

**COMMITTEE-OF-THE-WHOLE  
MINUTES  
April 20, 2021**

Mayor Gallo called the Committee-of-the-Whole meeting via Zoom Teleconferencing to order at 7:30 p.m.

**COUNCIL IN ATTENDANCE REMOTELY:** Aldermen Karen McHale, Nick Budmats, Kevin O'Brien, Jenifer Vinezeano, Jon Bisesi, John D'Astice and Lara Sanoica

**COUNCIL MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

**STAFF IN ATTENDANCE REMOTELY:** City Manager Barry Krumstok, Finance Director Melissa Gallagher, Deputy City Clerk Judy Brose, Assistant to City Manager Lori Ciezak, Police Chief John Nowacki, Fire Chief Jeff Moxley, Deputy Fire Chief Rick Acosta, Director Public Works Rob Horne, Business Advocate Martha Corner, City Attorney Melissa Wolf

Those who are joining us via Zoom or in the City Council Chambers will be afforded the opportunity for public comment to address the City Council on matters that are on tonight's agenda after the City Council discusses with Staff.

Members of the public present in the City Council Chambers listening to the meeting will be afforded the opportunity to provide public comment in accordance with the procedures applicable to public comment at an in-person meeting of the City Council. Namely, members of the public must have signed-in before the start of the meeting.

Public comment will also be afforded to the public who are joining us on this conference line as long as they provided their contact credentials and the subject matter for which they would like to speak about before the deadline as noted on tonight's agenda. Written comments that were submitted prior to the meeting will also be read out loud after the topic is discussed by Council.

We ask that persons wishing to address the City Council keep their comments to 5 minutes in length. Comments must be addressed to the Council as a whole through the Mayor, and profanity will not be tolerated.

**Mayor Gallo** – I know this is not typical practice to make announcements during a Committee of the Whole meeting, however due to the significance and timing I just want to remind our viewers that Rolling Meadows will be hosting a COVID-19 vaccination event. The vaccines will be administered on April 27 and May 18. The call center for scheduling those vaccines will be live this Thursday (4/22) and Friday (4/23). April 22 is for those ages 65 and older and April 23 is for ages 16 and older because it is the Pfizer vaccine. The number to call for scheduling your COVID-19 vaccination is 847-497-5505. Again, day one on Thursday, April 22 is for those ages 65 and older and day two Friday, April 23 is for ages 16 and over. This is April 27 of May 18 that this will begin.

### **1) Park Street Drainage Improvement Project**

**Rob Horne, Director Public Works** - The Park Street Drainage Improvement project proposes improving storm water conditions to address drainage concerns for residents along Park Street and alleviate area storm sewer surcharging of the storm sewer system at Meadow Drive and South Street. The project location includes Park Street and a portion of Meadow Drive, before the project limits run south along the south property line of the Kimball Hill School.

The project proposes the installation of storm sewer piping along the south side of the Kimball School property, with a discharge near Salt Creek. It additionally calls for the extension of the storm sewer north along Meadow Drive and east along Park Street to alleviate road flooding and rear yard drainage concerns throughout the neighborhood.

There is a five (5) year plan currently being developed, which will be discussed and reviewed at the Capital Projects Committee level, and will ultimately be incorporated into the City's Capital Improvement Plan. The entire project is estimated at approximately 1.4 million dollars. The critical project years for this project are FY2021 and FY2022. In these years there is approximately \$800,000 in engineering and construction costs proposed. However, these are also the years that staff anticipates utilizing fully the \$384,000 in grant funding received by the State and the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, which will help fund those costs.

As the Council may recall, the City received \$300,000 in State Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (DCEO) funding as part of the 2019 Capital Project Bill for this project specifically, and recently was awarded funding in the amount of approximately \$84,000, as part of the Green Initiatives Green Infrastructure (GIGO) opportunity. Approximately \$37,000 of the GIGO grant will be utilized on the engineering proposed in FY2021. So, while the first two years (2021 and 2022) propose spending the majority of the total project estimate, the grant funding the City has already received will account for almost 50% of that cost (\$385,000).

Baxter and Woodman, the presenter at tonight's COW, performed an initial feasibility engineering study to develop project scoping, budgets, etc. under a contract awarded by the City Council in FY2020. The initial feasibility study has been completed and as a result, we can now proceed with the next steps of the project, which includes engineering that will be presented to the City Council at the April 27<sup>th</sup> meeting. As part of that engineering work, coordination and discussions with the Rolling Meadows Park District and School District 15 will be heightened. The incorporation of bio-swales, natural detention areas, and educational opportunities for students are all very attainable on this project, based on the feasibility work completed by Baxter Woodman so far.

As this is proposed to be a multi-year project, staff and the consulting engineer fully intend to continue to pursue additional funding opportunities. The incorporation of clean water strategies such as bio-swales and a storm water basin, along with the educational benefits for the adjacent school continue to make this project an excellent candidate to receive funding assistance.

**Matt Moffitt, Associate Vice President, Baxter & Woodman Consulting Engineers** - I specialize in water resources, stormwater improvements and whatnot. As Rob said we're here to talk about Park Street/Meadow Drive Stormwater Improvement Program. Elaborating on the history, the problem area has significant rear yard flooding on either side of Park Street. Additionally, there is quite significant ponding and frequent ponding at the intersection of Meadow and School Drive to the west and South Drive to the east from Meadow. It gets about 2 feet deep in water which is impassable to residents, parents of the school and even at that depth it could be impassable for most emergency vehicles. As we were looking at the two identified problem areas we also came across a number of other smaller roadway ponding areas where the water might get 6 to 8 inches deep and what I would consider a standard normal rain event. I wanted to first lay out the area that we're looking at and the problems that are being experienced. The City has records of residential complaints from the 1970s. Decades ago there were programs to install rear yard inlets where they put a small under drainpipe along the rear property lines. Over time with these being in the resident's backyard and being smaller pipes, these pipes get compromised whether they're crushed or filled with roots or completely dug up during landscaping projects and very difficult for City Staff to maintain and going through multiple residential properties they certainly don't get maintained cohesively by the residents. In 2002 there was a stormwater management study done by the City's engineer where they identified the street

intersection flooding as problem area #5. One of the top problem areas is identified in that overall management study where they're looking at the big problem areas and the primary issues not the external issues of the rear yards or the lesser flooding. Last year we came in with the initial intent to look at the feasibility of various solutions and options for the rear yard issue and found that it really ties very directly into the problem area number #5. This really is a comprehensive issue and we kind of expanded the viewpoint of the assessment and the various problem areas throughout the neighborhood and also redirected our assessment of improvement options from the problem area #5 was really looking at some overflow options to improve the overflow that would have water leaving intersection through the rear parking lot of the school, flowing across the surface through the parking lot around the playground and across the park. As we were looking at this more comprehensive issue we wanted to look at a solution that had a lesser impact on the downstream stakeholders. I also wanted to note that just within the last few years, even since the rear yard installations in the 1970s, approximately 20% of residents along Park Street on either side have called in to City staff with complaints about rear yard drainage issues. One of the things that can impact this and why we're hearing more and more issues of drainage is that we are getting larger and more frequent rain events. The data is clear on this, the precipitation totals from before 1900 up through just before 2020 indicate that we are clearly getting more rainfall per year. An extreme participation event is defined as precipitation greater than 2 inches. An average across 100 years is 1.6 events per year that exceed 2 inches of rainfall and our larger rainstorms are getting bigger. A quick stormwater engineering 101 so we are all on the same page of what I'm talking about, I'm sure most of us have heard the term of 100 year storm, it's happening more than every 100 years now.

Rainfall definitions are based off of statistical analysis. Reoccurrence interval:

- 10-year storm – The storm that has a 1 in 10 chance (10%) of occurrence in any given year.
- 100-year storm – The storm that has a 1 in 100 chance (1%) of occurrence in any given year.
- Industry standard is for storm sewer systems to have the capacity to convey the 10-year storm.

Illinois State Water Survey (ISWS) updated Storm Definitions from Bulletin 70 (1989) to Bulletin 75 (2019) stated that approximately 15% increase in volume for a 10-year 24-hour storm.

The design criteria for this project provides a storm sewer capacity for a 10-year event. The estimated probable cost is \$1,389,000 and the schedule is flexible and can be accelerated or delayed by years. The City has already secured approximately \$400,000 towards Phase 1 Design and Construction through DCEO and IEPA to be used in 2021 and 2022.

**Alderman Vinezeano** – How does adding these larger pipes on Park Street going to help with the backyard drainage or does it not?

**Matt Moffitt, Associate Vice President, Baxter & Woodman Consulting Engineers** – The pipes are sized so that they can take on the volume of the rear yard drainage wholly. Our expectation along Park Street is from that 24" pipe every other property line the City would put a stub out from the pipe out in the road across the sidewalk to the property line so that there would be a location that residents could then put in their own drain lines and connect to a stub that's been brought out to their property line. It's empowering the residents to have a solution where the main trunk line that's draining everything away is in the City's right-of-way and maintainable by the City.

**Alderman Vinezeano** – Would it be cost beneficial to the residents if the same construction company were to do the entire street? I'm assuming there would be a cost savings then to the residents and do we have an idea what that cost would be?

**Matt Moffitt, Associate Vice President, Baxter & Woodman Consulting Engineers** - That's something we can certainly discuss. Director Horne and I had some preliminary conversations about that already. I think with going into the private property issues it might be a different contractor who would do that work. A contractor that's underground utility, working on the streets and re-patching it versus someone who has smaller equipment going between houses, working with fences and landscaping and whatnot, it's something that can be considered to look at an option with this project. It could be a better option to look for a contractor separately to help residents come together. I've seen it where it helps with some issues like that to find a contractor and get group pricing for residents to come together and each hire that same contractor at a group pricing. There are various options that can be considered but it's still really early to have to have a decision on something like that.

**Alderman Vinezeano** - I think residents, especially in that area, that will be their first question is what kind of cost is that going to be to them because some of them did initially in the 70's, a lot of them are original owners, put the investment in to have that backyard drainage and so I can imagine they'll say that they've already done it once why would they do it again. To have at least an estimate would be very beneficial.

**Matt Moffitt, Associate Vice President, Baxter & Woodman Consulting Engineers** – I don't have that off the top of my head but I could come up with that pretty quickly.

**Alderman Vinezeano** - Okay. My second concern is that all of this is leading to Kimball Hill pond, that area of the creek that already floods so with this additional water drainage going there, what is the expectation for that flooding in that area if it already floods without this additional drainage?

**Matt Moffitt, Associate Vice President, Baxter & Woodman Consulting Engineers** – All of the water that we would be sending to the creek currently goes to the creek, we would certainly be getting it there quicker. Our pipes are designed to convey for a 10-year storm event so the creek should not be experiencing very much flooding in a 10-year storm event. In a 100-year storm event we would still have some upstream ponding and the pipes can't convey in a 100-year storm event and it wouldn't change the flood maps that are controlled by FEMA because they're assuming everything is getting to the creek to define those flood elevations. In reality, the sewer length is very small compared to the overall watershed of the creek and the water can flow much faster through a sewer than it comes through the channel. The peak flow rate through these sewers would be through the sewers and downstream before the creek would start rising from the upstream waters.

**Rob Horne, Director Public Works** – Salt Creek is a flash flood creek. It's not a creek that floods and stays flooded for 7 days, usually in 48 hours is back down to normal flow and just have wet spots in the park. As Matt said, most of the water because the water that's in people's backyards doesn't get there for days after but most of the water already goes there it just goes in a different pipe or flows over land when it floods. We wouldn't even propose this project if we felt it was going to flood out the downstream property. Our first priority is to protect property, a park can dry out in 2 days so that was the intent. There's already a flooding problem there when we have high rain event, we're not going to make it dramatically worse so let's put it where the problem already exists.

**Matt Moffitt, Associate Vice President, Baxter & Woodman Consulting Engineers** – This won't make it any worse.

**Alderman Vinezeano** – We're not going to be causing any flooding into the backyards that back up to the creek.

**Matt Moffitt, Associate Vice President, Baxter & Woodman Consulting Engineers** – No.

**Alderman Budmats** – Based on where the pipes are proposed to go especially where the 48” pipe meets the 60” pipe on Meadow, it looks like the school would be a beneficiary of receiving some relief from potential flooding, is that anticipated and should we also be looking at that taxing district for some relief on the cost of this project?

**Rob Horne, Director Public Works** – We haven’t had any extensive conversations with the school district. We’ve mentioned the project so they are aware of it. That’s a touchy thing because I think there’s a potential that we may need the school district and need them to cooperate with us to secure land for easement for us to put the pipe in. Quite honestly I would wait for direction by the City Council on that in that regard. I don’t think it would be my position initially to do that unless directed by the City Council. I appreciate the question it does make sense.

**Alderman Budmats** – Do they have flooding issues with the rest of the neighborhood or not really?

**Rob Horne, Director Public Works** – Not that I’m aware of. I can certainly research that but I don’t recall ever hearing that they have a flooding issue there.

**Alderman Sanoica** – I just have some general questions and it’s relative to the assessments that were mentioned earlier. How long do assessment and storm water studies remain valid given that the residents engage in landscaping projects and other home improvements that may change elevation or drainage systems? I ask because 2002 and 18 years later that 2020 assessment, did staff or the City engineer note any significant changes between those two studies and assessments?

**Matt Moffitt, Associate Vice President, Baxter & Woodman Consulting Engineers** – In general, I would say an assessment study holds its validity for quite some time. The only thing from the 2002 study that I would say is outdated is the updated definition of the rainfall data. When they were looking at a 10-year or 100-year storms and what the results were for those size storms, the definition of those storms is larger now. Generally, when we’re looking at a larger scale so when we’re considering the flow in the rear yards and putting that into our model we’re assuming that everything can get to the sewer. Nothing is blocking it and nothing is being ponded because that’s the conservative assumption. If there’s anything that can’t get to the sewer it may at some point somebody may redo their landscaping or add a drain then the water can get to the sewer so we want to make sure that we’ve planned accordingly. The size of the pipes don’t change, the slope of the ground overall doesn’t change, you might have little deflections on each individual property but it’s still slopping. The study done in 2005 is still valid except where it states 10 year protection it’s more like 7 year protection as that definition has changed.

**Alderman Sanoica** – I would like some follow up that the Council can anticipate, I understand that this is the City of Rolling Meadows Stormwater Engineering Plan debut and that we should expect some similar projects in the future given potential funding sources. I would want to know how additional areas that experience underserved stormwater drainage surface will be prioritized in the future or if we’ll be relying on this older data that’s been done in 2002 and moving forward from there. If no further comment from staff then I have no further question at this time.

**Alderman O’Brien** – I do happen to be in this Ward of where this is. I did get several thumbs up from residents, it looks like we might be making progress on this. That was most of the responses I received. The question I recently received, they just want to get a feel for least impact to the school, church and residents. Just from a boundary perspective, if we talk Meadow is that roughly going to be from that back parking lot of Kimball Hill to South Street? Does it go as far north as Campbell? I’m just trying to see what the parameter is on Meadow and then furthest east it goes on Park Street, it looks like Oriole. That’s where a big pooling is at Oriole and Park. It doesn’t go around where Park turns into Dove, correct? They were asking for a rough outline of where this is all going to take place.

**Rob Horne, Director Public Works** – That’s correct. We are just going until the Oriole intersection and we are going to replace the inlets that are on that corner. As I probably told several of you, the community was built out before there were MWRD regulations that dictated storm sewer sizes. The pipe size on this street currently is 10” and that’s primarily why the flooding occurs in the streets the pipes are just not big enough to take the water. Park Street we would be east to Oriole where we would replace the inlets at that intersection and the northern limits would be Sigwalt. That’s where we tried to focus the improvement on so it would never extend beyond those limits so we wouldn’t extend to Campbell Street. To Alderman Sanoica’s question, the thing about the Park Street project is as I indicated, we put that on a list of 15 or 20 other projects most of which were road projects because it was fresh and it was something that was comprehensive and as I’ve discussed with you personally, we are evolving away from the backyard drainage installs that don’t last but 6-7 years and then they become unreliable and we end up back there with the same problem. This is the first one we had the opportunity to look at comprehensively and in addition we received \$300,000 for it so it was a nudge in the side to pursue this project as there is a benefit to pursuing this. I apologize for not answering your previous question.

**Alderman Bisesi** – In the beginning of this you mentioned that this was a kickoff. I do know that even within this Ward what I would consider significant flooding issues that are not within the blue area which is along Dove Street. Having been a former resident for 10 years on Dove Street I know that there is a lot of backyard flooding and we’re talking feet not inches of water. I do know that Dove Street floods substantially in a lot of these rains unless something has been done since 2000. I know this is going to all consuming thing for the next 4-5 years but are there plans for other areas that are on a list?

**Rob Horne, Director Public Works** – As I said before, the program in the past was really just 4” drain tile in people’s backyards that would run across backyards and end up discharging near or in an inlet and the reality is that wasn’t a comprehensive long term solution to the drainage problem. It was a quick fix and was done with the very best of intentions but there was no staying power. What we’re doing is we’re using GIS, we’re tracking all of our drainage complaints, all of our drainage problem areas and we’re trying to use that data to develop a more comprehensive programs. Obviously that one year that Matt laid out is like \$700,000 but the other years are significant but not overwhelming and there’s nothing to indicate that we can’t do multiple projects in a year or we can’t roll from this program right into the next program. This community is under designed because of the MWRD regulations. We have infrastructure needs that you’ll hear about in the near future related to water mains. These are programs that need to be done every year. You’re never going to do them all quickly but you have to do them consistently and keep working at it and over time you make the improvements that need to be made. To your point Alderman Bisesi, I could probably think of 30 areas like you’re describing and I’m not exaggerating but we are identifying those areas and we’re trying to build a plan to get those in the works. It’s something we’ll want to talk about in the near future as well is to potentially start doing some preliminary engineering on some of these projects so when we do get exposed to some of this grant funding or these quick capital improvement plans that come out of Springfield or Washington that we are agile enough to get our plans in right away and get some of those funding opportunities.

**Alderman Bisesi** – I get that. I know it’s been brought up in prior meetings such as along Hicks with the sidewalks and everything and it does impact the residents quite a bit over there as well.

## 2) American Rescue Plan Discussion

**Barry Krumstok, City Manager** - The American Rescue Plan (The American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 – ARPA) was signed into law on March 11, 2021 and provides \$350 billion in additional funding for state and local governments (newly established Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds program). The state funding portion is approximately \$195 billion with \$25.5 billion distributed equally among the 50 states and the District of Columbia and the remaining amount distributed according to a formula based on unemployment. (The total Plan signed into law has a value of \$1.9 trillion). [The plan had sections dealing with state & local aid; direct payments to citizens; tax provisions; expanded unemployment benefits; small business provisions; health & human services provisions; Medicaid/Medicare policy funding; nutrition provisions; Homeland Security provisions; agriculture provisions; transportation & infrastructure provisions; education provisions; environmental provisions; energy & utility provisions; consumer protection provisions; housing provisions; a section dealing with veterans; and finally a technology, broadband and cyber segment].

The local funding portion is approximately \$130 billion, equally divided between cities and counties. Localities will receive the funds in two disbursements – the first after the U.S. Treasury certifies the proceeds to each jurisdiction (as early as May 10, 2021) and the second one year later (2022 or later). Funding must be spent by the end of calendar year 2024.

For municipalities, \$65 billion is divided between jurisdictions that are Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) entitlement jurisdictions and those that are not. \$45.5 billion of the \$65 billion will be allocated to metropolitan cities utilizing a modified CDBG formula, and the remaining amount for jurisdictions that are non-entitlement CDBG, will be allocated according to population. For the non-entitlement jurisdictions, the amount will not exceed seventy- five percent of their most recent budget as of January 27, 2020. Additionally, non-entitlement jurisdictions proceeds will be allocated through the state for redistribution to local governments.

From all the information provided, the City of Rolling Meadows is scheduled to receive \$2.9 million from ARPA.

Eligible uses of these funds include:

- Revenue replacement for the provision of government services to the extent of the reduction in revenue due to the COVID-19 public health emergency, relative to revenues collected in the most recent fiscal year prior to the emergency,
- COVID-19 expenditures or negative economic impacts of COVID-19, including assistance to small businesses, households, and hard-hit industries, and economic recovery,
- Premium pay for essential workers,
- Make investments in water, sewer, and broadband infrastructure.

Restrictions on the uses of these funds include:

- Funds allocated cannot be used to directly or indirectly to offset tax reductions or delay a tax or tax increase;
- Funds cannot be deposited into any pension fund.

As mentioned before, funding must be spent by the end of calendar year 2024.

As with previous COVID-19 relief packages, implementation will be an extensive process as new or updated guidance and FAQs are developed and released by the U.S. Treasury. For example, the legislation requires each

jurisdiction's executive to "certify" that the funds will be used for eligible purposes. That process (including all paperwork, documentation, etc.) is currently under development by the U.S. Treasury.

Temporary Nature of ARPA Funds: ARPA funds are non-recurring so their use should be applied primarily to non-recurring expenditures.

- Care should be taken to avoid creating new programs or add-ons to existing programs that require an ongoing financial commitment.
- Replenishing reserves used to offset revenue declines during the pandemic should be given high priority to rebuild financial flexibility/stability and restore fiscal resiliency.
- Use of ARPA funds to cover operating deficits caused by COVID-19 should be considered temporary and additional budget restraint may be necessary to achieve/maintain structural balance in future budgets.
- Investment in critical infrastructure is particularly well suited use of ARPA funds because it is a non-recurring expenditure that can be targeted to strategically important long-term assets that provide benefits over many years. However, care should be taken to assess any on-going operating costs that may be associated with the project.

The influx of funds will undoubtedly benefit state and local finances, and aid in the recovery from the budgetary, economic, and financial impacts of the pandemic. Rating agencies will evaluate a government's use of the ARPA funds in formulating its credit opinion and, importantly, will consider your government's level of reserves and structural budget balance, or efforts to return to structural balance, as part of their credit analysis.

Finance officers (Staff, Boards, Councils, etc.) will play a critical role in highlighting the need to use ARPA funds prudently with an eye towards long-term financial stability and sustainable operating performance. The funding provided under ARPA provides a unique opportunity for state and local governments to make strategic investments in long-lived assets, rebuild reserves to enhance financial stability, and cover temporary operating shortfalls until economic conditions and operations normalize.

The funds received by the City will be audited by the City's auditors and other outside agencies.

While this discussion really deals with ARPA and local governments, please note that the small business provision provides:

- \$7.25 billion for the Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) forgivable loans.
- Made more not-for-profits eligible for the PPP by creating a new category called "additional covered nonprofit entity," which are those not-for-profits listed in Section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code other than a few excluded organizations, that can receive an initial PPP loan and complied with certain other provisions (like number of employees and lobbying activities).
- \$15 billion for targeted Economic Injury Disaster Loan (EIDL) advance payments.
- \$25 billion for restaurants, bars, and other eligible providers of food and drink.
- \$1.25 billion for shuttered venue operators.
- \$175 million to create a "community navigator" pilot program to increase awareness of and participation in COVID-19 relief programs for business owners currently lacking access, with priority for business owned by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, women, and veterans.

Overall, ARPA will provide emergency grants, lending, and investment to hard-hit small businesses so they can rehire and retain workers and purchase the health and sanitation equipment they need to keep workers safe. (The

American Rescue Plan also includes a Small Business Opportunity Fund to provide growth capital to main street small businesses in economically disadvantaged areas, including minority-owned businesses).

Finally, for businesses and individuals I would also refer them to the State of Illinois & Cook County programs that they have in place and continue to enhance. It is rumored that these programs may be increased, enhanced or renewed with the money received.

At this time, until all the rules and paperwork are completed, Staff is thinking that the best use for the money will be to allocate it to future water and sewer infrastructure projects. Staff strongly believes this keeps an eye towards long-term financial stability and sustainable operating performance in the City's Utilities Fund.

**Mayor Gallo** – I find it a bit shocking initially of the \$1.9 trillion that is going to be pumped out as stimulus we're anticipating \$2.9 million and this evening we just discussed one project, I'm not going to call it a small project but as far as it's regional span it's a small project within the City that's at a cost \$1.3 million. It's important that if we are limited to \$2.9 million in the upfront direct money to Rolling Meadows that we use it very specifically and get the most value that we can at this time.

Is there a motion to adjourn? Alderman Sanoica has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Vinezeano. Will the Clerk please call the roll?

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

With 7 in favor and 0 opposed, this meeting is adjourned.

**There being no further business, by unanimous consent the Committee-of-the Whole meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted: Judy Brose, Deputy City Clerk

April 20, 2021 Committee of the Whole Minutes Approved by Council on May 11, 2021.

*Judy Brose*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Judy Brose, Deputy City Clerk