

**COMMITTEE-OF-THE-WHOLE
MINUTES
July 21, 2020**

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

COUNCIL IN ATTENDANCE REMOTELY: Aldermen Mike Cannon, 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, 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 Jo Ellen Charlton, Business Advocate Martha Corner and 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 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.

1) G1 Discussion

Barry Krumstok, City Manager – This is the newest draft of the draft ordinance. Since we've been talking about the G1 the Mayor has met with Selby's and what's before you is a discussion between Assistant Director Public Works JoEllen Charlton, Public Works Director Rob Horne, City Attorney Melissa Wolf and Alderman John D'Astice where they looked at a few sections of the document and what's before you are the 12 items that are now in there and the rest of the document you've already seen in the past. The proposed changes are located on page 3 and page 18 of the document. We're down to 12 establishments and it sets up what would happen with the current ones and anybody coming in new would follow the new process. That's a very quick summary and hopefully after tonight's discussion it will be brought to the City Council for first reading.

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney – The Manager's summary was very sufficient and identified the general meeting and changes that were made. The changes that came from our meeting with Alderman D'Astice are identified in red and you could see those that impact the criteria. In addition, as you see the ordinance today, you can see that the zoning ordinance is attached as an exhibit to this ordinance and it is my understanding that the actual zoning amendment was heard before the Planning and Zoning commission already and there was a recommendation to

approve the zoning changes. What that means is that these provisions when it comes to the Council for approval at the City Council level both the changes to the liquor code along with the changes to the zoning code can be made at the City Council at one time as opposed to on two separate occasions. That's the only other addition that I have.

Alderman O'Brien - First of all, thanks to everybody, I know we've been talking about this for at least 14 months that I've been part of the Council. I know we discussed the 900 feet and since manager Krumstok did reference the meeting that you had with Shelby's, can you just confirm, since that has been a discussion numerous times, are they counted as new? Currently in the write ups now it says anybody currently having a license would be considered gaming cafés such as Isabella's, Daisy's, Lulu's and Sally's, they are already established and have their credentials from the City. When we say the new ones, let's say this goes through tonight and passes first and second readings, are we considering Shelby's as new and they would be applicable to the new rules? Or are we considering them in the draft now with a cap of 5 for gaming cafés? I wasn't aware of any communication with Shelby's so I am wondering what was communicated to them. I've been talking to my constituents and making sure that anyone that's in business now isn't going to be impacted. Going forward since we're saying new, how are we considering Shelby's? I know numerous Council members had questions on this in the past.

Mayor Gallo - For clarification, my meeting with Shelby's was an introductory meeting. It was the first time we've ever gotten to meet or speak since I was sworn in on May 14, 2019. As far as I'm concerned, that was an introductory meeting and they are brand-new to me.

Alderman O'Brien - That's fair. I think that will answer my question. I'm still mixed on the 900 feet because I know we started a half-mile radius it seems like we're adjusting the ordinance to accommodate someone that's not even established yet. If we could set that as the bar, I fully support that we would consider them new so they would have to come to us then go to the Planning and Zoning Commission and pay the special use permit fees and they would be under the new guidelines and we're not counting them as existing.

Barry Krumstok, City Manager - They would be considered new because they have no liquor license at this point and they've not gone before the City Council for any other items. They would need to follow the new guidelines.

Alderman O'Brien - I'm comfortable with that but with some angst is that at least we know who the five could potentially be and we're going to cap it at five. If we do look at the sheer number, the way it's drafted now, I'm 100% comfortable with the five gaming cafés because originally it was six but we excluded the one from zone 4, so we're capped at 5 the way it's proposed now. If we look at the accessories too that's going up to 17 gaming establishments for a town of 25,000 people. I just would like to see if we do move forward with consensus on five gaming cafés as drafted, that we could really consider looking at a cap of 10 instead of 12 for the gaming establishments because that doubles us right now. That's just for discussion. In my opinion 17 places for video gaming just might be a lot between five gaming cafés and 12 restaurant establishments.

Mayor Gallo - I'll leave that discussion up to the Council in the entirety representing the Wards that they're representing. I feel like we would shoot ourselves in the foot to reduce the accessory license which clearly defines a restaurant that has gaming terminals and this was entirely created for restaurants to give them a leg up as competitors in our neighboring communities but also giving our families and residents some additional entertainment. I think if we wanted to reduce it somewhere it should actually be with the gaming cafés.

Alderman O'Brien - I wouldn't be opposed to capping gaming cafés at four.

Mayor Gallo - We're 6.4 square miles or something like that and to have five gaming cafés...

Alderman O'Brien – I could understand that.

Alderman Sanoica - I just wanted to clarify as well because one of the establishments had also reached out to me and had stated that they are intending to use the establishment primarily for gaming. What I would want to communicate to the Council or to staff regarding that any communications that they've had with this establishment that's trying to open up in the City of Rolling Meadows. From my understanding they have been trying to open up before we began this discussion earlier in the year and in 2019 when the understanding was that the establishment would be a restaurant with a gaming accessory more or less although it wasn't explicit because of the kitchen language and that sort of thing. My question would be for staff and for the Mayor, during our conversations was there any illusion of the original intent because aside from Covid that would prevent establishment from opening up in the first place regardless of whether they get the liquor license?

Mayor Gallo - I'll let staff jump in and I could fill you in on my conversation with Shelby's regarding that sentiment around being a restaurant.

Barry Krumstok, City Manager - I think your question is really about one location off of Algonquin Road. There was no guarantees and there is no sentiment. There was nothing provided to us regarding what kind of room there would be or anything else. We've always been transparent and when we meet with anyone we let them know what the process is and let them know that it all depends on what the Council decides. Again, we always sit down and make it very clear what the process is and if someone goes to the gaming board first that's on them because they never reached out to us.

Mayor Gallo – Alderman Sanoica, from my conversations and I can't speak to any historic conversations as far as they were going to come in as a gaming accessory type license or they were a restaurant establishment with secondary gaming. For me, Ms. Johns was extremely forthright in admitting that Shelby's is a gaming café. There's no two bones about it but she did say that it is by far one of the best gaming cafés that Rolling Meadows would have in its community and stellar in terms of quality and service, etc. They are purely a gaming café and they would not allow for minors to enter.

Alderman Budmats - Following along with Alderman O'Brien, we're calling the existing gaming cafés like Lulu's, restaurants now so we have the opportunity for four more gaming cafés? I'm trying to understand or can we have a total cap on licenses and change that cap after businesses are reestablished gaming cafés as they really are or how do we actually start calling a spade a spade and classify the businesses for what they are? Can someone help me understand?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - The regulations that are set forth here to allow for the identification of the existing establishments as either GA licensed establishment meaning an accessory or a GC licensed establishment meaning a gaming café. Those existing establishments that are gaming cafés under the guidelines that we've established will be identified as such at the passage of these ordinances. I believe presumably there are four gaming cafés existing at this time and based upon the criteria and the evaluation of the establishment against those criteria, those four gaming cafés will take up the four licenses that are allowed for these ordinances. In addition, those existing establishments will be granted an administrative special use permit by the Council so they are lawfully using their establishment according to the guidelines in these ordinances as well. We will not have five more gaming cafés in addition to those that are existing today.

Alderman Budmats - At the last meeting we voted to have two gaming cafés in the Plum Grove district and I'm of the personal opinion that the market will not sustain one White Hen Pantry without going out of business is going to have a difficult time supporting two gaming cafés. To me, I think it's foolishness on our part to approve a second gaming license in that corridor when there's nothing on Algonquin Road in an area that probably could support a second gaming café. I will acquiesce to the Council vote but considering the fact that we approved a license for Sally's and they've barely been able to open for two or three weeks before Covid hit, I have a feeling that we're going to put them out of business. I just wanted to make sure that those people who fought so valiantly for that particular establishment realize what they're doing.

Alderman Bisesi - I just want to clarify. I'm very much in favor of capping it at five. I like the way that this has been rewritten, all the changes are really good. The one question I have regarding the accessory license, once this is passed four of the current establishments will be moved over to a café and that would leave eight that we currently have as accessory? Is that correct?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - We'll get the numbers for you but that is correct in the sense that you will be subtracting out those gaming café establishments from the gaming accessory establishments. Under these numbers here there will be a total of 17 different locations that will have gaming whether it's a gaming café or another type of use like a restaurant or bar.

Alderman Bisesi - Right now we currently have 11 or 12? Right?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - Yes, I'll look for the numbers of establishments but that is correct.

Alderman Bisesi - Basically from the time we did that map there was 12 different spots on it, a certain number in each one of those zones or areas, we've now increased the total number of establishments between last meeting and this meeting.

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - Not between last meeting and this meeting. This has been basically consistent throughout the Committee of the Whole meetings. It will allow more establishments than were previously allowed under the G1 initial evaluation the first time around when we try to amend this. This hasn't increased from the last COW meeting to this COW meeting. The last few COW meetings have had this same number and the philosophy behind the GA license being that it was to allow those existing other uses like a restaurant or bar to be able supplement their income and have a better economic opportunity and because those establishments are completely different than gaming cafés.

Alderman Bisesi - I'm thinking they went up. So basically the map that I have from the prior meeting does not have 17 dots on it.

JoEllen Charlton, Assistant Director Public Works - There are four that we are talking about that would become gaming cafés and the fifth one would be Shelby's which is a pending one so they do not fall under the code's ability to be granted the automatic special use approval because it doesn't have an existing liquor license. In addition to those five there are seven others that I believe were identified on earlier maps that were presented to you at prior meetings. One of those which was Picante Mexican Restaurant on Algonquin Road next to the Stadium, I believe, is still pending as I don't believe they have received approval to get an accessory gaming at this point. I believe that's how they would potentially be classified depending on our final review and moving forward. They were included on the map but I think they're still considered pending.

Alderman Bisesi - That helps a lot so I'm not imagining things. We did increase by five, the number of accessory gaming establishments.

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - We didn't change this number, the number 12 has been there for a while but because of the fact that the gaming cafés are not going to be counted for those number of establishments. What this ordinance does is allow for a total of 12 gaming accessory and a total of five gaming cafés.

Alderman Bisesi – It also allows us to have five more accessory gaming establishments.

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney – That's correct because of the fact that there are only seven accessory gaming establishments right now.

Alderman Bisesi - I would propose that we put this down to seven. The main reason is saturation of businesses that will have a gaming accessory within a particular area. I think our residents would like to have a restaurant that they can go to without gaming in it and if every restaurant that we have winds up having gaming they may go elsewhere. Those whole areas are pretty much moot if we're going to allow five more. Where are they going to go? We were limiting the number of total gaming establishments in each one of those zones and I'm just concerned that there's just going to be too many of them close together whether they're accessory gaming are not. There's rules here and it's very well spelled out of what an accessory is and I'm just concerned that 12 is too many. It pretty much throws those maps out the window with the exception of the gaming cafés. I'm not sure how the other Aldermen feel but I think we need to reduce that number because now we're just asking for five more.

Alderman Vinezeano - Attorney Wolf, I have a question, we had discussed at the last COW that area 4 at this time would have zero gaming café licenses available. I don't recall if we had addressed area 2, for instance in area 2 if one of the gaming cafés were to close could we at a later time as a Council decide for this area if it fits our needs better to only have one and add that additional one to area 4 since it's at zero? Do we have that ability?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - Yes, the City does have that ability to do that. I believe regulations that you're talking about regarding the zones are located in the zoning ordinance provisions. What that would require of the City Council which is a very common practice, is for the City to petition for a text amendment to that provision of the zoning code to reduce area 2 to one and increase area 4 to one. Along those same lines if someone wants to come in area 4 as you identified it as zero, that petitioner would have to go for a text amendment as well. This process requires the City Council first to refer the matter to the Planning and Zoning Commission before a text amendment is even considered so at the onset the City Council has the opportunity to say that we're open to reducing this or we're not open to reducing this. It's kind of dealing with it at the front end so if the Council is not willing to open up an area for an increase of a license you can tell the petitioner right away and they won't have to go through the special use or text amendment process.

Alderman Vinezeano - So if we have one of the cafés close, can we as a Council ask for that to be reallocated to that area 4 immediately since realistically we'd like one in area 4 but we allocated those five based on the current businesses we have? Or do we have to wait for one to petition?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - No, the City could petition. On behalf of the City, the City can petition and then it would have to go through the hearing process because it's a text amendment but it could be quickly accomplished. You don't have to wait for an outside third-party petitioner to request that.

Alderman Vinezeano - With that being said, I'm still okay with the five seeing how we have to accommodate the current businesses that we have to include the gaming cafés that we have. I kind of disagree with Alderman Bisesi

because the point of this license was to help our restaurants with additional income. To cap it at seven I think if we had another business that's hurting extremely bad right and they were to say that extra couple hundred dollars would help us right now because they have one or two machines and we say no we already have seven I don't think that's quite fair. As much as I don't want the whole town gaming I think our original numbers are right in line to have that 17. Now if everyone's in agreement to go down to 10 for accessory I would be okay with that but nothing less than the 10 with the five additional cafés to equal 15.

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - I wanted to provide a little clarification to Alderman Bisesi's questions. The map that was originally provided was just to show the Council existing establishments and establishments that have been proposed to staff. At the direction of City Council, I believe it was two Committee of the Whole meetings ago, there was direction given to provide additional ability for accessory use to restaurants that did not already have a gaming license. I don't want to mention their names but there were a variety of restaurants that were used as examples and that's why we settled on the number 12 to allow a business that may have been here for 30 years and just hadn't applied to actually apply for one and achieve an accessory license. That was at the direction of City Council at one of our recent Committee of the Whole meetings.

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - I do have another comment with respect to Alderman Bisesi's point. He does bring up a good point regarding the number of licenses. What you see here for a GA license with a cap of 12 but what you don't see is that in the City Code for each classification, there is a number restriction on those licenses and those numbers are related to the actual licenses that already have been issued. If Alderman Bisesi didn't bring up the point I probably would have missed it and it's something that needs to be put in this Code, Section 6-37 of our City Code identifies the licenses, for instance for the G1 licenses there are only eight G1 licenses because eight establishments right now in the City have gaming. What we're going to do now is revise that so that G1 is going to turn into a GA and a GC. The GA license number that's allocated will only be those seven that are existing now. So the number 12 that you see in these regulations is the ultimate cap on it but the licenses that we are restricting will be restricted to the actual establishments that exist today. Every time we have a license application before us the City Council has to open up that license, you guys would vote on an ordinance to increase the number of licenses for a particular license classification. That process will still exist.

Mayor Gallo - After the reclassification occurs from all the existing establishments then it will come back down to true numbers and those true numbers will be represented in our ordinances, is that what you're saying?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - Yes, exactly.

Alderman Bisesi - Given what Attorney Wolf just mentioned, would that mean the 12 is then lowered? If the Council would like lower it to 10 that would be fine, I would agree with Alderman Vinezeano.

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - The answer to your question is no. That cap is not lowered by the explanation that I just discussed. The license would not be opened because of the fact that there is a restriction on the number of licenses in another provision of the City Code.

Alderman Bisesi - With that number of licenses need to be increased?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - Yes, every time someone comes to the City Council to get a liquor license. The City Council would have to increase that every time.

Alderman Bisesi - Which they would need to have in order to get the gaming license.

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - Correct. With respect to your comment about 10 being the cap, that's a decision that's up to the Council.

Alderman Bisesi - I'll go with whatever the majority wants but it's my opinion that it should be lower than 12 because that gives a total of 17 establishments. The Mayor mentioned we're a 6.4 square mile City that's a lot of establishments.

Mayor Gallo - Is there any further comment at this time or should we take a straw vote on the reduction to represent 10 establishments? At this point, let's do a quick straw vote for those in favor seeing the number adjusted to 10 gaming accessory licenses, please raise your hand. 2 in favor; 5 opposed. The straw vote represents no change in the number of gaming licenses accessory.

Mayor Gallo opened the floor.

Charity Johns, CEO Laredo Hospitality – Thank you Mayor Gallo and members of the City Council. I hope all of you and those listening are safe, healthy and well. The last time I was able to address the City Council our organization had closed down all 95 locations amid the Covid-19 pandemic. I'm grateful that we've been able to safely reopen and welcome all of our guests back in the communities that we are currently in. It is my sincere hope that we can also move forward with our Shelby's location in the City of Rolling Meadows. We appreciate the time and consideration the Council has taken again even at this meeting to draft the GC license and ordinance with some of the changes that have been made. I believe these changes will hopefully allow us to join your business community. It's been over a year that we've been working on this opportunity with our landlord and with Barry and Martha at the City so we could ensure we met all the requirements and get it exactly right. I did tell you Mayor Gallo that we would build an establishment that your City would be incredibly proud of. We will make that investment. We hope that tonight Council will allow us to move forward with our Shelby's location in the Plum Grove Shopping Center. Thank you so much for your time.

Mayor Gallo closed the floor.

Mayor Gallo – Any last comments or questions?

Alderman Budmats - Which are the anticipated locations that would be classified as the GC's?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - I believe those locations would be Lulu's, Isabella's, Daisy's and Sally's.

Alderman Budmats - Where does Bigby's fit in? I assume they still have a gaming license, if they don't meet the restaurant criteria then what do we call them?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - They are still a gaming accessory but a bar. The gaming accessory license is allowed for their bar liquor license and I believe it's an A3 license. It's an accessory to their bar license being an A3.

2) Temporary Sign Enforcement Modifications

Alderman Cannon - As you can see from my write up it's a very simple request. I think we all are very aware of all the difficulty anybody in business has been having over the last 3 to 4 months. I thought this might be a small way we might help them increase their visibility and hopefully generate a little bit more business for them. In my mind it's a simple request but I'm guessing in some other people's mind it might not be so simple. I deferred to staff on purpose because I don't feel like I'm vested with enough knowledge. I think Jo Ellen and Barry did a great job putting together some criteria that I think we can live with fairly easily. I have asked for a limited time on this but I guess we can debate that time if other people would like to. I think it's a very simple straightforward request. Thank you.

JoEllen Charlton, Assistant Director Public Works - I have a few main points. We are very supportive of the efforts to help our business community get back on their feet. A couple of items, I know the original request came in and some people talk about allowing signage in the right-of-way and typically that is the area that includes everything from the back of sidewalk. As you know a lot of times there is a green area between the sidewalk and the curb and that is considered city-owned/state-owned/county owned right-of-way. I know areas are typically saved for signage that is intended to direct traffic and we feel very strongly that allowing or introducing signage within the right away is not a good idea both in terms of creating a lot of clutter and confusion and also potential liabilities. Once we open it up it's hard to get back. Also consider what happens if a motorist hits one of those signs then we have a whole new level of liability. Really the only strong objection staff would have to relaxing any sign regulations is to make sure that we do not allow them in the actual right-of-way. Once you get beyond that I think it's a policy decision of the Council and we listed a couple of ideas for Council to consider both in terms of where the signage goes along the roadway and who might be qualified for that signage and also some of the temporary signage that is closer to somebody's front door. I think there's kind of two main areas that make sense to identify and define some additional signage opportunities. We all have our opinions about where it's a feather or floppy sign, banners or no banners. We did take a brief drive and some of our commercial neighborhoods while some people are pretty responsible and putting up some of these temporary signs up we have a lot of people that just put one up every 10 feet. I think we do need some restrictions on the books so that the signage is helpful to people is actually helpful and not just lost in a clutter of signage. So I think putting some regulations in place will also help increase visibility. The only other thing that I wanted to mention is who is eligible to take advantage of this increase signage. Our proposal is to specifically focus on those nonessential businesses so that anyone that's been able to be open and operational since the restrictions took place aren't struggling nearly as much and kind of use that as an artificial boundary to other people who have been struggling to get additional visibility. Again, that's also policy decision up to the discretion of the Council. I'm happy to take suggestions, if we move forward with this I think we would treat it very similar to the way we created a draft ordinance for the Council's consideration when we did the outdoor dining. If we get direction we could put that together in ordinance format and bring that forward as soon as possible.

Alderman Vinezeano - I really liked all this but the only thing that stuck out was who was eligible. It says only those retail and restaurant business required to remain closed during the early phases of Covid. We know many of our businesses especially our restaurants were closed but they did a lot of take out, I just want to make sure that we know what that wording means because obviously we want them to be included in this. I don't know if we want to change that wording a little bit maybe add closed to customers or patrons. I just wanted to address that because I would definitely want those restaurants to be eligible for this if they were able to take out during the early phase. I totally agree with the duration with November 1 in reviewing this, I like that to go with the outdoor seating/dining and we can always review this as a Council together.

Alderman Sanoica – Have any businesses expressed what they want to do but can't per our signage code? I want to ensure that comprehensive insight is included in any of these code changes.

Barry Krumstok, City Manager - We haven't heard from any businesses one way or another. Most of them have either said they're putting a sign out or they're not interested. There really has not been a lot of feedback.

Alderman Sanoica - As a follow-up to not deviating from this agenda item, I appreciate turning to our neighbors for inspiration and to understand what everyone else is doing around us but I also think that Rolling Meadows has the opportunity to be a leader and go beyond signage. I would ask what additional marketing opportunities are available to connect customers with Rolling Meadows establishments? I think that is a question for us as a Council and for staff. I want the Council to go beyond gestures and perhaps consider more innovative problem-solving approach. We can consider what additional strategies are being proposed by the Rolling Meadows Chamber of Commerce or other regional Chambers of Commerce, Chicago Northwest and staff doesn't have to answer that now at tonight's meeting but I would like staff and our Business Advocate to propose recommendations that the Council can pursue to ensure that for those who are able and excited to do business that they do business in Rolling Meadows and that this code change for signage is included in a larger strategic plan for ensuring that our businesses are able to weather through the Covid-19 pandemic now and probably through 2021 and onward.

Mayor Gallo – Alderman Sanoica, I want to thank you for bringing that up. Just last Thursday I did have a conversation with Manager Krumstok on the fact that this sign campaign in its essence is noble and it's a good thing that we're trying to help provoke people to frequent these establishments but we do know that the data shows that it's not built on impulse where someone is driving by and they see the sign and deviate and turn in but it's more on the campaigns themselves, marketing, advertisement and messaging. Last Thursday, Manager Krumstok and I were talking about that and we're trying to see what staff can do to leverage resources for marketing campaigns. It's nice that we're trying to come up with a suggestion or create more notice of these establishments but that's not how pole strategy works when it comes to marketing or getting patrons to frequent the establishment. The conversation is happening and it began last Thursday afternoon but I appreciate you bringing that up tremendously.

Alderman Sanoica - I would also like to add that I don't want this to be extra work or considerably extra work for staff either. Many organizations hire companies do this for them or if there's something else that's happening regionally we could piggyback off of. The thing I'm thinking is Takeout Tuesday campaign that Chicago Northwest does. Those are things that the structure is already there and we don't have to reinvent we could just apply it to our restaurants for example to have that kind of campaign where everyone just takes out on Tuesday.

Mayor Gallo - We should just be the conduit that passes that information as a City and say if you're hurting or if your sales are low you should look to partner or collaborate with XYZ because they're available for you. That's how we could be better as a community for our businesses is by directing them to the right places or pre-existing campaigns that they can leach onto. That's what we'll do without having to dedicate a lot of staff hours to any of this.

Alderman O'Brien – I agree with Alderman Vinezeano and I'm in full agreement with the November 1 end date. Economic Development Committee also briefly talked about that. As we started to brainstorm for goals for the remainder of 2020 and strategic goals for 2021, a marketing campaign was discussed amongst councilmembers for some potential goal ideas. That's on the top of the EDC list and it is being discussed at the August meeting.

Alderman Budmats - The only point I want to make is the complaint that I received from residents regarding these types of signs especially from gaming type establishments, those were the primary focus of many complaints and

those businesses obviously were closed. Will their square footage requirement change as a result of this temporary ordinance with a waiver or will they still be required or limited in the number of square footage based on their gaming license? I believe signage for gaming establishments is limited by ordinance where it's not limited for other types of businesses so the question is, are those limits going to be lifted as a result of this ordinance? Those are where I primarily see objections (inaudible).

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - The qualified establishments under this proposed ordinance are those that were impacted by the closures implemented by the Governor so I believe those G1 licensed establishments were impacted. What we don't want to do is get into regulations that will be content-based so if we start to pick restaurants over others based upon the content of their speech we're going to be running into some problems. Like I said, to answer your question, those G1 establishments were closed during this time under the guidelines that are proposed here those so G1 establishments would be included in being allowed to have these temporary signs.

JoEllen Charlton, Assistant Director Public Works - I just wanted to comment because I'm not 100% clear on the liquor license signage either existing or proposed, I pay more attention to the zoning but I believe all the signage regulations for gaming cafés are for more permanent signs and are in this code is specifically put together to address temporary signs and how we look at temporary signs. We wouldn't propose that this short-term change to the code impact permanent window or wall signs but instead those specific categories of signs identified in the zoning ordinance as temporary signs which are typically limited in time and what we're proposing for this code is that we would potentially allow some additional signs in numbers and sizes and types then we would otherwise allow under our current temporary codes and allow them longer than the 30 to 45 day time period that we currently do and instead allow them until November.

Alderman Budmats - I'm just thinking if someone takes a temporary sign and attaches it to the building rather than out front in the lawn or something that they might be actually exceeding what the liquor code calls for and that's why I asked the question.

3) Local Business Assistance Program

Barry Krumstok, City Manager – You will see the temporary sign ordinance on the August 11th agenda. Before you is the Local Business Assistance Program Policy discussion. Staff was asked to come back with an idea. This is based on Lake Forest and our current TFA. It's very short and simple and hopefully you appreciate that we are bringing this back quickly. We have not heard from any establishments that are looking for assistance. It has \$5000 available like the TFA. The summary outline includes the purpose, funding, eligibility, maximum grant amount and the procedures for the applicant. We've also two program options and we just need to know if the Council would like us to create this program and if not we'll just move on.

Mayor Gallo – Does Council have a position or direction or comments on the creation of this program?

Alderman Sanoica - I'm looking at the packet and I'm on page 29 of the PDF and I would like clarification from staff on what's being proposed in item F there are two options that are listed. Could staff explain how option two is anticipated to work?

Barry Krumstok, City Manager – This would be another alternate option, instead of giving direct payment of the grant if it was for rent, payroll or utilities, this would be a grant payment with issuance of gift cards so we would actually give them the money and they would provide gift cards. In option one, we would specifically pay rent, payroll, or utilities or anything else that comes up. In option two, we would give them the grant money and they

would issue gift cards and give them to patrons/residents. It's just a different way of getting the money it's just how they utilize it.

Alderman Sanoica - I guess what I'm struggling with is, who is distributing the gift cards? Is it the establishment that's in charge of distributing that? Or is it the City?

Barry Krumstok, City Manager – It would be the establishment.

Alderman Sanoica - How would we confirm that they're distributing these gift cards?

Barry Krumstok, City Manager – It would be by sight and what we hear and confirming what is actually given out and when they're actually returned.

Alderman Sanoica - If they were to be given out to individuals then is the expectation that individuals would return or would have to spend these? I feel like everyone has a drawer of gift cards that hasn't been used. Would that be like a knock against a business if they were to participate in this program if we were to go for option two?

Barry Krumstok, City Manager – No I don't think so, what we're trying to do is giving them an opportunity to have repeat customers.

Alderman Vinezeano - Thank you for putting the program together, this is exactly what we're looking for. Who is going to be getting this info out to the businesses? Obviously this would be brand-new. I guess my fear is that we get this program established and nothing happens and then businesses close and we don't know that they were in financial despair until their doors are closed. What is the marketing plan to get this information out to the businesses?

Barry Krumstok, City Manager – We have a list of who we send our business newsletter to and we would obviously use that list to get that information out and the Business Advocate would also visit businesses. Those are the two avenues we have to get the information out about the program.

Alderman Vinezeano - I personally am very opposed to the option two. Personally I thought we were trying to get away from the gift cards and dispersing them. I think if a business is in need of money to pay rent, payroll or utilities much like our TFA program then we need to get them the money to do those things and not have to dedicate more staff time and worrying about gift cards and if they're being used and distributed and whatnot. If a business is coming to us as their last resort they're in emergent dire need. To have to take more time to disperse the gift cards and whatnot would be more time sensitive a business may not have. I am definitely for option one of giving the grant money to the business and I would really encourage if this passes through to get this information out to our businesses.

Alderman O'Brien - The only comment I would add is similar to Alderman Vinezeano, I would like to remove option two. I think the City outlined it great and we do have to see if they are behind in rent and utilities just like we do for the TFA and be treated just like that. I think everything else was well written we just go off of option one. Another thing, we also may know that if an establishment is behind on sales tax payment or any of those taxes. Those are about three months in arrears but that could be an indicator too, retroactively versus proactively with the Business Advocate or other communication of reaching out. It might give us some insight of who might need assistance.

Alderman Cannon - We started off this segment and Barry made a statement about the sign ordinance we just talked about would not be brought until August 11. I would ask staff to move that up to the next meeting or next week or we stretch the timeframe because if we don't approve the temporary sign ordinance until the second meeting in August that means our resident businesses would only have two months to use the signs. It seems to be an awfully short timeframe.

Alderman O'Brien - That was my thought too Alderman Cannon, I was wondering if we could request a waiving of the first reading when it comes back to us so it can be effective immediately like we've done with other to Covid related items. That's a valid point you have.

Mayor Gallo - Okay, let's take a straw vote, all those in favor of removing option two from this Local Business Assistance Program. 7 in favor; 0 opposed. It's unanimous. Let's take out the second option of gift cards.

Alderman Vinezeano - Moving along with what Alderman Cannon just said, I think some of our businesses could be in dire straits so I would really like to see this on our agenda in front of Council as soon as possible so we can get this approved so businesses could apply because it does take time to get this information together and the program out. So I would like to see this as soon as possible in front of us.

Mayor Gallo - Manager Krumstok I think the gist of the probability of putting this on a meeting sooner than later should be a reality.

Barry Krumstok, City Manager - We'll get this typed up and get it to the City Attorney and get it back because our deadline is Thursday for that publication, just bear with us.

JoEllen Charlton, Director Public Works - We can work on some things. I do know we have two items on second reading and two items on first reading and a resolution already in the queue for Thursday. If we bring it forward it would probably be in pretty rough format but we will do our best putting that ordinance together if you'd like it to be on the next agenda.

Alderman Sanoica - I just wanted to follow-up with some comments that have been made earlier today. No one in the business community has reached out explaining that they need assistance and so if staff requires time to put the ordinance together so it's not as rough, I would suggest that our Business Advocate begin the process of that marketing plan that Alderman Vinezeano had suggested in reaching out to those businesses or perhaps working with Finance Director Gallagher to see which businesses have reached out for payment plans or other assistance to pay obligations to the City as a starting point so that they can be prepared with what documents we're essentially asking for. Because this program specifically is considered last resort or if they need to apply to other programs to demonstrate that they haven't received anything to do that process now while we're finalizing the ordinance so that they are ready to go once this is ready.

Mayor Gallo - Let's see what kind of progress they can make and I'm assuming staff will keep us apprised in real time as to whether or not they can make this for the next meeting. It is July 21 and August will be here soon and if we need push a sign date back for the signage issues beyond November so businesses can have additional time toward the end of the year we'll be very malleable with this. Again, it's in the best interest of the business community to try and assist in their need and with this business program being the last resort. If those businesses are in financial despair they're probably preoccupied with other larger scale programs then turning to the City of Rolling Meadows for our maximum of \$5000. Staff just keep us in the loop as to how the progress goes by this Thursday.

4) Liquor Licenses

Barry Krumstok, City Manager - A liquor license duration is twelve months per the City's Code of Ordinances. During the Stay-at-Home Order, the Police Department notified all businesses with City-issued liquor licenses that the City extended the payment of liquor licenses to mirror that of the State of Illinois Liquor Control Commission rules [this was also approved by the City Attorney, the Mayor (as the Liquor Commissioner) and the City Manager]. (Liquor license payments due for licenses expiring on March 30th, April 30th and May 30th were extended until July 31, 2020.) Currently we are operating under the original guidance from the Illinois Liquor Control Commission and providing an extension for their liquor license payments until July 31, 2020.

During this COVID-19 time period, to promote economic development and to help businesses, the Mayor (again, as the City's Liquor Commissioner) approved curbside and delivery of prepackaged liquor and also authorized the sale or delivery of to-go mixed drinks and cocktails (once the State of Illinois allowed for these procedures).

Some businesses took advantage of these options to continuing selling liquor. There were some who made a business decision to close their operations completely. There were businesses who paid for their liquor licenses and some took advantage of the few additional months to pay for their liquor licenses.

Staff is dealing only with A1, A2, A3 and D Classes of Liquor Licenses, as these are the liquor license classifications that were subject to closure and/or limited operations due to the Governor's orders related to COVID-19. In addition, these options would only pertain to businesses who have a valid liquor license at the time the City grants the relief, if any. These options are not for new liquor licenses that have been approved by the City Council and have not paid for their liquor licenses. We have three choices:

1. **Do nothing – keep the status quo:** Do not offer further payment extensions for liquor licenses. All licenses due by July 31, 2020 must be paid by that date.
2. **Staff Recommendation – Provide more time to pay:** Follow the Illinois Liquor Control Commission to provide more time to pay for the liquor licenses which would extend the payment deadline to December 31, 2020. (Extended period to pay but not change the due date of the City-issued license.) (This option would not change the due date of the liquor license. This option would only provide additional time to pay for the 2020-2021 liquor license.)
3. **Alternate Staff Recommendation for Consideration – Extend liquor license due date from 12 months to 14 months:** To further economic development, the City may extend the liquor license due date from 12 months to 14 months for current license holders of Liquor License Classes A1, A2, A3 and D, due to constraints caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. This option provides an additional two months for payment as well as extending it from 12 months to 14 months. If this option is selected, the City Attorney will draft an Ordinance to update the City's Code of Ordinances to provide this temporary provision to businesses.

I've only heard from three establishments regarding the renewals. I heard from Meridian Banquets, they have an class A-1 license and are most affected by Covid-19 because they have not be able to do anything a restaurant is able to do.

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney – I have nothing to add at this time but I'm available for questions as they come up.

Alderman O'Brien - I would be in support based on our discussion at the last Committee of the Whole it seems like there was consensus on the potential extension to the 14 months. I just wanted to confirm for consistency perspective it would be across-the-board for any A-1, A-2, A-3 and D? Not that they requested assistance or deferred payment plan. From a consistency perspective we have to do it for all, is that correct?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - Yes, that is correct.

Alderman Vinezeano - It says it includes class D, does that include or exclude D-1?

Barry Krumstok, City Manager - It's only for class D so it does exclude the gas stations.

Alderman Vinezeano – I'm very much in favor of how this is written up with extending it from 12 months to 14 months. I did not want those D-1's included so I wanted to clarify that. I'm in favor of option three of extending it to the 14 months.

Alderman D'Astice - I agree with Aldermen O'Brien and Vinezeano. My only question is, were these businesses closed for two months or three months? If they were closed for three months they couldn't use their license and 15 months would be better. If they were closed for two months I'm fine with it at 14 months.

Barry Krumstok, City Manager - Some businesses only closed for two weeks and some businesses made a business decision and waited to open until Phase 4 when it actually allowed them to open. Some started doing the sales outside of per 2020-01 and 2020-02 very specifically starting early on.

Alderman D'Astice - Okay, then I'm good with the 14 months.

Mayor Gallo - Anything further from Council on this? If not, I'm going to work in reverse order since it seems the third option is popular at this time. All those in favor in pursuing option three, which is staff's recommendation to extend the liquor license due date from 12 months to 14 months. 7 in favor and 0 opposed. It's unanimous so we don't even have to go through option two or one at this point. Staff, if this is sufficient for you from a straw vote then I think you have your direction on this.

Barry Krumstok, City Manager – We'll get the ordinance typed up as quickly as we can and we'll also notify the businesses that are affected so at least they'll know that an ordinance is going to be passed soon.

5) Kirchoff Road Walk Light Fixtures

JoEllen Charlton, Assistant Director Public Works - The pedestrian-scaled "walk lights" along Kirchoff Road (shown in the top picture to the right), were originally installed in 1997. A total of 91 fixtures are installed at various locations along the corridor. These lights are supplemental to the taller cobra-head lights (shown in the bottom picture to the right), which illuminate the roadway pursuant to standards. Additionally, lighting within some private properties along Kirchoff also utilize the globe walk-light standard. These projects include Harris Bank, Kimball Square and River Walk Condos.

Beginning in 2016, the City started retrofitting the globe bulb fixtures with LED lights. The LED retro-fit lights had an original cost of \$54.76. A \$20.00 ComEd rebate at the time allowed the lights to be purchased at \$34.76 each. Since that time, the LED bulbs have gone up in price to \$67.83.

Over the course of time, the globe lens covers have started to deteriorate. The original globe fixture is a two-piece assembly, where the top is separate from the bottom. Until recently, the City was able to secure replacement parts for the top half of the globe. Those parts have since been discontinued and the entire fixture must be replaced with a one-piece assembly. In researching the one-piece assembly as an alternative, staff learned that the retro-fit LED bulbs will not exactly fit the mouth of the newer style fixtures. In the meantime, staff has been continuing to replace bulbs in deteriorated fixtures, and is learning that insects and water entering the fixture is causing the premature shorting out of the bulbs, resulting in multiple bulb outages along the corridor.

Satellite imagery shows just how much night-time light is emitted from street lights and other light sources in urban areas. The “Dark-Sky” lighting movement is one that aims to reduce light pollution. Regulations focus on the color and intensity of light, and also shielding light on the top and sides, and instead redirecting light down to minimize glare and light spillage to areas not intended.

In addition to making stars and other night sky features more visible (particularly in less urban areas), dark-sky lighting is beneficial to plants, nocturnal animals, birds and even humans, as light pollution has been found to affect human circadian rhythms and melatonin release.

There are a number of alternatives that can be selected to achieve better dark sky results. The selections below were reviewed as affordable alternatives that could be acquired for reasonable prices, which are described in further detail in the “Alternatives” section below. Note that both alternatives direct light down and would be an attractive alternative to the globe lights if that direction is desired at this time.

Alternatives:

1. Replace all 91 luminaires with new one-piece bulb fixtures which match the appearance of what we already have in place. Total approximate cost with “in-house” installation: \$22,750. Double with outsourced labor.
2. Replace only the fixtures that need to be replaced (about half or 45) with new one-piece fixtures, and continue to replace as needed over time until all are replaced. Please Note: Due to the need to use different bulbs in the newer versus the older fixtures, the color/hue between old and new lights will be different. Total approximate cost: About half of Number 1 alternative.
3. Replace all the fixtures with a new “dark sky” compliant luminaires that focuses light downward. Total approximate cost with “in-house” installation: \$31,850. Double with outsourced labor.

Recently, Public Works staff has found it increasingly difficult to maintain the walk lights on Kirchoff Road. Using replacement bulbs in the obsolete standards is wasteful because the bulbs are blowing out sooner because insects and water are entering the older fixture and shorting them out. If we want to continue the traditional look of the globe fixtures that have existed for over 25 years, we need to replace the previous two part fixture which is no longer available, with a one part fixture. If we do that, we also need to decide whether to replace them all at once, or over time. The latter option will result in light levels that may appear different between the two fixtures.

Given this opportunity, staff wanted to provide an alternative of switching to what some may consider a “green” alternative, and switch to a “dark-sky” friendly fixture that directs lighting downward. While the information about dark sky lighting in this report is overly simplistic, staff didn’t want to spend too much time on it if the desire was to maintain the traditional look. Certainly, more information can be provided if desired.

Public Works prides itself on maintaining a functional and attractive right-of-way environment. As existing walk lights burn out more quickly, we find it necessary to request the Council’s consideration of the alternatives so we

know how to address short term bulb replacements as well as long-term fixture replacements. Once we have Council direction, we will respond with an implementation plan that can either be worked into the current fiscal year budget or split over this year and next.

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - Assistant Director Charlton did an excellent job describing the issue at hand. The one point I did want to emphasize as part of Council's discussion is that the globes that we can purchase that are different style than the ones that are currently there do pose a maintenance problem as a result of how they're formed, they have a hole in the top which allows water and bugs in which causes the light to burnout more quickly than the current bulbs do. I just wanted to make sure the Council knew that. It is in the report but I just wanted to make sure I noted that for the Council's understanding.

Alderman Cannon - I look at these light fixtures like a lot of people look at paint for their houses, people have different opinions on what looks nice and what doesn't. Myself, I don't like the look of these things, I don't think they're charming. Over the years since I've been Alderman, on a number of occasions I strongly suggested that we do some major streetscape program downtown and up to this point it has been kind of ignored. I think this might give us an opportunity to rethink how we like downtown not just with these fixtures. Most people have decorative lighting overall in their downtown area and I don't look at ours as being very decorative. Again, it's personal opinion, I don't mean to insult anybody or hurt anybody's feelings, I just don't find these light fixtures very pretty. I think there's all kinds of alternatives and I would like to see in the near future a total plan of complete lighting on both the street-level and on the sidewalk level.

Alderman O'Brien - Certainly lighting is key along any area. I was thinking option 3 is that we do go with the more "dark sky" the more efficient type program but if we could do it over time. We don't want to double the cost to get it done by year-end but that we could potentially replace any that are out now. I was doing the numbers here and there's about \$100 difference for lights if we go with the previous style or the dark sky or the other style, it's about \$100 difference per fixture so that would just be an idea that I would toss out there. I do like the dark sky idea and spread the cost and replace them as needed.

Alderman Vinezeano - Are we just replacing the top part of the pole?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works – Yes.

Alderman Vinezeano - This does not change any of our holiday decor, banners or anything else that goes on these polls, correct?

JoEllen Charlton, Assistant Director Public Works - That is correct. The only thing that changes is what's called the luminaire, the bulb at the top. The pole from the luminaire down would stay the same.

Alderman Vinezeano - I'm assuming that these new dark sky are energy-efficient so there is going to be a savings in the long run as far as light bulbs?

Jo Ellen Charlton, Assistant Director Public Works - I know these new fixtures are LED which is what we already use. We've already switched to LEDs on our globe fixtures several years back so how much additional savings there might be because of the change of fixture I'm not aware but I could find out for you.

Alderman Sanoica - My question or suggestion to staff is to compare the dark sky light fixture in their ability to do the job. That's the only concern I would have is that things are being lit and if that's the case I would like to go forward that. The pictures that were sent in the packet it looks like the dark sky lighting is actually more efficient

at lighting pedestrian ways than the traditional light fixtures. For those reasons at this time, I am in favor of the dark sky option.

Mayor Gallo - A question for staff, are you looking for the Council to define whether or not they want you to pursue the traditional style or going with the dark sky version approach?

Jo Ellen Charlton, Assistant Director Public Works - You may want to do a straw vote, I'm hearing a preference for the dark sky alternative as opposed to the globe alternative. The next question to Council would be, do you want to be part of the design consideration? You want staff to work out a good deal and make sure we address issues of efficiency and lighting levels and what we choose is okay? You want that to come back? I want to address what Alderman Cannon said in that I understand this approach looks at how we're dealing with lighting on Kirchoff Road from a pedestrian scale only. In other words, these particular lights on Kirchoff Road are not intended to be full-scale lighting. If you go into some of the traditional downtowns you'll see a light fixture and the taller cobra head lights. I think that would be of very significant change that would take a lot of time and money to figure out if that is something we want to do moving forward and could potentially put us in a situation where our current globe lights are burning out and we don't have a plan in place to keep the walk lit because we're not sure which we were going to go with it. Our intent on this scope is to not change the whole scale lighting but instead just look at the pedestrian scale lights, with them continue to be supporting the taller lights and choosing which fixture we apply to it.

Mayor Gallo - I'm thumbing back through this packet and I can't seem to recognize any maintenance costs associated with the current style. I don't know if that's because components are no longer manufactured so it makes it a moot point or what does it cost to typically maintain what we currently have? In the first paragraph it says staff is requesting feedback and direction from Council on whether to continue to maintain the Kirchoff Road "walk light" luminaire's and their current globe style or to move on and purchase something new. I guess I want to take two steps back and understand what the cost and what's involved with maintenance versus the necessity to swap out to something new. Is money already allocated in the budget for these items or is this something that has to be budgeted for?

JoEllen Charlton, Assistant Director Public Works - Our ability to maintain these globes is no longer available because we can no longer get to piece fixtures. As bulbs burn out, as Director Horne indicated, we are able to replace those bulbs but because the top fixtures have issues then we're getting water and bugs in those fixtures and the bulbs are shorting out sooner. We're bearing a lot of costs now on replacing bulbs and fixtures that burn out. If the globe itself breaks we don't have any ability to replace that globe at all unless we go to a new one-piece fixture because a two-piece fixture is now obsolete. It's that question that we're to the point that we didn't want to start ordering one-piece fixtures to look like what we have and continue the maintenance of those until we got some direction from the Council if that's the direction you'd like to go. I don't know the cost of that but I guess it would be the cost of the fixtures divided by 91 so that would be the cost to buy the new globe fixture and replace it one by one on top of each pole. The other thing I included in the report which is probably worth noting is if we go piecemeal because we don't have a budget identified for whole scale replacement or half replacement now and half next year. We have money assuming we're maintaining the ones that burn out in this year's budget. Doing something over two years makes a lot of sense. If we do piecemeal, in other words replace the bulbs if they go out or do a section at a time, there's a very good possibility the lights will appear differently because the lighting level with the different types of bulbs that are required in each fixture even though the luminaires look the same, the bulb that you have to put in these is little bit different for the globe. You might get a slightly more intense light in the old fixture versus the new fixture.

Mayor Gallo - There's a whole lot of information that you shared. I appreciate the flexibility this current style affords us where we can replace the luminaires and keep the existing pole where if we convert because one pole gets damaged to a single piece then we're kind of stuck and committed to that single unit. The other thing is and I don't want to be a stick in the mud here but \$20,000-\$30,000 allocated towards lights and we don't know how often or frequent any of the globes have broken in the past but I would like us to be conservative in our spending as we have sufficient lighting with these in place, we have additional alternative lights down the same streets so whatever the Council does decide to do that's fine but I would just want to make sure what we do is either critical or necessary and not just desirable to this extent. I just want to keep those considerations in mind. As far as taking the straw votes for type whether it's dark sky what have you and then if the Council desires to be involved in the aesthetic.

Alderman Cannon - I appreciate all the conversation that we just had about this but we're just talking about one element of downtown. The frustration that I have is we're going to address one situation as part of a big picture. We're going to make a decision that might lock us out at making things better over the long run. We're just addressing one piece of it. I don't want to spend a ton of money either but we don't have a very good-looking downtown in a lot of ways and this might open up the opportunity for us to start thinking a little bit larger instead of just replacing some poles and we can all decide what we like and don't like when there's literally thousands of lights out there to pick from. I'm suggesting we look at a broader view of it in light of the fact that we have a couple of new commercial spaces that are going to be east of Meadow Drive so lighting should go down to there. I just think we're looking at a small picture instead of looking at the big picture. Maybe this could give us the opportunity to make a new look or at least start a new look for downtown.

Mayor Gallo - What I'm hearing from you is that maybe this conversation specifically to the lights is a bit premature as opposed to maybe a more comprehensive view of what we should do for our downtown main street. Is that what I'm hearing Alderman Cannon?

Alderman Cannon – Yes. Absolutely. That's exactly what I mean.

Alderman O'Brien - I was doing some of the number crunching here but I don't know the specifics, if my math is correct, if we were to replace three of the old bulbs at about \$70 apiece that's a new light fixture so I'm not sure how often we are replacing these. If we're replacing the broken ones or the ones with the hole on the top where lights are going out two or three times a year on a single one it would kind of be a moot point because we're spending \$210 on light bulbs because they're about \$70 each because Comed took away the rebate based on the write up in our packet versus getting a brand-new fixture that should not require us to change three lightbulbs at \$70 each. That's my additional thought.

JoEllen Charlton, Assistant Director Public Works - In talking with our utilities division I know it's just starting to occur. Obviously anytime we get a call and we go out to fix or replace the bulb those bulbs are burning out more quickly so we are starting to spend more money just on replacing the bulbs. Again, if the top of the luminaire globe is broken and we're not able to address that so we would probably leave it dark for the short term. If we want to look at this bigger picture we're going to need to provide some direction to the maintenance folks on how to maintain them this year until we come to a comprehensive decision. The other thing all mentioned too, we had an opportunity to look at potential Comed grants for this type of lighting. We tried to get into the system and ask some questions but didn't really get any answers yet so that may change the way this conversation goes. Obviously if we can get some grant funding but I believe that funding is available specifically for these walk lights, I do not know if it's available for the big broader project Alderman Cannon is talking about. From a cost perspective if we're looking at 6-12 more by the end of this fiscal year that's probably a pretty good guess. I know by City Hall they seem to burn out pretty frequently and I know we're replacing bulbs in those fairly often.

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - We have about 20 burned out lights in the downtown area along the Kirchoff Road corridor. The big problem is not the maintenance addressing the pole one time, the maintenance costs is occurring because we're replacing the same bulbs several times. Once we replace that bulb because we're having problems with the split globe we then have to buy another new type of globe that again does not protect the bulb in the same manner as the old globe. The costs are increased because we're sending guys out to the same pole numerous times for failures on the lightbulbs. That was really the reason why we brought this to Council as we thought it would be a good opportunity to look at updating the fixture to be more focused on pedestrian and be using a dark sky technology to improve the lighting in the area. That's really the reason why it was brought up.

Mayor Gallo - At this point I'm going to ask a series of questions to the Council. All those in favor of allowing staff to pursue changing out these fixtures for the range that's been indicated \$20,000-\$30,000, raise your hands. 4 in favor; 3 opposed. All those who think it would be slightly premature that we should look at this from a more comprehensive perspective with the larger street pole lighting and the shorter walkway lights. 3 in favor; 4 opposed. I think staff has a green light in pursuing this and then the next step is to determine which type, the conventional bulb or the dark sky model. Those in favor of the dark sky model, raise your hand. 6 in favor; 1 opposed. Those in favor of staff keeping Council informed/involved as to the selection of this dark sky model. 2 in favor; 4 opposed; 1 abstain.

Alderman Bisesi – During the discussion Assistant Director Charlton said that there may potentially be an opportunity for a grant. I would like to make sure that that avenue has been fully explored before we start doing anything.

JoEllen Charlton, Assistant Director Public Works – We've already started that process.

Alderman Bisesi – We know that it's something we can get we just have to submit the applications?

JoEllen Charlton, Assistant Director Public Works – I don't know that, I know that there's an opportunity to apply for it. I've not been successful finding that it's still available. I've got some calls in to make sure that's still the case.

Alderman Bisesi - I'm just a little concerned because I know there's a lot of other expenses were trying to get through, a zero tax levy and every little thing we add in could mean that we have to raise taxes.

JoEllen Charlton, Assistant Director Public Works - Understood. We'll even see if there's other opportunities outside of Comed that might be available.

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - We will look at other funding sources. The other thing we will look at is the ability to spread this project over more than two years if there's a congruent way to do that to not cause lighting issues for traffic. We will consider spreading it out over more than two years.

Mayor Gallo - You would have my blessing to look into some public/private partnership to find some lighting that is eco-friendly and small cell equipped to make way for future 5G and things like that.

Rob Horne, Director Public Works – Message received.

Mayor Gallo - There may be opportunities for reduced costs if we do join in with some P3 initiatives and things like that.

Alderman O'Brien - I was wondering if we could look at a couple of different financing options from doing it in-house versus the cost of going outside.

Mayor Gallo – Anything further on this?

JoEllen Charlton, Assistant Director Public Works - No, we'll take what you've given us and put something together to share with you at a later time.

6) Original Public Works Facility (3200 Central Road)

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - This item is being brought up for two different but connected reasons. The two items include Council's recent direction to sell the 2455 Plum Grove Road site/facility, and the long-term strategy for the use of the Public Works Facility located at 3200 Central Road.

The Council's recent direction to sell the property at 2455 Plum Grove Road raises significant operational concerns. First, the facility is currently being utilized for Public Works operations by eleven (11) employees. This location, along with the 5 employees operating daily out of the 3200 Central location, is part of the Public Works Department's current strategy to protect employees with adequate social distancing, in response to the Covid virus. By keeping crews separated, Staff is attempting to ensure that even if employees in one of the locations contracts the virus forcing one or several employees home due to the virus, essential City services will still be able to be provided from one of the alternate locations.

The second matter is a concern raised by the City's IT Coordinator. Currently, the facility at 2455 Plum Grove Road is the location of the City's Disaster Recovery site. This is the technology equipment necessary to meet the remote off-site server and duplication back-up requirements for all the City's electronic systems and files. There are short-term plans to relocate the existing system/hardware to another site. Current plans are only to investigate each fire station location for the best location to provide additional off-site storage as an enhancement to the existing back-up technology. The long-term plan is to investigate utilizing a different site or a cloud-based application for the City's Disaster Recover site. However, in either event, this process will take significant time to research and develop the best alternative for the City. The installation and implementation of a new Disaster Recover site are preliminarily estimated to be in excess of \$100,000.

Lastly, as each year passes, the likelihood that the facility located at 3200 Central Road facility will need to be demolished increases. Preliminary deliberations from earlier this year were that the facility located at 2455 Plum Grove Road could be utilized as an interim facility for equipment storage and operations, during the implementation of a more comprehensive long-term solution for addressing the long-term space needs for Public Works.

The second reason for Staff bringing this item forward is to seek direction from the City Council regarding pursuit of a potential long term solution to the issue of the Public Works Department operating out of two separate facilities that are both shared with the Park District. This matter has been contemplated and deferred by past City Councils for well over a decade, which is increasing the urgency of a clear future direction.

The primary and preferred alternative being proposed by staff is to discuss a potential buy-out of the Rolling Meadows Park District out of the Berdnick site. This would afford the Park District an opportunity to construct a new facility at the 3200 Central Road site, or in a more appropriate location to their operations.

The 3900 Berdnick site, with some alterations and without the RM Park District, provides ample space for current and long-range needs that can address not only the Public Works Department's needs, but also some of the City's long-term storage needs as well.

Recent conversations with Rolling Meadows Park District leadership have been positive and while specific details have not been discussed nor have any plans been shared, they do show a willingness to be part of future planning. Discussions related to long-term solutions for separating the shared use of each of the facilities have proven to have negative impacts on each agency's operations.

The facility located at 3200 Central Road was originally constructed in the late 1950's and as the photo below indicates, has been added onto several times over the years to meet the needs of the City as the City grew. The City and Park District have jointly occupied the 3200 Central Road building since the 1970's, and since 1999 the Northwest Special Recreation Association, has also been a leasing party at this site.

In 1996-1997, the City began and completed construction of the "Public Works/Park District Combined Service Facility" at 3900 Berdnick Street. The newer, larger facility was knowingly restrictively sized on the site, with the idea that certain Public Works and Park District operational needs were to remain at the old building.

Shortly thereafter, staff provided a request to City Council for consideration (September 2015) for professional assessment services necessary to gather additional information, following the rejection of a grant submission. This item was not approved citing that the City should not invest any money in maintaining this facility further, and that there should be a long-term solution developed. At that time, the costs were in excess of \$1.7 million. Using only a 2% increase annually, those same repairs/improvements will now cost over \$1.9 million.

With only minimal repairs being conducted at the Central Road site over the last decade, the condition of the facility is becoming dangerous and is raising concerns related to potential damage that could result from damaging weather or age deterioration. The condition of the facility is such that Staff feels strongly that a proactive approach should be taken on these matters, as the unexpected loss of the 3200 Central facility will have an immediate and long-term negative impact on operations and delivery of resident services.

Staff is seeking authorization to begin more serious conversations with the RM Park District Staff related to a potential buy-out from the current agreement. This would result in the consolidation of all Public Works operations and equipment storage into the 3900 Berdnick Road site, and provide the Park District with an opportunity to construct its own dedicated facility on the existing 3200 Central Road site or an alternative site.

Additionally, Staff would like to encourage the Council's reconsideration of the 2455 Plum Grove property sale, in the short term, in order to preserve current City operations in a safe manner due to COVID, and provide adequate storage and IT usage flexibility. Additionally, without this site, the implementation of any alternate IT plans or transitions with the Park District as discussed in this memo would otherwise require costly lease agreements to operate and store equipment. As a result there are no guarantees adequate space will be available or in a location that makes sense for City operations.

Mayor Gallo - Last week on Thursday in meeting with Manager Krumstok I did ask him if Director Kevin Romejko had been informed of some of the legacy conversations as well as being apprised of the most recent scenario and you said that you did speak with him briefly, is he fully aware the situation of the property and the agreements between the Park District and the City and may be exchanging materials from our Berdnick area that belong to the Park District and putting it back on the Central Road site and us migrating our way out of there? How much has he been brought up to speed?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - I was pleasantly surprised he had more information in the background of the agreements and the facility and its use than I expected. It was a very brief conversation probably half hour to an hour we sat and talked about it. I didn't want to get engaged in any real conversation until the Council give me some direction as to what they wanted to do. I was more concerned that he knew this information and he can let his Commissioners know that the item was going to be discussed so he wasn't blindsided by it by not knowing about the issue. Other than that about what was going to be discussed at that meeting we have yet to have a real in-depth conversation.

Mayor Gallo - I do think it would be valuable for us as a Council to know how receptive the Park District is in either severing relationship and selling off our portion back to them or what have you. I think a lot of that information will be valuable for the Council to help advise direction in addition to the information that you and additional staff are providing us as about how much space we need to move equipment and storage out of there and where ultimately it's best suited whether it's over on Berdnick or if it goes in the Plum Grove facility. If you could keep us informed to how receptive the Park District is in any sort of transaction or sale of this building I think that will be important for Council.

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - I understand that Kevin is a new Director and things may have changed. I will tell you that the previous Director and I had lunch fairly regularly and we had many, many conversations over the last two years and I think quite honestly they were more gung ho about the idea then we were at the time. Again, that's just speaking with the previous Director, I don't know if she was speaking on behalf of the commissioners or if she felt that the commissioners we're likely willing to support that, I can't speak to that. We will find the mind of the Park District and relay that information to the Mayor and City Council.

Alderman Cannon - With the comments you made so far would the direction you would be leading this conversation with the Park District be to take over the Central Road location and we would move all of our stuff to Berdnick?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - Yes. The way the transition would work in my mind as I see it if a site was able to be constructed on the 3200 Central Road site, all the equipment would be relocated to old Fire Station 16 site, the 3200 building would be demolished, a new facility would be constructed, the Rolling Meadows Park District would then relocate their operation into that facility and then we would relocate all of our equipment out of old Fire Station 16 into the 3900 Berdnick building therefore our entire operation would be out of 3900 Berdnick and we would not share the facility with any other entity. At that time, the old Fire Station 16 site would be available to sell.

Alderman Cannon - If that were to happen you're looking at least a few years at minimum.

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - The agreement with the Park District requires two years. I know it was with the previous Director but she indicated that the Park District does have the right to waive that timeline if there's positive direction. I know that they're operation wants to be out of the 3900 Berdnick facility. All of their sites and all of their work occurs off of Central Road and they would definitely want their operation closer to that area. But yes you are correct.

Alderman Cannon - If they were to rebuild on that site they're going to have to get the Army Corps of Engineers involved because of the floodplain issues, that alone might take a year.

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - I did a rudimentary drawing using GIS just to make sure in preparation with this memo that I wasn't leading us down the wrong path and I could fit at least a 25,000 square-foot facility on that

site and not even be in the floodplain let alone the floodway. I'm not a professional engineer, I didn't serve everything but based on our FEMA information that's on our GIS there is a building that could be put there. It would take some engineering to make sure we were able to build what the Park District wanted on that site.

Alderman Cannon - My personal opinion is that we start that discussion tomorrow. Going over to the other facility I guess I would like to express some frustration, we just got done building two brand-new fire stations, when we originally approved those we knew we would be selling the old fire stations and why we haven't made a contingency plan up until now for the emergency backup system is beyond my understanding. There was budget money available for it and we actually had people from staff sit in front of us four months ago and wanted to buy a piece of property at the corner of Kirchoff and Hicks because they wanted 12 more parking spaces so staff would have extra parking when they had the emergency center at the Hicks station. I'm completely confused as to why this thing has sat there and no one's address this until tonight. To me, someone has completely dropped the ball on this and I don't know who's at fault but we shouldn't even be having this discussion about this. This project should have been done already. Why hasn't that stuff been moved already?

Barry Krumstok, City Manager - Part of our old plans were to move all that stuff to Public Works once we had a location to put it there. If the Park District vacates we know exactly where it needs to be moved but it was always part of our emergency plan not to put it in direct line of one of our stations because we look at how far we are from Berdnick Street and that location was the safest and we have not moved anything at this time because we don't have the room on Burdick Street. The plan was always to make Berdnick Street backup for City Hall.

Alderman Cannon - Why are we having this conversation now? Why didn't we know about this months or years ago? We knew that the stations were moving and we knew that station would be sold so we knew we had to move it and now we really don't have a plan in place right now. We have a theoretical plan maybe. That seems to be real a really important issue. If it's a backup emergency plan we need to have something operational and it sounds like we're years away of doing that. That means you want to keep 16 now forever and another building we have to own and operate.

Barry Krumstok, City Manager – No, that's not what we're saying.

Alderman Cannon – Then what are you saying? You're confusing me. I'm getting mixed signals from this whole project.

Barry Krumstok, City Manager - The plan was two always to move the items to Public Works, Berdnick Street. If that would happen here at City Hall the first backup is Public Works but we also have it set up at the new fire station. The technical IT items were always to be moved over to Berdnick Street.

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - I think one of the issues relocating that hardware is I believe it's required to be at least 1 mile away from your existing primary site and I believe it's required to have a backup power supply and we do not have backup power supply at Berdnick.

Mayor Gallo - I think there's two issues going on here. One of the issues that's preventing you from getting an answer is that we have our backup systems that handle our data and I think Manager Krumstok needs to have a conversation with IT and understand why we're not looking at putting that at an above property data center where they have the appropriate securities and the appropriate power and all the criteria that we need rather than keeping it on premise and one of our locations like other municipalities do in this case. The second question is why are we active with this instead of planning and knowing that the day would eventually come.

Alderman Cannon - I agree with all that. Also, I am completely against hiring another engineering firm to do an analysis for the Central Road property. Anybody that looks at that building understands that that building has to go. We don't need to have another analysis of it and spend more money. Everybody knows the building is falling down. Let's just move on and go to the next step.

Alderman Bisesi - Alderman Cannon pretty much brought up almost everything that I wanted to talk about. I was also under the impression that both fire stations were able to be sold prior to me joining Council. I paid very close attention to the whole fire station and I was also under the impression that the IT stuff was going to move to the new Station 16. I believe the Mayor brought up a great point as another alternative for that IT equipment. As far as old Station 16 and keeping it, I would not have an issue of keeping it if it was part of a plan as Rob spelled out where eventually we would be moving everything to Berdnick within the next two years and getting everything out of that Central Road building. Frankly, I'm afraid the Central Road building is going to fall down. The one on the thing that I thought was going to be mentioned in favor of keeping old Station 16 was as soon as the fire department was out it would be a good location to store all the police evidence and equipment. I'm also wondering about is that we just spent money on the property next to City Hall so by the time we get that whole thing in place the way that we want we'll have spent ½ \$1 million probably. At some point we need to get some money by selling some of our properties. I would be in favor of keeping old Station 16 if we were progressing on a plan as Rob spelled out but I think there needs to be milestones and if we don't meet them then we just need to sell the building because I'm very concerned that things like Covid and other obligations that may pop up are going to deplete our reserves and it's going start to affect our City services.

Alderman Vinezeano - The expense to move the IT equipment where is that budgeted? Is it in the fire station 15, 16, IT department, where is it budgeted?

Barry Krumstok, City Manager - At this point it's not budgeted to be moved during 2020.

Alderman Vinezeano - Is it budgeted in 2021 yet?

Barry Krumstok, City Manager - We're working on the draft budget.

Alderman Vinezeano - To go with Alderman Cannon, it's pretty alarming to me because when these fire stations were voted on and you knew the equipment was in the fire station and it needed to be moved and we were selling this building you would be then asking us to approve a budget of \$100,000 to move this equipment quickly in a firehouse that was very controversial in building to begin with. I am with the other Aldermen and that I have been in Central Road building and I was afraid to walk through there. The fact that the building is falling apart I would assume we have millions of dollars of equipment in that building and it needs to be stored so I'm not opposed to hold on to the Plum Grove Road property to store our equipment in the transition of the next one to two years and not move the IT equipment until there's a better plan in place and it is budgeted properly. The fact that we went through a budgeted item of this nature a few weeks ago and other Aldermen didn't want to question \$150,000 and now we have to find another \$100,000 is just upsetting to me. I think to hold onto the firehouse right now on Plum Grove Road and move the equipment and move forward with the Park District. I am opposed to spending more money on doing a facility assessment, I think we all know that the building is falling apart and I'm that interested in spending any more money on it.

Alderman O'Brien - Let's start talking to the Park District because I think that building would be a huge liability for any government entity. We've got to get of there as quickly as we can. In the write up there something about the lease and the ownership (Central Road), do we have confirmation that it's 100% owned by the City? I know

NWSRA is also in that building, they store 23 buses in the back. Was there a joint agreement? Does the City own 100% of that property? There wasn't a clear answer in the write up.

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - The agreement establishes that the Park District owns 100% of the land and they have a lease with NWSRA to use a portion of their land for the buses. The City of Rolling Meadows owns the actual facility and the Park District utilizes it and I think we charge them about 14% for use of the building which also deducts a percentage that the Public Works Department uses in the site. It's a very concise and clear agreement that we certainly can work with the Park District on. I want to make sure the entire Council understands that staff has no interest in doing another assessment. When I referred to engineering it was to do engineering to show the Rolling Meadows Park District that a facility could be constructed on the site and not encroach the floodplain and floodway regulations. There would be some preliminary expenses related to the discussions with the Park District because we have to be able to show them that their needs will be able to be met on that site.

Alderman Budmats - I'm just curious if there's any contingency money left to use from the fire stations to move the IT equipment?

Barry Krumstok, City Manager – Yes, there is contingency left.

Alderman Budmats - Enough to move all of that?

Barry Krumstok, City Manager - If we were to make the decision to move it to Station 16 but again part of the emergency management specifically says that it needs to be far enough away and that's why Berdnick Street was identified to move the equipment there.

Mayor Gallo - I think that should be a broader conversation at a later time and if we have to relocate that hardware I think IT should drive a lot of that conversation and we should also look at and above property external data center where we could do it appropriately like a lot of other municipalities and other governmental agencies use when we're talking about relocating it. It's probably the best route to go for a long-term approach. The next part is to give staff some feedback on these two portions of direction that they're looking for. Staff is seeking authorization to begin more serious conversations with the Park District related to a potential buy-out from the current agreement. With a show of hands, all those in favor of allowing staff to pursue more serious conversations. 7 in favor; 0 opposed. Staff would like Council's approval to hold off on the sale of 2455 Plum Grove Road property until the transition period took place. With a show of hands, all those in favor of slowing down the sale of former Station 16 to allow staff additional time with that property. 5 in favor; 1 opposed; 1 abstain.

Alderman O'Brien - Would everything fit into former Station 16? I would not like to see additional storage costs incurred.

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - We would not ask the City Council for additional funds for the transition. We may need to get creative on how we store things at 3900 Berdnick site or we would probably come to City Council through the Planning and Zoning Commission and request a temporary outdoor storage of equipment on our 3900 Berdnick site. We would not look at any additional storage be on the former Station 16 site.

Alderman Cannon - Is there any way we can put a timeline on this thing so it doesn't go on forever? 24 months? This can drag on and a lot of the members that are here tonight might not be part of the Council when they decide they might be done with building. I would like to see a timeframe and then when that time is up we put the building on the market. The sooner we get rid of that the sooner the City will be better off.

Mayor Gallo – That’s fine to put some parameters around it in terms of duration it keeps a little of applied pressure. Director Horne, you think you can come up with a reasonable timeframe so the Council has some expectations of what we’re looking at so we can discuss it at a later date?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - I was going to ask staff to put together a timeline for each future meeting, at the next Committee of the Whole or the one immediately following.

Mayor Gallo - That way we can all be on the same page for reasonable expectations here to execute these action items.

Alderman Budmats - it feels to me like we’re taking this whole thing at a piecemeal approach. We built some fire stations and now we’re discerning a need for additional space or revamping space. I feel like we should have a comprehensive facility plan for all of our buildings before we move ahead with whatever is going to be next. It would take into account all the properties that the City owns and all of the needs that the City presently has. I would like to see a comprehensive facility plan.

Mayor Gallo - I know that conversation came up when I was in Alderman when the former Dominick’s property prior to it going to condos/townhomes was for sale, I brought up the fact that we need to explore a comprehensive property plan because we know we can use storage space and we’ve known that for decades that we’re out of storage space and that conversation was brought up then. I agree with you that staff should look at this going forward from this point on so that we’re not doing in such incremental steps that have no systemic value to the next move or previous move. And any further comments or questions?

Alderman Vinezeano - I think the IT topic through many of us off of not knowing of where it’s budgeted and not budgeted. We know that the plan is to sell the former fire station 16. Where is that going to budget in and what is the plan for that? I would like to see that plan as well moving forward.

Mayor Gallo – Are there any other questions or comments from Council? Seeing none, is there a motion to adjourn? Alderman D’Astice has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Bisesi. Will the Clerk please call the Roll.

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

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

There being no further business, by unanimous consent the Committee-of-the Whole meeting was adjourned at 10:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted: Judy Brose, Deputy City Clerk

July 21, 2020 Committee-of-the-Whole Minutes Approved by Council on August 25, 2020.

Judy Brose

Judy Brose, Deputy City Clerk