Minutes
Workshop Meeting
Glen Ellyn Village Board of Trustees
Monday, February 16, 2015

Call to Order

Village President Demos called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call

Upon roll call by Village Clerk Galvin, Village President Demos and Trustees Burket, Clark, Elliott, Ladesic, McGinley and O'Shea answered "Present". Trustee Elliott arrived at 7:21 p.m.

Trustees Clark and O'Shea were excused.

In Attendance: Village Clerk Galvin, Village Manager Franz, Assistant Village Manager Stonitsch, Village Attorney Mathews, Finance Director Coyle, Public Works Director Hansen, Police Chief Norton, Professional Engineer Bob Minix and Patti Taves, Records Supervisor. Finance Committee Chairman Ford.

Pledge of Allegiance

President Demos asked Trustee McGinley to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

Agenda Item E. - Proposed False Alarm Permit Discussion: (Chief Norton)

Police Chief Phil Norton led the discussion regarding the proposed false alarm regulation.

On June 8, 2009, the Village amended its Alarm Ordinance (6-6-1) which established an annual registration fee of $25 along with a restructured false alarm fine scale. Prior to that date, alarm permits required a one-time registration fee of $5.00. Due to budgetary limitations, we have not implemented the updated alarm registration process or the invoicing for false alarms. To that end, a committee of police staff members, along with Fire Chief Bodony, has worked over the last several months to identify the most cost-effective means to implement alarm systems registration and false alarm invoicing. The result of this study is an improved process that fosters a reduction in false alarms through pro-active responsible alarm management and education, and also generates the financial support to manage the program.

The committee considered two distinct methods of implementation:

1. Outsourcing through contracted services
2. Purchasing software to manage the system in-house.

Based upon our research, we recommend that the Village of Glen Ellyn contract with EnablePoint Systems, a Michigan-based company that provides professional outsourcing services for alarm systems registration, false alarm record management and invoicing. The committee believes that EnablePoint Systems offers the best overall solution from an outsourcing software product perspective as well as the most favorable revenue generation for both alarm permits and false alarm invoices. Moreover, EnablePoint Systems would allow us to transition to in-house alarm registration and billing at the end of the contract period, if desirable. Another significant factor in this decision was the anticipated volume of alarm billing for both the Police Department and Fire Company and EnablePoint has the most favorable fee scale structure for a municipality of our size.

Chief Norton commented that the biggest offenders of false alarms are public buildings. Trustee Elliott asked about the costs associated with staff. Chief Norton responded that it costs the Department money to respond to false alarms, this is not a source of revenue. We do not want this to cause people not to get an alarm; this is a burgeoning business with improved technology. If there are false alarm disputes, we can work with the Village Adjudicator.

Trustee McGinley expressed concerns that a school may hesitate to pull an alarm and they may rethink the process so as not to have a false alarm. A business may cancel service due to false alarms and she is hesitant to charge another fee to our businesses.

Trustee McGinley suggested eliminating schools from this proposal. Chief Norton cautioned against absolving schools from false alarms. Trustee O'Shea added we do not want schools to think twice about pulling an alarm. Trustee Burkett asked Trustee McGinley about her experiences with the false alarms at her business. Trustee McGinley responded she had 4 false alarms and the next one would cost $100. She added that businesses are already paying property taxes, registration and Chamber and/or Alliance dues. Furthermore, she expressed that people may cancel their alarms.

Supervisor Taves stated that this is to clarify the language of the Ordinance. There is a level of discretion for the cost of the false alarms. 85% of the businesses and residents have 3 or less false alarms, the ordinance excludes government or municipal entities from the registration fee.

Trustee O'Shea would like to see a breakdown. Chief Norton responded this would create a public document showing who has alarms or not. Trustee Elliott asked if someone could FOIA this document.

Trustee O'Shea commented that for 300+ false alarms, is it too much work for over 3 false alarms, do we need to outsource this? Trustee Clark asked about a fee for multiple false alarms. Chief Norton responded the proposed fee for over 10 is $200 each.

Manager Franz stated this ordinance has not gotten off the ground in 6 years and suggested letting a vendor handle this in order to drive the program and go from there. Supervisor Taves stated the cost is $17,000 to purchase the software and $3,000 to support. Chief Norton reiterated this Ordinance is already on the books.

Trustee O'Shea responded he is not in favor of registration. Trustee Clark and McGinley responded they are indifferent on registration but ok with the fines. Trustee Ladesic is ok with the fees and the fines and considers this a user fee. Trustee Burket is ok with the fee and said it is their option to pay; we have to stop coddling people for doing wrong things. Trustee Elliott expressed concerns the list could be subject to FOIA and asked Attorney Mathews to research.

Trustee McGinley questioned the registration fee being an annual or one-time fee. Trustee Elliott would like to see the Ordinance amended to increase the fines. President Demos suggested waiving the registration fee in the ordinance for now.

Agenda Item F. Proposed Ordinance Regarding the Sale of Municipal Property for Development Projects Discussion: (Village Attorney Mathews)

Village Attorney Greg Mathews led the discussion regarding the proposed ordinance for the sale of municipal property for development projects.

The Village Board frequently voices the opinion that promotion of development in Glen Ellyn will enhance the quality of life in the community. With the uptick in the economy we recently received several inquiries from developers seeking project approvals for the downtown business district. In some of the proposals, developers sought to acquire and include Village owned property, including recent projects involving the Main Street parking lot and the Glenwood parking lot. Many such development proposals involve negotiations over an extended period of time and require significant monetary investment by the developer to generate engineering and architectural designs.

One obstacle to negotiations and entry into a development agreement expressed by developers entails the current requirements for sale or transfer of public property as part of the agreement. The Village now operates under a set of rules which includes the requirement that municipal property must be sold or transferred after a formal bidding process pursuant to 65 ILCS 5/11-76-2. This means that a developer must choose whether to purchase property in advance of knowing whether a project will be approved or potentially go through the approval process and face a competitor's bid for more cash and lose out completely. The process may act as a disincentive for development.

The Village, as a home rule municipality with legislative authority, may enact an ordinance which streamlines the process for transfer of municipal property related to commercial development but includes sufficient safeguards to protect the interests of the community. The Ordinance for consideration by the Board will eliminate the need to put municipal property out for bid to provide assurance to prospective developers that their efforts will bear fruit but maintain the voting requirement that a ¾ majority of the Board must approve the transfer of property as part of a development agreement. Staff recommends that we exercise our authority to enact such an ordinance to promote a development-friendly atmosphere in Glen Ellyn.

The Board reached a consensus to move forward with the proposed ordinance.

A short break was taken from 8:23 p.m. to 8:29 p.m.

Ms. Cam Page, 206 Hill Avenue, Glen Ellyn approached the Board to ask that they have sufficient safeguards to ensure the Village receives fair compensation for the sale of Village property including appraisals. The new proposals coming up are better than those in the past.

Agenda Item G. Capital Project Funding Discussion: (Finance Director Coyle)

Finance Director Christina Coyle led the discussion regarding capital project funding options.

The Village Board has provided direction to proceed with the relocation of the Police Department to a new facility to be built near Panfish Park. To provide capital for the project, it is necessary to borrow in the form of bonds. To achieve the lowest cost to borrow, the Village is planning to issue tax exempt General Obligation Bonds, which provide the greatest security to bond holders and result in the lowest interest rates. The bonds will be repaid without increasing the tax levy by adjusting the scope and timing of other projects within the Capital Projects Fund, most notably deferring the reconstruction of some non-improved roadways.

The process of issuing bonds is lengthy, and will take around 3 months to complete. To assist with the bond issuance process, the Village engages a financial advisor and bond counsel. Robert W. Baird was approved as the financial advisor at the February 9, 2015, board meeting. Stephan Roberts from Robert W. Baird will be in attendance at the workshop to answer any questions the Board may have. Selection of bond counsel will be brought to the Village Board for approval in the near future.

In order to provide the funding necessary for the police station, the Village will need to issue debt. It may be advantageous to also issue bonds at this time for other identified, unfunded projects that can be completed within three years from issuance (bonds are required to be spent within three years of issuance). In July 2014, the Village Board provided some preliminary direction on funding levels for certain capital projects. At this point, staff is looking for direction from the Board on whether to include $6 million in additional projects to the issuance for the police station. This additional $6 million would provide $1.5 million for stormwater improvements and $4.5 million for Central Business District (CBD) street improvements. The $1.5 million in stormwater improvements would provide funding to address Lake Ellyn improvements that have been directed by the Village Board. The board preliminarily approved funding for the CBD Street and streetscape improvements at a level of $4.5 million, $3M for street work and another $1.5M for streetscape improvements. Although the scope of the work is still to be debated, sidewalk and lighting improvements as well as parkway tree and electrical improvements are some of the enhancements that have been discussed. The CIC had begun a discussion on this topic this month and will be providing some input for the Village Board to consider.

Staff is recommending that the Board approve issuing debt for these projects at this time due to the low interest rate environment. Issuing debt now versus later will likely result in a lower cost to the Village (and the taxpayer) by reducing the interest payments on the debt. Various financial outlets differ on when the Federal Reserve will increase interest rates. Some say as soon as mid 2015 with others anticipating rate increases later in the year. We are not equipped with a crystal ball to guess when interest rates will rise; we can only know that the only two options for the Federal Reserve at this juncture are to raise rates or keep them stagnant.

Trustee McGinley asked if the levy would be increased to assist in funding. Director Coyle responded half of the levy would go towards capital funding, half towards other projects.

Finance Committee Chairman Ford stated there are pros and cons of having a negative balance, which means we borrow from ourselves. We do not want the bond fund to pay for anything we were not going to do. It is a matter of timing/. Trustee Elliott asked if there was a firm consensus of the Finance Committee, Chairman Ford responded yes.

Trustee McGinley asked about CBD planning. Director Coyle responded in over 2 years there has been no change in scope the only change was adding the Taylor Street Underpass. With regards to timing, Engineer Minix responded the last time was in 1998, we are 2 years past and cannot afford to push off.

Trustee McGinley asked about Streetscape. Engineer Minix responded of 4.5 million, 1.5 is for Streetscape. The Capital Improvements Commission is looking to meet the Board's directive for surface related work. Trustee Elliott responded he would like to see some flexibility with which projects to use the funds. Director Coyle responded the Ordinance can be somewhat vague but the funds need to be spent in 3 years.

President Demos stated that the watershed and Lake Ellyn are important components to the economic development plan and wants some flexibility for use.

Trustee Ladesic would like to see engineering costs for a railroad over/underpass included.

Trustee O'Shea agrees with the Finance Committee recommendations and commented this is going to be a juggling game for the next few years.

President Demos commented they will have to be cautious of future expenses moving forward. The Board reached a consensus to move forward.

Adjournment:

At 9:01p.m. A motion was made by Trustee Elliott and seconded by Trustee Clark to adjourn. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Galvin,
Village Clerk