



AGENDA
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
July 19, 2011 – 7:30pm

- 1) **Northwest Housing Collaborative**
- 2) **Refuse Survey**
- 3) **Refuse Items – (Holiday Pick-up, one Side of the Street Pick-up, Etc.)**
- 4) **Fund Balances**
- 5) **Revenues**
- 6) **Landscaping & Lawn Care Professional License**
- 7) **Signs for Contractors – “Right to Know”**
- 8) **Website**
- 9) **Woodfield Crossing**

Council Action Summary – July 19, 2011

Agenda Location: Committee of the Whole

1) Presentation by Metropolitan Planning Council on Northwest Housing Collaborative effort

Attachments:

- Memo by CD Director dated June 15, 2011 on Northwest Housing Collaborative Activity Update
- Intergovernmental Agreement – Draft
- Request for Proposal for Interjurisdictional Housing Coordinator



InterOffice Memorandum

Date: June 15, 2011
To: City Council Members (via Weekly Notes June 17)
From: Valerie J. Dehner, Community Development Director
CC: Barry Krumstok, City Manager
Subject: Northwest Housing Collaborative - Activity Update

The Northwest Housing Collaborative is a loosely organized gathering of municipalities and organizations that came together in 2007 to promote affordable workforce housing. Mayors of Arlington Heights, Buffalo Grove, Village of Mount Prospect, Palatine and Rolling Meadows together with representatives from the Metropolitan Planning Council and Metropolitan Mayors Caucus believed that working together on housing development issues could have a greater impact than working independently. The collaborative's efforts have now expanded to include mayors and key staff from each of the five municipalities as well as addressing the most current foreclosure crisis and the preservation of affordable multi-family rental housing.

To that end, the Metropolitan Mayors Caucus, with support from and on behalf of the Northwest Housing Collaborative, submitted a grant application to the Chicago Community Trust for grant monies with which to hire an Inter-Jurisdictional Housing Coordinator to work on behalf of the five northwest suburban communities. The grant was awarded in the amount of \$35,000 for one year.

Work is beginning to formalize this effort with the development of Request for Proposal for the Inter-Jurisdictional Housing Coordinator and an Intergovernmental Agreement for the Northwest Suburban Housing Collaborative. **No monies are being requested or expended by any of the five municipalities -- only staff time.**

As this effort becomes more formalized, the City Council will be asked for its support of the Inter-jurisdictional Agreement, an appointment to the Collaborative (for which I gladly will volunteer) and desk space for this future part-time housing coordinator. Again, the City is NOT being asked for any funding of this effort. The part-time housing coordinator is being paid by the grant through the Metropolitan Mayors Caucus.

Beginning in January, 2012, another housing effort will be started which will be **Homes for a Changing Region** conducted by CMAP (Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning). They will be analyzing housing demands present and future and make specific recommendations which can be incorporated into the City's comprehensive plan. **This is another activity AT NO COST TO THE CITY.**

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT
NORTHWEST SUBURBAN HOUSING COLLABORATIVE**

THIS INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT (The “Agreement”) is entered into by and between the Village of Arlington Heights (“Arlington Heights”) the Village of Buffalo Grove (“Buffalo Grove”), the Village of Mount Prospect (“Mount Prospect”), the Village of Palatine (“Palatine”), and the City of Rolling Meadows (“Rolling Meadows”)(collectively, the “Municipalities”), all being Illinois municipal corporations, with the support and assistance of the Metropolitan Mayors Caucus (“MMC”) and the Metropolitan Planning Council (“MPC”) for the purpose of collaborating to address housing issues in the Northwest region.

RECITALS

WHEREAS, Article VII, Section 10 of the Illinois Constitution of 1970 authorizes units of local government to enter into agreements to exercise, combine or transfer any power or function not prohibited to them by law or ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act, 5 ILCS 220/1 et seq. (the Act”), authorizes units of local government to exercise jointly with any public agency of the State, including other units of local government, any power, privilege or authority which may be exercised by a unit of local government individually, and to enter into agreements for the performance of governmental services, activities or undertakings; and

WHEREAS, the corporate authorities of the Municipalities agree that a collaborative approach among the Municipalities to address housing issues using available state, federal and county funds, will most effectively address the housing issues in the region; and

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Mayor’s Caucus (MMC), on behalf of the participating municipalities, applied for a grant from the Chicago Community Trust (The Trust), which grant was awarded to the MMC in the amount of \$35,000, the purpose of which is to support on-going inter-jurisdictional housing work in northwest suburbs as described in the Grant Application and Grant Award attached as **Group Exhibit A**; and

WHEREAS, the Municipalities retained the independent consultant (the Consultant) to carry out the inter-jurisdictional housing work described in the Grant Applications and wish to form a Steering Committee to direct and oversee the work of the consultant.

Comment [j1]: Should we put a blank line in here to put the title/name of the consultant?

WHEREAS, the Consultant can apply for grants to support on-going inter-jurisdictional housing work in the northwest suburban area;

WHEREAS, the corporate authorities of each Municipality agree that it is in their best interest to enter into this Intergovernmental Cooperative Agreement; and

WHEREAS, the various undertakings by the Municipalities set forth in this Agreement relate to the respective government and affairs of the Municipalities.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the foregoing premises, the mutual covenants and promises herein contained, and for other good and valuable consideration, the sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged, the Municipalities hereby agree as follows:

Section 1. Incorporation of Recitals

The Recitals of this Agreement are hereby incorporated by reference into this Agreement as if fully set forth herein.

Section 2. Establishment of Steering Committee

Pursuant to the joint powers of the corporate authorities of the Municipalities, the Illinois Constitution and the authorization of the Act, the Municipalities wish to form a Steering Committee (the "Committee") to direct, oversee and cooperate with an independent consultant who shall be retained to assist, facilitate and coordinate the efforts of the Municipalities to create regional housing solutions to address the short and long term housing needs and to provide a range of housing types. In particular, the Committee will focus on: multifamily housing stabilization and preservation; condominium foreclosure strategies; engaging financial institutions in designing solutions; advancing the region's strategic plan and other local and regional housing efforts; supporting future fundraising for the member's inter-jurisdictional efforts; and addressing the challenges faced by the regional increase in housing foreclosures.

The Steering Committee consists of two representatives from each participating Municipality, appointed by the Mayor or Village President of each Municipality. The lead agency shall act as chair of the Steering Committee and principal liaison between the Consultant and the Committee.

No Member of the Committee shall receive compensation for service on the Committee, or additional compensation if the Member is an employee or elected official of the appointing Municipality. Each Member shall continue to serve on the Committee until such time as the Member is replaced by a new appointment from the Mayor/Village President of the appointing Municipality.

The Steering Committee shall be subject to and shall be governed by the terms of this Agreement and by any By-Laws adopted by the Committee and amended from time to time. In the event of a conflict between this Agreement and the Bylaws, the terms of this Agreement shall control the creation and operation of the Committee.

The Steering Committee is not intended to be a legal entity separate and apart from the individual municipalities and has no power to contract or take any other legally binding action.

Section 3. Duties of Steering Committee

The Committee is charged with the responsibility of overseeing the work of the Consultant, whose duties are described in the Request for Proposals attached hereto as **Exhibit B**.

1. The Steering Committee will provide general direction to the Consultant, and will identify priorities for the project.
2. The Lead Municipality shall act as Chair of the Committee and will be the day to day liaison between the Committee and the Consultant.

3. The Consultant will report to the entire Committee which will be responsible to ensure that Consultant performs its duties and obligations in accordance with (a) all applicable federal, state and local rules and regulations, (b) the requirements of the Chicago Community Trust (The Trust) grant funding for the work and other Consultant Funding Sources which may become available, and (c) the terms of this Agreement.

4. The Committee or its designee will meet with the Consultant and MMC periodically (but no less than once per quarter) to review the status of the projects, to coordinate the parties' efforts in furthering the goals of the projects, and to evaluate Consultant's performance based on certain benchmarks which the Committee, together with MMC will determine. MMC will work with the Consultant and the Steering Committee to determine the initiatives that the Consultant will undertake.

5. The Committee or its designee will communicate with Consultant and The Trust periodically (but no less than once per quarter) to evaluate the project's status and Consultant's performance with respect to the terms of the Chicago Community Trust Grant award.

6. The Lead Municipality shall act as the contracting agency for purposes of entering into an Independent Contractor Services Agreement with the Consultant, and MMC, as recipient and fiscal agent of the Grant, will be responsible for paying the Consultant.

The actions of the Committee and the work of the Consultant shall conform to the requirements of the Chicago Community Trust grant agreement, a copy of which is attached as Group **Exhibit A** and made a part hereof, provided however, that at the conclusion of the project funded by the The Trust Grant, the Committee will continue to exist and will operate according to the rules of any other funding agreement which may be entered into.

Under no circumstances shall the Committee or the Participating Municipalities incur any liability or be bound by the terms of any contract unless that liability or contract is expressly authorized and approved by the governing bodies of the Municipalities.

Section 4. Consultant's Responsibilities

The responsibilities and duties of the Consultant are set forth in the Request for Proposals (attached in Exhibit B), and upon hiring will be solidified into the Individual Contractor Service Agreement. The consultant's responsibilities may be expanded or continued if additional grant funds are obtained.

Section 5. Responsibility for Consultant Payments

The Lead Municipality has agreed to be the contracting agency for purposes of contracting with the Consultant. The Consultant shall be paid by MMC in accordance with the terms of the Request for Proposals, and soon to be solidified Independent Contractor Services Agreement, dependent upon the receipt of the The Trust and other Grant funds and on the Consultant's satisfactory performance of the responsibilities and duties outlined in the Request for Proposals.

Because the Steering Committee is not a legal entity, it shall have no responsibility for the payment of any invoices, provided however, that the Lead Municipality will direct the payment of only those invoices for which no objection is received from the majority of the Member Communities.

The Lead Municipality will distribute the Consultant's invoices to each of the Member Communities and will approve all reasonable charges for payment by MMC, provided that no portion of an invoice will be paid if a majority of the Member Communities object to that portion of the invoice in writing to the Lead Municipality within 7 days of receipt. In the event that timely written objections are received from a majority of the Member Communities, or the Lead Municipality determines that services have not been fully and satisfactorily performed, no payment shall be made unless and until payment is expressly directed and authorized by a majority of the Committee Members.

The Lead Municipality will submit the Consultant's approved invoice to the MMC for payment. The MMC, as fiscal agent for the Grant, will be responsible for paying the Contractor. Under no circumstances will any payment of grant funds or other funds or payments of any kind, including reimbursements, be made by or come from the Lead Municipality. All payments owed to Contractor under this Agreement shall be made by, and are the sole responsibility of, MMC, as recipient of the grant funds and fiscal agent for the Grant.

Any compensation under this Agreement is dependent on the receipt of sufficient funds from the Grant. In the event the Grant is not disbursed, this Agreement shall become null and void.

Section 6. Project Contributions

The MMC and MPC have agreed to provide staff support and technical assistance, free of charge, particularly related to assisting the Consultant in the position. As recipient of the CCT Grant and the entity responsible for making payments to the Consultant, the MMC will participate in the review of the Consultant's invoices and progress reports.

Each Municipality has agreed to absorb the already incurred and future internal administrative costs for their own employees' time, energy, miscellaneous costs and expenses associated with creating and implementing this Project. No other funds are required from the Municipalities unless specifically agreed to in writing by the corporate authorities of the Municipality.

Section 7. Mutual Release, Hold Harmless and Waiver of Claims

Each Municipality, for itself and its elected or appointed officers and officials, president and trustees, mayor and commissioners, agents, volunteers, attorneys, engineers, representatives and/or employees agrees to waive, release, relinquish and hold harmless all of the other Municipalities, and their elected or appointed officers and officials, presidents and trustees, agents, volunteers, attorneys, engineers, representatives and/or employees, from any and all claims, actions, suits, injuries, damages, costs, expenses and liabilities each Municipality has, or may have, individually, jointly or severally, and which arise directly or indirectly out of or in connection in any way with entering into this Agreement or entering into any Agreement or contract pursuant to this Agreement, or from the performance or termination of this Agreement.

Section 8. Cooperation

The Municipalities agree to work in good faith to achieve the objectives of this Agreement and to mutually resolve any disputes occurring or arising out of or during the term of this Agreement. The Municipalities agree to do all things reasonably necessary or appropriate to carry out the terms, provisions and objectives of this Agreement.

Section 9. Waiver

The waiver by any Municipality of any breach or violation of any provision of this Agreement shall not be deemed to be a waiver or a continuing waiver of any subsequent breach or violation of the same or any other provision of this Agreement.

Section 10. Default/Breach and Remedy

The failure or refusal by any Party to comply with any of its obligations shall constitute a default under this Agreement.

If any Party defaults or breaches in the performance of any of its obligations under this Agreement, a non-breaching Party shall give the breaching Party written notice of such default/breach, and if the breaching Party does not cure the default/breach within fifteen (15) days after the giving of such notice, (or if such default is of such nature that it cannot be completely cured within such period, if the breaching Party does not commence such curing within fifteen (15) days and thereafter proceed with reasonable diligence and in good faith to cure such default/breach), then the non-breaching Party may terminate the Breaching Party's participation in this Agreement. Upon termination of this Agreement, the Parties shall have the ability to pursue all available legal rights and remedies in court to assert or protect their rights.

Should any dispute arising out of this Agreement lead to litigation, the prevailing Municipality shall not be entitled to recover its costs of suit or attorneys' fees.

Section 11. Notices

All notices, demands, requests or other writings which any Municipality is required to, or may wish to, serve upon any other Municipality in connection to this Agreement shall be in writing and shall be deemed given (a) upon delivery, if personally delivered or if sent by e-mail or facsimile transmission, to the Municipalities to be given such notice or other communication; (b) on the third business day following the date of deposit in the United States mail, if such notice or other communication is sent by certified or registered mail with return receipt requested and postage thereon fully prepaid; or, (c) on the business day following the day such notice or other communication is sent by reputable overnight courier, to the following:

If to the Village of Arlington Heights: Village of Arlington Heights
33 S. Arlington Heights Road
Arlington Heights, IL 60005

If to Village of Mount Prospect: Village of Mount Prospect
50 S. Emerson Street
Mount Prospect, IL 60056

If to the Village of Buffalo Grove: Village of Buffalo Grove
50 Raupp Blvd.
Buffalo Grove, IL 60089

If to the Village of Palatine: Village of Palatine
200 East Wood Street
Palatine, Illinois 60067

If to City of Rolling Meadows:

City of Rolling Meadows
3600 Kirchoff Road
Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

Any Municipality may change the address at which it desires to receive notice upon giving written notice of such request to the other Municipalities in the manner herein specified.

Section 12. General

A. After approval by the respective corporate authorities, this Agreement shall be binding on each participating Municipality and its respective successors, including successors in office.

B. This agreement shall be construed together with the Independent Contractor Services Agreement to be entered into between the Lead Municipality and the Consultant, MMC's Grant Application on behalf of the participating municipalities, and the terms of the Chicago Community Trust Grant award and any other grants received.

C. This Agreement shall be deemed and construed to be the joint and collective work product of the Municipalities and, as such, this Agreement shall not be construed against a Municipality, as the otherwise purported drafter of same, by any court of competent jurisdiction and order resolving any inconsistency, any ambiguity, vagueness or conflict in the terms or provisions, if any, contained herein.

D. This Agreement creates no rights, title or interest in any person or entity whatsoever (whether a third party beneficiary thereof or otherwise) other than the Municipalities.

E. Nothing in this Agreement is intended or shall be construed as establishing a separate legal entity, or the relationship of principal and agent, partnership, or joint venture between or among the Municipalities, the Steering Committee or the Consultant. Each Municipality hereto shall retain the sole right to control its own employees and the affairs and conduct of its employees and representatives shall be sole responsibility of the participating Municipality.

F. The Municipalities shall be under no obligation to exercise any of the rights granted to it in this Agreement except as it shall determine to be in the best interest of that certain Municipality as from time to time determined by its corporate authorities.

Section 13. Amendments

No amendments, changes, modifications, alterations, or waivers of any term, provision or condition of this Agreement shall be binding or effective for any purpose unless expressed in writing and adopted by each of the Municipalities hereto as required by law.

Section 14. Assignment

This Agreement shall not be assigned by any Municipality without the express written consent of the other Municipalities, in the sole discretion of the other Municipalities.

Section 15. Severability

The terms, conditions, and provisions of this Agreement shall be severable, and if any term, condition, or provision is found to be invalid or unenforceable for any reason whatsoever, the remaining sections, subsections, terms, conditions, and provisions shall remain in full force and effect, and shall not be effective by such determination, unless the Agreement can no longer be performed by any Municipality.

Section 16. Counterparts

This Agreement may be executed in two or more counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original but all of which together shall constitute one and the same instrument. Facsimile signatures shall be sufficient unless an original signature is required by a Municipality. Reproduction of this Agreement and its signatures hereon shall be the equivalent of an original copy of this Agreement.

Section 17. *Effective Date*

The Effective Date of this Agreement shall be 12:01 a.m. on September 1, 2011.

Section 18. *Term of Agreement*

This Agreement shall be in full force and effect for a term of one (1) year commencing on the Effective Date of this Agreement, subject to early termination pursuant to Section 19.

Section 19. *Termination*

This Agreement shall terminate upon the expiration of the term set forth in Section 18 above, or upon mutual agreement, of all of the Municipalities. Any Municipality may withdraw from this Agreement, at any time, upon at least thirty (30) days prior written notice to the other Municipalities and MMC of its intent to withdraw from this Agreement. Such notice will terminate the rights, duties and obligations of the withdrawing Municipality, effective on the withdrawal date specified in the notice or on the thirtieth day after receipt of the notice by the MMC or the Lead Agency, whichever is later. If the withdrawing Municipality is in default under the Agreement at the time it issues the notice, then its right to participate and receive the benefits contained in the Agreement shall immediately terminate and the withdrawing Municipality shall still be obligated to cure the default. Withdrawal by a Municipality shall terminate only that Municipality's participation under the Agreement and shall not affect the other Municipalities or require an amendment to this Agreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Municipalities hereto have executed this Agreement on the date as set forth below and herein described.

BY: _____ Date: _____

President
Village of Arlington Heights

ATTEST: _____

Village Clerk

BY: _____ Date: _____

Mayor
Village of Mount Prospect

ATTEST: _____

Village Clerk

BY: _____ Date: _____

Mayor
Village of Buffalo Grove

ATTEST: _____

Village Clerk

BY: _____ Date: _____

Mayor
Village of Palatine

ATTEST: _____

Village Clerk

BY: _____ Date: _____

Mayor
City of Rolling Meadows

ATTEST: _____

City Clerk

**NORTHWEST SUBURBAN HOUSING COLLABORATIVE
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR CONSULTING SERVICES CONTRACT:
INTERJURISDICTIONAL HOUSING COORDINATOR**

July 5, 2011

The Metropolitan Mayors Caucus, in collaboration with participating northwest suburban communities, currently including Arlington Heights, Buffalo Grove, Mount Prospect, Palatine, and Rolling Meadows (the “Participating Communities”), is accepting proposals from parties for a consulting services contract with the Participating Communities as an Interjurisdictional Housing Coordinator. Responding parties must meet all qualifications as set forth below and conform to the other requirements set forth herein.

Proposals must be submitted not later than 5:00 p.m., Chicago time, on July 29, 2011. No consideration will be given to information/proposals received after that date and time, except as otherwise provided for herein. All documentation must be submitted as follows:

Inquiries and responses to this RFP for an Interjurisdictional Housing Coordinator should be directed to:

Allison Milld
Director of Housing Initiatives
Metropolitan Mayors Caucus
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 800
Chicago, IL 60606
amilld@mayorscaucus.org

Electronic submittal is preferred.

All statements and qualifications received will be considered confidential and not available for public review until after an Interjurisdictional Housing Coordinator consulting services contract has been awarded by the Participating Communities or their designee. All proposals should be submitted with the attached cover page information.

Applicants are advised to adhere to the requirements of this Request for Proposal. Failure to submit all information requested herein or to follow the above instructions may be sufficient grounds for disqualification.

Attached are a required Proposal Cover Page, a description of the consulting services sought, and a document setting forth additional proposal requirements and information.

The Metropolitan Mayors Caucus, on behalf of the participating communities, reserves the right to reject any and all proposals and to waive formalities and technicalities according to the best interests of the participating communities.

**PROPOSAL REQUIRED Cover Page
(Must be attached to front of Proposal)**

To: Allison Milld, Metropolitan Mayors Caucus

From:

Name _____

Mailing address _____

Home address _____

Phone number _____

Fax number _____

E-mail address _____

**Proposal Submittal: Consulting Services Contract - Interjurisdictional
Housing Coordinator**

**I have read and understood all of the information provided with this
Request for Proposal and agree to abide by the conditions set forth therein.
My signature below indicates my acceptance of all such conditions and my
request to perform contractual consulting services as an Interjurisdictional
Housing Coordinator for the Participating Communities.**

Signature of proposing party: _____

GENERAL POSITION DESCRIPTION

- Act as an interjurisdictional coordinator in aligning the plans, policies, goals, programs, and resources of the Participating Communities across municipal borders on common housing issues, with an initial focus on multifamily housing stabilization and preservation and condominium foreclosures.

RESPONSIBILITIES/DUTIES

- Coordinate and work with the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP) on its Local Technical Assistance Program and the *Homes for a Changing Region* housing supply and demand analysis for Participating Communities;
- Informed by the Homes for a Changing Region analysis, organize a strategic planning exercise to identify short-term and long-term housing needs and opportunities that include, but are not limited to, multifamily housing stabilization and preservation and condominium foreclosure strategies within the Participating Communities;
- Advance the strategic plan by helping to develop project strategies, attract resources, and track outcomes with the Participating Communities;
- Work in consort with and at the direction of the Participating Communities to create and implement common short and long-term goals and strategies;
- Create a long-term fundraising plan for the interjurisdictional efforts of the Participating Communities and formalize the structure of interjurisdictional coordination among the Participating Communities;
- Conduct outreach to financial institutions on housing issues, particularly foreclosure issues, and engage them in designing solutions;
- Engage and coordinate with regional partners in accessing resources and organizing educational events for Participating Communities and their residents;
- Assist with sharing effective program and policy approaches across the Participating Communities;
- Connect housing-related efforts to Participating Communities' other plans and priorities;
- Assemble and coordinate joint employer outreach to discuss employer-assisted housing and engage area employers;
- Facilitate joint planning, programs and decision-making among the Participating Communities related to obtaining and using funding and other resources;
- Explore incentives that will encourage local and regional developers and investors to target investments around the Participating Communities' priorities;

- Act as a resource and intermediary for the Participating Communities relative to data and best practices associated with identified housing goals and strategies; and
- Use best efforts to fulfill the above duties and obligations in a diligent and timely manner.

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS

- Familiarity with and understanding of federal, state, and local programs related to housing and housing funding;
- Three or more years related experience working with local governments, public housing authorities, community-based organizations, not-for-profit organizations, developers or similar on affordable housing and/or related issues;
- Demonstrated ability to work effectively with diverse constituencies, including government officials, community-based organizations, developers, or not-for-profit organizations;
- Strong analytical, written and oral communication skills required;
- Ability to work independently and take initiative.
- Computer literacy and strong organizational skills;
- Graduate degree in urban planning, public policy, social service or related fields preferred;
- Familiarity with the real estate development process, multifamily development and management, finance, and incentives is a plus; and,
- Good financial standing with each of the Participating Communities (e.g., no outstanding invoices, charges, debts or liabilities of any kind owed except for any matters paid under protest or being actively contested in the appropriate administrative or legal forum).

DELIVERABLES

During or upon completion of the contract, the selected party shall provide or perform the following:

- Report with short- and long-term housing needs of the Participating Communities and corresponding goals and strategies
- Fundraising plan for the interjurisdictional efforts
- Analysis of financial institution feedback
- Program guidelines for multi-family housing stabilization and condo foreclosure efforts
- Support the Metropolitan Mayors Caucus' periodic progress reports to the foundation providing initial funding for the Coordinator position

CONTRACT AMOUNT; TERM; LOCATION

- Initial funding for the consulting services contract will be primarily supported through a grant from a third party foundation (the "Grant"). The

successful party will be awarded an initial consulting services contract until funding is exhausted. The consulting services contract shall be for a duration and amount to be determined in advance of contract execution. The contract may be extended by agreement of the parties, should additional funds be available; and

- The successful party will be expected to devote at least 20 hours per week in furtherance of the duties and responsibilities set forth herein, with the possibility of increased hours per week depending on needs and funding availability. The successful party will primarily be housed in one member community, although space will be available in each community.
- The successful party may need to carry insurance acceptable to the Participating Communities, which may include professional liability and workers compensation.

SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

The submission must include the following elements:

1. Cover letter
2. Individual resume or Firm background, including:
 - Educational background,
 - Experience,
 - Certifications
3. Writing Sample
4. References from at least three (3) communities, professional contacts or organizations where similar duties were performed.
 - References should include descriptions of the project.

An electronic proposal submitted electronically to:

Allison Milld, Director of Housing Initiatives, Metropolitan Mayors Caucus
Amilld@mayorscaucus.org

All proposals must be received by **5 p.m. on Friday, July 29, 2011**. Late submissions will not be accepted.

The participating communities reserve the right to review the statements based on the Applicant's ability, experience, and thoroughness of information provided.

After reviewing the proposals, the Participating Communities will determine which applicants will be interviewed. Interviews will be conducted in early August 2011.

ADDITIONAL PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS AND INFORMATION

Proposals must include the responding party's qualifications, availability for commencement of the consulting services involved, and experience in accordance with minimum qualifications and consultant responsibilities and duties set forth above.

The Metropolitan Mayors Caucus, in collaboration with the Participating Communities, will evaluate proposals based qualifications, availability, and additional factors deemed relevant. The contract will not necessarily be awarded to the party who can perform the duties at the lowest cost.

The Metropolitan Mayors Caucus, in collaboration with the Participating Communities, reserves the right to reject or refuse any or all proposals, or any part thereof, make counter proposals and/or engage in negotiation with any or all persons making a proposal in order to obtain the required and appropriate contractual relationship at a cost acceptable to the Participating Communities and which will, in the sole judgment of the Participating Communities, best serve the interests of the Participating Communities.

The Metropolitan Mayors Caucus, on behalf of the Participating Communities, reserves the right to extend the response period, including but not limited, to supply further information, to make revisions in the description and responsibilities and duties set forth herein or to solicit additional proposals from other parties.

The Metropolitan Mayors Caucus, on behalf of the Participating Communities, reserves the right to cancel or amend the RFP at any time, without liability for any loss, damage, cost or expense incurred or suffered by any party as a result of that change or cancellation. This RFP does not constitute an offer to hire and the submittal of a responsive proposal is not deemed to be an acceptance. The submittal of a proposal is merely an offer to perform contract consulting services which may or may not be accepted by the Participating Communities. The Participating Communities shall be under no obligation to enter into a consulting services contract. Participation in this RFP process does not create any enforceable contract rights.

Each responding party is solely responsible for the risk and cost of preparing and submitting its proposal to this RFP, and the Metropolitan Mayors Caucus and the Participating Communities are not liable for the cost of doing so or obliged to remunerate or reimburse any responding party for that cost. This RFP does not impose on the Metropolitan Mayors Caucus or Participating Communities any duty of fairness or natural justice to any or all responding parties with respect to this RFP or the process it creates.

The consulting services contract, if one is awarded, will be executed between the successful party and one of the Participating Communities, on behalf of the other Participating Communities. The consulting services contract shall provide that the successful party may be terminated for any reason and at any time without notice. The consulting services contract shall also provide that upon termination, the successful party shall waive any and all claims of any kind he or she may have against the Participating Communities, provided the Participating Communities have fulfilled all of their obligations under the contract.

The Metropolitan Mayors Caucus and Participating Communities are entitled to act in their sole, absolute and unfettered discretion.

Committee-of-the-Whole Agenda – July 19, 2011

2) Refuse Discount Survey Results

Earlier this year a survey was prepared and sent out to residents asking for input on three (3) primary topics:

1. Whether or not discounted refuse raters should be offered to residents,
2. Would residents qualify for any such discounts, and
3. How should any loss in revenues be recouped?

The surveys were sent to all 5,900 residential refuse customers. Of the surveys that were sent out, one thousand one hundred and fifty-nine (1,159) or 19% were returned, while 4,741 homeowners (or 81% of refuse customers) did not respond to the survey. Not all survey respondents answered every question, therefore responses were categorized as follows: YES, NO, & DID NOT ANSWER. The attached document shows the detail of the responses. The responses are summarized and interpreted as follows:

- Question one: Should the City offer discounts to seniors, Snowbirds and or those with a medical hardship?
 - Fifty-five percent (55%) of the respondents would support senior discounts.
 - Sixty-seven percent (67%) did not agree with providing a discount to Snowbirds.
 - Discounts for those with a medical condition had less support than for senior discounts with forty-seven percent (47%) supporting medical discounts.
- Question two: Would you qualify for any one of the possible discounts?
 - Fifty percent (50%) of the respondents stated they would qualify for a senior discount.
 - Five percent (5%) of the respondent stated they would qualify for a Snowbird discount.
 - Twelve percent (12%) said “yes” to being eligible to qualify for a medical discount.
- Question three: Would you participate in a discount program if one was offered?
 - Forty-eight percent (48%) said “yes” they would participate.
 - Nineteen percent (19%) said “no” they would not participate.
 - Thirty-three percent (33%) did not answer the question.

- Question four: What criteria should be used for discount program?
(1) Age, (2) Income or (3) a combination of both.
- Forty-six percent (46%) said a combination of both factors should be used.
- Twenty-three percent (23%) said age only.
- Twenty-two (22%) percent said income only.
- Question five of the survey asked about making up any losses in City revenues due to providing any discount programs, the three choices residents were given were as follows:

<u>Choice</u>	<u>Majority Response</u>
• Increase refuse collection fees to others	53% said NO
• Other fees or tax changes to provide “subsidies”	44% said NO
• Service reductions	54% said NO

- Question six: This question asked residents to state how many months they were out of town for during the year. These response were as follows:

• Four Months	9 Residents
• Five Months	9 Residents
• Six Months	8 Residents
• <u>Seven Months</u>	<u>2 Residents</u>
• Total	28 Residents

Additional Written Comments

Two hundred and thirty-seven (237) residents provided written comments along with their survey submittal. These comments were categorized into 10 groups as follows:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Number Of Responses (out of 1,159)</u>
Bad Idea / not fair	81
Pay per bag or other financing ideas	37
If they can afford two homes they can afford their refuse bill	32
Yes - Give seniors a break	17
Expand Discounts to others	16
Reduce service level / reduce cost	14
Good Idea	3
Fees already to high	3
Could not make up their mind about one or more question	13
Non-specific Comment Not Related to Survey	21
<u>Total Written Comments</u>	<u>237</u>

Summary

If discounted fees were offered the largest group of the respondents and those that would benefit would be seniors, while only a small number of resident appear to be snow birds. Since the term “medical discounts” was not defined it is difficult to determine who might benefit from a medical discount program.

Note that currently, twenty seven (27) households participate in the free back-door refuse collection program, which does require proof of a medical hardship.

The summary figures and all of the survey comments received are attached for review.

#	Question	Responses						
		Yes	No	Total Responses	Did Not Answer	Percent Yes	Percent No	Percent Did Not Answer
1	Should the City of Rolling Meadows provide discounted refuse collection fees to certain citizen groups, such as?							
a	Senior Citizens (65 years of age or over)	637	482	1,119	40	55%	42%	3%
b	Snow Birds (those leaving the City for 4 or more months)	182	777	959	200	16%	67%	17%
c	Other Groups (handicap, other medical need, or hardship)	542	452	994	165	47%	39%	14%
2	If discounts were offered <u>would you qualify</u> for one or more of these options?							
a	An age discount (65 and older)?	574	556	1,130	29	50%	48%	3%
b	A “snow bird” discount?	60	872	932	227	5%	75%	20%
c	A medical discount?	136	813	949	210	12%	70%	18%
3	If you answered “Yes”, to any of the questions above would you utilize a refuse discount program if it was provided?							
		552	220	772	387	48%	19%	33%
4	If discounted fees are offered, should the discount be:							
a	Based on age only	267	592	859	300	23%	51%	26%
b	Income based	250	546	796	363	22%	47%	31%
c	A combination of age and income-based need	532	438	970	189	46%	38%	16%
5	If discounted fees are offered for refuse collection, the City needs to account for the loss in revenue. How should the losses be recouped?							
a	Increase refuse collection fees to others	249	610	859	300	21%	53%	26%
b	Other fees or tax changes to provide “subsidies”	381	512	893	266	33%	44%	23%
c	Service reductions	224	628	852	307	19%	54%	26%

Comment	Group Number
The City has wasted way too much time on this issue. Please do NOT do it. Terrible idea.	1
I want you all to drop this! It is shortsighted and not well thought out. If someone has the means to be a "snowbird" and vacation away several weeks they have the means to pay the low garbage rate. All seniors are not poor!! If folks have a special SHORT TERM need let them make a special request for a temporary abatement with a start and end date. For instance if you loose your job. Stop trying to set groups against each other. Many young folks are struggling and many seniors just don't want to spend. I know I'm a senior and don't expect any other group to pay me bills.	1
Do not discount per question #4.	1
Referring to Q6 - There is no fair of acceptable choice.	1
ComEd and NICOR no discount, why should City?	1
no discounts should be offered. How many special needs programs do we need? Stop them all and get on with making decisions based on all citizens, not the ones who become "winners" based on government selection.	1
At what point are children responsible for their parents?	1
Keep as is	1
Referring to Q1b – You must be joking. Referring to Q5b Yu are asking the middle class to pay the tax.	1
I do not think there should be a refuse discount for age – however if one was offered due to citizen demand – I would be “nuts” not to use it.	1
We cannot answer #'s 4 & 5 because we don't agree with the proposal “IF” never counts.	1
Not a good time to increase fees.	1
I am always grateful that seniors are looked out for. At this time when so many are not doing well, seniors are. I know that every month I am going to receive my money. I also know I am not going to lose my job. It not fair that others would have to pick up the fees I don't pay. I feel very lucky compared to many young people who are struggling to make ends meet and support their families.	1
Question #1-they need to understand it's more than refuse pick up, it helps other costs for services from the City.	1
Leave things alone! You would raise taxes somewhere. Stop raises - I've worked at NCH for 30 years are RN 0 raises for 4 years. They have taken \$44.00 a month for taxes from small pension.	1
The state can't pay their bill let's not follow their lead. RM has budget issues already – giving discounts? Snow birds they can afford a second home??? Only pickup one day a week what reductions would happen? This is a service everyone uses, everyone should pay. Let's cut the alderman's pay in half if they want to make the city a better place. Let them have no pay or benefits. Do they truly want to make things better? Lets see who's willing to run next time. Thank you for the survey.	1
Prefer same refuse collection with no discounts as now.	1
As for me I'd be satisfied with refuse collection twice a month and recycling once a month. I am sure that I am overcharged fro this service of refuse collection, because my refuse is really minimal. Regular garbage one or twice a month and recycling once a month or less. When I see my neighbors have a mountain every week and recycling every week full cans and plus more beside the cart. They feel very bad thinking I'm paying for them! Comparing with them I should pay nothing! I could live with collection only once a month.	1

Comment	Group Number
The town I have a second home in does not let me pay less for fro water and sewer even though I'm a summer resident only. I pay full rate even though the hoe is vacant and not rented for six month! I'm paying enough already!! Seniors get a break on real estates taxes, vehicle stickers, etc. I'm tired of subsidies for certain groups!!! Where does this stop?	1
Here is my opinion on survey question #5, If the City can't afford to do this very nice idea without putting the burden on the homeowners, especially the young who have young children, don't offer it. Don't increase our City's debt to the point we are on the same level as the state and the federal government. Don't add more taxes and more fees to our residents who have to deal with the state and federal taxes fees ect. Gas is so high – people have to use it to get to work – to support their families. In other word don't start up new programs that the city can't afford. If people are snow birds they are gone for many months at a time, their bill should be less anyways. If seniors medical hardship causes a very stresses out young family can't afford the rates then help those folks but please don't start any new programs unless the EXTRA money is there to do it.	1
1-Low income circuit breakers already get a great reduction in taxes (real estate) compared to the rest of us "regular" seniors who don't qualify for this reduction. Therefore it should be age related in my opinion. 2-I'm a senior in townhouse complex and most of us are also seniors and we only put out 1 small bag of refuse each week for \$31.13 per month. I notice piles of refuse in some driveways in my neighborhood along Kirchoff Rd. Almost \$8 a bag is pretty steep for us! Plus, being a private area, this is one of the few services we receive from the City. (No street cleaning, plowing, or street repairs ever given!)	1
Everyone should pay their share – there are enough subsidies for everything else.	1
I think that this is one of the stupidest things ever. Once again some old person gets a break but the average working family has to take it up the tail pipe, especially when so many seniors don't have nearly the expenses as a family.	1
Referring to Q3 – Don't Care Referring to Q4 – Don't offer!	1
If rich and old no discount. I think Question 4C needs to be more specific.	1
This is a really silly idea. We pay taxes to School District's 15 and 214 whether we have children or not – garbage should be the same.	1
I do not want any increases to pay for others. I am tired of paying for everyone else. I am a hard working middle class citizen. Also in my experience some people get these benefits unfairly. The middle class (65yrs) always gets stuck. I am retired too and out of town but I am willing to pay my fair share. Thank You. P.S. Where does this paying for others end? The government never gave me any breaks – just more taxes.	1
If we get discounts on refuse – we would have to pay for the service some other way. If snow birds can afford to leave town, they should still pay the fees.	1
Referring to Q3 – Should not be offered. Referring to Q4 A-C – Should not be offered. Referring to Q1C – Should not be offered.	1
Do not want my fees increased.	1
The City has to much debt to be offering discounts. Keep all rates low and equal.	1
Refuse fees are part of the cost of owning a home.	1
I think this would be unfair to raise the fees for residents who do not qualify.	1
Referring to Q4 A-C There shouldn't be discounts. Referring to Q5 A-C Against Discount Fees.	1
We have no money in RM., how can you discount fees? Ours streets need to be fixed!	1

Comment	Group Number
Referring to Q1A-C This is ridiculous – not in this economy. Referring to Q2A-C Maybe I am a senior myself but I am not in favor of subsidizing snow birds. Referring to Q3 Don't know would rather pay my own bill and not rich snow birds. Referring to Q4 This would only create another deficit. Referring to Q5 This is why this should not be considered all fees keep going up now! And we don't even get paper bags anymore. Yet there will be money for this?	1
Referring to Q2 A & B I do qualify but I don't want this for our people. If they can go to Florida they can pay for their garbage. Referring to Q6 This is a security questions and I will not answer it. I pay plenty already in state county and federal taxes to support indigent people. They will lie, they probably have cable TV. and I-pads and many other things I do without so I can pay my bills. NO! NO! NO! this is a stupid idea.	1
No new taxes period. We are over taxed now.	1
I refuse to pay more than I'm paying.	1
To many people abuse the system – don't implement.	1
If the City of Rolling Meadows has financial problems they should not consider lower rates.	1
I feel that credits for snowbirds would be difficult to prove and administer. Also folks who can afford two homes can afford to support services in RM. The services have to be provided whether or not they are in town.	1
We've had this service for as long as we've lived in Rolling Meadows. We don't think it needs to be changed now. Why should snowbirds get a break if they elect to leave for a few months. Do the gas and electric companies give them a break?	1
When we first moved out her in the 60's, we were charged for garbage according to how much water we used. The more water the bigger the family the more garbage. There are single people who own houses that have no more garbage than a senior citizen.	1
Economy is already hard don't make it harder.	1
711 Part 1 In my opinion, there should be no discounts offered. In our town there are more and more homes for sale not selling and or foreclosed on. People are out of work and struggling with high fuel cost, high medical cost and our wonderful Jewel Osco high prices. The seniors in this town have their homes paid for, have a pension, have social security which we will never see) have medical assistance.	1
711 Part 2 And I would guess this is the majority of them that have been in this town from the start. They can afford refuse pick up as well as the next guy. We have no more money than they and probably less. We also as neighbors help these seniors with snow removal and grass cutting for nothing! We supply them with home cook meals at times and are just there to listen to them babble about the past.	1
711 Part 3 This is not the past; they have lived theirs and get so many discounts already that we the younger generation end of paying for. This is our future and we should be given the discount if you want us to continue living in this town.	1
I do not wish to pay for another's garbage.	1
Stop raising taxes and cutting services! This City has raised and cut too much already!	1
Referring to Q1C - In community and schools there are excessive welfare and handouts for illegal immigrants cut those for _____ funds then available for Rolling Meadows. Referring to Q5C – Limit council, alderman expenses and city employee expenses. Pay for web based classes instead of sending on trips for classes.	1
Is the City Council on Drugs? Referring to Q2 Yes for hardship discount.	1

Comment	Group Number
Referring to Q1A – The whole town is seniors that would be a lot of lost revenue. Referring to Q1B If you can afford to own two homes and fly south for the winter you can pay your own bill! Referring to Q1C – Are state taxes already paying for the. Referring to Q1C – My husband just went back to work; why should I cover the lost revenue	1
818 Part 1 According to the criteria, my household would qualify for a refuse discount. I would not feel right accepting this while others foot my bill. I realize this program is in the incubation stage however I have concerns: Who would monitor this program? Who determines if a household is actually vacated for a season - if a resident' is gone, is someone there house-sitting in their absence? How long can seasonal discount apply? What constitutes household income? What constitutes medical discount? Would the handicap discount qualifier be the homeowner or other resident of the home? What precipitated the discount program? Complaints? From whom, how many?	1
818 Part 2 People complain about money; the price of gas, the cost of groceries, their ever rising bills yet they pay for wants (fast food, cell phones, cable TV, etc). There are those who would abuse the perk, finagling their situation to qualify, to beat the system. I'm sure your staff can substantiate my belief that refuse pick-up in RM is routinely abused by some. I know the City's expense goes beyond pick-up/disposing of refuse. How in the world would discounting help this?	1
818 Part 3 To monitor, would additional staff be needed, adding yet another employee to an ailing budget? Not long ago the city considered out-sourcing refuse collection to save money...now they're considering a discount?	1
818 Part 4 If the fees for refuse collection are not inflated, they--are-what-they-are I don't know how you could consider accepting less. I do not have a problem helping people in need - I regularly do so, personally. If a resident were in dire straits, I would think they would approach the City for help. I don't feel 'blanket' discount is the answer, regardless of what group you are considering. Are residents seriously concerned about a \$28 refuse bill? Or is the concern over their total monthly invoice from the City? (I note my bill escalates when I have an 'estimated' water meter reading.) I think you need to approach this program with extreme care. Thank you for taking the time to read my letter.	1
I am an 84 year old widower and live alone. I would not qualify for the Circuit Breaker program. On garbage day a weeks worth of my garbage consists of one grocery bag which I place on top of my recycling cart. The driver grabs it as he passes by and carries it to the next stop. Every week when I put out that little bag I think to myself I don't get my money's worth. However if it takes \$28.08 to have my garbage picked up, so be it. What I really wouldn't like a price increase.	1
Would not want this program or the increases it will cause, leave as is.	1
I am sure there are many people in our community who could benefit from such a program. My concern is this will only help set groups of people while others will pay the extra fees. If you are going to offer discounts it should be for anyone with a severe financial need, not just a certain age group! I know many young families struggling too who could use help, not just the seniors. I know the seniors would say its not fair to pay the same fees when they put out less garbage. For many of our seniors this is true. We live on a street with many seniors. Many of our senior retired couple put out the same amount or more each as our family of 6! It doesn't seem fair we would be asked to pay more, when we are conservative.	

Comment	Group Number
<p>As for the snowbird issue, it doesn't seem fair for them to pay full rates when they are gone. Does that mean that those trying to sell or rent a vacant home will get a discount? They aren't putting out any garbage. I know other towns offer snowbird discounts, but they where in place before the economy took a nose dive.</p> <p>I don't think RM can afford to offer this discount. There are many of us who can't afford vacations and have to work in that miserable cold weather. We can't afford higher fees so you can stay warm, sorry my answer is not to this one! I hope if a discount program is put in place it helps only those who truly need it. You need to look at the whole financial picture, not just he income level. With incomes dropping in large amounts and costs increasing, we have to use our savings and investments to close the growing gap. If I need to use my savings I want to make sure it is people in need.</p>	1
Not a good idea. You will risk less new families moving to the City.	1
Absolutely not!	1
1b-no way. Every homeowner should pay the same. If snowbirds can go south to nice weather for the Chicago winter, they certainly can pay \$28/month for a service they don't use. NICOR doesn't give discounts when you turn down your heat for a few months.	1
no discounts	1
<p>I do not expect my son on Thrush nor any other resident to pay form my refuse service because I am old, poor, and handicapped. That is not their fault nor their responsibility. I only pay for the water and electricity I use. Therefore, I should pay for the water I use, no problem.</p> <p>However, I am 72 and live alone. I only fill the refuse pick up container every 2 or 3 weeks. Why should I pay the same charge as a family of 5 or 6 who use more pickups? I would not mind my pickup to be reduced to every other week. That would be logical and fair to everyone. As I said, I do not expect charity but equity.</p>	1
I think it should stay as it is.	1
<p>Even thought we are both seniors we do not we do not feel we are entitled to a reduction of fees for service we al benefit from. Living in a community means that we all must share in the responsibility for paying for needed and wanted services. The only exception would be for medical and or financial hardship. Rolling Meadows is fortunate in that it has a dedicated, competent and professional City work force that provides excellent services. We should not jeopardize this to “save” a few dollars.</p>	1
I'm tired of paying for everyone else!	1
In essence this would be a tax on over taxed people. Helping people is the job of individuals and charities – not government.	1
<p>I think if residents aren't using the service and there is a cost savings (reduced pick up waste) then it would be fine to pass these savings on to those people (snow birds). But to ask us to pay more to further subsidize other households doesn't sit well with me. It is not that expensive of a service and there are certain costs associated with owning a home. What about reducing waste? We are a family of four and have typically one bag per week and a very full recycling bin</p>	1

Comment	Group Number
I do not fall into any of the proposed discount scenarios. However, I travel a lot on business. I often only put my garbage out once a month. Regardless of income level, these categories use the service more often than I do. I accept the fact I have to pay for the service when not using it but I have an issue with someone getting a discount over me who does use the service weekly. I say leave things as they are! I don't want to pay more for a service I already don't use so someone else can get a discount who does.	1
No free rides no more welfare.	1
I do not think people should pay for others, because there is too much of that. Everyone should pay their own	1
First, the opening paragraph of the survey indicates an income qualifier for seniors is being considered (Circuit Breaker Program). However, all questions related to seniors are geared towards an age qualifier, not age and income, with the exception of question #4. While I respect our senior citizens, age does not dictate whether someone is in need of community assistance in paying bills. I know both affluent and economically challenged seniors.	1
If you are going to offer a snowbird discount - then you should also consider a vacant house discount. Any discount program would be next to impossible to administer and cost should not be passed on to others.	1
The City should sell garbage bags and only pick up those bags. Those with more garbage pay more. This would be equitable without discriminating against anyone.	1
With the number of existing senior discounts (Senior Freeze, Senior Exemption in property taxes and countless others) a case could be made that the non-senior population is already subsidizing City services in favor of the elderly. At \$28.00 the amount paid for refuse collection is relatively low to begin with. What amount of subsidy are we to consider? \$2.00, \$5.00 \$10.00 discount? At what point will it have a significant impact on those we wish to assist? Has the City even looked at the potential benefit, or is this just an attempt to garner votes by creating some useless rate reduction for a sizeable segment of the population.	1
What type of increase does the City consider fair for the rest of us? In our current economic condition every demographic is suffering, young, old and middle aged. To single one group out for assistance based on age alone is inconsiderate and disrespectful of everyone else especially if that assistance is unneeded or offers little to no benefit and will require an additional burden for the rest of the Community.	1
To add insult to injury a provision in the survey mentions 'Snow Birds' as potential beneficiaries. I suspect that anyone who can afford to move to Florida for the winter while maintaining a residence in Rolling Meadows can afford to pay for refuse collection; it is just an accepted cost of living here.	1
If Council really wants to make refuse collection fair, the City should institute a "pay as you use" program available in many other communities. The more you recycle and the less you throw away the less you pay. Obviously if you leave for a few months you would have nothing to pay while you were gone.	1

Discounted Refuse Survey Comments

Comment	Group Number
This option allows residents to pay for what they actually use and encourages recycling and waste reduction, a benefit to everyone.	1
1 Count	81

Comment	Group Number
For social programs such as this one you inquire about here to be effective – you must first have a flowing source of income. i.e. more business in the so called downtown. Compared to the surrounding towns / cities in our area. They have the following which brings in money that can be used for such things as social programs, summer festivals, 4th of July fire works ect. There are multi cultural restaurants which have liquor licenses, pub and bars, shops and opportunities fro small business to flourish as it is we have a nearly defunct strip mall with a dry clearer, a Mexican restraint, Chase bank, Taco Bell, McDonalds, Jewel another failing strip mall and condo, condo, condo, River Walk? For what? How about a theater or a pizza place, or bar and a steak house, the point is encourage both big and small business to the downtown area let them be a source of community revenue (for social programs). Don't make the citizens pick up the tab. Look at Arlington Height's downtown as an example they have houses and condo's and all source of commerce.	2
5a-per bag of amount?	2
5a-maybe depends on est. discount, otherwise explore other areas for budget reduction.	2
streamline service	2
Suggestions Refuse collections in boxes ect. Are properly reduced in size and placed in containers – charge more for the large refuse box fro those who need it for senior residents provide smaller containers at reduced charge.	2
Sell landscape stickers	2
How about the “photo light” violations - Euclid is a gold mine.	2
Don't completely drop a part of this service, but limit certain parts i.e. landscape waste or furniture p/u.	2
hold City spending	2
5b-real estate tax	2
Cut city employees benefits.	2
Pay cuts	2
Add to property tax deduct from property tax.	2
Raise sales tax rate.	2
Households with 4 or more people should pay \$1- \$2.00 more	2
Referring to Q4 A-C – Should be based on usage. I think Arlington Heights uses stickers on their bags. Less Refuse then less cost, i.e. a base monthly fee plus cost per bag.	2
Referring to Q5 – Not sure how to do that or how much to increase.	2
The City should “Eat” the reduction rather than burdening other citizens.	2
Start collecting money for expired licenses and window stickers.	2
I think the city should negotiate more with other trash companies, to arrive at a more competitive and lower rate for all residents.	2
Referring to Q6 - Never I live hear all year round. How about people buying stickers for garbage bags. I usually have my bags and recycling down once a month. I don't have that much garbage and a lawn service for clippings.	2
Discounts should be based on the amount of refuse.	2
Sticker fees for yardwaste would be most fair to all. Pay for service.	2
Why not go to pay for use with a sticker per bag. That way if you make more garbage you pay more to get rid of it. It would also encourage more recycling.	2
Referring to Q5 – Reduce tax payers pension contribution and benefit expenses for public employees.	2

Comment	Group Number
Referring to Q1 – how about a price freeze. Referring to Q4 – Discounts for seniors only 62 and older. Get rid of vehicle stickers, just charge each house based on the cars they have. Put this on the utility bill.	2
Sensible wage and retirement programs for all public employees.	2
Pay for the amount of refuse at the curb. Extra fees for more than two bags, to encourage recycling. If you leave Rolling Meadows for months at a time you should be able to afford the refuse charge.	2
Charge more to those who put out more than three bags - or large households.	2
it should solely be income-based.	2
Why not make the refuse charge a percentage of the water bill. That way seniors and snow birds are using less water, therefore making their refuse bill smaller. Where as multi-family homes and large families are using more water – more garbage – higher refuse charge. That would make everyone happy.	2
I believe our current rates should apply to usage amount as with any other utility.	2
Referring to Q3A – At age 65. Referring to Q4B – Hardship Yes. Referring to Q5A Charge per bag.	2
Maybe people should be billed for the amount of garbage?	2
Program should be structured to include condominium owners who presently pay for this service through taxes but receive no benefit.	2
How about having a City dumpster place where residents can drop off their garbage bags so the trucks don't have to pick up so often. Another suggestion would be to look for waste or corruption in the system and cut back on that. The current rates are already high enough.	2

Discounted Refuse Survey Comments

Comment	Group Number
Perhaps charge for yard waste, I have a yard service I already pay for.	2
2 Count	37

Comment	Group Number
those who cannot afford a winter “get-a-way” home, have to subsidize those that are wealthy enough to own two homes? Our City has amazing refuse collection service. We feel that offering anyone a discounts is a bad idea.	3
If someone can afford two home they can afford the garbage fee. Documented hardship only.	3
If you are a snow bird for four months you can afford to pay your refuse bill.	3
1a-as their option-reduce their fees and only pick up twice a month. Do not pick up service. 5c-cut service to snowbirds only.	3
if they can afford to fly away they can pay	3
Referring to Q4a and time spent at location. Referring to Q5c– during absent periods month to month.	3
Why would we offer special prices for those who choose to leave the City every winter, doesn't make sense, aren't they still RM residents or not. And if they can afford to leave for the winter why the discount?	3
Being a snowbird means they are traveling to a “Second” Residence. They should be able to afford their responsibilities at this residence, their main one. They don't stop owning the property. This is my thought I have ne problem helping someone out when in need.	3
If you can afford 1-3 month vacations, you can afford to continue to pay garbage fees. Let's be honest, the work should be will not may cause an increase to fees.	3
1d include empty homes for sale in discounted refuse fees-if the home is for sale there shouldn't be a fee after the first month, 4b -if paying on two homes	3
1b-they own two house they can pay to keep them, too easy to play system. 3-65 on fixed income. 4b-fixes income as __ above.	3
If you can afford to be a snow bird you can afford to pay your refuse collection bill. How could you possibly monitor a snow bird reduction? What if they come home or if someone uses their home or their plans change last minute? Referring to Q5 There is incomplete information to answer this question How many people would qualify? How much of a discount? How much of an increase are you looking at?	3
Referring to Q3 - Have never and do not plan to leave for a long period of time. Referring to Q6 – If “Snow Bird” person leaves for long period of time – they are not using service, cost is less – so I do not see what losses need to be recouped.	3
if they have two homes they can afford to pay.	3
If you can afford to be a snow bird you should be able to pay for a couple of months of unused refuse collection.	3
1) Consider the state of the economy. 2) If “snow birds” can afford to leave the area they should not be awarded a reduction! 3) Would NICOR or ComEd give discounts?	3
The City could start charging for large items – appliances, furniture, construction materials as most other communities do now. As for “Snow Birds” if they can afford a second home, they should be able to afford the regular garbage rate. It should be based on age and income. The Circuit Breaker people should get a discount only. If the discount program is expanded to too many people, it would cost the City too much. Give the discount to seniors who really need it!	3

Comment	Group Number
1) If someone is having trouble with their bill, maybe they should move to a smaller home. 2) those who are snow birds have made a choice to leave the area. Their choice should not drive up our costs. 3) Our method of refuse collection is labor intensive. When I lived in Colorado, the community I lived in had a program where one driver could pickup the trash automatically and recycling from separate bins. Special needs were called in and charged separately. The trucks were much better and faster than our current recycling trucks.	3
Referring to Q3 - Yes but I don't qualify.	3
Referring to Q2 – At the moment I'm trying to pay everything I can. Referring to Q4A – Discount to be for those with a hardship also. Referring to Q6 – If I could afford to be a snowbird I would be able to afford all my bills.	3
People who are snowbirds not only can afford one home here, but another home somewhere else, they can also afford to travel back and forth. They can certainly afford to have their garbage picked up. I have to pay! Also if you are going to give a discount based on age, then why shouldn't young people who need to support a family be considered for a discount.	3
I feel if they can own a house, then they should pay full price. If they can afford to go somewhere else for the winter, they can afford to pay full price. It is their choice to leave. This is an unfair proposal. I try hard to recycle and reduce my family's waste. Some other families don't feel this is their concern and have many bags of garbage every week. Are you trying to make it based on consumption? Because that has nothing to do with income! I'm strongly opposed to this. Please don't drive away young families from wanting to live in Rolling Meadows, unless you want a town full of senior citizens and low income families. Can't we have a mix of population instead of making it appealing to low income people. What happens if someone loses their job and becomes "temporarily" low income? P.S. Seniors get discounts at stores without the cost getting passed on to other customer!	3
If you can afford to leave the city during the winter, you should be able to afford your refuse bill.	3
Discounts should only be given to seniors on a fixed income. We do not feel we should be paying for snowbirds, who can afford two homes, while we are struggling due to unemployment.	3
Snowbirds do not deserve a discount they are gone for 4 to 8 months to get tax breaks in Florida and we get no other income from them. They don't shop in Rolling Meadows gas, groceries, anything and then want a break for the rest of us to pay. I'm in the age group for discounts but it is not fair to other families to pay just because you reach a certain age. If you give a discount give it to everyone.	3
If you can afford two houses you can afford the RM. refuse fee for the full year. The fees should pay for the service, shifting them around to other taxes and fees just obscure the true cost.	3

Comment	Group Number
As far as snowbirds maybe there could be a 3 month discount, but as far as subsidizing senior and low income, please don't forget that some families have unemployed spouses, and will have 1 or 2 kids in college for the next ten years. Remember students in Illinois cannot go to college for less than \$20,000 a year unlike other states in the U.S. That pretty makes me have the same income as a low income person. Yet we don't qualify for financial aid just the parents being able to take out a 7.8% loan. In conclusion, there are many of us that cannot afford to subsidize seniors, and low income, but we would never be able to prove it because we have moderate incomes but our expenses are so much higher than the other groups and they already receive financial assistance we do not.	3
1b-definitely no. Anyone having the resources to spend months in Florida during the winter should not be given a discount especially if you are considering passing on their fees for refuse collection to those of us who have no choice but to stay put. 1c-yes but only to low income households as defined by any federal and state guidelines. 3-I would utilize only what I would be entitled to but would consider no discount if it would mean holding the line on additional rate increases. I strongly object to paying for snow birds. Why does it always have to be the rich getting the breaks. 5a-definitely no. Everyone needs to pay their fair share. I assume what we're doing now is working. Therefore, why not leave well enough alone?	3
If snowbirds can afford to leave, they can afford garbage fees.	3
Snowbirds are fortunate they can afford 2 homes. God has blessed them.	3
1b-if you can afford a second home you can afford to pay all utilities; 3-I always pay my bills and I am 82; 4 discounted fees-do not offer to anyone. This is a joke, poor snow birds cannot afford anything!!	3

Discounted Refuse Survey Comments

Comment	Group Number
Snowbirds should not get discounts because they can afford to bask in sunshine while the rest of us freeze. No hardship there.	3
3 Count	32

Comment	Group Number
Comment unreadable	4
5c-cut/combine City office jobs. Why does our water bill fluctuate so much in price? Especially when it's not even summertime and we are not watering something? There are no new appliances, we don't run a dish washer, we do minimal laundry. One month its \$59 next month its \$99? Why? Nothing's changed here. And the drinking water is salty and strange this year. No other complaints from our area because they can afford to buy bottled water.	4
Referring to Q2b in 5 years / Referring to Q3 Of course they would	4
Referring to Q1c – Perhaps but should be rare	4
Lots of families are experiencing hardships. My real estate taxes are up to \$9000 a year – can I please get some kind of relief? My husband and I both have had work hours cut, my son has to go to Harper at our expense, we can't afford to send him away to college, he has a "B" average and scored 34 on his ACT. Do to our real estate going up and house value going down we will be forced to leave Rolling Meadows and move else where in a few years. Refuse fee discounts should not be an option during these rough economic times. If it is an option should only be given to long time residents of Rolling Meadows. We are living paycheck to paycheck, never have done this before - please help us all. Also people do not have cash in our neighborhood for snow removable, landscape service, cars, trucks, plumbing, tow drivers, how will you account for this? Also why don't you issue fines to residents who have remodeled years ago and have not updated their taxes, how much money is the City loosing on this?	4
Be more creative!	4
I have lived here since 1953.	4
Referring to Q6 - Never I live hear all year round.	4
I've seen peoples relativities dump lots of garbage at seniors homes.	4
Referring to Q5 A & B – If after item B is item A still necessary?	4
Resident is deceased, house is empty, no refuse pickup necessary.	4
I'm paying \$71.18 which I don't own – that I didn't use that much water. My bills have been consistently every month around 1,630 to 1760 gallons.	4
You don't need to raise rate because you rip people off on their water bill.	4
People may not put out a lot of garbage, but I see those people putting out more yard waste per week than we do all year. So six of one, half dozen of the other.	4
3-at age we would qualify	4
1-single people with less refuse; 4-# of people in household	4
4d-medical	4
Referring to Q 4B – On voter rolls and a U.S. citizen. Referring to Q 5C – Make snow birds register and don't stop at their address.	4
Referring to Q4B Income is private. Referring to Q5C – Be able to put on vacation hold so they skip pickups while gone.	4
Referring to Q4C – Handicapped and medical needs should not be based on income.	4

Discounted Refuse Survey Comments

Comment	Group Number
Unreadable comment	4
4 Count	21

Discounted Refuse Survey Comments

Comment	Group Number
I only put my garbage out once or twice a month.	5
Referring to Q3 – not at this time , if health or finances change then yes.	5
I use collection service every other week	5
Circuit Breaker Only	5
Maybe they could cancel service when they are gone. Senior – Because they have less refuse and are alone. From the free bags you no longer give someone is getting this money.	5
Yes, low income I would qualify	5
I live at Church Creek but have my home on 2904 Grouse Lane.	5
Seniors should get a discount if they have a low monthly income.	5
I think this (discounts) would be fair I only have a small bag of refuse every 2 to 3 weeks.	5
for seniors only not other groups	5
1-all seniors regardless of income; 2-not if income is a basis; 3-because of household income	5
maybe you could set up a voluntary contribution program like NICOR gas has for people to done to help others in need and unable to pay their bill.	5
I would be glad to pay for an increase in back door service I have now	5
Referring to Q1C – Who would verify homeowners info? I maybe would want a verifiable check.	5
Referring to Q2a - About 1/3 of residents	5
Most seniors have limited income other cities give seniors a discount.	5

Discounted Refuse Survey Comments

Comment	Group Number
Seniors Only.	5
5 Count	17

Comment	Group Number
If you do this in this economy it should only be based on income. I'm single and the last two years I have made less than \$20,000 a year. Help those who need it.	6
Referring to Q1 - Especially one person households	6
2c-what is the medical "reason"? 5c-what reductions: service for "large" items?	6
Referring to Q4 I would help pay for people who are ill or handicapped.	6
Referring to Q1C – Provide discount if the person lives alone. Referring to Q3C – Discount for medical needs also.	6
Referring to Q1C Add Developmentally Disabled. Referring to Q2C – Not me personally. I work at Meadows Home for the Developmentally Disabled 320 S. Plum Grove Rd.	6
Referring to Q1 A-C To those who need it – as for me I'm doing OK.	6
Referring to Q4B – Yes depending on program. Referring to Q5A – Yes to a limit.	6
Referring to Q2A – Will be 65 soon. Referring to Q6 Not yet but will be in 2 years.	6
The concept of reducing fees for some based on need is worth considering but I'm not certain what criteria should be used. Income could be low enough to qualify, but the person could have assets that would indicate payment would not present a hardship. How will criteria be verified.	6
Referring to Q1A – What about person 62 – 65 that are not working?	6
Referring to Q1-C Yes to handicapped and medical need but not "hardship", Referring to Q5-C Not much we can reduce is there?	6
Referring to Q1 Only if low income - Referring to Q2 Only if low income.	6
If fees are adjustable due to age or income, perhaps fees should be adjustable to the number of people living in each home. For example, if one person lives in a home, their bill should be lower than a home that has eight residents. A single person would use less, in theory, than a household with eight people, reducing the amount of trash.	6
Referring to Q1C – Medical Need Possibly. Referring to Q2 – Sometimes our garbage is only put out every other week. – How does this affect rental properties?	6

Discounted Refuse Survey Comments

Comment	Group Number
I believe there should also be a required minimum residency of 5 years or more to be eligible.	6
6 Count	16

Discounted Refuse Survey Comments

Comment	Group Number
service reductions-don't know on what	7
1a-maybe, 1c-maybe	7
Referring to Q5 – Don't have an answer.	7
Referring to Q5 I do not have any idea.	7
Referring to Q5A-C I don't know.	7
Referring to Q5B – I don't have an idea of the cost, did not provide answer.	7
1c-not sure; 5d-not sure	7
1a-a combination of age and income based need	7
1-do not have enough information to make an educated decision-what % of residents might qualify? What % of discount would be given? Who would determine which residents qualify? How would program be monitored?	7
I think your discount program is a great idea however if you say you need revenue and have to increase other services...I would say this makes no sense. Discount one thing and increase another...why bother.	7
1a-on a sliding scale, 65-70, 70-75, 75-80; 4a-depends; 5a-possibly	7
5c-possibly	7

Discounted Refuse Survey Comments

Comment	Group Number
Referring to Q5 A & B I didn't really understand the difference. Referring to Q5C Please No!	7
7 Count	13

Comment	Group Number
we do not have much refuse. I am 74 and disable and I believe the water bill is too high. My bill for 2 people is anywhere from \$54 to \$67 (this month), that is way too high for a senior with disabilities. In City of Chicago water bills are \$101 for 6 months. Please try and reduce this bill any way you can. Suggest raising vehicle sticker and lower our monthly bills, it is easier to pay a one time higher fee than high monthly bills. Empty Dominick site City should looks into a resale store called "Village Discount" many locations in Chicago and Addison, Elgin, Etc. Call for questions 847-826-2423.	8
5c - depending on what reduction	8
garbage & recycling pick up every 2 weeks?	8
Referring to Q5C – To those participating.	8
Referring to Q5 A-C- Good Questions! Referring to Q5A - This is not fair. Referring to Q5C6 – We have already done this.	8
Referring to Q5C- Pickup is once a week. What kind of reductions could there be?	8
The rates are too high already.	8
Referring to Q5C – Services reductions to those who don't need it.	8
Referring to Q5C – Already have had service reductions – No Bags!	8
It is already too expensive, cut expenses.	8
Referring to Q4 – based on months pickup not used - Yes.	8
Try pick up once every other week	8
Referring to Q2A – Limit to one bag a week. Referring to Q5A – extra \$\$ for the 2 bundles of bags. All residents should buy stickers for the bags, it is easier for collectors also fair. Reduce rates fro income on stickers would increase recycling.	8
Referring to Q1B – Lower use of services.	8
As senior citizens we put of recycling 2 X a month and 1 bag of refuse a week.	8
Is it possible to change ecology to every other week?	8

Discounted Refuse Survey Comments

Comment	Group Number
Only have recycling picked up every other week or once a month.	8
8 Count	17

Discounted Refuse Survey Comments

Comment	Group Number
Cut Decision this should have been done along time ago.	10
Thanks for the survey good idea.	10
I think you have a good idea here. Perhaps a better way to charge for refuse could be usage. Set a price per bag. Maybe one rate for garbage and another rate for yardwaste. That way older users, handicapped, snow birds small households, large households would all be paying for what they actually use.	10
10 Count	3
Grand Count	237

Committee-of-the-Whole Agenda – July 19, 2011

3) Refuse Collection Operations – Possible Alternate Scheduling and Methods

At the May 24 City Council meeting, Alderman Judd and Alderman Buske requested information in regard to:

1. Holiday week refuse collection procedures:
 - a) Should “double” collection be performed on the day following a holiday as a cost savings?
 - b) What is the cost in providing refuse collection on Saturdays?
2. Could refuse collection be performed by placing solid waste, yard waste, and recycling on one side of each street as a cost savings?

Some background discussion first needs to be made as to why the City’s curbside refuse collections methods have been implemented the way that they are...the City has been in the refuse collection business for 42 years.

The Public Works Department is staffed and equipped for refuse and yard waste collection to be a five-day a week operation. The four refuse trucks are, on a typical day, utilized with two trucks on solid waste collection, one truck on yard waste collection, and a fourth truck as a “reserve” unit to be used in the event of the breakdown of another truck, to accommodate equipment servicing schedules, and on heavy collection days, such as the days immediately after holidays.

Prior to 1997, the Public Works Department did provide refuse collection services as a “double collection” on the day following the actual holidays. While records are not available, this procedure did result in a certain amount of overtime, in disruption of schedules for normal street maintenance operations (to assign additional employees to the extra routes) and on some occasions resulted in refuse being stored in the trucks overnight or over the weekend due to 4:00 p.m. transfer station closing times. The decision was made in 1997 to eliminate the double collections as the result of the City’s 1996 “Refuse Study” that also included the transition from two-man refuse collection trucks to one-man trucks.

Question #1 discussion:

On the six holiday weeks (New Year’s Day, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Thanksgiving Day and Christmas Day), the last collection day of the week is Saturday. This is not considered as an automatic 8 hour work day for employees; hours are worked only for the number of hours needed to complete the normal Friday route. On

3 to 5 of the holiday weeks, one or more seasonal employees are often used in place of one or more of the full-time employees (note that seasonal employees are paid at “straight-time” rates as they do not receive pay on the actual holiday and are therefore not eligible for overtime pay until they work more than 40 hours in a week).

Because full-time employees assigned to refuse collection physically work a fifth day on holiday weeks, while other employees work a four-day week, overtime compensation has been believed to be fair and appropriate for the additional duties and responsibilities of Saturday refuse collection.

A projection of the comparison between a “double collection” operation and a Saturday collection cost are as follows (in 2010-2011 costs):

	<u>Overtime Estimate of Manhours on a "double collection"</u>		<u>Actual Costs on Saturday (Full- time/Seasonal)</u>	
	Hours	Cost	Hours	Cost
New Years Day 2011	8	\$360.00	22.5	\$1,012.50
Memorial Day 2011	24	\$1,080.00	18/5	\$870.00
Independence Day 2011	24	\$1,080.00	19.5/20	\$1,117.50
Labor Day (2010)	26	\$1,170.00	23/11	\$1,167.00
Thanksgiving Day (2010)	16	\$720.00	47.5/6.5	\$2,101.50
Christmas Day (2010)	8	\$360.00	33.5/8.5	\$1,825.50
		\$4,770.00		\$8,094.00

Note that the “double collection” estimates are based on historical weights of refuse collected from previous holiday weeks. Also note that the avoiding of overtime hours of Christmas Eve and Thanksgiving Friday is not possible.

The average weight of solid waste refuse collection for the 8 days of accumulation during a holiday week: 131.54 tons per week (Memorial Day 2008-2011).

The average weight of solid waste refuse collection for the 7 days of accumulation during a non-holiday week: 103.88 tons per week (before and after Memorial Day 2008-2011).

Savings over the year, by this comparison estimate, would be \$3,324 in salary (\$0.05 per customer per month).

Another reason for changing the refuse collection schedule to a five-day operation in 1997 was with the input of the private sector refuse and recycling collectors, who do not typically provide for double route collections after holidays. As the City does use a contractual service for recycling collection, it would not be desirable to provide for refuse and yard waste collection routes on days of the week that differ from recycling collection

route days, or to likely pay additional costs to have recycling collection made in “double route” manner. (We could pose this question within the upcoming recycling collection RFP’s, if desired.)

A local survey of private sector refuse and yard waste collection companies confirms the five-day process as standard (Arc, Groot, Veolia, Waste Management, Marengo Disposal).

Double route collections performed on the day after holidays would require assistance from other staff that are not otherwise cost accounted for in Refuse Fund. This isn’t simply a matter of assigning one man and a refuse truck out to handle the second day’s route; such could only be accomplished if a holiday were to fall on a Tuesday or a Wednesday and with no additional refuse weights generated from the holiday activities itself.

We will not eliminate overtime if a double collection route were to be performed. In fact, the only holidays for which it would even be conceivable to perform a double collection without overtime would be Christmas and New Years Day, when no yard waste collection is made. However, we typically experience a 25% tonnage increase in holiday week refuse collection as compared to the weeks before and after the holiday. During yard waste season holiday weeks, the four tucks would be inadequate to complete both refuse and yard waste collection in an 8 hour period. The daily closure of the SWANCC transfer station at 4:00 p.m. will cause for garbage to be stored at Public Works garage and will affect productivity on the following day.

Note that there are labor hours throughout the year for which Refuse collection staff work in other divisions because refuse route collection does not always require an 8 hour day to complete the route, provide equipment maintenance, etc. (Street Maintenance, General Fund as the most typical assumptions). If the Refuse Fund seeks cost savings wherever possible as a goal, however, the labor costs could be reduced within it as a cost accounting action, however, the labor cost reductions in Refuse Fund would need to be offset by labor cost budget increases in the Street Maintenance – General Fund.

After 15 years of the current refuse collection schedule and procedures, a considerable amount of confusion to the refuse collection customers would be expected if the date schedules were to be changed for the limited savings potential.

Staff believes that the current operation of Refuse, yard waste, and recycling collection was proper when implemented in 1997, is the more effective way to schedule holiday week refuse collection, and is worth the minor savings that may otherwise be realized by “double collection” days.

Question #2 Discussion:

To analyze this suggestion, staff examined the current refuse and recycling collection route maps that are used. The routes used are generally followed closely from week to week. They have been developed, revised, and added to as needed over the years to provide the best efficiency for the refuse collector and for time spent on each route. The current routes are also established for vehicle and driver safety, and to minimize turn-around maneuvers, especially at intersections and at street dead ends. A sample map of a refuse collection route is provided as an attachment to this report. Please note the nature of the circulation of the refuse routes, making turns at intersections to avoid backing maneuvers.

To address the suggestion of collecting refuse, yard waste, and recycling on one side of the street, this process would appear to be able to provide for some savings on equipment fuel, and perhaps on labor hours, at first glance. As a residual, it could also provide a minor benefit in the reduction of two trips per week by heavy equipment on residential streets.

It is difficult to calculate a specific savings on equipment fuel use, but for estimating purposes an amount of 30% will be utilized, as refuse collection vehicles will travel to the Transfer Station the same number of times in any route collection method.

Refuse Operation Fuel Use Average = \$20,000 to \$25,000/year
30% Reduction = \$6,000 to \$7,500/year
Over 6,000 customers = \$0.08 to \$0.10/month savings

What effects would a “one-side of the street” refuse/yard waste/recycling collection have on refuse collector operations and on residents?

Refuse Collection Effects:

- No change in volumes collected.
- Minimal time savings in “driving time” for the route, as volumes are unchanged.
- Fewer refuse “stops”, if residents would consolidate the materials setout; longer stopping times will negate any “drive time” savings.
- \$6,000 to \$7,500 estimated savings in fuel possible

Resident Effects:

- This procedure change would cause at least 40% (2,500) of residents to carry refuse across their street, carry yard waste across the street, and wheel recycling carts across the street.
- Cul-de-sac streets will not be affected nor provide any possible benefits, streets where homes are only on one side of the street also will not be affected (i.e. Frontage Roads, etc.).
- This procedure change will cause residents that have refuse collection designated on their side of the street to accept refuse, yard waste, and recycling to be placed

in their parkway or driveway. How and where do we direct residents to place refuse – at neighbor’s driveways, in parkways?

- Transporting refuse, yard waste, and recycling across the street, 52 times per year, can be difficult for seniors; it can be hazardous in winter months; it may cause an increase in “lost” or misplaced recycling containers; it causes hazards in requiring 2,000 or more residents to cross the street additional times with the carrying of materials. Some streets would need to be considered as exempt and impractical, such as Kirchoff Road, Plum Grove Road, Euclid Avenue, and perhaps others due to street width and speed limits.
- What would we do with refuse set out by residents who forget or refuse to cooperate to set their trash on the opposite side of the street? To collect the materials as a “late stop” defeats the purpose, and would increase operation costs.
- How would “side of street” be determined for the designated refuse set-out? The City has many curved streets that do not lend themselves to a “north vs. south” or an “east vs. west” orientation, nor does an “even-odd” house number system work.
- How are violations handled – late set-outs, mixed refuse/yard waste, special collections...whose garbage is it? (Creekside area is a good example – how would one side collection be implemented there?)
- We also contracted several private refuse haulers about the “one-side of the street” refuse collection idea. None were aware of this method being used anywhere, and most expressed concerns about safety.

An alternate suggestion that was also considered was to have the refuse/yard waste/recycling vehicles travel each street in only one direction, and to collect both sides of the street in only one direction, i.e. to collect both sides of the street simultaneously. This is not recommended for a) safety concerns for vehicles swaying from one side of the street to the other, b) defeating the purpose of the one-man right-side operations, c) it could only be effective with a two-man operation; d) it is not practical for automated collection systems (as is currently used for recycling collection).

Staff does not recommend any further consideration of a “one-side of the street” refuse collection method, as the adverse safety and operational issues far outweigh any potential minor cost savings.

Summary:

It is the opinion of staff that future operational savings may be realized, and efforts better spent by the evaluation of a transition to an automated refuse and yard waste collection system by the use of carts. This would speed the collection process, minimize significantly employee injury, equipment wear and tear, and may lower labor costs. Conversely, we would see increased vehicle acquisition costs, possible increases to vehicle maintenance costs, along with the cost of carts. An automated system would cause for some alteration in the service level experienced over the past 42 years of nearly unlimited collection volumes being picked up and disposed of.

If cost savings within the Refuse Fund operations is an objective without regard to the effects on other funds, staff could compile data for a “true-up” process to, in essence, chargeback the other funds for labor hours spent by refuse division employees after each day’s routes are completed and visa versa when assistance is provided to Refuse operations...this would lower the overall salary costs in the Refuse Fund, but would increase in the salary funding needs of General and Utility Funds.

**Thursday Refuse Route - Pheasant Section
(1 side of street pick up)**



**Thursday Refuse Route - Pheasant Section
(2 sides of street pick up)**



Committee of the Whole Agenda Item – July 19, 2011

4) Fund Balance – Discussion Item

Attachments:

- A. A listing of the City's FY 2011 Funds;
- B. General Fund – Fund balance summary sheets and a look-back to 1999.
- C. Fund balance summary sheets. These sheets have been updated with 2010 Actual data and estimated projections as of what we know, now. Salaries and Benefits have not been projected because this is work that is done in late July for the proposed budget. These summary sheets look similar to what is shown in the FY 2011 Adopted Budget;
- D. Information from the 2010 Auditor's letter to Management, Comment # 3;
- E. Government Finance Officers Association Best Practice.

1) What is Fund Balance?

Definition of Fund [NCGAS 1/Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB)]: a Fund is a self-balancing set of accounts recording cash and other financial resources, together with all related liabilities and residual equities or balances, and changes therein, which are segregated for the purpose of carrying on specific activities or attaining certain objectives in accordance with special regulations, restrictions, or limitations.

“Keep in mind that a fund is not a pool of money available to spend. Rather a fund's balance represents the difference between the fund's assets and the fund's liabilities. Many assets are not in the form of money, such as a prepaid or receivable. So it is key to remember that a fund is an accounting term and for financial and reporting purposes, and is not the same as a bank account.” (*GAAP for Governments 2010, Wiley*)

Fund Balance is typically defined as:

Current Assets Minus Current Liabilities = Fund Balance or its Equivalent

Goals of Fund Balance:

- § To smooth cash flow – property taxes are a good example (received only two times per year.)
- § To avoid short-term borrowing and its interest costs – the City has borrowed for the last few years about \$1.5 million, typically in the last quarter, as a bridge loan to the 2nd installment of property taxes.

- § To maintain and improve credit ratings from Standard & Poor's, Fitch's and Moody's – rating agencies evaluate the City's finances every three years. The City of Rolling Meadows current bond rating is an A3 from Moody's and an A+ from Standard & Poor's. The City's bond rating was downgraded in 2009 for the years 2006 to 2008. The rating agencies will be re-evaluating the City for years 2009 to 2011, in the summer of 2012. Credit rating agencies review fund balance reserves and pension funded status as key components for their analyses.
- § To plan and pay for capital expenditures rather than issuing debt – a valuable example is the aging infrastructure in the Utilities Fund.
- § To be prepared for unforeseen circumstances – good examples are the closure of the Sam's Club, so less revenues, the State of Illinois withholding Income Tax payments, US Census numbers lowered.

2) What is the optimal level of Fund Balance?

There is no, one rule that governs how much fund balance or reserves are adequate. Fund balance should be based on what works for the City's circumstances. The Government Finance Officers' Association recommends at a minimum, to maintain in a City's General Fund, no less than two months of regular operating revenues or regular operating expenditures. In the case of the City's 2011 Adopted Budget, two months of revenues would be \$4.2 million, or two months of expenditures would be \$4.1 million.

It is common for a City to operate without a formal policy. However, to caution, with the new accounting standards (GASB 54), if a fund balance policy is adopted, then it must be followed.

3) Status from the 2010 Audit, at December 31, 2010 the funds that show negative fund balance:

Fund/Fund Number	December 31, 2009	December 31, 2010
General (01)	\$ (724,541)	(237,724)
911 Emergency (04)	(499,313)	(266,862)
Enhanced DUI (40)	(57,220)	(29,927)
TIF # 2 Kirchoff/Owl (37)	(450,574)	(512,304)
TIF # 3 Woodfield (50)	(136,085)	(33,130)
Plum Grove Road (82)	(434,272)	(49,964)
Municipal Garage (14)	(40,361)	(111,245)

Questions for the City Council:

What is an optimal level of reserves for the General Fund?

Would you like to see a FY 2012 Proposed Budget with proposals for “Fund Balance” reserves (not a written policy)?

A.

Fund Accounting Classifications

Governmental Funds (16)

Major Funds (3):

- 01 General Fund
- 03 Motor Fuel Tax Fund
- 47 Debt Service Fund

Other Governmental Funds (13)

Nonmajor Special Revenue Funds (3)

- 04 911 Emergency Telephone Fund
- 26 Foreign Fire Tax Fund
- 17 Asset Seizure Fund - *Summary not provided*

Nonmajor Capital Projects Funds (6)

- 61 Local Road Fund
- 41 Transit Oriented Area Development Fund
- 18 TIF #1 Kirchoff/Meadows Fund
- 37 TIF #2 Kirchoff/Owl Fund
- 50 TIF #3 Woodfield
- 82 Plum Grove Road Fund

Proprietary Funds (7)

Enterprise Funds (2)

- 20 Utilities Fund
- 16 Refuse Collection Fund

Internal Service Funds (5)

- 14 Municipal Garage Fund
- 25 Vehicle Replacement Fund
- 33 Buildings and Land Fund
- 23 Liability Insurance Fund
- 45 Health Insurance Fund

Fiduciary Funds (3)

Summary not provided

Pension Trust Funds (2)

- 06 Police Pension Fund
- 07 Firefighters' Pension Fund

Agency Funds (1)

- 08 Compliance Deposits Fund

Closed in FY 2011

Summary not provided

- 40 Enhanced DUI Enforcement Fund
- 83 Fire Station Fund

CITY OF ROLLING MEADOWS
GENERAL FUND - ENDING FUND BALANCE SUMMARY

1999 Actual	2000 Actual	2001 Actual	2002 Actual	2003 Actual	2004 Actual	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Actual	2008 Actual	2009 Actual	2010 Actual
8,592,496	7,888,781	6,307,630	4,927,041	3,161,361	3,433,338	4,726,110	3,692,745	(534,828)	(2,374,704)	(724,541)	(237,724)

Notes:

In June 1999, the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) established a new provisions for external financing reporting for state and local governments known as GASB 34. The City of Rolling Meadows implemented GASB 34 in FY 2002.

GASB 34 changed external financial reporting so that users of the statements have access to government-wide financial statements that provide a clear picture of the government as a single, unified entity. GASB 34 added a longer-term focus for governmental activities, a narrative overview and analysis as well as information on major funds. Furthermore, GASB 34 also presents comparisons to the original budget and incorporated infrastructure reporting similar to a private entity.

GENERAL FUND (01)

The General Fund is the City's primary operating fund. It accounts for major tax revenue to support administrative and public safety functions.

	FY2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Adopted Adopted Budget	As of 7-11-11 FY 2011 Estimated Projection
Revenue				
Taxes	16,973,178	17,314,334	18,383,505	18,079,490
Intergovernmental	2,550,400	2,571,712	2,309,409	2,375,526
Licenses & Permits	935,530	917,098	832,597	851,655
Fines & Forfeits	917,842	995,497	946,645	916,645
Charges for Service	2,222,484	1,968,775	1,869,871	1,836,870
Investment Earnings	(1,853)	2,494	2,500	2,500
Miscellaneous	427,721	269,742	543,613	486,282
Other Financing Sources	263,160	1,085,837	383,458	583,458
Total Revenue	24,288,462	25,125,489	25,271,598	25,132,426
Expenditures				
Salaries	14,008,471	13,414,533	13,583,723	13,500,171
Benefits	5,208,236	8,053,340	8,033,588	8,015,017
Contractual Services	2,587,541	2,283,112	2,708,308	2,708,308
Supplies	260,083	338,512	322,288	322,288
Debt Service	3,005	0	0	0
Other Financing Uses	570,962	549,175	27,290	27,290
Total Expenditures	22,638,298	24,638,672	24,675,197	24,573,074
Surplus (Deficit)	1,650,164	486,817	596,401	559,352
Ending Fund Balance	(724,541)	(237,724)	(42,263)	321,628

Notes:

- 1) Police and Fire Unions offered union concessions totaling more than \$580,000 from the Proposed to the Adopted Budget.
- 2) A transfer of \$250,000 from the Local Roads Fund Surplus is split evenly to between Police and Fire Pensions in the General Fund, thereby lowering the tax levy amount by 2.7%
- 3) The City Council in partnership, with City staff, trimmed the budget to realize a surplus of \$596,401 in the General Fund.
- 4) FY 2011 Adopted Budget & Projection Estimate show the Police Department Budget Amendment reducing Salaries and Benefits by \$102,123.

C.

MOTOR FUEL TAX FUND (03)

The City receives from the State an allotment of motor fuel tax. This allotment is based on population and the amount of motor fuel taxes collected. These funds are restricted in their use by the State. The City has chosen to use these funds for snow removal, street maintenance and capital improvements.

	FY2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	As of 7-11-11	
			FY 2011 Adopted Budget	FY 2011 Estimated Projection
Revenue				
Intergovernmental	642,330	743,796	636,500	580,000
Investment Earnings	2,105	221	0	0
Miscellaneous	10,776	0	0	0
Total Revenue	655,211	744,017	636,500	580,000
Expenditures				
Contractual Services	107,859	154,494	310,000	310,000
Supplies	143,471	122,417	174,000	174,000
Capital Outlay	0	819,466	930,000	930,000
Other Financing Uses	0	0	0	0
Total Expenditures	251,330	1,096,377	1,414,000	1,414,000
Surplus (Deficit)	403,881	(352,360)	(777,500)	(834,000)
Ending Fund Balance	2,051,851	1,699,491	738,919	865,491

Notes:

- 1) The Motor Fuel Tax revenues have been adjusted down per the new US Census data.

- 2) The Illinois Department of Transportation may release the 2nd installment of state funds from Illinois Jobs Now! Capital Program, in the amount of \$106,847 in FY 2011. However this has not been included in the forecast. In FY 2010 IDOT released \$106,847 to the City of Rolling Meadows.

E911 FUND (04)

The City contracts its emergency communication dispatch services through Northwest Central Dispatch Services. All parts of the emergency communications system is accounted in this fund, and includes the fees paid to central dispatching, as well as for police and fire radio/telephone communications.

	FY2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Adopted Budget	As of 7-11-11 FY 2011 Estimated Projection
Revenue				
Taxes	712,682	679,098	689,000	669,000
Intergovernmental	362,216	69,505	0	0
Investment Earnings	(470)	(39)	0	0
Miscellaneous	0	0	0	0
Total Revenue	1,074,428	748,564	689,000	669,000
Expenditures				
Salaries	502,605	0	0	0
Benefits	191,897	0	0	0
Contractual Services	438,406	617,899	647,065	723,281
Supplies	106	0	0	0
Capital Outlay	394,378	0	0	0
Total Expenditures	1,527,392	617,899	647,065	723,281
Other Financing Sources	0	101,786	0	0
Surplus (Deficit)	(452,964)	232,451	41,935	(54,281)
Ending Fund Balance	(499,313)	(266,862)	(288,071)	(321,143)

Notes:

1. The E911 Fund does not fund City personnel costs.
2. Emergency dispatch services were contracted out to Northwest Central Dispatch in 2009.
3. The E911 tax levy is maintained at the 2009 tax levy amount of \$509,000 for the 2010 tax levy.
4. The landline charges are trending at \$13,300 per month and the NW Central Dispatch expenses are trending at \$42,900 per month. This has been accounted for in the estimate.

DEBT SERVICE FUND (47)

The Debt Service Fund accumulates monies for payment of the 2002A, 2004 and 2005 General Obligation Bonds Series. These bonds were issued to refinance capital projects throughout town and a portion of the Meadows Town Mall and Meijer Store Projects. Property taxes are levied except for the 2004 bond, which utilizes a General Fund transfer of sales tax to pay its annual debt service requirement.

	FY2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	As of 7-11-11 FY 2011
	Actual	Actual	Adopted Budget	Estimated Projection
Revenue				
Taxes	1,370,277	1,348,771	1,360,088	1,360,088
Investment Earnings	223	75	0	0
Transfer in from General Fund	0	548,312	0	0
Transfer in from Fire Station Fund	0	0	0	610,243
Other Financing Sources	1,678,640	960,000	1,570,243	0
Total Revenue	3,049,140	2,857,158	2,930,331	1,970,331
Expenditures				
Contractual Services	1,505	4,065	1,505	1,455
Debt Service	1,900,198	3,063,884	2,887,670	2,887,670
Total Expenditures	1,901,703	3,067,949	2,889,175	2,889,125
Surplus (Deficit)	1,147,437	(210,791)	41,156	(918,794)
Ending Fund Balance	944,481	733,690	786,448	(185,104)

LOCAL ROADS FUND (61)

The Local Road Fund is used for street maintenance and construction. Funding is derived from locally imposed taxes or State grants.

	FY2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Adopted Budget	As of 7-11-11 FY 2011 Estimated Projection
Revenue				
Taxes	284,501	389,381	379,301	379,301
Intergovernmental	206,531	208,181	3,026,126	3,026,126
Licenses & Permits	377,951	379,500	365,000	365,000
Investment Earnings	413	88	250	250
Miscellaneous	53,776	13,445	15,000	15,000
Transfer in from Fire Station Fund	0	0	437,970	437,970
Other Financing Sources	1,237,063	317,592	0	0
Total Revenue	2,160,236	1,308,187	4,223,647	4,223,647
Expenditures				
Contractual Services	270,696	295,738	776,749	776,749
Supplies	64,369	100,811	119,600	119,600
Capital Outlay	540,987	275,486	2,656,858	2,656,858
Debt Service	161,438	302,214	285,563	285,563
Other Financing Uses	1,286,950	0	250,000	250,000
Total Expenditures	2,324,440	974,249	4,088,770	4,088,770
Surplus (Deficit)	(164,204)	333,938	134,877	134,877
Ending Fund Balance	139,982	473,920	529,262	608,797

Note: On 12/14/10 City Council approved a transfer of \$250,000 from the Local Roads Fund Reserves to the General Fund to be split evenly between the Police and Fire Pension Funds.

TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT FUND (41)

The Transit Development Fund is a capital projects fund. This Fund was created in 2004 to build savings for the future Metra STAR Line station in the City.

			As of 7-11-11	
	FY2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Adopted Budget	FY 2011 Estimated Projection
Revenue				
Intergovernmental	0	0	26,000	0
Investment Earnings	444	31	500	500
Other Financing Sources	56,402	80,154	0	0
Total Revenue	56,846	80,185	26,500	500
Expenditures				
Contractual Services	0	0	26,000	0
Other Financing Uses	0	100,000	0	0
Total Expenditures	0	100,000	26,000	0
Surplus (Deficit)	56,846	(19,815)	500	500
Ending Fund Balance	414,072	394,257	39,757	394,757

Notes:

- 1) The RTA grant/study will be moved forward to the FY 2012 Proposed Budget.

TIF #1 - KIRCHOFF & MEADOW (18)

The TIF #1 fund was created in April of 1988, and is located at the southeast corner of Kirchoff Road and Meadow Drive.

	FY2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Adopted Budget	As of 7-11-11 FY 2011 Estimated Projection
Revenue				
Taxes	132,719	87,508	65,000	65,000
Investment Earnings	1,172	135	250	100
Total Revenue	133,891	87,643	65,250	65,100
Expenditures				
Contractual Services	33,912	67,431	54,074	54,074
Total Expenditures	33,912	67,431	54,074	54,074
Surplus (Deficit)	99,979	20,212	11,176	11,026
Ending Fund Balance	659,402	679,614	733,349	690,640

TIF #2 - KIRCHOFF & OWL (37)

The TIF #2 fund was created in December of 2002, and is located at the southeast corner of Kirchoff Road and Owl Drive.

	FY2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Adopted Budget	As of 7-11-11 FY 2011 Estimated Projection
Revenue				
Taxes	379,238	415,304	400,000	400,000
Investment Earnings	(260)	56	0	50
Other Financing Use	28,137	30,000	0	0
Total Revenue	407,115	445,360	400,000	400,050
Expenditures				
Contractual Services	35,977	32,371	44,559	39,559
Debt Service	445,849	474,719	562,250	544,626
Total Expenditures	481,826	507,090	606,809	584,185
Surplus (Deficit)	(74,711)	(61,730)	(206,809)	(184,135)
Ending Fund Balance	(450,574)	(512,304)	(744,392)	(696,439)

TIF #3 - ALGONQUIN & ROUTE 53 (50)

TIF #3 was created in 2009, and consists of the area bounded by Algonquin Road on the north, Route 53 on the east, I-90 on the south, and Arbor Drive on the west.

	FY2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Adopted Budget	As of 7-11-11 FY 2011 Estimated Projection
Revenue				
Taxes	0	102,955	25,000	150,000
Investment Earnings	(158)	0	0	15
Miscellaneous	1,946	0	0	0
Total Revenue	1,788	102,955	25,000	150,015
Expenditures				
Contractual Services	69	0	0	0
Capital Outlay	0	0	0	0
Total Expenditures	69	0	0	0
Surplus (Deficit)	1,719	102,955	25,000	150,015
Ending Fund Balance	(136,085)	(33,130)	(111,095)	116,885

UTILITIES FUND (20)

The Utilities Fund consists of water, sewer and storm sewer activities. Each component has a separately determined user fee intended to cover the expenses related to delivering water from Lake Michigan and maintaining the underground utility system.

	FY2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Adopted Budget	As of 7-11-11 FY 2011 Estimated Projection
Revenue				
Taxes	52,663	74,816	72,792	72,792
Intergovernmental	350,472	0	3,262,500	3,262,500
Charges for Service	7,209,796	7,848,743	7,715,189	7,483,734
Investment Earnings	13,271	(6,086)	250	50
Miscellaneous	375,658	47,797	6,500	18,195
Other Financing Sources	0	0	0	0
Total Revenue	8,001,860	7,965,270	11,057,231	10,837,271
Expenses				
Salaries	1,412,156	1,359,536	1,359,593	1,359,593
Benefits	526,328	633,632	635,000	635,000
Contractual Services	1,393,478	1,227,457	1,831,390	1,831,390
Supplies	2,629,863	2,562,052	3,019,640	3,019,640
Capital Outlay	1,717,470	260,115	4,315,900	4,315,900
Debt Service	356,056	115,287	596,805	596,805
Other Financing Uses	404,714	56,402	0	0
Total Expenses	8,440,065	6,214,481	11,758,328	11,758,328
Surplus (Deficit)	(438,205)	1,750,789	(701,097)	(921,057)
Ending Fund Balance Equivalent	400,697	2,280,514	638,993	1,359,457

Note: Per the City Council's direction during 2010 budget discussions, the Administrative Fees in Contractual Services was reduced to \$575,000 from \$674,764.

REFUSE FUND (16)

The Refuse Fund is an enterprise fund and is used to account for waste collection and disposal services provided by the City to its residents. The City provides curbside and special pickup collection of household and yard waste, and contracts for recycling services.

	FY2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Adopted Budget	As of 7-11-11 FY 2011 Estimated Projection
Revenue				
Charges for Service	2,407,037	2,366,861	2,419,432	2,419,432
Investment Earnings	133	8	0	0
Miscellaneous	74,881	74,791	75,614	75,614
Total Revenue	2,482,051	2,441,660	2,495,046	2,495,046
Expenses				
Salaries	484,882	519,287	422,636	422,636
Benefits	179,199	228,497	181,849	181,849
Contractual Services	1,732,801	1,727,122	1,858,251	1,858,251
Supplies	6,928	2,021	6,375	6,375
Capital Outlay	36,497		800	800
Debt Service	0	0	36,438	36,438
Total Expenses	2,440,307	2,476,927	2,506,349	2,506,349
Surplus (Deficit)	41,744	(35,267)	(11,303)	(11,303)
Ending Fund Balance Equivalent	377,119	323,208	52,003	52,003

GARAGE FUND (14)

The Garage Fund is an internal service fund. Departments (or funds) are charged a fee for vehicle maintenance based on a five-year average of actual maintenance and fuel consumption within their departments (or funds). All expenses related to vehicle maintenance are charged here, including fuel purchases.

			As of 7-11-11	
	FY2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Adopted Budget	FY 2011 Estimated Projection
Revenue				
Charges for Service	981,857	988,748	1,174,582	1,174,582
Investment Earnings	91	8	0	0
Miscellaneous	9,104	6,428	6,500	6,500
Total Revenue	991,052	995,184	1,181,082	1,181,082
Expenses				
Salaries	318,304	322,586	316,425	316,425
Benefits	112,389	138,998	126,695	126,695
Contractual Services	148,353	192,071	316,152	316,152
Supplies	357,342	410,565	430,950	430,950
Total Expenses	936,389	1,064,220	1,190,222	1,190,222
Surplus (Deficit)	54,663	(69,036)	(9,140)	(9,140)
Ending Fund Balance Equivalent	94,042	39,662	40,710	40,710

VEHICLE & EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT FUND (25)

The Vehicle & Equipment Replacement Fund is an internal service fund used for vehicles and equipment. Additionally major capital items that have a cost greater than \$25,000 and a useful life expectancy of at least three years are generally funded in this fund.

	FY2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Adopted Budget	As of 7-11-11 FY 2011 Estimated Projection
Revenue				
Intergovernmental	87,111	62,888	88,565	88,565
Charges for Service	308,260	0	458,127	458,127
Investment Earnings	2,548	127	250	0
Miscellaneous	39,378	25,411	0	2,114
Other Financing Sources	0	0	0	0
Total Revenue	437,297	88,426	546,942	548,806
Expenses				
Contractual Services	150	160	1,200	1,200
Capital Outlay	428,259	19,654	714,555	714,555
Debt Service	160,009	32,220	214,005	214,005
Other Financing Uses	0	1,000,000	0	0
Total Expenses	588,418	1,052,034	929,760	929,760
Surplus (Deficit)	(151,121)	(963,608)	(382,818)	(380,954)
Ending Fund Balance Equivalent	2,082,944	734,610	384,269	353,656

BUILDING AND LAND FUND (33)

The Building and Land Fund is an internal service used for City building maintenance, remodeling, renovation and expansion of current buildings. Departments and funds are charged a fee based on their square footage use of City buildings.

	FY2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Adopted Budget	As of 7-11-11 FY 2011 Estimated Projection
Revenue				
Intergovernmental	0	112,097	100,000	100,000
Charges for Service	423,109	423,107	361,400	361,400
Investment Earnings	(432)	(21)	0	0
Miscellaneous	23,310	31,427	4,200	6,600
Other Financing Sources	150,000	0	0	0
Total Revenue	595,987	566,610	465,600	468,000
Expenses				
Contractual Services	165,779	196,521	208,613	208,613
Supplies	33,207	30,830	29,600	29,600
Capital Outlay	65,161	128,610	215,000	215,000
Debt Service	0	0	0	0
Other Financing Uses	1,066,950	0	0	0
Total Expenses	1,331,097	355,961	453,213	453,213
Surplus (Deficit)	(735,110)	210,649	12,387	14,787
Ending Fund Balance Equivalent	(309,767)	(100,740)	(103,454)	(85,953)

LIABILITY INSURANCE FUND (23)

The Liability Insurance Fund is an internal service fund used for tracking and paying the city's property, casualty and workers compensation claims. The City is a member of the Intergovernmental Risk Management Association (IRMA), which is an insurance pool consisting of over 75 local units of government. The City pays an annual premium to IRMA, which in turn processes all risk insurance claims for the City. City departments and funds are charged a fee for liability insurance based on insurance industry standards for risk, i.e., salaries (workers compensation), vehicles and budget.

	FY2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Adopted Budget	As of 7-11-11 FY 2011 Estimated Projection
Revenue				
Charges for Service	619,999	619,994	964,454	964,454
Investment Earnings	(134)	(16)	0	100
IRMA - Surplus	0	0	0	50,000
Miscellaneous	196,650	218,534	10,000	18,279
Total Revenue	816,515	838,512	974,454	1,032,833
Expenses				
Contractual Services	861,881	1,431,272	845,264	845,264
Supplies	7,068	150	7,500	7,500
Debt Service	1,735	0	0	0
Total Expenses	870,684	1,431,422	852,764	852,764
Net Assets Ending	(54,169)	(592,910)	121,690	180,069
Ending Fund Balance Equivalent	18,434	(26,723)	42,253	100,632

HEALTH INSURANCE FUND (45)

The Health Insurance Fund is an internal service fund where the City accumulates funds to pay health insurance premiums for its employees. Pursuant to State Statute retiring members of the City are eligible to retain membership in the City's insurance programs. Several retirees have exercised that right, however, they are required to pay 100% of the premium cost. Additionally, employee retirement payouts are funded in this fund as accumulated benefit payouts and are converted to retiree health insurance benefits. The City is in a pool (IPBC) that continues to grow with new municipalities joining every year.

	FY2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Adopted Budget	As of 7-11-11 FY 2011 Estimated Projection
Revenue				
Charges for Service	2,347,513	3,356,825	3,267,837	3,267,837
Investment Earnings	(101)	(20)	250	500
IPBC Surplus	0	0	0	400,000
Miscellaneous	1,130,459	811,621	840,000	840,000
Total Revenue	3,477,871	4,168,426	4,108,087	4,508,337
Expenses				
Benefits	4,136,882	4,221,897	4,167,146	4,367,146
Contractual Services	2,204	2,295	3,000	3,000
Total Expenses	4,139,086	4,224,192	4,170,146	4,370,146
Surplus (Deficit)	(661,215)	(55,766)	(62,059)	138,191
Fund Balance Equivalent	(731,083)	12,672	173,787	150,863

PLUM GROVE ROAD FUND (82)

This fund is used to account for the improvements to Plum Grove Road from Euclid to Old Plum Grove Rd. The City will be partially reimbursed from the State for land acquisition and engineering costs.

	FY2009 Actual	FY 2010 Actual	FY 2011 Adopted Budget	As of 7-11-11 FY 2011 Estimated Projection
Revenue				
Investment Earnings	(626)	0	0	0
Miscellaneous	203,697	0	0	0
Other Financing Sources	0	142,233	0	0
Total Revenue	203,071	142,233	0	0
Expenditures				
Contractual Services	0	0	0	0
Capital Outlay	13,439	0	0	0
Total Expenditures	13,439	0	0	0
Surplus (Deficit)	189,632	142,233	0	0
Ending Fund Balance	(434,272)	0	(49,964)	(49,964)

Note: The Plum Grove Road Project has not been closed out by the State of Illinois. The City is waiting for reimbursement from the county and also an invoice from the State of Illinois.

D.

PRIOR RECOMMENDATIONS – Continued

2. POLICE PENSION FUND AND FIREFIGHTERS' PENSION FUND – Continued

Status

Per the December 31, 2009 actuarial report (most recent available), the Police Pension and Firefighters' Pension Funds are 45.19% and 39.52% funded, respectively. For the fiscal year ended December 31, 2010, the City was required (per the independent actuary's report) to contribute \$1,509,629 to the Police Pension Fund and \$1,658,207 to the Firefighters' Pension Fund. Actual contributions for the year ended December 31, 2010 were \$2,045,289 for the Police Pension Fund and \$2,073,970 for the Firefighters' Pension Fund. The City is making efforts to increase funding to the Police and Firefighters' Pension Funds to improve the funded ratio of the Funds. This comment will not be repeated in the future.

3. NEGATIVE FUND EQUITY

Comment

During our previous year-end audit procedures, we noted that several funds reported negative fund equity.

Recommendation

We recommended that the City implement a fund balance policy in conjunction with a cash flow analysis for each fund to determine future funding in an effort to build fund balance reserves.

Status

At December 31, 2010 there are still several funds with deficit fund balance:

<u>Fund/Fund Number</u>	<u>December 31, 2009</u>	<u>December 31, 2010</u>
General (01)	\$ (724,541)	(237,724)
911 Emergency Telephone (04)	(499,313)	(266,862)
Enhanced DUI Enforcement (40)	(57,220)	(29,927)
TIF #2 Kirchoff/Owl (37)	(450,574)	(512,304)
TIF #3 Woodfield (50)	(136,085)	(33,130)
Plum Grove Road (82)	(434,272)	(49,964)
Municipal Garage (14)	(40,361)	(111,245)

As the funds above reported negatives fund equity in the current year, we repeat this comment.



BEST PRACTICE

Appropriate Level of Unrestricted Fund Balance in the General Fund (2002 and 2009) (BUDGET and CAAFR)

Background. Accountants employ the term *fund balance* to describe the net assets of governmental funds calculated in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP). Budget professionals commonly use this same term to describe the net assets of governmental funds calculated on a government's budgetary basis.¹ In both cases, fund balance is intended to serve as a measure of the financial resources available in a governmental fund.

Accountants distinguish up to five separate categories of fund balance, based on the extent to which the government is bound to honor constraints on the specific purposes for which amounts can be spent: *nonspendable fund balance*, *restricted fund balance*, *committed fund balance*, *assigned fund balance*, and *unassigned fund balance*.² The total of the last three categories, which include only resources without a constraint on spending or for which the constraint on spending is imposed by the government itself, is termed *unrestricted fund balance*.

It is essential that governments maintain adequate levels of fund balance to mitigate current and future risks (e.g., revenue shortfalls and unanticipated expenditures) and to ensure stable tax rates. Fund balance levels are a crucial consideration, too, in long-term financial planning.

In most cases, discussions of fund balance will properly focus on a government's general fund. Nonetheless, financial resources available in other funds should also be considered in assessing the adequacy of unrestricted fund balance (i.e., the total of the amounts reported as committed, assigned, and unassigned fund balance) in the general fund.

Credit rating agencies monitor levels of fund balance and unrestricted fund balance in a government's general fund to evaluate a government's continued creditworthiness. Likewise, laws and regulations often govern appropriate levels of fund balance and unrestricted fund balance for state and local governments.

Those interested primarily in a government's creditworthiness or economic condition (e.g., rating agencies) are likely to favor increased levels of fund balance. Opposing pressures often come from unions, taxpayers and citizens' groups, which may view high levels of fund balance as "excessive."

Recommendation. The Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) recommends that governments establish a formal policy on the level of unrestricted fund balance that should be maintained in the general fund.³ Such a guideline should be set by the appropriate policy body and should provide both a temporal framework and

¹ For the sake of clarity, this recommended practice uses the terms GAAP fund balance and budgetary fund balance to distinguish these two different uses of the same term.

² These categories are set forth in Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) Statement No. 54, *Fund Balance Reporting and Governmental Fund Type Definitions*, which must be implemented for financial statements for periods ended June 30, 2011 and later.

³ Sometimes restricted fund balance includes resources available to finance items that typically would require the use of unrestricted fund balance (e.g., a contingency reserve). In that case, such amounts should be included as part of unrestricted fund balance for purposes of analysis.

specific plans for increasing or decreasing the level of unrestricted fund balance, if it is inconsistent with that policy.⁴

The adequacy of unrestricted fund balance in the general fund should be assessed based upon a government's own specific circumstances. Nevertheless, GFOA recommends, at a minimum, that general-purpose governments, regardless of size, maintain unrestricted fund balance in their general fund of no less than two months of regular general fund operating revenues or regular general fund operating expenditures.⁵ The choice of revenues or expenditures as a basis of comparison may be dictated by what is more predictable in a government's particular circumstances.⁶ Furthermore, a government's particular situation often may require a level of unrestricted fund balance in the general fund significantly in excess of this recommended minimum level. In any case, such measures should be applied within the context of long-term forecasting, thereby avoiding the risk of placing too much emphasis upon the level of unrestricted fund balance in the general fund at any one time.

In establishing a policy governing the level of unrestricted fund balance in the general fund, a government should consider a variety of factors, including:

- The predictability of its revenues and the volatility of its expenditures (i.e., higher levels of unrestricted fund balance may be needed if significant revenue sources are subject to unpredictable fluctuations or if operating expenditures are highly volatile);
- Its perceived exposure to significant one-time outlays (e.g., disasters, immediate capital needs, state budget cuts);
- The potential drain upon general fund resources from other funds as well as the availability of resources in other funds (i.e., deficits in other funds may require that a higher level of unrestricted fund balance be maintained in the general fund, just as, the availability of resources in other funds may reduce the amount of unrestricted fund balance needed in the general fund);⁷
- Liquidity (i.e., a disparity between when financial resources actually become available to make payments and the average maturity of related liabilities may require that a higher level of resources be maintained); and
- Commitments and assignments (i.e., governments may wish to maintain higher levels of unrestricted fund balance to compensate for any portion of unrestricted fund balance already committed or assigned by the government for a specific purpose).

Furthermore, governments may deem it appropriate to exclude from consideration resources that have been committed or assigned to some other purpose and focus on unassigned fund balance rather than on unrestricted fund balance.

Naturally, any policy addressing desirable levels of unrestricted fund balance in the general fund should be in conformity with all applicable legal and regulatory constraints. In this case in particular, it is essential that differences between GAAP fund balance and budgetary fund balance be fully appreciated by all interested parties.

Approved by the GFOA's Executive Board, October, 2009.

⁴ See Recommended Practice 4.1 of the National Advisory Council on State and Local Budgeting governments on the need to "maintain a prudent level of financial resources to protect against reducing service levels or raising taxes and fees because of temporary revenue shortfalls or unpredicted one-time expenditures" (Recommended Practice 4.1).

⁵ In practice, a level of unrestricted fund balance significantly lower than the recommended minimum may be appropriate for states and America's largest governments (e.g., cities, counties, and school districts) because they often are in a better position to predict contingencies (for the same reason that an insurance company can more readily predict the number of accidents for a pool of 500,000 drivers than for a pool of fifty), and because their revenues and expenditures often are more diversified and thus potentially less subject to volatility.

⁶ In either case, unusual items that would distort trends (e.g., one-time revenues and expenditures) should be excluded, whereas recurring transfers should be included. Once the decision has been made to compare unrestricted fund balance to either revenues or expenditures, that decision should be followed consistently from period to period.

⁷ However, except as discussed in footnote 4, not to a level below the recommended minimum.

Committee of the Whole Agenda Item – July 19, 2011

5) Revenues – Discussion Item

Over the past several years, the City of Rolling Meadows, as with most Illinois municipalities, has experienced declines in previously; reliable revenue sources (Property Taxes, Income Taxes, Sales Taxes, Grant Revenues, and many other revenue streams). The challenge facing the City of Rolling Meadows is to successfully turn around the current declining position and to build fund balance reserves and sustainable and diversified revenue enhancement.

The City of Rolling Meadows has prudently dealt with revenue downtrends with reduction in personnel costs, leaving positions open, increasing outside funding, extending lives of capital assets, cutting supply, contractual and capital budgets, tightening up collection cycles and also including police and fire concessions for the 2011 Budget. As the FY 2012 Budget process approaches, and in light of the critical need to build fund balance reserves and loss of some revenues from the reduction in US Census data for the City, there are a number of revenue enhancements or continuation (sunset clause expiring) to take into consideration.

<u>Revenue Enhancement</u>	<u>Fund</u>
1) Electric Utility Tax (Sunset)	General Fund
2) Nicor Gas Tax	General Fund
3) Building Permits (Last 50%) from last year's discussion	General Fund
4) Local Motor Fuel Tax	Local Road Fund
5) Vehicle Sticker Increase	Local Road Fund

1) **Electric Utility Tax - Ordinance No. 08-54, Municipal Electric Use Tax—extension of expiration date (Sunset Clause).**

Background:

The City Council adopted Ordinance No. 08-54, Municipal Electric Use Tax on November 25th, 2008, thereby adding Article VII to Chapter 102, Taxation of the code of ordinances of the City of Rolling Meadows. Section 102-234 VII of this Ordinance states that “This article shall be of no further force or effect from and after December 31, 2011, unless prior thereto the city council extends the effective date of the tax.”

The Electric Utility Tax generates more than \$1.3 million in General Fund revenues. In light of the economic conditions which have resulted in reduced revenues to the City and whereby it is anticipated that revenues will continue to be reduced, it is recommended that the ordinance be amended to extend the effective to December 31, 2014.

Previous Council Action:

November 25, 2008 Adopted Ordinance No. 08-54 Municipal Electric Use Tax

Nicor Gas Revenue and Therms Report for City of Rolling Meadows

2)

Twelve Month Period Ending December 31, 2010

Therms Supplied to Rolling Meadows

	Therms			Revenue			
	Therms Supplied By	Therms Supplied By	Total Therms	Nicor Revenue		Total Billed Revenue	
	Nicor	Others		Nicor Revenue	On Supplier Accounts		
Residential	68.9%	\$ 5,154,397	\$ 583,143	\$ 5,737,540	\$ 4,158,494	\$ 142,588	\$ 4,301,082
Commercial	26.3%	1,966,822	2,255,086	4,221,908	1,518,740	444,213	1,962,953
Industrial	4.8%	360,926	688,312	1,049,238	254,844	71,047	325,891
		\$ 7,482,144	\$ 3,526,542	\$ 11,008,685	\$ 5,932,077	\$ 657,848	\$ 6,589,925

<i>Per Therm Tax</i>	<i>Revenue to City</i>
\$.01 cent per therm	\$ 110,087
\$.02 cent per therm	\$ 220,174
\$.03 cent per therm	\$ 330,261
\$.04 cent per therm	\$ 440,347
\$.05 cent per therm	\$ 550,434
\$.06 cent per therm	\$ 660,521
\$.07 cent per therm	\$ 770,608
\$.08 cent per therm	\$ 880,695
\$.09 cent per therm	\$ 990,782
\$.10 cent per therm	\$ 1,100,869

A Gas Tax on Therms supplied by Nicor and other suppliers is a tax that area municipalities have opted to add to their General Fund.

Included on the next page is a detail page showing municipalities charging a Natural Gas Use Tax ranging from \$.013 per therm to \$.06 per therm.

If the City of Rolling Meadows opted to charge a \$.01 per therm tax, then expected revenue for FY 2012 would be \$110,087, and so on, following the chart above. Typically therms supplied by Nicor and others is 11 million per year. The entire process takes 60-90 days to implement a natural gas tax.

Therm & Revenue Data Source: Nicor Gas

135th INFORMATION SHEET SUPPLEMENTAL TO SHEET NOS. 64, 64.1 AND 64.5 OF ILL. C. C. NO. 16, SCHEDULE G

(Superseding 134th Information Sheet Effective May 1, 2011)

RIDER 8 ADJUSTMENTS FOR MUNICIPAL AND STATE UTILITY TAXES

Applicable to all Rates

The additional charge currently applicable in each municipality which has levied a Gas Use Tax on therms delivered is shown below.

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>Per Therm Charge</u>	<u>TAX APPLICABLE TO</u>	
		<u>Transportation Therms</u>	<u>Rider 6 Therms</u>
Algonquin	1.03¢	Yes	Yes
Arlington Heights	5.00¢	Yes	Yes
Aurora	1.00¢	Yes	Yes
Bellwood	2.50¢	Yes	No
Berkeley	5.00¢	Yes	No
Berwyn	5.00¢	Yes	No
Bloomington	0.75¢	Yes	No
Buffalo Grove	5.00¢	Yes	Yes
Calumet City	5.00¢	Yes	No
Carol Stream	2.50¢	Yes	Yes
Carpentersville	4.50¢	Yes	No
Chicago	6.30¢	Yes	No
Chicago Heights	5.00¢	Yes	No
Cicero	5.00¢	Yes	No
Country Club Hills	5.00¢	Yes	No
DeKalb	4.00¢	Yes	Yes
Des Plaines	2.50¢	Yes	No
Downers Grove	1.50¢	Yes	Yes
Elk Grove Village	1.00¢	Yes	Yes
Elmhurst	1.50¢	Yes	Yes
Elmwood Park	5.00¢	Yes	No
Evanston	2.50¢	Yes	No
Freeport	2.00¢	Yes	Yes
Glen Ellyn	2.00¢	Yes	Yes
Glenview	4.50¢	Yes	No
Glenwood	4.50¢	Yes	No
Hanover Park	1.50¢	Yes	Yes
Kankakee	4.50¢	Yes	No
Lansing	5.00¢	Yes	No
Lincolnwood	4.00¢	Yes	No
Manhattan	4.00¢	Yes	Yes
Markham	4.00¢	Yes	No
Morton Grove	2.00¢	Yes	Yes
Mount Prospect	1.47¢	Yes	No
Naperville	4.00¢	Yes	No
Niles	3.00¢	Yes	Yes
Normal	3.80¢	Yes	No
Northlake	5.00¢	Yes	Yes
Oak Lawn	1.00¢	Yes	No
Oak Park	2.20¢	Yes	No
Oswego	4.50¢	Yes	No
Park Ridge	2.00¢	Yes	No
Romeoville	3.50¢	Yes	Yes
Rosemont	5.00¢	Yes	No
* Round Lake Beach	4.00¢ (a)	Yes	No
Schiller Park	5.00¢	Yes	No
Skokie	4.00¢	Yes	No
Stickney	2.50¢	Yes	Yes
West Chicago	2.50¢	Yes	Yes
West Dundee	4.00¢	Yes	Yes

(a) Effective July 1, 2011

135th INFORMATION SHEET SUPPLEMENTAL TO SHEET NOS. 64, 64.1 AND 64.5 OF ILL. C. C. NO. 16, SCHEDULE G

(Superseding 134th Information Sheet Effective May 1, 2011)

RIDER 8 ADJUSTMENTS FOR MUNICIPAL AND STATE UTILITY TAXES

Applicable to all Rates

The additional charge currently applicable in each municipality which has levied a Gas Use Tax on therms delivered is shown below.

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>Per Therm Charge</u>	<u>TAX APPLICABLE TO</u>	
		<u>Transportation Therms</u>	<u>Rider 6 Therms</u>
Wheaton	3.00¢	Yes	Yes
Wheeling	2.40¢	Yes	Yes
Wilmette	2.40¢	Yes	Yes

(a) Effective July 1, 2011

3) Building Permits (Last 50%) from last year's discussion (November 9, 2010 Committee of the Whole Meeting)

At the November 9, 2010, Committee of the Whole Meeting, staff presented a schedule of building permit fee increases which was first presented in September 2009. (Please see Attachment A, the memo from the November 9, 2010 Committee of the Whole Meeting.)

The City Council decided to raise the permit fees by 50% of what was proposed and if the economy improved in 2011, then the remaining half would be added. The Attachment B shows the remaining 50% increase.

Previous Council Action:

November 9, 2010 Committee of the Whole Meeting Discussion

December 14, 2010, Ordinance No. 10-48 - Amend Code – Building Permit Fees

A.



InterOffice Memorandum

Date: November 3, 2010
To: Sarah Phillips, City Manager
From: Valerie J. Dehner, Community Development Director
CC: City Council members
Subject: D2) Proposed permit fee increases and Estimate of increase

In July, 2010, staff presented a schedule of permit fee increases which was first presented in September, 2009. In July, it was decided to bring these fee increases back for possible adoption for Fiscal Year 2011. These building permit fees have not been modified since **June, 1997** – now **almost 14 years ago**. Not all fees are being raised. Those that are being increased are being generally increased by the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the period of 1997 to 2010 or at least enough to cover internal costs of inspections. Commercial fees may be slightly higher.

As mentioned previously, the proposed increases are not just arbitrary increases. When determining these building permit increases, staff took into consideration a number of factors:

- 1) the number of inspections required for each permit and the cost to the City for these inspections;
- 2) what the inflationary cost would be for the 13 years that the permit fees have not been raised (1997 to 2010);
- 3) what other communities are charging for similar permits in order to keep Rolling Meadows competitive - permits not too low or too high. (A survey was conducted when this effort first began. Please note that in some cases, a comparison of "apples to apples" could not be made or information was missing);
- 4) not all building department fees needed to be raised; and
- 5) in some cases, the building permit fees are further broken out by "residential" or "commercial." The purpose of this is two-fold - commercial permits generally require more time in both review and inspections and an attempt to keep the residential permits more affordable.

All proposed changes are in bold. Changes have been made in the actual code of ordinances. This is to demonstrate once again that not all fees are being increased.

Staff believes these increases to be reasonable and equitable. Staff believes that it is time for the building permit fees to be increased in order to be more reflective of 2010 pricing as well as attempting to help recoup some of the actual expenses in administering the building permit program.

BUILDING PERMIT FEE INCREASES- Proposed and Actual

	Previous RM PERMIT FEES In effect from 1997-2010		Originally PROPOSED RM PERMIT FEES (to reflect CPI and comps to other communities)		FINAL BUILDING PERMIT FEES <u>Implemented in 2011</u> reflects only a 50% increase from what was originally proposed
Minimum Permit Fee for First \$1,000 of Value (general bldg. work)	\$25 - 1 st \$1,000 value + \$7 per \$1,000 after		\$35 - 1 st \$1000 + \$9.50 per \$1000 after		\$30 - 1 st \$1000 + \$8.25 per \$1000 after
Minimum Electrical Fee <i>Residential</i> <i>Commercial</i>	\$25		\$35 \$70		\$30 \$47.50
Minimum Mechanical Fee	\$20 - 1 st \$1000 value; + \$7 per \$1000 up to \$40,000+ \$5 over \$40,000		\$35 - 1 st \$1000 value + \$ 9.50 per \$1000 up to \$40,000+ \$ 7 over \$40,000		\$27.50 - 1 st \$1000 value + \$8.25 per \$1000 up to \$40,000 + \$6 over \$40,000
Minimum Plumbing Fee <i>Residential</i> <i>Commercial</i>	\$25		\$35 \$70		\$30 \$47.50
Hot Water Heater <i>Residential</i> <i>Commercial</i>	\$10		\$35 \$70		\$22.50 \$40
Furnace only <i>Residential</i> <i>Commercial</i>	\$10		\$35 \$70		\$22.50 \$35
A/C only <i>Residential</i> <i>Commercial</i>	\$10		\$35 \$70		\$22.50 \$35
Driveway- New <i>Residential</i>	\$20		\$65		\$42.50
Driveway - New <i>Commercial</i>	\$50 + \$5 per 1,000 sq. ft.		\$70 + \$7 per 1,000 sq. ft		\$60 + \$6 per 1000 sq. ft
Driveway -Overlay <i>Residential</i>	\$15		\$35		\$25
Driveway - Overlay <i>Commercial</i>	\$25 + \$3 per 1,000 sq. ft.		\$35 + \$4 per 1,000 sq. ft.		\$30 + \$3.50 per 1000
New Plumbing Fixtures (1 st 5 fixtures) each	\$10		\$14 per fixture or \$50 minimum		\$12 per fixture or \$25 minimum

New Plumbing Fixtures <i>(5+ fixtures) each</i>	\$6		\$8 per fixture	\$7 per fixture
Replacement Plumbing Fixtures <i>(1st 5 fixtures) each</i>	\$7		\$9.50 per fixture	\$8.25 per fixture
Replacement Plumbing Fixtures <i>(5+) each</i>	\$4		\$5.50 per fixture	\$4.75 per fixture
Lawn Sprinkler System Residential Comm., Ind., MF	\$30 \$35 per 500 feet of piping		\$50 (Res.) \$45 per 500 feet of piping or \$75 minimum (Comm)	\$40 (Res.) \$40 per 500 feet
Drain Tile <i>(per 10 linear ft.)</i>	\$1		\$1.50 per 10 linear ft. \$65 minimum	\$1.25 \$32.50 minimum
Garbage Disposal	\$10		\$35	\$22.50
Gas Piping	\$15 per inch + \$5 for each 25 linear ft.		\$20 per inch + \$7 for each 25 linear ft.	\$17.50 + \$6.00 for each 25 linear ft.
Fence	\$15 for 1 st 100 linear ft; \$2 after		\$20 for 1 st 100 linear ft + \$3/100 linear ft. after	\$17.50 for 1 st 100 linear ft. + \$2.50/100 linear ft. after
Grading and Filling	\$1 per 1000 sq. ft. of area not less than \$15		\$1.50 per 1000 sq. ft. of area not less than \$50	\$1.25 per 1000 sq. ft. of area not less than \$32.50
Demo bldg. permit fee • <i>Single-family residence</i> • <i>Accessory building</i> • <i>Commercial</i>	\$10 per 1,000 sq. ft of building / \$15 Minimum		\$15 per 1,000 sq. ft or \$500 (SFR) or \$25 (Accessory) or \$1000 (Commercial) Whichever is Greater	\$12.50 per \$1000 sq. ft. of Building or \$250 (SFR) Or \$12.50 (Accessory) Or \$500 (Commercial) Whichever is greater
Minimum <u>Plan Review Fee</u> <i>Single Family Residences</i> & <i>Res. Additions</i>	\$75 per 2,500 sq ft \$50		\$105 per 2,500 sq. ft. \$70	\$90 per 2,500 sq. ft. \$60
Minimum <u>Plan Review Fee</u> : garages, accessory bldgs, decks, swim pools, drive- ways & all others not listed	\$15		\$35	\$25

Minimum Plan Review Fee Commercial/nonresidential				
Up to 60,000 cubic feet	\$250		\$350	\$300
60,001 to 80,000 cubic feet	\$305		\$400	\$352.50
80,001 to 100,000 cubic feet	\$360		\$450	\$405
100,001 c.f. to 150,000 c.f.	\$415		\$515	\$465
150,001 c.f. to 200,000 c.f.	\$500		\$600	\$550
Over 200,000 c.f.	\$550		\$650	\$600
Plus \$5.50 per 10,000 c.f. over 200,000 c.f.			Plus \$7.50 per 10,000 c.f. Over 200,000 c.f.	\$6.50
Street, alley or parkway obstruction permit	\$25 per month		\$35 per month	\$30 per month
Water for construction; Use fee during construction:				
Residential	\$20		Residential - \$75	Residential - \$47.50
Commercial	\$7 per 1,000 sq. ft. of floor area. Minimum of \$20		Commercial - \$9.50 per 1,000 sq. ft. of floor area/ minimum of \$150	Commercial - \$8.25 per 1000 Sq. ft. of floor area/ Minimum of \$85.00
Certificate of Occupancy <i>Residential</i>	\$25 per dwelling unit		\$30 per d.u. (multi-family) \$75 single family detached	\$27.50 per d.u. (multi-family) \$50 single family detached
<i>All other uses</i>	\$0.025 per square foot for the gross floor area to be inspected.		\$0.012 per square foot of floor area to be inspected or a minimum of \$75.00	\$0.012 per square foot or minimum of \$37.50
Permit Administrative Processing Fee for Fire Sprinkler/Fire Alarms	0		\$25	\$12.50
Permit Administrative Processing Fee for All permits not requiring plan review	0		\$20	\$10
Elevator – Semiannual inspection fees	Per Floor....\$12.00 Min. charge...\$50.00		Per Floor.....\$15.00 Min. charge \$70.00 for five story and less buildings	\$13.50 Min. charge - \$60. for 5 stories Or less

Storage Tank Removal Permit	\$75.00		\$150.00		\$112.50
Starting Work without a Permit	50% of permit fee or a minimum of \$30.00		50% of permit fee or Minimum of \$75.00		50% of permit fee or Minimum of \$52.50
Annual Sign Inspections Freestanding signs	30 feet or less in ht.: Illuminated: \$6 + \$0.12 per sq. ft. or \$15 min. Nonilluminated: \$6 + \$0.08 per sq. ft. or \$12 minimum		30 feet or less in ht.: Illuminated: \$35 min. or \$7 + 0.15 per sq. ft. Nonilluminated: \$35 min. or \$7 + \$.10 per sq. ft.		30 feet or less in ht.: Illuminated- \$25 min. or \$6.50 + \$0.135 per sq. ft Nonillum.: \$23.50 min. or \$6.50 + \$0.09 per sq. ft.
Annual Sign Inspections: Wall signs and other nonfreestanding signs	Illuminated: \$6 + \$0.12 per sq. ft or \$12 minimum Nonilluminated: \$6 + \$0.08 per sq. ft. or \$12 minimum		Illuminated: \$7 + \$0.15 per sq. ft. or \$17 minimum Nonilluminated: \$7 + \$0.10 per sq. ft. or \$17 minimum		Illuminated: \$6.50 + \$0.135 per sq. ft. or \$14.50 minimum Nonilluminated: \$6.50 + \$0.09 per sq. ft. \$14.50 minimum
Sign Face Change	\$15 + \$0.01 per sq. ft.		Wall Signs: \$35 + \$0.02 per sq. ft. Freestanding signs 30 ft or less: \$35 + \$0.05 per sq. ft.		\$25 + \$0.015 sq. ft
Sign Face Change Freestanding signs greater than 30' in height (billboards)	\$15 + \$0.01 per sq. ft. (Ave.: \$27 per face change)		Annual Face Change Fee: Static sign, per face: \$105 Digital sign, per face: \$525		Nothing implemented

Based on half hour inspections

Revised July, 2011

4) Local Motor Fuel Tax – Local Road Fund

Currently, the City of Rolling Meadows charges a \$.02 per gallon Home Rule Motor Fuel Gasoline Tax which supports the Local Road Fund. In FY 2010, the City received \$237,539 in revenues from this tax.

If the Home Rule Motor Fuel Tax increased by \$.01, the additional revenue would be approximately \$115,000, and if it were increased by \$.02, the additional revenue stream would be \$230,000.

5) Vehicle Sticker Increase - Local Road Fund

Currently, the City charges \$22 per regular-passenger vehicle sticker to support the Local Road Fund. In FY 2010, the City received \$379,500 in revenues from this tax.

If the regular-passenger vehicle sticker were increased from \$22 to \$25, this would equal approximately an additional \$45,000 (15,000 stickers). If the sticker increased from \$22 to \$30 then, the additional revenue stream would be \$120,000 (15,000 stickers). Discounts for seniors, disabled, military and antique stickers would **not** change.

Committee of the Whole Agenda Item – July 19, 2011

6) Landscaping & Lawn Care Professional License.

Attachments: None

Background:

Reason for the Discussion: Residents and Police Department Right to Know Who is Working on a Project or Driving Through the Community.

This lettering requirement is mentioned in the current motor vehicle code from the State of Illinois. From past experience, the Village's of Mount Prospect and Palatine do enforce this code.

An Ordinance would be created to follow state code.

The trucks and trailers of landscaping and lawn care professionals (contractors and sub contractors) would have to be labeled and marked with the business name.

Violations of this would be brought to Adjudication.

Staff Comments & Recommendation:

None at this time.

Committee of the Whole Agenda Item – July 19, 2011

7) Signs for Contractors – “Right to Know.”

Attachments: None

Background:

Reason for the Discussion: For the City to be Business Friendly.

Allow contractors to place an advertising sign (size of a regular garage sale sign) in front of the house or business (not in the public right away) that are servicing. The sign must be close to the house. They can only be posted from the time the crew arrives for the job and must be removed when you finish for the day. Again, the sign must only be posted when doing a job and can not be left over night. If a contractor does not remove the sign, then it would considered as an illegal sign. For the rest of this project no signs would be allowed.

If there are multiply contractors on a project, then there will be only one sign per house or business. This could also mean that the contractors take turns on displaying signs.

If the Council wants this it would be a sign code change.

Staff Comments & Recommendation:

None at this time.

Committee of the Whole Agenda Item – July 19, 2011

8) Website

Attachments: None

Suggestion: Please visit the City's web site (cityrm.org) and then visit other municipalities.

Background:

Reason for the Discussion: With reviewing other municipality web sites, maybe the City can revise/renovate what we currently have for the public.

Currently, City Staff maintain, update and create items for the City web page. Most residents and businesses (even potential residents & businesses) have found the site easy to utilize and navigate. It is not too busy or flashy. There is little to no expense with the current set-up.

Some municipalities in the area are utilizing and paying for web services and providers or they have someone who is solely dedicated to being the webmaster. (As some residents have stated to City Staff, many of these other sites, while flashy and new & improved, are too busy and not as easy or friendly as the current City of Rolling Meadows website).

Mayor Rooney has recently reached out to the Rolling Meadows High School to see if they have suggestions, ideas, etc. Maybe they can create a new page for the Staff?

Questions to think about:

Does the City Council like the current web page (ease, cost, look, etc)?

Does the City want to start paying for a service (new look, maybe new options & services, etc...)?

Is there something missing on the current City website?

Is there something that Council Members want Staff to look for or investigate?

Please note: there is no money in the 2011 budget for this kind of work or upgrade.

Staff Comments & Recommendation:

None at this time.

COMMITTEE-OF-THE-WHOLE – July 19, 2011

9) Woodfield Crossing

Woodfield Crossing acquired the property formerly known as 12 Oaks at Woodfield located at the northwest corner of Route 53 and the Tollway. The City Council approved the development in the mid 1960s. The development, as approved, provided for a portion of the parkway and parking spaces located primarily at the south end of the development to be located over a portion of dedicated Arbor Drive.

Woodfield Crossing has requested that the City enter into a license agreement providing for the owner and any subsequent owner to have the ability to continue to occupy the portion of the development which is within Arbor Drive. The owner also has requested to erect a fence and a monument sign in the licensed area.

The City Attorney and the owner have reached an impasse concerning the terms for the termination of license. The City Attorney would allow the City to terminate the license upon written notice to the owner. The owner has requested that the City's ability to terminate the license would be as follows:

- A) If the owner's use poses a danger to the health, safety or well-being of persons using the area covered by the license;
- B) If the use or configuration of the property changes except for additional parking or additional land is added to the development; or
- C) The City finds it necessary to widen the pavement for Arbor Drive.

Since the decision to approve the license agreement ultimately rests with the City Council, this matter was placed on the agenda for discussion.