

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
GOVERNMENT SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING
MONDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2015, 7:00 P.M.**

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

Members Absent: None

Others Present: Mark Koenen, City Administrator; Peter Suhr, Director of Public Works; Chris Adesso, Asst. Director of Public Works -Operations; Karen Young, Asst. Director of Public Works -Engineering; A.J. Reineking, Public Works Manager; John Lamb, Environmental Services Manager; Tom Bruhl, Electric Services Manager; Jim Keegan, Police Chief; Joe Schelstreet, Fire Chief

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

2. Roll Call

K. Dobbs:

Stellato: Present

Silkaitis: Present

Payleitner: Present

Lemke: Present

Turner: Present

Bancroft: Present

Krieger: Present

Gaugel: Present

Bessner: Present

Lewis: Present

3.a. Electric Reliability Report – Information only.

4.a. Presentation of 7th Avenue Creek Project – Information only.

Karen Young presented. I am here to present the 7th Avenue Creek Project; we also have Ajay Jain and Scott Marquardt from H.R. Green who worked on the study as well if we have any technical questions for them tonight.

Over the last year, the City's consultant, H .R. Green has been working on a study to identify options to help mitigate flooding within the 7th Avenue Creek area of the City. We are happy to share with you the findings of the study and we look forward to your input as we move along in this project. Tonight's agenda includes four different areas; we are going to talk about the study area and project constraints, an overview of project options, our public involvement process and next steps in moving forward.

Power Point presentation by Karen Young.

We have our public meetings on Thursday, October 29. We gave residents an option to pick one of two times (6:00 pm or 7:30 pm). We will be giving a short presentation followed by an open house so we can answer questions. We are going to provide comment cards so our residents can provide feedback, because we feel feedback from the public and Council is vital as we move forward. We will present the findings from the public meetings to you as well as what we feel are the best options to move forward and consideration for future studies, so we will be back sometime between now and February 2016 to do that.

I do want to remind you of the FEMA process, even though it is separate from our current process. We have just received the draft public maps for the new FEMA remapping. We are currently doing our initial evaluation of the maps, and FEMA will be scheduling a meeting either at the end or after the first of year to present that information to the public.

Aldr. Stellato: When we met in January 2015, I'm not sure that people understood the process, and I don't know that they realized we are on their side. One of the things I want to make sure we emphasize is what we have done to date - properties that we have purchased, homes that we have purchased; maybe put a dollar amount on that to give them an idea of what the Council and City has done to date. I don't want people to think that as of 2008 when we were made aware of the flooding, we haven't done anything. I would like you to have that ready for Thursday night at the Open House.

Mrs. Young: Yes, we will have that ready.

Aldr. Lemke: When FEMA looks at this, would they be doing the kind of detail that we talked about here like Elevation Certificates, or do they work more generally, in terms of topographical maps?

Mrs. Young: They work off of Kane County's two foot contour map which is why we felt it was important to do the Elevation Certificates. The problem is, if we are only getting an elevation every two feet, but yet we are going to do a survey that is to a 100th or a 10th of a foot that can make all the difference in the world from a property being in or out of a flood plain.

We will be providing the Elevation Certificates to FEMA as they only accept engineering data to remove a property from the mapping. We can't just say that a property has never flooded; we have to show the engineering data. That is the purpose that the Elevation Certificates will serve.

Aldr. Lewis: Regarding Grant Funding; do you have any idea of what eligibility might be?

Mrs. Young: We are working through that right now. They provided some information to us, but like with all grants, it is a very competitive process. We do know the cap they would allow if they funded a project to the fullest grant availability, and we will provide that to Committee at our next presentation.

Aldr. Payleitner: I see two hurdles; neighbor cooperation and funding. On my own I have been investigating the SSA process and I'm wondering if the neighbors will be made aware of the possibility of an SSA as well?

Mrs. Young: Right now we are trying to focus on options and what would be favored in terms of the look and impacts to the community, but we have looked at several funding options including an SSA that we will present to the Committee in the future.

Aldr. Payleitner: I got a map of all the SSA areas that had to do with storm water and there are more than 60 areas. I'm hoping the neighbors realize that other people are paying for their storm water retention and that they may need to kick in too.

Mrs. Young: A lot of times those SSA's are for backup and they aren't activated unless their Homeowners Association isn't maintaining the storm water retention area or there are other issues. But you are right, there are options, and we will certainly evaluate that as part of the opportunities to fund the project in the future.

Chairman Turner: I agree with Rita. This is going to be a big project, so everyone is going to be paying for this for only a modest amount of people to benefit. I think they should realize they are going to be the major benefit of it and people who are miles away are still going to get a big bill for this any way we decide to do it. We don't have to have an SSA for the full \$13 million, but some amount for ownership.

Aldr. Krieger: There was question about who owns the creek. Is some of it privately owned?

Mrs. Young: There are some areas where the property line goes through the center line of the creek, so technically that property is privately owned. But there are some areas the City owns as well.

Chairman Turner: Has FEMA answered all your questions?

Mrs. Young: Yes; the only question we haven't received feedback on is when the next meeting is. But now that we have the maps we are going to have a lot of interaction with FEMA over the coming year. Finalizing the maps is a significant process; we are looking into 2017 for the maps to be finalized IF things stay on track.

Chairman Turner: So we can say we have moved up on our priority list, but it is still going to be a long time before something actually could get done, even after we all decide on an option?

Mrs. Young: Yes. I would like to point out that even though these maps aren't finalized, we are required to approve permits or projects as though these maps are enacted. So we are doing our part to protect those areas moving forward while the mapping process takes place.

Chairman Turner: To Aldr. Stellato's point about the meetings this Thursday; make sure that you tell them we are moving forward, it's a slow process, we aren't the only ones involved with this, FEMA is, so just make that clear that we have been working on this since 2008 and it's going to be a while.

No further discussion.

4.b. Recommendation to award the Bid for Well #8 Booster Station and Well #9 Roof Replacements to Malcor Roofing of Illinois, Inc.

AJ Reineking presented. The roofs at the Well #8 Booster Station, located on 37th Avenue, as well as Well #9 on Route 25 have experienced failure and are in need of replacement. Both roofs are flat concrete decks roofs with a roll on membrane. This project will consist of removing the existing roofing membrane as well as the wash stone top, replacing the skylights, resealing the joints and rolling and torching on the new membrane material.

On October 6, 2015 we opened bids for the project. Of the four bids that we received, Malcor Roofing of Illinois, Inc. was the lowest responsive and responsible bidder. Malcor recently relocated their offices to St. Charles. We anticipate this project will be complete this calendar year if the weather holds out. If not, it will be deferred to the spring, but will be completed this fiscal year. This is a budgeted expense, and the roofing systems carry a 30 year warranty.

If there are no questions, Staff recommends awarding the bid for the Well #8 Booster Station and Well #9 roof replacements to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, Malcor Roofing of Illinois in an amount not to exceed \$91,500.

No further discussion.

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

4.c. Recommendation to approve Solar Siting Agreement and Easement with IMEA.

Tom Bruhl presented. I am here today with the final agreement to place the Solar Project on the Legacy Substation site. As you may recall, we bid to host this site with IMEA and it is part of both our diversity plan and IMEA's diversity plan to get into solar and renewables.

The Legacy Substation is a five acre parcel that was purchased in the event that we needed 138 kV transmission type feed. The current planning forecast is that we will not need a 138kV feed in the foreseeable future. In fact, since 2006, our loads every year have been going down. With that, it becomes possible to use some of this property for solar.

This agreement does have the provisions that if 138kV was needed by the City, we could buy this out and have it removed from the site and make it available for our purposes. We have to provide a \$320 meter and we have to remove some of the trees on the current berm which is approximately \$1,500. The solar site itself will be fenced and a third party will own, maintain and take care of everything inside the fence. The City will have no financial obligations to keep the weeds down or keep the solar panels clear; we are only getting the energy that is coming out of the system.

We did negotiate public access which means that we will have a link on our website that a third party will own and maintain that will have all the graphs of what it has produced on a daily, monthly and life to date basis. Additionally, we negotiated access to the site with escort; if we wanted to have a "Green Day" and have tours of the site, we can, with proper notice have someone from IMEA to escort us and explain how it works. That language is built into the agreement.

Finally, there is an easement that goes along with letting them use the land; it's a reversible easement that if the solar plant ceases to exist, then the easement reverts back to the City. Attorney McGuirk participated in the negotiations all the way through; he was actually the person who drafted the Easement Agreement.

Staff recommends approval of the Solar Siting Agreement and the Easement with IMEA and the authorization for the Mayor and City Clerk to execute same.

Aldr. Turner: Is there a cost to hooking up this solar facility to the City grid?

Mr. Bruhl: No, that is all provided as part of their proposal.

No further discussion.

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

4.d. Recommendation to approve Engineering Contract with Engineering Enterprises Inc. for a Capacity, Management, Operation and Maintenance (CMOM) Plan.

John Lamb presented. In December 2014, the City received a renewal of its NPDES, which is an IEPA permit for the East Side Wastewater Plant. In addition to standard permit limits, there are usually some special conditions that might require additional reporting, plant modifications and new regulations. One of the special conditions was that the City develops a CMOM plan. The plan is required to have a number of measure and activities the City will take to maximize the efficiency and capacity of its sanitary sewer system or lift stations in our Wastewater Treatment Facilities. It also will help address sanitary sewer overflows and provide an assessment of the system.

This requirement was anticipated by Staff and budgeted for accordingly in the current fiscal year. Staff sent out six requests for qualifications for Professional Services and received three submittals back. The submittals were reviewed by a committee of five staff members who came to a consensus on Engineering Enterprises, Inc., also known as EEI. Staff met with EEI and negotiated a fee of \$56,174 which is below our budgeted amount of \$60,000.

Staff recommends awarding a Professional Services Agreement to Engineering Enterprises in the amount of \$56,174.

No further discussion.

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

4.e. Presentation of Phosphorus Removal Project at Main Wastewater Treatment Plant – Information only.

John Lamb presented. This item is also a result of our last EPA permit; there is a condition that requires the City to remove Phosphorus. Phosphorus in the wastewater could be a detriment to the receiving water in the Fox River. This will involve construction and modification of our existing facility. This condition has a compliance schedule and requires a Feasibility Report which investigated how the phosphorus removal would meet the proposed limits and what process is recommended.

The project is to start in May of 2017 and be completed in June of 2018. Staff has retained the services of Trotter & Associates to perform the Feasibility Study which involved a lot of different methods and extensive modeling that Scott Trotter will be giving a brief presentation on.

The first method is biological and the second is chemical. The biological process involves more capital improvements up front; however, the chemical process requires higher annual operational costs over the life of the system. Both amounts were reviewed for the potential impact on our user rates by Trotter & Associates as well as our Finance Department and Mark Koenen, City Administrator, so there was quite a consensus and discussion on the impact of user rates in the future. There are also some non-financial factors that were discussed and there was a matrix developed.

In conclusion, the recommendation of staff is to implement the biological process. Although it has a higher cost up front, we still consider it to be the most fiscally and environmentally responsible decision. The project will be budgeted in the upcoming year and it is intended to fund it through an Illinois EPA low interest loan as we have done with other projects.

Mr. Trotter: Scott Trotter of Trotter & Associates, 40W201 Wasco Road, St. Charles, IL.

Power Point Presentation by Scott Trotter of Trotter & Associates.

Aldr. Stellato: How many of towns are impacted by this issue that the EPA came up with?

Mr. Trotter: There are 12 states, including Missouri up to Yellowstone, so all the way from Montana through Pennsylvania, all funneling down to New Orleans. If you saw an aerial view of this, we are talking about 500 miles of dead zone from Louisiana through Galveston and further down the Gulf Coast.

This is a significant issue and it's not something that can be solved by one plant, but I will tell you that they have told the treatment plants to remove Phosphorus, and they've told the Agriculture community to remove the nitrogen, so it is a two prong approach.

Aldr. Stellato: The change from 1 to .5; do you anticipate that is going to happen soon?

Mr. Trotter: No, I don't, actually. It's taken almost 20 years to get to this point where they want it to 1. It could be implemented, but we are talking about spending \$7 million to get to 1. To get the other half of a milligram per liter, it's an additional \$10 million. There would have to be other things that happen to take us to the next step. I'm not saying it couldn't, it's just not an easy step to justify.

Aldr. Lemke: We talked about a net present value. Usually when I see those calculations, they go over a period of 10 or 20 years. What is our time frame that you would be talking about for that net present value?

Mr. Trotter: 20 years.

Aldr. Payleitner: What is the source of the phosphorus?

Mr. Trotter: Mostly organic material. Our bodies are made up of phosphorus, we use phosphorus, and therefore we excrete phosphorus.

Aldr. Payleitner: It is tested at our plant or in the river?

Mr. Trotter: The EPA tests it in our final affluent, and they are also monitoring the river as well. So they are looking for us to produce 1 milligram per liter, their ultimate goal is for the river to be around .1 milligram per liter. Right now, it's somewhere around .3 milligrams per liter.

Chairman Turner: John, what is your timeline on this?

Mr. Lamb: This is for information purposes only; but this will be in the upcoming proposed for FY 16/17. We are recommending the biological, so that budget number would be \$7.2 million.

Aldr. Lemke: Is biological something like the anaerobic digester where you can have some microbial action?

Mr. Trotter: It is similar. We are reusing the existing aeration basins and repurposing some of the tanks, rather than being aerobic tanks to be anoxic and anaerobic tanks, so we are modifying the existing aeration system to do a better job and do it a little differently.

Aldr. Lemke: So it's more the tanks that are out there on the property as opposed to the "onion dome".

Mr. Trotter: Correct, and there is only one additional structure which is a backup chemical system that would be housed in a building.

Chairman Turner: Will you be coming to us for approval of your method before you go through this, or not?

Mr. Lamb: While I stated that this is for information only, we are recommending the biological process, so that is the number we would be placing in the budget. We wanted to make sure when you see that number in the budget, you understand from this presentation where it came from.

Aldr. Gaugel: That is for one year?

Mr. Lamb: Chris Minick is better equipped to answer that than I am, but we put it in the budget for one year in debt service and our standard EPA loan is 20 years to pay that project back.

No further discussion.

4.f. Recommendation to approve Change Order No. 2 with Martam Construction for Services related to the North 5th Avenue Watermain Replacement Project.

John Lamb presented. Staff is requesting approval of Change Order No. 2 with Martam Construction in the amount of \$46,712. The items are summarized on the attachment. A couple of the items were configuration of piping due to field changes and a hook up that we were not aware of to the Country Club shed and also some striping and reflection items for the pavement. There were also two deductions for \$18,000.

Staff recommends approval of Change Order No. 2 in the amount of \$46,712.

Aldr. Krieger: Do we have a new completion date yet?

Mr. Lamb: We had good progress over this past weekend. The system is holding pressure at the north end, we have chlorinated tested and the north end is good to go. We will be moving to the middle section later in the week. With paving, we are still projecting the end of November.

Aldr. Silkaitis: That is going to put them over three months past the original completion date. How much of that is due to things that we did not anticipate and how much is due to the contractor?

Mr. Lamb: It's a combination of factors. Unfortunately a lot of it had to do with the HDPE fusing. The couplers and connections that were being made originally were all going to be HDPE but we have had to change to mechanical because the HDPE connections were not holding the pressure test; they were essentially leaking. That process has been investigated extensively, both by Trotter & Associates and a third party; we had some of those pieces shipped off for inspection by a third party expert which we are still waiting for some results on.

Aldr. Silkaitis: Did we request those connections or did they tell us that they would be using those connections?

Mr. Lamb: We requested them, they were specified in the contract.

Aldr. Silkaitis: So that part of the delay would be on us, correct?

Mr. Lamb: We weren't anticipating those problems at the time, obviously.

Aldr. Silkaitis: I could understand a month, but now we are three months over and it may not be done yet. Someone's got to pay for this.

Mr. Lamb: There are talks with the contractor about potential liquidated damages.

Aldr. Silkaitis: I would like to pursue liquidated damages, and I would like to be kept abreast of that too, please.

Mr. Lamb: Yes, we definitely will do that.

No further discussion.

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

Motion carried

4.g. Recommendation to approve Change Order No. 1 with Trotter & Associates for Services related to the North 5th Avenue Watermain Replacement Project.

John Lamb presented. This item is for Change Order No. 1 to Trotter & Associates in the amount of \$230,097.75. As we were just discussing, since this project has gone over by several months, Trotter & Associates has submitted a Change Order for fees for those three months which was the original contract and the amount of time that we have overrun.

Aldr. Krieger: Didn't we see any of these problems coming?

Mr. Lamb: Unfortunately, no. HDPE is not widely used, but it is used and we spoke with other communities who used it successfully, both with HDPE and mechanical fittings. We didn't think it was going to be the issue that it was. Part of the reasoning for using this process was that the alternative would have been to essentially dig up a lane of North 5th Avenue (Rt. 25) and do it the way we did on North Tyler Road, which is all ductile, which is usually the conventional method. The soil underneath Route 25 is considered "hot" soil which is why the watermain underneath there right now is in the condition that it is. The utilities that were so tight in the Right-of-Way on both sides of Route 25 would have made it extremely difficult to trench that whole area so this was considered a viable alternative at the time. We had great success with running the HDPE underneath the river at Red Gate Road. Granted, that is a short stretch, but there was a couple radical angles going down the river and boring underneath the river through rock. Obviously there were no utilities there, but it will still be a challenging project and we had no issues whatsoever when we did that project.

We could not have anticipated anything to this degree.

Aldr. Lewis: It says it's not budgeted, so where does the money come from?

Mr. Lamb: Due to a number of these items we will also be asking for a budget addition for this amount. Those funds could potentially be reimbursed at the end of the project.

Aldr. Payleitner: How did we not have the Country Club on our GIS?

Mr. Lamb: The plans were reviewed by the Fire Department, Public Works and Trotter. No one was aware that the shed was on there until one of my water guys who has been with the City a long time remembered it when he was up in the area.

Aldr. Lemke: Isn't it a requirement? How could the Fire Department not generally know about it; the ability or need to provide water in that area?

Mr. Lamb: Once it was discovered, the first thing we did was call the Fire Dept. and they were extremely helpful in looking into what was in the shed and determined that it does indeed need to have a sprinkler system in it.

Aldr. Lemke: When you talk about "hot" soil, does that mean the backfill under the road was caustic, or what?

Mr. Lamb: There is an old railroad bed underneath that road, as some of you may know. The material from railroad ties is what creates that "hot" soil. The other advantage with HDPE is since it is non-ductile material it is not subjected to the corrosion, so we wouldn't have the issue again in future years.

Mr. Koenen: I just want to clarify that the St. Charles Country Club is not the service that was in question; it was actually a water service for a storage shed.

Chairman Turner: Back to Aldr. Lewis' point; is this money at this point coming out of reserves?

Mr. Lamb: Correct; it is coming out of Water fund reserves.

Aldr. Gaugel: I have some serious issues with this as we discussed, and maybe Mr. Trotter can address some of them. We paid him to do both the design work, as well as oversight for this project. From the looks of it, it seems as though you've absolved yourself of any responsibility in this whole thing to the tune of \$230,000. Can you address that? How did it get from a design that you gave the City to the oversight of the project to now all of these couplings and connections having to be dug up and be done over again, of which you are getting the majority of overruns and fees here.

Mr. Trotter: When this project was designed, it was designed with an HDPE system. That meant from one end of the job to the other. The fused joints have all held. The couplings at the T connections are what had this issue. The couplings are provided by the same manufacturer as the pipe itself. It is a system that is provided by one manufacturer. HDPE pipe is being connected to HDPE pipe. The question is whether this is related to the way it is being installed, or was it the coupling itself and how it is being fused? Is it a

materials issue or a workmanship issue. We have had specialists out, we have had multiple meetings, not only with the manufacturer of the couplings, but the supplier and the contractor and we have been involved with all of that. Trotter & Associates designed the system in accordance with what the City requested and the manufacturers provided us. When we came to construction, there was a very specific construction period. In fact, the contractor's original scope of work and project schedule showed this project to be completed three weeks before the contract deadline.

Because of the low bid and the subcontractor that the contractor hired, the work that was being done for this fusing unfortunately did not hold pressure. Yes, our people were on site and our people are trained. In fact, the manufacturer's people were on site and watched the first several installations. When the failures started to occur, obviously we were all confused because we have a manufacturing system that should work together. There was a considerable amount of time invested by all parties involved to investigate the cause of the failure. That has not been determined yet, but in the essence of trying to get this project done and Rt. 25 repaved before the snow flies, we had to finally make the decision to move forward with ductile iron fittings at all these connections. The final determination as to whether it was a material failure or a workmanship failure is yet to come.

With respect my Change Order as being presented, our contract for construction inspection included a specific amount of days that would parallel the contractors contract. It also included 50 hours a week for being on site. We provided that and because of the hours that they decided to work, 7:00 a.m. until 7:00 or 8:00 p.m., we were out there 12 hours a day, 70 hours per week. We have a very long standing relationship with the City, so my response is that Trotter & Associates has stood behind the project and will continue to do so. We are on this project and continuing to provide those services that were requested, but the services we are providing are beyond our contract amount.

Aldr. Gaugel: So if I understand correctly, the manufacturer is partly at fault?

Mr. Trotter: We don't know that yet.

Aldr. Gaugel: So we don't know if they are, do we firmly know if the subcontractor is at fault on this?

Mr. Trotter: We know the way the couplings were installed did not bond from the "T" pipe to the host pipe.

Aldr. Gaugel: So there are three parties involved that could potentially have some responsibility in this end result being the mess that it currently is. Of which, only one of them – yourself – has come back to ask for \$230,000 more to remedy the situation. The manufacturer hasn't, and that subcontractor hasn't. Is that accurate?

Mr. Trotter: At the moment, that is accurate. Are you suggesting that Trotter & Associates has done something wrong? The fact of the matter is that at this point we are providing services and have continued to provide services as we have in the past.

Aldr. Gaugel: I am not suggesting you have done something wrong, but there is responsibility that goes clear around the board on this one. Maybe this is a lesson for staff and Council that if the contractor was going to be working out there until midnight some nights and you needed to be there to supervise, then you should have had that in the contract.

Mr. Trotter: It is in the contract. There is a set amount of time to be spent in the field that the contract was estimated on and the contract provides clearly if there is additional time required that there is a mechanism by which that is done, but that also requires approval by Council to pay that. It can't just automatically escalate; it has to go through Council to have approval.

Aldr. Gaugel: How did we go from the initial bid of this which was \$234,000 to now having an overrun of just short of 100% of the initial proposed amount of \$230,000?

Mr. Trotter: At the moment, it's a time and material issue. We are not complete with the contract as of yet and there will be punch list work in the spring; we have tried to estimate these things.

Aldr. Gaugel: This one leaves a very, very bad taste in my mouth and I've expressed that to staff already. If the residents of the 4th Ward and people of St. Charles look at this and see this document and see that the original contract is written to \$234,000 and now we are adding an additional \$230,000 on to it – 100% increase. That is going to raise a lot of eyebrows, and it really does for me.

The other thing is how this is going to end, and that doesn't sit well with me as well. I talked about this with staff as well. The last project which was the Wastewater Treatment Plant didn't end perfectly for the contractor either. Here is my concern with this; if contractors get wind that Trotter + the City of St. Charles = problems which don't end well for them, we are going to end up paying for that in terms of quality, in terms of the quality of bidders that come through in the future and we are going to end up paying for it flat out in the price. It's going to happen; these guys talk and they know exactly what's going on.

Mr. Trotter: I recognize we are in a Public Meeting, but just to clarify – on the last project the final dollar to the City for the project was \$2,000 difference over \$10 million.

Aldr. Gaugel: Okay, let's address that then. At what cost? What was your contract amount initially and what did you finally end up with? If my memory serves me correctly, it was somewhere over \$200,000 that you got additional. So the expense of where that came from was in a settlement with the contractor. Is that correct?

Mr. Trotter: That is correct. I also ate \$80,000.

Aldr. Gaugel: So that's my concern. Future jobs that we have, if we are bidding these out and vendors see Trotter + the City of St. Charles are they not going to bid on it? Or are they going to build in additional cost because they know it won't end well, or are we not going to have firm competition? These guys talk, you know that.

Mr. Trotter: I do.

Aldr. Bessner: What happens if we don't approve this? Does everything stop?

Mr. Lamb: Potentially, yes. We don't have an inspector on site for the remaining work.

Mr. Trotter: We will continue on. We always have.

Aldr. Bessner: That doesn't answer my question. How does it affect the overall project, the timing? Would it be something where we would stop what we are doing and look elsewhere and regroup? Or would that create more expenses?

Mr. Lamb: Some of our staff is qualified to supervise, but we don't have staff to spare to do that due to the amount of time required out there. That's why we asked for them to be on site because we are not equipped with experienced staff due to the specialty equipment being installed.

Aldr. Lewis: Will there be more overruns or is this it? It sounds like there could be another request for funds?

Mr. Lamb: Mr. Trotter has projected out; some of this money hasn't been spent yet. Trotter's time from August 15 which is the original completion date to October 12 is approximately \$120,000 and then the other \$110,000 is what is projected out for the completion of the project.

Aldr. Lewis: But if the project isn't finished, then there will be another Change Order?

Mr. Lamb: Yes, but we feel confident now that we are in the home stretch with the project. We have gotten through all the issues with the HDPE couplings.

Chairman Turner: Is there a chance the City can be getting some money back on this or not?

Mr. Lamb: Yes, there is definitely the potential.

Aldr. Silkaitis: I need more than "potential".

Mr. Lamb: It could be through settling things with the contractor.

Aldr. Lemke: Are we trying to do the same thing again and again and expecting a different answer?

Mr. Lamb: We feel like we've got the answer now because we are changing mechanical joints. Martam is now out there with four or five crews daily in the areas which need to be completed along with the subcontractor, so they are out there hustling right now to finish that remaining work.

Aldr. Lemke: Is our pressure higher than other applications? I'm surprised that no one has encountered this before and proposed a scenario quickly.

Mr. Lamb: We didn't get up to full pressure when they leaked.

Aldr. Krieger: What about the days in July when there was no one working up there?

Mr. Lamb: Unfortunately the contractor had parts that were on back order.

Aldr. Bancroft: John, I have to be honest. Your material is insufficient to make a decision to justify the cost overrun. Right now I have one sentence that says "the scope and complexity of this project, weather delays, unforeseen circumstances, parts delays, changing of the scope". If I got this in another area of my life, it wouldn't be enough for me to sign a check and I don't see why we should sign a check right now.

Mr. Trotter, this is not anything against you or for you – I don't have any way on these two pieces of paper to justify, so I think this is just premature.

Aldr. Stellato: Based on that, we have more research to do. I move to table this item.

Aldr. Lemke: Second.

No further discussion.

Chairman Turner: Kristi, please call a roll for the motion to table this item. We will talk about this at the November 2015 Government Services Committee Meeting.

K. Dobbs:

Bancroft: Yes

Krieger: Yes

Gaugel: Yes

Bessner: Yes

Lewis: Yes

Stellato: Yes

Silkaitis: Yes

Payleitner: Yes

Lemke: Yes

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

5.a. Recommendation to approve Street and Parking Lot Closures for the 2016 Peapod Sly Fox Half Marathon.

Police Chief Keegan presented. Mr. Scott Iot from the Marathon is here with me this evening if you have any questions for him. This event will take place on Saturday, April 23, 2016. Parking lot and street closures are identified in your packet. We anticipate most of the road and parking lot closures to be open in time so as not to affect the lunch traffic. There are some modifications we put in place to make sure businesses are accessible for the morning and breakfast rush.

There are some costs associated with this request, and the event sponsor will reimburse the City for all costs exposed to the City.

Aldr. Krieger: On the map it looks like you are going up Randall Road, I would hope not.

Mr. Iot: No, we are going on the bike path.

Aldr. Lewis: This is your second year; was the first year successful?

Mr. Iot: Yes, it was very much. The weather didn't exactly cooperate with us; we had about 1,000 registered runners and about 800 who actually ran between the ½ marathon and the 10k.

No further discussion.

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

Motion carried

5.b. Recommendation to approve School Resource Officer Agreement for School Year 2015-2016.

Police Chief Keegan presented. This is a recommendation to approve a School Resource Officer Agreement for school year 2015-2016 with School District 303.

As you know, the St. Charles Police Department has enjoyed a long standing relationship and contract with our local school district to provide full time services at both of our high schools and ancillary services to the three middle schools that are sometimes affected.

As mentioned in the contract there is usually a fiduciary responsibility on behalf of the school district; that is being offset because of the Little Woods School Acquisition and the Red Gate Bridge Project. So we are not billing the school district for our personnel at the two respective high schools; that will be offset for a couple more years until the Little Woods School and Red Gate Bridge projects are paid off.

Aldr. Payleitner: Who signs off on this with the school district? I can't read the handwriting.

Chief Keegan: Dr. Schlomann.

No further discussion.

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

Motion carried

6. Additional Business.

None.

7. Executive Session.

None.

8. Adjournment from Government Services Committee Meeting.

Motion by Aldr. Lemke, seconded by Aldr. Payleitner. No additional discussion. Approved unanimously by voice vote. **Motion carried.**