back to ask for a \$.05 increase to that fee which would take us from \$3.35 to \$3.40. This increase represents an approximately 1.5% increase which is the increase we have negotiated with the contractor that executes that service which happens to be Kramer Tree Service.

I have had a great deal of positive feedback about their service. Last year was no different, and I intend that to be the same as we move forward.

Staff recommends approval of the \$.05 per month increase to the user fee.

Aldr. Stellato: Motion made and seconded. Please call a roll.

K. Dobbs:

Monken: Yes

Carrignan: Yes

Payleitner: Yes

Turner: Yes

Rogina: Yes

Martin: No

Krieger: No

Bessner: Yes

Lewis: Yes

No further discussion.

Motioned by Aldr. Monken, seconded by Aldr. Turner. Approved unanimously by voice vote. **Motion carried.**

7.a. Recommendation to approve Class B3 Liquor License for Bulldog Ale House

Mayor DeWitte presented: This item is on the agenda this evening for approval of a B3 Liquor License for an establishment known as the Bulldog Ale House. This is the former Bennigan's location off east Main Street. All applications have been processed, background checks have been completed.

This establishment does have two other establishments in the area; one in Addison, another one in Roselle. I did have the pleasure to speak with Mayor Savorino from Carol Stream and he has had the opportunity to frequent this establishment. I understand from him that they have a very lively, family oriented, sports oriented establishment. He spoke their praises for the type of business that they run.

As I stated, applications are complete, background checks are done. Staff recommends approval.

No further discussion.

Aldr. Stellato: Please call a roll call vote.

K. Dobbs:

Monken: Yes
Carrignan: Yes
Payleitner: Yes
Turner: Yes
Rogina: Yes
Martin: No
Krieger: No
Bessner: Yes
Lewis: Yes

Motioned by Aldr. Monken, seconded by Aldr. Carrignan. Approved unanimously by voice vote. **Motion carried.**

8. Executive Session

Aldr. Stellato: Can someone please make a motion to go into Executive Session to discussion land acquisition?

Motioned by Aldr. Carrignan, seconded by Aldr. Turner. Approved unanimously by voice vote. **Motion carried.**

K. Dobbs:

Monken: Yes

Carrignan: Yes

Payleitner: Yes

Turner: Yes

Rogina: Yes

Martin: Yes

Krieger: Yes

Bessner: Yes

Lewis: Yes

9. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 9:01 p.m.

Motion by Aldr. Monken, seconded by Aldr. Carrignan. No additional discussion.

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