

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
MINUTES – June 14, 2011**

**Mayor Tom Rooney called the Council meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.**

**Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag:**

**ROLL CALL:**

Present: Cannon, Buske, Judd, Banger, Jr., D’Astice, Larsen

Absent:

**Staff Members Present:** City Manager Barry Krumstok, Deputy City Clerk Ginny Cotugno, City Attorney Jim Macholl, Community Development Director Valerie Dehner, Assistant Finance Director Melissa Gallagher, Fire Chief Ron Stewart, Police Chief Dave Scanlan, Public Works Director Fred Vogt, Assistant Public Works Director Bob Hartnett

Mayor Tom Rooney read the following statement:

MEMBERS OF THE AUDIENCE ARE REMINDED THAT THESE PROCEEDINGS ARE BEING VIDEO TAPED FOR CURRENT AND FUTURE BROADCAST OVER THE CITY’S CABLE TELEVISION CHANNEL.

**MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES:**

The Chair would ask unanimous consent to consider the minutes of the May 24, 2011 Council Meeting; and the May 17, 2011 Committee of the Whole Meeting together, without objection. Are there any additions, deletions, or corrections to the minutes?

Yeas: Cannon, Buske, Judd, Banger, Jr., D’Astice, Larsen

Nays: 0

Absent:

Minutes Approved

➤ **MOTION TO DEVIATE:**

Alderman Larsen made a motion to deviate; motion seconded by Alderman Buske

- 1) Swear-In Ward 2 Alderman Jim Allen

The Chair would like to place in nomination for the vacancy of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Ward seat on the City Council Jim Allen. Is there a motion to approve Mr. Allen’s nomination? Alderman Cannon made the motion; it has been moved and seconded to approve the nomination. Is there discussion?

Alderman D’Astice: Having read the information you provided about Mr. Allen, I am confident that he will be a fine alderman and meets the qualifications to represent the people of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Ward. However, I will be not voting for him. I believe that we had four initial candidates, one you had selected leaving three, and then when the first one said no, I thought for sure you would look at the three that remained. I believe of those three remaining, there was a very strong candidate that should have been considered and selected for this position. I believe that individual had extremely good qualifications, not that Mr. Allen does not. I feel that I’m not sure if I like that people applied after someone said no and not in a

## City Council Meeting

June 14, 2011

Page 2

timely fashion, so I'm uncomfortable, I don't want Jim to think that this vote is against him but rather a vote against the procedure in the way we are handling it.

Mayor Rooney: Having said that, I would point out that government should always be more open rather than more closed. The invitation was open to every member of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Ward; I felt I didn't have a right to tell people they were too late. Is there further discussion on the nomination?

Alderman D'Astice: Yes, and in addition I think that one of the original three remaining candidates had excellent qualifications as well, possibly even better than Mr. Allen's so it's a timeline thing. Again, no disrespect to Mr. Allen, I look forward to working with him closely. I'm sure he will be nominated this evening and I welcome the opportunity to work with him, but I needed to express my opinion on how I felt.

Mayor Rooney: Is there further discussion? Hearing none, the question is shall Mr. Allen be appointed to the Council?

YEAS: Cannon, Buske, Judd, Banger, Jr., Larsen

Nays: D'Astice

Absent:

Mayor Rooney swore-in Alderman Jim Allen as 2<sup>nd</sup> Ward Alderman. Mayor Rooney asked Mrs. Allen to come up and pin our City Pin on Mr. Allen. Mayor Rooney also presented Mr. Allen with a temporary nameplate for the dais.

### 2) Recognize 2011 Public Works Academy Graduates

Mayor Rooney presented the 2011 Public Works Academy Graduates for 2011 with a certificate of completion.

## **MAYOR'S REPORT:**

We were able to get back a former alderman who was not able to be here on the final night for the alderman on the council, who was not able to receive the tokens that we have for their service and we are privileged to have Mr. John Pitzferro, former Alderman of the 1<sup>st</sup> Ward, in the audience tonight. Asked Mr. Pitzferro to come forward and presented him with his proclamation, street sign, and name plate from the Alderman's Room. Alderman Cannon thanked Mr. Pitzferro for his service to the City.

Introduced Janet Mintz who will be nominated to the Urban Affairs Committee later during the meeting.

The City of Rolling Meadows is unique in offering the Veterans Dinner that we offer the night before the parade and we offer a ceremony that we think can stand up with the best. Being in attendance at that ceremony this year, and fielding lots of phone calls and emails, and actual letters from Veterans who participated and pointed out that the City has a lot of heart in providing this, I wanted to say this year was another great experience for Veterans and that we know that the Veterans are very appreciative of that day.

**City Council Meeting**  
**June 14, 2011**  
**Page 3**

The last time I spoke at the behest of a number of communities around us on the effort to stop the State from cutting off the local government funds, it is my pleasure to report that the State did decide to do no harm to the local governments. They had a very big mess to sort out, it's technically still not sorted out, but the City survived unscathed through the process and all cities across the State of Illinois are very grateful and to all three of the State senators who serve this area, to all three of the State representatives that serve this area, and to the entire general assembly we offer our sincere thanks for listening to the concerns of the cities and deciding not to take the action that they took. We are very appreciative.

**WARD REPORTS:**

**Ward 3 – Alderman Buske**

I received a letter from Mr. Howie Steck, a resident for many years, his concern was that he runs a business in Rolling Meadows, and he has been in business for many, many years and he's not happy with the ordinance for signage when a contractor goes into a house that he can't put up a sign that he is the one working at that house. This is something I brought up in the past, the "Residents Right to Know". I don't see any reason why they can't put out one of their signs for the time that they are there. They would have to remove it when they leave. I would like to put this on a COW agenda to discuss the aspects of this. I think there is some merit to it. We're talking about keeping people employed and trying to back our businesses, I think this is a good way. As long as we can keep control of it. Nothing on the parkway or for 24-hours. It has to be up towards the house. It might give someone a boost in the arm for their business.

**Ward 6 – Alderman D'Astice**

A couple of residents have commented to me and asked me to compliment Public Works Department for taking care of the long grass around Barker Lake. They got it cut and cleaned it all up and the residents are very happy about that. Fred if you could compliment your men, the residents would be very appreciative. Secondly, we took some Willow trees out from around Barker Lake and the question was whether the City would be replacing any of those trees.

Mr. Vogt: We can replace trees if the residents desire that. If they haven't already contacted us, I ask that they do so or we can reach out to them and we would put them on the schedule with other parkway tree replacements as funds allow and then we'll plant them.

So the resident should contact Public Works if they would like those trees replaced

Mr. Vogt: Correct, or we could send a letter to them and ask them what their desires are in the upcoming weeks

Let's be proactive and just shoot one out.

Mr. Vogt: Sure

**Ward 1 – Alderman Cannon**

I just wanted to compliment Valerie and Fred, and both their departments, with helping me out with a number of issues this week. They took care of them right away. In conjunction with that I want to ask a question about trees. A neighbor said he thinks he has a damaged Ash tree, so Fred, how should we handle that. Just make a phone call into you guys?

Mr. Vogt: Yes, that would be the appropriate and preferred way to do it. Just call the Public Works office and leave your name, address, and phone number and we'll have the City Forrester or Staff investigate them.

**MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR 20 MINUTES:**

No one came forward

➤ **PENDING:**

**None**

➤ **CONSENT – ORDINANCES (1ST READING)**

Mayor Rooney: The first item is the consent agenda. I would like to ask that Ordinance B be removed from the agenda. The Chair does have the authority to pull something from the agenda if it's not ready. I would choose not to exercise that power this evening and ask the Council by Unanimous Consent to remove Item B. In my opinion, an Alderman asked for an Ordinance to come forward and the Ordinance that is listed under Ordinance B does not reflect in any way, shape, or form, the wishes that he expressed the Ordinance to come forth under. When this happens once, it's miscommunication; but this is a topic that was addressed at the last meeting, when it happens twice it's a step towards obstructionism, in my opinion. Rather than the Mayor say I feel this should be pulled, I would like unanimous consent of the Council to speak with one voice and say an Ordinance should not come forward this way, we are taking this one from the agenda, start over and try again and come back in two weeks. Is there objection to removing Item B from the agenda?

Alderman D'Astice: Will this go to a Committee of the Whole meeting for further discussion or will it just reappear again in two weeks

Mayor Rooney: The theory would be it would reappear again in two weeks more reflective of the concerns to the Alderman who asked for it. It could be moved to a Committee of the Whole if we chose, but it still has to go to two readings. It would be my preference that they bring back another one that more clearly reflects things, and then it doesn't lose a step in the process

Alderman D'Astice: As regards to Item B, I had several questions, comments, concerns and suggestions. Will we be able to make those questions, comments, concerns and suggestions at the 1<sup>st</sup> reading of this agenda?

## City Council Meeting

June 14, 2011

Page 5

Mayor Rooney: At the 1<sup>st</sup> reading, and if you wish even before. There's a two week period where people could send emails, call the City Manager's office and say here's what I think should go into the Ordinance, there's a two-week period to get that done even before the 1<sup>st</sup> reading.

Alderman D'Astice: I guess my preference would be to express my opinions to the entire Council, so we could generate additional ideas, questions, concerns, and comments on Item B

Mayor Rooney: That could happen during the 1<sup>st</sup> Reading, that could happen at the Committee of the Whole

Alderman D'Astice: Ok

Mayor Rooney: Again, we're asking for Unanimous Consent to pull Item B from the agenda entirely

Alderman Larsen: As a practical matter, if we were to provide some feedback to give our thoughts to Staff, I'm thinking it actually would be less than a week, it would be by Friday, then the following week they would actually put together the Resolution again, or Ordinance again, and then we would be looking at it for the first time for 1<sup>st</sup> reading two weeks hence

Mayor Rooney: It could be done

Alderman Larsen: I have some particularly strong views on this too and I really want to express my dismay with how this was even brought to us, as well

Mayor Rooney: And if I may, I would like to be able to say that folks do have ample opportunity whenever they choose. The purpose is not to give all aldermen a chance to give their feedback, although they can, because that is what the whole process is for. The purpose for asking Unanimous Consent is to simply put a foot down and say this was not what was requested and go back, start again, and bring forward something that was requested. Is there any objection?

Alderman Larsen: I understand that part, and I'm just thinking that we're talking about this now; I wanted to ask.....

Mayor Rooney: I get that, but it's not really a debatable motion, it's just that there were questions about how to proceed

Alderman Larsen: That's all that I'm asking. Once we vote one way or another on this, then we move on to the next thing and we're done talking about it

Mayor Rooney: Once nobody objects, we just remove it from the agenda and there's lots of time to talk about it in the future. Unanimous Consent is meant to speed something up, not slow something down. I promise there is time for discussion. I believe the statement that needs to be made is we're yanking this. Is there any objection to that statement being made by Unanimous Consent from the Council?

Alderman D'Astice: I don't have a problem pulling it from the agenda; I have a problem saying we're drawing the line in the sand. I have an objection with that. If it's just pulling it off the agenda, I'm ok with that, but if we're making a statement that it's totally inaccurate or something like that, then that I have a problem with. If it's just to pull it off, I'm ok with that, but if it's to make the statement that this is the worst thing since sliced bread, then no. I would have to object

**City Council Meeting**  
**June 14, 2011**  
**Page 6**

Mayor Rooney: The Chair will simply state the motion as it was originally proposed, is there Unanimous Consent for whatever reasons a person might have to yank this item from the agenda. Hearing no objection, Item B is removed. We now go to the Consent Agenda and this is the normal, if something gets pulled from the consent agenda it means it will be talked about on its 1<sup>st</sup> reading and it cannot be bundled together. The Chair asks Unanimous Consent to consider Items A, C, and D as one item, would anyone like an Item removed from that list

Alderman Buske: Item A

Alderman Judd: Item C

Mayor Rooney: If we remove Item A and C, there is no longer a Consent Agenda and we will take these in their turn.

**A. Ordinance / Adopt Prevailing Wage**

Mayor Rooney read the background on the Ordinance

No motion was made to move this Ordinance forward for second reading. For the eighth year in a row, this Ordinance dies on 1<sup>st</sup> Reading

**C. Removal of Motorcycles from the Disposal Ordinance**

Mayor Rooney read the background on this Ordinance

Alderman Larsen made a motion to move this Ordinance forward for 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading; it has been moved and seconded to move this Ordinance forward for a 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading

Alderman Buske: Chief Scanlan came up with a plan, I would like to know how this plan goes, before we have the plan in writing, or whatever we're going to do, how that goes before we pull these cycles off the Ordinance or change the Ordinance on the bikes

Chief Scanlan: I don't understand what you're asking me. Are you asking me if that's the policy we're going to use in the program or.....

Alderman Buske: I'd like to have the policy in writing, that when you were suggesting that if we put the bikes back on, that's what we're asking to do here today is basically take them out of the surplus equipment, that we have a plan. We talked about it, but I'd like something in writing to say what direction you are going. Otherwise if we don't have that, and we're taking this thing out of mothballs, and we don't have a plan in place

Chief Scanlan: What I gave you is the program, it is the policy for the Police Department.

Alderman Buske: Then I would suggest if you could write that up and make sure all the Alderman have a copy of that. You have a new Alderman and he doesn't know what we're talking about. I would feel a lot safer knowing I've got something, then let's take them out. Otherwise we take them out and we're back to the same thing again where if we don't get them used, it was stated they would go up for sale again if we don't use them properly

**City Council Meeting**  
**June 14, 2011**  
**Page 7**

Mayor Rooney: Chief, I believe you're referring to the report that you submitted to the Council three weeks ago, is that correct

Chief Scanlan: That is correct

Mayor Rooney: Mr. Buske, does that allay your concern that the report that was submitted three weeks ago is the policy in writing that he is talking about

Alderman Buske: That's fine. Could you send me another one?

Mayor Rooney: Is there further discussion?

Alderman Judd: I've read your report and I don't know that I necessarily agree with it. One thing that strikes me as interesting is we're going to run these things from March 1<sup>st</sup> – November 1<sup>st</sup>, correct?

Chief Scanlan: I don't have the report in front of me, but I think that's what it said

Alderman Judd: That's roughly 43 weeks, let's call it 40 weeks. If we're going to save 300-360 a week, that's 12000 a year, why don't we get rid of all of our cars and just ride the bikes because if we're going to get 12000 a year, they're a hell of a lot cheaper than cars. That being said, I don't buy those numbers. I did some rough numbers, 24,000 miles is what a squad gets, that's roughly in that same eight month period, 2/3 of it - 16,000 miles - we're going to use the cars, I mean the bikes, roughly 2/3 of the time, the rest is going to be taken up with what or what not, so we call it 10,000 miles divided by 45, that's 222 gallons of gas. Take a squad at 15 miles to the gallon and that's 650 gallons of gas. It's only 400 and change gallons of gas x 4.00, we're only talking 15-1600 dollars. The depreciation on these things, we're going to put 10,000 miles on them. We've brought these things for roughly 15,000 a piece, couldn't sell them for 13,000; the best bid we got was 11,000 with 2000 miles on them. As soon as we get 10,000 miles a year on these things for two or three years in a row, number 1 you're going to have a lot more mechanic issues, you're going to have a lot more parts issues, and they're going to plummet in value. Are they going to go to zero, I don't know, but if you take a depreciation schedule, you'd depreciate it down to zero. You're going to have training as time goes on, you're going to have numerous scheduling issues, you've got guys on vacation, you've got guys you're going to have to flip and flop, I don't see the real benefit to this. The depreciation alone if you lose 6,000 bucks on these things, you wipe out your savings in gas. You've got repairs, the shop has to have more training for the guys that are taking care of the vehicles, this seems to me a pure complication of the whole process. Keep it simple, why are we making this more complex. You're going to have to jockey around things, you've already said you have a guy on third shift; you're going to move him to first, now you're bumping guys around. This makes absolutely zero economic sense to do this. Chief, you've been asked questions, you've provided the information. I don't have an issue; I just have an issue with the actual information. I don't buy it. I don't see the savings in this in any way, shape or form, I don't know why we're doing it, I think we get rid of these things and move forward and not complicate more things than we have to. We're going to have a lot more issues than it's worth. If we were going to save 15,000 or 10,000 a year, sure, I'd say it's worth while, but we're not. It's going to be a scratch at best. There's no reason to keep these and I will not support it.

Alderman D'Astice: First question to Chief Scanlan, are you going to just retrofit one bike?

Chief Scanlan: I think that's what we discussed. To be honest with you I didn't show up tonight to discuss this issue because I thought we had already done that. We have a use, with manpower and what we've got, use one bike at this time. I don't think we can do two.

Alderman D'Astice: Right, my only question was your plan moving forward, based on your report, would be to take one of those bikes at a cost of about \$250.00, with the lights and the bells and the whistles on there

Chief Scanlan: Yes

Alderman D'Astice: Do we need to take both bikes off of surplus just to keep one in mothballs or do we try to sell the second bike at this point and time

Mr. Krumstok: The recommendation would be to pull both of them off and actually retrofit and bring them both back so that if something happens to one, we could ride one and than the other one. Staff's recommendation at this point in time is to bring both of them back

Alderman D'Astice: I was in favor of getting rid of the bikes previously, I brought this back up because a few of the residents had requested it, I'm ok with Chief Scanlan's report on how he plans to utilize them, I somewhat agree with Alderman Judd that I don't think there is a significant savings in using them, but as Chief Scanlan said, it is another tool in his quiver and I think that as long as Chief Scanlan uses his tools wisely, I will go along with this, but I will repeat what I said last time, if it starts to be that these bikes are purely for parades and for social leisure types of things, I will come right back and recommend that we get rid of them once again

Alderman Buske: I would suggest that if you have two bikes and it costs you a couple hundred dollars to retrofit the second one, do them both and let's run one and then run the other one so you're building up miles slowly. If you have one that needs to be serviced, you have the other one. I do not see us getting that kind of money back out of the bikes. What size engines are on those?

Chief Scanlan: Can't tell you off the top of my head. I didn't bring any of that information with me tonight

Alderman Buske: My 650, if you really lay on it, you get about 54 miles a gallon, if you take it easy you get 64 and that's a 650. Those got to be somewhere 9-1200.

Chief Scanlan: They do get 50 miles to the gallon

Alderman Buske: I think it's a good tool, if we can get them out there and use them. You can see a squad time all the time because they're big cars. The only thing I see that kind of sets them aside is the type of light bars on them. They're not the high bars anymore. I would like to see these things being used and if we can get some efficiency out of them. Get them into these areas to stop the speeding. We have to stop this. Kids are out of school. Seems like it doesn't bother people, they keep on speeding. Maybe this is the part of the thing that will help us.

## **City Council Meeting**

**June 14, 2011**

**Page 9**

Alderman Cannon: I am going to support this Ordinance and I just wanted to express my thoughts as to why I would like to go forward with this. I think we hired Chief Scanlan to run our Department; he's established with us at our last meeting that he would like these. It seems like the police officers that work for us would like them. If you look at all of our neighbors, they have an assorted array of vehicles, much more than motorcycles and squad cars, so I think we have to look at it not just from an economic standpoint, but I think we have to allow them the opportunity to cut crime for us. They look at this as a tool, I'm sure not in a position to judge what's the best tool for them, but I think it's a good tool for them. They expressed a desire to want them, we have sunk some cost into them already; we're not going to get our value out of them by selling them, so that's my reasons for supporting it.

Mayor Rooney: The question is shall the ordinance move forward for second reading

YEAS: Cannon, Allen, Buske, Banger, D'Astice, Larsen

Nays: Judd

Absent:

### **D. Ordinance / Amend Chapter 20 of City Code Regarding Road Weight**

Mayor Rooney read the background on the Ordinance

Alderman D'Astice made a motion to move this Ordinance forward for 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading; it has been moved and seconded to move this Ordinance forward for 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading

Alderman Buske: Are we going to put something in here about the bridges and so forth that we talked about at the last Council meeting. Will we have the opportunity of doing that ourselves on these bridges that we are taking over on East and West Frontage that they are repairing? Once they're repaired they're our baby and I would think we would want less weight going across there constantly so we get more years out of them before we're stuck with future repairs.

Mr. Vogt: I recall last council meeting and asking about that, we deferred that to our City Engineer who was to research that and get information back to us. We will probably put that on a Traffic Review Committee agenda first and then report back to Council

Alderman Buske: So we're working on it then

Mr. Vogt: Yes, we are

Mayor Rooney: The question is shall the ordinance move forward for 2<sup>nd</sup> reading

YEAS: Cannon, Allen, Buske, Judd, Banger, D'Astice, Larsen

NAYS:

ABSENT:

➤ **NEW BUSINESS:**

**E. MOTION TO APPROVE PAYMENT OF BILLS ON WARRANT 06-14-2011**

Alderman Buske made a motion to approve the June 14, 2011 Warrant; it has been moved and seconded to approve the June 14, 2011 Warrant

YEAS: Cannon, Allen, Buske, Judd, Banger, Jr., D'Astice, Larsen

NAYS:

ABSENT:

Warrant Approved

Mayor Rooney: The Chair asks Unanimous Consent to consider Items F, G, H, and I all as one item. Would anyone like an item removed?

Alderman Judd: Items G & H

Alderman D'Astice: F

Mayor Rooney: Then we have no consent agenda for resolutions

Alderman Buske: Also F

Mayor Rooney: They are all removed, there is no consent agenda

**F. Resolution No. 11-R-70 – Approve Plum Grove Bike Path Land Acquisition**

Mayor Rooney read the background on the Resolution

Alderman Cannon made a motion to adopt the Resolution; it has been moved and seconded to adopt the Resolution

Alderman Buske: I know we're into this with Palatine Park District, this is the one that's going down Plum Grove, wasn't this after we finished Plum Grove Road, this was supposed to be connected in there somewhere. So this is an ongoing thing. I will support this because it's been on its way for a while. We're coming up with more and more bike paths and I won't be supporting these any more for the simple reason that we have roads that are falling apart and people are completely disappointed that we are putting money into bike paths that nowhere near the amount of people will ride our bike paths as drive our streets and I think we have to start looking more at the streets than a bike path, so this has been going on so I'll support this until we finish.

Alderman D'Astice: Why is parcel 2 is 3 or 4 times as much as the other two parcels

Mr. Macholl: It's that much larger. It's between Harris Bank and the property at the southwest corner of Bryant. It's the larger shopping center that's parcel 2

**City Council Meeting**  
**June 14, 2011**  
**Page 11**

Alderman D'Astice: Ok. This is not just an easement; this is permanently taking the property over

Mr. Macholl: That's correct. There are temporary construction easements in conjunction with it, but there are actual conveyances

Alderman D'Astice: Ok

Alderman Allen: I would like to say I live half a block or a block away from this location. I was out walking my dog one night and dance school was getting out. I had to walk through the parking lot and almost got hit by a car. It would be nice to have someplace safe for people to walk.

Mayor Rooney: The question is should the resolution be adopted

YEAS: Cannon, Allen, Buske, Judd, Banger, D'Astice, Larsen

NAYS:

ABSENT:

The Resolution passes

**G. Resolution No. 11-R-71 – Approve Placement of Temporary Signage in the Public Right-of-Way – Community Church of Rolling Meadows**

Mayor Rooney read the background on the Resolution

Alderman D'Astice made a motion to adopt the Resolution; it's moved and seconded to adopt the Resolution

Mayor Nelson: The question is should the resolution be adopted

YEAS: Cannon, Allen, Buske, Banger, D'Astice, Larsen

NAYS: Judd

ABSENT:

**H. Resolution No. 11-R-72 – Accept Change Order # 4 – Richnee Sanitary Sewer Lift Station Force Main Replacement**

Mayor Rooney read the background on the Resolution

Alderman Banger made a motion to adopt the Resolution; it's been moved and seconded to adopt the Resolution

Alderman Judd: The soil testing was more than expected or less than expected. It has a negative number there.

Mr. Vogt: It was less than expected.

Alderman Judd: Less than expected, so we're reducing the original 5,000, and they're only charging us 1600.

Mr. Vogt: Correct

Alderman Judd: I thought it was going the other way

Mayor Rooney: That's correct. The Chair was mistaken

Alderman D'Astice: I'm a little ticked, more than a little bit upset. We pay engineering studies to do this and now we've got pavement patching, 360 sq yards vs. 74 that's about 4 times as much. We've got curb and gutter removal from 0 to 30 ft, linear feet, and that costs us more. I don't understand these changes. They have here, you don't need to remove any curb and gutter to now we have to remove 30 feet. Were they sleeping? To go from 74 sq yards of patching to 360, we're they not awake, did they not anticipate this, did they not look at this. What are we paying them for and this is the 4<sup>th</sup> change order. It seems to me that the engineer should have to pay for this. Why should the City have to continue paying for their mistakes or their ineptitudes? I know it has to be done, but I'm quite upset that whoever engineered this did not take this into consideration and that we get these extra changes. That's what we pay them to do. I'm going to vote against it

Alderman Buske: I think Mr. Vogt had something to say

Mayor Rooney: Mr. D'Astice ended his statements and didn't appear to be looking for answers

Alderman D'Astice: If Mr. Vogt has some answers, I'd like to hear them

Mayor Rooney: Fair enough. We can put Mr. Vogt on the spot for that, I just would like to point out that we did talk at a Committee of the Whole meeting of trying to minimize this whenever possible and I took the comments as a statement and if they can stand as a statement that would be great; if we would like to pose them as questions, we can do that too.

Alderman D'Astice: I'd like to pose it as a question, why did we have this much of an error. This isn't a 5% or 10%, pavement patching 74 to 360 is about, Brad you're good at numbers, about 400% more?

Alderman Judd: It's about 300%

Alderman D'Astice: Sorry, 300% more; that's a big error.

Mr. Vogt: I'll be brief. The project was to be augured and pushed pipe to minimize disruption on Richnee Lane and Tall Oaks. The project developed, or we learned of some utility conflicts, particularly at the corner of Tall Oaks and Richnee which caused us to excavate a much larger area of the pavement in order to receive the pushed pipe and to make sure that it cleared the utility conflicts that were in the way. The engineer was not our City Engineer, its RJN Group, was not able to anticipate that. I think that was a reasonable move that they made, given the information that they had at that time. If we had excavated this whole project, it would have certainly cost us a lot more in terms of pavement removal and restoration. I believe the project proceeded almost within the budget that was provided. We estimated two years ago that this was about a 75,000 project. We were very surprised and pleased when the bidder came in at 61,000, but this was part of the reason why we have had some change orders

because there were some unanticipated costs as well as a few design things that we erred when their engineer changed mid-stream; we had to pick up the pieces from that. So at an 80,000 cost from the 75,000 estimate two years earlier, we felt that it was reasonable and we got the product that we had asked for originally

Alderman D' Astice: I appreciate what you're saying, and I appreciate the fact that you were able to bring it in only 5, 6, 8,000 over budget. My comments are not against you. I think what I would like to see in the future, if the Council would like to see it as well, is that we put whoever does the engineering, we put their feet to the fire. If you, Fred, say here's the engineering, and a typical plus or minus is 5%, then the City accepts that and if it ends up being 10% over then let the engineer pay for it because their job is to anticipate all this. That's what we pay them for; to know where the pipes are, to know where all this stuff is, so that they anticipate that for us. Once we start holding their feet to the fire, then I don't think we'll have nearly as many overages as we do. Right now we pay the engineer, he's done his thing, he's got his money, and now we have to pay out all the overages. We stick it to the residents because the engineer didn't do his job as well as he could have or she could have. I will ask the Council in the future to please let's look at putting some further parameters on these engineer studies so that the engineer doesn't say I've got my 20,000, it's going to cost you 90 or 100 and it costs us 110, and they walk away with all the profit and it costs us more because they erred.

Mayor Rooney: The question is should the Resolution be adopted

YEAS: Cannon, Allen, Buske, Banger, Larsen

NAYS: Judd, D' Astice

ABSENT:

The Resolution passed

**I. Resolution No. 11-R-73 – Accept Revised Right-of-Way Agreement with IDOT – Plum Grove Road**

Mayor Rooney read the background on the Resolution

Alderman D' Astice made a motion to approve the Resolution; it has been moved and seconded to adopt the Resolution

YEAS: Cannon, Allen, Buske, Judd, Banger, D' Astice, Larsen

NAYS:

ABSENT:

**OTHER BUSINESS & REPORTS:**

Mayor's Appointments:

The Chair would ask Unanimous Consent to consider two appointments to be in one vote; the appointment of John D' Astice to serve on the Economic Development Committee and Janet Mintz to serve on the Urban Affairs Committee. Is there any objection to considering both appointments as one?

Alderman D'Astice: I'm uncomfortable voting for myself

Mayor Rooney: I understand that, but as an alderman you are entitled to do so. It's like going in to the voting booth when you're up for election and voting for yourself

Alderman D'Astice: Ok

Mayor Rooney: You can certainly choose to abstain, but you are entitled to vote for yourself and there's nothing wrong with that

Alderman D'Astice: Personally I would prefer to split these

**1) Appoint John D'Astice to the Economic Development Committee – term to expire 4/30/13**

Mayor Rooney: The phrase is Unanimous Consent and it's not unanimous, therefore the Chair would ask for a vote to appoint Alderman John D'Astice to the Economic Development Committee. Is there a motion to appoint him to that Committee? Alderman Buske made the motion and it has been seconded. The question is shall Alderman D'Astice be appointed to the Economic Development Committee.

YEAS: Cannon, Allen, Buske, Judd, Banger, Larsen

NAYS:

ABSENT:

PRESENT: D'Astice

That appointment passes and Mr. D'Astice is now a member of the Economic Development Committee

**2) Appoint Janet Mintz to the Urban Affairs Committee – term to expire 4/30/14**

The Chair would ask for a motion to appoint Janet Mintz to the Urban Affairs Committee. Alderman D'Astice made the motion; it has been seconded. The question is shall Mrs. Mintz be appointed to the Urban Affairs Committee

YEAS: Cannon, Allen, Buske, Judd, Banger, D'Astice, Larsen

NAYS:

ABSENT:

Mrs. Mintz is appointed to the Committee

Mayor's Proclamation: **1) Congratulating MB Financial Bank on its 100<sup>th</sup> Anniversary**

City Clerk's Report:

City Staff Reports:

**1) Community Items of Interest**

- 1) Vehicle stickers and pet license are on sale. Reminder, you are able to purchase vehicle stickers and pet license from the City web page (under the Finance section). The stickers must be displayed by June 30<sup>th</sup>.
- 2) New Wilke Road construction is to be mobilized starting June 20<sup>th</sup>. The project should hopefully be completed by the end of September.
- 3) Friendly reminder that the City's 4<sup>th</sup> of July Parade is scheduled for Monday, July 4<sup>th</sup> – starting at 11:30 am. Fireworks will also be conducted on Monday, July 4<sup>th</sup>.
- 4) July 16<sup>th</sup> – Fourth Annual Duck Race (4:00 pm at Kimball Hill Park) sponsored by the City's Environmental Committee, Rolling Meadows Park District Foundation, and Rolling Meadows Rotary International. Tickets (\$5 per duck) and additional information can be found at City Hall and the Park District Community Center.
- 5) Thank you to the thirty-six participants of the City's June 8<sup>th</sup> Blood Drive.
- 6) The Garden Club's 2011 Garden Walk will be on Sunday, June 26<sup>th</sup> - Noon to 4:00 pm. Tickets are on sale at the Community Center (3705 Pheasant Drive) or online at [www.rollingmeadowsgardenclub.com](http://www.rollingmeadowsgardenclub.com).

Alderman Cannon: I was just wondering with our construction starting soon, our governor's been threatening a lot of the local building projects. Will that impact us at all?

Mr. Krumstok: The project that you're inquiring about is New Wilke that's ARRA money, which is Federal money, so that should still be deposited to us. At this point and time, don't worry about it.

**2) Cottonwood Park**

Mr. Vogt: The Cottonwood Park lease expires in July, it's been in effect with renewal since 1989, this was discussed at the January 2011 Committee of the Whole meeting and since that time we have been contacted by the Park District Staff with their desire to fund the necessary stream bank stabilization that is on this piece of property. It was one of the areas that we did not do 3 years ago when we did Kennedy Pond and a couple of other areas of the adjoining Salt Creek. It wasn't in such significant need as the other areas that we did get grant funding for and used our stormwater fund for those improvements. It certainly is in some need and the Park District indicates that they have the funding resources to proceed with this. It's certainly not something we could do overnight, it will require engineering design, permits and the like and probably, at best, would happen later this year with more than likely 2012. In consideration for that funding the Park District would like some assurances for their investment, so to speak. Rather than just approve of a 10-year lease as we had in place for the last 20 some years, as to

## City Council Meeting

June 14, 2011

Page 16

whether or not we could extend that lease to 20 or 30 year period, or as I suggested in part of our discussion, provide a system where we can have a 10-year lease, but renewable unless either party objects to it within a 90 day or 180 day notification type of a period. It is with this that we would develop a resolution to present at the next City Council meeting for Council consideration.

Mayor Rooney: That will leave plenty of time for folks to ask questions, unless there is any need for clarification of the actual paperwork that was submitted, we can move on.

Alderman Judd: What's the value of this property?

Mr. Vogt: We have not had an appraisal on this property. We have had no reason to do so in the past. The property is roughly 50ft wide by 250ft in depth. It's adjacent on the south to the rest of Cottonwood Park that Palatine Park District owns. It has playground equipment and open space on it. To the north is Salt Creek. I don't believe the property is buildable; at least part of it would be in a flood zone. We have not had an appraisal done.

Alderman Judd: I'd like to ask some questions about this.

Mayor Rooney: What we're trying to do with the report section is to have it be information to the Council. There's a two-week period where folks can pick up the phone or write an email. I'm not going to begrudge anybody questions; I'm just asking folks to be a little bit judicious in what needs to be asked tonight and what can be asked before it becomes a Resolution. If you would still like to ask a question you certainly may

Alderman Judd: What's the purpose of us keeping this? Why don't we just give it to them and put in the covenant that they have to maintain the stream bank. If it's not of any value to us, why are we going to spend 13,000 of the City of Rolling Meadows residents' money? Give it to Palatine and let them deal with it, but put it in the covenant that it has to be taken care of to a certain specification for 100 years. Why are we wasting our money? Let them deal with it

Mr. Vogt: It's certainly an option that the Council has to give direction to Staff to put that back to the Park District in the form of a question if so desired. I can't speak for what their desires would be, but we can certainly ask if the Council so chooses.

Alderman Judd: What would be the downside to that?

Mr. Vogt: We haven't committed to spending any money at this point, but I felt it was worth consideration if the Park District is willing to fund the construction costs to offer the services of our City Engineer who did the design and construction supervision on the adjoining areas 3 years ago with Kennedy Pond, that's certainly something that could be up for consideration as well. As far as upsides, downsides questions, I really haven't had the chance to prepare that. I certainly can get some thoughts and recommendations back to you at a later date

Alderman Judd: I'd appreciate that

### **3) Staff Traffic Advisory Report**

Mr. Vogt: Traffic Review Committee previously met May 11<sup>th</sup>. We discussed the posting of the weight limits on certain streets. It was a staff report from the Police Department that was given 1<sup>st</sup> Reading of Ordinance tonight. Second item was Owl Drive. This preceded the Committee of the Whole discussion on that. We'll go back with discussion and comments that were provided at the May Committee of the Whole meeting at the next Traffic Review Committee meeting scheduled for tomorrow afternoon. Third issue is parking at 3203 Peacock. Staff, City Engineer, and the Police Department all looked at this location. Parking is already prohibited on one side of the street; the request was to prohibit it on the other side of the street due to driveway configuration. We felt that there was no real good way to solve that without potentially adversely affecting the residents on that side of the street where parking is allowed. Therefore, there was no recommendation made to take any action on that particular matter. Fourth is an update pertaining to Carriageway Bridge? We expect at some point in mid to late 2012 we will have the bridge closed for probably 2 – 4 weeks minimum period. The City attorney is working with the adjacent property owner to secure temporary access easements for the residents in the Three Fountains complex, both for emergency needs and for during the course of the closure, for access out to Newport. We will continue to monitor that and report on that before the Bridge is closed. This is very similar to a project that was done I believe in 1995 when the Carriageway Bridge was rehabilitated. The Traffic Review Committee will monitor that in terms of the traffic and the requiring of the necessary access easements.

Alderman Larsen: With respect to Item 3, parking issue at 3203 Peacock, since the Traffic Review Committee has determined that there is no other parking restrictions that are appropriate in this case, there is a still ongoing parking challenge that the resident is experiencing, so I'll direct this to Chief Scanlan, can we step up any kind of monitoring of parking to ensure that there is no encroachment on someone's driveway. Absent any kind of solution from....

Chief Scanlan: I did go over to the residence at that location. They are somewhat creating the problem with the amount of cars that they have there. I can talk with you at length after the meeting to explain it further. There is an issue there, I have talked to them, I think we came to some temporary resolution to the problem. The house that is on the corner that seems to be creating much of the problem, I have not gotten feedback from the resident as to whether that has eased the problem at this point. I want to give it a month to see if that doesn't resolve it to some matter.

Alderman Larsen: We can talk about it later

### **4) PO Disclosure Over \$2500.00**

Alderman D'Astice: Convert PTO drive truck, converting to what or from what

Mr. Vogt: This was a power takeoff that failed on one of our Public Works trucks, Unit 320, the truck for sign maintenance. The PTO and the clutch failed. Sauber Manufacturing Company did the repairs. That has corrected the problem

Alderman D'Astice: What's a PTO?

Mr. Vogt: I ask Bob Hartnett to speak to this

Mr. Hartnett: The PTO power takeoff is to divert the power from the engine to the hydraulic pump to run the hydraulics to lift the boom on that truck; it's a 20 foot boom

Alderman D'Astice: Ok

### **5) Presentation of the June 21<sup>st</sup> Committee of the Whole Agenda**

Mr. Krumstok presented the agenda items for the June 21<sup>st</sup> Committee of the Whole meeting

Alderman Judd: I will not be at that meeting

Mayor Rooney: Is there anything there that you would wish to wait until your return. I should say that none of us can really dictate agenda items by our absences but I remember you asking that something not be discussed while you were gone, is any of these them?

Alderman Judd: No

### **MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA:**

Alderman Buske: Mr. Krumstok, on the front of this building on the very top everything is peeling off. What are we going to do about that? It's quite embarrassing. Was that put up when Bear Construction did all this work or was it a different outfit?

Mr. Krumstok: That was a different outfit. It was during the renovation and there is a Capital item that you will see, that we are going to be discussing to deal with that issue

Alderman Buske: Isn't there a guarantee on it?

Mr. Krumstok: It's passed its one year

Alderman Buske: It's aluminum

Mr. Krumstok: Painted over

Alderman Buske: Oh, they painted over the aluminum. I thought that was baked on

Mr. Krumstok: No

Alderman Buske: So are we painting it or replacing it

Mr. Krumstok: I would tell you when we get to the Capital items you'll hear how we're going to be covering it

Alderman Buske: I'm disappointed that you're not covering it now. Thank you

Alderman Larsen: Earlier today I had a conversation with Barry and Fred about the identifying information on the City's website. I found it to be less than intuitive for me to try and track down what I

**City Council Meeting**  
**June 14, 2011**  
**Page 19**

was looking for on the City's website. I'd like to move forward more aggressively to review what options we have for redoing our website, what are the costs and so forth. I don't know what the best procedure is for making that happen, but I'd like to start talking about this now so that if we are to consider included in the 2012 budget, now would be the time to start exploring that in greater detail now, so that actually by sometime in 2012 it would be in the budget and we could actually have the website that would better leverage the advantage of the community at large

Mayor Rooney: I would suggest a Committee of the Whole; would that be an adequate option in your mind?

Alderman Larsen: Yes, why would I say no?

Mayor Rooney: Would July be alright, or do you think it needs to be as early as June?

Alderman Larsen: We have seven things on there now, can we add it to June

Mayor Rooney: I would say that with 7 items probably, but when one of them is the Audit, I think we might be here a while. Would July be sufficient?

Alderman Larsen: I guess it will have to be

Mayor Rooney: Mr. Krumstok, please put that down as an item for the July Committee of the Whole. Does that satisfy your concern?

Alderman Larsen: Yes

Alderman Cannon: Is this the time we're supposed to ask if we want to bring up a future discussion item

Mayor Rooney: You certainly could, yes

Alderman Cannon: Somewhere near the end of the summer I would like to have an initial discussion about replacing and moving Station 15 Fire Department. At least start an initial discussion as opposed to us continually putting money into a building that's falling apart, I'd like to at least get the discussion started. I know it's going to be a long process

Mayor Rooney: Would the August Committee of the Whole meeting be sufficient

Alderman Cannon: Whenever we can fit it in, that's fine

Mayor Rooney: Mr. Krumstok, you'll make a note of that

Alderman Larsen: When we showed up this evening we had a hard copy of a memorandum about a PowerPoint presentation. We also got this conveyed to us electronically in an email dated Friday, June 10<sup>th</sup>. I went through it. I don't know how much of a tree this killed but I don't see the point in us having hard copies of this on top of it. In the past we have had Council members that were predisposed to wanting hard copies of the packet; since that time we had talked on numerous occasions about other council members, including myself, desired to do as much electronically as possible. I'd like to reiterate

my thoughts along those lines. This to me is a complete waste. I'd rather not have any more hard copies

**CLOSED SESSION:**

- 1) Personnel – 5 ILCS 120/2 (c) (1) of the Open Meetings Act**
- 2) Appointments – 5 ILCS 120/2 (c) (3) of the Open Meetings Act**

The Chair would ask Unanimous Consent to consider the two items for closed session discussion to be considered as one motion. Is there any objection to making one motion for both subjects? Hearing none the Chair will entertain a motion to do those. Mr. D'Astice has made the motion; it has been moved and seconded to go into Closed Session for those purposes.

YEAS: Cannon, Allen, Buske, Judd, Banger, D'Astice, Larsen

NAY:

ABSENT:

Members of the press and members of the audience are advised that we will be taking one action after the Closed Session Meeting

**Entered into Closed Session at 8:50pm**

**Returned to Open Session at 11:11pm**

**MAYOR'S APPOINTMENTS:**

- 3) Appoint Len Prejna, Jr to the Board of Fire & Police Commission – term to expire 4/30/14**

The Chair would entertain a motion to approve the appointment of Len Prejna, Jr. to the Board of Fire & Police Commission

Alderman Larsen made the motion to appoint Len Prejna, Jr. to the Board of Fire & Police Commission; it was moved and seconded

YEAS: Allen, Larsen

NAYS: Cannon, Buske, Judd, Banger, D'Astice

ABSENT:

Appointment failed

**City Council Meeting**  
**June 14, 2011**  
**Page 21**

Chair asked for Unanimous Consent to adjourn the meeting

City Council meeting of June 14, 2011, adjourned at 11:14p.m.

Respectfully submitted by: Ginny Cotugno, Deputy City Clerk

June 14, 2011 Minutes Approved by Council on June 28, 2011

---

Ginny Cotugno, Deputy City Clerk