

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
MINUTES – July 12, 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, Allen, Buske, Judd, Banger, Jr., D’Astice, Larsen

Absent:

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

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:**

Mayor Rooney: Without objection we’ll consider both items as one. Is there a motion to approve both minutes?

Alderman Judd: I don’t object, but I wasn’t here on the 21<sup>st</sup>, so I can’t vote for them

Mayor Rooney: There is absolutely no reason why anybody who was or was not at the meeting can still approve minutes. There is no need to abstain for the vote. The minutes are, are they an accurate reflection of what was said, and because the Council Meetings are on camera, because folks do have a chance to catch up, no Council member needs to feel that they have to vote present on minutes.

Alderman Judd: That’s fine, I just wanted to make a point that I wasn’t here.

Mayor Rooney: Fair enough. I promise I will explain this more in November. It doesn’t have any bearing on the Minutes and any Alderman can feel free to still approve them if they’ve taken a look at them and feel they are an accurate reflection. Is there a motion to approve both minutes in one?

Alderman Banger moved to approve the minutes of the June 28, 2011 Council Meeting; and the June 21, 2011 Committee of the Whole Meeting; it was moved and seconded to approve the minutes.

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

Nays: 0

Absent:

Minutes Approved

➤ **MOTION TO DEVIATE:**

**MAYOR'S REPORT:**

- 1) Nobody will be surprised that the unpleasant one will be first. We're all experiencing the after effects of the storm that rolled through. All around the area, all through the City of Chicago, there are a lot of folks who are markedly unhappy. I would like to commend Mr. Krumstok, the City Manager, for his diligence for letting ComEd know about our pockets and that we are unhappy. I was able to participate with him on a conference call that they do for municipalities. By way of information the approach that ComEd has taken to the after effects of this storm involved tackling their lock outs first, lockouts basically mean what most of us call feeders, the very big things that usually involve transformers that will service 15,000 – 10,000 people at a shot. Their approach, which is a logical one, is to tackle all feeders first. Not that that's their sole use of manpower right now, but it's their primary one. They have over 100 left at 4:00pm that they were still working on. They have enough manpower that they were working on 49 of those 105-106; they are clearing about 5-6 per hour. There are other crews roaming around, they're two man crews. The bulk of their workforce, until the feeders are done, is going to be working on just those. They're approach that they announced to all the cities is those feeders hit 15,000 people at a crack, 10,000 people at a crack, and their goal is to get as many people as they can to get the most bang for the buck. For a lot of places, including Rolling Meadows, where at last count we still had around 3600 folks who were still without power, it was described as being a medium fish. The large fish will be tackled first. Mr. Krumstok and I were both surprised that there were different voices on the phone, representing folks who have hundreds of outages and maybe even a couple hundred, who were trying to make their voices as loud as the rest of us, and ComEd did politely say, we're not saying that your couple hundred people aren't important, but you need to know that you're going to come after the bigger communities and Mr. Krumstok and I looked at each other with the look that we're sitting at 3600, we think we're a little more important, but then cities with more up the food chain would be able to say the same to us. That's the best we can do right now in terms of information. The City of Rolling Meadows' voice is just as loud as everyone at the table. We are aware of the pockets we have. We will keep poking until things go up, and as ComEd tells us every time, we encourage everyone out there to keep poking as well. The phone call itself, continually coming in, is how they keep track of numbers. If everyone keeps squawking, we won't be that far down on the list. Once all the feeders get back on, those larger crews can be split up into groups of two people to go out and start tackling more smaller pockets. That's the information as of 4:00pm this afternoon. At this point I would ask Mr. Krumstok do you have anything to offer over the last 3 hours that might be different.

Mr. Krumstok: After that phone call, they did have a few crews rolling around in Rolling Meadows, specifically the Fire Station, the Library, and some other locations. Remember any ETR is just an estimate. Sunday the 17<sup>th</sup> is an ETR. They are trying to push that ahead. ComEd has additional utilities throughout the United States coming in to assist. We are working on it; we have another conference call with them. We do update the website after the conference calls or first thing in the morning if I do have any additional information

- 2) The 4<sup>th</sup> of July took place and I will admit I got my share of emails where folks thought budget cutbacks were showing a little bit through the fireworks and through the parade. The overall response from folks was they thought we did a great job with the 4<sup>th</sup> of July. The Chamber and volunteers are to be commended. They didn't notice a difference in fireworks. Others thought they were noticeably shorter. In general, I think people were pleased. A big thank you to everyone involved in the 4<sup>th</sup> of July
- 3) There are two appointments coming to the end. The two appointments will be Carol Adams to the Veterans Committee and Tom Callard to the Fire & Police Commission. Thank you for serving on these two bodies.

### **WARD REPORTS:**

Alderman Larsen: I did get some concerns expressed by Creekside residents about people speeding on Creekside and Crestwood and failure to stop at the stop signs. I followed up with Chief Scanlan and will be following up with Creekside Association and the residents accordingly. More often than not, the speeders are the people that live on the side street. It's our own neighbors that are doing it. Please, watch out for each other, and slow down, and obey the stop signs, obey the traffic laws so that we can all be safe

Alderman D'Astice: Thank you to Public Works for their cleanup after the storm. If a tree has come down in the parkway, does the City replace that, and if so, when. I don't expect Fred to have an answer, but I do want to say thank you to you and your staff in getting the trees and brush cleared out as quickly as you have

Alderman Banger: I echo that. Tuesday morning at 8ish I drove down New Wilke that had a huge tree that had fallen on the south side, and on my way back down Dwyer, there was a tree that had fallen across the road. The New Wilke tree, which we took ownership of, was gone. The one on Dwyer was not at 11:30-12ish. Thank you for doing that. I'd like to thank Barry and Mayor Rooney for publicizing the outages.

Alderman Buske: If we look back at our tree stock, a big thank you should go to Jim McFeggan. They are doing an excellent job of thinning out these parkway trees and trimming them up. When big winds come, if it's a solid tree and they're not being worked on and kept up to keep them thin, it's like a billboard. We would have lost a lot of them. I compliment the cleanup and the keeping up with the trees. That saves a lot of trees. How many trees did we lose?

Mr. Vogt: The confirmed number was 4

Alderman Buske: I recall one down in Wren Lane that got hit by lightning. Cut the tree right in half.

Mr. Vogt: We'll continue this week to assess the damage.

Alderman Buske: We did very well

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

Sue Walton, 2508 Mill Creek Lane, came to talk about the Duck Race. Duck Race will be held July 16<sup>th</sup> at 4pm at Kimball Hill. This is an important Duck Race. We are in collaboration with the City of

Rolling Meadows Environmental, Rotary Club and the Rolling Meadows Park District. The project that we are working on is the cleanup that we do each year and planting trees. We're working on a pilot project down by the Creek to keep the water clean. That project is in its second year and we're continuing to work on that. Tickets are \$5.00 each, 5 for \$20.00. I encourage you to get them downstairs or the Park District. We will sell them at the Softball Tournament near the Beer Tent. We look forward to each of you joining us.

Brian Lahl, 2707 Rohlwing Road, Apartment 102, here to talk about the power outage in my area. I appreciate your efforts and Mr. Krumstok's efforts. ComEd has frustrated me to no end. To tell me that I have to wait a week to get power is, basically my frustration is this. In the last 5-10 years, yes there is an area across the street from me and whenever the power goes out, they have power immediately, or shortly thereafter. The area that is bounded by Kirchoff Road, Rohlwing Road, down to Emerson, and in that general area, we remain without power for many hours and I do appreciate that there are others without power right now; I can only fight my own battle. Others should do the same. What has happened in time that this seems to have gotten worse and worse? I did talk with Mr. Krumstok at one time, I believe it was year or so ago, and we asked about a feasibility study. He was going to look into that. My main concern is how does my area get connected to the same thing that the area across the street is connected to and who controls that. I tried to get this answered from ComEd. I did not get a satisfactory answer more than we have no control over that. I tried to explain, who installs the transformers. They were like, we do. I said well then you should know something about who is connected to what. No, we don't. I just wanted to know how is it that the City can be an advocate for me and my neighbors. How can we get this changed, so that in future we can be as protected as those across the street?

Mayor Rooney: The first step is a feasibility study. Did we do that?

Mr. Krumstok: We had a feasibility study done last time and the last report they talked about it. My request was to do another feasibility study before they come in August to do their annual report. Even with looking at the numbers for 2707 Rohlwing, they do have an outage now. Last year they had three outages due to vegetation. My comment to our Governmental Affairs is they should do heavy vegetation removal in that area. They do know and when everything comes down, when they come in August they should have another feasibility study for that area

Mayor Rooney: When is the next ComEd sit down with City Staff?

Mr. Krumstok: We don't have a date yet

Mayor Rooney: We would be assured this would be on the agenda

Mr. Krumstok: Yes, and his VP also knows about it too

**City Council Meeting**  
**July 12, 2011**  
**Page 5**

Mayor Rooney: Not quite sure that that would do a whole lot more, but at least there we have a captive audience and can be a little more forceful than you can be when there are cameras around

Brian Lahl: What is a feasibility study

Mr. Krumstok: They evaluate everything on that circuit. They look at what created the outages. What's available in the area? What additional work can be done to actually make sure that's reliable? They look at what kind of outages have happened. They take it down to the root of what they're looking for

Brian Lahl: We see that 80% of the town is up. What is the difficulty in getting that other 20% going and why is there always seems to be a problem every year in getting the other 20% going. You're already out here once, can you fix it and then you all can move on to the next major issue.

Jeff Ihde, 3815 Ashley Court, follow-up, we have only been here 6 months or so. The types of outages we are talking about are the types that if you lived in Wisconsin you might have 2 -3 day outages. We can't get answers when this happens. Between 6 and 6:20, power was restored to the area, just west of Rohlwing, east of 53, and then it went off again and we have no answer as to what happened. Who can you talk to to get answers?

Mayor Rooney: Mr. Krumstok looks like he wants to answer. When you get emails from ComEd that say in the morning you have 1800 people who are out of power still and 3200 had been restored, and then in the afternoon because we had more power outages, 3600 are now without power and 6200 have been restored, it makes me wonder if they're double counting the restored. Mr. Krumstok immediately asked for an explanation

Mr. Krumstok: Part of the issue is we would not have the tickets back from ComEd. When we sit down later on, when they've done their storm analysis, that's when they can start drilling down. From the June storm we still haven't seen what happened then. We might not know until the end of August as to what happened. Technically, after they energize an area, something else was wrong, it creates another outage. For instance down on Kirchoff it came back on in the afternoon on Monday and then failed again. Each incident is looked at. What has happened in the past is they look for the biggest bang for their buck. They might be in an area, they do the work, and then they move to the next area. The Command Center is telling them we know this is huge, we need you over here. Sometimes it's just rotating the crews in and they are working 16 hour shifts right now

Jeff Ihde: It just seems strange that it's on then it goes off. Seems strange that the day of the storm you have power for 20 minutes, then we have nothing.

Mr. Krumstok: Again, ETR is an estimate. They are pushing that as quickly as they can with more crews coming in.

Jeff Ihde: Can other cities gather together and put more pressure on ComEd. They just don't seem to be as responsive as other power companies. It didn't seem to be that bad of a storm. It seems that there should be a better response

Mayor Rooney: ComEd was supposed to give their annual report this month. They asked to be put on the August agenda. Folks will be able to see when they're representative is actually here. Folks will be able to speak at that meeting. No one in the room works for them, that night there will be somebody who does. More comments like these when someone is in the room, those people can be pigeonholed

before the meeting starts. I don't know how effective that is for the ComEd structure, and I don't mean to make light, but sometimes it's the actual pressure on our representative that leads to these things. We know that from about 6-7 years ago when we were dealing with this a lot, it was even longer ago because it wasn't Mr. Buske's Ward; it was Ms. Jungmann's Ward, when a lot of that was going on. That's the one suggestion I can make. The other one that's a little more structural is that when we were at the annual banquet for the NWMC. Obviously this particular storm hadn't happened but the one last month did, and a lot of folks there were talking about the NWMC getting together and getting a little bit of a louder voice with ComEd, hopefully we'll see some progress there too

Jeff Ihde: I've never experienced in a suburban neighborhood, I've never seen so many generators. I was shocked.

Mayor Tom Rooney closed the floor.

➤ **PENDING:**

**A. Ordinance No. 11-17 / Revise Mechanic B Position & Salary**

Mayor Tom Rooney read the background on this Ordinance.

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

Alderman Buske: I have no problem with the 8 steps. The police and fire are on the 8 steps. I do have a problem when we get down to step 7. Step 7 and 8 is a 7,000 raise per year, for two years in a row. I don't support that. On the step salary range, keep it the way it is at the 38,982 to start with, but I'd like 3,500 deducted between the step from 6 to step 7, which would be 63,000, take 3,500 off of that, and 7 to 8 the same thing, which would bring the 7,000 raise down to 3,500. I'd like to make a motion to do that.

Mayor Rooney: We have to ask Mr. Macholl, the effect of that would be to actually lower the full salary for that position.

Alderman Buske: That is correct

Mayor Rooney: Can that be done in this ordinance, or does that have to be done separately

Mr. Macholl: I think we can do that in this ordinance. The ordinance would serve to amend that classification. We have a salary ordinance, as well

Mayor Rooney: That's the reason for the question. Would we have to amend the salary ordinance separately to lower the full salary for this position, or could that be done just by making this change and then that would, in effect, change the salary ordinance and there would have to be an \* applied to it

Mr. Macholl: If that, in and of itself, serves to amend the salary ordinance, this would take care of it. If it doesn't, we would have to come back and amend the salary ordinance

## City Council Meeting

July 12, 2011

Page 7

Mayor Rooney: Well, it does, we just need to know how to proceed for now, I guess, then, in the spirit of trying to make things more efficient, rather than less efficient, let's rule the amendment in order, and if that turns out to be wrong and we come back, then we have to have a second ordinance, but if we turn out to be correct, we got it done in one ordinance and there is no need for two. The amendment is ruled in order, is there a second. It's been moved and seconded to amend the ordinance to remove 3,500 from step 7 and remove 3,500 from step 8. The full effect would be to lower the whole salary by 7,000. Chair will remind Council that the discussion is limited to just the amendment

Alderman Buske: The reason I want this amendment is that I was amazed that hearing from a friend that someone that comes straight out of college makes about 15 to 18.00 per hour. If that person is working for the private sector, they are actually making income for the company that he is working for. We're not doing that as a City. You really can't match these. A journeyman makes between 60 – 80,000 a year. If you take these figures, an employee that makes 60,000, that's 2080 hours of work, I took 100.00 per hour. If this employer is paying this man 60,000 a year, this man is making him a 148,000 a year. If the other guy is making 80,000 a year, he's making 128,000 for the dealership. We can't match this because we are not in the retail business. They're repairing our equipment. Mr. Vogt was saying we have 100 pieces of equipment that gets worked on. I'm sure they don't get worked on every day. There are a few things that I want to get done. We have the motion on cutting back the 3,500. I cannot see a person coming up in his final last couple of years; it's almost like getting close to spiking for heaving money towards the end of his top pay. 7,000 two years in a row, that's 14,000, that seems a little high, in my book, for taxpayer's money. That's the main reason.

Mayor Rooney: We'll get to you as soon as the amendment is done.

Alderman Buske: Then you'll come back to me on the second one

Alderman Larsen: We're talking about the mechanic 2 position; there is also a higher paid mechanic 1 position and a supervisory position. I would be ok limiting the top pay for this position, based on the assumption, if warranted, an employee could be moved from mechanic b to mechanic a and receive the higher pay that way. I do want to comment about Mr. Buske's basis for this. If I'm a mechanic, and I'm working on trucks, the fact that I'm working for a municipality that doesn't generate a profit vs. one that does, it's immaterial to me as an employee. I'm just trying to make a living. Are we saying we can't compete with the private market? I don't think you would get quality employees because they would work for the private sector because they will always be able to make more money based on that. I would be ok with the amendment on that basis

Alderman D'Astice: I'm ok with this. The 7,000 increase in the final two years equates to 11.1% increase in salary. If you add cost of living you could be talking 15%. I would absolutely agree on that. As far as the basis of Mr. Buske's motion, I would have to disagree with my compatriot next to me; in addition to salary there are benefits that this does not include. The benefits that our municipality offers as compared to what most people get in the private sector, specifically a pretty healthy pension, vacation time, sick days, etc., etc., would more than compensate so you have to look at it and say do I want more money and less benefits, or less money and its made up for with all the extra benefits the City would provide in relation to the stability of not having to go through the ups and downs of the economy. The City would have two mechanics and 100 pieces of equipment and we've always had a 100 pieces of equipment as compared to the retail where it gets busy sometimes and sometimes it doesn't. I would support this.

Alderman Cannon: The amendment says the 7<sup>th</sup> year; there would be 3,500 less, the last year 7,000 less

**City Council Meeting**  
**July 12, 2011**  
**Page 8**

Mayor Rooney: Correct. The amendment would strike the number 63,788 and insert the number 60,288. It would also would strike the number 70,876 and replace it with 63,876. I'm not phrasing it that way on purpose; I'm phrasing it as we're taking 3,500 out of each step and then 7,000 just because it's easier to deal with. The amendment is shall those two steps have a strike and insertion? Shall we remove 3,500 from step 7 and 7,000 from step 8?

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

NAYS:

ABSENT:

Mayor Rooney: The Ordinance is now amended. Mr. Buske, I will pay the respect of going to you first because you said you also had further things after you're amendment

Alderman Buske: I'm going to make another motion. I wasn't happy with steps. I guess we're going to live with them, but that's an automatic raise. My motion will be this, if an employee is on a step program, he will get a step raise for that year, but he will not get a COLA raise. That would be eliminated. He would get only one raise. If a man is in the step program and he gets promoted, he will take the promotion, but will not get a COLA. You could basically get a step raise, a COLA raise, and be promoted. You could get three raises. I think that is so unfair. They will get only one raise

Mayor Rooney: The Chair considers the point well taken, but the motion not. I believe that requires a larger way to tackle that issue. We would have to make some form of ordinance to talk about the promotion side and since this ordinance does actually lay out dollar amounts, we would simply have to, if a cost of living adjustment is negotiated for next year, it would actually have to be written to apply to this position. By having dollar amounts, what you said about cost of living adjustment will not happen. That's already taken care of because these dollar amounts will not change if a cost of living adjustment is given next year. At that time we could easily say it does not apply to this particular position.

Alderman Buske: What about the rest of the positions?

Mayor Rooney: That requires an ordinance of itself

Alderman Buske: Ok, how do we do that?

Mayor Rooney: Bring that up under Matters not on the Agenda. You may ask Mr. Krumstok to bring an ordinance like that forward

Alderman Buske: A promotion usually calls for 10%

Mr. Krumstok: It depends on the promotion, but that would be fair

Alderman Buske: A promotion is one raise, they shouldn't get a COLA. They should get one raise, not two or three

Mayor Rooney: That's certainly a legitimate opinion, but the Chair would rule that not applicable to this ordinance. It would have to be an ordinance on its own that goes City-wide

Alderman Buske: That's fine.

**City Council Meeting**  
**July 12, 2011**  
**Page 9**

Alderman Larsen: If we approve this ordinance, this is for one position, effectively one person. We could change the pay rate for this position or any other position at some later date. We're not just painting ourselves into a corner by approving it. All we're doing is not continuing the pay plan we had previously

Mayor Rooney: For this particular position, correct. The question is shall the ordinance be adopted

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

Nays: none

Absent:

Ordinance Adopted

**B. Ordinance No. 11-18 / Amend Chapter 38 – Environment**

Mayor Tom Rooney read the background on this Ordinance.

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

Alderman Larsen: How did we land on such a curious number?

Mayor Rooney: In our discussion under 1<sup>st</sup> reading it was originally \$225, it was batted around to make it 1,000, staff was given direction go back at this again and give us figure that could be defensible legally by actual costs to the Staff and that was the direction they were given to come forward for 2<sup>nd</sup> reading

Ms. Dehner: That's exactly what was calculated with the staff involved in doing these cases

Alderman Larsen: I'd like to propose an amendment to make it \$350 even

Mayor Rooney: The Chair would ask unanimous consent. Does anyone object to making the fee \$350?

Alderman Banger: A few thoughts on this

Mayor Rooney: If I may ask you to hold on for a few seconds. Mr. Larsen, would you formally make a motion.

Alderman Larsen: I move to make it \$350.00 even

Mayor Rooney: It has been moved and seconded to amend the ordinance to strike 352.80 and insert 350.00.

Alderman Larsen: \$352.80 seems to be an awkward number to land on. As much as I'm a proponent of this environmental ordinance in general, and not having the city shoulder any additional administrative costs in this particular case, I think for the city to shelve the 2.80 is acceptable in my view

Alderman Banger: I congratulate staff on her exactitude with this figure. The State passed a law that said cities can charge back for costs associated with cleaning up properties. This was brought on by the onslaught of foreclosures and walk aways. The intent of this law, and the intent of the \$225, was to

**City Council Meeting**  
**July 12, 2011**  
**Page 10**

recoup our cost involved in property mitigation, the cleanup of property, the majority of which are walk aways, bank foreclosures, and seizures. Last time we talked about this it went all the way up to let's inflict some punishment on what we considered mostly to be banks. Mr. Macholl advised we couldn't do that. It wasn't our job to punish people; it was our job to recoup costs. I was planning on making an amendment to bring it back to \$225. This exact figure was actually brought up by Staff researching given current staffing levels and current staffing costs, what the cost to the City would be. I like the \$225 initially. The result is we are now recouping some of the costs, where we weren't doing that. I thought the \$225 sounded good and my idea for an amendment was to adopt \$225 as previously discussed by staff and that would be my idea to bring it back down to. I agree with Mr. Larsen that the 352.80 is pure silliness. The \$225, in my opinion, is number 1, more than nothing; number 2 is probably more realistic than our \$352.80 which reflects our current staffing and every possible amount of time that could be put into it. If Mr. Macholl has to take a look at this, maybe we should calculate that cost. I thought the level of exactitude which we directed staff to get was over the top. They're doing exactly what we asked them to. I like the \$225. It's more in the spirit of the actual statute.

Mayor Rooney: We can ask Mr. Larsen, are you willing to change your number from 350 to 225

Alderman Larsen: Our actual costs are 352.80 are they not?

Ms. Dehner: Yes, with staff time that is entailed in carrying one of these cases through from the very beginning, first inspection, through actually placing a lien on the property

Alderman Larsen: Where does 225 come in? Was that some arbitrary number?

Ms. Dehner: Not necessarily. It wasn't an exact number, in fact it was reduced somewhat

Alderman Larsen: Yeah, reduce by like \$127.80. No, I don't see any basis for going back to \$225

Mayor Rooney: Then the amendment will stand at \$350 and Mr. Banger, you're advised that if whether or not this amendment does go through, once it is done you are free to propose to change the number back down to \$225, if you wish. At the moment the subject is really just rounding a number down for ease.

Alderman Cannon: Ms. Dehner, on recording fees, how much does it cost to do that?

Ms. Dehner: I believe \$50.00

Alderman Cannon: Does our law firm handle that?

Ms. Dehner: I understand we can do that

Alderman Cannon: So there are no legal costs involved

Ms. Dehner: Not at this time

Alderman Cannon: Do we charge interest

Ms. Dehner: Yes, we're charging 9%

**City Council Meeting**  
**July 12, 2011**  
**Page 11**

Alderman Judd: Question, \$225 to 352

Mayor Rooney: Once again, we can open that up after the amendment is dealt with, but the amendment is really are we going to round 352.80 down to \$350. The question is shall the ordinance be amended to strike \$352.80 and simply insert \$350.

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

NAYS:

ABSENT:

Mayor Rooney: Ordinance is amended to \$350.00. Mr. Banger, as promised, if you wish you could make your amendment now and then we can start the discussion over. Do you wish to move forward with that amendment?

Alderman Banger: No

Alderman Judd: From 225 to 352, 50% difference, why the huge disparity. If it would have been 275 to 352, that's one thing, but are we off that much?

Ms. Dehner: It was rounded down originally

Alderman Judd: That's a little bit more than rounding

Ms. Dehner: This was to be a little more palatable

Alderman Judd: I want to make sure we didn't magically find more cost.

Ms. Dehner: No

Alderman Judd: Section 3869, number a (Alderman Judd read the section). Can we add something in here; we can go to adjudication correct? I'm still concerned that you get a resident, they can send me a notice, I don't do anything about it, they cut it and send me a bill. I don't like that. If the provision is there for adjudication, again this main purpose is for the banks and people that neglect their property; they're not going to come here for adjudication anyway. Can we add the wording adjudication, so that a resident who is here, that would actually say I want to argue this, has that ability? It doesn't state it in here. I'm really bothered when we don't have exacts in here. This seems to be a very gray area

Mayor Rooney: We'll turn to Mr. Macholl for a moment because Mr. Macholl, if I'm not mistaken in my memory how this process goes, we wouldn't actually need to put it in here that it can go to adjudication. This is one of the things that could come already, is it not?

Mr. Macholl: That is correct. We would provide notice to anyone who owns the property, whether it be a bank, a resident, whoever it is, they choose to be here, they can be here. If they choose not to be here, that have that right as well. I don't know where we're going with that

Mayor Rooney: Mr. Judd, the point being, you're point is well taken, but we would not need to actually add that to this code because it's actually something that comes after. Somebody can choose to go to

Adjudication. That's their choice. It wouldn't need to be specifically written here because there's all kinds of sections that are subject to adjudication and this would be one the way it is written. Guaranteed

Alderman Judd: Where's reasonably notice defined in here

Mayor Rooney: Having worked there 10 years ago, after having written these letters, seeing the trouble the City has to through to identify an actual property owners, because I'm sure it's a bank, but sometimes its somebody who is renting a property, reasonable notice is not the kind of thing that is going to be defined in an ordinance like this. There is one step that takes 10 days for them to respond, there is another step that takes 30. There are safeguards built in from the administrative side that doesn't need to be specified in the ordinance. Mr. Judd has asked the question, I would certainly not step in the way of an answer, but again, there are plenty of steps in place right now that don't need to be re-written with an ordinance

Ms. Dehner: You're exactly right. We do, in these cases, give reasonable amount of time. In this case with trees, we do know it is a more expensive and more owner's responsibility, in this case we would give them more time to get it done as long as it doesn't create a threat, that has a shorter period of time. Our goal is not to penalize or charge people unnecessarily, our goal is to get compliance and make sure everything is safe. We are not going to try to incur that cost if we can find an owner who will take care of it. They do not, we have that opportunity to go through adjudication and have an adjudicator ask why you haven't done this and then make a judgment on that.

Alderman Judd: A bank is not going to waste its time with this. Does a bank get an adjudication notice no matter what?

Ms. Dehner: Not for grass. In this case, if it was a dead tree that potentially could fall, that is going to cost significant, we could certainly do that, yes

Alderman Judd. What if its bushes that are unsightly?

Ms. Dehner: Unsightly is a notice. We're not going to trim bushes. We'll take them to adjudication. If there is a visibility, unsightly is not necessarily an issue. Unsightly has to mean if it's being, if the visibility is affected or the sidewalk is affected so people can't walk. Unsightly we're not going to, unsightly is so subjective

Alderman Judd: My concern was we're not going to send a bank to adjudication, but we have that in place. If we have to leave the wording this way, I'm not supporting this. It's a great ordinance, I like it, but I don't like the fact, in my opinion, a resident could get stuck for something that they don't, the wording's not in here, if that's the way it has to be, then that's the way it has to be, and that's how I'll vote

Alderman Buske: A person's home is his castle. You don't want people coming on my property, from that point we're protected by laws. If you see a tree that is dead, you would contact the people and advise them of that. We don't just go down and take it down. They'll go to adjudication and if they didn't like what happened they have legal options. The part I do like, Mr. Judd was talking about lousy looking bushes. I recall two instances of bushes blocking sight lines. Mr. Vogt asked these people if we could do the work for them to open it up. That's the way you go about it. I don't see any Hitler service going in here. I think Community Development will do it the right way. I don't have a problem with this because people still have legal aspects

Alderman Banger: I will support this because we have to recoup our costs. These are our exact costs. We did what we could do based on the State Statute. I like the fudge factor of the \$225. One thing I have to keep in mind is we just discussed an ordinance about lowering salaries. All of a sudden we're going to take salaries that are connected to these figures that calculate this very exact figure and we're going to lower them. So now this new figure, which doesn't have a fudge factor, is inflated and it's unfair, whether you're looking at banks or whether you're looking at private individuals. I like the 225; I think we've overcomplicated this because it gave us that fudge factor. It was along the spirit of the ordinance, which was you can now go after people who you couldn't go after before who were being bad citizens, whether they be actual citizens of the City, or some bank in who knows where who didn't care about properties they owned in cities. I think we should let staff and in this case, I have no problem with the \$225 figure, of being something grasped out of thin air, it wasn't exact, but I think it mirrored the spirit of the State law change that allowed us to recoup some of our costs. I would warn folks that when you get this exact, and simultaneously other things are happening like lowering salaries, then that complicates things. There is no fudge factor once we take anything that figured into this calculation into account and lower it. Certainly I'm going to support it because we are recouping our cost, which was the whole point of this. I just think we've overcomplicated it and we should have taken the first one and run with it and saved ourselves 70 minutes worth of discussion.

Mayor Rooney: The point is well taken, Mr. Banger. However, what we changed tonight was one position, and it was a mechanic position, so that wouldn't be involved in any of the administration of this particular ordinance

Alderman Banger: I understand that

Alderman D'Astice: Thank you for making it \$350, thank you for making it \$352.80. I wish we could make it 5,000 to get someone's attention. I know we can't do that, but if that was something we could have done 15 years ago, the Dominick center wouldn't be vacant right now. I'm good for \$350. I'd like to move the question please

Mayor Rooney: Previous question has been moved, is there a second. It has moved and seconded for previous question. The ayes have it by more than 2/3. The question is shall the ordinance be adopted

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

Nays: Judd

Absent:

Ordinance Adopted

**C. Ordinance No. 11-19 / Approve Amendment to the Planned Development to Allow Fencing in the Front Setback for Saratoga Condominiums**

Mayor Tom Rooney read the background on this Ordinance.

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

Alderman Buske: Ms. Dehner, the mayor just said that there are other areas in the city that have these fences. Are these commercial or some residential also

Ms. Dehner: The ones that were used as comparables are all residential complexes

Alderman Buske: Ok, complexes, not residential homes, because they can put a fence in the setback area too

Ms. Dehner: Complexes, townhomes, condominiums

Alderman Buske: Thank you

Mayor Rooney: The question is shall the ordinance be adopted

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

Nays: none

Absent:

Ordinance Adopted

**D. Ordinance No. 11-20 / Amend Ordinance No. 01-26 to Allow a 24-Hour Facility with Revised Signage (Lend Lease on Behalf of 7-Eleven, 4200 Kirchoff)**

Mayor Tom Rooney read the background on this Ordinance.

Alderman Larsen made a motion to adopt the Ordinance; it has been moved and seconded to adopt the Ordinance

Alderman Buske: The Marathon used to be open 24-hours a day. I think it's a benefit to have it open 24-hours again. They would have a liquor license, that would be the one transferred from the Marathon

Mayor Rooney: It can't be transferred by sale of the property. They will have to go through the Liquor Commission proceeding

Alderman Buske: So they still have to come back for a liquor license

Mayor Rooney: Correct. The question is shall the ordinance be adopted

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

Nays: none

Absent:

Ordinance Adopted

**E. Ordinance No. 11-21 / Approve a Text Amendment to the Comprehensive Zoning Code to Allow Secondary Face Sign in M-1 and M-2 Zoning District**

Mayor Tom Rooney read the background on this Ordinance.

Alderman Larsen made a motion to adopt the Ordinance; it has been moved and seconded to adopt the Ordinance

Mayor Rooney: The question is shall the ordinance be adopted

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

Nays: none

Absent:

Ordinance Adopted

➤ **CONSENT – ORDINANCES (1<sup>st</sup> Reading):**

**None**

➤ **NEW BUSINESS:**

**F. MOTION TO APPROVE PAYMENT OF BILLS ON WARRANT 07-12-2011**

Alderman Buske made a motion to approve the June 28, 2011 Warrant; it has been moved and seconded to approve the June 28, 2011 Warrant

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

NAYS:

ABSENT:

Warrant Approved

Mayor Rooney: Asking for consent to consider the four resolutions as one. Would anyone like any of the resolutions removed from the unanimous consent.

Alderman Buske: G

➤ **CONSENT – RESOLUTIONS:**

**H. Resolution No. 11-R-82 – Award Contract for Pavement Preservative - CAM**

**I. Resolution No. 11-R-83 – Award Contract for Pavement Preservative – GSB88**

**J. Resolution No. 11-R-84 – Award Contract for Sanitary Sewer & Storm Sewer Pipelining**

Mayor Rooney: Without objection, H, I, and J will all be considered as one. Is there objection. Is there a motion to approve resolutions H, I and J. Is there a motion to approve those three resolutions?

Alderman Buske made the motion, it was moved and seconded. Without objection Resolutions H, I and J are passed

**G. Resolution No. 11-R-81 – Award Contract for Purchase of a Dump Truck**

Mayor Rooney read the background on this Resolution.

Alderman Larsen made the motion to adopt the Resolution; it has been moved and seconded to adopt the resolution

Mayor Rooney: The Chair would ask unanimous consent to correct just a couple of typos that are in the actual resolution itself as the body. If you look at the CAS the base amount listed in the Resolution was actually the base amount from another company. We need to insert the number that was actually from Chicago International, and if you do the math of adding those numbers together, the \$575 for three minor upgrades that I mentioned in the description, is the difference and was inadvertently left out. Since those are typo changes to insert the correct bid amounts and to insert the phrase and \$575 for three minor upgrades, does any alderman object to simply amending the resolution to correct those typos. The Resolution is amended.

Alderman Buske: I met with Mr. Vogt and the Equipment Committee and Alderman Larsen. I would make a motion that we postpone this because Mr. Larsen and myself are looking for additional information that will be sent to us. We will be reviewing this.

Mayor Rooney: Mr. Buske, may I ask, postpone to July 26<sup>th</sup>, or the first meeting in August. We do have to specify a timeline

Alderman Buske: Mr. Vogt, I would have to ask Mr. Vogt, you're saying that, is there any emergency on what you're telling us of having to order this truck. We're talking about 5 months delivery

Mr. Vogt: It's estimated to be a 5 month delivery time and if it's postponed for at least two weeks, that's fine. We can get the information that was requested tonight.

Alderman Buske: Go for the two weeks

Mayor Rooney: There is a motion to postpone this Resolution until the July 26<sup>th</sup> meeting. Is there a second. It's been moved and seconded. Motions to postpone are debatable. Is there discussion. The question is shall this Resolution be postponed until the July 26<sup>th</sup> meeting

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

NAYS:

ABSENT:

Mayor Rooney: The Resolution has been postponed until the July 26, 2011 Council Meeting

### **OTHER BUSINESS & REPORTS:**

Mayor's Appointments:

- 1) Appoint Carol Adams to Veterans Committee – Term to expire 4/30/14**
- 2) Appoint Tom Callard to Fire & Police Commission – Term to expire 6/30/14**

Mayor Rooney: Without objection we'll consider the two appointments together as one. Mayor Rooney gave background on both appointees. The question is shall these two appointments be approved by the council

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

Nays:

Absent:

Mayor's Proclamation:

- 1) Tom Trzebiatowski's Retirement from Public Works**
- 2) Larry Hoehler's Retirement from Public Works**

City Clerk's Report:

City Staff Reports:

### **1) Community Items of Interest**

- 1) 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.
- 2) The 55<sup>th</sup> Annual Cornfest (held at the Community Church of Rolling Meadows, located at Kirchoff Road & Meadow Drive) is scheduled for Saturday, August 6<sup>th</sup> from 11 am to 7 pm. This is an annual event for families and individuals of all ages to enjoy. There will be a raffle, a craft fair to browse, and a meal consisting of: hot dog or hamburger, all the corn you can eat (picked at an area farmer's field the same day), beverage, and watermelon.
- 3) At the August 2<sup>nd</sup> Plan Commission, there will be four items on the agenda and they consist of: 1) a special use with a variation for outside storage at 3802 Industrial Avenue; 2) extension of subdivision approval at 2600 Benton Street; 3) amendment to the planned development elevations and sign variations at 1323 and 1327 Golf Road; and 4) a text amendment pertaining to increasing the amount of time that a temporary sign can be displayed for a school, institutional location or church.
- 4) There will be no August Zoning Board of Appeals meeting, however, at the September 7<sup>th</sup> meeting, currently, the July 6<sup>th</sup> tabled 4528 Lincoln Avenue request for variance to required side yard (garage addition) will be up again for action.
- 5) Storm damage - because of the storm, any storm debris or trees if you can bring that out to the parkway by 7:00am on July 18<sup>th</sup> we will pick it up. This is for storm damage and debris only

Alderman D'Astice: Having no power since 8:00 yesterday morning, I had something of Community Interest and I don't know if now is appropriate or Other Matters

Mayor Rooney: I believe that would be Matters Not on the Agenda

### **2) Salary Survey**

Mayor Rooney: As mentioned last week, there were four agencies that Mr. Krumstok was consulting with. We are not at the stage of preparing a resolution yet, but Mr. Krumstok, anything further to add

Mr. Krumstok: No, I've reached out to each one of them. We're waiting for a response

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

Mr. Vogt: No, just to note that we will be discussing the questions raised regarding weight limits on bridges at tomorrow's meeting with the information that we asked for and received from the City Engineer at the last meeting, as well as discussing Owl Drive speed controls, things that we have been discussing for several months. That meeting will be held tomorrow afternoon

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

Alderman Judd: The ambulance, which one is that that we're repairing, hopefully the old one

Mr. Vogt: Ambulance 623. I don't know if that is the old one or new one, I would defer to Chief Stewart

Mayor Rooney: Chief, off hand do you know about the number 623

Alderman Judd: Is this something's that in reserve or are we actually using this vehicle

Mr. Vogt: Yes, we are using it

### **5) May 2011 Financial Report**

Ms. Gallagher: There are three items to go through for the May 2011 unaudited financial report and statement of cash. We have included some projections for the general fund, so that is in the general fund summary. We also have, as of May, reached a 50% target and adjusted that because of the reserves that have come in. 40% are expenditures for the general fund, and also included in that is a cash statement and the other funds, as well

### **6) Presentation of the July 19, 2011 Committee of the Whole Agenda**

Mayor Rooney: There are two quick items. I have to be out of town next week in Cincinnati, Ohio and so Mr. D'Astice will be the Chair and will conduct that meeting. Mr. Macholl, you wish to be recognized that if we can there is an item that would need to be added based on things that have transpired today

Mr. Macholl: I've been in discussions for the last couple of weeks in connection with the Woodfield Crossings, formerly the 12 Oaks Property, concerning installation of a fence, a monument sign, some parking, and we've been talking about a license agreement. It should be very brief.

Mayor Rooney: Does anyone object to adding a brief 9<sup>th</sup> item for the Committee of the Whole next week. Without objection that's item 9

Alderman Buske: My wife is going through surgery on the 19<sup>th</sup>. I might be gone at that time. If I am, then we would take the two things I wanted to talk about which would be the Landscaping and Lawn Care, and Signs for Contractors, and postpone until the following Committee of the Whole.

Mayor Rooney: If that seat happens to be empty we'll know why, and whether it isn't or whether it's full next week, our thoughts will be with Brenda next Tuesday

Mr. Krumstok: Items number 4 and 5 are going to flip

Chief Stewart: Not on the agenda, but an answer on the ambulance. 2006 is the model that had repairs done which is in front line service now at Station 15

Alderman Judd: How many miles are on that?

Chief Stewart: I have no idea

Alderman Judd: It seems odd that we're replacing a CAM shaft and lifters for a vehicle that's five years old and probably doesn't have a ton of miles on it. Why are we doing this?

Chief Stewart: 5-years, low mileage, once again we're into a lot of engine hours as well. I will get you the mileage

Alderman Judd: I'm not comfortable doing this, personally

Mayor Rooney: I'm not sure under what circumstances someone would know the answers to those questions off the top of your head. When there are detailed questions asked of a department head, again, there have been a couple different portions of this evening where we delved back into asking department heads questions. This is something we want to try to minimize. This is what a COW is for. We understand everyone is busy, we certainly understand that not every time a packet comes out will someone have lots of time to contact folks, but we were talking about things that we had two weeks to ask questions. The Chair would ask that folks consider, from time to time, that no one is saying conduct anything behind closed doors, but what I said back in May, if you ask a question, and there's a point to asking in the open, please feel free to do so. I will not step on anybody's question, and if somebody asks a question, we'll let it be answered. Some of the things could have come up in the last two weeks and some of the things I don't see a conceivable way that someone sitting in this room would know the answer off the top of their head. Things will go a lot better for all of us if folks are given a little heads up that I have this question and I'd like that information to be ready at the meeting on Tuesday.

**MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA:**

Alderman D'Astice: I have a well-written letter, and I will cut it down, that I would like to read. It comes to me and the Council

Mayor Rooney: Reading of any document does require unanimous consent of the council. Does anyone object to the reading of the letter?

Alderman D'Astice: Read the letter inviting the Council and the public to come and watch the Rolling Meadows Park District swim team, the Rapids, for their first annual fundraiser. I think you should go there and watch these kids swim.

Alderman Buske: You said to bring this up at this time. I would like an ordinance designed that would not allow more than one raise to an employee a year, whether it be a step raise, a COLA or a promotion. We owe this to the residents as far as our salaries that have gotten so out of control.

Mayor Rooney: Mr. Krumstok will do that. In the past I have pointed out when things from the staff did not come back in the way that they were asked for. I would hope they will be creative. The portion of your request that would say they couldn't get a step and a cost of living adjustment in the same year; they don't have any idea how that could possibly be done without creating extra steps. It's literally just the way the math works. We'll hope they'll be creative, but if there is literally not a way to do it without creating extra steps, I don't want anyone to look at it as here's another instance where the staff didn't return what we asked. I think we're asking an impossible task in that case.

Alderman Buske: I don't understand

Mayor Rooney: A step is a percentage of the full salary. If the full salary changes, then the amount of money is going to change too. What you would have to do to make sure someone moving from 70% of a 50,000 salary, which should be 35,000, if they were to go to 75%, which would be 37,500, the next year if that salary changes, it will be higher than that. To not give them that would actually create a step 1.8 or something like that, because it would be about a \$300 difference that I don't think that that's something that they can make the math workout without adding additional steps in the middle. I think the promotional idea is certainly something that would work. If we wanted to talk about some way of altering the steps, we could, but literally when the % that is being calculated off the changes, there's not a way to keep it the same, there just isn't.

Alderman Buske: I recall even on promotions, I thought it was a little haywire here because for instance, step 5 is going to step 6, a promotion from one step to another should be 10%. It was not 10%; it was 8%, so we give him an additional step, now we're at 16%. If we're going to agree on 10% on these things, one step, or two steps should have 5% each so somehow it stays at 10. If you have to use two steps, rather than turn around, if he didn't get the 10% in one step, you give him two steps it's 14%, we have to adjust that where it would be accurate to what we're talking about. That's the problem I have with the steps

Mayor Rooney: Before we get lost in the numbers, that is the part they can come forward with an ordinance. It's the step and COLA that I think is really an impossible task. If they don't come up with a way to do it, I don't want anyone thinking here's an instance that Rooney's going to yell about again. In that case I wouldn't because I think we're setting them up for something that's impossible on that particular route. The promotion one should be something that's easy to do.

Alderman Buske: Let's see how it goes

Alderman Judd: Chief Stewart, my apology, I wasn't trying to put you on the spot. My concern is if we have a 2006 vehicle, I'm not interested in spending \$6,000 for a little bit more information. Has this already been done and we have to pay for it. What are we doing?

Mayor Rooney: The original intent for the idea of the purchase order disclosures over \$2500 was to do exactly what Mr. Judd is asking. The thing hasn't been spent yet, it's in the works, and the entire purpose was to allow alderman to get advanced notice and say I don't think I'll support this if it comes forward in the warrant. There's nothing wrong with doing what you're doing now under Matters not on the Agenda, saying I don't think I'm good with this, because that is the purpose.

**City Council Meeting**  
**July 12, 2011**  
**Page 21**

Alderman Judd: I don't know if I will or won't. On the face of it I won't. I would like more information from either Chief or Fred. Why is a vehicle that doesn't have that many hours or miles need to have it's CAM shaft replaced. I've had vehicles with over 200,000 miles, but haven't touched them. I don't know why I would want to do that, spend \$6,000 of the citizens' money unless it's a very fundamental reason why it's bad and then why wasn't it covered under warranty at some point.

Mayor Rooney: Chief, sometime before the July 26<sup>th</sup> meeting, if you could please put together a description of why the repair was necessary and send it to everyone. If you're able to do that over the next two weeks, because the next warrant couldn't be until then anyway, that would be appreciated. Is that something you can do?

Chief Stewart: Yes, I will get with PW to determine why those repairs needed to be made

Alderman Judd: Are the repairs going to be done and the warrant is to pay for it. I wouldn't know that we would want to do that yet. I don't want to do it to say we did it, here's why we did it, and write a check for \$6,000 because at that point and time I can't say don't pay for it.

Mayor Rooney: If we want to put it on hold, pending the information, that requires a vote of the council, that can't just be a request by an alderman. Purchase Orders, it would take three weeks between purchase order to being spent. We discussed at the time at the very earliest it could be on the warrant at the very next meeting, but more than likely it would be at the warrant two meetings hence. That would be plenty of time to get a report from the Chief and if you felt you wanted to go forward with stopping the repair, that would be something that, I would like this to be put on the agenda for the 26<sup>th</sup>. Through the channel of Mr. Krumstok, the Chief would get that and then be told don't go ahead with this until the Council decides and then on the 26<sup>th</sup> there could actually be a resolution or some form of action that the council would take. A request of information can be done by any alderman, for any reason. A request to put something on hold requires a vote of the council.

Alderman Judd: My concern was I didn't want to get the information in a week and a half, a week and four days, and then we get the warrant two weeks from now and it's a moot point. If we're going to get this information in a week and there are no issues it's no big deal. If we get this information in a week, and a week and a day the repair gets done, then you can't get out of it.

Mayor Rooney: I believe the intent is clear with staff and we can take care of that. The intent will be followed

Mr. Vogt: I have some information I can provide. The ambulance was sent out for repairs due to the fact that it was a front line ambulance. This happened two weeks ago and was diagnosed and because we're down in terms of a mechanic, staff decision was made to outsource the repair so that we could get the ambulance back up as quickly as possible. It was an emergency

Chief Stewart: I talked to our maintenance Battalion Chief. I understand this problem has been an ongoing issue with the international type chassis and engines. It would appear that it probably is a little premature, but they haven't had enough of those instances where it's considered a recall. It's a repair that we had to make

Mayor Rooney: Does that answer the question

Alderman Judd: Not really, if this is ongoing, why didn't it come under warranty.

**City Council Meeting**  
**July 12, 2011**  
**Page 22**

Mayor Rooney: Instruction to staff, please put something together on paper as soon as you can, knowing that there is a concern about the repairs, and send it to everyone, that would be appreciated. The intent is in time before the purchase order gets paid. That is the intent of the request

Alderman Judd: Is it being done

Mayor Rooney: Is that correct?

Chief Stewart: Yes, the work was done. We were without the ambulance for a week. We had to borrow an ambulance from Palatine for the 4<sup>th</sup> of July, so we didn't have enough equipment and we had to make the repair

Mayor Rooney: So the purchase order is just in the hopper now because it just happened right now

Chief Stewart: Correct

Mayor Rooney: I misunderstood that. I was not following that part, I apologize. Then Mr. Judd, how do you wish to proceed

Alderman Judd: I would like the information

Mayor Rooney: There are multiple requests to go into closed session. There are actually four personnel items that all fall under personnel, they all fall under section (c) (1) of the Open Meetings Act. There is an additional request for union negotiations that's section (c) (2) of the Open Meetings Act. Without objection they will be considered as one.

**CLOSED SESSION:**

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

Alderman D' Astice made a motion to go into Closed Session; it was moved and seconded to go into Closed Session

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

NAYS:

ABSENT:

Mayor Rooney advised the press and audience members that no action is anticipated after the Closed Session

**Entered into Closed Session at 9:20pm**

**Returned to Open Session at 11:15pm**

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business, Alderman Cannon moved to adjourn, it was moved and seconded to adjourn the meeting

**UNANIMOUS**

City Council meeting of July 12, 2011, adjourned at 11:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by: Ginny Cotugno, Deputy City Clerk

July 12, 2011 Minutes Approved by Council on July 26, 2011

---

Ginny Cotugno, Deputy City Clerk