

Committee of the Whole Minutes
May 17, 2011 – 7:30pm

Mayor Rooney called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm.

COUNCIL IN ATTENDANCE: Mayor Rooney, Aldermen Mike Cannon, Larry Buske, Brad Judd, Robert Banger, Jr., John D’Astice, Jim Larsen

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: City Manager Barry Krumstok, Deputy City Clerk Ginny Cotugno, Public Works Director Fred Vogt, Community Development Director Valerie Dehner, Police Chief Dave Scanlan, Deputy Fire Chief Scott Franzgrote, Assistant Finance Director Melissa Gallagher, Assistant City Engineer Jason Souden, City Attorney Jim Macholl

Mayor Rooney explained the 15 minutes allowed for presentations.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

1) Newly Elected Officials Training

Tom Bastian, from Storino, Romello, & Durkin, congratulated newly elected officials and re-elected officials. He gave an overview of the Open Meetings Act, Conflicts of Interest, Prohibited Political Activities Act, Ethics Code of Ordinance, Gifts Ban Act, and City Code dealing with the Interaction with Staff and Personnel. He encouraged all Council Members to read the various statutes and Ordinances that were in the booklet covering his topics that were presented to Council.

Mayor Rooney: One of the purposes that Council can go into Closed Session says the appointment and compensation of specific employees. Does that mean specific individuals, does it mean if there’s a class of employees that only have three, or four, or five that could be in closed session, or if its something that involves a certain number of people does that automatically make it open

Tom Bastian: No, you’re talking about benefits or discipline, if you’re going in to speak to discuss that, I don’t believe it’s limited to any one particular employee. That’s the reason for executive session, to discuss that in a closed meeting, you certainly don’t want to name or do anything in open session that might identify that class or that specific employee.

Mayor Rooney: The second question is about the meetings themselves. Before a meeting it’s just kind of natural that we’ll be standing around talking to each other waiting for the meeting to start. After a meeting it’s kind of natural that we’re all going to stroll to our cars. Is it so that literally when the meeting starts is when 3 people can talk about City business and that before the meeting starts, even if we’re standing around, it can’t be about City business

Tom Bastian: Well, let's assume you and Alderman Buske are standing here having a discussion and there are other Alderman around; they are not engaged in that discussion and you're not round tabling or saying well, ask him what he thinks. The act is clear, City business in open session with a majority of the quorum, is in violation of the Act.

Mayor Rooney: Thank you. For the record that's what 18 minutes 39 seconds felt like. I have told Mr. Krumstok that if someone comes to him and tells him that they just can't do it in 15 minutes, he can tell them that they can pass what they want to talk about to me and if I think it really can't be done in 15 minutes, they can have 20. I'll give them a 5 minute extension if they ask, but pretty much we all find this manageable as opposed to some of the stuff that goes on and on and on that people bring before us. Hopefully this will be something that helps out making these things a little smoother.

Tom Bastian: I would add one final note, the statute that I've provided is the Open Meetings Act as it stands today. It's going to change. The FOI Act is going to change. We can't rely on what we have today.

2) Consent Agenda

Mayor Rooney: The next two items are from me. The first idea involves the idea of generally talking about our Consent Agenda. In general, with the Consent Agenda, the rules we're talking about are Roberts Rules of Order and our City Code of Ordinances. If the City Code doesn't say something specific, then what's in Roberts Rules of Orders is what governs. Anything in the City Code that overrules that book is fine, but if the City Code doesn't say anything specific, then Roberts Rules of Order is all we go by and we can ignore the Code for now. In Roberts Rules of Order, there is the idea called Unanimous Consent and it basically let's you drop your guard for just about anything as long as nobody is in opposition. We have all these rules for a reason; it's to make sure that even just one person that opposes doesn't get trampled on by the majority. If there isn't one person who opposes things, then why bother going through the motion, and the second, and is there discussion, and let's call the vote. That's all there in case someone objects; if nobody objects, then you can shortcut and get to different things that are really more the meat of what we're here for. One of the big rules that protect a minority is that every motion has to be voted on separately. It keeps a majority from taking somebody who really wants an idea and bundling their idea together with two or three things that they would never vote for and saying you have to take it or leave it. If the person wants what they want, they have to give up their opposition to other things. You could turn it around, you could take something that you know someone is opposed to and attach it to three or four things that they really want and then they are stuck in the position of having to vote for the whole package. The rule says you vote on one motion at a time, now think about the consent agenda. The consent agenda passes a whole group of Ordinances through their first reading all at once. You might think there is going to be conflict and these two things means something's wrong here and we have a conflict in the rules. That's not the case. It's a use of unanimous consent. These two ideas go together very nicely when you put together the idea of the Consent agenda. What it says is we want to break the one motion at a time rule and bundle things together so if nobody objects, we get to, and as long as nobody objects, you can take as many things as you want to on first reading and put them together and pass them. If you take that idea, it yields some interesting results. This is why anyone can pull anything from the consent agenda. If any Alderman wants something off the Consent Agenda it's just pulled without asking for a second or

asking for vote. That's why the consent agenda is called the consent agenda. It is a use of unanimous consent to bundle ordinances together. If there is only one item on a consent agenda, you don't need a consent agenda. If we have a consent agenda with three items on it and two get pulled, you don't have a consent agenda anymore and you just move on. There are a lot of things we can do with unanimous consent if no one objects. All the resolutions can be put on a second consent agenda. If anyone wants to pull a resolution, you just pull it. We'll be talking about opening and closing the floor to the public, we'll be talking about that a little later, but in general there will be times where we have to open and close it. We can use unanimous consent and be done with these things in a second. We can amend a resolution.

Alderman Larsen: I'm not clear on how that would work in that case, I get the idea if you only have only one item there's no point in having a consent agenda, but you're saying opening and closing the floor at some later point in the meeting

Mayor Rooney: Yes

Alderman Larsen: In which case I'm not clear on how that would work

Mayor Rooney: We'll get to that. We can do some of the amendments we throw out where somebody says I like this idea, certainly not every amendment, we're not saying they all have to go through this way, but if it's an idea that someone seems to have no problems with, we can simply ask is there unanimous consent to just put this amendment through, if there isn't, then we would have to go through the motions and nothing's lost, but if there is, we can save all that time. Adjourning or recessing you can do by unanimous consent. Basically, how do you do this if you want to use this for these particular applications? Unanimous consent is sometimes a method of voting, we can say we want to have everyone say yes when their name is called, we can say we want to have a voice vote, the Mayor will say all in favor please say aye, all opposed please say no, and the Chair gets to pick how we vote unless the City Code says something has to have a particular roll call. If you hear me simply say "without objection" and pause and wait, and if you have an objection you simply raise your hand and say you have an objection, if nobody objects, we go on. As a final note, I'm just suggesting that we don't want to do this in one area. I'm suggesting that 2nd readings on ordinances should have its own vote all on its own, especially if they get through on 1st reading in a bundle. We should say we vote on every change to the law separately.

Alderman D'Astice: I say let's try it out

Alderman Larsen: I'm all for expediting the meetings. If this sets us on that course, I don't see why we wouldn't want that

3) Council and Committee of the Whole Meetings

Mayor Rooney: The City Council at its council meetings is actually a legislature that passes the laws. There is supposed to be a degree of formality with rule following. There are statements to be made; here's where I stand on this issue, here's why I stand in this place on this issue, you don't see people asking questions. Those interchanges take place at committee meetings. Committee meetings are less formal. You have more freedom to ask questions, rather than make statements. No action is taken at a Committee meeting; recommendations are made.

Alderman D'Astice: I'm willing to try anything. I have heard both sides of the issue. Some people say the vote comes up and we don't know what just happened. I sometimes don't have time to reach out to Staff when they're here. When I get a few minutes I'll shoot an email off because it is quicker to do that and then Staff can reply at their convenience to me and I can reply back to them if needed. If things get passed boom, boom, boom, people say how come no one asked any questions and then when there are too many questions, it drags on, then they say couldn't you get this done quicker. I think there is going to be somewhat of a mix between the two. I don't know if I'm ready to vote yes to items on the Consent Agenda or items removed from the consent agenda just so it goes to a Committee of the Whole. If I'm in opposition to it, I might just want to express my opposition the first time, at the Committee of the Whole, and at the second reading as well.

Mayor Rooney: I think you're mixing the two ideas in a way they're not intending to be mixed.

Alderman D'Astice: Ok.

Mayor Rooney: When I was talking about pulling something off the Consent Agenda, what that means is we now go through debating that as itself; it can't be bundled with something else

Alderman D'Astice: Understood, and then you also said that the debate should take place at a Committee of the Whole, not necessarily at the Council meeting, which is where it will be at that point and time

Mayor Rooney: But again, I think you're mixing things in a way that I did not mix them. The idea that I was talking about sending something to Committee of the Whole is a 1st Reading on an Ordinance, not a Resolution. Resolutions don't apply. When we pull a resolution off a Resolution Consent agenda there's only one reading, so nobody would say this has to go to a Committee of the Whole and I believe I was pretty clear in saying if you have questions, by all means have at it and do that, lets just try to be a little bit more judicious in the way we do it.

Alderman D'Astice: Understood, so there are 10 items on the Consent Agenda; 3 items get pulled; the other 7 pass; it's an ordinance

Mayor Rooney: I believe that what I said was that you can't do that. Either it's a resolution or it's an Ordinance

Alderman D'Astice: It's an ordinance

Mayor Rooney: No, there are resolutions and there are ordinances. There's a specific difference between them.

Alderman D'Astice: I understand that, Sir. When we have a Council meeting, the first thing that comes up is a Consent Agenda which is typically ordinances.

Mayor Rooney: It's always Ordinances

Alderman D'Astice: Ok, so there are 10 ordinances on the consent agenda; 7 get passed, 3 get pulled. What happens to the 3 that get pulled?

Mayor Rooney: The 3 that get pulled have a 1st reading debate, just like all of them do when we pull them off the consent agenda right now.

Alderman D'Astice: Ok, but didn't you just say you want to take those and move those all to the Committee of the Whole

Mayor Rooney: No, no sir, I did not

Alderman D'Astice: Ok, then I misunderstood you.

Mayor Rooney: What I said was in the case where we would need an answer from a business representative, because we told business representatives you don't need to be here on 1st readings to answer questions, what I said, and I thought I was clear, but if I wasn't I apologize, in those cases when staff says we don't have an answer for your questions Alderman, we would need to ask the business, those could get passed on 1st reading and sent to a Committee of the Whole. It's only that case that I mentioned.

Alderman D'Astice: Ok. Let's run it through and see how it works

Mayor Rooney: I fully recognize the point that Mr. D'Astice made first; that it is true that sometimes folks told me too, sometimes we don't know what you just passed, but I don't think it's because it doesn't have debate and it doesn't have questions. I had two specific people talk to me, which is why I hope you noticed that the descriptions of the resolutions and ordinances that we were talking about last week when I was in the chair were longer and more descriptive. I had folks specifically tell me, great when the thing says this resolution would give a contract to this company, you tell me the specific street address, but you don't tell me how much money, what for, and I don't know why we're doing it. So I've changed that already. The descriptions that we're giving now are much more friendly to the public in understanding how much money we're spending, whether there were bids, here's what its for, and even where it comes in relation to the budget. I think that would help with the concerns folks have where they say I don't know what just passed. Does that make sense?

Alderman D'Astice: Yes, but my point still was that when we pass things and there was no debate, people thought the fix was in. I think they like to hear a little bit of debate on certain things, on issues that are of importance to them. I don't think they care too much about x, y, z, but there are some things that are concerning to people and those are the ones that if they get passed just like that, they're like, what did these guys just do.

Mayor Rooney: Correct, but again, I would point out that in those cases, if we have something to say, that will happen. It's the questioning, it's the feel of a Committee during a council session that if we can minimize, it would help.

Alderman Buske: Let me make sure I'm understanding two points; one you're saying that if we have some questions Staff can't answer, we would suggest sending it to a Committee of the Whole.

Mayor Rooney: Yes

Alderman Buske: But on the other hand, we're talking about if the representative of the business is in the audience, wouldn't we open the floor to him right there, if he can answer, or do we just say no

Mayor Rooney: We could if they're there, but again, what I'm suggesting is we can tell people you don't need to be there on the first reading. If they felt it necessary to be there, then they can. If the people happen to be in the audience and council wanted to do that, they still could. In general, the idea says it's much more appropriate to open the floor to a business person during a Committee of the Whole. I remember Committee of the Whole meetings and there were people there interested in the topic and they were told at the beginning that just as a reminder this is a Committee of the Whole meeting and there is no public portion tonight so people are not allowed to speak. We should be opening that microphone at Committee of the Whole meetings and we shouldn't be opening it at Council meetings more than necessary.

Alderman Buske: I believe that we agreed on this a long time ago. My stance would be a Committee of the Whole meeting is to discuss everything to get ready for the voting. I never understood that point you're just saying, why can't we have people that are interested in this to talk about it. They might want to come here to change our minds on something. I would have to say this Council is not a rubber stamp, never has been. There's a lot of talk back and forth to find out what's happening, which forms your decision. I always try to call Staff on certain things that I have been concerned with to keep it out of the meetings. If I get answers that I don't like, I will ask that question again at the meeting. I agree with Alderman D'Astice that a lot of times you can't get all this stuff done because you can't find the time. You can get some of the things done during the day, but that staff member is not there.

Mayor Rooney: Which is why we're saying all of us do have a responsibility to make the effort and to try to minimize it as much as we can.

Alderman Buske: Our biggest change in the Committee of the Whole would be that we could open the floor

Mayor Rooney: If people want to speak at a Committee of the Whole, they should be allowed to.

Alderman Buske: I think it is a good point.

Alderman Judd: Are you going to contemplate, if you have 8 things on the agenda and you have 4 people that want to speak on each one, are you opening it per item or are you going to say in the beginning anyone that wants to speak, or are you going to say we're talking about number one; anyone wants to speak; number two; anyone wants to speak; number three; you could get it to four or 5 hour meetings; are you contemplating a second Committee of the Whole Meeting.

Mayor Rooney: If the Council is interested in putting together a plan for that, an idea would be a shortened version of the podium that happens at the public meetings. The Committee meetings, everyone would have a time limit. The rules right now for the public podium say 25 minutes, no more than 5 minutes per person. We could put an upper limit on how many things are allowed. We might want to say we'll allow five people to talk, or we'll allow 15 minutes.

Alderman Judd: You would expand it.

Mayor Rooney: Yes

Alderman Judd: My second question is, you have a consent agenda and someone pulls something off and you want to hear something from the business entity, and the representative is not there, is the Chair going to take the liberty to discuss things that don't necessarily include the business entity, in other words an Ordinance that has a fair amount of discussion to go, to say we're talking about this a fair amount and let's just pass it on Ordinance one and move it to the Committee of the Whole. Are you going to take the liberty to say let's put it on the Committee of the Whole to discuss further.

Mayor Rooney: One of the things we will be talking about in another one of these is when the Chair wants to take a liberty I can't really do that. I have to suggest that one of you do. The phrase for that is "The Chair would entertain a motion to", but it seems that every motion was phrased that way. That's supposed to be reserved for the Chair saying this would be a good idea, does anyone else agree. That will be the way that I would try to suggest, we've talked about this long enough, we're not ready to pass it tonight, we should refer this to a Committee of the Whole meeting. Does that answer your question?

Alderman Judd: Yes

Mayor Rooney: I do think that Mr. D'Astice is exactly right. We are going to have to feel our way through this one and I have no objections to feeling our way through it. I'm happy to err on the side of allowing more questioning than even I would like to see. I do think we're underestimating what a lot of folks think if it's free reign to do committee style debates during a council meeting

4) Traffic Control Devices

Fred Vogt: As a Traffic Review Committee initiative in regards to the Owl Drive corridor and concerns about speed control, we've identified several incremental improvements to consider, one has already been implemented with the stop signs approved a few weeks ago and installed at Bobwhite and the sports complex; the second initiative to investigate was one of speed display boards, those typically being the electronic type that by radar measure a vehicle speed, as a committee we would like to look at that as an option somewhere to be determined on Owl Drive in each direction between the stop signs for speed control. In many cases you see those in other communities that do have an effect. We researched this, there are examples in the packet, we've got several other vendors that provide similar types of products, the units cost anywhere from 4-5,000, it varies based on whether or not you use solar power, or hook it up to a known electric supply, we've also looked at some battery operated units that can last up to 30 days before they need to be recharged. There are several grant sources that may be available. It seems that grants aren't being decided upon or money is being provided, at least in the State, in the same manner we're used to seeing. We have applied for grants, we may have an opportunity to fund these partially or totally if we do get selected for grants. There is no money in the budget, FY2011, for these devices unless we were to re-prioritize some of the expenditures that are already approved there. We'll certainly look at the Police Department in that regard. What we were looking for was interest of the council in terms of pursuing the idea of the speed control displays. If so, we will

continue to search for the grants monies if they become available and look for savings, or other projects or expenditures that can be deferred later on in the season, or look at it as a consideration and initiative of FY2012 budget when we start preparing that later this year and just wait and install such devices next year. That's where we are right now.

Alderman Banger: These are permanent or semi-permanent

Mr. Vogt: I would say our recommendation would be semi –permanent. It's certainly something we would want to install on a regular basis, but would have the opportunity to move them elsewhere or if we see the need no longer exists, they could be removed

Alderman Banger: So the reason for existence of these would be to push people into compliance with the speed limit on Owl, they recognize based on the digital readout that they are going too fast, they slow down, so it's a damper on speed and my question would be is there scientific evidence that says these things modify behavior or is it where it modifies people's behavior for a short time and then the residents are used to it and continue with speeding behavior. The other thing is I would almost be reluctant to put something up if we're going to move it all the time just because it sounds complicated and adds moving equipment to our inventory

Mr. Vogt: The Committee did look at it as a more permanent installation basis as it was discussed the last couple months that as we are looking at some of the products, at least from the Public Works standpoint, we would like to consider, even though something might be intended to be permanent or mostly permanent, to at least have the opportunity if there is a need to take it out or to move it elsewhere

Chief Scanlan: In all cases we try to seek compliance. The more the community complies and supports what we're trying to do, if its just nothing more than an alert, they're not paying attention they're trying to get their kids to the Sports Complex, they're late, they recognize that they see the flashing lights, some of them once they're exceeding the speed limit will say slow down, people will do that and comply. Neighborhood speeding complaints are the biggest complaints that we get. We don't have enough officers to put them on all 34 locations that we are experiencing problems on, and speed calming devices have a history of being successful. They're not all the end of all of the problems, but generally speaking you'll get compliance. There is always 1 – 10% of the population who you will not get compliance from. One of the biggest problems with speed complaints in the neighborhood is the first people we write tickets to are the people that live on that street. Some are even the people that complaint to us. They're willing to accept it and sometimes we make them warnings. That's not necessarily what we're trying to do in some of the cases and these devices just bring it to people's attention that they're speeding and they work. I'm real supportive of it and excited about putting these out in town. It's certainly worth our time.

Alderman Banger: These versus a stop sign

Chief Scanlan: A stop sign, technically, is clearly not something you want to use to control speed. It might solve one problem and create three or four other ones. If you put more than one up in a roadway, people generally speed from one stop sign to the other. Unfortunately, we don't have the funds to do, and enforce, the other speed calming devices that we have at our fingertips, they're just extremely expensive. The only devices that we've had in the past are stop signs. Traffic Review Committee has been trying to find other devices like this one; there are speed bumps, the problem

with some of those things is that Public Works doesn't like them in the winter time because they cause problems for the plow drivers. We're doing the best we can with what we have. This is the device that I would recommend because I think it works.

Alderman Banger: They have to be deactivated at night, is that for aesthetics for neighbors so they're not complaining about blinking LED displays.

Mr. Vogt: That was the concern that was brought up with the Traffic Review Committee that if possible, we have them so they can be deactivated late at night so we don't get complaints about blinking lights or excessive light. We don't have to deactivate right away, but it's something we could look at because we are looking at neighborhoods and we do tend to get those types of complaints for unnecessary lighting.

Alderman Banger: I was also thinking just kind of a return on investment standpoint, you would not be recording speed around the clock and I would hate to pay a lot of money for something we would use 1/3 of the 24-hour cycle.

Chief Scanlan: Every situation is a little bit different. You take a look at where you have them, what the complaints are. Many times we would put our portables out and we'd turn them off because the kids like to speed to see how fast they can get them to go, so we would turn them off.

Alderman Larsen: We had been tossing around numbers more in the neighborhood of 1500 -1800 for these devices

Fred Vogt: You remembered correctly, the initial information had a number somewhere between a 1000 -2000, we later learned that was a quote based on just the solar aspect of the device. The device itself is generally about 3 or 4,000. To add solar would be another 1-2000. One of the things we didn't realize until we started researching this was the possibility of battery devices as well, but it would be less costly and as long as we're not out there changing them every day or every week would have long life, that might be something we would consider that doesn't appear to be at a less cost. We just want to avoid a ComEd connection, which is expensive and is a permanent connection.

Alderman Larsen: Hopefully we can get somewhat accurate initial information. That's a huge disparity. We also talked about speed tables as a possible alternative at some point. Ballpark what a speed table would run on a street the width of Owl Drive

Fred Vogt: Staff hasn't begun research on those yet. Certainly it's safe to say they're more costly than speed control displays. Whether it's speed tables, speed humps, that are made portably, we would look at that as perhaps the next level of the incrementalness of studying this issue

Alderman Larsen: There are portable ones available

Fred Vogt: For speed humps, yes. Things that you could set out there and pull up in the winter

Alderman D'Astice: A speed hump is essentially the same as a speed bump. We're talking about something that goes up maybe 6" and comes down within a foot

Fred Vogt: It's a hump, or it's a speed bump, as opposed to a hump or a table, so to speak, that may have a couple of inclines and declines to it.

Alderman Larsen: The only exposure that I have had to what I think is a speed table would be I've seen them permanently affixed where they come up about the height of a speed bump then extend out 6 – 8 feet and then come back down so that if you were plowing over them as a permanent fixture it wouldn't be that big of a deal, but if you're doing 25 you're okay, but if you're doing 35 it gives you a pretty good jolt and you're inclined to slow down. Am I understanding that correctly?

Fred Vogt: Yes

Alderman Larsen: I had no idea there was such a thing as a portable version of it. Certainly we're talking about two of these devices, one presumably going either way on Owl Drive

Fred Vogt: That was the discussion with the Traffic Review Committee to consider installing one northbound and one southbound

Alderman Larsen: With the potential to be supplemented by two others at some later date perhaps

Fred Vogt: I think that needs to be determined based on measuring the effectiveness of the first two that we put up and if they are effective, whether there is a need within the Owl Drive corridor

Alderman Larsen: I'm thinking that directionally if you have two, there's probably one for northbound traffic and one for southbound traffic, correct

Chief Scanlan: Yes, and we've got other locations in town that there's a lot of noise coming from, Fulle Street, down at the high school this time of year is when the kids are getting their driver's licenses and trying to get back and forth to the school, it's a nightmare. There are locations like that all over town where we get a lot of phone calls from people and it's frustrating. I've got 38 places to try and put squad cars and those cars are busy, so it's difficult to do and that's why if we get a couple on Owl Drive and they work and they have an effect, we should try to move them around. We do have some portables that we deploy periodically but they are battery operated, but we have had very little success with the batteries, we're constantly having problems with them and are constantly replacing the batteries, so those are a little more difficult for longer term locations.

Alderman Larsen: I'm certainly interested in exploring this further. I am also interested in exploring in greater detail the cost associated with portable and permanent speed tables just so we have some sense as to how many speed tables; can I put in one speed table, for example, for the cost of three of these devices. Is it 15,000 per speed table, we don't know yet. I'd be curious to know what those kinds of costs are.

Fred Vogt: We would be happy to have the Traffic Review Committee work on that and research that information. One other consideration the Committee made was some striping for parking to narrow the through lanes, as well as the potential because Owl Drive has some curves to center line stripe, with the intent that that might have a positive effect on speeds. There are a variety of things we can talk about roundabouts or rotaries and I think looking at the whole corridor with one possible exception, there really isn't room for that without right-of-way acquisition and that would become very costly, but we owe it to look at all options and get cost information on that

Alderman Larsen: Exactly, in the future, I'm interested in that information as a function of this discussion, otherwise we'd be looking at making a decision on whether or not to proceed with these devices absent the other information. I would hope that we would be looking at having all the different options available to us so that we can select from a full menu.

Mayor Rooney: I do think we want to broaden the discussion; personally I don't have any objection to the devices that were in the packet. I have very strong objections to speed tables and speed humps so I think we need to bring this back at another time when it's a broader item on our agenda, which we can certainly do any time we feel like

Alderman Larsen: Can we expand this to include that

Mayor Rooney: Sure

Alderman Larsen: I'm not convinced that speed tables or speed humps are the answer. We would be remiss to get to the point where we're potentially approving two devices 9-11,000 and we don't really know how much the striping or speed tables or speed humps and all those things would cost us and we find out after the fact it will cost less than we thought

Mayor Rooney: Is there any reason, Mr. Vogt, why we couldn't put a broader discussion on for July.

Alderman Vogt: It would be fine if Staff, including the City Engineer, had time to research that with the police department, absolutely we could do that

Mr. Krumstok: This is for discussion and direction. We're still looking for grants and other things. We'll be back in July with additional information

Mayor Rooney: If there were other questions, we could hold them until that time. Is that satisfactory to everyone

Alderman Buske: Chief Scanlan is sold on these things. I'm on the opposite side of that coin. There is one of these speed trailers on Rohlwing Road just north of Northwest Highway. The speed limit in that section is 25mph. They have it going southbound, nothing going northbound. It amazes me that we're talking speed control...this is not anywhere near speed control. This machine is 4500-5500. The old speed trailer we had took down a lot of data. These take down nothing. This is just a flash that shows them what speed they're doing. You can't get any stats off of these. I'd have to see some strong stats on that. I'm not set on these. I'd have to see some very, very strong stats. How do we know its working?

Alderman Cannon: Has the stop sign had any effect at all, either positive or negative

Chief Scanlan: We haven't run any speed studies. We're going to give them some time before we run any studies on them.

Alderman Cannon: Speed bumps are awful.

Alderman D'Astice: College Campus, Northern Illinois University, they have flashing speed monitors. First time I drove down there and driving normal and I hit the first speed table, at about 35mph, and I thought I was going to take off. When I got down to the end of it I hit my brakes and thought I was going to crash the car. I drove a little further, there was another one, I learned my lesson. There are four on that street in a residential neighborhood. I think they are permanent and I know they get snow there and they plow there. I'll tell you what, I've never gone over 25mph on that street. I don't know about the signs, but I can guarantee you that my experience is I slowed down a lot. I would encourage us to look at that, because if they put those up in DeKalb which has got snow and plows the snow, maybe you want to call them and ask them what their experience is because it's the same climate as ours.

Mayor Rooney: Any objections to bring this back as a wider topic to include the tables, the humps, the bumps, stripes and all the rest for July. That is the direction for tonight

5) Police Department Motorcycles

Mr. Krumstok: This is an issue from the past. Last year the City intended to sell the motorcycles for a minimum price that was not reached. Part of the discussion would be how much would it cost to re-commission the motorcycles and what would need to be done. As of late this morning additional information was found. In 1993 the Park District purchased one motorcycle. In 1999 two corporations purchased another motorcycle. In 2008 the City traded them in and brought two new motorcycles currently in inventory. In 2008 when we purchased the two motorcycles, the 1993 motorcycle we received \$4000 trade in; the 1999 we received \$6000 trade in. The overall price of the two motorcycles we have currently was over \$30,000, when you add in the trade-in prices the City paid \$20,395.00. We are asking what do you want us to do. The two options are either reduce the price for selling the motorcycles, or to re-commission the motorcycles. It will take roughly \$500 to re-commission those and it deals with lights, decals, etc. The police staffing we have, there are 6 officers currently eligible to be on the motorcycles and trained. Out of the six 1 is retiring 7/31; 1 individual is a detective; and 1 was promoted to a sergeant. These motorcycles have ABS, when they did have lights and sirens on when they were in the off mode, the lights could stay on. These are better motorcycles than the older ones.

Alderman D'Astice: I brought this up because a resident asked me to. The resident's idea was if we had the vehicles, the resident thought that the City could save money on gas by re-commissioning them. I don't see a whole lot of dollar signs here. In order for me to satisfy my curiosity, in terms of the sale of the vehicles, knowing that the City's gotten 20,395, I would be willing to set a lower price for the sale of those vehicles. Is it \$500 for both vehicles or \$500 per vehicle.

Mr. Krumstok: For both vehicles

Alderman D'Astice: So it's for both vehicles

MR. Krumstok: That is correct

Alderman D'Astice: Staffing – we had six – we will have 3 – the 3 need re-training. Is there a cost associated to the retraining of the three?

Mr. Krumstok: No, there is not. We do it in a large parking lot, because they are still certified, it's just bringing them up to speed

Alderman D'Astice: If we were to re-commission for \$500, no cost to retrain, is 3 people enough to run a motorcycle detail and what is the motorcycle detail. I don't see a lot of savings if you have a pair of them riding in tandem. Would they be on patrols, I would like more information on that. In the past we didn't do this program to the degree we could have and if I'm going to change my mind, it's going to take more than a few dollars in gas savings, because I see a lot more costs here.

Chief Scanlan: The motorcycles get 45-50mpg, which is better than the squad cars. Motorcycles were purchased with a partnership with the Park District to get the officers into the parks and the bike paths. The program was de-commissioned last year when the bikes were taken out of the Department's inventory and we still have a certified licensed trainer on board. Will have to look at how we can put the 3 remaining certified bike riders out there. The 4th is a sergeant who can still ride the bikes. They're primarily for Park patrols and radar enforcement on the side streets. For Public relations purposes there are outstanding. The unfortunate answer to your question is I don't control the weather, we don't ride in rain, we don't ride them on the midnight shift, we primarily ride them on days, some on afternoon shift.

Alderman D'Astice: I think you just answered my question. They envision the motorcycles taking the place of a squad car and you told me it's not

Chief Scanlan: They do radar enforcement on side streets

Alderman D'Astice: Radar enforcement, a squad car sitting on the side doing radar enforcement, there is no gas saving on that. I'm not saving any money having a bike do that

Chief Scanlan: I don't think they were designed for saving gas. They were originally designed to get us into places in town where a squad car can't get.

Alderman D'Astice: Would we be using these in lieu of patrol cars or in addition to, or using them for something else

Chief Scanlan: My view of them is that they are a tool that is an accent to what we currently have in the force and when an officer is on a bike, he is not in a squad, so there is some savings in relation to that

Alderman D'Astice: Do these officers get paid any extra for riding a motorcycle than driving a squad car

Chief Scanlan: No

Alderman D'Astice: Ok, so I would need more information to say yes move on, I'd like to know can you manage this with 3 people. There would be some kind of patrol. They're not going to be driving through the parks, they are going to patrol what a squad car would take, and this one would take patrol 1, based on the weather. If the weather is bad, the officer can jump to a squad car

Chief Scanlan: They would take them out in morning, and if it's raining they switch back to a squad. They are sent out to directly respond to something where we can't use the squad car.

Alderman D'Astice: Is it worth it to do this, or are we better off just selling them.

Chief Scanlan: They are a nice tool, they work, but that's all they are. We can use them for our Speed enforcement program and patrolling the park. The Public Relations provision of this makes it worth its weight in gold. It's a positive experience with the public.

Alderman D'Astice: It's a good PR tool

Chief Scanlan: I'm not asking you to buy the motorcycles, I'm suggesting that they're here and to see them sitting in the garage and not being able to use them is painful.

Alderman Larsen: What kind of enforcement shortcomings have you identified in not having the motorcycles in operation.

Chief Scanlan: We're not patrolling the bike paths. When the motorcycles were being used in the parks, I thought that was effective

Alderman Larsen: Have we had any kind of increase in vandalism or illegal activity in the parks

Chief Scanlan: The parks are always a challenge for us. We have large green space; it's difficult to easily patrol the green spaces. We have officers on bicycles in the park. We can't use bicycles for radar

Alderman Larsen: So you have the one sergeant who is a certified trainer

Chief Scanlan: We have a patrolman as a certified trainer, we have a sergeant who just got promoted that is a motorcycle specialist, and we have 3 other people that can ride, we have one detective that can ride

Alderman Larsen: But realistically we have 3 persons that would typically use these

Chief Scanlan: We have 4 people assigned to patrol that are motorcycle certified; one of them is on the midnight shift, I can move him to a different shift

Alderman Larsen: Is it likely that you would move him to a different shift simply to use the bikes?

Chief Scanlan: If we had those as a tool, I would certainly use him if we could

Alderman Larsen: In a perfect world, how many guys would you have certified to use the bikes?

Chief Scanlan: I would say probably 8 officers – 2 on each shift

Alderman Larsen: Would you want more officers certified

Chief Scanlan: Yes, I would

Alderman Larsen: What's the cost to train them?

Chief Scanlan: Our certified trainer is retiring. He was doing all of our training so the cost of our training was significantly reduced. I would have to send someone to school for the train-the-trainer program

Alderman Larsen: How long does training take?

Chief Scanlan: It's a 3 week program

Alderman Larsen: The person who is the trainer now

Chief Scanlan: It's a 4-5 day training program depending on their skills

Alderman Larsen: So that individual is not leaving until July. So in theory, if we approve re-commissioning of the motorcycles, you could have 2-3 officers trained by this trainer by the time this person leaves in July

Chief Scanlan: Potentially, but we have to outfit them with uniforms and that does get expensive

Alderman Larsen: What is the expense for that?

Chief Scanlan: Motorcycle pants, and the boots and the helmets is expensive; its 5-600 per officer

Alderman Larsen: And that would be funded by the Department

Chief Scanlan: Yes, and none of it is budgeted

Alderman Larsen: The trainer is leaving, but I could get 2 or 3 guys trained, but I couldn't get them outfitted, but I could at least get these guys trained

Chief Scanlan: The wheels are spinning in other areas. Motorcycles are not my priority right now.

Alderman Larsen: The Park District contributed to the purchase of these. To what degree did the Park District contribute to these?

Mr. Krumstok: The 1993 motorcycle was 9,000 and some change. The 2008's replaced the 1993 and 1999 motorcycles. They passed a resolution that allowed the police department to patrol the parks.

Alderman Larsen: They currently have no investment in our motorcycle program

Mr. Krumstok: Not at this point in time

Alderman Larsen: Is there any reason why we couldn't explore the Park District financing whatever the cost of uniforms are

Mr. Krumstok: We can always ask

Alderman Larsen: What prevents us from re-commissioning the bikes and leaving them available for sale?

Mr. Krumstok: Nothing. We would pay \$500.00 to re-commission them, and then have to pull all the stuff off them. There would be two costs associated with that

Alderman Larsen: We're using them, the miles will go up. Does seem to have \$20,000 in assets sitting there doing nothing. If we've spent the money on them, why not use them to the best of our ability. I don't know about the \$9,000 sale figure. I don't know the market well enough. \$13,500 was obviously not doable. Someone wants to offer an acceptable number, then strip the equipment and sell it. Is there any reason we can't take that approach

Mr. Krumstok: If that's the direction. We're just looking for direction.

Alderman Larsen: I don't know the market, it seems curious to me that we would lower the price 30% or more. How badly do we really need to get rid of them?

Mr. Krumstok: The highest bid was \$11,000

Alderman Cannon: Would you like to have these bikes back. Does staff feel it's valuable to them?

Chief Scanlan: Yes. They enjoyed that part of the job

Alderman Cannon: We have to support the Chief in this or sell them. Don't re-commission and then sell them...that's not fair. I think that anything you can do to get close to the people helps everyone. I don't see a downside to this.

Alderman Buske: Basically, when these went up for auction at \$13,500, we were offered 11,000 and we didn't take it. You have here to lower the price to 9,000; I think that's really cutting it low. The problem with motorcycles, we're talking about putting all our cards on saving gas, to me that doesn't cut it. You've got so many days you can ride, so many you can't ride; you have the expense of uniforms, just to use it as PR, that's not my bag. The squad cards with kids will give you the same PR. The biggest thing I see here, I recall you never saw the motorcycles, then all of a sudden you'd say where are the motorcycles and the next day you would see two of them out there. When you see two of them riding together, what good is that? You don't see two officers in a squad. If you stop someone for speeding, you can't handcuff them to the back of the bike, so you're going to call a squad, that's more gas. So don't put the emphasis on saving gas. The cost of running them is not that exceptional. \$500 is putting lights and decals back on. Tuning them up is nonsense. I want to see a plan presented to Council where these bikes will be used in the residential areas. Anything that I have ever heard is that they never see a squad car in their neighborhood. We're not talking about adding two more police officers, they are either in the squad car or they're on the bikes. Unless we have a plan on these things, I see no reason to re-commission them. I don't see us getting that much use out of them. I would not go any lower than 10 – 10,500 if we are going to sell them.

Mayor Rooney: All the folks that were in the queue to talk have. If the options are 1 and 2, lower the minimum sale price, just take the 9,000 figure out, lower the minimum sale price basically says I want them gone; re-commission them obviously says stay, how many hands would vote for option 1, just lower the price and still get rid of them – 3; and how many folks would say let's keep them 3. What if we said we would like the Chief to have this in a staff report on May 24th? Mr. Farina will be seated as an Alderman and at that point it's just a report that night. If we've got a divided Council right now, if there is anyone that has something to say that would change a person's mind, I'm willing to hear that, but right now we're deadlocked and we are awaiting a seventh member, I think we have to say the deadlock means we are stuck for now. Does anyone object to saying, Chief could we have Mr. D'Astice's questions answered in a staff report at the next council meeting, it's just information at that point, people can ask clarification questions and then we can sound out our 4th member and give folks a chance to think about this a bit more. Does anyone object?

Alderman Judd: I do unless you bring it back up at another COW meeting; because I'm not wasting time now without being able to say my piece.

Mayor Rooney: No one is saying you will not be able to say your piece, we're just saying we'll move it on and let people think. We will go to item six.

6) California Avenue Right-of-Way

Mr. Krumstok: In April, a resident in this area, 2451 Chapman location, inquired about the property. Staff met with him and told him that we would bring this up to Council to see if they wanted to move ahead with this. We went back to the 2008 inquiry from the same resident for the appraisal for just his location. This did not deal with the entire piece of property we're talking about, the California right-of-way. We asked the resident to go back to his neighbor at 2461 Chapman and ask him about it. There is no money in the 2011 budget to do an appraisal of the entire California right-of-way. We want Staff direction what next steps to deal with. The resident was informed that this would be before the City Council tonight. If an appraisal is completed, the City doesn't know what would be done at that point.

Mayor Rooney: I'm assuming that the reason we are pointing out there is no money budgeted for an appraisal is because somebody might say if we're going to sell it we would get the appraisal money back, but if it doesn't sell, then the City is on the line for the appraisal cost. If that turns out to be a deal breaker because people feel that the appraisal is too high, then the City is the one holding the bag, is that correct?

Mr. Krumstok: Correct

Alderman D'Astice: You can't sell one piece without selling the second piece.

Mr. Krumstok: That is correct

Alderman D'Astice: So you need to let the person know that. I'm all in favor of selling it with what the market will bear, but we don't know what the market will bear, so why can't we just tell the interested party or parties that we will hire an appraiser, they are on the line for the appraisal one way or another, they pay for it, if they like the price then they can buy it from us and if they don't

like the price they still pay the appraisal and it's their choice at that point, as opposed to us, the residents being on the hook for the price of the appraisal, offer it to them if they're interested in it.

Alderman Buske: We had a lot of dedicated roads we sold off. Every appraisal we got, we didn't come close to selling this stuff. Who was doing the appraisal at that point? Were we paying for it or was it us putting figures together

Mr. Krumstok: No, we do utilize an appraiser

Mr. Macholl: Bruce & Company did the appraisal for a portion of this

Alderman Buske: I wasn't only talking California, there was Smith Street. Even when we went to the wells, we said we were going to keep so many wells activated in case this pipe would break from Chicago, plus we have interconnections with other Cities, but if they came up with this property, this is worth 900,000, all of a sudden when it comes down to sell it, probably about 40-50,000. Do we pay for these appraisals?

Mr. Macholl: We paid for it. For the appraisal for the portion of California Avenue that was prepared in October of 2008, the City paid for it.

Alderman Buske: What would an appraisal like this cost?

Mr. Macholl: This one was 1200.00

Alderman Buske: That isn't much

Mr. Krumstok: That was only for a section. You have to do the full length

Mr. Macholl: You could pretty much double it. If you're talking about California Avenue you're talking about 100x33 one segment to the north and the second immediately to the south. I think it would be a pretty good ballpark figure

Alderman Buske: I wouldn't want to pay for the appraisal. Somehow you could put it into the sale price.

Alderman Cannon: Is this buildable property

Mr. Krumstok: It is not currently buildable; there are a lot of utilities overhead and underground in this area

Alderman Cannon: Has this gentleman expressed a desire to buy it

Mr. Krumstok: He has expressed an interest. This area does hold water. After we did some work in this area, it drains much better.

Alderman Cannon: Did you tell him we had an appraisal for 43,000 a few years ago

Mr. Krumstok: He knew about past appraisals. He had not seen it.

Alderman Cannon: Did he react to that one way or another

Mr. Krumstok: He didn't take it

Alderman Cannon: If it was 43,000 three years ago, to get 30,000 for it now would be manna from Heaven. Is the other piece buildable?

Mr. Krumstok: None of it is buildable

Alderman Cannon: Then anything we can get, we don't want to keep it do we

Mr. Krumstok: All that we would be maintaining are the right-of-ways; specifically ComEd is in the area.

Alderman Cannon: Can we cut a deal with this guy. Why don't we ask what he's willing to pay for it? Can we do that?

Mr. Macholl: If you want to sell surplus property, which is what this is, then under the Municipal Code, you need to get an appraisal, because the sale price cannot be anything less than 80% of the appraised value. Secondly, when the appraisal came in, I did send it to the property owner's attorney

Alderman Cannon: Anything we can get for this property is a benefit to the City. They would have to take care of it also

Alderman Judd: Looking at the map it says Fairfax Avenue then California comes up to it, there is a 41 and 4 lots there, are those all developed

Fred Vogt: There is a single house on the east half of those 4 lots, but the rest of it is vacant

Alderman Judd: The box that has the 41 in it

Fred Vogt: The house is roughly where the 41 is on the map

Alderman Judd: Does that person have any interest in this property

Fred Vogt: My understanding is that all parcels that are adjacent to the subject area if it were to be vacated would have an option to purchase the property. We can't just sell it outright to a single property.

Mr. Macholl: They changed the statute so that we can actually sell to either or all to one adjoining property owner

Alderman Judd: Have we determined if there is any interest in the person at 41

Mr. Macholl: The 41 block, I don't know. I sent correspondence to the neighbor to the South to see if they were interested in obtaining the rest of the property... I have not heard anything from the property owner on the West

Alderman Judd: I guess my contention is we sell both to either one of these guys, but get a fair market value. So I don't want to take the first guy and sell it to him and then we're stuck with the other half of this that we can't do anything with which detracts from the value. Now he has a 280 ft lot vs. what he has now, it expands and makes a real nice piece of property. Number 12 is 100 ft lot and he is 41 which is 150, so if he owns that whole piece of property he has almost a 300 foot lot. If someone would decide to tear that down, you could end of with a nice cul-de-sac in there. I don't want to jeopardize that potential just to sell that thing. I think those things have to be taken into consideration

Fred Vogt: The house that is there is an older house, from a Staff's standpoint we speculated that this property could, or part of it could, make that lot bigger if it were re-developed. We suspect that 5-10 years from now it will be redeveloped in some form. We agree that there could be some value to adding to that lot.

Alderman Judd: Based on that, I'm not interested in selling it at all

Alderman Banger: It scares me to slice and dice, especially things that have easements. I agree with Mr. Judd about hanging on to this in terms of the big picture. When you start chopping up these off-centered easements, you have issues; I want to put up a fence, now your fence is not on the parallel with common property line and that's just the kind of unregulated developments you don't want to have. If all the stakeholders there would be in agreement, I would be a big fan of making some money and putting something on our balance sheet and getting something off the idle land parcels that we have. Unless there is something planned, and it wasn't sliced and diced, I wouldn't be a fan of this.

Alderman D'Astice: Mr. Macholl, you did say in order for the City to sell, we have to have an appraisal done and it can't sell for less than 80% of that. The decision has to be, do we want to spend 12 or 1500, have the land appraised, and then we have options. Right now we have no options. We can't sell it if we wanted to; we can keep it, that's the only two options, so if we wanted to sell it we would have to have an appraisal done. That's the decision the council has to make first, first we have to spend 12-1500 for the appraisal and then do we want to sell it to one guy, two guys, to six guys, to a development, then we have options. At this point we have no options

Alderman Buske: I am very familiar with the house. This is where the road bends from Fairfax to California. We'd be better off if we held on to it until the lots are brought up. Why didn't these streets ever go through?

Mayor Rooney: We don't know

Alderman Buske: I think our best shot is to hold on to it and put the whole parcel together, I think we would get more money from the builder who wants to have that extra 33 feet

Mayor Rooney: How many folks if the choice was just stay put right now, not even go out for appraisal, just we are not interested in selling at this time, I've heard multiple opinions, I want to know how many there are, how many folks say not interested in selling right now – 4. Unless there is any other point to be brought up, we stop there.

7) Fourth of July Fireworks

Mr. Krumstok: This is just a discussion item. Prior discussion was to create the foundation to go for the 501c3. The foundation is established and incorporated, however we do not have the 501c3, so we are here to talk about the 4th of July because that was a major discussion we had regarding the budget and also part of one of the revenue line items deals with some money to offset certain things in the 4th of July. We need direction to move ahead, if the Council says continue with community events, then you would see a Resolution next week on May 24th that would authorize a contract for the fireworks

Mayor Rooney: The money is in the budget, it seems to me, with this item being reported, unless folks say let's not do this, the assumption is we go ahead

Mr. Krumstok: That is correct and Staff just wants to confirm

Alderman Larsen: We've already discussed this as a function of the 2011 budget considerations and we did say let's see where we at around this time. Since we don't have the 501c3 designation, there is no other funding to draw from, therefore we fall back to plan A which was to fund fireworks out of the budget funding we approved. I do have questions about the Foundation's legal status, how are we coming on the 501c3.

Mayor Rooney: Mr. Macholl, let's keep this short, the topic is fireworks. We can talk about the 501c3 at a later date

Mr. Macholl: There is process that needs to be gone through for the 501c3 letter that we would potentially get from the IRS. That's all being worked on. I would happy to tell you after the meeting where that's at

Mr. Krumstok: We do have foundation papers, so the State of Illinois knows that the City of Rolling Meadows Community Foundation is set up, but we need the papers on the 501c3.

Alderman Larsen: This is a foundation that has no staff to the foundation; it's a paper foundation at this point

Mr. Krumstok: There are technically 3 people on the incorporation documentation – Barb Lusk, myself, and Melissa Gallagher

Alderman D'Astice: So if this was a resolution, how would I say Mr. Mayor I would like to ask for unanimous consent?

Mayor Rooney: Hopefully we wouldn't even need that with the direction we got earlier, there will be a consent agenda of resolutions and as long as it doesn't get pulled it will sail right through

Alderman D'Astice: Nothing more to be said

Mayor Rooney: Maybe in general there is nothing more to be said

Alderman Buske: When going over the budget for this, a lot of the residents said get rid of it to save money; others said no, we've got to keep this. They used to have cans in the store for your change. That's where all the money came from for the fireworks. Nothing came from the City. I was hoping that we did understand that we had to keep the money in the budget. We should do the same thing next year with the foundation. This gives the residents a chance to pitch in with putting money in the cans. If you say you want it, are you willing to donate?

Mayor Rooney: Is there anyone who does not agree that we will use budgeted funds. There's your direction

8) Salary & Benefits – Discussion Continued from April 12, 2011 Council Meeting

Mayor Rooney: We move on to Salary & Benefits and that's what it's titled; it's the transparency issue. The specific recommendation from the Staff is that once the budget discussion is done; there is a part of that that deals with transparency. Does anyone feel the need to push the issue now?

Mr. Krumstok: This is from the April 12th Council Meeting where we had some discussion on posting additional information on our website. Staff's recommendation is when we're starting to work on the 2012 budget I do have a plan as to how information will be presented to deal with the web and transparency issues. We're asking for Council to wait for the 2012 budget, see how I'm presenting additional information and that would spark discussion, and what you'll see at that point you'll like. If we move ahead, there would be a resolution and discussion that staff needs to have because of certain rules such as HIPPA and other concerns that I have.

Alderman D'Astice: I know that this is something that Alderman Adams had a real desire to see happen. He was concerned about transparency. He was concerned that the residents know the salaries. Waiting until the 2012 budget means we are waiting another 6 months. The City has to put that information in the newspaper.

Krumstok: By state statute we do have to put that information in the paper - ranges

Alderman D'Astice: Why can't we take those ranges and start with that. At least it shows the residents that we're working towards it. We have that information and then fine tune it in the 2012 budget, but to do nothing right now and knowing that we have the opportunity to do it, I think we should move forward and put that out there for all to see

Mayor Rooney: Mr. Krumstok, what was the last publication date when something was sent to the newspaper

Mr. Krumstok: I believe that was done in 2010, it might have actually been in 2011. Annually you have to do that.

Mayor Rooney: Is there an objection to taking whatever was posted last, in the form it was posted, and making a link to it on the website. Mr. Judd, you would object

Alderman Judd: Yes

Alderman Larsen: I've heard people bring this up to the previous City Manager. Other municipalities publish people's salaries. What is to be gained by this? I'd be ok with posting whatever we previously published on our website. I'd be OK with waiting on Barry's plan to unfold. I do have some misgivings somehow unilaterally posting people's salaries and benefits for some desire to see what people make so people can stew about it. I'm not sure what the point is

Alderman Buske: Every penny this City spends, whether it's employees or vendors, that's what you're talking about. Basically, do you want to use names or not, they're in there anyway. Buffalo Grove prints this. They talk about everything, even how much retirement they put in. I think what we're talking about is transparency. I don't see any problem with posting it exactly as Buffalo Grove does. I think the people have the right to know what our people are making here. Transparency and Honesty, I agree, let Barry bring something back

Alderman Judd: The reason I object to ranges, they are worthless. Tell someone this guy makes between 65 and 100,000 doesn't tell me anything. As a resident looking at numbers, we have 48 people that make between 65 and 100 – do they make 66 or 99 and what percentage makes 66 and what percentage make 99? That's valuable information, when you're trying to figure out where your expenses are. But to know a range, it's worthless. I don't understand why we wouldn't want to do this. The taxpayers are paying the salaries. Why shouldn't we have a right to know what they make? We should know what the benefits are. Why is 85% of the general fund salary and benefits? Maybe the salaries only come out to 48% of that, and the other 45% of it is benefits and vacation, and sick time, and insurance. That makes a difference if all of a sudden 75% of that is coming out to be salaries. We raised taxes 1.3 million dollars in electric tax 3 years ago, 1.5 two years ago, a million last year, we're going to raise them 1.3 million this year. Why is it? Because our employees get paid x amount of dollars and if we continue to pay our employees x amount of dollars, we have to raise the taxes on everybody, so why shouldn't the residents know why we're raising the taxes. And if they know that employee x makes 82,000 and he is being given a 4% raise as of January 1st, and he is going to be making 85,600, they should know that, especially when we're saying pony up more money, even though your house value has gone down, even though you've been furloughed, even though you're not working as many hours, even though your 401k is in the dump, guess what, pony up more because we're going to pay these people more. And when you start saying wait a minute, I'm only making 52,000, and everyone at the City makes x, I think that's something the residents should know and I don't know why we don't spell it out for them in black and white. I understand what Mr. Krumstok is trying to do moving forward, but this doesn't detract from what you're doing moving forward. You're taking the information on a spreadsheet that you have in Human Resources and you say this is exactly what each person makes and you put it on the website. It doesn't detract from what you're going to do 6 months from now with the budget. Those numbers aren't going to change. You're still paying a guy 58,000 now, you're still going to pay him 58,000 in six months, so all we're doing is providing the information for the residents and I think they deserve to know.

Mayor Rooney: I speak on this issue as the only person on the Council whose primary salary is public knowledge to whoever surfs the web. I have no issue with posting salaries. I will demand absolute accuracy in what we print. Anybody can search my name and be told I make over 9,000 more than I actually make. The number is wrong. I will demand that for something like my salary, I get an extra stipend for that, I demand that that be separated out as a stipend. I don't have any problem with that figure being out there as long as it is accurate and as long as it is as detailed as it needs to be. There has been some pretty blatant abuse of these numbers. People taking someone's salary and their benefits and their additional duties, everything including the value of retirement, and lumping into one sum and saying that's what somebody makes. I would demand that we have a salary column, benefit column, and all the rest. That takes a while to produce. With the level of accuracy I demand, it is going to take a little while. Why don't we let him do it as part of the budget process, but if folks don't want to do that and are impatient to make it move forward, I don't object. It's not that big of a deal for people to know as long as we insist it be accurate because a lot of the abuse of these statistics could have been nipped in the bud if this stuff was up on the website and somebody inflating the statistics to talk about a person's position could have had it pointed to by anyone on the web, you're exaggerating your points. They're salary is high enough to scream about, you don't need to be unfair and add all these other things in.

Alderman Larsen: It's hard to argue against the concept of transparency, but I've seen things posted in the newspaper. Invariable someone says, the guy gets a hundred grand, I'd do it for half of that, except that the guy has been doing it for 25 years and the person who would do it for half that is not even remotely close to being qualified, but you see this regularly. I'm confident that we are not trying to hide anything. I just don't see what is to be gained by identifying that supervisor x earns 73,400 and then his benefits are x without the context of and he's been on the job for 26 years, and maybe part of that is accumulated overtime. I think it is very difficult to get the whole picture or just starting to lay out pounds of numbers. To Mr. Judd's point about well is the salary 45%, and something else is making up the 55%, I think it's valid to have some kind of analysis of that and identify the people, this is what additional benefits cost you as taxpayers. Frankly I don't know why taxpayers need to know what each individual makes. You have elected representatives that are involved in this. That's why you had an election and select people to represent you, not so you can know the nitty gritty of what everybody in Public Works, or Fire Department Commander makes. Its one thing to say the President of the United States makes 200,000 and a police commander makes this even though you didn't put the guy's name on there. There's too much potential for abuse of that. So to your point, Mr. Mayor, about accuracy, yes, if it could be done accurately. I'm not sure how that would actually be done

Alderman Buske: I agree with Alderman Judd, I don't want to see ranges; I want to see actual salaries. Did you get that Mr. Krumstok, Buffalo Grove's list?

Mr. Krumstok: I know what you're referring to and I have concerns about that. Again, HIPPA has to be complied with. I want to reiterate, I have a plan and you will see this. I think a lot of these things we are talking about you are going to see. Salaries are one thing, benefits are another. We are nailing it down and that's the plan, base salary, longevity, all these things are narrowed down. It does take time. It's going to be done; give me the time and when you see the 2012 budget I think you'll like what you see.

Alderman Buske: I don't have a problem with it taking a little while longer. We will get it done. What is HIPPA?

Mr. Krumstok: It deals with health insurance. If an outsider can say that person is attributed to that medical, that's a violation because HIPPA specifically states all medical records, medical issues, they can't narrow it back to you.

Mayor Rooney: Let's return to the main topic. I want to take one second to point out to be careful with our terms. The employers of the public employees do know and can know what they make, that's us. When we throw out the simplistic argument that the taxpayers pay the salaries, I don't believe that if I own a piece of stock in a company, I don't think I have the right to know what each person is making. I also think, let's be fair, nobody said let's publish ranges and then stop. What we said was to publish the actual data will take awhile and it would be a nice step in the direction to, in the meantime throw the ranges out so that at least we can say here is something that didn't take us any time to produce. Nobody was saying let's just do ranges and stop. We were saying if you don't want to put the ranges up on the website, there will be nothing up on the website until this process is over. And it might not be a bad thing to have ranges that were in the paper. Let's be fair.

Alderman Judd: Based on that thought process, I don't disagree. We talk about private vs. public. The Public sector has the right to vote us in; they don't have a choice as to what they are paying in taxes. When you live in the City of Rolling Meadows, and your property taxes are due, you're going to pay the City of Rolling Meadows. When you do a construction project, you're going to pay the permit, when you buy your sticker you're going to pay the City of Rolling Meadows; you do not have a choice as to what those things are. Since I don't have a choice, do I want to pay \$22.00 for a vehicle sticker or do I want to pay \$18.00, I should have those rights.

Mayor Rooney: When I was an alderman, I was sick and tired of hearing customer service applied to public employees and public services because I'm not a customer, I don't get to go to another town and buy a sticker if I don't like the way it is going, and more importantly, I'm a citizen, a citizen is a whole lot higher on the respect scale than a customer is and people should be treated that way.

Alderman Buske: I hate the term customer as well. People in the City are property owners. They own a part of the City. I always despised that term "customer"

Mayor Rooney: Me too, we are in agreement. Straw Poll wise, let's go back to what we were discussing. I think there are two different issues here: #1 do we want to have a process that will post specific information as separate from the budget process, meaning a little sooner if possible, or wrapped into the budget process and that will be one; depending on how that goes, our second issue is do we want to post range information in the meantime, no matter what happens. Let's treat them separately – first thing I want to know about is how many folks would say if your choice was let's get a process for transparency as part of the budget process, or sooner than that as choice # 2. How many would say as part of the budget process is soon enough for you – 4. How many would say I want it sooner – 2. Four was a determinative before because it is a majority of any council...we'll say for the budget process as of now. I will help get this done. Since we are waiting for part of the budget process, how many folks would be in favor of, in the meantime, posting the range information on the website. That's everybody. Mr. Krumstok do you need any further direction? Without objection we'll adjourn. Is there objection?

Committee of the Whole Meeting
May 17, 2011
Page 26

Committee of the Whole Meeting adjourned at 10:31pm

Respectfully submitted by Ginny Cotugno, Deputy City Clerk

May 17, 2011 Committee of the Whole Minutes approved by Council on June 14, 2011.

Ginny Cotugno, Deputy City Clerk