Minutes
Village of Glen Ellyn
Regular Village Board Meeting
Monday, February 26, 2024
7:00 PM
Glen Ellyn Civic Center, Galligan Board Room

A. Call to Order – 7:00 P.M.

B. Pledge of Allegiance

C. Roll Call

Upon roll call by Deputy Clerk Cannova, President Senak and Trustees Christiansen, Fasules, Kalinich, Gould, Simon, and Thompson answered "Present."

Also in attendance: Village Manager Franz, Assistant Village Manager/Community Development Director Rodman, Village Attorney Mathews, Public Works Director Buckley, Finance Director Brankin, Economic Development Coordinator Hannah, General Manager Vesevick, Management Analyst Irizarry**,** Information Technology Director Chiappetta, Communications Coordinator Paplauskas, and Deputy Police Chief Vavra.

D. Audience Participation

There was no off-agenda audience participation.

E. Consent Agenda - The following items are considered routine business by the Village Board and will be approved in a single vote in the form listed below:

RESULTS:	**DENIED [2 to 4] VOTE TO TABLE CONSENT AGENDA**
MOVER:	**Trustee Thompson**
SECONDER:	**Trustee Gould**
AYES:	**Thompson, Gould**
NAYS:	**Fasules, Kalinich, Christiansen, Simon**

Motion to approve the following items which have been reviewed by the Management Team and Village Attorney and are consistent with the Village's purchasing policy (Trustee Thompson)

1) Authorize the Village Manager to execute a contract for 2024-2026 Landscape Maintenance Services for an amount not to exceed $284,676.00 and a contract for the 2024-2026 Alternate Bid for Parkway Restorations in an amount not to exceed $28,605.00 to City Escape Garden and Design of Chicago, IL (Public Works Director Buckley)

RESULTS:	**APPROVED [5 to 1]**
MOVER:	**Trustee Fasules**
SECONDER:	**Trustee Kalinich**
AYES:	**Fasules, Kalinich, Christiansen, Gould, Simon**
NAYS:	**Thompson**

Trustee Thompson requested this item be voted on separately. The Board unanimously agreed.

Public Works Director Buckley reviewed the contract process in which the 3-year contract went out for bid, sending it to 37 landscaping companies and receiving 9 bids. He said they were going with the low bid based on positive reference checks with the municipalities of Tinley Park, Buffalo Grove and Oak Park.

President Senak said he was pleased that the contract was sent out for bid.

Trustee Thompson was concerned that a new provider had been chosen for the 3-year contract that the Village has no experience with. He added that the bids were all over the board and wasn't sure that the companies know what they were bidding on.

Trustee Thompson was also concerned that the Village is going outside of the county to service this contract and wanted to know if any preference was given to the incumbent servicer, Barry.

Public Works Director Buckley replied there was not, adding that Barry holds other contracts and there was a concern that it would seem as if the Village only used Barry, and that it was common to change contractors.

Village Manager Franz added that because it's a Public Works contract, the Village must go with the low bid unless there is a reason not to accept the low bid. Discussion ensued, including expected service levels and how to break the contract if those levels are not met.

Trustee Thompson asked about why there were some large discrepancies in the bids. Public Works Director Buckley said there was an error in the Excel Spreadsheet which some vendors caught while others did not. Because of this, Public Works went back to ensure that each vendor understood the accurate information so that everything was accurate.

President Senak asked if there was an exception in the Village Code to the lowest bidder requirement if there are professional services involved. Village Manager Franz replied that there was, but this is not considered a professional service. Discussion ensued.

Trustee Thompson asked if the Village Board can override the lowest bid requirement and take the second lowest bid. Village Manager Franz replied that he thought the Board could but that the Village Attorney would probably advise that there should be a very good rationale for that. Discussion ensued.

Trustee Gould asked if the contract amount had been reduced since some of the property maintenance had been outsourced to the Park District. Public Works Director Buckley replied that those properties have not been part of this contract in the past or currently. He then gave some details on the Park District properties.

Trustee Gould asked what are the parcels that Public Works manages that someone else maintains. Public Works Director Buckley replied about these parcels.

2) Authorize the Village Manager to execute a Change Order in an amount not to exceed $180,000 for construction services to the current contract for Construction, Inc. of Lombard and a Change Order in an amount not to exceed $34,000 for design fees to the current contract for KTGY Group, Inc. of Chicago related to scope modifications to the renovation project at the Village Links/Reserve 22 Clubhouse to be expensed to the Village Links Cash Reserves (General Manager Vesevick)

RESULTS:	**APPROVED [5 to 1]**
MOVER:	**Trustee Simon**
SECONDER:	**Trustee Kalinich**
AYES:	**Simon, Kalinich, Christiansen, Fasules, Gould**
NAYS:	**Thompson**

Trustee Thompson requested this item be voted on separately. The Board unanimously agreed.

Trustee Thompson was concerned about authorizing both the engineering architecture and the project without seeing the plans. He suggested that the architecture be approved and then come back to see what's proposed, and then approve the project. He added that he felt this was being rushed. General Manager Vesevick replied with details about the construction change order and what is trying to be achieved with the available small space.

Trustee Thompson said that the way this was being done was not the way the Village usually does things. He was concerned that the change order did not get vetted and approved by the Recreation Commission.

Trustee Kalinich responded to Trustee Thompson by saying that sometimes changes do come up that need a decision within a tight timeframe. She added, for this particular change, she knew personally from using those facilities that it's needed. She also felt that it would be absolutely appropriate to have the follow up with the Recreation Commission soon as possible so that loop could be completed.

Trustee Thompson countered by saying that it was still going outside the way the Board should be doing things. He added that there had been no public process and it was just being decided because it’s convenient.

Trustee Fasules commented that if the Village is going to renovate a building in 2024 and not make it ADA-compliant, then the Board is not doing what they need to for the Village. He continued by saying that some people were going to lose locker space but the Village will gain ADA compliance.

General Manager Vesevick replied that the loss of lockers was addressed in the Recreation Commission January meeting, at which the members went into detail regarding the number of current lockers and what how many would be available with the switch to ADA-compliant space and lockers.

Trustee Kalinich asked if it was possible to have lockers in another location as well. General Manager Vesevick replied, explaining why no other space is available.

Trustee Christiansen asked how long it would take it take to go through the Recreation Commission and return to the Board as well as the risks involved in delaying the decision. General Manager Vesevick replied that the risk is that it puts the project further into the golf season. He added that this would not be the end of the world, however, there is work in the kitchen that needs to be finished before the restaurant starts getting busy with banquets.

Discussion continued about how much time it would take to send this to the Recreation Commission. Trustee Fasules interjected that there was no need for that because the Board is the ultimate authority of the community, the staff has given their OK, and this is what they believe is the right thing to do in order to make the building ADA compliant. He suggested trying to find another place to put some sort of locker facilities.

Trustee Gould asked for clarification if before this change, there were no ADA compliant bathrooms, or were there just not enough. General Manager Vesevick replied that there were none except in the restaurant. Trustee Gould then asked if the current ADA restrooms were enough to meet requirements. Village Manager Franz responded with the considerations of not adding ADA compliance versus adding it, with the decision being made, based on quotes, that it was the right thing to do, and since the renovations were being done, the ADA compliance should be included.

F. Approval of a Purchase and Sale Agreement with Full Circle Communities, Inc. concerning the property commonly known as 640 Taft Avenue (Manager Franz) (Trustee Fasules)

RESULTS:	**APPROVED [7 to 0]**
MOVER:	**Trustee Fasules**
SECONDER:	**Trustee Gould**
AYES:	**Fasules, Gould, Christiansen, Kalinich, Simon, Thompson, President Senak**
NAYS:	

1) Motion to Approve Ordinance No. 7094, an Ordinance authorizing the approval of a Purchase and Sale Agreement with Full Circle Communities, Inc. concerning the property commonly known as 640 Taft Avenue, Glen Ellyn, Illinois

Village Manager Franz stated that Consultant Kon Savoy would review the details of the motion. After that he said that representatives from Full Circle would speak, and that he would be part of the presentation as well. He then turned the presentation over to Mr. Savoy.

Before starting, Mr. Savoy thanked everyone involved for keeping the vision in mind, which included his entire team who worked on market analysis, public participation, and design concepts, as well as Village staff. He added that Mark and his team are some of the most dedicated, creative, knowledgeable, thoughtful, and skilled professionals he had worked with.

Mr. Savoy then gave a quick review of the property on Roosevelt Road and Taft Avenue, giving details about the entire parcel and the split of east and west. He then gave a brief history of the site, talking about how it is now a catalyst site per the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Savoy reviewed the limitations of the Roosevelt frontage and a number of other site constraints that limit the development of the property.

Mr. Savoy talked about the Village's objectives when it moved into the process of securing the property for redevelopment. He then reviewed the purchase and sale agreement for the property.

Mr. Savoy stated that his firm was engaged in September 2021 to assist in identifying a vision for the redevelopment of the site, assisting in the public process and in the development recruitment process. He added that the Village closed on the property in January 2022 for $2.85 million, purchased using corporate revenue reserves and TIF funds.

Mr. Savoy reviewed actions taken since purchase of the property. He then spoke about the market analysis and its findings regarding what developers would be willing to build on the site. He talked about the community open houses held regarding potential development on the site and the encouragement of public input, including the establishment by the Village of the Roosevelt Road/Taft Avenue Hotel Site Work Group, an ad hoc working group consisting of ten members of the Glen Ellyn community.

Mr. Savoy emphasized that this was a public-driven design process, and in the end, 27 different development scenarios came out of the ad hoc community group. He said the consultant team then took these scenarios and developed 5 design concepts to submit to the Village as well as the ad hoc group.

Mr. Savoy turned the meeting back to Village Manager Franz. Village Manager Franz described that at that point in the process, the Village hired Matt Ishikawa from CBRE to lead the efforts to market the property, collect the offers, and vet various developers.

Village Manager Franz stated there were nine different offers to develop the property. He then gave highlights of the negotiations with the developers to reach the current offers. He then spoke specifically about the offer for the west parcel and said that the Village had negotiated a draft purchase and sale agreement, which was being considered at this meeting, with Full Circle Communities, to develop multi-family, affordable housing. The Village and Full Circle had negotiated a draft purchase and sale agreement.

Village Manager Franz then invited representatives of Full Circle to give a presentation of their plans.

Mary Donahue, a project manager with Full Circle Communities, gave a brief history of Full Circle and their current portfolio. She spoke about their mission and how they achieve it. She added that because they are the developer as well as the long-term owner and property manager, they are committed to the success of their development and to being a good neighbor in the communities where they work.

Ms. Donahue then reviewed Full Circle's property management approach on the local as well as corporate level. She gave examples of positive feedback from municipal officials and community partners in many places where we already work.

Ms. Donahue then highlighted the type of work they do in their facilities and the high standards they demand. She then transitioned into an overview of their initial plans for the site at Taft and Exmoor, with plans being finalized as the process continues with the Village.

Ms. Donahue defined supportive housing units as those that typically rent to household at 30% of the area median income. She then reviewed the units in to be included in this proposal and added that they are responding to the community needs for affordable and accessible housing that were identified in the Village's housing assessment.

Per the request of Village Manager Franz, Ms. Donahue introduced Full Circle President & CEO Joshua Wilmoth and their attorney, Steve Freeland.

Village Manager Franz reviewed the basic business terms of the purchase and sale agreement. He also went through key deadlines to keep in mind as the project moves forward.

Next, Village Manager Franz talked about the financial impact of the whole Roosevelt Road site, information attached to the meeting agenda. These points included covering the acquisition cost, site demolition, and the total taxes anticipated over the life of the TIF as well as property taxes. He concluded by saying that in the long term, the Village anticipates a return on investment, including about $593,000 of TIF increment overall.

Lastly, Village Manager Franz highlighted the next steps of the process for the west side, emphasizing that all will be vetted publicly through various commissions and ultimately by the Village Board. He added that the process for the east side may be the same depending on the final agreement.

Trustee Kalinich said she understood that senior housing would be included and asked Full Circle if this was in the plan. Full Circle replied that seniors would be eligible to live there.

Trustee Kalinich wanted to confirm that the percentage for adults with disabilities was 30%. Full Circle replied yes, and it could be more.

Trustee Kalinich asked Full Circle to give practical examples of support services that would be offered. Full Circle's CEO, Mr. Wilmoth, replied that they services would be tailored to the residents through outreach to provide services available in the community.

Trustee Fasules asked why senior housing is not specifically allotted. Mr. Wilmoth replied that they could not without violating terms of the federal fair housing law.

Trustee Thompson asked if the income levels apply to all of the housing. Mr. Wilmoth replied, explaining the breakout and percentage scenarios.

Trustee Thompson asked about the application process and if there was actual proof that applicants have to provide when presenting their financial data. Mr. Wilmoth replied yes, giving further details.

President Senak followed up by bringing up the implication that letting Full Circle develop the property is simply recreating the hotel situation. He asked that Mr. Wilmoth give some sense of what their vetting process is for selecting residents to occupy the property, and then what would occur if a resident violated the law? Mr. Wilmoth replied that there are hundreds and hundreds of people right now in Glen Ellyn who want to, and qualify to, live in this property. Mr. Wilmoth then went through the steps and the screening process involved in renting with Full Circle.

President Senak asked what happens if one of the residents does commit a crime. Mr. Wilmoth explained that Full Circle does not tolerate this in their properties and outlined the steps taken to correct the problem for the safety of the building residents as well as the community.

Trustee Christiansen asked what percentage of applicants are accepted. Mr. Wilmoth replied, saying that the data is challenging but gave their Larkin property in Elgin as an example.

Trustee Christiansen asked about partnering with local providers and services and wanted to know who those providers and service providers would be. Ms. Donahue replied these supportive service providers are often chosen to reflect the target population of the of the development. She talked about the Larkin property, and others, to illustrate this.

Trustee Christiansen asked for an explanation of each of the different types of housing and how they vary from one to the other. Ms. Donahue replied, explaining affordable and workforce housing.

Trustee Gould asked Full Circle to give an idea of the mix to be expected and the high, low and median numbers in terms of students in K through 12 to expect as well. Mr. Wilmoth replied with results of an analysis they did of 189 similar units in the Chicagoland area. He said they had found that on average there was one child for every five units and one school age child for every six units, adding that no children are allowed to live in the studios in Taft/Exmoor property, and expected 9-11 children if completed as designed.

Trustee Gould asked about Full Circle's Arlington Heights development that is currently in progress, wanting to know if it is similar or different as far as the targeted resident population here. Ms. Donahue replied.

Trustee Fasules asked if seniors can be moved up the waitlist up the same as applicants with disabilities. Mr. Wilmoth replied no, but many seniors have disabilities, adding that Full Circle is disability neutral per fair housing law.

Trustee Fasules asked what percentage of their residents come from the same community as the building location. Mr. Wilmoth replied with data points.

Trustee Thompson asked if there were legal residency requirements in fair housing, and what is the residency requirement. Mr. Wilmoth replied. Trustee Thompson followed up by asking if it is open to U.S. citizens only. Mr. Wilmoth replied that it is open to citizens and naturalized immigrants.

Trustee Thompson asked if this property will be open to people with Section Eight vouchers. Mr. Wilmoth replied, saying that they are not allowed to restrict based on source of income.

Trustee Thompson asked Village Manager Franz to talk about the taxes that were paid by the hotel property in the last ten years. Village Manager Franz replied saying that last year the property taxes for the entire site were $31,000. Trustee Thompson followed up by asking how much of that did the schools receive. Finance Director Brankin replied.

Trustee Thompson asked what the projected increment will be. Village Manager Franz replied that for the west side, it is projected to be $593,000 and when the TIF expires in 2037 there would be a new tax rate. Finance Director Brankin talked further about the TIF currently and after its expiration. The east side of the property has preliminary projections and will be updated once its contract is final.

Trustee Gould asked about the taxes generated on a per-acre basis compared to other parcels of Roosevelt Road. Finance Director Brankin replied he would need to research to answer. Trustee Gould replied with her own calculations and thought that it was a good revenue stream.

Trustee Gould asked how many units of affordable housing have been added to the Village since the 2018 data. Village Manager Franz replied. Trustee Gould gave her own ballpark of the development that she was aware of and felt the number was still hovering around 16%.

President Senak stated that the Roosevelt Road property is a similar situation to Five Corners and APEX and that his approach would be the same as he used for those, in that he would do his homework and not only let it be known how he will vote, but also say why he's going to vote that way. He then gave some background on the property saying that had been for sale for years and there were no takers during that time.

President Senak continued by saying that the condition of the property was affecting the equalized assessed value of the property around it and that the crime at this location was disproportionate. He added that past Boards took a hand-off approach that was not solving the problem, so the current Board decided to take a more proactive approach by acquiring the property in January 2022 with the intent to facilitate the redevelopment of the property. He commended the Trustees for their foresight in making the decision to purchase the property, thanking the staff for the substantial amount of additional work they put into the project.

President Senak reviewed the steps taken in the development of the property which included a housing study and much community input.

President Senak stated that the development of this property is a unique opportunity for the Village and he wanted everyone to understand that in this situation, residents had a direct impact on the type of development that would be realized before a decision was made. He added that this wasn't a decision made by a developer, or of the staff, or even a decision of any individual on the Board, but it was a community decision.

President Senak emphasized that the Board took great care to ensure that developing and planning for this site was done properly, and that regardless of whether someone agrees or disagrees with the outcome, any claim that this Board did not listen to the community is frankly not supported by the facts.

President Senak then went through what was learned from this process from the consultant, citing the demand for 15,000 to 25,000 square feet of new retail space at this location, minimal demand for new office space, potential residential use but not for single family housing, and the need for affordable senior apartments.

President Senak went on to talk about what was learned from the community, citing about 62% in favor of affordable housing, 33% in favor of commercial development and opposed to affordable housing, with 4% neutral and 1.8% for affordable housing, but not at this site. He continued by recapping his involvement in the process and in all modesty, he felt that no one has heard more public comment about this issue than he has.

President Senak talked about the myriad suggestions for development that had been submitted, pointing out that the community could want a certain type of development but without market support and a developer that wants to build it, nothing can happen.

President Senak followed up by saying that the Village asked the development community for its interest in developing this property consistent with Village guidelines and received nine proposals from seven different developers that included affordable housing as well as commercial development. He then gave his thoughts on the commercial development of the east side, saying he was in complete support of the final proposal being considered.

President Senak then spoke about affordable housing and its definition as it relates to the proposal on the table for the west side of the property. He then talked about the current zoning and if this was a suitable location for affordable housing.

President Senak asked if there is a need in the Village for more affordable housing units, given that the Village exceeds the legally required amount. He then went on to speak about the housing shortage for adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities within the Village, as well as seniors. He wrapped up by citing the Comprehensive Plan and that more affordable housing is definitely needed.

President Senak then considered whether affordable housing was a good deal for the Village and gave his thoughts on this question in terms of highest and best use which included sale price as well as comparing future revenue generation for commercial, residential, and residential affordable housing.

President Senak addressed the residents' concern about the impact affordable housing would have on School District 89, citing the major factors that determine the amount of money available for schools, which are state appropriation, federal aid, tax rates, and enrollment and property value. He stated that he had studied the impact question and had concluded that loss of revenue was miniscule and student increase would be offset by decreases in student enrollment attributable to other demographic factors.

President Senak also addressed the concern about falling property values if affordable housing is put on the site and said he found no empirical data whether an affordable housing development would or would not negatively impact property values in Glen Ellyn. He then elaborated on how the impact on property values was dependent on the developer and that Full Circle's proposal states that they are committed to designing the building to meet the goals of the residents and the local community. He then gave his thoughts on factors that affect property values which included supporting information.

President Senak stated that the Comprehensive Plan is the Village's guiding document and on the issue of commercial development, one goal of the Village is that the Village should develop a system of commercial retail and office development that provides residents with employment opportunities and needed goods and services. Increases Village sales and property taxes enhances the image and appearance of the community. He continued by expanding on what this means in relation to Comprehensive Plan and the issue at hand.

President Senak discussed the rezoning of the Kingsbrook Glen subdivision property to residential and the proximity of it to the Roosevelt Road property. He also pointed out that Panfish Park is surrounded by residential development and because of this, the Full Circle proposal is consistent with the use and zoning of the nearby properties, but that there were other factors to consider. He then outlined those factors which included the concerns with the housing being near the Shell gas station, public safety and crime. President Senak went into detail on each of these concerns and why they are not applicable to this location or type of housing.

President Senak turned the conversation to the benefits of affordable housing, saying they were well laid out in the workgroups, which include a more stable and robust labor pool for local area businesses, reduced transportation and employment related expenses, promotion of family stability, and additional tax revenue.

President Senak summed up his comments by saying that he fully supports moving forward with this proposal, including the signing of the purchase and sale agreement with Full Circle, adding that this is the beginning of the process and there is a lot of work to be done before the proposal can be considered for approval. He was also in favor of moving forward with the east side proposal as well.

Public comment began with Norris Eber, resident, who spoke about his experience with the process and assumed that the Board will keep its pledge of no negative income economic impact on the Village or school districts caused by the real estate taxes paid by the affordable housing project. He also gave his thoughts on the Ryan Report's findings and felt that there was a major conflict between the Ryan Report analysis and what is stated in the purchase and sale agreement. He submitted information to substantiate his statement and gave a suggestion to change the last two lines of the proposal.

John Day, resident, posed questions to the Board: 1) Is there a breakdown of the 42 units as to the number of studios, one and two bedrooms; 2) Will there be onsite management on the property; 3) if Full Circle does not get their tax credits, are they prohibited to coming back to the Village for that; 4) more information of how project base units would work to keep the residents from the immediate community.

Pat Van Tiem, resident, said he was surprised that the Five Corners gas station wasn't allowed, but housing will be allowed close to the Shell station. He then read some negative comments he found on the FCC website regarding other Full Circle properties. He then asked if the property taxes in the Ryan report were in fact, true. He concluded by saying he hoped that Glen Ellyn median income numbers are being used.

Nicolas Nelson, resident, thanked President Senak for a very thorough analysis, especially the tax analysis which he found correct but felt it was a significant amount going to District 89. He also felt that an increase in 9 – 11 students does make a financial difference. He questioned the support within the community for housing at this location, recalling that the majority of the ad hoc committee voted against housing being at that site. He compared the very active group that supports this proposal to the South Glen Ellyn Community Business Development and the public outreach each has done to promote their point of view along with which side is actually the majority view. He expressed frustration that there is no guarantee that units will go to Glen Ellyn residents. He stated that many against this location for affordable housing would be for it at another location. He also felt that there has been the lack of transparency and explained why he felt this way. He also had issues with bids being accepted for the west side property and timing of grant submissions, feeling these were done behind closed doors. He wrapped up by stating his belief that there has been unfair treatment of the community members residing south of Roosevelt Road.

Marti Boyd, resident, said she had some of the same concerns as Mr. Nelson but was not concerned about the residents not getting a priority for rental of the units. She asked for further clarification about what the waitlist preference means. As far as the disabled tenants, what does that really mean and how does that really work? She also wanted to look at President Senak's notes on tax revenue. President Senak offered to share a copy. Her final question was what the total Village projected costs are to redevelop the hotel properties.

David Firchau, resident who lives near the property, talked about the kinds of crime and unsavoriness that he had witnessed when the hotels were operating. He stated that the majority of the people have said that they are scared, adding that he felt the College of DuPage moved into our Village and makes the decision, and if it wasn't for politics, he didn't think everyone would be in this meeting right now. He also said that he believed there should be affordable housing in the Village. He then went into a list of past grievances with how the Village has conducted itself over the years in regard to other projects.

Tony Payne, resident, cited some of the history of the property purchase process, along with information concerning the zoning. He stated that he believed that the Village had never published the complied summary of the results of the community feedback until this evening. He then went into some of highlights of the Full Circle development plan and argued that the Village had not conveyed how putting the low-income housing unit in a commercial retail zone will improve the safety and vitality of the area. He thought that this decision should have been put up for public vote. He then asked that the Board show some courage to oppose the purchase and sale agreement with Full Circle until a vote can be held in the Village.

Pete Ladesic, resident, did not think this is the time or the place for this development and gave his reasons for his position, emphasizing the tax revenue issues surrounding the development. He spoke about the concern that Village residents are not guaranteed to benefit from this type of housing. He suggested developing group homes in other residential-zoned areas of the Village. He wrapped up his comments by asking the Board to slow down on a decision for the property and reconsider the sale.

Rachna Chaudhori, resident, encouraged the Board not to sign with Full Circle communities and to instead make the property only for commercial purposes. She cited affordable housing decisions over the last 40 years. She felt that the housing is concentrated in certain areas and that none of the Board lives near affordable housing and said that in essence, the Board was for affordable housing as long as it is not in their personal backyard. She concluded by saying if the Board members truly want to create affordable housing and lift up those in poverty, she implored them to redistrict this affordable housing unit into District 41 schools, so they could benefit from a more diverse school system.

Patruck Lopardo, resident, came to the meeting to support affordable housing and thought that everything he had heard so far about it sounded amazing.

Dennis Thums, resident, asked that something to provide preference to military veterans with disabilities be added to the resident qualifications. He also asked if being a U.S. citizen was going to be one of the criteria. Mr. Wilmoth confirmed that applicants must provide a Social Security number, or if you don't have a Social Security number, you must provide naturalization paperwork from U.S. Immigration. He then went into a request he had emailed earlier asking that the Village Board to consider a resolution that would make Glen Ellyn a non-sanctuary status city, giving his reasons for believing this would be a positive direction.

Kevin McGrane, resident, served on the ad hoc committee and pointed out that there is a petition of south side residents that are overwhelmingly against putting housing in this location. He felt that the wants and needs of those living south of Roosevelt are routinely ignored. He then touched on two items. First, he felt that this process was largely driven by outside organizations because the League of Women Voters have had on their website that there was an agreement with the Village that this site would be affordable housing, adding that the President denied that there was any such agreement made. Second, he stated that the Village had brought in an affordable housing specialist who said the only way to ensure this housing would not revert back to the eyesore or crime problems from before would be for the Village to build into their agreement with Full Circle Communities that this property never be used for illegal aliens, the homeless, parolees, those with mental disorders or violent behaviors, etc. and from what he had seen, none of these restrictions are part of the agreement. He concluded by saying that we should be differentiating between affordable housing and supportive housing for adults with developmental disabilities who do represent a group that should be helped, but since Illinois is a failed state that has largely been abandoned.

Renie Atchison, resident supporting the Full Circle development, pointed out that the property had been on the market for eight years with no viable commercial offers. She suggested that this is the very beginning of supplying affordable housing for special needs adult children of Glen Ellyn residents. She talked about turning single family houses within the neighborhoods into full-time supportive housing. She concluded by saying that she is tired of the insinuation that outside organizations are the ones here to supporting something in Glen Ellyn when they don't live here because it is not true.

Clair Hughes, resident and representative of DuPage United, a group of 28 inclusive nonprofit institutions whose members are organized to engage in nonpartizan relationship building with various community groups and public officials. She said that while this is the group's official mission, what they really do is work together on common areas of interest based on core value for human dignity, equality and respect and that members research, listen, develop proposals, and act together to bring about meaningful changes that improve the basic quality of life for people in DuPage County. She continued by saying that their work in Glen Ellyn had just begun and went into some history of that work and said it had been a sometimes-arduous process and also a journey which has made the community better because of the new relationships forged. She concluded by saying that our community is better because we've experienced the power of people working in collaboration and engaging in civil dialogue and that this building of healthy public relationships between residents and our elected officials will enable us to move effectively forward together as one community and other issues in the future.

Trustee Kalinich stated, quote, "I was seated as a Village Trustee in May 2021...

> The Village, with my eager approval, entered into a purchase and sale agreement for the Roosevelt Road property in June 2021, with the goal of upgrading the depressed site for the betterment of the community. This sale was finalized in January 2022. While I was aware that there were community members seeking a location for affordable or attainable housing specifically to provide support for adults with disabilities, I had no knowledge that the Roosevelt property was a site that the community members had identified as a potential location for such a facility.
>
> Throughout the entire examination of options, the use of this property, at no time did I have a predetermined plan or goal as to what the outcome would be for the purchase and development of the. I participated in many of the community

engagement discussions as I was able to do, and at each meeting I wrote down and reviewed the feedback offered.

There is no community member for whom I dismissed their perspective. There have been two critical pieces of information I considered when making decision regarding the future use of this property. One, review of a current housing assessment and related needs and two, review of the actual bids that were submitted for purchase of the property. When the data from the housing assessment was shared, it became overwhelmingly clear that the need for affordable or attainable housing was necessary for our community.

The specific areas of need identified included housing for aging adults who wish to downsize and remain in Glen Ellyn, workforce housing as well as individuals with disabilities. When the bids for the properties were submitted, I was surprised that there were not more bidders with a greater variety of options. My anticipation of options was formed in part by my participation in the summer of 2022 and the charrette process.

Through this activity, there was some great ideas shared, and I found myself anticipating potential uses of the property that I had not previously considered.

I have every confidence that our real estate broker from CBRE aggressively promoted the sale of the Roosevelt Road property and has worked diligently on behalf of the Village. My job as a Trustee is to review the options and provide input on how the options could best meet the community's needs, as well as recoup the financial expenses incurred by the Village.

I recognize that there are passionate and thoughtful opinions and how this property should be developed. I appreciate everyone's commitment to advocate as they believe. There have been some comments related to the potential impact on our schools if housing is built on this property. As a 33-year career educator, I care very much about the impact on our schools.

With this in mind, I have reviewed some of the concerns raised related to an increased burden placed on District 89 schools versus District 41 schools, including cost, space and student performance. To complete this assessment, I reviewed the most recent district report card data that was submitted to the Illinois State Board of Education.

This includes data from the 2022-2023 school year. The highlights I would like to note include the following: There are many similarities such as two elementary districts in Glen Ellyn. Both are representative of striving for excellence in education. District 41 has two schools rated exemplary and three schools rated commendable. District 89 has one school rated exemplary and four schools rated commendable.

This means that based on student test performance, none of the schools have subgroups of students who are underperforming. The exemplary schools are those who are identified as being in the state's top 10% of student performance on the standardized tests. Each district has an exemplary school. Both categories are good and where any community should want their schools to be categorized.

The major difference between these two school districts is in their enrollment numbers. District 89 has 37% less enrollment than District 41. This is true from school to school as well as in the total enrollment. When our Glenbard Township High School District 87 enrollment are considered, Glenbard South has 53% fewer students enrolled than Glenbard West. I know that some community members been concerned about the cost per pupil figure for each of the elementary districts.

> This is a difficult number to use for comparison of districts, as it is a simple calculation of each district's annual expenditures divided by the number of enrolled students. A smaller student enrollment will typically result in a higher per pupil expenditure. However, I do make note that in District 89, the community voted for recent referenda to both operating and capital funds, which has placed additional taxes on the residents who are in the District 89 boundaries. When the potential real estate tax for the Roosevelt Road property is considered in relation to Districts 87 and 89, there will ultimately be an increase to each district from what was previously collected. The last time real estate taxes were collected for this property was for fiscal year 2021, Approximately 75% of the real estate taxes paid from a property are allocated to education.
>
> The specific amounts collected for our schools 2021 were $14,772 for District 89 or less than the calculated per pupil expended of one student at 16,654, and it was 9,117 for District 87, which is less than 50% of the calculated per pupil expenditure of 20,313. With the proposed two developments offered for the Roosevelt Road property and the first Full Circle Community option, we are considering tonight the increase in real estate revenue to each school district as projected to be significantly more than has been historically received.
>
> I will be voting to approve the purchase and sale agreement for the Full Circle Communities development this evening because as a steward of the Village, I believe one, it meets an identified research-based need for this in terms of housing. Two, it allows the Village to recoup taxpayer money spent for the original purpose of the property. And three, it will ultimately provide increased real estate tax revenue for our schools.
>
> I know that my decision will not be embraced by all of the community members I represent. I, too, have not supported some of the decisions made by our Village Board over the years. But I do believe that in most cases the Trustees made the decision that they believed to be correct. If the Full Circle Community's purchase and sale agreement is approved, I appeal to those who are not happy with my vote to continue to be engaged as planning and development processes take place so you can continue to provide input and be knowledgeable of how this development will integrate into our treasured community."

Trustee Christiansen thanked everybody for coming out and that it really does take a village, adding that there had been a lot of misinformation bandied about on social media, so she was glad for those who took the time to come to the meeting in person.

Trustee Christiansen continued, quote, "Over the past couple years, the Board has been accused of having decided this issue from the beginning, and as far as I have seen, and certainly for my own part, nothing could be further from the truth…

> In fact, I was researching this issue as late as 6:30 pm tonight as I really wanted to see what I could find out about Full Circle, about claims that affordable or supportive housing would tank property values, about any impact on local schools, and any effect it might have on crime.
>
> So, here's just a little of what I found. The 1212 Larkin was a recipient of the 2023 Charter Award from the Congress of New Urbanism. That award recognized the

urban design, placement and community building of that development. In 2022, the Illinois Chapter of American Planning Association presented 1212 Larkin with its Best Practice award. These people know what they're doing.

Numerous studies simply do not support the notion that crime goes up and property values go down when affordable housing is developed. I have found studies from 2011 from Cornell, from 2013 from Princeton, from 2015 from Texas A&M and from 2022 from UC Irvine, all of which state that affordable housing does not drag down the quality or value of homes in the area.

Furthermore, administration officials from District 89, whom I spoke to as recently as lunchtime today, have told me directly that the District would expect at most, and I quote, a handful of kiddos across all grades, and that the impact enrollment would be negligible. I also wanted to address claims about crime, so I did a little research. It's not easy to find some data, but I went to the Elgin Police Department website and perused their crime statistics.

I found not a single crime listed so this year in the entire 1200 block of Larkin in the community of Elgin. And this is despite the fact the entire city has just this year alone, more than 10,000 dispatch calls for service, not one of which was 1212 Larkin.

I also wanted to address fears and complaints or concerns about building housing near the gas station and near Firestone, and I admit, this was a tough one for me. So, I spent about an hour on the property on a Saturday afternoon at lunch time, notably one of the busiest times on Roosevelt Road. I heard nothing from Firestone, despite the fact that their parking lot was packed. I heard nothing and smelled nothing from the Shell station, despite the fact that it's one of their busiest times of Saturday.

I also wanted to note several housing and residential areas are near similar properties. The Legacy development on Pennsylvania is across the street from Lord's Auto Works. Single family homes have been there behind an auto body shop on Roosevelt. Single family homes are also adjacent to the Haggerty property and its service bay.

I got a lot of messages from residents indicating a desire for a sit-down restaurant, and I thought that was a great idea. Who wouldn't want to sit at a restaurant overlooking the park. It sounds lovely. That idea was included enough among the five design charrette concepts that were shared with our developers. No one, not a single person, sent in a bid for that concept. We can't force developers to submit proposals of any kind under any circumstances, especially for concepts they don't believe to be economically viable.

Our 2023 housing study indicated a need for attainable housing. President Senak talked a little bit about average median household income. I just want to talk about individual average median income. Here in Glen Ellyn, it's about $54,642. Across all of DuPage County, the average median income is $43,245. For purposes of comparison an 80% average median income in the Village would be about $43,714, which is about what the county averages.

Folks, that's 21 bucks an hour. And if you don't think that people in this town are making 21 bucks an hour or less, you're not talking to the right people. We've heard a lot tonight about there is no guarantee that the Full Circle development will provide no benefits to our residents. This breaks my heart and I have gotten some what I considered to be ugly, hateful messages from people.

> But I believe that welcoming people of socioeconomic status and people who are other-abled is a benefit to our Village and all of our residents.
>
> Finally, I'll just say that there have been strong emotions on various sides of this issue, and it's not a 'us to them' or 'north or south' or whatever. And there's been a lot of presumptions made about what all of us think, because we don't live near development area, we don't care about it. And that is just bunk.
>
> But at any rate, it was important to me that any sale of the property to any developer or developers make financial sense. And from what I've seen today and what we've looked at over the past many long months, what have before us does make financial sense. And I will be supporting this PSA."

Trustee Simon started by saying that she dropped into this process pretty late in the game and was very concerned about it because there was a lot of learning she needed to get under her belt for this.

Trustee Simon continued by saying, she lives on the south side of Roosevelt Road and, quote, "I also technically live in affordable housing. I live in the Raintree. Raintree is composed of houses, townhouses, and condos. The condos where I live actually fall under the minimum for affordable housing in Glen Ellyn…

> We are all that live there, small families, we are senior citizens, we are retired, we are people work in the community. We don't consider ourselves in any way other than residents of Glen Ellyn. We all provide very important roles and responsibilities in this community, and we contribute to this community. And the value of our property is also very important to us.
>
> What I found interesting as I have been listening over the last year and a half to two years, is that there is this sense that there's winners and losers here, that if our side doesn't win, that's a problem. I don't understand that. I was so concerned that we would not be able to find a result that would accommodate everyone in this community, and yet we were.
>
> We were able to find someone who wanted to commercially develop one side of this property. And we found Full Circle who was willing to develop affordable housing -- sustainable housing, housing for disabled vets, housing for people who needed residence in this community that is not being currently solved or served. And I thought, oh my, that was like an act of God that blessed this community, that we would be able to accommodate everybody that we didn't to pick or choose, that all we needed to do was provide something for everyone.
>
> And listen, we've been accused that we're not listening, but we've been listening. People wanted commercial. We provide that. We have a letter of intent for commercial property, and that is coming along. It took us a long time to get here because of the economic situation and because the developers previously that were interested in commercial dropped out. And so, it took us a long time to get those commercial properties online, and yet we were able to accomplish that.
>
> And Full Circle, thank goodness, has stayed with us the course. They put forward a proposal early in this process and have continued to work with the Village so that we didn't lose them while we tried to get this 'everybody wins' solution. And yet, and I want to give kudos to President Senak for putting together what I thought was a wonderful, comprehensive, brief about where we are in all of our decisions.

> And yet we have people who are complaining, people who are saying, 'you're not listening to us.' I don't know how much more we can listen. Everybody won. You wanted commercial property. You are getting it. You wanted affordable housing. You are getting it. What more can we do as a Board? We are accommodating everyone. And so therefore, I vote for this proposal from Full Circle as well, because I know that next, we're going to be voting on commercial property as well."

Trustee Fasules said that this process was outlined as starting in 2022 but for two members of the Board, it started in 2019.

Trustee Fasules continued, quote, "We were faced with two issues. One, increased crime in a blighted property and nothing that the property owner was doing to resolve that. This crime was starting to go into the neighborhood, and we decided that maybe we should take some action on that…

> The second one was that even though we have a robust economic development process, that in this case, this property had been on the market for eight years or so. It wasn't working. And for us to get something going, we had to jumpstart. And the only way for us to jumpstart some economic development in this area was to get involved now.
>
> We had a lot of people tell us, don't do it, don't do it. It's not our role to be involved in the private sector. We decided, it wasn't necessarily this Board, that we should start this process. The process of negotiating with the owner was very difficult. He wasn't necessarily rational at all times. We had all difference of opinion on values.
>
> It was a mess. However, we did purchase it. And when we purchased it, I resolved one of my biggest things as a Trustee… one my biggest goal of a Trustee is public safety. I want to make sure we have the safest and best public safety in the country. And part of that is to try to eliminate crime.
>
> And once we did that, once we bought it, we boarded it up. Crime in this area went down. If you knew the percentage, the calls that the police were doing on this, you'd be shocked. But we did that. So, part of that came through. What was going to happen? I don't know because it depends on who was going to bid.
>
> I would love to have said we got someone who is going to put in a great Apple store. Not going to happen. Love to say that we're going to get a Capital Grille on the site. Not going to happen. And as Trustee Simon said, people have to come and want to buy it.
>
> I then part of my process of getting here was to look at and review the charrette tape and unfortunately, I was surprised to find out that when Nick Nelson came up and talked, he had one where it was commercial on the east, it was selling part of it to the vet and then he had commercial and office building right where Full Circle is.
>
> We've done two of those three things. We've got a commercial deal on the east side. Full Circle is going to get work with the vet to give them parking on their so the vet wins. So, we've got two thirds. The only thing that's different in that is we're putting in affordable housing. Now, a lot has been said -- it's this group… that group.
>
> I've got 600 south side residents that they say they're on a Facebook page against this. I have 400 residents who are saying we're residents of Glen Ellyn -- we need housing.

> What we don't know is what the quiet majority wants. I have 29,000 residents who I don't know how they feel. And unfortunately, I've got to figure out what is the best for the community.
>
> And because of that, I have to sit back and say, what is this? I now have a solution that will go through a process that gives both sides what they want. However, it's a compromise and the problem with a compromise, everyone loses. So, instead of turning around and thinking I lost, think of that as I won.
>
> And not only did we come out and get the highest return for what we invested, because I never thought we were going to be able to do that in a million years -- that happened. And because of that, I compromise now with the quiet majority, I give those funds that the Village used to buy this to stimulate growth.
>
> I give it back to them to do projects that may benefit again, the whole community. So, it is win-win. It's a compromise where both sides win. Now, people say, 'Gary, you still haven't heard us, the 600. We have some concerns.' I do believe you do have some concerns with the students. If you get into a philosophical debate on TIF districts, you know, some people say TIF districts work, some people say TIF districts don't work. In this case, I'm a firm believer that any TIF district in our community, when we do it, the people who lose are the school districts.
>
> So, because of that, I am instructing, I'm asking staff, to report back to this Board in 30 days if we can give the school districts their full share of the TIF when we develop this, not put the portion that gets frozen into our TIF district but give it to the school districts. And from what I heard, that's going to be an extra 40, maybe $50,000 a year. I don't know if that's legal, so that's why I'm asking that.
>
> So, I'm asking them to present it to the Board. So, as we develop this and go forward with that, that we have that discussion as a Board, if do that to make this so it might be more palatable to that 600 who think that if they get all commercial that that's going to reduce their property taxes.
>
> Unfortunately, we'll get a lot of sales tax, but that wouldn't necessarily reduce the property tax that would happen. So that's what I I'm going to vote for it. I think Mark did an eloquent job of stating the facts. I don't think we can improve on that.
>
> So, Mark, I thank you for that. And I'm going to vote for it knowing that we've got a long way to go in this process.
>
> For some of us already, it's been four years. For others it's been two and a half. We've got a long way to go before we see something happen. Stay involved. We can only get better and we'll get something that this community is proud of. And it'll be part of our community and be part of our fabric of who we are for years to come."

Trustee Gould spoke next, saying that she approached this from a high level, basically asking, what problem was trying to be solved. She added that everyone knows the hotels were blighted so the Village jumped in bought the parcels with a lot of negotiating with staff and the broker to get to this point. She said there was a lot of improvement right away.

Trustee Gould continued, stating, quote, "I also had visions of a sit-down restaurant with rooftop dining or a window by the sidewalk...

It was great. I was already reserving my table. And so, I share a lot of your ideas. And also want to flip back to say that although I did not attend every one of the listening sessions or the open house, however I either attended or watched the videos, and oftentimes more than once. So just to make sure that I heard everything that was being spoken and heard the concerns and the ideas.

So, we got we got nine offers from seven developers. No sit-down restaurant at this point. So, we have to move forward. We look at these offers and I just echo other sentiments here. I think it was really the best the best two options for our community overall.

It was a compromise. It addressed the demonstrated need. There's clearly some property tax revenue that's being generated. We recouped, or close to recouped, our purchase costs. It fits with the Comp Plan and is supported by the housing study. I don't really know what else we could do. We didn't go with 100% housing, which was an offer.

And so, then everybody, you know, one whole half would be upset. We didn't go with 100% commercial. We did go with the 60% the lot that was 60% of the overall size that was dedicated to commercial and the smaller portion without the Roosevelt Road on the Taft side, was selected for the housing. So, again, we are listening.

We didn't go 100% this way or 100% that way. We use the smaller parcel without the frontage for housing. Again, I feel like we did the best and it was a compromise. And so, again, no one's happy. I don't know what else makes the most sense. What else could we do from a logical perspective, and that's why I support both of the directions on these parcels.

And again, we're pointing the ship out of those nine offers, we're pointing the ship to say we think these two things should be pursued. We're going to send them through the system where people will look at, again, the facades, the traffic and everything that the Plan Commission does and everything that the Architectural Appearance Commission does. And we'll see what comes out of that.

It is clearly just the concept now that we're supporting based on all of our research. And we'll see more detailed plans go forward and continued to be shaped by feedback, by commissioners, by members of the AAC. So, thank you for coming. I support this PSA tonight and I appreciate, again, all your feedback through the many meetings."

Trustee Thompson was the last Trustee to address the meeting. He thanked President Senak on his brief, saying he thought it was excellent, absolutely brilliant, and encapsulated about every point that could be made in a completely logical sense.

Trustee Thompson then said there was another Trustee that was involved in this process, Bill Payne, who spent a lot of time in the work group. Trustee Thompson thanked him for his valuable insight at the earlier stages of this process.

Trustee Thompson then wanted to make a few points, quote, "Our goal here was to point the ship, right? Our goal was to point the ship. We needed to make something happen at this site. This site has been a blight on Roosevelt for Glen Ellyn for years...

Previous boards had tried to make something happen but were hampered by various roadblocks. It was not contributing to economic health of Glen Ellyn.

It was clearly not paying its fair share of taxes to the community, and it was a burden to our police and public safety of Glen Ellyn. So, the Board decided to buy it. This property was on and off the market for over a decade.

Sometimes it was for sale, sometimes it wasn't. Sometimes he was interested in offer, sometimes he wasn't. So, the seller was not willing to subdivide the property. If he was going to sell it, he was going to sell all of it. So that's why a lot of the commercial developers didn't want to get into it, because it was it was really just too much.

So, when this Board decided to act and act fast, we would buy the whole property for his asking price. And I think that was negotiated a little bit because there was kind of a give and take there, the $2.85 million. So, we decided to buy it, we may have had to hold it. We may have had to hold it. It was risky to buy this distressed property and we weren't really sure we were going to get any offers.

So as a Board, we decided that all the options were on the table as far as ideas for the site, nothing was off the table. So commercial, residential, mixed use, affordable housing, supportive housing, park land. Again, all options were on the table. So, as has been said, we engage the commercial real estate broker to market the property as being in the TIF district would help, but it's no guarantee that it would sell quickly.

We were open to the idea of affordable or supportive housing. It was just something that was an idea and all options were on the table. So, it's been stated that we wanted to maintain some of the commercial footprint on Roosevelt Road which we are going accomplish here. That's very important.

But it's really a big challenge to find the right commercial developer. Retail restaurant ideas will take a lot of work at this location and we will wait to see what the developer does. We don't know what he's going to propose here. A lot of us would like to see the Starbucks move, but there are a lot of people that would have to go through as far as corporate at Starbucks to make that possibly happen.

But who knows? They may not want to move and we certainly can't force them. Obviously, housing was of interest here. And we had an offer to buy the whole thing and put micro units at this site. But we heard the residents say we don't want it to be all residential. Right? We want it to be commercial and residential.

So, I think we've answered that question. The pros are it’s close to Panfish Park. It's close to the grocery stores, buses, retail, transportation, the fire department and medical services. And the cons were talked about… the relation to the traffic, the gas station and the tire center. I too, also spent a Saturday afternoon standing near the Firestone property and I heard that (zoom SFX) sound and it isn't really appealing to me.

But for some people maybe that isn't going to bother them being near there. I'm sure you can hear that quite far from that area. So, in conclusion, I just wanted to state for the record that I am a proud D89 taxpayer, just like Trustee Simon is. We are the two the D89 taxpayers on the board. If that matters, does that really?

We pay a pretty good price for the schools in this area and we've got great schools in D89. Yeah, I suspect that will make my house, my townhouse at Baker Hill even more valuable in the years to come, because we have those great schools. But I don't just represent the D89 taxpayers. I represent all of Glen Ellyn.

> And I want you to know I've read every public comment via social pinpoint. I participated with residents at the design charrette. I was at the table with Nic Nelson, and I was at the table with you too, Norris, and we came up with some great ideas. I have read every email sent to the Village Board. I have listened to your comments during our public meetings for and against this project. But please don't confuse not being heard with not getting your way. You have been heard. Yes, the process has worked. The process has worked.
>
> So, the only other thing I'd like to add, I would like to see the same kind of investment in Roosevelt Road that is occurred in our downtown. I want the same kind of intense investment in our sidewalks, parking, trees, and roadway. And this will be the focus of the remainder of my time in office here in Glen Ellyn. Thank you."

With all comments from the Trustees finished, President Senak wanted to take a moment to address those people who oppose affordable housing at this site, saying to them, quote, "I can only ask you not to rush to judgment. I can only ask you to open your hearts, open your minds and open your community to people who want to have what you have. That is to live in a safe community with good schools, good jobs and good people…

> Give them a chance to enjoy what you have. If you look hard enough, you will see that somewhere along the line someone did the same thing for you. They helped you. Maybe you deserved it. Maybe you didn't. But I can tell you few can sit here and say that without the help of someone else, they would have gotten here.
>
> I can say I was benefited by any number of people who helped me along the way. And I think if you ask yourself of the people helped you, what did they want in return? They would give you a simple answer: Do for someone else what they did for you. So please understand we cannot this without you. No single part of this community can accomplish something if the whole community is not for it.
>
> As Lincoln famously said, a house divided cannot stand. You have the power to make the people who live in this development feel welcome in our community. Or you can them isolate them and make them feel like they're inferior. You can either perpetuate the stereotype or you can break the cycle of poverty and the despair comes with it. Some of you have heard me recently say that it's not a zero-sum game.
>
> It's not just the cliche for me. I really believe that we can do this without creating any disadvantage to anyone, but it is important to understand the significance of what we are doing this evening. What we are contemplating is not only transformational, it's generational. Families will now have a chance to stay close to each other. Young adults who would have been forced to move miles away to find a place to live will now have a chance to stay in the community where their family and friends live, where they grew up, where they go to school, and where they many of them work.
>
> Kids who would have never had the opportunity to live in a safe community, to go to the kinds of the schools that we have will now have the opportunity to do so. They will live better lives because of the decisions that we make here this evening. They will be more productive citizens. So will their children and their children's children.
>
> That is what government is supposed to do. More importantly, that's what we're supposed to do as people: to lift others up, not push them down… to open our arms, not clench our fists. Is there some risk with this? Absolutely. I cannot sit here and tell you that there will be no crime, there will be no pedestrian accidents, or that somebody's property value might go down. There likely will be.

But what I can tell you is if we come together as a we can overcome those challenges. And I can personally pledge to you tonight that as long as I remain in this chair, I will do everything I can to make this development a success and to ensure that it does not disrupt the quality of life that we have come to enjoy in the Village. Thank you."

G. Other Business

Trustee Thompson was very pleased with the letters that President Stanek wrote regarding the migrant bus situation. He thought that they represent the sentiment and feelings of the majority of the Board. He asked for support those letters as the Board that they should be adopted as the policy of the Village Board.

President Senak suggested that Trustee Thompson talk to the Village Manager and make that request to make it an agenda item on an upcoming meeting.

H. Reminders

1) Village Board Special Workshop Monday, March 4, 2024 at 7 pm
2) Village Board Meeting Monday, March 11, 2024 at 7 pm

I. Adjourn – 11:24 P.M.

Mover: Trustee Fasules; Second: Trustee Gould. Unanimous vote to adjourn.