

**MINUTES FROM THE MEETING OF THE ST. CHARLES CITY COUNCIL
HELD ON MONDAY, APRIL 7, 2014 – 7:00 P.M.
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, IN THE CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
2 E. MAIN STREET ST. CHARLES, IL 60174**

1. Call To Order By Mayor Raymond Rogina At 7:01 P.M.

2. Roll Call.

Present: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner
Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis

Absent: None

3. Invocation – Alderman Rita Payleitner

4. Pledge of Allegiance.

5. Presentations:

- Presentation of recognition of achievement of Eagle Scout Brian James Arvanites – Boy Scouts Troop 1.

6. Motion by Martin, seconded by Krieger to approve the Omnibus Vote as amended.

ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,
Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis

NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0

MOTION CARRIED

***7. Motion by Martin, seconded by Krieger to accept and place on file minutes of the regular City Council meeting held on March 17, 2014.**

ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,
Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis

NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0

MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)

***8. Motion by Martin, seconded by Krieger to approve and authorize issuance of vouchers from the Expenditure Approval List for the period of 3/2/14 – 3/16/14 in the amount of \$2,084,324.44 and Expenditure Approval List for the period of 3/17/14 – 3/30/14 in the amount of \$4,140,220.17.**

ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,
Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis

NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0

MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)

I. New Business

That was provided as part of status of one of the milestones that the Council has established previously. It will give you some basis to consider to granting the preliminary plan.

Alder. Turner

That kills it for me.

Mr. Robert Rasmussen, 409 Illinois Suite 1D, St. Charles

I want to reiterate, we the First Street Partners want to build the next phase of the project in the form that we have currently presented to you through the conceptual plan. One of the challenges that I think we have had together, we came up with a list of goals and achievements on November 18 that needed to be met. The first one was for us, First Street to move forward with the conceptual plan through the historical commission, getting the fire and building department and through the plan commission. And to come to you folks to get that conceptual approval so that we know before we go and spend additional dollars. We have spent a significant amount of money to get to that stage. In our mind, the next phase needed to be an agreement on the terms. Before we go and spend another \$100,000 on the design of the building and parking garage. I think we can meet everyone's needs, historical, Council, Commission. We initiated an email on January 3rd, myself to Staff, wondering where we were at with that meeting in redevelopment. Got a response on the 6th and, I am not sure if you are aware of the 20th email that was sent by myself, that clearly stated the next step of the process is for us to come to terms on the redevelopment agreement. There are three terms of the RDA that we have not gotten any response on. I can go through those if need be. I wasn't able to get that in front of you. Without that, we can't go and spend that next chunk of money. We can spend that next chunk of money immediately, and draw those buildings and move forward. Our challenge, we want to keep First Street going. You see dark lights on the first floor. We need to change that. We need to change the zoning. I have a zoning application right now that I would like to continue forward no matter what happens to look at the zoning of the PUD in general. So that we can facilitate keeping those first floors occupied. It is a bit restrictive right now; we have talked about that in the past. We want to continue that process forward. We filed that application on April 1. I don't think we have been short in any way of trying to accomplish what we told you we would. I stand here today ready to move forward if we could get some feedback on the RDA. And that's where we stand tonight. I can answer any questions.

Alder. Turner

So you want to delay the start dates of these outer lots, 7 and 8, phases 4 and 5, you want to move them back 2-3 years.

Mr. Robert Rasmussen

Realistically, is phase 3 is built this year, September 1. We have move forward now if we are going to do that. We have to get going. The next phases would have to follow subsequent years. Can't happen during the construction of that phase.

Alder. Turner

The concern is as we move this out, the effect of that is the development is not really paying a lot of the TIF and the gap falls on the taxpayer.

Mr. Robert Rasmussen

The concern I have now is that if we don't move forward with something, that gap will become significantly bigger. That's why we have been saying this for nine months now. We know what the number is each month that this could generate, just this phase. What you are talking about is one of the three things in the RDA that has not been agreed upon. Do we, as First Street, have the ability to move forward with the next phases after that? We put the dates that we could. We have mentioned previously, during the conceptual meetings, that we are open to first right of refusal if someone steps in and says they can build this sooner. Our concern is, before putting in two new four-story buildings, almost simultaneously on that project, we need to minimize our competition on that street while we are doing it. The buildings need to be stabilized so they are not dark. That will actually help the taxes, if they are filled. Those are the reasons for that.

Alder. Turner

You want to change the zoning away from retail too, on the first floor of the first street building.

Mr. Robert Rasmussen

Yes, similar to what the City did on the downtown overlay district. It will give us more opportunity for foot traffic.

Alder. Martin

In regards to that, I will not support any change to office on the first floor. It is designed for retail. I insist that it be retail. I am still supporting retail.

Mr. Robert Rasmussen

I would prefer that as well, but we also would prefer it not to be dark as well. There is a fine line.

Alder. Lemke

My vision for this is that we would have a walk able retail corridor on both sides of the street off of Route 64. It would get away from the traffic. Supportive of what Jim Martin suggested.

Mayor Rogina asked for the motion, no motion given.

Mayor Rogina asked for legal counsel to explain what the lack of the motion means.

Attorney McGuirk

The extension will expire tomorrow. It will lapse. The plan approval will lapse with it. No further action by the Council is necessary.

Alder. Turner

When does the cure process start for this?

Attorney McGuirk

The cure process pertains to the redevelopment agreement. And that starts when the City decides to provide them with a notice of default. We have not gotten to that stage. As indicated in this notice from Staff, the RDA doesn't have a direct relationship on what we are doing here tonight. That would come at a future date. It does not start immediately.

- D.** Motion by Martin, seconded by Turner to approve the **Ordinance 2014-M-7** Authorizing the Execution of a Twelfth Amendment to a Purchase Agreement By and Between the City of St. Charles and SMN Development, L.L.C. to April 8, 2015.

Alder. Stellato recuses himself from discussion.

ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Martin, Turner,
NAY: Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Krieger, Bancroft,
Bessner, Lewis
ABSENT: 0
ABSTAIN: Stellato
MOTION FAILS

Rita Tungare

Both items D and E go hand in hand. They relate to the same property and SMN development. The SMN development site, the former Manor restaurant site, is part of the First Street property. There are two separate actions that are required here. One that relates to the purchase agreement with SMN to purchase a 52-foot parcel from the City with the purposes of combining that parcel with property they own for the purpose of redevelopment of that property. The second action is an extension to commence construction in accordance with the existing preliminary plan. The Council has recently granted extensions on both of these items, which will expire tomorrow. Similar to the First Street situation, the Council has established benchmarks. We have provided a table in your packet with a status of these benchmarks. The developer was to provide an assessment of the financial viability and marketability of the proposed development as well as a schedule of project implementation. SMN has submitted a written request for an extension of one year to April 8, 2015. They are here to comment on their rationale.

Joe Klein, 36W494 Hunters Gate Road, St. Charles, Illinois

I submitted a letter on Friday outlining our position in regards to why we are here before you this evening. Since we last met I want to talk about the benchmarks and the viability of the project. We met with Staff and elected officials twice. The first meeting with met with a real estate broker and elected officials regarding marketability of our site, market in general and the market in St. Charles. We met with Sultas Construction to discuss construction alternatives to our building. To find ways to make our building more affordable and marketable. The purpose of that first meeting was to inform City Staff and Council members on the marketability of our site. And the viability of our project now based on estimated construction costs. And the second was to present to the City to alter the plan to make it more affordable. We took feedback from the City with the specific ideas that the City thought made sense. We came to the City again with ideas that we thought would make sense with price considerations and cost. Also presented a few ideas on the site. We presented a market analysis from our broker. We presented the City with alternatives to our construction in an effort to bring our costs down. The purpose of that was not to come with ideas that the City would reject, but come up with ideas that the City would consider. As it relates to specific construction schedule we are not prepared to give you a specific schedule now related to the building. However, we are able to present to the City an alternative and an option. We tried to come up with some ideas that would address some of the issues faced by City Council and some of the issues faced by us regarding marketability of the building that is currently proposed. What we could do in the interim. What you have in front of you is called, Main Stage Main Street market

concept. What it is is an opportunity to develop the site temporarily until market conditions will change to allow for a viable development on the site. There are some real benefits to that project. It improves the visibility of the site. It focuses attention on the site and it ties First Street all the way down to Illinois. It creates traffic for existing First Street business and creates foot traffic for nearby businesses. It creates a commerce center at First Street and Main. It facilitates foot traffic to and from the river walk. It creates a public gathering space that is consistent with the intended use of the west plaza and the planned east plaza. A venue for private and public events. A venue that would promote community activity and events. It would promote First Street. This is a place you could bring a prospective tenant. Look at success of the small retail spaces. It could promote shows at the Arcada theatre and other local performance centers. It creates a transitional retail use for the site of what is now a vacant lot. It's a scaled down version of what we hoped to see at the beginning. It creates a transition time. It allows us to wait for market conditions to change. It allows us fill the vacancies that currently exist on First Street and in the community. SMN is prepared to do this this year. This plan has been vetted by the City, Fire, Police, Zoning and Planning. We would have to go back to those original meetings and see what has changed since then. We are prepared to do this today and could be done this year hopefully before festival season starts this year. It is something that is exciting and consistent with intended use of First Street. I think it gives us the opportunity to move forward and time to allow market conditions to change. Our site is a little different than other sites on First Street. And we need a little time for market conditions to change. No TIF money used to support our project. Not subject to an RDA agreement. There is no risk to the City to extend the contract to purchase the 52 feet. Even if you extend the contract, there is nothing stopping the City getting developers to promote or develop the site. I see no benefit in the City terminating that contract. We have worked closely and diligently with City Staff. We have worked hard to come up with alternatives to favorably promote development on First Street. Staff would tell you that we have had good discussions regarding First Street. We would like to ask for consent to move forward. To move forward we would require the extension that has been requested this evening.

Mayor Rogina

There are several Council members present that were not Council members when this was presented previously. My point is very intriguing, I would like to advance to the Council that this idea should be further vetted through Staff. The question would be whether or not this proposal here would have an impact on points D and E on the agenda. I will look to legal staff to comment. The question would be whether Staff could vet this thing and bring it back to the Council at a future committee meeting.

Attorney McGuirk

This proposal is not on the agenda. It is not something that the Council can consider. The only thing on the agenda is whether or not to extend the contract for the 52 feet. The developer is saying this would have an impact on this in the future, it would have to go through the appropriate committees and staff would have to vet it.

Mayor Rogina

Are there any questions?

Alder. Payleitner

What are we looking for in a market change? Are we looking for construction costs to go down? Property values to go up? What are you looking for?

Mr. Klein

Demand for office and retail space. It's apparent that the demand is down. This is depressing rents. And the amount of rent we can collect is related to income and how we can pay.

Alder. Payleitner

Office space?

Mr. Klein

Our building is approved for retail on the first floor and office on second through fourth. Both markets are depressed but office is particularly depressed at this time.

Alder. Lemke

In terms in retail, what market are you referring to? Is it the market downtown oversupplied? Or are you saying over supplied throughout St. Charles or the tri-city area.

Mr. Klein

I think the market is depressed in general. Statistics we got was that there is a 27% vacancy in St. Charles, which is consistent with the tri city area.

Alder. Turner

If we do not grant their 52 feet, is there a time line that we have to inform SMN that we are not going to guarantee them this 52 feet?

Attorney McGuirk

This contract is a little different. This contract states that if they don't meet the condition precedents in the contract, which they are asking to extend for a year, then either party can terminate. So we would have a right to terminate tomorrow.

Alder. Turner

That doesn't stop them from coming back at any time or the Council from granting them that 52 feet in the future.

Attorney McGuirk

At a later date, no.

Alder. Turner

So if we discuss this concept at planning and development, we could say if you need that 52 feet for this concept, we could grant you that 52 feet.

Attorney McGuirk

You can enter into any agreement you want at that point.

Alder. Turner

How long would it take Mr. Klein to construct this?

Mr. Klein (consulting Morris McNally)

Two to three months once we got past the City approval process.

Alder. Martin

I am intrigued by your concept here. On your project is first floor approved for retail exclusively?

Mr. Klein

That is the only thing it is approved for.

Alder. Martin

I support the extension.

Alder. Bessner

In regards to the permanence, what kind of materials are we expected to see if this could go up in 2-3 months?

Mr. Klein

The plan doesn't have a lot of construction if you look at it. Its façade work relative to the existing foundation. There is a stage and landscaping. Kiosks would commercial grade kiosks that you see at different types of venues. We would come to the City to get their approval.

Alder. Bessner

You expect this to be for a year, roughly.

Mr. Klein

It could be for a year or more depending on the market and how things go.

Alder. Bessner

I am intrigued by plan. My only concern there has been chatter by residents that think that first street should be a park. People assume it will be a park and residents who are against that. It would be a very expensive park. So my concern would be if it's temporary and you pull that up, that might cause a lot of angst.

Mr. Klein

It is interesting you bring that up. We talked about that in our most recent meetings with the City. My reaction was that this an opportunity for the City to demonstrate to the community that you are taking some informed steps to get some development on First Street. I think that transparency would be important stating that it is not a permanent development. It's something transitional that would encourage future development on First Street. It's a way for developers to show potential tenants the foot traffic potential and retail commerce. I would envision as part of the signage as promotions of further development.

Alder. Lewis

All of this is not to be discussed tonight?

Attorney McGuirk

You can take it under consideration; it is not on the agenda.

Alder. Lewis

Is this something you would request anyway? If that 52 feet were not extended tonight, would you go forward with this?

Mr. Klein

That puts a lot of things in question. The plan that you have anticipates that the 52 feet are part of the development of the stage and kiosks and areas for other things encompass that 52 feet. If the request for the contract for the 52 feet is terminated, that cuts the property in half and makes it difficult to do what we propose to do. I don't know if this contract, relative to that 52 feet prevents you from doing what you want to do. I don't know if there is anyone out there now who is ready, willing and able to step up and develop that on that site. If that contract is continues for a period of time, there is nothing that presents you from looking for some other developer and terminating that contract in the future. If you are not happy with what we do here, how we progress and develop with this project. Our intention is to get this done this year. But we have to have the 52 feet to do it.

Alder. Lewis

Is that a no?

Mr. Klein

I don't know. I don't know what that really means to be honest with you. I don't know what the City's intention is. I would have to come back to you in some sort of a meeting to say what do you intend with the 52 feet. Did you terminate the contract so I can come back and ask for it? Do you want me to continue? There would be a lot of questions.

Rita Tungare

In relation to this separate proposal, if the Council decides not to extend the agreement, it could be moved to a license agreement. If the City owns that 52 feet, we could then enter into a license agreement to rent the use for that property.

Alder. Bancroft

I am not sure I agree that we have all the options with this contract. I think there is a quelling effect, if there is a contract out there; it is very hard to get anyone else to look at a property. No one wants to spec the time when something isn't available. So I don't know if I agree with the comment that we are no better or worse position with the contract existing. Trying to sell something that is encumbered even with termination rights is not easy to do.

Mr. Klein

I understand that in particular to residential properties. That is because of very tight time frames, 45-60 day window from contract to closing. That is not the case here. You can extend or shorten this contract for as long as you want to. Any developer that comes before you with any proposal isn't going to be ready to build in 30, 60, 90 or 120 days most likely. I don't think those tight time frames don't apply here. So the chilling effect might not be as much of an issue.

Alder. Bancroft

The other question I have, the concept would exist for a year and is a temporary solution. What does your crystal ball say?

Mr. Klein

I don't have a crystal ball. It would be foolish for me to try and predict for you what others

Alder. Bancroft

Is your concept, would this remain in place and be maintained until development is ready? Is that the thought the process?

Mr. Klein

Nothing happens independent of you. My thought is to move forward with this project in concert with the City. We would continue to market the property, we would continue to market as currently proposed or from ongoing discussions with you. There would be constant touch points with you. Relative to how we are marketing the property. I still want to explore with you guys all those different options regarding the permanent development of that site. I don't think that process stops because this starts. This is a transitional piece. This is a piece that allows us to continue our conversations. Some things we have talked about, expanding the footprint, changing the façade, the construction materials, and all those things we have talked about. We have not fully vetted those because we haven't had time. As that process continues, stuff happens at the corner of First and Main and it's good stuff that is consistent with what we want to see. That's my vision of the process.

Alder. Payleitner

I too was at that meeting when you talked about the woes of the current market. Also you mentioned that when you last met with the City you presented eight new concepts, six new variations and two entirely different concepts that were received by Staff and Elected Officials.

Mr. Klein

The last meeting, that you were not at, we discussed different building alternatives. It was construction materials and then we talked about flattening that west side and enclosing the southeast corner, we talked about cantilevering it. We presented some drawings at the last meeting that was done by our architect. Those were the six variations of the existing plan. Then we discussed this as one of the new ideas. Then we discussed a new idea of a one-story idea that was conceptual but not ready for much discussion this evening. It was another idea as we try to vet out what we want to do there. That process has to keep going.

Alder. Payleitner

Rita, with these new concepts, would that call for a new PUD or anything new? Or do they all seem comparable.

Mark Koenen

At the last meeting, there were concepts presented. They require a new preliminary plan that would have to be vetted through the process. So we would have to go back through this process we are in right now. Generally extensions on the building in part of what we see today. There were totally new concepts presented. The real issue tonight is what are we going to do with the 52 foot land purchase agreement and what are we going to do with the preliminary plan and construction start date on the agenda for tonight. The other issue of the market square is an interesting concept. It may have an opportunity for us to consider in the future. I think that is something that should be vetted through the process to include a staff review or staff report that comes back to the City Council committee for conversation. Possibly along with either the concept to extend the purchase agreement or preliminary plan or it may be the another vehicle, maybe a license or a lease. How we move forward together as we wait for the economy to improve so we can build the building we want to build.

Alder. Payleitner

If we decide not to extend item 1E, does it matter, because we are going to start from scratch anyway?

Mr. Koenen

Yes, particularly if there is a new concept in development.

Alder. Turner

Is this motion capable of being tabled?

Attorney McGuirk

You can table, but the date is the date. The agreement will still lapse.

- E. Consideration of a **Resolution** Granting a Tenth Extension to Begin Construction Following Recording of the PUD Final Plat for the First Street Redevelopment PUD Phase III, Lots 1 and 2 (SMN Development LLC Development Site – Building 9).

Alder. Stellato recuses himself from discussion.

No motion – no vote – extension request will lapse.

Attorney McGuirk

The agreement will lapse.

II. Committee Reports

A. Government Operations

1. Motion by Turner, seconded by Silkaitis to approve a Class B (restaurant) liquor license for McNally's Irish Pub with a late night 2:00 a.m. permit to be located at 109 W Main Street.
ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,
Bancroft, Bessner, Lewis
NAY: Martin, Krieger ABSENT: 0
ABSTAIN: Stellato
MOTION CARRIED
- *2. Motion by Martin, seconded by Krieger to waive the bid procedure and approve "Spot Buying" of transformers and switchgear on an as needed basis for FY2014/15.
ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,
Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis
NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0
MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)
- *3. Motion by Martin, seconded by Krieger to waive the bid procedure for FY2014/15 and approve ordering gasoline and diesel fuel (bio-diesel) per order on an as needed basis.
ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,
Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis
NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0
MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)
- *4. Motion by Martin, seconded by Krieger to waive the bid procedure and approve "Spot Buying" of aluminum and copper cable order on an as needed basis throughout FY2014/15.
ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,
Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis
NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0
MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)
- *5. Motion by Martin, seconded by Krieger to award FY2014/15 Hauling/Excavation bid to Koz Trucking, Inc., Medinah, at unit costs provided on the bid results.
ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,
Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis
NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0
MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)
- *6. Motion by Martin, seconded by Krieger to award 2014/15 low bid to Koz Trucking, Inc. for two (2) base bid types of stone and gravel and eight (8) alternate types.
ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,
Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis

NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0

MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)

- *7. Motion by Martin, seconded by Krieger to approve an **Ordinance 2014-M-8** Reserving and Authorizing the Transfer of Volume Cap in Connection with Private Activity Bond Issues and Related Matters.

ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,
Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis

NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0

MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)

- *8. Motion by Martin, seconded by Krieger to approve a **Resolution 2014-12** to extend the Intergovernmental Agreement with the County of Kane for Animal Control Services for one year.

ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,
Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis

NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0

MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)

- *9. Motion by Martin, seconded by Krieger to accept and place on files minutes of the March 17, 2014 Government Operations Committee Meeting.

ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,
Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis

NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0

MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)

B. Government Services

- *1. Motion by Martin, seconded by Krieger to accept and place on file the Minutes of the February 24, 2014, Government Services Committee Meeting.

ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,
Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis

NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0

MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)

- *2. Motion by Martin, seconded by Krieger to approve a **Resolution 2014-13** Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk of the City of St. Charles to approve a Purchase Order to G&W for 35kV Switchgear for the Dunham Road Substation.

ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,
Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis

NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0

MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)

- *3. Motion by Martin, seconded by Krieger to approve a **Resolution 2014-14** Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk of the City of St. Charles to execute a Contract for Construction Services for the South 19th Street Water Main Improvement Project.

ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,
Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis

NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0

MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)

- *4. Motion by Martin, seconded by Krieger to approve a **Resolution 2014-15** Authorizing the Director of Public Works to Execute Change Order No. 1 for the Tyler Road Drainage Improvement Project to Martam Construction, Inc.
ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,
Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis
NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0
MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)
- *5 Motion by Martin, seconded by Krieger to approve a **Resolution 2014-16** Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk of the City of St. Charles to execute an Illinois Department of Transportation Resolution for the 2014 Motor Fuel Tax (MFT) Street Rehabilitation Project.
ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,
Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis
NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0
MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)
- *6. Motion by Martin, seconded by Krieger to waive the formal bid process, approve a budget addition and approve a **Resolution 2014-17** Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk of the City of St. Charles to approve a Proposal from Layne Christensen Company for City Hall Well #3 Preventative Maintenance.
ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,
Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis
NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0
MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)
- *7. Motion by Martin, seconded by Krieger to approve a **Resolution 2014-18** Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk of the City of St. Charles to approve a Contract with Advanced Disposal for Spring Clean-Up on May 3, 2014 (east side) and May 17, 2014 (west side).
ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,
Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis
NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0
MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)
- *8. Motion by Martin, seconded by Krieger to approve a Resolution 2014-1 of Tri-City Ambulance Service Board of Directors Authorizing the City of St. Charles as Lead Agency for Tri-City, to Include the Approved Operating Budget for the Period of May 1, 2014 through April 30, 2015 in the St. Charles Municipal Budget for and on Behalf of Tri-City Ambulance Service.
ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,
Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis
NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0
MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)
- *9. Motion by Martin, seconded by Krieger to approve a Resolution 2014-2 of Tri-City Ambulance Service Board of Directors Authorizing the City of St. Charles, as Lead Agency for Tri-City, to Execute an Agreement between for Paramedic Services, for and on Behalf of Tri-City Ambulance Service.
ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,
Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis

NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0
MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)

C. Planning and Development

- *1. Motion by Martin, seconded by Krieger to accept and place on file minutes of the March 10, 2014 Planning & Development Committee.

ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Stellato, Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Turner,
Bancroft, Martin, Krieger, Bessner, Lewis

NAY: 0 ABSENT: 0

MOTION CARRIED (Omnibus Vote)

D. No Executive Session

E. Additional Items from Mayor, Council, Staff, or Citizens

- Mayor Rogina

I am sorry that the individuals who presented are not present. Tonight the City Council decided not to grant any extensions on First Street. What is important to note, is that the opportunities that exist on First Street are open to all that are interested in moving First Street forward. This includes the individual who presented tonight. This development when it was first proposed and partially developed does present wonderful opportunities which still exist.

F. Adjournment

Motion By Turner, seconded by Stellato, to adjourn meeting

VOICE VOTE UNANIMOUS MOTION CARRIED

Meeting adjourned at 8:15 P.M.

Nancy Garrison, City Clerk

CERTIFIED TO BE A TRUE COPY OF ORIGINAL

Nancy Garrison, City Clerk