

**CITY COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
July 14, 2020**

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

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

ROLL CALL:

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

With 6 present and 1 absent there is a quorum.

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

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

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

Given the situation of our State and the Governors Executive Orders we have to modify the way that we vote during these virtual meetings so from here on out each vote will be required as a roll call vote, we can no longer "all those in favor say aye/nay" votes.

MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES:

The first order of business is to approve the minutes from the *June 9, 2020 City Council Meeting*. Is there a motion to approve the minutes? Alderman O'Brien made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Bisesi. Are there any corrections, additions, or deletions to the minutes? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call the Roll.

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

With 6 in favor and 0 opposed, these minutes are approved.

The set of minutes are for the *June 23, 2020 City Council Meeting*. Is there a motion to approve the minutes? Alderman Sanoica made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman D’Astice. Are there any corrections, additions, or deletions to the minutes? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call the Roll.

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

With 6 in favor and 0 opposed, these minutes are approved.

MOTION TO DEVIATE: None

MAYOR'S REPORT: None

WARD REPORTS: None

MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR 20 MINUTES:

The next step is to open the meeting to the public but the Deputy City Clerk did not receive any requests for public or written comments so we’ll move on to the next item on the agenda.

➤ **PENDING:** None

➤ **CONSENT ORDINANCES:**

Mayor Gallo - The next item on the agenda are the Consent Ordinances. It consists of three (3) items, item A through C. I am going to pull item A. Is there any Alderman that wishes to pull B or C?

Alderman D’Astice – Item C.

Mayor Gallo – I am just going to read the three items individually. I pulled item A because Staff is requesting a waiver of 1st reading for so this Ordinance can be approved immediately. Is there an Alderman willing to make a motion to waive the 1st reading for this Ordinance? Alderman O’Brien has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Sanoica.

A) Ordinance No. 20-26 – Approve Confirming and Extending the State of Emergency within the City of Rolling Meadows Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic (1st Reading)

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is shall the Ordinance be moved forward for final approval, will the Clerk please call the Roll.

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

With 6 in favor and 0 opposed, the Ordinance does move forward for final approval.

Ordinance No. 20-26 is now back for final approval. Is there a motion to adopt this Ordinance? Alderman O'Brien has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Bisesi. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is shall this Ordinance be adopted. Will the Clerk please call the Roll.

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

With 6 in favor and 0 opposed. This Ordinance is adopted.

B) Ordinance No. 20-00 – Approve a Special Use to Allow Outdoor Storage and Variations for Side and Rear Yard Pavement Setbacks at 4000 Industrial Avenue (1st Reading)

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

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

With 6 in favor and 0 opposed. This Ordinance will be moved forward for 2nd Reading.

Item C was pulled by Alderman D'Astice.

C) Ordinance No. 20-00 – Approve an Amendment to the Ramlin Rose Planned Development to Authorize a New 70-Space Parking Lot and Associated Improvements for Property Commonly Known as The Preserve at Woodfield located at 4700 Arbor Drive (1st Reading)

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

Alderman D'Astice you pulled this so you have first comments.

Alderman D'Astice – The Stadium Club had been in my Ward for many, many years and the owner Mr. Bufalino contacted me about this. Apparently, he is in negotiations with the ownership of the apartments and they are discussing a lease of parking spots that they've had for many years. I don't know the exact details. The owner also told me that he had offered to sell them those additional parking spots. I had met with him about a month ago and he walked me around the area. He said that if they are unable to come to terms not only would the apartment complex lose about 60 spots that they lease but in addition he owns land which allows the tenants an additional 100 or so parking spots. I think it might be beneficial for us at this time to delay any movement on this until both landowners are able to come to terms. As I read through this, I believe they're short on parking spots and these spots would help but if they don't come to terms the apartments could lose 160 spots. I think it might just be beneficial for us as a Council to delay this and

I would make a motion that we delay this for 90 days that should give them plenty of time to negotiate a deal. If they're unable to come to terms then the apartment ownership group would probably want to put more parking spots on the property and that might impact what they want to do with this one section.

Mayor Gallo - You had made a motion to postpone this for 90 days, correct?

Alderman D'Astice - Yes, to delay it for 90 days to give the principals time to do whatever they're going to do.

Mayor Gallo - Okay, is there a second to Alderman D'Astice's motion? Alderman Cannon has seconded the motion. Is there any discussion on the postponement?

Barry Krumstok, City Attorney – Vince Bufalino is actually here at City Hall. He did not look at the agenda and did not see that he needed to request to speak one hour before the meeting. He did provide a written statement and I will read that for the record.

Good evening Mr. Mayor and members of the City Council. I am here to let you know that my family is in a lease dispute with Preserves of Woodfield. We have made two attempts to settle the dispute with 2 separate offers. They have not responded to either. Due to the virus and courts being closed we have been unable to litigate the matter until now. The end result will be the loss of a total of 160 parking spots for Preserves of Woodfield, 53 spots directly on our property and access to an additional 107 parking spot via our property. Not only will there be the loss of parking spots, new fire lanes will need to be established. With the loss of their lease, the proposed parking addition will need to be reconfigured to accommodate fire lanes and access to lost parking spots. Most likely this will not be able to be accomplished without using more green space. I hope we are able to settle the issue to both parties benefit. We felt it needed to be on the Council's radar to avoid future problems. Thank you. (Vince Bufalino, 4001-4025 Algonquin Road)

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - Maybe I can defer to JoEllen Charlton on this matter. In a lot of cases with respect to zoning decisions, if the City Council delays on making a decision based upon the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission that delay is deemed a denial and it's often 60 days. I'm perusing the Code right now to see if that limitation is impacting the City but I just want to make the City Council aware that a delay of that nature is deemed a denial and gives the applicant the right to review and move forward to Circuit Court if they don't make a decision in an appropriate amount of time.

Mayor Gallo - You mentioned 60 days and Alderman D'Astice's put the recommendation for 90 days and I don't know if he was just trying to give additional padding and wasn't aware like myself being a 60 window. Should we strike this motion? What is your recommendation illegally on that if it deems a denial?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - I think we should hear from JoEllen Charlton on this matter before the Council votes on this but since the motion before the Council was 90 days, Alderman D'Astice could amend it and then the City Council could vote on that. I don't have the time limitations in front of me at this point.

JoEllen Charlton, Assistant Director Public Works - Attorney Wolf, if you could still look for the language that might be in the City Code or statutes with regards to the timing, I can't really speak to that at this point but I wanted to advise the Council of the content of the conversation that occurred at the Planning and Zoning Commission. Mr. Bufalino did attend the public hearing and made a lot of the same statements. He did notify the Commission that he and the petitioner were in dispute over a lease agreement and it has to do with the parking that's directly behind his shopping center that provides access not only

to some additional parking that he's leased but also access to some additional parking as he mentioned to the tune of about 100 spaces. When we first talked to the applicant about their proposed parking scenario they were aware of this dispute and wanted to ensure that regardless of the outcome of that dispute that they would be in a position to provide additional parking for the residents. We made sure through the design that they would have proper access to the new 60 parking spaces by access that didn't rely on the access that Vince Bufalino is talking about. The Planning and Zoning Commission was very interested in ensuring that the two parties would continue to negotiate in good faith, it was their opinion that the proposed parking met all of the standards of the Planned Development and could proceed with their recommendation for approval with or without the recommended satisfaction of the lease terms through the courts. He did mention that they were trying to negotiate in good faith but the courts closures due to the pandemic had prevented that. I do believe that the Planning and Zoning Commission's recommendation is good to move forward with this particular parking while this discussion continues through the courts.

Alderman Bisesi - I'm trying to understand the real purpose for delaying this. I don't see how one really impacts the other. It sounds like the apartments want to provide more parking for the residents. I'm not really sure but it sounds like someone is trying to gain leverage over another party in a separate discussion that they're having regarding their rights to those other spots. I'll be voting yes on the original ordinance and no on the delay.

Alderman O'Brien - I think Ms. Charlton confirmed what I was wondering is based on the write up we received it would be two separate things because the landowner now would have access from a new access drive for those 60 spots so it's the 100+ spots that are in question, is that correct? I'm for the delay but maybe a 45 day delay and we'll defer to Attorney Wolf on that because it would be great if they could work it out themselves. It is two separate things, correct?

JoEllen Charlton, Assistant Director Public Works - That is correct.

Alderman Budmats - As Mr. Bisesi said I feel like we're being used as leverage to help push a decision from one business owner to another. If the business owners being The Preserve at Woodfield, if they have the legal right and if having approval within the confines as defined by our agreement to put a parking lot in and they're not asking for any special exceptions then I think we're obligated to give it to them because they've met the requirements. Just because a neighboring business wants to enter a lease dispute and it feels to me like it's unrelated and has nothing to do with our approval of this and they're entitled to the approval and it's something they should get because they've gone through our process. I'll be voting for it and against any delays in providing it.

Alderman D'Astice - Truly there is no ulterior motive, there's no gaining leverage or anything else that the other Aldermen spoke of. I just thought that it would probably help because the way it was explained to me yesterday was that they'll be able to get the new parking spots but they could potentially lose 100 more spots if they're not able to work out some kind of agreement with their neighbor. I'm happy to change my motion from 90 days to 60 days, I just wanted to give the parties ample time to have a conversation and try to negotiate something. I would change my motion from 90 days to 60 days so that they don't automatically get denied and I would change it to 45 days if that's what's needed or whatever the law would allow.

Alderman Sanoica - As these properties have been discussed today are in my Ward, in the 7th Ward as of this date. I represent the residents that live at The Preserve at Woodfield and at a previous Council decision we voted to remove street parking with the assumption that additional parking would be built to compensate for that loss. That was a decision that was supported by our Police Chief and other City Staff

and I received no response from residents regarding the loss of that street parking. I do appreciate the goodwill of Mr. Bufalino for also meeting with me today regarding this issue and I hope that he will continue throughout these negotiations to continue his goodwill and hopefully come to a resolution where he can continue to lease those parking spaces as it's a benefit to my residents to have the spaces that they need. Per our packet, even with the additional 70 spaces we're still at about 1.6 spaces per dwelling unit. Regardless of what happens with Mr. Bufalino's pending litigation with The Preserve at Woodfield management it is still in the best interest of the residents and the public good to approve the 70 parking spaces without delay. I will be voting no to any delay today and I will be voting in favor of the parking lot because it's going to benefit our residents the most.

Mayor Gallo - Attorney Wolf, have you had an opportunity to find how to better define this window of time for Alderman D'Astice's motion?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - I'm not finding any specified time period as identified by the City Code but I am now looking at the statute to see if there is a defined time period for which the Council has to make the determination. My recommendation is that since this is first reading maybe the Council hold off on postponing this matter until second reading and at which time I could advise Council if there is a specific duration of time that's mandated by the statute or the City Code and get some further research completed.

Mayor Gallo - That does make sense given this is the first reading that while this motion is on the floor we just vote it down and vote on the original and we still have up until the second reading to determine if there needs to be Council action to push this out for a period of time or just continue procedurally as we are. Are there any further matters to discuss on this motion to push it out? Alderman D'Astice, you mentioned that you're okay with amending it from 90 days to 60 days. The vote here is to the delay this which is what you were hoping for in good faith so they can work it out to delay it for 60 days or do you want to stick with your 90?

Alderman D'Astice - 60 days is fine. I don't want this to automatically die, I was just trying to give the parties an opportunity to have a conversation since the courts were closed and it will give everyone else an opportunity to go out there and take a look because not only will they lose the leased space if they can't work out something they'll lose 100+ more spots so the percentage is going to go down from 1.6 to 1.3. I'm good with 60 days.

Mayor Gallo - The vote right now that Council should vote upon is to delay this for 60 days. Again, this is first reading only so maybe that's not necessary.

Alderman Sanoica - I just wanted to clarify that when we're talking about parking spaces disappearing as a result of this lease not being renewed or whatever result happens from this litigation then that's the responsibility of The Preserve at Woodfield to come back to us and try to be compliant with our Code and that would not be on the other party, correct?

Jo Ellen Charlton, Assistant Director Public Works - The reduction in parking is true. I know that there is access to additional parking spaces that would not be available if the lease were not successfully negotiated and the access to those parking spaces were cut off. During the public hearing, the applicant testified that there are other locations within the development that additional parking could be provided. While the Planning and Zoning Commission was amenable to considering those future expansions for parking, they did talk a little bit about the continued loss of green space so there will be a measure of looking at the disparity between providing additional parking and making sure that there's still adequate green space. Obviously, the best scenario for all involved would be the successful negotiation of this lease

as you indicated in your earlier statement. That's the message what the Planning and Zoning Commission left with both parties and both parties agreed that they would try to do that as soon as the courts allowed but again the owner of the apartment complex does have additional alternatives that don't involve this property.

Alderman Sanoica - Regardless of the outcome of that litigation what could end up ultimately we would still want this parking lot created for the benefit of the residents. If we need additional parking after we have knowledge of the result of that pending litigation then the petitioner can come back to us with that knowledge because right now we're dealing with hypotheticals so I don't think it's prudent for the Council to make a decision to delay based off of that hypothetical. Given that it wouldn't be whether or not we would build this parking lot or whether or not we would build this parking lot and then some. That's all that I wanted to clarify at this time.

Mayor Gallo - We're at the point of the vote for this motion to postpone this decision for 60 days. Will the Clerk please call the roll.

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

With 2 in favor and 4 opposed. The motion to push this out 60 days has failed.

Mayor Gallo – This brings us back to the original Ordinance of 1st Reading. Is there any additional discussion? Seeing none, the question is shall the Ordinance be moved forward to 2nd Reading? Will the Clerk please call the Roll.

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

With 5 in favor and 1 opposed. This Ordinance will be moved forward for 2nd Reading.

➤ **NEW BUSINESS:**

D) MOTION TO APPROVE PAYMENT OF BILLS ON WARRANT 7/14/2020

The next item of business is a motion to approve the Warrant from July 14, 2020 as presented by the Finance Department. Is there a motion to approve the Warrant? Alderman O'Brien made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Sanoica. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call the Roll.

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

With 6 in favor and 0 opposed. This Warrant is approved.

➤ **CONSENT RESOLUTIONS:**

The next items on the agenda are the Consent Resolutions. It consists of four (4) items, items E and H. Does any Alderman wish to remove any item from the Consent Agenda for Resolutions?

Alderman D’Astice – Items E and F.

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

G) Resolution No. 20-R-69 – Award a Contract to Provide Engineering Services to Conduct an American Water Infrastructure Act Risk and Resilience Assessment and Emergency Response Plan for the City’s Water System

H) Resolution No. 20-R-70 – Authorize a Contract for the Purchase of a 2020 Refuse Truck (Replacement of RM305/T334 2012 Peterbilt/McNeilus)

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

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

With 6 in favor and 0 opposed, the Resolutions are adopted.

Item E was pulled by Alderman D’Astice

E) Resolution No. 20-R-67 – Approve Local Public Agency Agreement for Federal Participation with Illinois Department of Transportation for Proposed Quentin Road (Euclid Avenue to Hartung Road) Bike Path Project (Engineering, Right-of-Way Acquisition, Construction and Construction Engineering)

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

Alderman D’Astice you pulled this so you have first comments.

Alderman D’Astice - When I was reviewing this it just seems to me that \$260,000 to do this and I just want to be able to vote independently either for or against this and the next one because it seems like it’s a lot of money to be spending at this time for bike path that I’m not sure if it’s quite a mile or a couple miles maybe, it just seems like a lot of money. I know we’re getting help from the feds which is always nice but it’s still \$260,000.

Alderman Sanoica - As a member of the Northwest Municipal Conference Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee as well as a resident of this City, this is part of a larger plan over a couple of years. I'm also part of the Capital Improvements Committee here at the City as is Alderman D'Astice so it surprises me that he appears to be questioning the value of increasing Complete Streets for our main roadways. Specifically this one mentioned here where we have already received Federal backing at an 80/20 split and because phase I engineering has already been completed and we've already paid for it. This is a bike path and pedestrian way that specifically will connect one half of the City towards a path that connects to Harper College as well as other industrial and commercial areas to the greater Northwest Suburbs. I will be voting in favor of this. We have it planned for and we have it planned for many years in order to be able to ensure that these are costs the City is more than ready to expend on this particular item. Did staff also want to speak to this item as well either Director Horne or Assistant Director Charlton?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - I don't have anything at this time.

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

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

With 5 in favor and 1 opposed, this Resolution is adopted.

Item E was pulled by Alderman D'Astice

F) Resolution No. 20-R-68 – Award a Contract for Phase II Design Engineering and Right-of-Way Acquisition Services for Quentin Road Bike Path Project (Euclid Avenue. to Hartung Road)

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

Alderman D'Astice you pulled this so you have first comments.

Alderman D'Astice - I have nothing more to say.

Alderman Cannon - I was wondering if staff can give us a little more information where they would need the land acquisition.

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - Particularly down by Hartung Road, properties along that area there is very slight encroachments that will be required. Many of the encroachments, I think there are 11 total, and 4-6 we believe are significant enough to enter into negotiations with property owners. In addition, I think one of them is the JAWA water station which we hope to get administratively. Again, they're just very small along the planned unit developments on Hartung Road.

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

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

With 5 in favor and 1 opposed, this Resolution is adopted.

OTHER BUSINESS & REPORTS:

Mayor's Appointments: None

Mayor's Proclamations: None

City Clerk's Report: None

City Staff Reports:

Barry Krumstok, City Manager went over the following:

1) Community Items of Interest:

- 1) Thank you to everyone who donated blood at the Thursday, June 25th City Blood Drive here at City Hall. Because there is such a need, another City Blood Drive has been scheduled for Thursday, August 27th from 1:00 pm to 7:00 pm in City Hall (Council Chambers). Due to the need for social distancing, appointments are really needed for this event and may be scheduled by contacting Vitalant at 877-258-4825. Wearing of a face covering (mask) is required. Walk-ins will only be accommodated if no scheduled appointments are present in the Council Chambers. *Vitalant will also be conducting COVID-19 antibody testing for all those individuals who complete the donation process during this blood drive.*
- 2) If you missed the June 27th – City Market, the next one is scheduled for July 18th from 10:00 am to 2:00 pm at Community Church (2720 Kirchoff Road). *(Face coverings, one way travel and social distancing will all be part of this event).* [There will be a tent for the Mayor & City Council at this event]. *Note: At this Market, the City will be conducting a food drive.*
- 3) As a friendly reminder, DO NOT flush any type of WIPES down the toilet! Only flush toilet paper down the toilet. Flushing wipes (even ones that say “flushable”) create sewer issues and back-ups. Do not flush: wipes, disposable wipes, cleaning wipes, cleaning related cloths, Kleenex or other items down the toilet. Dispose of these items in your trash receptacles. This is very important to share with your friends, family and neighbors.
- 4) If you have not done so, please take a few minutes out of your day to respond to the U.S. Census Survey. Rolling Meadows is doing a great job at responding at this time. Rolling Meadows response rate is 75.6% and is outpacing the overall state response at 66.7% and Cook County rate of 61.5% (as of July 7th). Everyone “wins” when you respond to the 2020 Census

because when everyone is counted, there are more opportunities for shaping our community's future. As a reminder, you may respond to the U.S. Census survey online at 2020census.gov or by phone at 844-330-2020 or using your printed U.S. Survey to respond by mail. Please respond today!

- 5) A reminder for the community – the Internal Revenue Service announced that the federal income tax filing due date is automatically extended from April 15, 2020 to July 15, 2020. The IRS urges taxpayers who are due to a refund to file as soon as possible. The State of Illinois also extended the Illinois income tax filing to July 15th.
- 6) Second Installment Cook County property tax bills are out and property owners have until October 1st to pay without any late charges. (The second installment is due August 3rd, but thanks to an ordinance passed back in May by the Cook County Board of Commissioners, property owners can pay without any interest charge through October 1st).
- 7) Another friendly reminder for residents and businesses, if you are having a hard time paying your utility bill or food & beverage payments, please contact Finance at (847) 394-8500 or by email at finance@cityrm.org and they may be able to place you on a payment plan.
- 8) Please Shop, Dine and Order in Rolling Meadows (it is more important than ever). During these times, it is significant to remember our big boxes, restaurants and small businesses.
- 9) A mailing will be distributed soon that will provide notice that require all water customers (residences & businesses) to participate in the City's Cross Connection Control Survey. This online survey is required by the IEPA every two years for all public water suppliers. The survey helps to identify potential cross connections that may exist within the City's water system. The online survey portal can be found at www.backflow.com/rollingmeadows Residents and Business owners' participation is appreciated.
- 10) Scam Alert! ComEd and Nicor are saying that there are people out there trying to scam residents. Please do not give out any of your information.
- 11) We would like to remind everyone to lock your vehicles and your garage doors.

Rob Horne, Director Public Works went over the following:

2) Traffic Review Committee Report – June 2020

There is not a lot to report this month of note. We did install a hospital sign to direct emergency vehicles to the hospital off of Kirchoff Road. Other than that, we're still working on a few items, hopefully getting some movement on an item that's been on there a long time.

Barry Krumstok, City Manager went over the following:

3) July 21, 2020 Committee of the Whole Draft Agenda

- 1) *G1 Discussion*
- 2) *Parkway Signs – Relief until December 2020 (Alderman Cannon)*
- 3) *Business Assistance Program*
- 4) *Liquor License*
- 5) *Pedestrian Light Fixture Changes – Kirchoff Road*
- 6) *Old Public Works*

Barry Krumstok, City Manager went over the following:

4) July 28, 2020 City Council Draft Agenda

MOTION TO APPROVE CITY COUNCIL MINUTES OF JUNE 16, 2020 COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING AND JULY 14, 2020 CITY COUNCIL MEETING

MOTION TO DEVIATE:

MAYOR'S REPORT:

WARD REPORTS:

MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR 20 MINUTES:

PENDING:

- A) Ordinance No. 20-00 – Approve a Special Use to Allow Outdoor Storage and Variations for Side and Rear Yard Pavement Setbacks at 4000 Industrial Avenue (2nd Reading)***
- B) Ordinance No. 20-00– Approve an Amendment to the Ramlin Rose Planned Development to Authorize a New 70-Space Parking Lot and Associated Improvements for Property Commonly Known as The Preserve at Woodfield located at 4700 Arbor Drive (2nd Reading)***

CONSENT ORDINANCES:

- C) Ordinance No. 20-00 – Approve an Ordinance Confirming and Extending the State of Emergency within the City of Rolling Meadows Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic (1st Reading)***
- D) Ordinance No. 20-00 – CDD Fee Schedule Revision (1st Reading)***
- E) Ordinance No. 20-00 – Amend Liquor License: Video Gaming Ordinance (1st Reading)***
- F) Ordinance No. 20-00 – Amend Zoning Code – Cannabis (1st Reading)***
- G) Ordinance No. 20-00 – Amend Zoning Code – Liquor License (1st Reading)***

NEW BUSINESS:

H) MOTION TO APPROVE PAYMENT OF BILLS ON WARRANT 7/28/2020

CONSENT RESOLUTIONS:

- I) Resolution No. 20-R-00** – Authorize the Support of a Cook County 6b Classification Incentive for 900 Carnegie Street
- J) Resolution No. 20-R-00** – Authorize the Support of a Cook County 6b Classification Incentive for 980 Carnegie Street
- K) Resolution No. 20-R-00** – Authorize the Support of a Cook County 6b Classification Incentive 4000 Industrial
- L) Resolution No. 20-R-00** – Approve Plat of Consolidation for 4280 Kirchoff Road and 4290 Kirchoff Road
- M) Resolution No. 20-R-00** – Emergency Siren Relocation

OTHER BUSINESS & REPORTS:

Mayor's Appointments:

Mayor's Proclamations:

City Clerk's Report:

- City Staff Reports:*
- 1) *Community Items of Interest*
 - 2) *June 2020 New Businesses*
 - 3) *June 2020 Financials*
 - 4) *New Billing System – Live 8/1/2020*

MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA:

CLOSED SESSION:

- 1) Personnel – 5 ILCS 120/2(c) (1) of the Illinois Open Meetings Act**

ADJOURNMENT:

MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA:

Alderman Budmats - Tonight we heard from Mr. Vince Bufalino as well as a Mr. Gabe who both wanted to address the Council and both apparently went to City Hall assuming that they would be able to address us and because they were at City Hall and didn't give us one hour notice prior to the meeting starting that they weren't able to do so. Perhaps we need to do something to do a better job of getting the information out as far as if you wish to participate in the meeting. Maybe there needs to be a sign put up at City Hall or something that lets people know that for the length of time that the Covid problem is going to be affecting our ability to freely and safely meet that we should make sure that there's signs that lets people know that they will not be able to just walk in City Hall like usual and participate in a City Council meeting and that we want to help them in order to let their voices be heard on matters that are important to them.

Alderman O'Brien - I wanted to provide a quick update from the last Economic Development Committee meeting. It was mine and Alderman Vinezeano's first one and it's as part of the role that the Mayor asked us to do was be the liaison and provide a report back to our fellow Councilmembers. Mayor Gallo joined us as an introduction and to welcome the new members. We awarded a title company for the Next Level Northwest which I'm interested in getting additional information from City Staff as we move forward. There was recognition for a graduate that the Next Level Northwest provided. There were two 6(b) requests and we talked about new businesses that came into town. This was a great thing to see, the committee divided the new business list and the committee members are going to call and welcome them to the community. We talked about goals, not in detail but one of our future agenda topics will be discussing goals of the Committee for the remainder of 2020 and 2021. One item that I thought would be of all of our interest, there was a write up in the materials that the gaming terminal operator for Egg'lectic submitted an initial inquiry just about potential gaming. That clearly would be an accessory because that's a restaurant. There was no conversation at EDC about that, it was in the printed materials, we ran out of time because of the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

Alderman Sanoica - This is in direct response of Alderman O'Brien's recap for us. I think that this is a fantastic idea. Most of what he's giving us as updates to the Council but also because we keep such meticulous meeting notes thanks to our Deputy City Clerk and as a result the high-level important aspects of those meeting notes then will be more accessible to the City and to the residents. For those who are accessing meeting notes or watching recordings of our City Council meetings on YouTube or on the City website then this is an opportunity for them to know the important work that's being done on our committees in addition to the City Council. For our other committees, I would appreciate a similar high-level update in the future.

Mayor Gallo - It is my full intention that our committees and commissions do provide us a regular update and cadence that's more in line with what we haven't seen before in order to keep the Council more informed as to all that they do through the exercises they go through.

Alderman O'Brien - I know we talked last time about going back to in person meetings. I'd like to circle back to that because I know you talked about a blended approach. I personally am comfortable about being back in person, we moved to phase 4 and I attended EDC in person. I just wanted to circle back on that, is based on tonight we had 2 residents come to the City Council Chambers thinking they would be able to address us. I know your thought earlier was going with the majority of Council, people have personal reasons for potentially not being there, predisposed as well or caretaking of other family members which I completely understand. I just wanted to see if we could potentially get some type of closure to that for your potential blended approach for those of us that might be comfortable being in person. I don't know how that would work but I know we have the technology. I would like to see us start leading by example since other committees are back in person. I would like to just get a feel from the group.

Mayor Gallo - What changed my mind and put us back in this virtual meeting is when I attended the Economic Development Committee meeting I saw members having face masks on but I saw the attendees/audience sitting shoulder to shoulder without face masks on. Maybe they put them on after I left but we have a clear sign at the front door that says "face coverings must be worn". Just because the meeting didn't start yet doesn't mean the facemasks can't be on. Until I'm fully aware that that is being obeyed at all times I don't want to put the Council, staff or community members at further risk by having looser restrictions or may be not being vigilant and not even knowing some members or attendees are not wearing face coverings. As to a blended approach, it won't work to the extent we think it will, if you were to sit at the dais the Council gets the audio pumped in through the speakers and if we were to have some who were present and some who were virtually absent at their own home or elsewhere, anytime you were to speak at the dais that reverberation from the delayed effect in the microphone would be picked up because of

the speakers that are pumping out someone else's audio. If we're going to have a blended approach it still has to completely exist on a digital platform whether Zoom or WebEx, a blended approach still requires entire 100% commitment on a digital platform so we might as well be distant as a result. Staff is present at City Hall to advise these individuals. While Mr. Gabe was putting his comments out publicly I did address him privately and let him know that staff will be reaching out. I also heard through Manager Krumstok that Public Works is going to be reaching out so I think they're getting a great deal of care that sometimes otherwise wouldn't. I do know that it's better to do things physically present because it's just easier. This does come with its drawbacks. We've had a series of meetings for number months and I can count on my one hand how many glitches we've had and I'd rather have a technical glitch than I would an infection of some sort. Again, I don't want to be the cause of somebody else's infection or the transmission of that. I don't think there's any rush. There's 37 states currently that are going up in Covid and I don't want to be part of us receding in any progress that we've made. Furthermore, right now the confidence that I had by seeing attendees of a meeting not wearing face masks before the meeting started was a bit shocking and concerning to me.

Alderman O'Brien – You were there prior to myself and I don't recall seeing them without their masks. It's just personal feeling that I wanted to bring up, a handful of us were at the City Market for the Meet and Greet, we're stressing to go out and support local businesses but we're not as a Council. That's why I wanted to bring it up because you said you'll leave it to the Council but obviously it's your right as the Mayor to do so I'll respect that. We go out to dinner, we say support local businesses and we all have to run to the Jewel but I was not there as early as you were for the meeting so I didn't see that. I'm sure we can work with staff to put a police officer at the door to make sure people do have masks.

Mayor Gallo – I can respect that and it's not a time for discussion of course. I don't eat out, I go out when it's essential and necessary and it's very infrequent. These are the parameters I put around my family and my loved ones because this is what we need to do for our household. I don't want to impress my opinions on others and as a result I'd rather err on the side of caution.

Alderman O'Brien – That's why I thought a blended approach was an idea but it sounds like technology wise it may not be possible.

Mayor Gallo – It still has to exist on a digital platform as a blended approach and at that point it's 100% existent and reliant on that digital approach. Trust me, it would be a nightmare.

Alderman Sanoica – I wanted to state my support for continuing virtual meetings as necessary. I know at a previous meeting I stated that it's helpful for staff because they don't have to travel, we have a lot of staff that actually don't live within the City of Rolling Meadows and we can go late. Even now this was a light agenda and we're probably not going to get out until maybe 9:30pm with the closed session, being optimistic. I don't want to give residents the impression that we're being hypocritical because I think that's what Alderman O'Brien was getting to, I want to emphasize that the circumstances are quite different. If I can take a jump drive and stick it in my computer and download food for myself then that is what I would do but I have to go to the grocery store because I have to physically get food, that's a necessity. If we can continue to provide a service where that's not necessary and we even have some advantages that are involved with it then I think we should continue in virtual until circumstances change.

Mayor Gallo – We've had over 35-50 attendees on non-controversial items alone which is far greater than we've had at physical meetings.

Alderman Bisesi – I am very much in favor of continuing to have our meetings virtually. I do believe we have outside of myself other members that may be somewhat compromised. The simple test is when we

can lift the state of emergency then we can meet. Either that or we need to Covid test everyone coming in the door with at least that same things that every single workplace is doing with temperature checks and all of that type of stuff because we cannot control the amount of people that will be in the building at one time. I also worry about closed session whether we'd be doing that in the Council Chambers or in our normal closed session area.

Alderman D'Astice – I just want to weigh in on this and say that I agree with Alderman O'Brien.

CLOSED SESSION:

1) Personnel – 5 ILCS 120/2(c) (1) of the Illinois Open Meetings Act

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

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

With 6 in favor and 0 opposed. We will now enter Closed Session for that item.

There is also another one that you don't see on the list but it's a pending litigation item. It's a motion to find that litigation or certain matters involving the City are probable and imminent go into Closed Session to find more information on this. Do I have a motion to enter into Closed Session for this issue? Alderman Sanoica has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Bisesi. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call the Roll.

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

With 6 in favor and 0 opposed. We will also enter into Closed Session for this item. The audience and press are advised that we do not anticipate taking any action upon returning to Open Session unless we don't make the progress in Closed Session we will return to Open Session to discuss this on Matters Not on the Agenda.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, by unanimous consent the City Council meeting was adjourned at 8:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted: Judy Brose, Deputy City Clerk

July 14, 2020 City Council Minutes Approved by Council on August 11, 2020.

Judy Brose
Judy Brose, Deputy City Clerk