

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
MINUTES – January 10, 2012**

**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, Judd, Banger, D’Astice, Larsen

Absent: Buske

**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, 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 December 13, 2011 Council Meeting; it was moved and seconded to approve the minutes.

Yeas: Cannon, Allen, Judd, Banger, D’Astice, Larsen

Nays: 0

Absent: Buske

Minutes Approved

➤ **MOTION TO DEVIATE:**

Alderman D’Astice made a motion to deviate; it was moved and seconded

**1) Public Hearing – CDBG Call for Projects**

The Cook County Bureau of Administration requires the City of Rolling Meadows to hold a Public Hearing regarding the use of Cook County Community Development Block Grant Funds. This Hearing is to solicit input from the Community regarding future funding and program needs.

Let the record show this Public Hearing opened at 7:32 p.m. on Tuesday, January 10, 2012.

The Cook County Community Development Block Grant Program funds a variety of needs some of which include Single Family Rehabilitation, Fair Housing Activities,

Housing Counseling, Affordable Housing Opportunities, Infrastructure Improvements, Commercial Rehabilitation, Capital Improvements and Public Service Activities.

**City Council Meeting**  
**January 10, 2012**  
**Page 2**

The Rolling Meadows Park District intends to apply for a Community Development Block Grant for a American With Disabilities (ADA) Parking Lot Improvements at the Rolling Meadows Senior Center. No other parties have requested applications to date for use of Cook County Community Development Block Grant funds for the 2012 program year.

The City of Rolling Meadows encourages any interested parties or organizations to present any current or future request or ideas regarding the use of Cook County Community Development Block Grant Program funds.

The City of Rolling Meadows City Council will be requested to approve any Community Development Block Grant project applications at its regularly scheduled meeting of February 14, 2012.

The City is required to follow the established procedures of the Cook County Community Development Block Grant Program regarding project submittal and established limitations on funding. The City of Rolling Meadows will also consider any necessary revisions to its Five Year Plan on file with Cook County Department of Planning and Development, at the February 14, 2012 City Council meeting.

Is there anyone in the audience who wishes to speak regarding the Cook County Community Development Block Grant Program?

Mr. Brian McKenna – Park District: This grant has been a long standing grant for us. We look for your support with this.

Let the record show this hearing closed at 7:35p.m. January 10, 2012.

**MAYOR'S REPORT:**

Meacham Road Project – I assure everyone that's interested, there is plenty of time and ample opportunity, there will be plenty of public notice for things like our Committee of the Whole meeting next month. There are lots of people out there that have heard things about the project. The message that I tried to send to folks I've talked to is that I assure you, as you will see through the process, the City of Rolling Meadows is your friend in keeping this project as small and contained as it can possibly be. There is no design here to make a throughway out of the road. It's simply getting done what needs to be done and everybody will have an ample opportunity to participate in the discussion.

**WARD REPORTS:**

Alderman D'Astice: A resident called and asked about putting up Christmas decorations next year. I can only assume that this resident, along with some of their neighbors, are planning a real treat for the rest of us. Is there someone who they could speak to about direction on what they can or cannot do?

Ms. Dehner: There is a time-frame on how long they can have Christmas lights. I can contact the person and find out what plans they have and go from there.

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

No one came forward.

Mayor Tom Rooney closed the floor.

➤ **PENDING:**

**A. Ordinance No. 12-01 / Amend Traffic Code – Speed Limit on New Wilke (2<sup>nd</sup> Reading)  
(Postponed at the December 13, 2012 City Council Meeting)**

Mayor Rooney read the background on the Ordinance.

Alderman Allen moved to adopt the ordinance; it was moved and seconded to adopt the Ordinance

Alderman Judd: I think we should consider what we're doing. The 35mph is asking for trouble and issues. I'm not going to support 35mph. I would go for 40mph.

Alderman Cannon: I would like to make an amendment to move it to 40mph.

Mayor Rooney: Is there a second. It has been seconded to the amendment to change the number 35 to 40.

Alderman Cannon: It seems like we're begging people to speed there. We've made the road the nicest road in town. There are very few residents that walk along the street. There are no schools there. There's only residential on one side. It has traditionally been 40mph. We tried to solve a problem with that structure and now we make it harder for people to stay within the law.

Alderman Banger: If we're going to make an amendment, would we have to have Burke do another study to send to the State to get a 40mph zone approved?

Mayor Rooney: Mr. Macholl, what would the procedure be for rejecting the recommendation of the engineering report and going with our own?

Mr. Macholl: I don't know procedurally what would be required. We have a report from the Engineer that says the appropriate speed would be 35mph. Based on that I find it somewhat difficult to actually increase it to 40.

Alderman Cannon: The last time we had a discussion about this I asked this exact question. The statement that was given that night was that it wouldn't make any difference if it was 35 or 40mph, it was our prerogative. The same study would be in effect for both.

Mayor Rooney: We discussed the bandwidth for most of these speed limit warrants. They are wide enough to accommodate both. That is correct. We did discuss that. To go into the process of saying here's a study actually makes a recommendation and that's where what Mr. Macholl is talking about comes in. If a set of warrants says you can be in this band, that's one thing. We had the availability to

**City Council Meeting**  
**January 10, 2012**  
**Page 4**

go into it deeper with an actual engineering report and that's a half step higher. That's where the change comes in.

Alderman Cannon: I haven't heard the Police Chief or police department say there is a problem here or a past problem with accidents or with people getting run over. That's when it was a horrible road and there were a lot more issues there. Now's there's less issues because you have a newly engineered road with great site lines, it's straight, it's smooth, people can see coming and going out. It's like we made it better, but we're punishing the people that drive on it in making it harder for them to stay within the law.

Alderman Banger: Jim's answer essentially was the study dictates the speed.

Mayor Rooney: I think the word dictate might be a little strong, but it is correct that any kind of court proceeding involved, there is a traffic study on record that was done at a specific level and made a certain recommendation. The recommendation actually came out to be 34.2 which is even a little bit on the lower side of 35. There is a recommendation out there that's yes, we can be in the bandwidth where we want to be, but we were specifically told by an engineering firm here is where we think you should be. That's something that people can take into consideration.

Alderman Larsen: Chief Scanlan, it's my understanding that speeding tickets are not typically issued for violations in the 5-7mph over range. Is that a reasonable statement?

Chief Scanlan: We have no department policy that regulates that. A school zone might be one case.

Alderman Larsen: That would be a different situation. I'm going to go with what my belief is that more often than not, speeding tickets are not issued for people going 5-7 mph over the limit. That would be my assumption. I'm not trying to say the Chief is going on record saying they don't enforce speed limits. I don't think that the Cook County Court system has time to entertain those types of violations. It's my understanding that because there is a predominance of eating establishments there that there would be the potential for a fair amount of foot traffic there. That's another assumption I'm making. By having it at 35 rather than 40, whatever the number is, you're going to be depressing the speed of the vehicle somewhat. I can't support the amendment.

Alderman Judd: I'm going to support this for the continuity. It's not so much the fact that it's straight or a raceway. It's just so it's consistent.

Mr. Vogt: Keep in mind that the roadway is not totally completed. The southern most block, several hundred feet from Golf, still needs reconstruction when the Golf Road project takes place which hopefully will be a year from now. Certainly there are opportunities in the future to revisit that. Once the Golf intersection project starts, there will be a taper required of several hundred feet in advance of Golf Place going southbound which will shorten the length considerably during that period.

Mayor Rooney: Further discussion on the amendment? Seeing none, the question is shall the amendment be passed?

AYES: Cannon, Judd

NAYS: Allen, Banger, D'Astice, Larsen

ABSENT: Buske

The amendment fails

Mayor Rooney: Is there further discussion on the ordinance itself? Seeing none, the question is shall the Ordinance be adopted?

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

The ordinance was adopted.

➤ **CONSENT ORDINANCES:**

**B. Ordinance / Amend Adjudication Code (1<sup>st</sup> Reading)**

**C. Ordinance / Amend Traffic Code – Parking Restrictions on Keystone Court (1<sup>st</sup> Reading)**

Mayor Rooney: Does anyone want an item pulled from the consent agenda? Seeing none, I ask unanimous consent to consider both B and C together. Is there any objection? Seeing no objections, the question is shall items B and C be moved forward for second reading?

Mayor Rooney read the background on the ordinances.

AYES: Cannon, Allen, Judd, Banger, D' Astice, Larsen  
NAYS: 0  
ABSENT: Buske

The ordinances were moved forward for second reading.

➤ **NEW BUSINESS:**

**D. MOTION TO APPROVE PAYMENT OF BILLS ON WARRANT 01-10-2012**

Alderman Larsen made a motion to approve the January 10, 2012 Warrant; it has been moved and seconded to approve the January 10, 2012 Warrant

YEAS: Cannon, Allen, Judd, Banger, D' Astice, Larsen  
NAYS: 0  
ABSENT: Buske

Warrant Approved

➤ **CONSENT RESOLUTIONS:**

**None**



## **2) Staff Traffic Advisory Report – December 2011**

Mr. Vogt: We met last Wednesday. First, traffic signal timing at Plum Grove Road with its intersection of Kirchoff and DuPont, the City engineer met with CC Highway Department and staff a few weeks ago and what we've learned is that the traffic signal at Plum Grove, DuPont and Kirchoff works off the signal at Plum Grove and Euclid with regards to its timing from 6:00am – 11:00pm. Overnight it operates on its own based on traffic demand. We feel it's worthwhile to try to adjust that so that after 7pm we allow that traffic signal to operate on its own based on traffic demand. We will monitor that to see if we do get improvement with regards to the length of time it takes vehicles to make left turns off of Plum Grove onto DuPont. All the County needs is a letter from us requesting that. We plan on doing that shortly and monitor that situation to see if that improves the reports of evening extensive delays getting the left turn arrow at that location. Second item, the Carriageway Way, Algonquin Road issue with the no turn on red sign that was installed by IDOT during the last phases of the bridge construction. A suggestion was made to add a sign when pedestrians are present to that so that one would be required to stop if there were pedestrians there, but then proceed to be able to turn right on red if it's clear. The Police Department received contact information from IDOT indicating some concerns with vehicle speeds and it's caused us to want to revisit this and we will do so and reschedule this at our February meeting and report back at that time if there's any action to be taken. Third item, 4902 Tollview, we received a complaint from a business person with regards to trucks that park on the street frequently. The Police Department has done a preliminary investigation and will continue that. The Committee doesn't believe that we should provide any additional parking restrictions, but at some point in the future if the matter can't be resolved, perhaps a restriction on truck parking there rather than vehicle parking might be worth consideration due to the visibility problem that it causes for vehicles coming out of the driveway at that location. We'll continue to study that. Fourth item, Owl and Central intersection – we received a resident complaint about vehicle speeds with a suggestion to consider an establishment of a three-way stop-sign to stop traffic eastbound/westbound on Central Road. The Police Department has looked at this. We will continue to do selective enforcement. What we're recommending at this point is that we keep this on the Traffic Review Committee Agenda in future months to monitor the enforcement that the Police Department will continue on Central Road for vehicles speeds. The fifth item being an information item that we had a request to check all of the entry points to the City to make sure that we have adequate signage for the 2am-6am no parking on city streets ban. There are several locations where we need to add signage. We've given the inventory to the Police Department to double check for us and we will be in the process later this winter of putting up signs at all locations where there isn't adequate signage.

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

No report

**4) Presentation of the January 17, 2012 Committee of the Whole Agenda**

Mr. Krumstok presented the agenda. I would like to remove Engineering Services and RFP Refuse Development and readjust how the COW is going to be.

I would like to thank Alderman Allen for sitting on the Review Committee for Engineering Services. We talked to ten different engineering firms. Eight submitted proposals to us. From that eight five were interviewed. A decision has been made to go ahead and that final decision would be brought to the City Council Meeting on January 24<sup>th</sup>.

Regarding the RFP Refuse Development, we had a meeting last Thursday to go through the working draft. Another meeting is set for January 19<sup>th</sup> for the second review of the working draft. It is in development stage. It's not ready to come to the City Council.

Alderman D'Astice: The first thing at 7:30 on January 17<sup>th</sup> will be ComEd coming to City Council. If anyone has questions, please come to the meeting.

Mayor Rooney: Mr. D'Astice, we thank you for reminding everyone that one week from tonight at 7:30pm, ComEd will be the first item on the agenda. Are there any other comments? Mr. Krumstok, you may take that as direction and adjust the Committee of the Whole agenda accordingly.

**MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA:**

**None**

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business, by unanimous consent the meeting adjourned

City Council meeting of January 10, 2012 adjourned at 8:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by: Ginny Cotugno, Deputy City Clerk

January 10, 2012 Minutes Approved by Council on January 24, 2012

---

Ginny Cotugno, Deputy City Clerk