

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
April 28, 2020**

Mayor Gallo called the Council meeting via Zoom Teleconferencing to order at 7:30 p.m.

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

ROLL CALL:

Present: Cannon, Budmats, O'Brien, Vinezeano, Bisesi, D'Astice, Sanoica
Absent: 0

With 7 present and 0 absent there is a quorum.

Members of the virtual audience are reminded that these proceedings are being recorded for current and future broadcast.

Staff Members Present Remotely: City Manager Barry Krumstok, Finance Director Melissa Gallagher, Deputy City Clerk Judy Brose, Assistant to the City Manager Lori Ciezak, Police Chief John Nowacki, Deputy Fire Chief Jeff Moxley, Director Public Works Rob Horne, Assistant Director Public Works JoEllen Charlton, Business Advocate Martha Corner, City Attorney Melissa Wolf

Members of the public will be afforded the opportunity for public comment as long as they provided their contact credentials and the subject matter for which they would like to speak about before the deadline as noted on tonight's agenda. In addition, written comments that were submitted prior to the meeting will also be read.

MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES:

The first order of business is to approve the minutes from the *March 31, 2020 Committee-of-the-Whole Meeting*. Is there a motion to approve the minutes? Alderman Sanoica made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman D'Astice. Are there any corrections, additions, or deletions to the minutes? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye; those opposed say nay. The ayes have it and the minutes are approved.

The next set of minutes are for the *April 14, 2020 City Council Meeting*. Is there a motion to approve the minutes? Alderman Sanoica made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman D'Astice. Are there any corrections, additions, or deletions to the minutes? Are there any corrections, additions, or deletions to the minutes? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye; those opposed say nay. The ayes have it and the minutes are approved.

MOTION TO DEVIATE: None

MAYOR'S REPORT:

We're following information closely from both the IML and the Northwest Municipal Conference in addition to what the Governor is saying directly. They've been handing out messages and waiting to hear how the City should comply with any of the safety and well-being for all the residents as things progress coming toward May 1st so updates will be soon to come. In addition to that, we do have some better information on the community level, the Rolling Meadows Show Choir is participating in a performance

scheduled at 3:00 pm this Saturday. It's an online performance, it's going to start at 10:00 a.m. and there are 5 middle school performers and 7 women choir performances. The Rolling Meadows group specifically will compete against three other schools in their group, they will perform in order to go to the finals and the last performance is being held at 6:45 p.m. Anyone who's interested in watching the New Directions, the Rolling Meadows choir, they can follow that on the website which is www.showchoir.com, they will be in the meeting minutes after this meeting and it will be posted on our digital signage as well. Maybe take a break from the other monotony we have and watch New Directions, our Rolling Meadows choir perform.

WARD REPORTS:

None

MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR 20 MINUTES:

The next step is to open the meeting to the public. In order to secure the rights of the citizens of the City to a fair and just representation before their elected officials, and to guarantee to the elected officials an order and dignified form in which to conduct the City's business, no person shall be allowed to engage in any activity that will disturb or disrupt the orderly proceedings of the City Council.

Per Rules of Procedures the public is to address the City Council, and the fact that no member of the City Council responds does not mean that the City Council or any member thereof agrees or disagrees with the comment.

In order to attain this objective the following rules of conduct are hereby established:

1. Any person who seeks to address the City Council at this time for public comments, shall be permitted to speak only upon recognition of the Presiding Officer and such person shall adhere to the following provisions:
 - a. Each person addressing the City Council shall state their name for the record.
 - b. Each person shall be granted no more than 5 minutes of the allotted 20 minutes in order to address the City Council.
 - c. Questions and/or commentary shall be limited to City business. Comments supporting or opposing a nominated person's candidacy for elective office of the City shall be out of order.
 - d. Commentary shall be directed to the Presiding Officer unless the Presiding Officer permits the individual to address the Council Members or other City officers present.
 - e. Discussion shall take place in a professional manner which displays mutual respect.
 - f. Profanity shall not be used in any form or manner.

Megan Gawlik – I live in the 4th Ward and I am here to speak about the Emergency Family Assistance Program. First, I would like to applaud the City Council for working to help Rolling Meadows residents during this unprecedented time. I would like to offer amendments to the current resolution and ask the Council to consider allocating \$100,000 to fund the program in order to find an appropriate balance between the quantity of and the impact on program recipients. My husband and I are the kitchen coordinators of St. Colette's PAD site, we serve roughly 40-50 men, women and families experiencing homelessness as part of Journey's the Road Home's rotating overnight shelter program. The average length of stay in the shelter system is 50 nights. This statistic is not a national average, this statistic is specific to the Northwest suburbs so this is the lived experience of our neighbors. The truth is that suburban homelessness is incredibly diverse. I've fed an 8 month old baby, hugged a woman in her 20's undergoing cancer treatment and talked profit and loss statements with a guest who held a master's degree all in the basement of St. Colette's. These individuals all experience the traumas of homelessness differently but I believe that their past could have been greatly altered and those 50 nights of traveling between churches could have been avoided if they had been fortunate enough to receive one time financial support and then connected to resources. Hardships with employment and housing securities are two of the biggest contributing factors to our neighbors experiencing homelessness. COVID-19 has caused unemployment to soar and current polices are helping evictions, I predict that we will see an unprecedented number of neighbors struggling to make rent and mortgage payments when deferments have concluded and four or more months payments become due all at once. Being prepared for this surge will help residents in Rolling Meadows stay in Rolling Meadows keeping the place that they call home and when this surge comes I believe residents will need more than the current \$500 maximum housing benefit. Two bedroom apartments, for reference, at the Preserve of Woodfield and Willow Bend rent for around \$1400 a month and the median homeowner is likely paying around \$1800 a month between property taxes and 4% on a mortgage of a \$250,000 home. Based on those numbers, I would recommend increasing the housing benefit cap to \$2000 per household and each of our residents are unique and to preserve their own dignity, I feel the category for miscellaneous should be increased from \$200 to \$1000 for a total maximum benefit that wouldn't be able to exceed \$2500 per household just to keep us within some rounded numbers. I do understand that there would be additional documentation for IRS purposes once the benefits exceeds \$600 but I feel this additional paperwork shouldn't get in the way of developing a program that will be meaningful for our residents. I would like to add that the small business that I work once 1099'd a balloon artist so I'm confident that the City can prepare the necessary papers to help our families in need. While it's a good start, I feel the current proposal would only provide a Band-Aid that would barely be non-adhesive instead of a meaningful act of charity that will keep our neighbors safe at home. I would like you to take a moment to consider your own living expenses and as you do that mental math, I think you'll see that \$2500 is not an extravagant number. Increasing the fund from \$5000 to \$100,000 is a big ask but such an increase is necessary if the Council wants to create a program to substantially impact our community. During this time of crisis, this is what our tax dollars should be doing helping our neighbor's meet their basic needs. In future years, I think this program can be expanded and modeled after popular employee assistance programs and that could be funded independently by community donations or and opt in in a water bill tax or something similar but in the minds of a global pandemic, I really feel that this should be funded generously by the City's budget. Thank you for your time today and I appreciate your consideration.

Maggie Trevor – I actually emailed the City Clerk to pull my name from the list. I spoke at the Committee of the Whole and I think my comments are on the record but I can repeat them very quickly. I just wanted to remind people of the history of this program. My mother ran this program for several decades going back to the 60's. It was a critical part of the safety net and as Megan said so eloquently, it can do a lot of good to keep people in their homes in times of crisis. I just wanted to urge you to ramp up this program in this time of crisis and also to address the eligibility criteria to make them non-discriminatory. Thank you.

Mayor Gallo closed the floor.

➤ **PENDING:**

None

➤ **ORDINANCES:**

The next item on the agenda are the Consent Ordinances. It consists of three (3) items, items A thru C. Staff is requesting waiver of 1st reading on tem C so that leaves items A and B. Does any Alderman wish to remove item A or B from the Consent Agenda for Ordinances?

Alderman Vinezeano – Item A.

I will take these items individually beginning with item A.

A) Ordinance No. 20-00 – Amend Chapter 20 “Traffic” of the Code of Ordinances – Prohibit Parking on Arbor Drive (1st Reading)

Is there a motion to consider this Ordinance for 1st Reading? Alderman Vinezeano has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Sanoica.

Alderman Vinezeano you pulled this so you have first comments.

Alderman Vinezeano – I’m hoping that Staff or Chief Nowacki can help me understand this. In our notes it says Staff recommends that it’s in the City’s best interest to prohibit the parking on Arbor Drive but it really doesn’t tell us why it’s in our best interest. I would really like some clarification as to why it’s in the City’s best interest for the residents in that area.

John Nowacki, Police Chief - The Ordinance was passed over 10 years ago allowing parking on Arbor Drive and it was obviously prior to my time with Rolling Meadows. My understanding was that there were two additional apartment complex buildings, there was a lot of overcrowding in that area and the private property could not handle the parking for the apartment complex so they devised a permit system to park on Arbor Drive. Since that time two buildings have been removed and right now if you drive down Arbor Drive it is basically being used as long term storage because a lot of those cars, trailers and all kinds of vehicles are just being stored there. There are issues in the winter time when vehicles aren’t moved off the road causing issues with snow plowing. A lot of individuals are actually parking on Arbor Drive and then going into the apartment complex whether they’re living or visiting which they do not have permission to because they’re not allowed to park in the parking lot, they don’t have permit parking and they’re vehicles will be towed, there’s been a lot of issues. The new property management had asked if that parking can be removed, they put in some additional parking and they’re working on installing some other parking for visitors and guests in that lot. There really is no longer a need for Arbor Drive parking. It pretty much is a storage area and it’s an eye sore. Some undesirable individual’s do park there and either live or visit in the complex causing other issues. I hope that answers your question you have.

Alderman Vinezeano – Yes, thank you.

Alderman Sanoica – I just wanted to also state for the record that I reached out to the Preserve at Woodfield to talk with the manager or the management team. I haven't received a response yet but it's been a weekend so I will have time before the second reading on May 12th to discuss if there's any additional information that the management team can provide for us aside from this letter. I haven't received anything from my residents in that area with that complex being in Ward 7 so at this time there has been no resident backlash or any other perspective as to why this shouldn't pass at this time. I will be voting in favor of this Ordinance.

Mayor Gallo – Any further comments? Seeing none, the question is shall the Ordinance be moved forward for 2nd Reading? Will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: Bisesi, D'Astice, Sanoica, Cannon, Budmats, O'Brien, Vinezeano
NAYS: 0
ABSENT: 0

With 7 in favor and 0 opposed. This Ordinance will be moved forward for 2nd Reading.

B) Ordinance No. 20-00 – Amend Chapter 2 “Administration” of the Code of Ordinances – Amend Aldermanic Term Limits to Two (2) Consecutive Four (4) Year Terms (1st Reading)

Is there a motion to consider this Ordinance for 1st Reading? Alderman Vinezeano has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman O'Brien. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is shall the Ordinance be moved forward for 2nd Reading? Will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: D'Astice, Sanoica, Cannon, Budmats, O'Brien, Vinezeano, Bisesi
NAYS: 0
ABSENT: 0

With 7 in favor and 0 opposed. This Ordinance will be moved forward for 2nd Reading.

Staff is requesting a waiver of 1st reading for item C so this Ordinance can be approved immediately. Is there an Alderman willing to make a motion to waive the 1st reading for the Ordinance? Alderman Sanoica has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Vinezeano.

C) Ordinance No. 20-17 – Approve Confirming and Extending the State of Emergency within the City of Rolling Meadows Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic (1st Reading)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is shall the Ordinance be moved forward for 2nd reading? Will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: Sanoica, Cannon, Budmats, O'Brien, Vinezeano, Bisesi, D'Astice
NAYS: 0
ABSENT: 0

With 7 in favor and 0 opposed, the Ordinance does move forward, the 1st reading is waived.

Ordinance No. 20-17 is now back for final approval. Is there a motion to adopt this Ordinance? Alderman D'Astice has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Sanoica. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: Cannon, Budmats, O'Brien, Vinezeano, Bisesi, D'Astice, Sanoica
NAYS: 0
ABSENT: 0

With 7 in favor and 0 opposed. This Ordinance is adopted.

➤ **NEW BUSINESS:**

D) MOTION TO APPROVE PAYMENT OF BILLS ON WARRANT 4/28/2020

The next item of business is a motion to approve the Warrant from April 28, 2020 as presented by the Finance Department. Is there a motion to approve the warrant? Alderman O'Brien made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Budmats. Is there any discussion?

Alderman Budmats – In looking through the warrant there's payments to the firehouse Station 15 and Station 16. In reviewing this I noticed that we're spending the contingency money on Station 15 and that in both cases Wegman has increased the amount of their portion of the contract beyond what was originally bid by them. I asked about this, I sent an email to Barry and I didn't get a response until about an hour ago, so I have more questions as to why we're spending the contingency funds. I understand that originally there was a budget amount and we've used all of that up on Station 15 but now we're using up the contingency funds, so I would like to postpone the payment on both fire stations until the next meeting, if possible.

Mayor Gallo – I'm assuming you're making a motion to postpone this?

Alderman Budmats – I am.

Mayor Gallo – The second would be from Alderman Sanoica. At this time, I'll ask the Council if there is any discussion on this request and motion.

Alderman D'Astice – I would like to know what questions there are that will force us to postpone this and ask Staff if postponing this has any negative effect on the contract?

Mayor Gallo – Alderman Budmats, if you can reply with some of your findings after reviewing this that might help.

Alderman Budmats – In the case of Station 15, we talking about contingency funds and it was our understanding when we originally approved this back in 2018 that the contingency funds were not to be spent freely that they were for a contingency if there were some type of emergency. It appears that the original contingency fund of \$250,000 has shrunk to \$50,000 meaning \$200,000 of the contingency fund has been spent. When I looked through this week's pay period, we've paid \$5.6 million so far for the property which is what we originally agreed to pay and then there was a \$250,000 contingency and this what we're currently being asked to fund a \$140,000 against. I think it's not unreasonable that inasmuch as we looked at what the expenditures were going to be for the Budget and we knew what they were, if we're \$200,000 "over budget" we should at least know what those expenses are for. That's what I want

to know, is what they're for and get a listing of them and see if they're reasonable based on what's expected. In addition, the contractors says that they've already been paid 100 % for their thing including retainage under construction management fee but they're looking for another \$10,000 according to their AIA G703 Form within the packet. I don't understand why we're paying \$10,000 more than what they asked for as well as paying them \$10,000 over what they originally bid on fixing the site condition. I'm not in favor of spending \$200,000 without an accounting for it.

Mayor Gallo – I would agree with that. I hope the rest of the Council sees an opportunity to evaluate this spending.

Alderman D'Astice – I'd like to know from Staff if postponing this would have any negative repercussions.

Melissa Gallagher, Finance Director - Considering this is the first that I've heard of this other than just an email asking for contingency logs from Alderman Budmats. That was a lot to digest. From the very beginning from 2018, the contingency was always discussed in the process of the construction management of the project. Every single pay application shows the contingency adjustments plus the amount of the contract every single time. To the point of the question back to how that affects the contract that is something that I would defer to the City Attorney, Attorney Wolf. At the same point, that was a lot to digest without any information ahead of time and if it needs to be a larger discussion then I would suggest that something in the future in terms of a Committee of the Whole meeting. That was a lot to discuss all at once, I wasn't even able to take all the notes. I wanted to just answer the question and if you have any other questions, we'd be happy to answer them.

Mayor Gallo – Alderman Budmats, can you explain the timeline to which you received this information?

Alderman Budmats – I asked yesterday morning for the logs on what the expenditures were for the contingency funds and I received them like at 530-6:00 pm tonight so there really wasn't adequate time to look at it before the meeting.

Mayor Gallo - These are the themes that I think we've all on separate occasions brought up the fact that we don't appreciate being rushed and I think everyone appreciates not being rushed into that.

Melissa Gallagher, Finance Director - I'll be happy to answer any questions. I would just add that if something is requested it certainly is always provided. We're trying to assist where possible, nothing has changed in terms of how the project has overall been administered. I just wanted to note that because everything has been running exactly since 2018, since the first pay application was submitted to the City Council in addition to that every single pay application is reviewed by the City Attorney as well and the owner sworn statement is prepared by the City Attorney and any questions ahead of time are always answered. In addition to that, the Capital Improvements Committee has also approved different pieces along the way for the project and I would also add that Chicago Title is also involved with the entire project. Just wanted to let you know and if there's something that we can further provide definitely but again I would defer to Attorney Wolf in terms of any contract issues if payments are deferred. Thank you.

Mayor Gallo - Attorney Wolf, I'm not sure if you would have the immediate answer right now but if there's a way you can look into Alderman D'Astice's question in the meantime while I allow Alderman O'Brien to speak. If there's any implication to postponing payment while I pull up an email about what contingency was defined as well. Attorney Wolf, is that possible to look into? What impact there is?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - I don't believe the contract is attached to the packet. At this time I don't have access to the contract language so I can't render any advice as to what impact that would have. At this time I wouldn't be able to do that unless I was forwarded the contract in the meantime and I can review it right now but at this point I don't have the contract to review.

Alderman O'Brien - This might be a question for Director Gallagher, does the guaranteed maximum price (GMP) include the contingency? If I was tracking right, we would still be about \$40-\$50,000 under the GMP? I'm not objecting to wanting to know what the money is being spent on but from the overall budget perspective, my question is that the GMP or the overall cost includes the contingency funds as well as, if my math is right, we're still running at about a \$40-\$50,000 savings?

Melissa Gallagher, Finance Director - Yes, currently for the Algonquin station it's \$52,857 for the contingency so that would be under budget by that amount. Based on through March 31 in this packet the contingency for Hicks is \$235,736 under budget for the Hicks station.

Alderman O'Brien - Thank you for clarifying that. I just wanted to make sure I was tracking correctly on the side.

Mayor Gallo - Finance Director Gallagher or Attorney Wolf, I have put up on my screen from the Committee of the Whole agenda of November 20, 2018 and highlighted the paragraph about the contingency money and what it set aside for to *cover unexpected or unforeseen costs during the construction process; the City's requested changes; design modification changes; and allows for protection processes. During the construction process, if savings happens through value engineering, then money is put into the contingency. In addition, if there are unforeseen items such as regulatory requirements from outside agencies, then money from the contingency is used to cover those costs.* Can we be certain this evening that the contingency Alderman Budmats is speaking about went to cover those costs? Do we have any information that?

Melissa Gallagher, Finance Director – Yes, you do. If I could just add to that, the contingency as you're pointing out and I'm glad you pulled that up from November 2018. You described it exactly as that. A lot of the changes throughout the entire project was related to the permitting process. Some outside agencies pieces, it's all very detailed in a log and there's also supporting documentation with every single one. Every single contingency adjustment has been fully vetted through the Fire Chief process, through the entire staffing process and also through all the permitting process. There were adjustments, some to increase contingency to further under budget but there were some things that took away money for the contingency process and that was because there are things that you have to address the permitting process. The majority of that I would say would be permitting, there were some owner changes along the way to meet the specifications of the Fire Department and the Fire Chief. Those are the reasons why the contingency existed from the beginning. If you recall back from November 2018, the discussion was to not slow down the process and that's the reason for the contingency and then with these construction escrow payments that are presented to the City Council for every single payment. All of those details are shown, in this packet it's electronic page 80 and electronic page 88 that will show the actual reduction or increases to contingency with every single owner's sworn statement. Again, that is reviewed by legal and then it's fully approved by City Council every single time there is a pay application and then it's also sent to Chicago Title for release of funds. I would add, I was jotting down information to get answers to the Council, but in terms of RC Wegman the construction management fee did not change, the amount that was originally contracted for is the same amount. Again, we would verify everything to make sure but I just wanted to get answers back to what your questions were. Thank you.

Mayor Gallo - What I pulled up on the screen was from City Manager Krumstok email to the entire Council yesterday afternoon on April 27 a little bit before 1:00 pm. I would encourage Council to take some time to pause, it was also discovered throughout the course of today that many, 14 of the subcontractors had been compensated more than what their estimates were and normally it's trivial in the overages but this is not trivial and I think we should do some due diligence.

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - I just wanted to advise the Council that with respect to any payment for goods or services the Illinois Governmental Prompt Payment Act applies. That law requires that payment be made within 30 days. If it's disapproved there are certain procedures that the City Council would have to undertake but I just want to put the City Council on notice of that 30 day time limit.

Mayor Gallo – So if we were to postpone from now until the next City Council meeting which would take place on May 12th, would fall inside the timeframe.

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney – It looks like the invoice is dated April 16.

Mayor Gallo – Okay, so we'd be squeaking by but we're still within the parameters. Further comments or questions? Alderman Budmats this is going to be the last time for you because I did ask you to speak to clarify for Alderman D'Astice but this is your second time.

Alderman Budmats – The only thing I can say is that the project itself is several months late. The Council when asked to extend the contract did so at RC Wegman's request. Even though the project came in late, it's at the end of the project for the first building and we're nearing the end of the project for the second building. As much as I remember Alderman Cannon asking to be actively involved in having an Alderman on the committee that was reviewing the expenditures as they occurred and we were told that it wasn't necessary. Today, I'm looking at the thing for Hicks Road and the document that you show in the packet says there was \$250,000 or \$260,000 in contingency but the document that I was afforded today, an hour ago, shows that there's only \$175,000 in contingency. In terms of two weeks we spent \$75,000 in contingency money near the end of the project or at least accounted for spending that money at the end of the project. To me, this is a good time to get some last minute oversight before we pay the final bills on the project because at this point we've already paid RC Wegman the majority of their retainage and everything else. We bared along with them, I think that to get a little bit accounting clarification isn't that much to ask for.

Melissa Gallagher, Finance Director – I would just like to ask for clarity because I'm not sure that I understand the request of the Finance Department, I just want to make sure that I'm very clear on what I'm to provide because I'm not sure I understand what to provide. I want to make sure it's clear to the entire City Council as well. Perhaps it's not me, perhaps it's the City Attorney, City Manager or even the Fire Chief or it's something different. I just want to make sure that I'm understanding, it's not so much accounting functionality here, I believe that the work was done and now payment is being requested. These are bond payments that we will eventually replace the cash that we're spending now with bond funds. I just want to make sure that it's very clear as to what I'm to provide by May 12th or maybe even the Committee of the Whole meeting if that's what it is.

Mayor Gallo – Alderman Budmats can you clarify for the Finance Director and for the Council what your expectations to see are in the meantime if we are to postpone this payment?

Alderman Budmats – Now that I've see the excel spreadsheet that explains where the contingency funds have been added and subtracted, I had a chance to briefly look at them. I would just look for some of the backup documentation for those amounts, it's really not per se an accounting issue, I just want to try and

understand what the pluses and the minuses were in terms of physically. The description in some places say miscellaneous electrical for a couple thousand dollars, I'm an electrician, I would love to know what miscellaneous electrical for \$2000 is. So I don't think it's something that you'll be able to answer for me per se. Inasmuch as the Aldermen had not participated in any of the meetings, in the beginning we approved the budget for it and now this is the chance to look at the things that weren't in the budget and to understand what those expenditures were before we approved them. If that's not a concern and spending the \$200,000 is okay then I guess we can just move ahead with it. I wanted a little bit more detail on it, that's all. It's more about the nuts and bolts of what we bought with that money.

Mayor Gallo – It should be a concern, its \$200,000, it should be a concern.

Alderman Vinezeano – Obviously, I was not on the Council when these fire stations were approved but I was a resident and this is a very controversial topic in our City. As we all know as Aldermen and women, I think we need to do our due diligence before we approve payment especially toward the end to make sure that all the t's are crossed and i's are dotted in that what we're paying for is what we're getting and our contractor is being held accountable because it's my tax money, it's your tax money and I think our residents are owed that and it's our obligation. I'm sorry that it's kind of forthcoming at this meeting and Staff is just getting this notification but I think for us to come back to residents and say yes I approved this bill payment and this is why. To say well this was billed to us and we owe it is not a valid reason, at least for me. I think if we have those logs and invoices and what work was done and what it's for would be extremely helpful for me as an Alderman.

Alderman O'Brien – I guess what I'm personally struggling with is that if we do request this I'm not in favor of requesting this delay. I think we would have to ask Staff to prioritize or help them with prioritization based on the other agenda topics. We deferred the payment for road construction prior to they're trying to make sure that didn't impede that contract, there is some additional discussion where Staff may have some other pressing tasks at hand for the emergency family relief fund. My comfort level is that I'm okay with this, the reason being is that we have to entrust that Staff is doing their day to day jobs. If someone showed my an invoice that said an extra 3000 feet of electrical wire, I can't answer, but maybe some of the fellow Council members can, I can't answer if that's a realistic fee or not for building the fire station. I don't feel comfortable from an expertise perspective other than Chief Moxley is involved and engineer's involved, those are the subject matter experts. I have enough faith to put in them as that is their expertise versus me looking an invoice saying \$3000 for electrical wiring, I wouldn't be able to know if it's right or wrong. I have a trust factor that they're going to do their jobs as we've asked them to do. I'm currently not in support of this just based on the discussion because it still is underneath the guaranteed maximum price that was set by prior Council as well as operating at a savings as well.

Melissa Gallagher, Finance Director - Thank you for the clarity. I wanted to add that each one of the contingency items that have been adjusted and the information in the packet is through March 31st so that contingency is a different amount. Those are decisions that were made by the Fire Department and also permitting all the way through. We might want to make sure that each one of those contingency items have been carefully logged with backup documentation. What we can do to make this efficient, is have Alderman Budmats meet with the Chief because the Chief is going to be able to describe contingency #6 what was it intended for, contingency #10 why was it done, etc., rather than I sit down. I just want to make sure that the right information gets to the right people. Certainly each contingency log will be pulled. As a suggestion, is have Alderman Budmats meet with the Chief and perhaps RC Wegman, I don't want to make any promises as far as timing but I think that might be the best approach.

Mayor Gallo – I think that’s the only way to go is have Alderman Budmats sit with the Chief who is the acting project manager and discuss any disconnect with the general contractor. If there is not further discussion that we put it a vote to make sure Council allows Alderman Budmats the opportunity to do this over \$200,000. Is there further comment or discussion on postponing this particular payment? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call the Roll to see if we’re pulling this payment out.

AYES: Budmats, Vinezeano, Sanoica
NAYS: O’Brien, Bisesi, D’Astice, Cannon
ABSENT: 0

With 3 in favor and 4 opposed. The payment does not get pulled.

Mayor Gallo – That brings us back to the original warrant. Are there any other items to discuss? Seeing none, the question is shall the Warrant be approved?

AYES: O’Brien, Vinezeano, Bisesi, D’Astice, Cannon
NAYS: Sanoica, Budmats
ABSENT: 0

With 5 in favor and 2 opposed. This Warrant is approved.

➤ **CONSENT RESOLUTIONS:**

The next items on the agenda are the Consent Resolutions. It consists of seven (7) items, items E thru K. Does any Alderman wish to remove any item from the Consent Agenda for Resolutions?

Alderman Sanoica – Item E.

Alderman Vinezeano – Items I, J and K.

Alderman Budmats – Item H.

Mayor Gallo – Any others? Seeing none, the Chair declares it in order for one motion to consider the remaining two (2) Resolutions, items F and G in one motion without debate. Is there such a motion? Alderman Budmats has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman D’Astice. The question is, shall the remaining two (2) Resolutions be adopted?

F) Resolution No. 20-R-44 – Approve a One-Time Bonus for City Manager’s Performance During 2019

G) Resolution No. 20-R-45 – Adopt the 2020 Zoning Map

The question is shall the two (2) Resolutions be adopted? Will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: Vinezeano, Bisesi, D’Astice, Sanoica, Cannon, Budmats, O’Brien
NAYS: 0
ABSENT: 0

With 7 in favor and 0 opposed, the Resolutions are adopted.

Item E was pulled by Alderman Sanoica.

E) Resolution No. 20-R-43 – Amend Resolution No. 10-R-41 to Adjust the Policy Guidelines for the Emergency Family Assistance Program

Is there a Motion to adopt this Resolution? Alderman Sanoica has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Vinezeano.

Alderman Sanoica you pulled this so you have first comments.

Alderman Sanoica – At the Committee of the Whole I requested that we remove the frequency limits on the financial distribution which is currently set at once per calendar year that we remove financial caps on categories such as housing assistance given that the average monthly rent payment is more than doubled the maximum distribution of the current program policy of \$500 and increase overall funding to this program with the anticipated and growing need in our community. I appreciate our residents in the fourth Ward that came forth and spoke on promoting those measures as well. However, after speaking with staff these are items that we need to consider and compare in the context of our entire budget. Staff is continuing to update and work on the fiscal year 2020 initial estimates to be presented at the May 12th City Council meeting as a staff report and at the May 19th Committee of the Whole meeting the fiscal year 2020 initial estimates will be presented to the City Council for discussion. At that time, I would expect City Staff and the Council to identify what we are capable of funding for the Emergency Temporary Family Assistance Fund and any other adjustments to the funding policy and fund administration at that time. Tonight, I would like to propose two changes in two motions regarding program eligibility. After the Committee of the Whole last week our City Attorney looked into the legality of the citizenship requirement as a prerequisite to receive public aid. During her review, Attorney Wolf identified the Illinois Public Aid Code is applicable and essentially provides both United States citizens and lawfully present non-citizens are eligible for cash or other public aid assistance. The Public Aid Code does allow units of local government that do not receive State funding to impose any citizenship requirement as allowed under the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act and that Act provides more restrictive eligibility requirements with respect to immigration and citizenship status. However, since the City of Rolling Meadows receives funding from the State of Illinois for various other programs, the City must abide by the same Illinois Public Aid Code eligibility requirements for public aid assistance with respect to citizenship and immigration status. As such, it is the City Attorney's recommendation that the City amend the policy guidelines for the City's Emergency Temporary Family Assistance Program to provide that an applicant be changed and defined as an individual who is United States citizen or a lawfully present non-citizen as set forth in sections 5/1-11 of the Illinois Public Aid Code in addition to the Rolling Meadows residency requirement. As an Alderman of the municipality, I do not have the ability to propose an amendment that removes these prerequisites that opens up this program to allow for direct distribution to any Rolling Meadows resident regardless of immigration status. State and Federal law restrict my ability to do so at this time. Therefore, I move to amend the policy guidelines for the Emergency Temporary Family Assistance Program as recommended by our City Attorney to provide that an applicant is an individual who is a United States citizen or a lawfully present non-citizen as set forth in sections 5/1-11 of the Illinois Public Aid Code and has maintained their principal domicile within the corporate limits of the City of Rolling Meadows for a continuous period of six months immediately preceding the request for assistance, this is my first motion and I will need a second.

Mayor Gallo - You have a second by Alderman Vinezeano. To that point, is there any discussion on this amendment Alderman Sanoica is making?

Alderman D'Astice - I am in agreement with what the attorney has proposed. I do have a question, what about individuals with warrants or known criminals, do we want to let our taxpayers supplement these individuals as well or can we exclude them?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - Those are policy considerations that can be made by the City Council but those are separate from the citizenship requirement that are being addressed at this point. Alderman D'Astice, those are policy issues that can be considered and decided on by the City Council.

Alderman D'Astice - Okay, this is not the present time but I would ask you to provide language so that we can add this to our ordinance?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - Yes, I will be able to look into your inquiry and when the policy is discussed further you'll be able to have information in that regard so you can provide input on that issue.

Alderman Cannon - I have another question for our Attorney. I was wondering if we could include that the person must have completed the Census for this year (*inaudible*).

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - That's another policy issue that I would have to look into. I think that the Census completion is a voluntary thing so I don't know if it was obligatory. I don't know if there is a prohibition from the Council deciding that issue on a policy level but I can look into that.

Alderman Cannon - Okay, I just think that if we're giving someone money they should at least be counted so we can get State and Federal funds.

Mayor Gallo – Is there any further discussion on Alderman Sanoica's motion with the amendments? Seeing none, will the Clerk call the Roll.

AYES: Bisesi, D'Astice, Sanoica, Budmats, O'Brien, Vinezeano
NAYS: Cannon
ABSENT: 0

With 6 in favor and 1 opposed, those amendments are included.

Mayor Gallo - Alderman Sanoica, the floor is still yours because you said you had a second part to this now that this motion is over.

Alderman Sanoica - Additionally, I would like to move to amend the policy guidelines for the Emergency Temporary Family Assistance Program to waive the continuous period of six months immediately preceding the request for assistance. When the City Council declares a state of emergency including this declared emergency. This would allow a resident who moved into the City of Rolling Meadows in February of this year and then lost their job in March to apply for temporary emergency financial assistance if needed. That would be my second motion is to waive that six months again when the City Council declares a state of emergency.

Mayor Gallo - Is there a second to Alderman Sanoica's request to change the policy guidelines to waive the six month period? Alderman Vinezeano provided the second. Is there any discussion on Alderman Sanoica's request to amend the policy guidelines?

Alderman D'Astice - I have issue with that because with no guidelines an individual technically could rent a hotel room and then apply the next day for assistance. I think the six month waiting period is fair and is effective and I don't think we should have no waiting period because of what I just said. In addition, individuals that we wouldn't want in our City. I'll talk about the criminals who could move into a hotel, rent a room for a week or less and then apply. I would be opposed to not having the six month waiting period.

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - I just want to make a statement with respect to the current policy. I believe that there is proof of residency required via a driver's license/voters registration/property lease or mortgage or other recognized source. I just wanted to point that out that the policy does state that as it's written right now to protect against that situation where someone would be just staying at a hotel. That wouldn't be a valid source of residency.

Alderman O'Brien - I am in support of waiving the six month residency as long as we can verify as Attorney Wolf just said. My question is then, back to Alderman D'Astice, before we vote on this where do we insert the other requirements or stipulations? The one that was coming to mind was that I think there's a Federal or State guideline or law, for example someone that's in arrears for child support or if there's a warrant, where does that get inserted? Does it go to a Committee of the Whole discussion? If we approve this tonight because, I'm in favor after Attorney Wolf just clarified, of waiving it if a state of emergency has been declared by City Council, but I want to make sure that we do address at some point if there is a warrant out for them or if they're in arrears for child support the other guidelines that are in or could be in place where that gets inserted. Is that tonight? Or is that at a Committee of the Whole?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - That's at the discretion of the Council. It is my understanding that these are issues that may need further background information and education of the Council and further discussion but there's nothing stopping a City Council member from making a motion to amend the policy now because it is before the Council at this time.

Alderman D'Astice - In the State of Illinois if an individual resides at a hotel for 30 consecutive nights they're considered a resident. Without having at least a 30 day stipulation someone can check into a hotel, stay 30 consecutive nights and then they are considered a resident. With that said, I would like to include an additional amendment as we move further.

Mayor Gallo - We'll get this amendment finished up here then the floor can be yours if you want to create such an amendment. While we're still on this current amendment for policy guidelines, the six month period that Alderman Sanoica has placed before us.

Alderman Budmats - A question on the amendment, I thought I heard Alderman Sanoica say people who are residents of Rolling Meadows on the day that the emergency was announced which was February 15. I don't think if somebody moved into a hotel room now, I don't think they could prove residency on February 15 or did I misunderstand what she was saying?

Alderman Sanoica - Alderman Budmats, I am proposing that we include in the policy in this resolution, the amendment would be that the six month continuous residency requirement would be waived anytime the City Council would declare a state of emergency, that would include now and include anytime in the future. For example, if there was a natural disaster or a tornado that left several individuals homeless due to damages then we would still waive that requirement if we declare that state of emergency. So it would be inclusive of now and then going forward as well. Did that answer your question?

Alderman Budmats - When you gave your example you said that the people moved in right before the state of emergency occurred so I guess what I'm saying is if they were a resident prior to the state of emergency being declared then we wouldn't have to worry about carpetbaggers moving in after an emergency had been declared to get the funding. I'm just suggesting that you make it that they're resident in the state of an emergency at least prior to the declaration thereof if they want to be eligible for funds as a resident.

Alderman Sanoica - That wasn't the original intent but we can propose that if this fails. I have a question for our parliamentarian because before we began with the agenda items today we had Maggie Trevor who was an individual who was quite involved with this program or had a family member that was quite involved with this program. I would like to make a motion to open up the floor to ask some questions regarding why that six months was included. Am I able to do that in this or do I have to wait for this motion to clear?

Mayor Gallo - I believe we have to wait for this motion to clear and then make a motion to open the floor. Attorney Wolf, is that protocol?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - I believe you're correct, I believe it would be out of order to have a motion to open up the floor at this time.

Alderman Sanoica - I will do my best to speak on Ms. Trevor's behalf with this program. From my understanding the reason that those six months were in place before was to address some individuals, it wasn't widespread, the situation you're describing of anyone abusing or taking advantage of the program and for there to be an easy way for the City to administratively deny funding for bad actors who were known throughout the community. That said, it's not like this is an automatic online form that people complete and once they hit submit and they automatically receive funding. This is an intensive application process that is processed through the City and vetted accordingly. If there were any individuals that were living in a hotel and we discovered that they're living in hotels everywhere and have driver's licenses that prove that they're living in hotels everywhere and there are multiple items that are required in the policy right now including birth certificates. If someone's willing to go through that amount of effort in order to receive a maximum of \$500 for the year of 2020 and that's something that our current program administrator would have to verify and check with other welfare agencies. I believe the popularity of this program is not even that high. I think our program administrator is on today if they wanted to clarify how popular this program is at this point.

Mayor Gallo - This is a good opportunity for staff who is familiar with our Outreach Coordinator Natalia Nieves, if you do have information to share with the Council it might help inform our decision on making this adjustment.

Natalia Nieves, Police Social Services - This program is administered by Joyce DeLeon, it's not administered by me, I hope that's clear. What exactly did you want me to speak about?

Mayor Gallo - Alderman Sanoica brought up something about participants. Alderman Sanoica, I will allow you to repeat the question back to Natalia.

Alderman Sanoica - This might be for Natalia but his also might be for Ms. Joyce as well. My question was, how popular is this program? As Ms. Nieves explained, she does not administer this program at this time.

Joyce DeLeon, HR Specialist – I pulled the files from 2009 after the housing crash and we had about 20-25 applicants. If you want to compare it to when the economy was really tight.

Mayor Gallo – Alderman Sanoica, do you have any additional concerns for Ms. DeLeon right now?

Alderman Sanoica – I don't have any concerns at this point. I just want to make sure that Alderman Budmats if he's going to then frame a motion to change the dates so that the six month waiting period is waived for anyone that moves in after an emergency or did I misunderstand that?

Mayor Gallo – He just meant that it was a safeguard to control somebody moving in after the fact and establishing temporary residency by being in a hotel for 30 days. If they weren't here prior to the declaration of the emergency then it's essentially nullified as a resident because they were not fully established here by the date the emergency was declared which was March 13th I believe.

Alderman Sanoica – Then my follow up for Ms. DeLeon would be that during 2009 were any of the applicants individuals that were longstanding residents within the City of Rolling Meadows? Or were they any individuals that had attempted to apply and were denied because they hadn't met that requirement? Or anything of that nature would help inform the amendment to waive this requirement?

Joyce DeLeon, HR Specialist – No, not the six month requirement as that was easily fulfilled.

Mayor Gallo – At this time, is there any Alderman that hasn't brought up a point on this motion to amend the policy guidelines to waive the six month period? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: Sanoica, O'Brien, Vinezeano, Bisesi
NAYS: D'Astice, Cannon, Budmats
ABSENT: 0

With 4 in favor and 3 opposed, this amendment to change the policy guidelines to waive the six month period is approved.

Mayor Gallo - Now we circle back to the original resolution with amendments unless there are other Council members who have additional amendments they would like to inject.

Alderman D'Astice - I would like to add another amendment that individuals who have warrants and those that owe child support and I would ask Attorney Wolf if there are any other individuals along that line that we should eliminate? Again, individuals who have outstanding warrants and those that owe child support. I don't think they should be given resident taxpayer money.

Mayor Gallo - Is there a second? Alderman O'Brien has seconded the motion. Is there further discussion to Alderman D'Astice's motion to include warrants or owed child support as a factor?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - I just have a need for clarification and maybe I have to provide some legal guidance on the comment regarding warrants. Are we talking about warrants for arrest?

Alderman D'Astice – Yes.

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - Okay, because that can be discriminatory on its impact. We all know that an arrest is not tantamount to a conviction and there's research that shows that arrests can implicate specific classes more than others. I would hesitate from passing anything that relates to warrants for arrest. I can tell you that the federal law prohibits SNAP benefits for those that are convicted of a felony conviction related to drug crimes. That level of conviction is allowable but simply denying someone the benefit based upon an arrest could be discriminatory.

Alderman D'Astice – I will accept your comment and I will remove individuals with warrants and insert what you just said about felony conviction and those that still owe child support.

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - His motion was amended so do we have a second to his amended motion?

Mayor Gallo - Can I get a second to his amended motion to remove warrants and replace with the language that Attorney Wolf provided about felonies? Alderman O'Brien has seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Brien - That was just an example that I was using try to go off of what you did. I'm completely in agreement with a felony conviction if that's the wording we should use. I was just using child support arrears as an example and I'm okay with that coming out. I was just drafting some language and I know we have it in other ordinances and I might look to Chief Nowacki for this. Is there a way to say residents in good legal standing? Or does that put us into a box or example being any felony convictions? I don't want a lot of staff time on this so that might be a question for Chief. I'm guessing one of your officers can check in a database if there are any current felony convictions and it wouldn't be more than a 10 or 15 minute thing? I'm completely comfortable with felony convictions and removing the child support since it was just an example I was using.

Mayor Gallo - This is a motion that's out there right now and maybe to Attorney Wolf's point, maybe it's best that we revisit this parameter setting in a Committee of the Whole. Alderman Sanoica's was very concise and pretty simplistic. I believe the road we're going down with Alderman D'Astice can become a little bit more complex and might warrant a lot more dialogue.

Alderman O'Brien - I don't agree with that but I would not be comfortable moving forward, as I mentioned before, that's why I'd like to address these at the same time because that's why I was comfortable with removing the six month waiting period if we would have these other safeguards in place. That's the only reason why I would ask to move forward with this instead of bouncing it to a Committee of the Whole.

Mayor Gallo - I'm not saying we don't, what I'm saying is let's not use this time to try to generate a laundry list, let's stick with what's in the motion right now and then take the necessary action at a Committee of the Whole we have that liberty.

Alderman O'Brien - Just to clarify, the motion right now would be felony conviction?

Mayor Gallo - Felony conviction and child support.

Alderman O'Brien - Chief, is that something your officers have access to? Or City Staff? Are people in child support arrears readily available? If it's not easily assessable information then I'm okay with that not being in there.

John Nowacki, Police Chief - To answer your questions I would have to do a little bit more research. I know checking someone's criminal history, there are some specific regulations on who we can run the criminal history on whether an arrest or criminal investigation. Just to run an individual to obtain their criminal history for an application process they would definitely need to sign releases in order for us to even do that. I definitely would have to look into that. I know we just can't run someone just to check arrests unless they were arrested and we were looking to charge them with something. There's definitely requirements from the state and federal government on running criminal histories on individuals.

Alderman Budmats - I heard a couple of different things when talking about child support. I heard owed and then I heard arrears in child support. There's a big difference because there's a lot of people who owe child support on a regular basis versus people who are in arrears. I can tell you when I hire someone it usually takes about 3 to 4 weeks maybe even longer before we find out that we have to start removing child support from their check. This is not something that's readily available, it takes the State about a month the process if there's child support that needs to be removed on a regular basis. Whether or not they're in arrears is secondary. I think if it takes that long to find that out for an employer standpoint it would slow the process down in getting approvals to that same degree and if we're trying to provide aid to someone who needs it to have them wait for month while we figure out if they owe or if they're in arrears on child support while those are valid concerns. I think trying to wait to find the answer from the governmental agencies that provide those answers could take a significant amount of time and defeat the purpose of what we're trying to accomplish.

Alderman Bisesi - One thing with the child support, I agree with Mr. Budmats, that it could be extremely time-consuming. It also requires that there's been a complaint and a lot of other things have happened before we would ever be able to detect something like that. I think it's something more for a Committee of the Whole on that particular thing. I would be in support of waiving the six month during an emergency as well as the felony conviction as a reason for denial but I would not necessarily agree with the child support at this time without having further discussion.

Mayor Gallo - To be clear right now the motion is to amend this policy of the Family Assistance Program to utilize the language Attorney Wolf mentioned on felonies and verbatim from Alderman D'Astice child support owed.

Alderman O'Brien - I was just using child support as an example as it could be getting into something that would be in the gray area. It can be completely struck from the ordinance, it was just an example so we wouldn't get into possible discrimination. Attorney Wolf cleared that up by going with the felony conviction route. Just for efficiency we can completely take child support off the table.

Mayor Gallo – Alderman D'Astice, would you make a motion to strike the child support owed?

Alderman D'Astice – Yes, I would.

Mayor Gallo - Alderman O'Brien has second the motion. Okay, now we're just back to the language of the felony on this amendment. Any further discussion on just a language provided by Attorney Wolf on the felony conviction?

Alderman Sanoica - I wanted to state because it sounds like this is coming from a place where Alderman D'Astice believes that taxpayers should only pay for individuals that are upstanding citizens. I want to remind him that his tax dollars also goes to paying for prisons and also goes to paying to feed prisoners and their healthcare within prison systems. Again, the purpose of this fund is for individuals that are in dire emergency financial straits and so whether or not they have a felony conviction in their past and

they're out and they require assistance it makes more sense for us as a City to participate and ensuring they could adjust to society and not return. I will be voting against this measure because I think it is counterproductive to what we're trying to accomplish.

Barry Krumstok, City Manager – I just want to throw this out and comment about felonies that was mentioned, maybe it should go back to manager discretion for the final review as everyone deserves a second chance.

Mayor Gallo - Any further comments on this motion to amend with the language from Attorney Wolf on felony convictions? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call the Roll.

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney – It was mimicking the restrictions that are provided in the federal law regarding these public aid benefits. That law is the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act and the specific felony conviction was related to drug related offenses. That excludes applicants for eligibility for public aid benefits under that federal law. My felony conviction language was specifically related to drug offenses.

AYES: Cannon, O'Brien, Bisesi, D'Astice

NAYS: Sanoica, Budmats, Vinezeano

ABSENT: 0

With 4 in favor and 3 opposed, that language is now incorporated.

Mayor Gallo - That brings us back to the original Resolution with the three (3) new amendments added to it. Is there any further discussion?

Alderman Budmats – I don't know if this is the right time to bring this up, I don't know if it needs to be an arm of this or a second program. In my discussions with Ms. DeLeon this week it seems like there's been a limited use of this program in the last 3 to 5 years. However, with my discussions with Natalia Nieves this week it seems like she's had multiple people who've been able to seek relief and quickly get assistance through applying to the Salvation Army. She has referred many people, victims of crime etc. in Rolling Meadows to them so I think something the City Council should also consider in addition to the program that we're operating but it seems that with limited public interaction when our police social worker is sending applicants and helping applicants get quicker relief from the Salvation Army I think that we should look at or at least hear what Natalia Nieves has to say about that program and it is my understanding that we could earmark funds through them only for Rolling Meadows residents. I don't know if this is the time to bring it up or if I should bring it up of the good of the order or matters not on the agenda but to me that seems like an effective way to quickly get money to residents who need it and they have an application which I believe is also forwarded to Manager Krumstok this week. If we could hear from Natalia as to the benefits of that program and how it interacts with Rolling Meadows presently.

Mayor Gallo - Attorney Wolf, as we're taking the time to re-craft this family assistance program policy here, does it make sense to do this while we're having it open or do it matters not on the agenda or some other time entirely?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - The measure would have to be taken some other time. Right now, the City Code provides that this program is administered by the City Manager or his/her designee. We can't change that without an ordinance change and we don't have an ordinance on the agenda in this regard. What we're considering right now is a resolution regarding the policy so this would have to be a matter considered at another time.

Alderman D'Astice - I'm not sure if this is the appropriate time but I would like to ask staff if they could please investigate what other opportunities are available with Elk Grove Township, Wheeling Township, Palatine Township, Schaumburg Township, Cook County and the Red Cross. Our City is part of each of these townships and I'm under the impression that each of them have something like this program. It's not a part of this resolution but I would like staff to look into that. I would also like staff to check neighboring communities to see if they have a program that gives away money.

Mayor Gallo – I'm sure staff will do that. I know the Northwest Municipal Conference has generated a laundry list of neighboring communities as part of their 65 municipalities that are members and what type of relief programs they're offering and I'm sure staff has a copy of that as well and wouldn't mind forwarding it to you regarding relief and updates and how they do that.

Alderman Cannon – I have a couple questions about procedure. Are we going to have discussion about this at the next COW meeting? Is that my understanding? We're not going to approve anything tonight that's actually going into effect?

Mayor Gallo – Yes, we will be adopting this resolution by the end of this final vote, after these three (3) amendments have been incorporated into it. We can ask, as a Council, to please put this program up on the next COW agenda for discussion. Right now this resolution will be adopted if Council adopts it.

Alderman Cannon – A couple of points I would like to get clarification on. We're talking about adding a bunch of money to this fund that we don't have in there right now and I would like to hear from staff of where the money is going to come from. Is this a one-time thing we're going to fund or are we going to fund this program going forward forever?

Barry Krumstok, City Manager – Currently, this funding is \$5000. I think the idea is to infuse additional money for a one year period. At this point, we have not talked about any money being transferred and it would come out of reserves. At the past Council meeting Alderman Budmats did say to utilize money from a different fund to take care of this and that's part of what staff is looking at but we need to know what number you're looking at and tonight we heard \$100,000. I hope that answers your questions.

Alderman Cannon – Since this was brought up last week, I've had more than a handful of people call me and not one of the residents are in favor because they feel that there is other programs available where people should be going first. There are national, state, county programs plus the townships have funds available for things like this. The people that I've talked to is not in support of this. I think everyone understands that there is a great need out there.

Alderman Bisesi – It sounds like we're going down that rabbit hole again. It is my understanding that tonight we are taking no action whatsoever regarding how much is being funded. Specific requirements other than the topic of waiving the waiting period and changing the residency requirements from being a US citizen to include the people who are here via any other legal means. I think any discussion on anything other than that needs to wait for another time.

Alderman Vinezeano – I agree with Alderman Bisesi. I think we've kind of lost focus in the fact that we're just voting on passing this resolution and the amendments that were made not looking to discuss funding of this program. I'm hoping that this would come back to us at a COW meeting. I, too, had a couple of residents reach out and the fact that we would be taking their tax dollars and helping their fellow residents is exactly what they want their tax dollars used for not for other expenditures during their time of need. I'm hoping as Council members we don't lose sight of that.

Alderman Budmats – I'm moving to call the motion to a vote and close debate.

Mayor Gallo – The motion has been seconded by Alderman Bisesi. Again, the question is shall Resolution No. 20-R-43 be adopted with the three (3) amendments? Will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: Budmats, O'Brien, Vinezeano, Bisesi, Sanoica

NAYS: Cannon, D'Astice

ABSENT: 0

With 5 in favor and 2 opposed, the Resolution is adopted with the three (3) amendments.

Item H was pulled by Alderman Budmats.

H) Resolution No. 20-R-46 – Award a Contract for 2020 Sanitary Sewer and Storm Sewer Rehabilitation Pipe Lining

Is there a Motion to approve this Resolution? Alderman Budmats has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Vinezeano.

Alderman Budmats you pulled this so you have first comments.

Alderman Budmats – I spoke with Director Horne this afternoon trying to find out the necessity of spending this amount of money \$300,000 at this time given the impending financial crisis that is anticipated and asked him what part or all of this could be delayed. His answer to me was that the sanitary portion of this should not be delayed because we have an obligation to keep up with our system for the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District but the storm sewer portion could be delayed for a year without a major problem to our system. By doing so, we would save approximately \$100-\$150,000 and he was going to reissue an item on the agenda and I think it came out around 6:00 pm so I haven't even seen the final number. My motion is to only approve the portion for the sanitary sewer and not for the storm sewer at this time.

Mayor Gallo - Is there a second to Alderman Budmats motion to request paying only for the 2020 sanitary sewer and not the storm sewer at this time? Alderman Vinezeano had made the second. Is there any discussion on this adjustment?

Alderman Sanoica – I just wanted to give the opportunity to Rob Horne to provide additional background on this item as well as in addition to Alderman Budmats' statement tonight just because I know there are a lot of items throughout that were underlined essential. Director Horne, did you want to speak on this item?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works – Alderman Budmats hit on all the important points. The primary point is that we are required by the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District to perform a certain amount of maintenance on our sanitary sewer system annually. While this does not meet that requirement fully it is a good chunk of it, about 60% of the sanitary sewer. Again, the storm sewer work that we proposed is not mandated, however the other work I would consider mandated as it's required by another agency. The primary reason for this is to seal pipes from taking groundwater which the residents ultimately end up paying for in their sanitary sewer bill when they have to treat rainwater. That's why the sanitary portion of this agenda item is fairly critical.

Alderman Sanoica - I just wanted to then clarify that the items that we would be addressing are the critical items to ensure that services is still working. Okay, I see you shaking your head yes.

Alderman O'Brien - We talked about this at the last meeting. Staff had to go back to our business partner for the road resurfacing project since we delayed approving it see if there would be an increase in the cost. So with that in mind, if it would be pulled from this year, which I'm not in support of right now, while it might save us \$100,000 now, next year it could cost \$125,000. I'm making up numbers but that is what staff stated last time when we approved the delay in the road resurfacing project that the contract price wouldn't hold for more than 30 to 45 days. This money has already been allocated and it's in the budget and already earmarked, we might be saving \$100,000 this year but it might cost us additional amounts next year.

Rob Horne, Director Public Works – The general conditions of these contracts that are multi-year contracts done through the municipal partnership initiative, generally allow an increase annually to the contract. To do the same work next year will for sure cost more but to say it is going to cost \$25,000 more would be a little dramatic, it would probably cost and I'm guessing \$3000 to \$7000 more next year to do the same work.

Alderman Bisesi - I agree with Alderman O'Brien as that is the exact thought I had. I'm concerned about what it may cost in the future if we kick the can down the road, not only on this one but especially on the one we had last week, I'm very concerned how much higher things may cost. Right now we're in a period of time where costs are relatively low due to some of the material costs and stuff like that. I'm not even convinced when we come back on May 12th that that number is going to be right anymore because I very much believe that that cost has gone up. I do not want to see us moving things down the road when we have the funds allocated and it's something that needs to be done so I would not be in favor changing anything here.

Alderman D'Astice - I agree with Alderman Bisesi and Alderman O'Brien.

Alderman Vinezeano – Thank you Alderman Sanoica for pointing that out. I did ask staff last week to start helping Council with what is essential and what is not and I did notice in the packet that every item was underlined essential. I'm hoping that maybe in this next week I can clarify with staff on what my intention was or what I was asking for. On this topic, I agree with the other Aldermen, I think the sanitary sewer and storm sewer are essential to our infrastructure and pushing it down the line will cost us more money. I think there are other items on our agenda this evening that I pulled that would be more appropriate in postponing versus sanitary sewer and storm sewer. I am in favor of passing this resolution as it stands initially.

Alderman Bisesi – One last point I wanted to make. I would really not like to pass this amendment unless we have an actual dollar amount of what we would save. The way the resolution is written, whether we take that out or not we're approving \$324,000 because this is not itemized unless I'm missing something.

Mayor Gallo - Director Horne had sent an email with revised numbers.

Rob Horne, Director Public Works – Yes, I can give you the exact number. The total is \$324,000 and if you remove the storm sewer the new contract amount would be \$203,937.50.

Mayor Gallo –Alderman Budmats has requested to remove the storm sewer portion from the rehabilitation of pipe lining resolution. Is there any other discussion? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: Budmats
NAYS: O'Brien, Vinezeano, Bisesi, D'Astice, Sanoica, Cannon
ABSENT: 0

With 1 in favor and 6 opposed, the removal of storm sewer portion of the Resolution has failed.

Mayor Gallo – This brings us back to the original resolution, Award a Contract for 2020 Sanitary Sewer and Storm Sewer Rehabilitation Pipe Lining. Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: O'Brien, Vinezeano, Bisesi, D'Astice, Sanoica, Cannon
NAYS: Budmats
ABSENT: 0

With 6 in favor and 1 opposed, the original Resolution is adopted.

Item I was pulled by Alderman Vinezeano.

I) Resolution No. 20-R-47 – Award a Contract for the Roof Replacement on Well House #6 Located at 1950 Golf Road

Is there a Motion to approve this Resolution? Alderman Vinezeano has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Sanoica.

Alderman Vinezeano you pulled this so you have first comments.

Alderman Vinezeano – To Director Horne, I apologize for not sending you these questions in email earlier. With this roof replacement, is there a reason to believe that the roof would not sustain its integrity for another 6 to 12 months and/or is there damages that we're unaware of that this would be a necessity to replace right now with not having our fiscal numbers that we've requested from staff for the COVID-19 impact?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - I understand the question. The roof is not in good condition, it's over 30 years old as you probably read in the memorandum. The primary reason, as you know the well house is our redundant water supply for our system if JAWA, our water supplier, was to have an issue or the City were to have an issue with the water supply. Right now, we have a telemetry system/computer system/ electronic system and the actual well motor head that are in jeopardy because of the leaking in the roof. With that said, if it were to be delayed six months, I can't say for certain that anything would go wrong. We tried to build a plan where we've been trying to fix things that were neglected in the past and not repair or replace in the timeline that they should have been. We didn't want to do these all at once so we've been trying to do one a year and I believe this is the last station that we have proposed. We have fixed the other ones in the two previous years. That's why I listed as essential because it's part of our water supply system.

Alderman Vinezeano - Just to sum up what Director Horne said, that it's your professional opinion that it's a necessity that we replace this roof now, obviously it's an integral part of our water system. I just want to be extremely clear on that and if that is the case then I'm all for passing the resolution.

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - I wouldn't feel very comfortable with that roof going through the winter.

Mayor Gallo – Is there any other discussion? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: Vinezeano, Bisesi, D'Astice, Sanoica, Cannon, Budmats, O'Brien
NAYS: 0
ABSENT: 0

With 7 in favor and 0 opposed, this Resolution is adopted.

Item J was pulled by Alderman Vinezeano.

J) Resolution No. 20-R-48 – Award a contract for Professional Engineering Services for proposed Drainage Study in the Hicks Road/Kirchoff Road Area

Is there a Motion to approve this Resolution? Alderman Vinezeano has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Bisesi.

Alderman Vinezeano you pulled this so you have first comments.

Alderman Vinezeano – Again, Director Horne, correct me if I'm wrong but I believe this resolution came to fruition because Council had directed staff for this study for the drainage at that intersection and mainly give us some insight to some solutions for the water drainage in that area. Is that correct?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works – Yes, you are correct.

Alderman Vinezeano – With that being said, I know I was one of them that had asked for this. In our time of unprecedented times, I would be in favor of postponing this study at a later time. I don't think that even with the knowledge that we have of the drainage study, we don't have it in our budget to move forward on any solution that they may come to us with and by the time we would the information that they give us may be outdated. That would be my assumption and correct me if I'm wrong. I think it might be premature of us to have this study done at this time.

Rob Horne, Director Public Works – At Council's direction, I got these cost estimates and you will notice there isn't the word "essential" in the description and so I took your direction. However, I did want to bring it to the Council as directed and the Council can vote as they choose.

Alderman Cannon - A quick question for Mr. Horne, I assumed this was going forward because this is in conjunction with our potential bike path along there. Will this jeopardize any of our funding for that we have in line with the Municipal Conference?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - We are in the phase 1 design of that bike path so as far as jeopardizing the bike path, it should not jeopardize that. All it really would have done is give the engineer

that's doing the phase 1 design some alternative information and potential land-use but as it exists right now, I don't think it would have a negative impact on the bike path at all.

Alderman Cannon - Thank you, I'm fine with postponing this.

Alderman Budmats – Correct me if I'm wrong, this is to solve a verifiable flooding problem that exists right now. The sidewalk along Hicks Road is unusable in the winter because it's covered with ice, is that what we're talking about? Or is it only for the intersection down by Kirchoff because I was of the understanding that this is also solving the flooding problem along the west side of Hicks where it continually flood?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - You are right on both counts. The phase 1 engineering design, IDOT will require our drainage study as part of that, however in that drainage study the only focus is on the limits of the project. You'll notice from the memorandum how the red area circles a larger watershed area, that's the difference between the two. In regard to your concerns about the Hicks bike path or sidewalk that is underwater, this study almost overlays that area. In their study it would be counterproductive to redact that area from the study. I guess that bike path area will be studied twice, once through the phase 1 engineering for the bike path and once in conjunction with this overlay area and more of a drainage basin study.

Alderman Budmats - Is it safe to assume that it will be at a much higher cost when we have a separate study for that purpose?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - No, because the study for the phase 1 engineering, the drainage review, has already been approved by the Council and is already underway. I think that's money that's already been spent on that task. This one was a more holistic view of the area not specific to the sidewalk.

Mayor Gallo – Is there any other discussion? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: Budmats
NAYS: Bisesi, D'Astice, Sanoica, Cannon, O'Brien, Vinezeano
ABSENT: 0

With 1 in favor and 6 opposed, this Resolution has failed.

Item K was pulled by Alderman Vinezeano.

K) Resolution No. 20-R-49 – Authorize a Contract for the Purchase of a 2020 Ford Transit - (Replacement of RM226/T362 2008 Ford F-250)

Is there a Motion to approve this Resolution? Alderman Vinezeano has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman O'Brien.

Alderman Vinezeano you pulled this so you have first comments.

Alderman Vinezeano – Again, Director Horne is this essential at this point that we purchase this vehicle? The vehicle that it's replacing can it get us through summer/winter? You can you give us some more information on the vehicle that it's replacing and do we absolutely need this right now?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - The issue is not so much that the vehicle could not last another year if it had to. The bigger issue is over the last several years we take great care with the Vehicle Replacement Committee in reviewing and considering vehicles for replacement and deferring those vehicles as necessary while also trying to keep a balanced expenditure in the fund. What we don't want to end up with is not replacing any vehicles or equipment for two years and then everything going bad in that third year and then not being able to defer any vehicles either. Again, this is one of those vehicles that we did not earmark for potential deferral. We are deferring several vehicles and we do have a meeting with the City Manager and the Finance Director later this week to talk about vehicles and equipment. This is a vehicle that serves the Water Division and those employees usually work by themselves so they don't group up in a vehicle and this vehicle is very tired. We have an outstanding mechanic division, they could keep it running for another year and I think the value of the vehicle would be reduced greatly and we put ourselves in a position that we are having to replace too many vehicles in the upcoming years which might be discovered in the future that we might not want to put ourselves in that position.

Alderman Vinezeano - Thank you, I appreciate you preparing that and giving me explanation. I will be voting in favor of it.

Mayor Gallo – Is there any other discussion? Seeing none, the question is shall this Resolution be adopted? Will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: D'Astice, Sanoica, Cannon, Budmats, O'Brien, Vinezeano, Bisesi
NAYS: 0
ABSENT: 0

With 7 in favor and 0 opposed, this Resolution is adopted.

OTHER BUSINESS & REPORTS:

Mayor's Appointments:

Fire Pension Fund Re-appointment:

Melissa Gallagher

Planning & Zoning Commission Appointments:

Milton Buckingham

Steve Holish – Mr. Holish withdrew his name for appointment.

Suzanne Morrison

I would like Council's approval for the appointment of *Milton Buckingham* to the *Planning and Zoning Commission*. Is there a motion to approve this appointment? Alderman O'Brien made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Sanoica. Is there any discussion? See none, will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: Sanoica, Cannon, Budmats, O'Brien, Vinezeano, Bisesi, D'Astice
NAYS: 0
ABSENT: 0

With 7 in favor and 0 opposed, *Milton Buckingham* is appointed to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

I would like Council's approval for the appointment of *Suzanne Morrison* to the *Planning and Zoning Commission*. Is there a motion to approve this appointment? Alderman Vinezeano made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Sanoica. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: Cannon, Budmats, O'Brien, Vinezeano, Bisesi, D'Astice, Sanoica
NAYS: 0
ABSENT: 0

With 7 in favor and 0 opposed, *Suzanne Morrison* is appointed to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Economic Development Committee Appointments:

Roberta Marcinkus
Alderman Kevin O'Brien
Alderman Jenifer Vinezeano

I would like Council's approval for the appointment of *Roberta Marcinkus* to the *Economic Development Committee*. Is there a motion to approve this appointment? Alderman Cannon made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Budmats. Is there any discussion? Will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: Budmats, O'Brien, Vinezeano, Bisesi, D'Astice, Sanoica, Cannon
NAYS: 0
ABSENT: 0

With 7 in favor and 0 opposed, *Roberta Marcinkus* is appointed to the Economic Development Committee.

I would like Council's approval for the appointment of *Alderman Kevin O'Brien* to the *Economic Development Committee*. Is there a motion to approve this appointment? Alderman D'Astice made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Vinezeano. Is there any discussion?

Alderman O'Brien – Based on our conversation, I really do appreciate and I am honored to be asked to be appointed. As everybody does know, I do travel for work for professional reasons, while I don't see that getting back to normal any time in the near future given the COVID. I did discuss with Mayor Gallo that assuming by next year travel will be back so just in full transparency as always, I will make every meeting that I can but as you do consider Mayor Gallo's appointment request, I deem my responsibility primarily being our City Council meetings as well as the Committee of the Whole. If there is a chance that I might miss a meeting, I would probably have it fall on the Economic Development Committee if I had that flexibility in my travel schedule. I don't see that again this year based on COVID-19 and travel restrictions across the country but just in full transparency as you consider my appointment, I just wanted to be upfront about that.

Mayor Gallo - Will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: Vinezeano, Bisesi, D'Astice, Sanoica, Cannon, Budmats
NAYS: 0
ABSENT: 0
ABSTAIN: O'Brien

With 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 1 abstention, *Alderman Kevin O'Brien* is appointed to the Economic Development Committee.

I would like Council's approval for the appointment of *Alderman Jenifer Vinezeano* to the *Economic Development Committee*. Is there a motion to approve this appointment? Alderman O'Brien made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Budmats. Is there any discussion? Will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: Bisesi, D'Astice, Sanoica, Cannon, Budmats, O'Brien
NAYS: 0
ABSENT: 0
ABSTAIN: Vinezeano

With 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 1 abstention, *Alderman Jenifer Vinezeano* is appointed to the Economic Development Committee.

Mayor's Proclamations: 51st Annual Municipal Clerks Week – May 3-9, 2020
Building Safety Month – May

City Clerk's Report: None

City Staff Reports:

Barry Krumstok, City Manager went over the following:

1) Community Items of Interest:

- 1) Thank you to everyone at the City and in the community who has volunteered their time and efforts for the Mobile Food Pantry. Over the last few weeks, these efforts have provided meals and necessities for hundreds of families. For future Mobile Food Pantry events please see the City's website for information in English and Spanish. In addition, the City would like to thank our business community for donating Rolling Meadows' grocery and restaurant gift cards to families in need.
- 2) For the safety and protection of the community, the Public Works Department prepared "Refuse and Recycling Guidelines" with guidance from SWANCC, emergency response and health agencies. The "Refuse and Recycling Guidelines" follow the "Topics to Mention" and have been posted throughout the City, via social media pages, electronic signs, the website, on Channel 6 and many other areas.

If you or someone in your household show COVID-19 symptoms, do NOT recycle. Bag all recyclables and place them in your trash/refuse cart (if you have one) or at the curb in closed trash bags. Resume normal recycling when no one in your household shows signs or symptoms of COVID-19. If you do not have signs of COVID-19 then continue to place empty, clean and loose recyclables in your City provided recycle cart.

In addition, for everyone, please bag and tie your garbage for the weekly curbside pick-up. Unclosed or damaged bags will not be picked up. To keep our garbage crews safe – open, untied or damaged bags will NOT be picked up. Some tips on how to help if you have issues

with critters: 1) Place garbage at the curb in the morning by 6:00 AM; 2) Double bag smelly waste, and 3) Spray bags with Windex or Ammonia. Please re-bag damaged garbage that is not picked up and save for the next pickup.

- 3) A friendly reminder for safe and proper disposal of gloves and masks – plastic gloves, face masks cannot be placed in recycling bins at home. All gloves and face masks should be placed in a trash bag. When you are out in the community or shopping, please dispose of gloves and masks in a garbage bag and not in shopping carts or on the ground. Let’s keep each other safe and healthy! *Please also maintain social distancing.*
- 4) As a friendly reminder, DO NOT flush any type of WIPES down the toilet! Only flush toilet paper down the toilet. Flushing wipes (even ones that say “flushable”) create sewer issues and back-ups. Do not flush: wipes, disposable wipes, cleaning wipes, cleaning related cloths, Kleenex or other items down the toilet. Dispose of these items in your trash receptacles. This is very important to share with your friends, family and neighbors.
- 5) If you have not done so, please take a few minutes out of your day to respond to the U.S. Census Survey. Rolling Meadows is doing a great job at responding at this time. Rolling Meadows response rate is 62.4% and is outpacing the overall state response at 55.7% (as of April 20th). Everyone “wins” when you respond to the 2020 Census because when everyone is counted, there are more opportunities for shaping our community’s future. As a reminder, you may respond to the U.S. Census survey online at 2020census.gov or by phone at 844-330-2020 or using your printed U.S. Survey to respond by mail. Please respond today!
- 6) A reminder for the community – the Internal Revenue Service announced that the federal income tax filing due date is automatically extended from April 15, 2020 to July 15, 2020. It is best to file by April 15th. The IRS urges taxpayers who are due to a refund to file as soon as possible. The State of Illinois also extended the Illinois income tax filing to July 15th.
- 7) Another friendly reminder for residents and businesses, if you are having a hard time paying your utility bill or food & beverage payments, please contact Finance at (847) 394-8500 or by email at finance@cityrm.org and they may be able to place you on a payment plan.
- 8) Please Shop Rolling Meadows (it is more important than ever). During these times, it is significant to remember our big boxes, restaurants and small businesses.
- 9) We do want to mention Happy Retirement to Community Development Inspector, Vince Glasgow, May 1st is his last day with the City of Rolling Meadows. We do appreciate all that he has done and we hope it’s a long and happy retirement. Rob would like to say a few words.

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - As a result of the extended shelter-in-place order, we are unable to celebrate retirements in the fashion we normally would. I would like to take a moment to take time to recognize the ending of a career for a long time employee. Vince Glasgow started his career with the City in January of 1984, as a Property Maintenance Inspector. He has devoted over 36 years of his life to the service of others, dedicated to protecting the health, safety, and welfare of thousands of residents and business owners who have made Rolling Meadows their home. What most of you probably don’t know is that in 1987, while on duty performing inspections, Vince rescued a woman from drowning in flooded retention area in the City, when he dove into the water and rescued her from her car. While that is certainly impressive, we should consider the thousands of other Rolling Meadows residents, visitors, and business people whose lives have been protected through Vince’s diligent enforcement of the City’s adopted

building codes. This type of dedication to others, and to one organization is not necessarily in vogue in today's world, but the resolve needed to spend an entire career dedicated to the service of others is something that merits our appreciation and respect.

I've never liked the word "retirement", because retirement generally means the "END" of a career. Instead I would ask everyone to join me in wishing Vince the best of luck as he EMBARKS on the next stage of his life, whatever that may be.

Melissa Gallagher, Finance Director went over the following:

2) 1st Quarter Financials

This financial report covers the 1st Quarter (January through March 2020) Budget Comparison Report [this data is unaudited]. The report is a results of operations through March 31, 2020 and is not a financial estimate. All reports are presented on a cash basis (i.e., modified accrual accounting) – meaning that some revenues received and expenditures incurred are attributed to the previous fiscal year. Comments will focus primarily on three key operating funds: the General Fund, the Utilities Fund and the Refuse Fund as of March 31, 2020.

Staff is continuing to update and work on the FY 2020 Initial Estimates to be presented at the May 12th City Council Meeting as a Staff Report. At the May 19th Committee-of-the-Whole Meeting, the FY 2020 Initial Estimates will be presented to the City Council for discussion. It is important to note due to the COVID-19 virus, that this is a fluid environment and there will be continual updates to estimates. Data is being compiled on many aspects of the City's budget (sales taxes, building permits, ambulance billing and many other items). As a reminder, the City's FY 2019 Audit will be presented at the June 16th Committee-of-the-Whole Meeting.

Year-to-date revenue in the General Fund is \$11.7 million which is approximately 10% better than budget for the year-to-date receipts due predominately to receiving the 1st installment of the property tax levy. (The City typically receives approximately 50% of the Property Tax Levy by year end. The property tax levy is 36% of the City's General Fund Revenues.) (Note: Video gaming revenues were on track to exceed the budgeted amounts before the COVID-19 Stay-at-Home Order.) Please remember that on July 1 marijuana sales will be taxed by the City and this revenue will help the City. In addition, the Local Use Tax was trending higher due to online sales (a relatively new revenue part of this tax to the City by state law.)

Total General Fund expenditures amount to \$10.9 million for the year-to-date which is approximately 6% above the budget target of 25%. With the City in receipt of the allotment of the property taxes, a corresponding expense is recorded for pension benefits of about 50% for the police and fire pension funds. As a reminder, the Fire Chief retired in March 2020.

Utilities Fund Notes: Total year-to-date revenues for the Utilities Fund are \$2.7 million (similar to FY 2019) which is approximately 3% below the target for the budget for the year-to-date. Expenditures are trending at about 12% below budget and total \$2.0 million year-to-date. As a reminder, the COVID-19 waivers of late penalties started late March 2020. Current and future capital expenditures are being reviewed. The bond project funds will be spent down for the underground utilities projects.

Refuse Fund Notes: Refuse Fund revenues and expenditures are fairly stable through the year. Revenues are \$539,616 which is on target with the budget. Expenditures are trending lower with \$527,289 spent to date which is approximately 3% below budget (some of this will increase due to landscaping invoices coming in).

City's Fund Structure: As a reminder, each of the City's Funds complies with accounting standards per the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) and the City produces financial statements which follow the Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP).

The City's estimated, unaudited cash position at March 31, 2020 shows \$23.7 million across all funds. The General Fund shows \$5.9 million which is 25% of the total cash on hand is the primary source to pay salaries and City expenses. Continued monitoring of cash reserves will be essential in the upcoming months and in FY 2021.

Melissa Gallagher, Finance Director went over the following:

3) City Operations Update – COVID-19 Response

This is information provided to the Mayor, City Council, residents, businesses and the community.

City Hall and Public Works Offices are temporarily closed to the public, based on health guidelines issued in response to the Covid-19 outbreak. City services continue to be delivered. The City's Emergency Planning Committee is working on preparations for when the State of Illinois stay-at-home order is lifted.

**Access late breaking updates on the City's
COVID-19 Response page at www.cityrm.org.**

Individual web links offer access to a wealth of information on a variety of topics:

- **Weekly video updates** from Mayor Joe Gallo.
- **Online payment options** for monthly utility bills, real estate transfers, and more.
- **Operational updates** for City Departments and information provided by the State of Illinois on the COVID-19 virus.
- **Hours of operation** for grocery stores and other essential businesses around town.
- **Food pantry** resources.
- **Help for small businesses.**

Residents may also stay informed via the City's Facebook pages at
[Facebook.com/cityofrollingmeadows](https://www.facebook.com/cityofrollingmeadows).

City Services and Continuity of Operations

Illinois Governor J.B. Pritzker announced a state-wide shelter-in-place strategy on March 20th to slow the spread of COVID-19. From Police and Fire to Public Works to Finance and Administration, City employees developed and applied creative social distancing to maintain full staffing levels and deliver vital operations while simultaneously protection their own personal health. The City is working on its operational and continuity plans for when the City fully reopens to the public.

- ✓ The Administration, Finance & Community Development Departments continue to operate at this time via phone and email (see www.cityrm.org for various emails).
- ✓ Payments are accepted by the following methods:
 - Online at www.cityrm.org;
 - White Drop Box (City Hall Parking Lot);
 - By mail (City of Rolling Meadows, 3600 Kirchoff Road, IL 60008).
- ✓ There are **NO LATE PENALTIES** for any types of bills.
- ✓ There are **NO WATER SHUT OFFs for Water Bills**.

Restaurants, Gas Stations & Hotels (Food & Beverage Tax Payments & Liquor Licenses): Finance is actively working with businesses to help make payments arrangements that fit their needs. The City of Rolling Meadows is following the State's guidelines for payment extensions for Liquor Licenses (license renewals due now may be paid by July 31, 2020). Some businesses are paying for their Liquor License and some need several months.

Businesses who need to speak about payment arrangements should reach out to Finance Director, Melissa Gallagher at gallagherm@cityrm.org or call (847) 870-9041 to request a payment arrangement. (At this time only four businesses have requested a formal payment plan.)

FY 2020 Financial Estimates: As discussed at the April 21, 2020 Committee-of-the-Whole Meeting, the City is preparing initial financial estimates to be presented at the May 12, 2020 City Council Meeting as a Staff Report. At the May 19, 2020 Committee-of-the-Whole Meeting, the FY 2020 Initial Financial Estimates will be presented to the City Council.

Barry Krumstok, City Manager went over the following:

4) March 2020 New Businesses

We did not have any new business licenses in the month of March. However, we did have some business license compliance applications.

MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA:

Alderman Cannon – We saw new appointments for committees today. Is it my understanding that we're still two short on the Economic Development Committee?

Mayor Gallo – Yes, I have additional names on the list that I will be bring forth going forward.

Alderman Cannon – Same thing with Planning and Zoning? We're short one or two now?

Mayor Gallo – Yes.

Alderman Cannon – Another thing I would ask, I know we had a major change with people who were on the committees before who are no longer there, which is fine, I would hope that you're sending out a professional letter thanking the people who spent years on those committees for the service they provided to the City. I think a lot of those people have been on there for a long time and I think it would be nice to have some sort of a formal thank you sent to them since they get paid nothing. Another thing, as of May

1st the Governor has stated that everyone needs to wear masks outside. I know that it probably doesn't bother some people but to me it's very important. My wife was out shopping at Jewel the other day and she said about 2/3 of the people in the store had not masks on. If you know anybody who has the virus, it's really serious stuff, and some of us that have compromised immune systems it's critical. I wish the City would put it on our cable channel and a better emphasis to make sure people wear their masks when they're outside, it's really important to some of us.

Alderman O'Brien – Based on some resident inquiries, I was wondering on the Committee of the Whole meeting for May if we could discuss the outdoor ordinance smoking in outdoor public spaces. I also did send a note knowing that the gaming is on the Committee of the Whole and it looks like we'll be talking about the emergency assistance, it's completely fine if this gets deferred to June. It was just a request and based on other competing priorities this one is not probably as high as gaming or the emergency assistance so deferring to June would also be at your discretion as you develop that agenda.

Alderman Vinezeano - I just wanted to share again NCH is asking and accepting supply donations for personal protective equipment (PPE) so any local businesses that have any that would be willing to donate. They are also accepting hand sewn masks. You can email supplydonation@nch.org or call (847) 618-0252. These essential workers really need this PPE. This pandemic is far from being over and our supplies will be diminished quickly and we do need PPE in order to care for sick patients. I implore you to please while you're sitting at home get crafty and make some face masks if you can.

Alderman Sanoica – I just wanted to confirm that the Emergency Temporary Assistance Program will also be an item at the Committee of the Whole in May.

CLOSED SESSION:

- 1) **Review Closed Session Minutes – 5 ILCS 120/2 (c) (21) of the Illinois Open Meetings Act**
- 2) **Personnel – 5 ILCS 120/2(c) (1) of the Illinois Open Meetings Act**

Mayor Gallo - There is request to go into closed session. It does require a motion and roll call vote. Is there a motion to go into Closed Session? Alderman Sanoica has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman O'Brien. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: Bisesi, D'Astice, Sanoica, Cannon, Budmats, O'Brien, Vinezeano
NAYS: 0
ABSENT: 0

With 7 in favor and 0 opposed. We will now enter into Closed Session. The audience and press are advised that we do not anticipate taking any action upon returning to Open Session.

Entered Closed Session at 10:18 pm
Returned to Open Session at 11:02 pm

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, by unanimous consent the City Council meeting was adjourned at 11:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted: Judy Brose, Deputy City Clerk

April 28, 2020 City Council Minutes Approved by Council on May 12, 2020.

Judy Brose

Judy Brose, Deputy City Clerk