

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES – March 26, 2019**

Mayor Prejna called the Council meeting to order at 7:31 p.m.

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

ROLL CALL:

Present: Cannon, Budmats, Majikes, Gallo, Banger, D’Astice, Williams

Absent: 0

Mayor Prejna - With 7 present and 0 absent there is a quorum.

Members of the audience are reminded that these proceedings are being videotaped for current and future broadcast over the City’s cable television channel.

Staff Members Present: City Manager Barry Krumstok, Finance Director Melissa Gallagher, Assistant to the City Manager Lori Ciezak, Deputy City Clerk Judy Brose, Fire Chief Terry Valentino, Police Chief John Nowacki, Director Public Works Fred Vogt, Assistant Director Public Works Rob Horne, Business Advocate Martha Corner, City Attorney Jim Macholl

MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES:

Mayor Prejna: The first order of business is to approve the minutes from the February 19, 2019 Committee-of-the-Whole Meeting and the March 12, 2019 City Council Meeting. Is there a motion to approve the minutes? Alderman Majikes made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Banger. Are there any corrections, additions, or deletions to the minutes? All those in favor say aye; those opposed say nay. The ayes have it and the minutes are approved.

MOTION TO DEVIATE:

Mayor Prejna - I am requesting a motion to deviate. Do I have such a motion? Alderman Majikes made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Banger. All those in favor say aye; those opposed say nay. We will deviate from the Agenda.

Public Meeting:

1) Cook County 2019 Community Development Block Grant Program

The Cook County Bureau of Administration requires the City of Rolling Meadows to hold a Public Hearing regarding Cook County Community Development Block Grant Applications for Funding in Program Year 2019.

Let the record show this Public Hearing opened at 7:34 p.m. on March 26, 2019.

The City of Rolling Meadows intends to apply for a Community Development Block Grant for Arbor Drive Roadway and Watermain Improvements – Phase I.

The proposed improvements serve the residents of City of Rolling Meadows, the adjoining Woodfield Gardens Apartments, a commercial area, tollway building. This road also serves residential and business areas in Village of Schaumburg.

City Council Meeting

March 26, 2019

Page 2

No other applications have been received to date for use of Cook County Community Development Block Grant funds for the 2019 application cycle.

Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to speak regarding the Cook County 2019 Community Development Block Grant Program?

The Cook County Bureau of Administration also requires that the City of Rolling Meadows submit potential programs and project needs for the preparation of a Five-Year Consolidated Plan, as required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The Five-Year Consolidated Plan is to include both the needs as identified by the City of Rolling Meadows and any of the non-profit agencies located within the Municipality that wish to submit program and project needs. The Five-Year Consolidated Plan, as currently proposed, includes additional proposed projects and programs from:

City of Rolling Meadows:

- Arbor Drive Roadway & Watermain Improvements Phase I (2020), Phase II (2021) and Phase III (2022)
- Algonquin Parkway/Route 62 Intersection and Public Transportation Improvements (2024)

Rolling Meadows Park District:

- North Salk Park ADA Improvements (2022)

A copy of the Five-Year Consolidated Plan as proposed is attached within the City Council packets and is on file with the City Clerk for public review. It is scheduled on tonight's City Council Agenda for approval by resolution.

Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to speak regarding the Cook County Five-Year Consolidated Plan project and program proposal to be submitted by the City of Rolling Meadows?

Let the record show this Public Hearing closed at 7:37 p.m., March 26, 2019.

Is there a motion to close the floor? Alderman Gallo has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Majikes. All those in favor say aye; those opposed say nay.

Mayor Prejna closed the floor.

MAYOR'S REPORT:

Mayor Prejna – This week I need to correct some statements that were made by the Alderman from the 1st Ward at our last meeting. These are the minutes of the March 12, 2019 meeting. At that time Alderman Cannon stated, *“I sat in my hotel room and watched the tape of the 26th meeting, the first part of that with all the comments was 37 minutes... I would ask you to readjust your timing, in the past when Mr. Rooney was sitting in that chair he always told people that if there were more than four people they all had to reduce the amount of time that they could spend speaking.”* There were only four people who spoke that night for a total of 11 minutes and 15 seconds.

Secondly, I need to speak to the fact that on March 12th Mr. Cannon came back and brought a motion of censure however neither I nor members of the Council, the City Attorney or the City Manager were informed and it was a surprise. It should definitely be out of respect to the Council and members of the Council that you would announce your intentions ahead of time. That has been asked before. I want to

City Council Meeting

March 26, 2019

Page 3

make it clear that censure is a slap on the wrist, someone may be censured a second time for a different offense but no person can be removed from the City Council by censure. I want to make certain that that was made clear.

Also, each one of you were handed a handout this afternoon, the fact that if we're going to be respectful, this is Ordinance section 2.85, Recognition Required before Speaking. Every member of the City Council, prior to his speaking, making a motion or seconding a motion, shall address himself to the presiding officer and say "Mr. Mayor," and shall not proceed with his remarks until recognized and named by the chair. I have spoken to members of the Council individually and I've spoken to you all, we need to show more respect to one another going forward so this evening let us begin anew.

WARD REPORTS:

Mayor Prejna – Are there Ward reports? Mr. Cannon.

Alderman Cannon – Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I would like to offer an apology to some people in my Ward. I had a couple phone calls that I missed from a technology mistake that I made not our staff and I just wanted to reach out to just say I was sorry. I spoke with the people who I missed their call and email and I apologize to both of them and told them the situation. I'm not asking for forgiveness I just want to acknowledge that I did make a mistake. Thank you.

MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR 20 MINUTES:

Mayor Prejna – The meeting is now open 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. 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 and address 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.

City Council Meeting

March 26, 2019

Page 4

- f. Profanity shall not be used in any form or manner.
- g. You will be warned the first time, the second time you will be asked to sit down or leave the proceedings.

Alderman Budmats - Mr. Mayor, point of order. I direct your attention to section 2-81, sub item 6 under the Rolling Meadows Code, which says there's wording that instructs the Mayor prior to hearing public comments to advise the public that the fact that no member of the City Council responds does not indicate that the City Council or any member thereof agrees or disagrees with their comments. If you'd like to look that section up. I've looked at the video from a number of recent past meetings prior meetings as well as this one have not included this announcement as required by Ordinance. In my opinion, this omission which has occurred for significant length of time has led to some accumulative frustration on the part of citizens. This portion of the meeting is an opportunity for citizens to have a voice and most importantly discern that their voices are heard and not ignored. This accumulative frustration has in part caused citizens to comment to a point where you've now determined it's necessary to read lengthen rules and regulations whereas before they were read with abbreviation concerning their limitation on public comments. We as a Council need to encourage public participation even or especially if it comes in the form of words which are uncomfortable to hear. Citizens come before us sometimes with great emotion and sometimes do so in conflict with their own personal preferences against public speaking but they do so for what they deem are for the good of the City. We as Aldermen all have a voice with much less limitation than those citizens who muster up the courage to speak at this portion of the meeting. In my opinion, every citizen brings forth something of value to be used in gleaned from by the Council. Rather than scold or diminish citizens for their comments, we need to listen and reflect on what they do bring in which portions and to what degree they apply to us and to apply those to our decision-making process on the matters in consideration before us. We owe a debt of gratitude to those who come before us and like us they care enough to speak out on those issues which they deem are important to the City. I further believe that future public office candidates will more likely be deterred from serving if they witness the political circus which presently occurs between Council members much more than by witnessing a few citizens that come forward with honest and sharp criticism. In closing, Mr. Mayor I ask that you rule on this point of order as point well taken and that you properly advise the citizens as required by section 2-81 sub 6 in both this and subsequent City Council meetings, doing so will lead to increased mutual respect between the citizens and the Council which has been in my opinion declining for quite some time. It is our job to set by example rather than attempting to dictate to them with a longer dissertation of the rules.

Mayor Prejna – Thank you, Mr. Budmats. I would have appreciated you giving me a heads up on that before the meeting. I have ruled that it will be a point of order. We will include it in the future meetings.

Alderman Budmats – Thank you very much.

Mayor Prejna - The first signatory is Theresa Budmats.

Theresa Budmats – 2620 Benton, Palatine – Mr. Mayor and City Council. I was out of town at the time of the last City Council meeting on March 12, 2019. I watched a video replay of the meeting and I wish to provide clarity, perspective as well as a response to the personal criticisms that were directed towards me by name during the meeting. In my original remarks at the February 26, 2019 meeting I invited further conversation and yet I received only one phone call from a member of this Council and City Government looking to discuss my comments and their reasoning. Yet I did receive at least a dozen direct messages, phone calls and emails in support of my comments from both citizens and business leaders of Rolling Meadows, some I have never even met prior. This kind of response from the citizens and lack of response from those who my comments were addressed means I struck accord and demonstrates the distance between City Government and the citizens. I have observed many meetings where citizen after citizen

City Council Meeting

March 26, 2019

Page 5

have come forth to express their majority desires and concerns only to then witness the Council vote directly against their partition with little or often times no discussion. I believe this kind of response is more the reason why the citizens of Rolling Meadows will choose not to want to get involved in city government versus the remarks I made four weeks ago. The timing of my remarks were most definitely not politically motivated or connected to the upcoming election as accused. My comments were only a direct result and response to the actions that took place at the two City Council meetings immediately prior to my remarks. The fact that those actions occurred prior to an election is the only reason my comments were made close to an election. I appreciate that the City Council spends a lot of time preparing and reading for City Council meetings but it does no good to read documents and not offer mutual respect and acknowledgment of the citizens who come to have their voices heard. The documents and the citizens deserve the same level of consideration. I am happy to apologize for my previous comments if they came across as harsh or unfair but I will not apologize for raising the issues I brought forth. My words were rooted in the amount of frustration I have experienced and the embarrassment I have felt over the last several months by some of the decisions and actions of this Council. As I stated in my original remarks, I am still open to further conversation and welcome anyone to reach out to me directly for discussion. I hope my comments today are accepted in the spirit that they're offered and that the City Council can move forward in a positive light with and for the entire City. Thank you.

Mayor Prejna – The next signatory is Karen McHale.

Karen McHale, 2703 Old Mill Lane, Rolling Meadows – I first want to thank you for your service to our Community, I know that it can be a thankless, time consuming and often difficult position. I'm here today on behalf of my neighborhood to urge Council to reconsider the electronic sign that is to be erected at 2550 Quentin Rd., Quentin and Silent Brook Lane. I have personally tried to get information on the sign before the final vote to no avail which is what brings me here today. I first heard of this sign around December in a Facebook community page which the agenda of the City Council meeting was being discussed. I asked where I can find some details of this electronic sign to which Mr. Dave Whitney of the Planning and Zoning Commission kindly gave me his phone number. I called him and he gave me some basic details about the sign, this was around December 18th. I was under the impression that at this point and time that there was quite a few more steps that needed to be taken before it became a reality. At this point there had only been approval granted that signage would be allowed on this parcel of property. I called the Ward 1 Alderman, Mike Cannon around that time on the stated phone number on the City's website and left him a message because I had questions and concerns about this issue. I had been looking through the City Councils meeting minutes and did not see it come up again and I figured I would just keep an eye out if any information popped up.

Plum Grove Creek has a neighborhood group that keeps us connected through various outlets, social media, neighborhood events, etc. and we decided that a newsletter would enhance our communications throughout our neighborhood. I thought I would write something up in the newsletter about the sign, it came up briefly as a topic of conversation in our neighborhood at a couple past events. No one is aware of the possibility of an electronic messaging center or knew any details. I wasn't planning on putting an opinion whether it was a good idea or not just details of what was proposed and maybe a picture. On March 6, 2019, I sent an email to the Ward 1 Alderman email address as stated on the City's website with questions and concerns regarding the sign to include in my newsletter for the neighborhood. March 12, 2019 at the City Council meeting the sign is up for a vote and gets approved. How can that be? I've been trying to get information about the sign since December and have gotten no response and now it's approved for installation. This is such an odd spot for an electronic message board, a residential area where there is no stoplight or stop sign and cars are cruising past at 35 mph that's if they're going the speed limit. How are people going to read and retain that information? What information are we trying to relay that cannot be done via email, social media or the newsletters that I get with my water bill? I can tell you that just about every person in my neighborhood that I spoke to about this sign does not think that this is good

City Council Meeting

March 26, 2019

Page 6

placement or good use of taxpayer money and of those people in my neighborhood that I spent hours talking to and making aware of this sign not even one knew that this was happening until it was a done deal. That is not right. Where is the conversation? How did we not know that this was a possibility? I have no doubt that intentions are good however I personally believe that this not the most well-thought-out plan. I feel that I did what I could in attempting to obtain more information about this to bring to the attention to my community. I don't feel that my representatives actively listened to or communicated well enough in response to my concerns and I'm still waiting for a response. I'm sorry Mr. Cannon but I have not heard from you yet in response to my email. I'm requesting the Council to go back on this one and take a look and really listen and hear what the residents of Rolling Meadows are asking and I thank you for your time and service to our Community.

Mayor Prejna – The next signatory is Nancy Mau.

Nancy Mau, 2609 Old Mill Lane, Rolling Meadows – I've been living in Ward 1 for nearly 16 years. My Alderman Mike Cannon told me last week that he hasn't checked his aldermanic phone messages or emails since last fall when he lost his cell phone. He never set up his aldermanic communications when he obtained his new phone and failed to notice that he wasn't hearing from his constituents. My neighbor Karen McHale and I both contacted him more than once about the sign to be installed on Quentin near the entrance to our subdivision. As he voted yes for the sign without input from his constituents, I'm asking for you to please reopen this topic for a new discussion and vote. The original vote was taken and ultimately approved even though affected constituents questions and concerns were not mentioned or addressed. I was told by the City Manager that the deposit had already been made to the vendor but I see tonight you're voting on the easement for the sign. Why would you have made payment before all aspects of the project have been approved? In just a week's notice, despite neighbors traveling for spring break, Karen McHale and I were able to speak out to well over 50% of the households in our neighborhood. 99% of those we were able to reach opposed to sign. We have a list of all the signatures and a map showing you how much of our neighborhood oppose this sign. We oppose for several reasons. First, an electronic sign with red scrolling information doesn't fit in with the aesthetics of our neighborhood and should be put with commercial property. I can't understand how the Planning and Zoning Commission approved such a sign on land zoned residential. I was told the sign was originally to be put on Plum Grove Road by the fire station and it changed to Quentin because the fire station is being sold. We are better off without an additional sign then one placed just because we have access to land. Alderman Cannon stated in an email response to one of our neighbors that this was plan B and not ideal. That a sign was seriously researched and discussed for Plum Grove Road. I received a FOIA request today from Judith Brose the Deputy City Clerk for Rolling Meadows for all the discussion regarding the sign on Quentin and the only information that I was able to find was discussion from the Planning and Zoning Commission nothing from City Council discussing the sign on Quentin. The Planning and Zoning Commission inquired about if a traffic study had been done, if a photometric study to determine how the light would impact the neighbors. No studies were done for the land zoned residential and I fail to understand why the Planning and Zoning Commission approved the project. I also question why the City Council didn't have any discussion on this project and failed to act as a check and balance on the Planning and Zoning Commission. More importantly as neighbors and friends of the houses on Silent Brook, we are concerned about the financial hit these homes will face as the sign shining into their backyard and even housing will devalue their home. I ask the City Council, have you guys contacted the home appraiser to calculate their losses? I know if they try to sell their homes right now with the sign they're going to take a huge financial hit. Cars will be driving a minimum 35 mph looking at a sign where there isn't a stop sign or stop light, how is this not a distraction for drivers and how much information can they really absorb driving that fast? For safety reasons we are concerned that the sign placement will block our vision we look southbound to make a northbound turn to turn onto Quentin. My husband and I stood where the proposed sign will be placed at the intersection and we really believe visibility will be reduced. I know that the goal of the sign is to reach out to Rolling Meadows residents who live west of Route 53, but how many Rolling Meadows

City Council Meeting

March 26, 2019

Page 7

residents drive down Quentin especially between Silent Brook and Hartung? My entire neighborhood, we polled them when we were going door to door getting signatures and pretty much everybody said if they leave and they want to go northbound they go out Silent Brook, if they want to go southbound they go out Hartung, they never pass that stretch of road. So the people driving down Quentin are primarily residents of Schaumburg and Palatine not Rolling Meadows. Thank you so much for your consideration in this matter.

Mayor Prejna – The next signatory is Patricia Callahan.

Patricia Callahan, 3400 Wellington Ct., Rolling Meadows – Good evening Mayor and City Council. Each one of you holds the future of the Rolling Meadows downtown in your vote. Commerce whether it's services, retail or restaurants balances the residential. Too much residential creates commerce leakage to get the services not available in our downtown. Leakage equates a loss of tax dollars which must be made up. Our local tax base is high enough. Past decisions and votes of this Council and others have closed the door on commerce for this downtown and community. The Dominick's lot is the last chance for the downtown Kimball Hill built. Communities that have been built with a downtown of shopping centers have city leaders found ways to reinvent with the times not tear down commerce structures and replace with residential. Sunday I've sent all of you a thesis by Dr. Begashaw, Director of the Economic Department of Harper College, I hope that you were able read at least the conclusion. I apologize for the error of the number of pages. The thesis contains factual information that states there needs to be a balance of commerce and residential. Actually more commerce allows a community to prosper. Replacing residential where commerce is a detrimental and long-term liability to the community. Without creating more commerce within a community all the city is creating a higher tax base for the residential. I'm urging each of you to do the right thing for the residents and future residents to vote no on Taylor Morrison. Thank you very much.

Mayor Prejna – The next signatory is Annette Szafran.

Annette Szafran, 2309 Central Rd., Rolling Meadows – I come before you because I'm just a little bit confused on what's going on, like a lot of us are. It seems to me that when we were at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting it received a no vote on Meadows Square because of height and closeness to Meadow Drive. Then at the last Committee-of-the-Whole meeting they took an informal straw vote that went forward. Now it looks like on the agenda approve final development. So if there were questions about the structures didn't it have to go back to the zoning board to see if their plans included what you wanted or are you just letting them say okay we made the changes, we added a few nicer colors. They basically took the Ryan Home plans, took their name off and put their name on and now we're moving forward. How much time did you have to study Morrison plans not the Ryan plans because I'm considering them gone and away. How much impact does an informal straw vote carry? I would think that it would have to go back to the plan commission to include the changes that you requested to make sure that the plans when they're on file for the future are in agreement with what you wanted. The height had to be changed and the closeness to the street. Secondly, why is there such a rush by this Council to make this approval? I have this feeling, like many of the residents, you want to hurry up and rush this through. I don't know why, I don't know what promises were made to Morrison but this should be tabled. You know an election is coming up I think that's the reason behind pushing a final approval through at this particular time. You guys need to stop and think just like these ladies that were talking about the signage, nobody ever does that. You take a vote and boom it's done. This Council has lost trust because you rush things through all the time. Not one instance. many many many times. You don't cross your t's and you don't dot your i's, you just rush it through because you want this notoriety to be on this Council. Stop already. We don't need people to rush through things, we need people that are intelligent and look at things and ponder it and give it the right reasoning. If it needs to go back to the zoning commission to make sure that they've got all the things in place, please do that. Don't skip over a process because you want to hurry it along.

City Council Meeting

March 26, 2019

Page 8

Morrison will be here for the next several months, years, whatever. We don't need to give them final approval tonight or any other night until it's a done deal.

Mayor Prejna – The next signatory is Maggie Trever.

Maggie Trever, 3905 Redwing Court, Rolling Meadows – I am here today about 19-R-20 which is the authorization of the submittal of a grant application for the Hicks/Euclid bike path. I'm here to both answer any questions you may have when this comes up as a member of the Environmental Committee and the bicycle liaison to the Traffic Committee but I also would like to add a couple of things that I think are really important to keep in mind. First of all, the bike path along Hicks from Kirchoff to Euclid addresses a very serious issue in terms of flooding of the sidewalk. I took a picture that should have been submitted to you that shows how hazardous this is for both bicycles and pedestrians. It was impassable this March with ice and slush from the snowplows. Also, I want you to keep in mind that this section of the bike path was part of the bike path master plan as well as being consistent with the Comprehensive Plan which the Council approved. In addition, again keep in mind that this is only approval to submit a grant application, it's not approving any funds. You're simply allowing us to go forward with pursuing this grant. I also want to point out that this grant would provide 80% of the funds for this project which is an incredible return on our investment especially since this is such an important project for safety for bicycles and pedestrians. Again, I will be here for any questions you may have about this. Thank you.

Mayor Prejna – The next signatory is Karen Gill.

Karen Gill, 2408 Martin, Rolling Meadows – I am here as the Rolling Meadows Environmental Committee Chairperson. I am also in support of Resolution 19-R-20. Our membership feels it's important to get another section of bike path connected between Kirchoff and Euclid on Hicks. By having a bike friendly infrastructure will protect the walking pedestrians and keep the riding cyclists safe from accidents. Having more bike riders in the community is good for the public health and the environment. This is an opportunity for better connectivity of our paths and improve the mobility of our community in and around Rolling Meadows. By having a bike friendly infrastructure will cut down on the carbon emission pollution in an area that at times has heavy car traffic and consistent airplane traffic. By connecting this we will allow people from the north and people going north to Countryside Park. We will also be able to have people coming south into Rolling Meadows. They can get to the community events, the parks, the library, the Salt Creek corridor and Emily's Prairie, just better transportation into Rolling Meadows. Again, Rolling Meadows Environmental Committee is in favor of this. I would also like to add, we have earth Day coming up on April 27.

Mayor Prejna – The next signatory is Dale Engelking.

Dale Engelking, 3206 Plum Grove Drive, Rolling Meadows - Just want to remind everybody that there is an election coming up next week. When you vote for an Alderman, remember that they are to represent the people in their Ward. It's not about I, I, I or anything like that, it's about we as a community, as a town. The majority of the Council, I feel it's only about them and they want to push the agenda that they want. There's a couple councilmembers and they know who they are that vote according the way the people want. I just think for you Mr. Mayor to try to silence us and try to silence the Council members from speaking is an insult to the residents of Rolling Meadows because we're paying your wage, it's our town, we pay the taxes and I believe with the new election coming up that it's not about I, I, I, it's about we as a town. That's all I have to say. Thanks.

Mayor Prejna closed the floor.

City Council Meeting

March 26, 2019

Page 9

Mayor Prejna - The Council moves on to its first order of business, Consent Ordinance, 2nd Reading.

➤ **PENDING:**

A) Resolution No. 19-R-20 – Authorize the Submittal of a Grant Application for Illinois Transportation Enhancement Program (ITEP) Fund for Hicks/Euclid Bike Path Extension (tabled at 2/12/19 & at 2/26/19 City Council Meetings)

At the February 26, 2019 City Council meeting, a vote on this proposed resolution of support for a grant application was POSTPONED until the March 26, 2019 City Council meeting, to obtain more information on the project. The additional information is included in the Agenda Packet.

This Resolution, if adopted, would authorize the submittal of a grant application to ITEP for the proposed construction of a bike path on the west side of Hicks Road (from Kirchoff Road to Euclid Avenue), and on Euclid Avenue (from Hicks Road to the Countryside Park entrance). This route is identified in the City's Master Bike Path Plan.

Is there a motion to adopt this Resolution? Alderman Majikes has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Banger. Is there discussion?

Alderman Williams - I have taken this under a good deal of consideration, I am a bit of a neophyte here, being here only eight months. I have two problems with this bike path grant. On the surface it sounds like a great deal where we only pay 20% and the City gets the other 80% elsewhere. I have measured the total distance of this segment of the bike path and it is one half of a mile. The cost to Rolling Meadows is proposed to be \$240,000 with a total cost of \$1,083,000. We are being asked to commit to a payment of this sum of money potentially in 2021 or 2022. Right now the total annual budget for our road repairs is \$1,250,000 per year which means we are being asked to commit an amount equal to 20% of our now annual road repair budget 3 to 4 years from now without knowing whether we will even have the money or that it won't be desperately needed for road or other infrastructure repairs at that time.

My second problem is the projected cost of this half mile bike path. According to the Midwest Economic Institute the cost of 1 mile of asphalt 1 lane road in the state of Illinois is \$60,000, \$52,000 for construction and \$8000 in engineering costs. I'm willing to assume that this number is wrong by 10 times so 1 mile of asphalt road would cost \$600,000. This leads to a question why does half a mile of bike path cost almost \$1.1 million?

Taking both of these items into consideration, I simply cannot vote for the City to commit spending ¼ of \$1 million 2-3 years from now on something that seems to be way overpriced when we may badly need the funds to bring roads in town up to par and there may be other infrastructure items, floodwater control, water lines, etc. that may need the money. If we commit to this now we will be forced to carry through regardless of our then needs because if we don't there will be a political price to pay for the City's reputation and our ability to get future grants. I just don't like possibly putting the City in a position that limits what we can do and when we can do it in the future on a very iffy item in the first place. I will be voting no.

Mayor Prejna – Any further discussion?

City Council Meeting

March 26, 2019

Page 10

Alderman Budmats – A question for Mr. Vogt. This area is subject to flooding and if we're going to put this bike path in this area, will this transfer into greater flooding for the residents who are on Adams, on the east side of Adams where their backyards would become the lowest point and they would flood there instead of flooding now in the sidewalks on the other side of the fence where it currently floods, the proposed area of the bike path?

Fred Vogt, Director Public Works - My response to that question is, that's why we do Phase 1 Engineering Design. We have to study the entire corridor, study the drainage patterns that exist not only in Hicks Road proper and Euclid Avenue but also the adjoining properties. I would expect in the Phase 1 Engineering Study, identified situations where drainage would have to be correctable by either ditches or retaining walls or by combination of even storm sewer, storm pipes, storm structures which I think in worst case, talking specifically about the adjoining properties may require easements to be obtained in order to accommodate the drainage. We would certainly look at the possibilities of swales to keep costs down but storm sewers or storm drainage structures and the like might be an option depending on how that bike path is designed. Phase 1 identifies all options and preliminary costs and certainly would provide for solutions to not create any problems.

Alderman Budmats - With those solutions would they be included in that \$1,080,000 fee or not really?

Fred Vogt, Director Public Works - We believe so, yes.

Mayor Prejna – Further discussion?

Alderman Gallo - I was not aware that would be justifying or defending the need to have bicycle lanes are additional bicycle paths throughout a community. Understanding that in the future this is what generations that are younger than myself are looking for and toward for multi-mobile use for transportation to and from work. So I don't have many statistics in front of me but I do know that it's a \$6 billion industry, bicycling is, and the nation's \$60 million annual recreational bicyclists spent \$46.9 billion on meals, transportation, lodging, gifts and entertainment. One study estimates that the spillover effect for all bicycling related activities could be as large as \$133 billion supporting 1.1 million jobs in generating \$17 billion in federal and state taxes. When we look not just today but toward tomorrow that it's a sound investment and we expect to get some return on that investment by making our community more appealing for younger generations.

Mayor Prejna – Further discussion?

Alderman D'Astice - If we apply for the grant and are lucky enough to receive it, do we have an option to turn it down in the future or must we accept it?

Fred Vogt, Director Public Works - That's always an option at any stage of a project. We've had other grants that have been tenuous at best with regards to proceeding through the various processes. The City Council always gets the opportunity should we be fortunate enough to make the grant application, to get acceptance of it, to schedule that work with input of the Council an annual basis. Staff estimates if we are successful the project would at least a three-year timeframe from the start and completion of Phase 1 Engineering, IDOT's review of the Phase 1 report and then doing the final design and engineering leading into construction, it may even be a four year process. It is over a several year period. If we were to turn down the grant later, it's hard to say whether that would affect future grant opportunities. It certainly wouldn't look favorably on us at that point but every Council may have reasons to turn it down or deferring it. We've always been able to request extensions if there are issues including financial ones.

City Council Meeting

March 26, 2019

Page 11

Alderman D’Astice - I just want to make sure that I understand the pricing. \$823,000 for construction and that includes pedestrian traffic signal. Can you explain what the pedestrian traffic signal is? Land acquisition, that’s \$80,000 that we’re estimating that we will have to purchase to offset the flooding. \$80,000 for utility relocation that’s relatively straight up. Then \$100,000 for design and construction engineering, that’s typically 10% of the cost and that could be somewhat fluid. My main question is can you tell me more about this pedestrian traffic signal?

Fred Vogt, Director Public Works - The traffic signals that are currently located at the intersection of Hicks and Euclid are simply traffic signals for the vehicles, there are no pedestrian signals. In order to build any bike path project using federal monies one has to provide safe means of crossing the street. It’s very similar to what we have at Rowling and Euclid, when that bike path was built to go from North to South across Euclid there are pedestrian signals that was put in as part of the project. That’s what this money would be used for, to install the pedestrian signals on the existing traffic signals.

Alderman D’Astice - Do you have an estimate on how much that’s going to cost?

Fred Vogt, Director Public Works - The estimate per what’s in the packet from the City Engineer who put this together year ago is \$65,000.

Mayor Prejna – Further discussion?

Alderman Majikes - What is the timing for applying for this grant? Why does it need to be applied for? Is there a specific date?

Fred Vogt, Director Public Works - I don’t know exactly the date. I believe the timeframe for the ITEP grants is a summer submittal.

Mayor Prejna – Further discussion? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: Budmats, Majikes, Gallo, Banger
NAYS: D’Astice, Williams, Cannon
ABSENT: 0

Mayor Prejna - With 4 in favor and 3 opposed this Resolution is approved.

B) Ordinance No. 19-23 - Authorize Reserving the City’s 2019 Home Rule Private Activity Bond Volume Cap (2nd Reading)

This Ordinance, if adopted, would reserve the City’s 2019 private activity volume cap so that should there be a future project the volume cap can be sold or transferred for a fee.

Is there a motion to adopt this Ordinance? Alderman Banger has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Majikes. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: Williams, Cannon, Budmats, Majikes, Gallo, Banger, D’Astice
NAYS: 0
ABSENT: 0

Mayor Prejna - With 7 in favor and 0 opposed this Ordinance is approved.

City Council Meeting

March 26, 2019

Page 12

C) Ordinance No. 19-24 - Amend 106-18(a) of the City Code – Parking Prohibited in Specific Places – Meadowbrook Drive (2nd Reading)

This Ordinance, if adopted, would establish additional parking restrictions in certain locations on certain public streets in the City; specifically, on the south side of Lois Drive and on the west side of Meadowbrook Drive. These streets already have “No Parking” signage posted on the north side and east side of the streets, respectively, per Ordinance 18-58. The inclusion of these street locations within the City Code, Traffic Section 106-18(a) will establish enforcement of traffic regulations, and consistent posting of signs.

Is there a motion to adopt this Ordinance? Alderman D’Astice has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Williams. Is there any discussion?

Alderman D’Astice - This is in my Ward and I have had contact with the company US Waterproofing. They were concerned initially about the prohibiting and I’m happy to say that Mr. Vogt and I walked the area, made some determinations and now US Waterproofing which is a great company in town are in support of this action. Be that as it may I will be voting in favor of this.

Mayor Prejna – Further discussion? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: Cannon, Budmats, Majikes, Gallo, Banger, D’Astice, Williams
NAYS: 0
ABSENT: 0

Mayor Prejna - With 7 in favor and 0 opposed this Ordinance is approved.

➤ **CONSENT ORDINANCES (1st Reading):**

Mayor Prejna - The next item on the agenda is the Consent Ordinances in for 1st Reading. It consists of three (3) items D thru F. Does any Alderman wish to remove an item from the Consent Agenda for Ordinances?

Alderman Budmats – I would like to pull item D and F.

Mayor Prejna – We no longer have a consent agenda. We will take them one at a time.

Ordinance D was pulled by Alderman Budmats.

D) Ordinance No. 19-00 – Adopt the City’s 2019 Comprehensive Land Use Plan Update (1st Reading)

This Ordinance would adopt the proposed update to the City’s Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

The 2019 Comprehensive Plan Update has been prepared by the City’s planning consultants, Teska Associates, during a nine (9) month period of time (June, 2018-March, 2019). Public engagement efforts included online web page access, focus groups, workshops, and public hearings. The Plan is intended to be a guide and tool for evaluating future land use, development, and redevelopment proposals considered by the City.

The document is available for viewing online at www.plan4rollingmeadows.org.

Do I have a motion to move this forward for the 2nd reading? Alderman Banger has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman D’Astice. Mr. Budmats you asked for this to be pulled, you have the first comments.

Alderman Budmats – This document is something that we only purchase once every 10 years, so I really think there would be value in it seeing that 20% of the citizens of Rolling Meadows are Spanish-speaking or Hispanic in nature, that we would have this document available in Spanish. I’ve looked into it and a different citizen has also come forward with several quotes, this could be accomplished for less than \$5000. To be able to reach our 20% of our citizens in a different language with a document that is really important to the City that’s only produced once every 10 years, I would strongly urge Staff to consider having this translated into Spanish so that all of the citizens of Rolling Meadows can easily access this and utilize this very important document.

Mayor Prejna - Is there further discussion?

Alderman Gallo – I can’t be a master of all things and I’ve weighed my opinion against this Comprehensive Plan with other nongovernmental organizations who also check to see what communities and municipalities are doing in the northwestern region of Illinois and the southeastern region of Wisconsin so tonight I will be declining this but not to put a kibosh on it but to wait until I hear more conclusive evidence that we are moving in the appropriate direction with the greater portion of the region of our state and the southern region of Wisconsin.

Mayor Prejna – Any further discussion? See none, will the Clerk please call the roll.

AYES: Budmats, Majikes, Banger, D’Astice, Williams, Cannon
NAYS: Gallo
ABSENT: 0

Mayor Prejna - With 6 in favor and 1 opposed this Ordinance will be moved forward for the 2nd Reading.

E) Ordinance No. 19 – 00 – Approve Amendment to the Continental Towers Planned Development for Electric Vehicle Charging Stations – 1701 Golf Road (1st Reading)

This Ordinance, if adopted, would allow an amendment to the existing Continental Towers Planned Development to allow three (3) Electric Vehicle Charging Stations in the parking lot.

Do I have a motion to move this forward for the 2nd reading? Alderman Majikes has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Williams. Will the Clerk please call the roll.

AYES: Majikes, Gallo, Banger, D’Astice, Williams, Cannon, Budmats
NAYS: 0
ABSENT: 0

Mayor Prejna - With 7 in favor and 0 opposed these Ordinances will be moved forward for the 2nd Reading.

Ordinance F was pulled by Alderman Budmats.

F) Ordinance No. 19 – 00 – Approve Final Planned Development for 2819-2915 Kirchoff Road – Meadow Square (1st Reading)

This Ordinance, if adopted, would grant final approval of a Planned Development of 106 townhome units, including stormwater detention facilities, private streets, and common areas/open space, for the property commonly known as 2819-2915 Kirchoff Road, Rolling Meadows.

Do I have a motion to move this forward for the 2nd reading? Alderman Banger has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Cannon. Mr. Budmats you asked for this to be pulled, you have the first comments.

Alderman Budmats - I listened that the Environmental Committee ruled on the Hicks Road bike path but I see nothing in the packet about how the Environmental Committee reviewed the plan for this particular item 19 – 00. I looked at the map that they provided for the Hicks Road and includes the bike path which is in front of the property in question where it clearly shows that the bike path but part of the packet does say that they will be removing the bike path but the Environmental Committee hasn't ruled on this or even discussed it according to the packet. Can we please have the Environmental Committee look at this and get back to us and give us ruling? We wouldn't want to discount their opinions and as much as we used it already consider other matters tonight?

Mayor Prejna - This is the first reading.

Alderman Budmats - I don't know how often they meet.

Mayor Prejna - I'm sure they're willing to do a special meeting. Is there further discussion?

Fred Vogt, Director Public Works - In regards to Alderman Budmats question, the Environmental Committee has not weighed in on this, certainly they can at their next meeting which is in early April. When Staff looked at this proposal with regards to the considerations for the building location fronting Meadow Drive and looking at our master bike path plan that was last revised in 2017, the section on Meadow Drive to the south is called for to be a future bike lane not to be an off street bike path. That was the consideration that Staff put into the proposal that you see before us with regards to taking the existing 10 foot wide sidewalk or bike path as it was constructed 20 years ago that terminates at the south end of the former Dominick's site. To recognize what the bike plan path says is consistent with that, that's why you see what you see tonight.

Mayor Prejna – Further discussion?

Alderman Budmats - Can I make a motion to allow the Environmental Committee have a meeting about it and discuss it so that we know what their recommendation is, seeing that we care about what their opinion is about this other bike path, I can't imagine discounting it about this? I like to move that we let the Environmental Committee do their job.

Mayor Prejna – Mr. Vogt further comment.

City Council Meeting

March 26, 2019

Page 15

Fred Vogt, Director Public Works - We can put that on their next agenda, they're tentatively scheduled to meet on Tuesday, April 2, 2019. I believe they may be moving that meeting because of the election but whatever date that next meeting will be, we'll put that on their agenda.

Mayor Prejna - They will bring back to us at the April meeting.

Alderman Budmats - So can we table this until after that?

Mayor Prejna – This is the first reading, they can bring it back to us for the second reading and you can adjust it then or you can table it.

Alderman Budmats - I would move the table it.

Alderman Budmats has made the motion to table this Ordinance and it has been seconded by Alderman Gallo.

Mayor Prejna – I need a motion to open the floor. Alderman Banger has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Majikes. All in favor, Aye.

Scott Barenbrugge, Taylor Morrison, VP of Land Acquisition and Development, 1834 Walden Office Square, Suite 300, Schaumburg – As Staff pointed out we're not proposing to remove the long-term plan for an on street bike lane. That bike lane does not yet exist, it's in the long-term plans of the Environmental Committee and City Staff. That's not what's being proposed this evening. There is an existing 10 foot sidewalk or path along Meadow Drive that is no longer part of the City's long-term bike path plans that we are replacing with a 5 foot sidewalk. Again, the on street bike path in the long-term plans is not part of the proposal. Deferring to the Environmental Committee, I'm not sure what that accomplishes.

Mayor Prejna – Mr. Vogt, can you weigh in on this?

Fred Vogt, Director Public Works - This was discussed with the Petitioner going into the Planning and Zoning Commission Public Hearing because of the setback consideration for the proposed buildings on Meadow Drive. Staff felt comfortable with narrowing the sidewalk that exists and moving it to where the new sidewalk would be roughly the same place as the face of the existing 10 foot bike path is. If City Council is uncomfortable with that proposal, to take the 10 foot wide concrete sidewalk/bike path and change it to 5, certainly it's the Council's discretion to make that bike paths stay as it is. It's not going to affect the Petitioner's proposal because it is all within the confines of the right-a-way. Whether it's a 10 foot bike path/sidewalk as currently exists or whether it would become a 5 foot sidewalk with a future on street bike lane that the City would be responsible for is really at the Council's discretion.

Alderman Budmats - In the pictures that they provided us there is a picture of what looks to me like a bike lane. It's 10 foot wide and they're telling me that they're going to put a 5 foot sidewalk there instead and have bicycles ride in the street that seems to me to be different than what it currently is used for and I would like our Environmental Committee to be able to at least rule on that and then the Zoning Committee could use that information in their plan. We have a no vote from them, I would really like for them to look at it and make a good decision. As Mrs. Szafran said it seems to be going really fast. Why are we going to let one committee not rule and another committee not use their information all so they can get done really quick? I would ask that we table this and let our committees do their work, that's why we have these people do this job.

City Council Meeting

March 26, 2019

Page 16

Mayor Prejna – You’re proposing to go back to Zoning and the Environmental Committee?

Alderman Budmats – The Environmental Committee, I don’t know about Zoning, we don’t know what the Environmental Committee is going to say.

Mayor Prejna – Mr. Vogt, since you are the liaison for the Environmental Committee, we need your input of when they can meet and come back with a recommendation for the City.

Fred Vogt, Director Public Works - We certainly can have them meet at their next meeting, presuming the meeting date could be on April 2 but they are looking to move the meeting because of the election. My point again, if City Council is uncomfortable with removing the 10 foot bike path/sidewalk that’s there now and much of it is likely to be damaged during construction anyway. If Council wants to retain that, it’s certainly is your choice and that can be made a condition. I don’t believe that one way or another that is going to affect the development by simply having a wider sidewalk/bike path. It really doesn’t affect the project at all.

Mayor Prejna – You’ve heard the concerns, just want you to be aware of it.

Scott Barenbrugge, Taylor Morrison, VP of Land Acquisition and Development, 1834 Walden Office Square, Suite 300, Schaumburg – Yes, I guess we’re just a little confused on the process. We were not informed of the Environmental Committee as part of the zoning process for final PUD approval.

Alderman D’Astice - What I’m hearing is that there’s a 10 foot sidewalk that can remain there or it can be a bike lane in the street like we have in other areas of the city. Either way it doesn’t impact the project. I don’t see why there is any reason to table this because it does not have any impact on the project.

Alderman Gallo - I’ve been hearing conversations that there’s a potential for a bike path to migrate into the street and maintain a 5 foot sidewalk or a 10 foot sidewalk and allow bicycles to traverse that path on Meadow. Keep in mind that there is heavy usage by children on Meadow going to and from both Kimball Hill Elementary School and Carl Sanberg Junior High so it’s important that we do let the Environmental Committee look at this from all aspects and see how it affects the children and users of the sidewalk before we make a decision.

Mayor Prejna – I do agree with that, I brought that up at our meeting along with other items. Do I have a motion to close the floor? Alderman Banger has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Majikes. All in favor, Aye.

Alderman Majikes - As Mr. Vogt said, the Environmental Committee will be meeting early next week so they’ll have plenty of time to come back to us. There is really no reason to table it because we’re still going to have the opportunity table it if we don’t like what we see when it comes back to us just like we did today when some of the Aldermen voted against the grant. That’s the process I feel that we need to go with.

Alderman Gallo - With all due respect, I do recommend we table this because it will give us time to allow the Committee to do their due diligence and bring it back before us as City Council Members so we can bring it back before our Ward thereafter and then make a decision.

Mayor Prejna – I do agree with you and I’m letting everyone have the discussion on the motion before we go forward. Any further discussion? Mr. Budmats, you have made a motion to table this Ordinance

City Council Meeting

March 26, 2019

Page 17

and it has been seconded by Alderman Gallo. Is there further discussion on the motion to table? Will the Clerk please call the roll.

AYES: Gallo, Budmats
NAYS: Banger, D'Astice, Williams, Cannon, Majikes
ABSENT: 0

Mayor Prejna - With 2 in favor and 5 opposed the motion to table this Ordinance. The motion has failed.

Do I have a motion to move this Ordinance forward for the 2nd reading? Alderman Banger has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Cannon.

AYES: Banger, D'Astice, Williams, Cannon, Majikes
NAYS: Budmats, Gallo
ABSENT: 0

Mayor Prejna - With 5 in favor and 2 opposed, this Ordinance will be moved forward for the 2nd Reading.

➤ **NEW BUSINESS:**

G) MOTION TO APPROVE PAYMENT OF BILLS ON WARRANT 3/26/2019

Mayor Prejna: The next item of business is a motion to approve the Warrant from March 26, 2019 as presented by the Finance Department. Is there a motion to approve the warrant? Alderman Banger made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Williams. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: D'Astice, Williams, Cannon, Budmats, Majikes, Gallo, Banger
NAYS: 0
ABSENT: 0

Mayor Prejna - With 7 in favor and 0 opposed this Warrant is approved.

➤ **CONSENT RESOLUTIONS:**

Mayor Prejna - The next items on the agenda are the Consent Resolutions. It consists of seventeen (17) items, Items H thru X. Does any Alderman wish to remove any items from the Consent Agenda for Resolutions?

Alderman D'Astice – I would like to pull item H.

Alderman Gallo - I would like to pull item V.

Alderman Budmats – I would like to pull item W.

Mayor Prejna – Any others? Seeing none, the Chair declares it in order for one motion to consider the remaining fourteen (14) Resolutions in one motion without debate. Is there such a motion? Alderman Banger has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Williams. The question is, shall the remaining fourteen (14) Resolutions be adopted?

Resolutions H, V and W were pulled. See below.

I) Resolution No. 19-R-37 – Award a Contract for Professional Services for Modifications of the HVAC Control System (Phase 2) for City Hall

This Resolution, if adopted, would authorize a contract for the materials and installation services to perform the proposed modifications to the City Hall / Police Station to the controls for the HVAC Systems to remedy the existing problems.

J) Resolution No. 19-R-38 – Award Contract Landscape Service for City Properties for FY2019

This Resolution, if adopted, would authorize a one (1) year contract, with two (2) one year annual renewal options, for landscape services to be performed at various City properties for the 2019 season.

K) Resolution No. 19-R-39 – Award Contract for the 2019 Street Reconstruction Project

This Resolution, if adopted, award a contract for the proposed 2019 Street Reconstruction Project. In the approved budget for FY2019 is \$742,500 (Local Roads Fund) for construction and \$50,000 (Stormwater Fund) for stormwater repairs, totaling \$792,000.

L) Resolution No. 19-R-40 – Award Contract for 2019 Street Reconstruction Project – Engineering Services.

This Resolution, if adopted, would award a contract for civil engineering services for the necessary construction observation for the 2019 Street Reconstruction Project, consisting of Highland Drive, Arlingdale Drive (east of Quentin Road), Kevin Lane, Michael Court, Jessica Court, and Prairie Drive.

M) Resolution No. 19-R-41 – Award Professional Service Design Engineering Services for the South Street/Plum Grove Drive Water Main Replacement Project – Bond Funded

This Resolution, if adopted, would award of a contract, in an amount not to exceed \$67,500, for professional design engineering services needed to replace approximately 3,400 linear feet of water main along South Street and Plum Grove Drive. The South Street and Plum Grove Drive locations were identified as one of the highest priority utility projects associated with the recent City Council actions related to the issuance of an infrastructure bond, upcoming in 2019.

N) Resolution No. 19-R-42 – Award Contract for Replacement of Existing Water Main on Arbor Drive Phase 1 – Bond Funded

This Resolution, if adopted, would award of a contract, in an amount not to exceed \$650,037.50, for the replacement of approximately 2,500 linear feet of water main along (and under) Arbor Drive. This project is the first of a four phase plan identified in the 5-year Capital Improvement Plan. Although this project was identified in the FY2019 Budget, the costs associated with this project will be funded as part of the recent Bond Issuance.

O) Resolution No. 19-R-43 – Award a Professional Engineering Contract for Construction Observation and Related Engineering Services for the Proposed Water-main Replacements at Arbor Drive (Phase 1) – Bond Funded

This Resolution, if adopted, would award of a contract, in a negotiated amount not to exceed \$71,030.20, for construction observation and engineering related services for the proposed phase-one water main improvement project located on Arbor Drive. As with the previous facets of this project, these costs will also be funded from the Utilities Fund. The funds needed to perform these engineering related duties are identified in the FY2019 Budget.

P) Resolution No. 19-R-44 – Award a Contract for Phase One of the Public Works Parking Lot Improvement Project

This Resolution, if adopted, would award a contract for the removal, preparation, and installation of hot-mix asphalt pavement and some minor concrete work for the first of a three phase project to repair the Public Works Parking Lot located at 3900 Berdnick Street.

Q) Resolution No. 19-R-45 – Award a Contract for 2019 Sidewalk and Curb Replacement

This Resolution, if adopted, would award a contract for the removal and replacement of failed and hazardous sidewalk sections, along with replacement curb and gutter sections, due to failures or for storm sewer repairs.

R) Resolution No. 19-R-46 – Award a Contract for 2019 Street Maintenance Crack Sealing of Various City Streets

This Resolution, if adopted, would award of a contract for the preparation and installation of asphalt crack sealing on various City streets for the 2019 season.

This is the first year of a contract that allows for up to two, one-year extensions. The services were bid as part of the Municipal Partnering Initiative, which included three (3) separate bids. The bids ranged from \$1.15 to \$1.35 per pound of sealant.

S) Resolution No. 19-R-47 – Authorize Application for 2019 Cook County Community Development Block Grant Funds

This Resolution, if adopted, would authorize the application process for obtaining Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Funds.

The CDBG project request for the 2019 Program Year is for utility (watermain) replacement and roadway resurfacing for a section of Arbor Drive. The Grant, which is being requested, would provide up to \$400,000 for improvements to Arbor Drive if approved. Note that this is proposed to be the same project submittal as was made for 2017 and 2018, which was not awarded funding by Cook County.

T) Resolution No. 19-R-48 – Authorize Submittal of a 5-Year Consolidated Plan for the Cook County Community Development Block Grant Program

This Resolution, if adopted, would authorize the submittal of an updated Five-Year Consolidated Plan to the Cook County Department of Planning and Development for the Community Development Block Grant Program.

U) Resolution No. 19-R-49 – Authorize Certification of Matching Funds Availability for the 2019 Cook County Community Development Block Grant Program Funding Application

This Resolution, if adopted, would authorize the execution of the certification of local agency matching funds for the proposed 2019 Community Development Block Grant Program Project watermain replacement and pavement resurfacing on a portion of Arbor Drive.

X) Resolution No. 19-R-52 – Authorize a Referendum to Limit the Terms of Alderman to two (2) Consecutive Terms

This Resolution, if adopted, would authorize a referendum question to the voters of the City of Rolling Meadows to reduce current term limits for Alderman from three (3) consecutive to two (2) consecutive terms at the March 17, 2020 Presidential Primary Election.

Mayor Prejna – Again, the question is shall the fourteen (14) remaining Resolutions be adopted? Will the Clerk please call the roll.

AYES: Williams, Cannon, Budmats, Majikes, Gallo, Banger, D’Astice
NAYS: 0
ABSENT: 0

Mayor Prejna - With 7 in favor and 0 opposed the remaining fourteen (14) Resolutions are adopted.

Resolution H was pulled by Alderman D’Astice.

H) Resolution No. 19-R-36 – Award Police Towing Contract to Hillside Towing

This Resolution, if adopted, would award a Police Towing Contract to Hillside Towing. The contract will secure for the next three years excellent and well established professional towing services, the use and availability of quality equipment, all at a very economically low and competitive rate.

Do I have a motion to move this Resolution forward? Alderman Banger has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Williams. Mr. D’Astice you pulled this Resolution, you have first comments.

Alderman D’Astice – While I’m not necessarily objecting to this in particular, I am objecting and will be voting no on the fact that in my opinion the RFP that went out for the towing contract pretty much limited the bidders to one. We’ve talked about this in the past when we approached various pieces of equipment how sometimes Staff will propose an RFP and create it so that only one bidder can actually meet all of the conditions. I talked to the Chief about this and I expressed my opinion to him so it’s not a surprise, I feel this RFP was created to the benefit of only one bidder. So I will be voting no on this.

Mayor Prejna – Further discussion from the Council? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: Cannon, Budmats, Majikes, Gallo, Banger, Williams
NAYS: D’Astice
ABSENT: 0

Mayor Prejna - With 6 in favor and 1 opposed this Resolution is adopted.

Resolution V was pulled by Alderman Gallo.

V) Resolution No. 19-R-50 – Grant Final Approval for a Subdivision located at 2819-2915 Kirchoff Road (Meadow Square)

This Resolution, if adopted, would authorize approve a 26 lot subdivision which is currently occupied on a single lot at 2819-2915 Kirchoff Road (the former Dominick’s shopping center).

The property owner, Clark Street, and the contract purchaser of 9.5 acres, Taylor Morrison, are requesting the subdivision of this single lot into multiple lots, for the purpose of building 106 townhomes on said 9.5 acres, and reserving the front 1.6 acres to two commercial lots. The proposed subdivision is named “Meadow Square Subdivision”.

Do I have a motion to move this Resolution forward? Alderman D’Astice has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Banger. Mr. Gallo you pulled this Resolution, you have first comments.

Alderman Gallo - I pulled this one couple reasons. The first reason is and maybe we can answer the question later but the question was that we had a community in the 2nd Ward a while back prior to this Council that asked to have a construction project take place and they were denied. They recently came back to our Council in May and they were told that they have to come to Zoning and then Committee-of-the-Whole and then they have to stand by for a first and second reading. Though nothing on their project change from the day of denial on the first time that they have gone through the gauntlet here. Now we have a project that has changed owner’s hands, has permits that are in new names, project plans that have

City Council Meeting

March 26, 2019

Page 22

changed, they've gone through the Zoning, they've gone through Committee-of-the-Whole but now we're going to fast-track it through this group of Consent Resolutions and I don't understand why we wouldn't put that through a 1st and 2nd reading similar to the other group who didn't have any changes but were made to follow this process.

In 2017, I spent my freshman year here with a truncated 3 hour meeting with the Director of Economics and condensed it down to a five minute speech to the same Council about why it does not make sense to turn this property into residential homes as a commercially zoned lot. I don't want to repeat those reasons but we know that there is an inverse relationship that causes increased expenditures over time. I know it does seem to make sense in the short run we can recognize a dollar upfront but it will cost the community five dollars in the future.

In 2018, I brought this for a potential vision to the property owners and to the Council here with Craig the owner of Comet, we had a vision and we had a drawing and we sent this before the Council and some remarks under the breaths were that's nice but where were you 10 years ago when the gentleman had brought these drawings forward?

In 2019, I just met with restaurateurs on Kirchoff Road both franchisees and local owners and they've recognized that there is not enough residents who are engaging in their restaurants today to keep them afloat if we are going to go ahead and subdivide this property to leave 2 more property parcels upfront for more restaurants. If we do that, they will have to split the current group of people who go out to eat amongst each other and force each other out of business. What we need is commerce and commercial work in this area in order to generate a cycle of economics and a virtuous cycle of bringing business back to the community, not housing.

Back to the first question, why do we not have to have this go through a first and second reading?

Jim Macholl, City Attorney - Resolutions don't require a second reading.

Alderman Gallo - How did this become a Resolution?

Jim Macholl, City Attorney – Our ordinance provide for approval of subdivisions by way of Resolution.

Alderman Gallo – Not with anything to do with construction projects? Changes hands or property owner?

Jim Macholl, City Attorney – No, it's just a plat of subdivision that's all you're approving.

Alderman Gallo – Okay.

Mayor Prejna – Is there further discussion?

Alderman Budmats - I'm looking at this and it looks like everything that I read and I did a search for the word 26, I don't see where the Planning and Zoning Commission voted. It says there's a request for a 3 lot subdivision, there's no request for a 26 lot subdivision. I don't see where the Planning and Zoning Commission voted on that, there's nothing that says 26 lots and the drawing date from Taylor Morrison looks like it has a date on it where it was revised and it's after the meeting that the Planning and Zoning Commission has. I have no idea what drawing it was that the Planning and Zoning Commission looked at. I don't know what revisions were made or what drawing that they'd look at? Did it have 26 plots? Or did it only have 3 plots on it? Nothing in their documents says that they recognize having 26 plats in any of their comments. So what did they vote on because according to the paperwork it says they voted on a 3 lot subdivision but this is asking us for 26 lot subdivision? I'm very confused and I don't know what the

City Council Meeting

March 26, 2019

Page 23

Planning and Zoning Commission voted on, can you please have someone from the Planning and Zoning Commission tell us if they knew there was a 26 lot subdivision?

Fred Vogt, Director Public Works - With regards to the Planning and Zoning Commission, when Staff wrote up the report to the Planning and Zoning Commission, we referred to a 3 lot subdivision because that was what the preliminary approval given in February 2018 to the Ryan Homes petition. Taylor Morrison submitted documents and the condition #1 in the Planning and Zoning Commission vote reads: *1) The site is to be developed in substantial conformance with the preliminary plat of survey dated January 18, 2019.* I don't have that in front of me but I believe it consistent with what minor revisions were made to street names in the packet information that City Council has tonight that has 26 lots on the proposed final plat.

Alderman Budmats - The Planning and Zoning Commission voted against this. I don't understand, they voted against it and I don't know what document they looked at because it's not in the packet. So how can I vote yes to something that they voted against and I don't even know if we have the same documents that they had?

Fred Vogt, Director Public Works - If I could just correct Alderman Budmats' statement. The final plat of subdivision was voted 5-2 to recommend final approval. The final plat of subdivision was a vote separate from the planned development.

Alderman Budmats – That showed 26 lots? I'm just curious, I don't understand.

Fred Vogt, Director Public Works – Correct. The plat submitted by Taylor Morrison that was in the Planning and Zoning Commission packet showed the 26 lots that you are seeing in your packet tonight.

Alderman Budmats – The report doesn't say that so I'm at a loss.

Fred Vogt, Director Public Works – We can provide that information, we can provide that through Friday report or through other means or staff report at the next meeting.

Alderman Budmats – This isn't one and done, right? We're not getting a second crack at this? I don't get to look at it before we vote?

Fred Vogt, Director Public Works – The plat is in the packet. I'm not clear as to what other information is being requested. The final plat of subdivision is dated January 18, 2019, the only change that I'm aware of that's been made is the street name.

Mayor Prejna – Further discussion? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: Majikes, Banger, D'Astice, Williams, Cannon

NAYS: Budmats, Gallo

ABSENT: 0

Mayor Prejna - With 5 in favor and 2 opposed this Resolution is adopted.

Resolution W was pulled by Alderman Budmats.

W) Resolution No. 19-R-51 – Approve and Accept a Municipal Sign Easement for a Proposed Community Events Sign at 2550 Quentin Road – NSMJAWA Property

This Resolution, if adopted, would have the City of Rolling Meadows approve and accept, for recording purposes, a permanent easement being granted for a section of land to be used for purposes of a community events sign, and associated appurtenances and landscaping, which will be maintained by the City of Rolling Meadows. The section of land, 12 feet by 5 feet (60 square feet), is located at 2550 Quentin Road within the City of Rolling Meadows. The proposed community events sign is to be constructed within the easement granted by the Northwest Suburban Municipal Joint Action Water Agency.

Do I have a motion to move this Resolution forward? Alderman Banger has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Majikes. Mr. Budmats you pulled this Resolution, you have first comments.

Alderman Budmats – This evening I received an email, I'm assuming the rest of you did as well with petitions signed by several members of the community near this sign. Obviously, they don't want it. I have a difficult time of overriding their desires when this is in their neighborhood and it seems that they didn't get a chance to converse with Alderman Cannon before the last vote for whatever reason. I have a difficult time approving this over their objections. I at least think that there should be some discussion between the parties before we look at this. At the very least, I think we should table this or vote it down because it doesn't seem like they actually had their day in court if you will.

Alderman Majikes - Quick question. This kind of reminds me of the cell tower issue that we had a couple years ago in my Ward. I know at that time the Park District had sent out certified letters to the residents in the area and I'm guessing the City sent a letter to the residents informing them of this. Was there a meeting that they were told about?

Fred Vogt, Director Public Works – To answer Alderman Majikes' question, the requirements of the Planning and Zoning Commission hearings of which this took place, I believe December 4, 2018, is a 250 foot mailing radius that's per law/code and that's what was done in this case. We did have a hearing on December 4, 2018, we did have a couple people attend that meeting and speak on the matter.

Alderman Majikes – Not a good turnout. I understand everyone didn't know about it. I actually sympathize with them because I know the fight that we lost with the cell tower and how that affected the residents in my Ward. I would agree with Alderman Budmats if we could at least table this for now, is that a possibility? What happens with the deposit?

Barry Krumstok, City Manager - First thing there is no deposit as I told Ms. Mau. We have a purchase order out there so the city has not done any transaction in money. We have a purchase order for the community events sign, if you want to call it that. Again, if for some reason the purchase order is pulled back there could be a penalty but we never asked them that. So the purchase order is out there for the sign, this just deals with the easement. There is no timing on this and there is no guaranteed time when the sign would go in. If the Council wants to table it. Going back to both speakers that spoke in the open session where they said reconsider, again all that's out there is a purchase order. If the Council decides if they want to bring back something that would be between us and the sign company.

Alderman Majikes - Having gone through a similar situation I think that's only fair.

City Council Meeting

March 26, 2019

Page 25

Alderman Budmats – Two questions. The sign that we have a purchase order for, is it specific to this location? Or would that sign work any place in Rolling Meadows?

Barry Krumstok, City Manager - The sign is created for this site but it could be used somewhere else but it might need some re-fabrication because of how it's positioned to be viewed. If the Council decides that we would go back, we would go back to the contractor. Your question of could it be used somewhere else, there is a potential but without asking them because this one was created for this site and how it is actually created.

Alderman Budmats - We used to have a sign in front of places where there was going to be something before the Planning and Zoning Commission, was a sign placed out in front as well as a certified letters?

Fred Vogt, Director Public Works – Yes, it was.

Mayor Prejna – I need a motion to table this Resolution. Alderman Budmats has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Majikes. Further discussion on the motion to table?

Alderman D'Astice - Is there a date to bring it back? Or table just to let it go? I just want clarification.

Jim Macholl, City Attorney - If you table it, you're just putting it away for an indefinite period of time. I'm not a big fan of it myself.

Alderman D'Astice - I just want to make sure everybody knows the difference between postpone and table. Postpone comes back the next meeting, table just goes away and comes back some other day but there's no definite time frame. I'm not a big fan of table unless we set a date and table it until then. This way whatever action that needs to take place will happen.

Mayor Prejna - Okay. A motion to table it to the last meeting in April?

Alderman Majikes - Does that give the residents enough time?

Fred Vogt, Director Public Works – I'm not clear as to what the direction to Staff will be at this point. We will do whatever the direction of the City Council is.

Mayor Prejna – Mr. Budmats wants it tabled for further discussion from the residents and further information from the City.

Alderman Budmats - Point of information for Mr. Vogt, we received an email tonight with the petition signed by a large number of residents who are not in favor of this, they should have their chance to be heard. I understand that residents 250 feet away from the sign received notices but it seems like it's going to affect more than those 250 feet of people.

Mayor Prejna – Mr. Vogt, how long would it take you to put something together so you can reach out to the residents to have an informational meeting?

Fred Vogt, Director Public Works – If the direction is to put an informational meeting together that the City Staff will host in this room or another location to be determined, I would certainly want a couple of weeks to craft a letter, get a location and get the information out to residents and give them enough lead time. At least until the second meeting in April.

City Council Meeting

March 26, 2019

Page 26

Mayor Prejna - Is that acceptable Mr. Budmats?

Alderman Budmats – That’s great.

Mayor Prejna – The motion is to table until the second meeting in April. At that time there will be more information and a letter sent out to residents regarding a meeting.

Fred Vogt, Director Public Works – We will likely get a letter out by next week. We’ll look at the petitions that were signed in terms of the geographic location and try to cover everybody that way.

Mayor Prejna – Any further discussion?

Alderman Budmats - Can we have Staff look at the possibility of placing the purchase order on hold? Or least making it that it’s not so site-specific? And then it could be reused at a different location should that determine later that that’s not the optimal location.

Barry Krumstok, City Manager - I think I heard that loud and clear Mr. Mayor and Aldermen.

Mayor Prejna – We had first, we had a second and we had discussion. Can we have a vote on tabling this?

Alderman Cannon - You haven’t asked me for my opinion yet, I had my hand raised. Can I make a point of order please? I’m for tabling it, I’m fine with that. Point of order, 28 homes did get certified letters and to my knowledge only one gentleman came to the Planning and Zoning meeting when there was an open discussion about the sign and how it would affect the area. Just point of order only.

Mayor Prejna – Further discussion? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call the Roll about tabling the Resolution.

AYES: Majikes, Gallo, Banger, D’Astice, Williams, Cannon, Budmats
NAYS: 0
ABSENT: 0

Mayor Prejna - With 7 in favor and 0 opposed this Resolution is tabled until the last meeting of April.

OTHER BUSINESS & REPORTS:

Mayor's Appointments: None

Mayor’s Proclamations: None

City Clerk’s Report: None

Barry Krumstok, City Manager went over the following:

1) Community Items of Interest:

- 1) Early voting for the consolidated election has begun. Please check with Cook County for voting locations.
- 2) The Rolling Meadows Chamber of Commerce will be conducting a “Chili Challenge with a Twist” on Sunday, March 31st from 12:00 pm (noon) to 2:00 pm at Rep’s Place, which is located at 3200 Kirchoff Road. There will be a \$10.00 attendee fee and this covers chili samplings and one free raffle ticket.
- 3) Just a friendly reminder, yard waste collection starts on Monday, April 1st (no fooling). In addition, please remember that this also marks the end of early refuse set out, which is allowed by ordinance from November 1st to March 31st. Beginning Monday, April 1st, residents should place refuse and recyclables at the curb after 6:00 pm the night before scheduled pick-up. For more information, please contact Public Works at 847-963-0500 or visit www.cityrm.org/PublicWorks
- 4) Remember to vote on Tuesday, April 2nd.
- 5) The following is a reminder for all candidates and supporters about placing signs in the parkway. Per Rolling Meadows Code Section 122-22 – Signs: *Political campaign signs*. Signs or posters announcing the candidates seeking public, political office and/or political issues, and data pertinent thereto up to an area of 12 square feet. Signs shall be displayed for no more than 60 days. Signs shall be removed within 48 hours after an election. Political signs shall not be permitted on public property.
- 6) St. Colette School (3900 Pheasant Drive) will be conducting an Antique & Vintage Spring Market on Saturday, April 13th from 8:00 am to 3:00 pm. (To attend it will cost \$2.00 for adults & kids are free).
- 7) Anna’s Red Apple, locate at 2121 South Plum Grove Road will finally be open for dinners starting Monday, April 22nd.
- 8) Earth Day activities are set for April 27th from 9:00 am to 12:00 pm. Individuals who want to participate should meet at Old Public Works (3200 Central Road). For additional information, please contact Public Works at 847-963-0500.
- 9) Future topics at April Committee meetings:

Economic Development: *due to a lack of items, and the general elections, the April meeting has been cancelled.*

Planning and Zoning Commission: *(Wednesday, April 17th 7:30 pm in the Council Chambers): One Public Hearing is tentatively scheduled and it consists of: 1) a Sign appeal for an electronic billboard sign at 3105 Tollview Drive, M-1 Manufacturing District, Sam Roti, Genband Media, Petitioner (continued from the January 9, 2019 meeting).*

Barry Krumstok, City Manager went over the following:

2) New Businesses – February 2019

- 1) I Divide by Zero Technical – IT Services, Web Sales, Consulting
- 2) Direct Mobile Services – Mobile Phone Accessory Web Sales

Fred Vogt, Public Works Director went over the following:

3) Traffic Review

The staff Traffic Review Committee monthly meeting was held on Wednesday, March 6, 2019. The following topics were discussed and are summarized for informational purposes for the Mayor and City Council:

1. *Carriageway Drive Refuse Containers in the roadway on collection days* – Cooperation is anticipated from the condominium complexes, and a site improvement is being planned for Spring/Summer, 2019
2. *Meadowbrook/Lois Drive on-street parking issue* – Ordinance has been prepared for City Council consideration in March, 2019.
3. *Kirchoff Road corridor traffic signal improvements* – Weather permitting, electrical LED lighting upgrades will begin in March.
Replacement of the two control cabinets will be scheduled in late March. Each traffic signal – Kirchoff Road/Rohlwing Road intersection and Kirchoff Road/IL Route 53 off-ramp – will need to be taken out of service for a minimum of 8 hour period of time. Police Department assistance will be needed for traffic control.
4. *Bike path grant applications* – Discussion was held on support for bike path grant applications
 - a. Quentin/Hartung Roads – Approved by City Council to submit.
 - b. Hicks Road/Euclid Avenue – Postponed; to be reconsidered in March upon preparations for additional information. This Committee supports the grant application to seek funding support for this project.
5. *Guardrail request at Arbor Drive 90 degree curve* – A representative of the Preserves at Woodfield Apartments spoke to the Committee about the accidents that occur there and damages to fencing. City engineer will investigate. Land acquisition is likely needed from the apartment complex and impact to existing parking lot will need to be considered. This item will be discussed further at a future meeting of this Committee.

The next meeting of the Traffic Review Committee is scheduled for Wednesday, April 3, 2019 at 2:30 p.m. at City Hall.

City Council Meeting

March 26, 2019

Page 29

Fred Vogt, Public Works Director went over the following:

4) Non-Union Benefits

The City of Rolling Meadows, during 2018, entered into two new contracts with employee labor bargaining units – Operating Engineers Local 150 and AFSCME. The results of these actions have left all non-union City employees (of which there are 25) with certain benefits that are at a value that is less than those of bargaining unit employees. In most cases, the non-union employees are supervisors, which means that the employees that they supervise now have greater benefits, effective in 2018, than the supervisors have.

This is specifically true in regard to:

- Vacation accrual limits
- Sick leave monthly earning

Staff proposes to prepare and bring forward a proposed Ordinance for first reading at the April 9, 2019 City Council meeting, to amend the City's Personnel Rules and Regulations to make equitable the employee benefits referenced herein:

- Vacation Accrual to be changed from a 40 hour limit to an 80 hour limit (1-5 years of service) and at an amount equal to one year's earnings for all other years of service rates that are for five years of service and greater.
- Sick leave earnings to be changed from a four hours per month rate to an eight hours per month rate.

Barry Krumstok, City Manager went over the following:

5) Future Committee-of-the-Whole Meeting Discussion

This is just a notice to the City Council at a future Committee-of-the-Whole meeting we will be discussing City Code Section 2 – 53. The biggest part of this additional discussion on this Code is for Notice if this is ever used and how it is provided and overall how it would be actually be utilized. This section of the Code has been around for over 50 years. The intent is to have a discussion and provide Notice provisions.

MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA:

Mayor Prejna - There were a couple comments about the new rules that we read at the beginning of a meeting. I just want to say that the reason they were instituted is every citizen is free to their express opinion but they are not free to attack Staff or members of the Council. In the future please come forward to express your opinions and it would be appreciated.

Alderman Williams - Ever since the recent need for Council to notify an outside entity that we did not want the name of Rolling Meadows used in their promotional material, I have been bothered by the City's failure to formally inform all of the Council and the citizens of Rolling Meadows as to just what an Alderman's responsibilities are when it comes to representing the City to other people and organizations. Whether we like it or not we are put in a position where people assume that we can speak for Rolling Meadows or can commit the City's cooperation on a given project. I have been given to understand that it is our responsibility to make clear to those who would have us join their cause that we cannot do so on behalf of the City. We must not verbally or by action mislead others to think that we can do so. The fiduciary responsibility of Alderman is to represent the citizens of their Ward not the City or any other

City Council Meeting

March 26, 2019

Page 30

Wards. At no time should we treat that responsibility casually or even hint to others that we possess powers or responsibilities we do not have as Aldermen. I'm bothered by the way the casual approach taken by Alderman Gallo whose careless action created the necessity for the City to pull its name from the support of an organization for all intents and purposes appears to be worthy because the approval did not come from the consensus of the Council before being insinuated or given. That was an embarrassment for us all. To those who would pass this off as being of no great moment I would point out that in their own business would certainly not allow an employee to make or even appear to make comments or take actions for their businesses beyond their position in the company and if they overstep they could well be in danger of losing their employment. Having owned my own business for over 19 years I can assure you this would not happen more than once and if the problems caused were grave enough the employee would be fired immediately after the first offense. All Aldermen need to step up and accept their responsibility of office to make sure that they meet with and are aware of their authority and that they do not speak for anything other than their personal beliefs and the Ward they represent on issues involving Rolling Meadows. When I became Alderman my fiduciary responsibility was not outlined for me in writing, I assume this may be true for other Aldermen. Therefore, to make it clear to all Aldermen and the citizens of the City I propose the City Manager, Mayor and City Attorney put out for the Aldermen an outline of the laws and/or rules covering this type of occurrence. They should also issue a formal reassurance to the people of Rolling Meadows that an Alderman's failure to properly care for his/her fiduciary responsibilities will not be tolerated and should it happen again what course of action will be taken to remedy it.

Alderman Gallo - With all due respect, the reason that this application for a grant which was not the actual grant came before the City Council was because there was positive publicity with my name attached to it and I happen to be running for Mayor and another Alderman on this Council did not like it and he ran to the City Manager and filed a complaint about this. They worked together to try to figure out a way to put this on the agenda before I even had an opportunity to bring it up as a Ward Report or Matters Not On the Agenda. The time the article came out there were two weeks between the next meeting and within that time it already made its way as an agenda item. So with this, because there is no specific agenda that I have to stick to right now I brought up the fact that this made its way selectively onto the Council along with the fact that there was a logo of our City's emblem used and for some reason our City Manager didn't have the executive discretion to just make a phone call and take it down but yet he has the executive discretion to spend over \$70,000 of taxpayer money and we don't focus on that. He has a \$10,000 limit so if a rule is a rule is a rule anything over \$10,000 must require Council authority and approval. If a rule is a rule is a rule and I'm not allowed to pursue getting a grant which was a zero cost to the City which would have brought in over \$600,000 should we have been lucky enough to see our initiative to be enticing enough to capture the National Safety Council's appeal. But instead you wanted to make a political mockery out of this and focus on things that are not relevant to the City in terms of the long-term ramifications of the community. My actions here did not have any impact the City and where it could go or where it's been. We focus on things that are so trivial instead of focusing on significant issues. I think we need to take that into consideration right now.

Mayor Prejna – I need to reply. When this came out in the newspaper we asked Mr. Gallo for a copy of the grant and his response was “standby”. We have not received a copy of the grant. I reached out to Mr. Gallo for more information and it was not forthcoming. We had to go through the Freedom of Information Act to find the information. All this process had to be is to come forward and say here's the information. We still do not have the entire grant, the grant application was 10 pages. I want to make it very clear that when we talked to another city there's a per vehicle, per day cost so I want to make sure that everyone is aware of that. I reached out to you again and all you had to do was provide us with a copy of the grant. Have you provided the City with a copy of the grant application? When we asked you for a copy of the grant, did you provide it to us?

City Council Meeting

March 26, 2019

Page 31

Alderman Gallo – I told you Mr. Mayor that you have the same information I do. I cannot get anything more than what you already obtained through channels beyond me. Why am I going to give you redundant copies of what you have? There is no reason for that, it's the same exact thing and we already addressed that. The other thing is, you have to make it very clear that for the City of Rolling Meadows that this is a zero cost for all devices, it has nothing to do with what is happening up in Michigan. Nothing to do with what's happening in Michigan because of the relationships that I've fostered. So with all due respect don't start spouting information about costs and fees that are not relevant to this situation. You cannot do that to the public, it's not appropriate.

Alderman Williams – If I may Mr. Gallo, my complaint here is not with the grant, my complaint is not with its cost, my complaint is with someone saying for the City of Rolling Meadows that they will participate in this without adequate authority. That's my only complaint. It seems to me there's rules and how the City of Rolling Meadows can make commitments. Those rules does not permit me as an Alderman to go out and say the City will do this type of thing or even to insinuate that.

Alderman Gallo – So clearly it doesn't work for me to go out and find some preliminary work toward an initiative but when Alderman D'Astice goes out and has conversations on behalf of the City of Rolling Meadows exploring a restaurant program much like the one in Wheeling on 22, he has full autonomy to do that and nobody will say anything? He's representing the City of Rolling Meadows as an Alderman.

Alderman D'Astice - I have never approached the City of Wheeling nor any other city. So what Mr. Gallo just said right now is a blatant lie. I have never approached any other city.

Alderman Budmats - I have to agree with Alderman Williams. When he and I came on the Council we were given little or no direction as to what we could or couldn't do. You may recall that I went and I sought bids for something for a vehicle lift and I knew that we were overpaying for it. I didn't say I was on behalf of the City of Rolling Meadows but I had to say where it was going to be installed. I went and did investigation, there's no way to investigate something to do as an Alderman on behalf of the City without saying that I'm an Alderman in the City of Rolling Meadows trying to get information. There's a lot of gray area and I believe that we were poorly instructed as to what we could or could not say or do in trying to do our job to the best of our ability. I will agree with Alderman Williams that there has to be much more definition as to what we can or can't do. I think we're kind of left to our own devices in this area.

CLOSED SESSION/ADJOURNMENT:

Mayor Prejna - Do I have a motion to adjourn? Alderman Banger made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Gallo. All in favor say aye; opposed.

There being no further business, by unanimous consent the City Council meeting was adjourned at 9:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by: Judy Brose, Deputy City Clerk