Minutes
Special Workshop Board Meeting
Glen Ellyn Village Board of Trustees
Monday, December 7, 2015

Call to Order

President Demos called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

Roll Call

Upon roll call by Village Clerk Galvin, President Demos and Trustees Clark, Elliott, Kenwood, O'Shea and Senak answered "Present". Trustee Ladesic arrived at 6:45 p.m.

In Attendance: Village Clerk Galvin, Village Manager Franz, Assistant Village Manager Stonitsch, Village Attorney Mathews, Finance Director Coyle, Director of Planning and Development Hulseberg, Police Chief Norton, Deputy Police Chief Acton and Deputy Police Chief Holmer.

Pledge of Allegiance

President Demos asked Ms. Deanne Mazzochi, Vice-Chairman of the College of DuPage Board of Trustees to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

Public Participation

Ms. Deanne Mazzochi, Vice-Chairman of the College of DuPage Board of Trustees, addressed the Board and explained that the College is in the process of choosing a new President. They are seeking public input and 2 public forums are scheduled. The COD Board would also like to work with Glen Ellyn in a more collaborative manner and she has already discussed this with President Demos. With regards to the Suburban Law Enforcement Academy, the COD Board has invested heavily and will continue to do so.

Police Facility Project Update

Village Manager Franz began the discussion of the new police station project. He indicated that he believed that, at the November 30 meeting, there was a Board consensus on the following points:

(1) That the police station project should proceed;

(2) There was a willingness to exceed the original $12 million budget;

(3) At least some portion of the funding for public improvements associated with the station could come from the capital improvements budget;

(4) Some funding could come from drug forfeiture funds;

(5) Purchasing 81 S. Park with non-bond funds; and

(6) Alternatives 1 and 4 (discussed on November 30) were no longer on the table.

Manager Franz indicated he believed the Board still needed to reach consensus on alternates 2 and 3. Manager Franz recommended that the Board purchase 81 S. Park with funds from the corporate reserve fund. The Corporate Reserve Fund has a current cash balance of $200,000.He indicated that he expects the reserve fund to be replenished with funds from the sale of 825 N. Main and possible a sale of a Riford Avenue property.

The Corporate Reserve Fund has a current cash balance of $200,000.

Trustee O'Shea inquired what the purpose of the Corporate Reserve Fund was and what balance the Village liked to keep in there. Finance Director Coyle responded that it is essentially a revolving loan fund and does not have a set reserve balance.

Finance Director Coyle explained the differences between Alternative #2 and #3. Alternative #2 includes building the main facility with a community room, the "shell" of the auxiliary building and Wilson Avenue improvements with a plan to build the auxiliary building in the future. Alternative #3 includes building only the mail facility with a community room and not the auxiliary building. Elements of the auxiliary building, not including the firing range, would be redesigned into the main building. This also includes the Wilson Avenue improvements.

Finance Director Coyle then explained the funding sources for Alterative #3 which include $12.0 million in bonds, $250,000 from the Capital Projects Fund; $100,000 from the Water & Sewer Fund; and $1.16 million from the Federal Drug Forfeiture dollars.

Trustee Elliot asked if the $13.5 million in Alternative #3 excluded already incurred property costs which was affirmed. Trustee Kenwood then stated that the cost is really $14.1 million all in including those costs. Trustee Kenwood then asked if there was uncertainty with the $1.16 million in drug forfeiture funds. Director Coyle stated that the $1.16 in drug forfeiture funds was the amount we needed to fund the project. The Village has approximately half of that amount now and will receive the rest over time. Trustee Elliott inquired if the funds were unencumbered. Director Coyle responded that the funds could be used for allowable costs under the forfeiture program.

Trustee Elliot then inquired if the $13.5 was a turnkey number. Manager Franz responded yes.

Trustee O'Shea inquired what drug forfeiture dollars did we plan to spend in the 2016 budget. Director Coyle responded that the 2016 budget included spending forfeiture dollars for an officer and additional K-9 costs.

Trustee Elliot inquired under Alternative #3, what would be the number in the Leopardo Contract? He assumes they don't order items like desks, chairs, etc. Ms. Leigh McMillen, Leopardo answered that he was correct. The police will purchase some items like FF&E. Trustee Elliot further inquired what was budgeted for FF&E and the response 400,000. Ms. McMillen also added that there is an owner contingency in the contract.

Manager Franz then outlined the pros and cons of Alternative #3. The pros are that there is no need to use reserve funds, drug forfeiture dollars could be used for other police department needs and that we could decide to build the range when the fund is replenished. The cons of Alternative #3 include that it does not have an auxiliary building and the main building would need to be redesigned to fit some of the elements of the auxiliary building. The cost of construction is also cheaper now to construct the auxiliary building.

Trustee Kenwood inquired if there were any pros and cons financially based upon our priorities. Manager Franz responded that we will answer that question when we go over Alternative #2.

Finance Director Coyle then explained the funding sources for Alterative #2 which include $12.0 million in bonds, $250,000 from the Capital Projects Fund; $100,000 from the Water & Sewer Fund; and $1.2 million from the Federal Drug Forfeiture dollars; and $990,000 in General Fund reserves. The main difference between Alterative #2 and Alternative #3 is that Alternative #2 includes $990,000 in General Fund reserves.

Director Coyle then reviewed the General Fund cash reserve policy. The current policy is 28% of operating expenditures or $4.661 million. This will change to $5.056 million on January 1. The Village policy is to eventually reach 35% of operating expenditures for the General Fund.

Trustee Clark inquired if it was reasonable to get from 29% to 35% over 5-6 years. Director Coyle responded yes. Manager Franz added that the main variable in how our cash reserves progress is the state budget and how it may affect reserves.

Trustee Kenwood asked if we spent the $12.0 million, then could we add $2.5 million to the General Fund. The response was no, those dollars are not for the General Fund.

Trustee Elliott asked if the General Fund is where the Village would provide dollars to increase the police pension fund contribution. Director Coyle responded yes.

Director Coyle then outlined how the drug forfeiture funds could be used to repay the General Fund in 10 years. The payback could be quicker if the forfeiture funds come in higher/quicker than expected. Director Coyle then went over some competing needs for those reserve funds. Trustee Kenwood asked if any of those needs have a $1.0+ million cost. Manager Franz responded yes.

Manager Franz then went over the pros and cons of Alternative #2. Pros of Alternative #2 are that it includes a shell for the auxiliary building and elements of the auxiliary building would not need to be redesigned into the main facility. The building shell would be built now, presumably when construction costs would be lower. Alternative #2 would also better meet the needs of the police department now and in the future. The cons of Alternative #2 is that it uses $990,000 in General Fund reserves. The auxiliary building will not include a functioning shooting range which would be built at an unknown future date. Based on conservative projections, it will take approximately 10 years to repay the General Fund with drug forfeiture dollars to replenish the reserves which may limit the ability to do other projects. Lastly, the Finance Commission has recommended that any excess funds should be used to fund the Police Pension liability.

Trustee O'Shea then inquired what the differential for the range was. Manager Franz indicated that $1.6 million was a good number, but it is really just an estimate at this point.

President Demos stated he is a fan of the Police Department, and recognizes the contributions they make. He emphasized that the Board is 100% behind the police force, but also needs to weigh certain financial factors in connection with this process. President Demos indicated that he believed a proposal suggested by Trustee O'Shea at the November 30 meeting might be a workable solution, and he asked Trustee O'Shea to summarize that proposal.

Trustee O'Shea suggested Alternative 3, which includes a community room, but does not include a range. He was willing to spend up to $13.5 million, not including the $600,000 in land acquisition. He stated he is willing to fund at that level because he feels the budget needs to be reasonable to provide a facility that the experts are telling us is needed. He does not support a range at this time, and hopes the police will consider other options including COD, but is not against building a range in the future if appropriate for training and if financially feasible.

Trustee Senak inquired about the facilities in New Lenox and Clarendon Hills and the relatively low cost. Ms. McMillen, Vice-President, Leopardo Construction, responded that the Clarendon Hills facility is very different from the proposed facility. Clarendon Hills is a precast box with a conventional frame. Clarendon Hills took a different approach than Glen Ellyn is pursuing. Ms. McMillen confirmed that the New Lenox facility was completed in 2014, but emphasized that it was bid well before that. Trustee Senak asked what an expected cost increase might be between the time for bidding in New Lenox and the present time. Ms. McMillen roughly estimated that annual construction cost increases might be at least 5% per year. She confirmed that the construction cost for New Lenox was approximately $380 per square foot.

President Demos asked how many officers Clarendon Hills has. Chief Norton responded that Clarendon Hills is much smaller and added that the station was built on their municipal campus.

Trustee Clark asked whether there might be an advantage to build a pad for the auxiliary building at this time. Ms. McMillen indicated that was not a recommended approach.

Trustee O'Shea stated that Bloomingdale built space for a range in 2008, and it still has not been built. He suggested not building the shell. Trustee O'Shea noted that his proposal is essentially the same as Alternative 3, except a $60,000 difference in cost.

Trustee Clark commented that he is still leaning towards Alternative 2.

Trustee Senak is in favor of Alternative 3. He recently toured COD and Hanover Park with Trustee Kenwood. He indicated that he believes the College of DuPage range is state of the art and there is lots of availability and COD has demonstrated a willingness to work with us. He questioned whether Glen Ellyn could build a facility on its par that would permit an equivalent level of training. He noted that the Village has other competing projects that need to be funded.

Trustee Elliott (who is a partner for a law firm that provides legal services to the College of DuPage) stated he can get behind Alternative 3 although he continues to struggle with the dollar amount. He noted that Glen Ellyn currently has 40 uniformed officers in a 14,000 square foot space. Alternative 3 would double the current space. He noted that the current estimated cost is over $10 million, and he cannot recall the Village ever making a capital investment of this size, which represents a very significant commitment to the police force. This project started at $11.5 million and it is being increased an additional $2 million. He stated it has not been demonstrated that the additional $2 million is necessary. He noted that additional $2 million is significant to him and it should be significant to all, because it is money that cannot be used on projects such as overpasses, underpasses, the fire department and the police pension obligations. He still wants to see what the Village can get for $11.5 million before agreeing to spend $13.5 million.

Trustee Kenwood remarked he takes the previous Board's intent to spend $12 million seriously. However, he noted that several of the previous Board members were comfortable in increasing that amount. He noted that one of the purposes of the new station was to provide a better work environment for the Village's officers, and he had some concerns about aspects of the main facility, such as electrical outlets in lockers and a reduced size of the EOC room. However, he recognizes that there are competing projects such as the fire department and overpasses. He does not think we currently have the funds to build a range at this time. He stated he can get comfortable with Alternative 3 and a $13.5 million cost.

Trustee Ladesic agreed with Trustee Clark and indicated he prefers Alternative 2. The purpose of our range would not be to replace COD, but to supplement. He referenced an FBI Agent after the Boston Marathon bombings who stated we need to train local law enforcement officers as they will be our front line as also evidenced in San Bernardino. He recognized that the Board majority appeared to favor a $13.5 million facility, but noted that if the Board compromised between Alternatives 2 and 3, it would be right where it started. The original number was approximately $14.7 million.

President Demos indicated the consensus appears to be for $13.5million and asked Ms. McMillen to continue to find value to further reduce that number. Trustee O'Shea asked when the Board would get a guaranteed number. Ms. McMillen responded that would happen when the project goes out to bid in the spring. Trustee O'Shea asked what would happen if the bid numbers are high. President Demos responded they will re-review or bid alternatives.

Trustee Kenwood asked the design team if the $13.5 million amount is reasonable or will they be coming back for more money. Ms. McMillen responded she feels good about this amount, and explained the process that would be pursued during the design and bidding phases. She indicated that she had vetted the number.

Ms. Amy Keating, 21W701 Monticello Rd., Glen Ellyn approached the Board to state her support for the proposed range/training facility. Ms. Keating stated she is glad they are researching the necessity of having a range. The Board is doing their due diligence, thank you. She noted that Glen Ellyn is an affluent community with high standards, and that some residents say we do not need and that we do not have that type of crime. That is not true; we take for granted why we feel safe. She stated that Chief

Norton has taken on a monumental task of providing for public safety, and has pared down this facility as much as possible and we should trust what he feels he needs for his officers and for the residents.

Mr. Jim Meyers, 531 Stafford Lane, Glen Ellyn approached the Board to state his support for the proposed range/training facility. Mr. Meyers is a 35-year resident of Glen Ellyn and Chairman of the Police and Fire Commission. Mr. Meyers shared a story of an officer who, after a two-day training program stated that she appreciated the training and that she became comfortable with her service weapon. For their safety and the safety of the community, Mr. Meyers asked that the Board not compromise on training for the officers.

Ms. Dianne McGinley, 293 Abbotsford, Glen Ellyn. She approached the Board as a former Trustee to state that she voted for the $12 million and is pleased to see the project is progressing. All of the designs were high; some were over $20 million. She expressed disappointment that no $12 million option was presented. With respect to the firing range, at the time of the original discussion, the COD range was not an option, but now it is. COD has a state of the art facility that we cannot replicate. We should consider that option. She also noted that the current proposed facility has training facilities (except a range) onsite. She expressed a concern that $13.5 will not be the final number, but that there will be cost overruns.

Mr. Thomas Turek, 357 Birchbark Ct., Glen Ellyn approached the Board to state his support for the proposed range/training facility. Mr. Turek is a 60 year resident and a 40 year + law enforcement professional, primarily in Elmhurst. When you use another's range you are always at their beck and call. COD is probably great but he strongly supports Glen Ellyn having its own range.

Ms. Patricia Sander, 1198 Royal Glen Drive, Glen Ellyn approached the Board to state her support for the proposed range/training facility. She stated no matter what COD says, we do not know what COD will do. In 5-10 years, things may change.

Attorney Mathews stated no formal action had been taken by the Board. To protect our interests (as well as the interests of the design/build team) he will put together a Resolution for the Board. He clarified that he intends to draft a resolution that:

(1) Directs the design team to use the figure $13.51 million;

(2) Includes language to make clear that the $13.51 does not include land acquisition costs; and

(3) Includes the exterior design palette #2. The Trustees discussed including "not to exceed" language in the resolution.

Chief Norton thanked the Board for all of the work that has gone into this. He expressed disappointment that the Board did not support building the entire project. He indicated that the COD facility may be very nice, but no matter how nice COD is, it does not present the same opportunities. Wheaton, however, does provide the police department with the training opportunities it needs (minus the inconvenience of travel and distance). Deputy Chief Holmer added that he recognizes what a difficult decision this has been for the Board. Deputy Chief Action remarked that he wants the Board to know he has been working with an exceptional team of Leopardo/Dewberry.

Trustee Kenwood stated whatever training the police department needs, he wants them to get it if they feel they are not getting it. Trustee Senak added that the Board is not saying no, they are saying not now, and if various alternatives do not work out, he is willing to revisit the issues associated with training. He emphasized that he believes both Wheaton and COD have sufficient availability and capacity to permit training. He noted that we are devoting $473 per square foot to the new facility; well above the $380 per square foot that New Lenox cost.

A**djournment:**

At 8:07 p.m. a motion was made by Trustee Kenwood and seconded by Trustee O'Shea to adjourn. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Galvin,
Village Clerk