

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
MINUTES – July 26, 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, Assistant Community Development Director Jim Sylverne, Assistant Finance Director Melissa Gallagher, Fire Chief Ron Stewart, Police Chief Dave Scanlan, Public Works Director Fred Vogt, and City Attorney Jim Macholl

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:**

Alderman Banger moved to approve the minutes of the July 5, 2011 Special Committee of the Whole Meeting; and the July 12, 2011 Council 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:**

Thanked Alderman D’Astice for handling the July 19, 2011 Committee of the Whole Meeting.

Talked about the rainstorm on Friday night. A number of residents contacted him or the City offices that made reference to the Everbridge automated phone call. Number of folks expressed concerns that during the overnight hours when folks are sleeping, we would want to make sure that it is targeted well. I pointed out to a number of them that there were some folks who the call actually made a difference, not necessarily with their belongings, but more commonly with their cars. I was able to point out to folks that to some, that call was necessary. I stand in agreement that if there’s anything we can do to target things to certain areas, that might allow folks a little more overnight sleep.

Gave an update on Brenda Buske. The surgery went well and we all send our best wishes to Brenda

**WARD REPORTS:**

**Ward 5 – Alderman Banger**

Had a call last night from a resident that was expressing frustration from sewer backups. The storm system just can't handle the volume of rain that fell in a small amount of time. Mr. Vogt might send a mailer out with suggestions on fixes. I will follow-up with you, Fred.

**Ward 6 – Alderman D'Astice**

Had quite a bit of flooding in the area. There was more water than the system could handle. We did have a tree come down that was blocking a part of Salt Creek that is connected to Barker Lake. Compliments to Fred, his team, and Chief Scanlan for removing the tree. Did we install a check valve backflow preventer from Barker Lake to the Creek so that it didn't back up?

Mr. Vogt: The check valve has not been installed. We have priced a few different types. Once our City Engineer gets the information from us, and approves it, we'll proceed with that. One of the delays that we had was trying to get a contractor or two down the creek because we had to wait until the water level got low enough in order to be able to do the measurements. Now that we have that, we have the prices; we'll get that installed probably within the next 30-60 days.

So I can let the residents know that that will be installed within the next 30-60 days.

Mr. Vogt: It was discussed and recommended last year, it's in this year's budget and we have been working on it when the weather conditions allowed us to get the measurements. Weather permitting it will be installed in 30 days.

What that does is prevent that portion of the creek from backing into Barker Lake

Mr. Vogt: It would delay the water or prevent it providing the water in Salt Creek does over top the bank

I can let the residents know that's being taken care of. Someone sandbagged the transformers, as well. The backflow preventer would help with that too?

Mr. Vogt: That would delay the situation from occurring or, if in the event that we only get perhaps 3 or 4 inches of rainfall overnight last Saturday, it may have prevented it from flooding. We put the sandbags unfortunately after the event because the water rose so high we couldn't get there beforehand. We did that as a preventative measure later.

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

Mr. Len Prejna, 2135 Adams Street, Rolling Meadows – Wanted to thank Fred and his crew. I wanted to mention to the residents of Rolling Meadows when you have your sewers rotted out, you can call the City and they will bring a television camera and check out free of charge your sewer all the way to the street which is a win-win for the citizens and the City because it gives them an opportunity to go into it at a different angle.

**City Council Meeting**  
**July 26, 2011**  
**Page 3**

One of things we need this Council to focus on is that we need to have more growth & development in the City. As a citizen, we hear City Council meetings where the biggest discussion we have is signs. We're all concerned about signs, whether it's AYSO or the Rolling Meadows High School, whoever wants to come before you. There's a little important fact that needs to be brought forth. We do not need your permission to put signs in our front yard. Never have and never will. Anything that's put behind our sidewalk is none of your business. I've never seen an Alderman come before the City Council and ask permission to put a sign up when its election time or mayoral candidate. For those of you that have lived in Rolling Meadows for a long time, for over 50 years you will see a sign for Cornfest right down the street on Kirchoff. Rather than getting involved in long discussions on where you can put a sign and not put a sign, if you're a resident of Rolling Meadows put it behind a sidewalk on your front lawn and maybe we can get the City Council instead of spending time worrying about signs it would be more better spent trying to get more economic development for the City.

Mayor Tom Rooney closed the floor.

➤ **PENDING:**

None

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

- A. Ordinance / Approve an Amendment to the Planned Development and Variations for Apartments at Woodfield Crossing**
- B. Ordinance / Approve a License Agreement between the City of Rolling Meadows and DIV Woodfield Gardens Property, LLC**
- C. Ordinance / Amend Chapter 18 “Buildings and Building Regulation” – Accessory Structures**

Mayor Rooney: Would anyone like item A, B, or C removed from the Consent Agenda. The Chair would entertain a motion to consider Items A, B, and C as one.

Alderman D'Astice made a motion to approve Items A, B, and C; it was moved and seconded to send Items A, B, and C for second reading.

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

NAYS:

ABSENT:

➤ **NEW BUSINESS:**

**D. MOTION TO APPROVE PAYMENT OF BILLS ON WARRANT 07-26-2011**

Alderman Banger made a motion to approve the July 26, 2011 Warrant; it has been moved and seconded to approve the July 26, 2011 Warrant

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

NAYS:

ABSENT:

Warrant Approved

➤ **CONSENT – RESOLUTIONS:**

**E. Resolution No. 11-R-81 – Award Contract for Purchase of Dump Truck (Postponed at the July 12, 2011 Council Meeting)**

**F. Resolution No. 11-R-85 – Award Contract for Meacham Road Concept Engineering**

**G. Resolution No. 11-R-86 – Approve Intergovernmental Agreement with the Village of Schaumburg for Meacham Road**

Mayor Rooney: Staff has asked that Item E be postponed once again. The Chair would entertain a motion to postpone this item for two more weeks until the August 9<sup>th</sup> meeting. Alderman Larsen has made the motion, Mr. Buske has seconded it. The item is postponed until the August 9<sup>th</sup> Council Meeting.

The Chair suspects there will be discussion on Items F & G. If we expect discussion, we wouldn't usually put things on a consent agenda. The Chair will only ask you unanimous consent to consider items F & G together, not to pass them without debate, but simply to consider them together because they are definitely connected to each other dealing with the same subject. Is there any objection to dealing with items F & G together? Mr. Buske

Alderman Buske: Are we going to discuss these at a COW meeting?

Mayor Rooney: We will be discussing them right now as long as there is no objection. Seeing no objection, Resolutions F & G will be considered together. Is there a motion to pass Resolutions F & G? Mr. Larsen has made the motion; it's been moved and seconded to pass Resolutions F & G. Is there discussion on either Resolution?

**F. Resolution No. 11-R-85 – Award Contract for Meacham Road Concept Engineering**

Alderman Buske: I talked with Mr. Vogt about this and it appears that what this pertains to is the Meacham Road reconstruction. I talked with Mr. Vogt and what you're talking about when you talk about feasibility and concept engineering, this doesn't really match out regular engineering of the job. Correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Vogt, what this thing is going to be is its going to be an engineering deal called concept engineering to find out anything we can to get information back to the people that this

**City Council Meeting**  
**July 26, 2011**  
**Page 5**

came up about ten years ago, even more than that, and it was shot down by a few people. My feeling is that I'm not personally that interested in concept engineering. We have safety problems out on that road and that's what we're trying to correct. If we're going to be spending 40 some thousand dollars in concept and we're going to listen to two or three people say well I might as well lose a couple trees, which will basically be covered anyway, I think it is a waste of money. Either we turn around and we go across this and say we're going to do it, then take the money, forget the concept, and turn around and use it for the engineering to get the street going.

Mayor Rooney: The Chair realizes that while Mr. Buske was speaking that I neglected to read the general introduction to these two items so that anyone watching without an agenda would know what we're talking about. The Chair read the background on these resolutions.

Alderman Larsen: In the background information it says the engineering services are both required and desired prior to completing Phase I preliminary engineering design. Mr. Vogt, can you expand on the requirement and what aspects of it are required as opposed to desired.

Mr. Vogt: The required aspects deal with our ability to dialogue and discuss with IDOT the criteria for the roadway. The traffic counts, for example are required. The accident data and analysis is required. A very preliminary or concept type of cross section analysis of the roadway is required in terms of talking to IDOT. The reasons we need to do that is that locally we can convince the state to fund most, if not all, the construction in addition to the 3.5 million dollars that we have previously secured in federal funding assistance, as well as to hopefully pay for a goodly share of the engineering. What we will have to develop with the state, once we focus in on the private scope, is a letter of intent. For those that have been around a number of years we had similar with Rohlwing Road, similar with Plum Grove Road. It was reconstructed 4 or 5 years ago. That's very critical as that is where we have to commit to any funding that the City will provide because the state hopefully will agree with what they indicated to us ten, fifteen years ago, was a jurisdiction transfer of the road to Rolling Meadows and Schaumburg. We hope that that encourages them to pick up more than they normally would do. Normally the local agencies have to pick up and pay for most of the Phase I and some of the Phase II engineering. It will put us in a better position with IDOT to do this concept engineering and have this information for them before we talk with them. One of the requirements is that we also have in this whole process is to have a public information meeting. That will be the last thing we do in this.

Alderman Larsen: Isn't it correct that in general there are preliminary engineering designs and studies and a number of council members have balked at the high cost, or apparent high cost, of some of these things, as well as some residents. Is it fair to say that that's just part of the way the whole thing works? If you want to get grant money, if you want to do anything intergovernmental, that you have to have some kind of, you have to establish some kind of an objective, a definitive base line based on engineering criteria and that's just the nature of the beast.

Mr. Vogt: As an overall response to that, I would agree the answer is yes. On this particular project, I would further point out that a number of tasks that we would do in the concept engineering would be work we would have to do in the preliminary Phase I engineering anyway, even if we didn't do it before the discussions and development of the letter of intent with IDOT. One way or another we would have to do the tasks that are within this proposal.

Alderman Larsen: That's been my sense as well. It's not like we're taking 21,000 and blowing it needlessly. It's just part of what has to be done. Same thing applies to if we were going to try to get some economic development done in a shopping center like Dominick's. Any perspective buyers are

**City Council Meeting**  
**July 26, 2011**  
**Page 6**

going to be looking for traffic data, not just we think it's a nice spot. No one is going to invest millions and millions of dollars based on our gut feeling.

Alderman Buske: Fred, that is not exactly where our conversation was. I understand there's engineering to be done, so you don't have to bring that up and bring it to everyone's attention. We know that. We talked about that you wanted to run with this engineering thing because I asked you, at one of the COW meetings there was some talk about this. You said that the thing you were talking about doing was doing some engineering concept to inform the people because you lost their, several years ago there was enough people that complained about this that we lost the project and we had 3 million dollars now set aside. That's what you told me. If you recall, I said I would not go along with that. It was just wasted money just to tell the people what's going to be done. I did not say that the regular engineering I'm against. I did not say that. To come back and say that well I'd like everyone to know, we all know the engineering has to be done, but this is a different type of engineering that I was informed it was going to be. I said before I would waste 40 some thousand or our share of half of that, to just advise people what's going to happen, I wouldn't do that and let two or three people say well I don't like this and we just lose 3 million dollars and we still have a dangerous road, that's what our conversation was.

Alderman D'Astice: Will doing the concept engineering reduce the cost for Phase I engineering? It sounds as if many of the issues that are going to be studied are part of Phase I engineering.

Mr. Vogt: Yes, that is correct. We would expect to see some reduction if we proceed with Phase I engineering, the primary area being the traffic. Count data, the accident analysis, as well as some of the cross sections in terms of the grading, in terms of looking at the drainage, is all something that would be part of the scope of the Phase I study, so we will have a leg up, so to speak, or a bit of an advantage in terms of having some of this work already done so the Phase I costs should be less than they normally would if we were just starting the Phase I

Alderman D'Astice: Does the state require us to do that in this concept engineering or is that a requirement of Phase I engineering.

Mr. Vogt: The state would not outright require us to do a concept engineering plan, but because of the numerous discussion that have taken place years ago, and part of that being what I discussed with Alderman Buske several weeks ago, there needs to be some information that we feel is provided to the people that live along the road, as well as those in the neighborhood if they wish to have input. At this point we don't know whether a two lane road with a center shared left turn lane would meet state and federal funding standards. We don't know whether that's the preferred construction technique of the residents. We don't know whether or not the project should have storm sewers included or whether we should try to maintain more of a rural character with a storm water drainage ditch. That ditch would be somewhat subjective to how many lanes the roadway actually will ultimately have. There are also things that are a bit unusual with the road in terms of the sensitivity of the landscape. Those are all things that not only do we need to study from the standpoint of what we can do with the various different lane widths that may be considered, as well as trying to accommodate that for the residents out there.

Alderman D'Astice: It sounds as if there's a possibility of a two lane road with a center lane or a four lane road.

## City Council Meeting

July 26, 2011

Page 7

Mr. Vogt: I believe the alternatives probably will end up being a what we would call a 3 lane road with one lane in each direction and a center left turn lane or a 5 lane which would be 2 lanes in each direction with a center turn lane.

Alderman D'Astice: And for the safety and the flow on that street, do we have any sense of what would be best for the region, for the City?

Mr. Vogt: I certainly have my opinion. I think its somewhat based on that, but until we do the data collection in terms of the traffic counts, the movement counts, as well as the accident data and that all has to follow IDOT standards to be considered by them, we won't have any specific empirical data to be able to share with them. The data may come back and say we can't do a 3 lane cross section and use federal funding. We would have to do a 4 lane or a 5 lane. That's part of what we need to do with this.

Alderman D'Astice: So I see what you're saying, or part of what you're saying. We need to do some engineering that would normally be done in Phase I engineering, the traffic counts to find out what size road IDOT would possibly fund and then go to the people and say this is what it takes to fund the road. Let's take the 2 opposite ends, a 3 lane vs. a 5 lane, let's just say the people want a 3 lane and they want ditches, but IDOT says it requires 5 lanes and sewers. The recommendation from the engineering study is going to come back and say 5 lanes with sewers because that's what it takes for the state to pay or you can do it the other way but we're not paying anything and it's on you own. So is that why we're doing some of the Phase I engineering during the concept opposed to Phase I engineering?

Mr. Vogt: That is a very good summary.

Alderman D'Astice: I just want to make sure I understand this because so we're not going to go to the people and say what do you want, we are going to go to them after the fact, after we've done this, which is normally done afterwards, and say here's what the state is going to pay.

Mr. Vogt: Yes, because we see little point in having discussion with the residents in that area and the neighbors in that area without having all of our homework done.

Alderman Banger: I think if our intention behind this is from the start, we are going to make Meacham Road safer and less congested, then our intention going forward depending on what the results of this preliminary study comes back, should be whatever the cost, let's just call this the price of progress is going to be in terms of those households along Meacham Road. We're going to be prepared as a council to say we spent a lot of money on the preliminary study, which Schaumburg shared with us, and this is dependent on Schaumburg having an agreement with us to go half and half with this preliminary study, at that point we need to make a commitment to say we are going to go whole hog with whatever is recommended and this is why there are things out there such as eminent domain where the government says we've decided to put a 5 lane street through here, we're going to carve a small section of property, and compensate you for it. I think as a council I'm going to support this and I think as a council, if you're going to support this, you should also think ahead to the next step which is going to be oh look what the engineer has recommended is a five lane possibly and then at that point we should also be committed to supporting what they say, because number 1, we're going to get that money to build it; number 2 we're going to have some costs that we're going to be spending if we approve this and we want to make sure we're committing and doing justice for the money that we spent to commit to go ahead with what is recommended.

**City Council Meeting**  
**July 26, 2011**  
**Page 8**

Alderman Buske: Thank you Mr. Banger, that's exactly what I'm saying. If we're going to spend all this money, this council has to say we're going to get a safety issue taken care of. If anyone says a couple people complain and I'm not going to support it, then I won't support it. I don't see us wasting that kind of money. Let's go through the whole process and see what comes up.

Alderman Cannon: If this road is owned by the state, why is the onus on us to pay for all these studies?

Mr. Vogt: That is the procedures that the state puts to us. The state does not generally improve roadways, they only maintain roadways. This being an unnumbered state route, this has been something for many years has been somewhat their unstated policy to give those roads up to the local agencies with the incentive that the state will utilize federal, and in many cases, state money to pay for the improvements. Part of Plum Grove Road was done exactly that way with the jurisdictional transfer. For Rohlwing Road, north of Industrial, was done that way from the state. Rohlwing Road south of Industrial was done by County jurisdictional transfer incentive, as well as Kirchoff Road in the downtown area back 15 years ago. It's the way IDOT does business. IDOT about 8 or 10 years ago put a resurfacing on Meacham Road because it was in very poor shape, one of the worst roads in the area. My guess is that a few years from now they may do the same thing, but that's all they would do to the roadways to continue to maintain it in its current condition.

Alderman Cannon: There's no possibility that they would rebuild it on their own.

Mr. Vogt: We're certainly hopeful. I would certainly hope to bring back to the council after we can dialogue and negotiate with them a letter of intent for that. In addition to the federal funding, would provide for a goodly amount of the state funding as their willingness to improve the roadway to what we and the Village of Schaumburg would desire and take it off their route system and give it to Schaumburg and Rolling Meadows. We have yet to see, based upon the fact that we don't know what we're asking for yet until we do this preliminary study, what the state would come up with, when they might program it, something they might be interested to do, something we might find out may be several years away in that case. Those are the questions and discussions we have to have.

Alderman Cannon: A project this size, what are the odds that we will have to contribute more money in the future. Is it possible we'll get to the process where we actually decide on a plan and then the state says we'll give you this much funding, but the project is going to cost x, so you guys have to come up with 100,000, 400,000, is that a possibility?

Mr. Vogt: It's certainly a possibility. Many times the state will come back to the local agencies and dealing with landscaping, dealing with bike paths, dealing with other types of amenities, say that those are strictly local agency costs. They aren't qualified for state costs. Typically utility relocations are not eligible for state participation. We don't see that there's a lot of City or Village of Schaumburg utilities out there that would be facing relocation, so we don't think those costs are significant, but again, it's all part of a process and some things are very standard for the state and some things, over the years, and depending on the project, have been negotiable.

Alderman Cannon: I'm really frustrated with this whole thing when we take possession of these properties. I think going forward, we're just putting Rolling Meadows in handcuffs because we're not going to get the funding to repair these things. 20 – 30 years down the line, no matter how well we construct this road, we're not going to have the funding to fix it. Even though it's great that the state gives it to us, they're not giving us any funding mechanism to take care of it long term and we have to take care of it from the day they give it to us. That really concerns me from the City's standpoint.

**City Council Meeting**  
**July 26, 2011**  
**Page 9**

Alderman D'Astice: Back in June we were talking about engineering and engineering overages. I don't see anything in the resolution that says should there be an overage, the engineer has to pay for it. I'm just wondering do we need to have that put in here or do we need to have it put into all of our contracts from now on because I know we've had engineers come back to us and say it's a change order for an extra 3,000 or an extra 5,000. June 14<sup>th</sup> was when I had mentioned that if I can see some kind of a clause in here that covers us so that if there is an overage, the engineer put the bid together and you have to live with what you said you're going to do. My question is do we have that clause put in there?

Mayor Rooney: We'll let Mr. Macholl answer that, but before he does, I would just say that the answer that we usually dealt with from up here, you're correct, is very different for something like this than for actually building a project. The actual resolution does contain the phrase "an amount not to exceed" and there is no actual building where somebody can come back and say we actually had to move certain things and incurred costs. Again, I'll turn it over to Mr. Macholl, but the usual way we've operated under these things is that for something like this, if they feel they go over, that's tough, we said not to exceed and there is no actual building going on.

Mr. Macholl: You've answered it.

Mayor Rooney: Mr. D'Astice, does that answer the question?

Alderman D'Astice: That's fine. I'm fine with that, but again, I will be bringing this up every time there's an engineering study of any kind. I'll be asking the same question. I know it says not to exceed, but it says that in all other ones and they come back with well we need to do an extra study for this or we need to move something for that and there's a change clause in there. I think we hold all of these engineers and firms that we hire to their bids. I think we, as government, need to start holding them to their costs as well.

Mayor Rooney: I would say again there is a very big dividing line between actual buildings. You're point is very well taken. The Village of Schaumburg is going to consider these same items. Our vote tonight, whatever it is, will only take effect if the Village of Schaumburg also passes these items in an identical form. If they vote them down, we're back to the beginning and if they make any changes, if they strike the word "the" and insert the word "in", it would have to come back to us for approval, so there's nothing binding with tonight's vote. Shall resolutions F & G be adopted?

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

NAYS:

ABSENT:

The resolutions pass

**OTHER BUSINESS & REPORTS:**

Mayor's Appointments: None

Mayor's Proclamation: None

City Clerk's Report: None

City Staff Reports:

**1) Community Items of Interest**

- 1) 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.
- 2) 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.
- 3) 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.
- 4) Economic Development Committee meeting – August 2, 2011 – 6:00pm
- 5) Check Valves – we'll have more information about that later. Individuals after the 2008 flooding had put in check valves. Those areas worked pretty well.
- 6) Everbridge – Have to opt-in to the system. You can find the link to sign up on our website

Mayor Rooney: Mentioned CornFest – we encourage everyone to attend

**2) PO Disclosure Over \$2500.00**

No discussion

**3) June 2011 Financial Report**

Melissa Gallagher: The June Financial statements are presented as unaudited income and cash statements. In the general fund we are beginning the process of zeroing in on our 2011 projections for revenues. Over the next month the departments are entering their year-end projections for 2011 along with their data for the 2012 year. In brief, the monthly target for June is 50% and for the general fund as of June revenues are trending at 56.9%, however, if we equalize for property taxes, that percentage is 54.3%, still over the 50% target, and if we further remove the surplus funds from IPBC and IRMA, the City is at 53.5%, so still on target. An important note, we are going to continually note each month is that the income tax cash receipts are behind from the State of Illinois by 5 months, or 842,398 dollars, so we're still seeing quite a lag. There are a few local taxes that are trending lower than budget and these

have been adjusted accordingly in the forecast. Hotel tax at 49%, Food & Beverage Tax is at 47.9 and Real Estate Transfer Tax is at 41.3. We may see some of this turn around in the summer months as they come to a close, but we will be continuing reviewing the year over year data to see what other projections we will be looking at. For expenditures, June is trending at 46.6% and as my note entails, expenditures, they are imperative that we keep those in line as we move through the year, keeping them under the target.

**MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA:**

Alderman Buske: Mr. Vogt, on this Meacham Road project, is it possible that Schaumburg could also get some federal grants for their portion of this? If we've got 3 million, and we're halfway into this thing from that point, is it possible they could apply for the grant and get more money for their half.

Mr. Vogt: The Federal three million that we secured several years ago was a joint application for the City of Rolling Meadows and the Village of Schaumburg. We already pursued that to look at it as a separate project but were told we couldn't. It may be possible if there are other federal or state grants that come about that we as a City or Schaumburg could pursue. We'll certainly keep our eyes open for that.

Alderman Buske: I didn't know that it was a joint application for that grant. My second comment, Mr. Prejna talks about economic development for the City. If he sat in on the Economic Development Committee meetings he would know that we don't let up on this. Everyone works on this. Maybe it's not in front of the council yet but these things are coming through. We never stop working on any of that. I'd like to correct that statement.

**CLOSED SESSION:**

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

Alderman Banger made a motion to go into Closed Session; it has been 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 8:20pm

Returned to Open Session at 9:35pm

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business, by unanimous consent it was moved to adjourn.

City Council meeting of July 26, 2011, adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by: Ginny Cotugno, Deputy City Clerk

July 26, 2011 Minutes Approved by Council on August 9, 2011

---

Ginny Cotugno, Deputy City Clerk