



AGENDA
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
January 17, 2012 – 7:30pm

- 1) ComEd
- 2) Police Department “Eyes and Ears” Program
- 3) Goal Setting
- 4) Landscaping/Brush Collection
- 5) Efficiency Test for Public Works
- 6) Votes at Committee-of-the-Whole Meetings
- 7) MFT and Local Roads

Committee-of-the-Whole Agenda – January 17, 2012

1) ComEd (follow-up from August 16, 2011 Presentation)

Background: Mr. James Dudek, External Affairs Manager for ComEd, is scheduled to be present at the January 17th Committee-of-the-Whole meeting as a follow-up from the August 16, 2011 presentation.

Committee-of-the-Whole Agenda – January 17, 2012

2) Police Department “Eyes and Ears” Program

Background: Sgt. Tom Gadomski will be present to discuss this public awareness program.

The program is set-up to encourage residents and businesses to report suspicious or unusual behavior by calling the Police Department.

The “Eyes and Ears” program is similar to a “neighborhood watch program.” Its overall goal is to establish partnerships between police departments and the communities they serve, and to protect and solve crime in communities and schools.

Committee-of-the-Whole Agenda – January 17, 2012

3) Goal Setting

Throughout much of the 2000's, the Council held an annual goal-setting session to set a list of 18-month priorities. The goal-setting session consisted of a single Saturday session of roughly six hours, held off site on a Saturday. It was an open public meeting of Council, representatives from the staff, and representatives from the community.

The Council discontinued the practice of an annual goal-setting session. The chair's opinion of the process at the time was that it was a very poor process, and the chair believes negative sentiment toward the goal-setting process that was used is well-justified.

However, the idea of setting goals at regular intervals is a good one; it's the baby that was thrown out with the bath water. A goal setting process done well can be a valuable tool, as it is in many organizations that do it well. Unfortunately, it's used by lots of organizations that do not do it well either, so many organizations look at goal-setting with the same cynicism that led to discontinuing the Council's annual sessions.

The chair believes that the goal-setting sessions had two major flaws:

- a) the process never distinguished between setting goals for the City as a public entity and setting goals for the city staff as an organization. The two constantly got mixed and mingled together because they were never consciously separated.
- b) the process always was a one-shot deal where whatever was on people's minds that day was set in stone for the next 18 months. Every step from brainstorming all the way to decision-making was done in that one-day meeting. Aside from each department developing a list of department goals, there was no preparatory work; aside from voting on the final wording of the goals, there was no real follow-up discussion.

A goal-setting process that avoids these main flaws (and tidies up some minor ones as well) could be worthwhile.

Would the Council be interested in giving goal-setting a better try?

Committee-of-the-Whole Agenda – January 17, 2012

4) Discussion on the Curbside Brush Collection Program Termination

The City Council made the decision at the November 22 Committee-of-the-Whole meeting to eliminate the annual curbside brush collection program as provided by Public Works Department. (This was a \$8,338 reduction in the FY2012 budget.)

This decision causes further discussion, direction, and action by the City Council, as the elimination of the scheduled (May and June) curbside brush collection program does not address the other provisions of the overall curbside brush program activities.

1. Should curbside brush “special collections” as a fee based program continue to be offered, or should it also be eliminated?
 - Special collections have required a resident to call in the request for service, then requires a Public Works streets or refuse division employee to visit the site, provide a price quotation, have the resident travel to City Hall or Public Works office to pay for the service, than have Public Works crew travel to the site to pick up and dispose of the brush. This is not an efficient system.
 - A suggestion has been made that would require residents to request special brush collections within a designated 1-2 week period, then provide for the collection within that designated week. This would only provide for a bit better efficiency, in that most residents would need to set out brush well in advance of the designated service week in order to allow lead time to make cost quotations and for payments to be made. Residents may not like the length of the delay from their ordering time to the collection time, plus having to make payment arrangements.
 - Another suggestion has been made that the special brush collection fee should be established based on the actual cost of the City to provide this service. Given the time invested to make two trips to each service site, the cost will need to be set at a minimum of \$70 - \$100. Will residents be willing to pay for this service? We do not know what the demand will be. With 20% of residents using the former program on an annual basis, this would mean that up to 1,200 service requests might be anticipated. It would be hoped that many would choose to prepare and dispose of their brush with regular yardwaste collection procedures. Even having to respond to a few hundred “special collections” in this manner will be quite labor intensive and inefficient in past practices.
 - The City could arrange to provide a contractor service to perform special brush collection requests, and charge the cost directly to the residents for the service.

2. Decisions are needed on either the retention or the elimination of “special” curbside brush collection services, and if the service is retained, to establish efficiency in its procedures.
The March 2012 News and Views needs to be utilized to get this message to our residents in advance of the former May and June brush collection schedule.
3. Curbside brush collection is, in reality, a diversion of landscape waste materials from the yardwaste collection process and its disposal cost. In the event that a future decision is made to privatize refuse and yardwaste collection, the providing of special brush collections by Public Works is deferring costs that would otherwise be a function of the refuse/yardwaste collection program services.
4. Current Municipal Code Section 114-71 through 114-78 establishes and identifies procedures for the previous curbside brush collection program. An Ordinance will need to be prepared by staff and approved by the City Council to formally eliminate the regularly scheduled once a year curbside brush collection program and special collection service. The municipal code referenced sections are attached. (Note: Christmas trees can be picked up and disposed of via SWANCC transfer station, and can be treated as general refuse; no separate handling nor chipping is required.)

Sec. 114-42. Penalties.

(a) Unless provided elsewhere in the specific section, any person violating any provision of this article shall be fined the full amount of any mitigation costs incurred by the city in addition, any person who injures any public tree shall be held responsible for the cost of repairs, if in the opinion of the director of public works or designee, the injured tree will not die as a result of such injuries. Specific penalties for violations of this chapter are subject to establishment by the city council from time to time, as reflected in appendix B of the Code of Ordinances.

(b) In addition, in the case of unauthorized destruction or removal of such public trees, the person committing the offense shall be held responsible for the cost of removal and replacement of trees at the rate of \$100.00 per inch of trunk diameter of the tree that was destroyed or removed.

(c) A separate offense shall be deemed committed on each day during or on which a violation occurs or continues.
(Ord. No. 00-36, § 1, 8-8-2000)

Sec. 114-43. Citations.

(a) The director of public works or designee has the authority to issue citations to any persons who violate the provisions of this article, violations committed by employees or contractors of companies during work-related activities will be considered violations committed by the employing or contracting company, and citations will be delivered to the employing or contracting company.

(b) All citations issued relevant to this article will advise the notified person or organization that a violation to a specific subsection of this article has occurred, and the violation will be detailed. The citation will request the notified person or organization to make payment in the amount specified in this article as settlement of the violation. The citation will also inform the notified person or organization that upon failure to settle the violation, a complaint will be filed with the city's administrative hearing officer.
(Ord. No. 00-36, § 1, 8-8-2000)

Sec. 114-44. Service of notice or citation.

Service of any notice required or citation permitted by this article may be accomplished by either of the following methods:

- (1) *Personal service.* This may be achieved by actual delivery to a person at least 12 years of age at the premises.
- (2) *Substituted service.* This may be achieved by mailing of the notice or citation by both registered and regular mail to the person to whom the most recent general real estate tax bill for the premises was sent. If within 14 days of mailing no proof of delivery has been received by the city, the notice or citation shall be posted on or about the front entrance to the premises, in which case proof of signing for the registered mail shall not be necessary.

(Ord. No. 00-36, § 1, 8-8-2000)

Secs. 114-45—114-70. Reserved.

DIVISION 2. VEGETATION COLLECTION SERVICE*

Sec. 114-71. Definitions.

The following words, terms and phrases, when used in this division, shall have the meanings ascribed to them in this section, except where the context clearly indicates a different meaning:

Brush or stems means any trimmings whose branches are less than six inches in diameter, and that is not a vine, multi-flora, stump, log, or root system as defined in this section.

Log means any section of the trunk or a large branch exceeding six inches in diameter.

Multiflora means any plant having, consisting of, or affecting more than two thick clusters which make it seem as one; also, one which has many thorns or stickers.

***Editor's note**—Ord. No. 00-36, § 4, adopted Aug. 8, 2000, repealed §§ 114-71—114-78 in their entirety. Further, Ord. No. 01-28, § 3, adopted Sept. 25, 2001, added §§ 114-71—114-78 to this chapter. Formerly, said repealed sections pertained to similar subject matter. See the Code Comparative Table.

Root system means that part of a tree, plant or brush usually below the ground that lacks nodes, leaves or shoots and that holds the tree, plant or bush in position and that draws water and nourishment from the soil.

Stump means the lower end of a tree or plant, which would normally remain in the ground, after most of the stem or trunk has been cut off.

Vine means any plant with a long, thin stem that grows along the ground or climbs a wall or other support.

(Ord. No. 01-28, § 3, 9-25-2001)

Sec. 114-72. Services.

(a) Brush pickup is available to the city residents, only, and not for commercial or industrial establishments or for private contractors for hire and profit.

(b) Brush pickup service will be provided to residents once yearly. Other services such as pickup of vines, multiflora, stumps, logs and root systems will be picked up for a fee only.

(Ord. No. 01-28, § 3, 9-25-2001; Ord. No. 09-11, § 5, 3-10-2009)

Sec. 114-73. Pickup sections.

(a) The city shall be divided into four sections; each section will be provided one brush pickup per year.

(b) Each brush removal period will be one week in duration, and each resident will be allowed one pickup during that period.

(Ord. No. 01-28, § 3, 9-25-2001; Ord. No. 09-11, § 6, 3-10-2009)

Sec. 114-74. Brush removal dates.

Under this division, brush removal dates shall be determined by the director of public works. Said dates shall be announced to the public at least 30 days in advance, via water billing statements and by other publications.

(Ord. No. 01-28, § 3, 9-25-2001; Ord. No. 09-11, § 7, 3-10-2009)

Sec. 114-75. Placement for collection.

(a) All brush, stems or branches shall be stacked in an orderly fashion on the parkway with cut ends or butt ends toward the curb, and shall not obstruct the sidewalk or extend past the curb.

(b) Brush, stems or branches shall not exceed six inches in diameter and anything exceeding six inches in diameter will not be removed free of charge.

(c) Brush shall not be set out at curbs or in parkways for more than seven days prior to the scheduled brush collection period for each pickup section.

(Ord. No. 01-28, § 3, 9-25-2001; Ord. No. 09-11, § 8, 3-10-2009)

Sec. 114-76. Special pickup services.

(a) A fee will be charged for special pickup of vines, multiflora, stumps, logs and root systems, and for brush that is not picked up as part of the city's free brush collection program.

(b) All fees will be assessed by the director of public works based upon the cost of manpower and equipment with the minimum fees as set forth in appendix B, XXII.

(Ord. No. 01-28, § 3, 9-25-2001; Ord. No. 09-11, § 9, 3-10-2009)

Sec. 114-77. Penalties.

If any brush, stem, log, multiflora, root system, stump, vine or refuse is accumulated in such a way as to violate this division, the director of public works shall cause written notice to be sent by certified mail to the owner, occupant or lessee. The notice shall clearly specify that the resident will have five days from the date the notice is mailed to remove the violation, and if the violation is not removed, the director of public works shall cause the material to be removed by city employees and the owner, occupant or lessee shall be charged a fee based upon the cost of manpower and equipment with the minimum fees set forth in appendix B, XXII.

(Ord. No. 01-28, § 3, 9-25-2001)

Sec. 114-78. Exceptions.

Exceptions to this division shall be as follows:

- (1) Christmas trees will be picked up in January, at no cost to the residents.
 - (2) Diseased trees, as outlined in this article.
- (Ord. No. 01-28, § 3, 9-25-2001)

Committee-of-the-Whole Agenda – January 17, 2012

5) Efficiency Test for Public Works

Background:

Alderman Buske has asked for this discussion item.

Efficiency can be considered the measure of how well something operates or the effort given to the projects or type of work that is completed. Effort can be individually or by a team. The productivity, projects done, achievements of Public Works would be evaluated.

From some contacts the City can contract with (no pricing has been requested):

Waters Edge Coaching (contact Scott Andersohn 1-630-967-4995)

McGladrey (Bill Brehmer) – 1-847-413-6900

But it would be suggested to do a more detailed search for firms interested in doing this kind of study and receive some other suggestions for folks in the field.

Note: If this was to proceed, money would have to be allocated from some fund and appropriated at a later date.

Committee-of-the-Whole Agenda – January 17, 2012

6) Votes at Committee-of-the-Whole Meetings

During the budget discussions, the issue of voting at Committee of the Whole meetings arose briefly. Traditionally, the Council has used a less formal vote, the show of hands. This practice has informally been dubbed a “straw poll” over the years.

Robert’s Rules of Order recognizes three forms of voting that are relevant to the Council: voting by roll call, voice vote, and show of hands. All forms are equally valid in a Committee of the Whole setting, and the Council may choose any of the forms it wishes. (A fourth form, a standing vote, isn’t relevant for the Council.)

The chair’s position is simply that the same form should be chosen every time. If the Council wishes to change the form to a roll call vote or a voice vote, the chair has no objection at all.

Does the Council wish to change the voting procedure at Committee of the Whole meetings?

Committee of the Whole Agenda Item – January 17, 2012

7) MFT and Local Roads

As a follow-up from FY 2012 budget discussions and as Staff begins preparations for the FY 2013 Budget, the following is a breakdown of the Motor Fuel Tax Fund (03) and the Local Road Fund (61). The detail for this discussion reflects Operating vs. Capital Revenue and Expenditure line items as per the FY 2012 Budget for each of these Funds.

Previous Council Action:

- November 8, 2011 Committee of the Whole FY 2012 Budget Discussion

FY 2012 BUDGET: MOTOR FUEL TAX FUND VS. LOCAL ROAD FUND

	<i>FY 2012 Operating/MFT</i>	<i>FY 2012 Capital/MFT</i>	FY 2012 Operating/Local Road	FY 2012 Capital/Local Road
REVENUES				
Current Levy SSA #1 (Local Road)			\$ 90,882	
Current Levy SSA #3 (Local Road)			\$ 58,419	
State Motor Fuel Tax (MFT)		\$ 600,000		
Home Rule Motor Fuel Tax (Local Rd)			\$ 345,000	
Current Levy - Road & Bridge (Local Road)			\$ 210,000	
Vehicle License (Local Road)			\$ 428,000	
Investment Earnings (Both)	\$ 100		\$ 100	
Transfer from TIF # 1 Reimb (Local Road)				\$ 54,000
Reimbursements (Local Road)⁽¹⁾				\$ 183,700
Grant (MFT)⁽¹⁾		\$ 76,000		
Grant (Local Road)⁽¹⁾				\$ 1,405,000
TOTAL REVENUES	\$ 100	\$ 676,000	\$ 1,132,401	\$ 1,642,700
EXPENDITURES				
Bank Fees (Vehicle Sticker Payments) (Local Road)			\$ 2,500	
Printing (Forms, Stickers & Tags) (Local Road)			\$ 5,000	
Vehicle Maintenance Chargeback (Local Road)			\$ 176,846	
Vehicle Replacement Chargeback (Local Road)			\$ 200,000	
Building & Land Chargeback (Local Road)			\$ 64,000	
Postage (Vehicle Stickers) (Local Road)			\$ 10,000	
Professional Services (Vehicle Stickers) (Local Road)			\$ 17,000	
Debt Service (Local Road)			\$ 162,151	
Utilities - Electricity - Street Lights (MFT)	\$ 110,000			
Rental - Bobcat (Local Road)			\$ 1,600	
Outside Repairs (MFT) Traffic Signals/Lane Markings	\$ 85,000			
Outside Repairs (Local Road)			\$ 130,900	
Disposal of Debris (Local Road)			\$ 22,000	
Operating Supplies (Local Road)			\$ 121,000	
Small Tools & Equipment (Local Road)			\$ 3,600	
Repair & Maintenance Supplies (Local Road)			\$ 20,000	
Snow Removal Supplies (MFT)	\$ 179,000			
Professional Services (MFT)⁽²⁾	\$ 280,000			
Professional Services (Local Road)⁽²⁾			\$ 102,500	
Capital Improvements (MFT)⁽²⁾		\$ 980,000		
Capital Improvements (Local Road)⁽²⁾				\$ 1,551,732
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$ 654,000	\$ 980,000	\$ 1,039,097	\$ 1,551,732

Notes:

(1) Grants & Reimbursements are detailed in the FY 2012 Budget Book and following this page.

(2) Professional Services & Capital Improvement Projects are detailed in the FY 2012 Budget Book and following this page.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES / CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS DETAIL

FY 2012 BUDGET: MOTOR FUEL TAX FUND VS. LOCAL ROAD FUND	FY 2012 Operating/MFT	FY 2012 Capital/MFT	FY 2012 Operating/Local Road	FY 2012 Capital/Local Road
REVENUES				
Reimbursements (Local Road)				\$ 183,700
<i>Salt Reimb Dist 15 - \$15,000</i>				
<i>50% Meacham Study/Sch - \$22,500</i>				
<i>10% Comm Dr/AH - \$7,000</i>				
<i>80% Plum Grv BP/IL -\$84,800</i>				
<i>80% Comm Dr/IL - \$54,400</i>				
Grant (MFT)		\$ 76,000		
<i>MFT High Growth \$12,000</i>				
<i>MFT Carriageway \$64,000</i>				
Grant (Local Road)				\$ 1,405,000
<i>Construction ENG (IL CAP) \$255,000</i>				
<i>Infrastr. Imprv (IL CAP) \$150,000</i>				
<i>Emerg Repairs (Phase 2) New Wilke \$1,000,000</i>				
EXPENDITURES				
Professional Services (MFT)	\$ 280,000			
<i>Engineering: Annual Street Program-\$50,000</i>				
<i>Engineering: Carriageway Bridge PH2-\$80,000</i>				
<i>Engineering: Meacham Rd-\$50,000</i>				
<i>Engineering: Golf New Wilke Intersection-\$100,000</i>				
Professional Services (Local Road)			\$ 102,500	
<i>Weather Forecasting Svc-\$2,500</i>				
<i>Comm Dr Rd & BP-\$30,000</i>				
<i>Quentin Rd BP-\$15,000</i>				
<i>Eng-Plum Grv - Euclid BP-\$25,000</i>				
<i>Engineering Bridges-\$30,000</i>				
Capital Improvements (MFT)		\$ 980,000		
<i>Annual Street Program-\$500,000</i>				
<i>Citywide Sidewalk Program-\$130,000</i>				
<i>Rt62/58 Street Lights - City Exp-\$300,000</i>				
<i>Bridge Improvements-\$50,000</i>				
Capital Improvements (Local Road)				\$ 1,551,732
<i>Plum Grove BP CMAQ 10%-\$20,000</i>				
<i>Golf/New Wilke Intersection-\$401,650</i>				
<i>New Wilke St @ Golf-\$1.0 million</i>				
<i>Comm Dr & BP-\$130,082</i>				