

Minutes

Village of Glen Ellyn Board of Trustees

Workshop Meeting

January 20, 2014

Call to Order

President Demos called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

Roll Call

Upon Roll Call by Clerk Galvin, Trustees Burket, Clark, Ladesic, McGinley and O'Shea answered "Present". Trustee Elliott arrived at 7:07 p.m.

Staff present: Village Manager Franz, Assistant Village Manager Stonitsch, Police Chief Norton, Finance Director Wachtel, Public Works Director Hansen, Director of Planning and Development Director Hulseberg, Deputy Police Chief Action, Deputy Police Chief Holmer, Utility Superintendent Bob Greenberg and Village Attorney Mathews.

Agenda Item 4 A. – Cross Connection Control Ordinance

Public Works Director Julius Hansen and Utilities Superintendent Bob Greenberg presented information regarding a Cross Connection Control Ordinance.

The purpose of adopting a Cross Connection Control Ordinance is to establish the authority necessary to enforce the regulations and codes of the Illinois Plumbing Code and the Illinois Pollution Control Board. Establishing a viable cross connection control program for all public water supply systems with the appropriate ordinance language to enforce and direct the program is an Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA) required mandate.

By definition, a cross connection is a physical connection between two otherwise separate piping systems one of which contains potable water and the other a substance of unknown or questionable safety whereby there may be a flow from one system into the other system. Under normal working conditions the pressure exerted by the water in a public potable water system will keep these unknown or questionable water sources from back flowing into the public potable water system. A potential health hazard exists when the pressure on the public potable water system drops below the pressure of a private water system that is not protected with a backflow prevention device, causing the water from the private system to backflow or back siphon into the public water supply system.

These potentially health-threatening back flows can be prevented by installing backflow prevention devices. While the fixed proper air gap does a wonderful job of protecting our potable water system from simple backflow problems, it cannot protect our potable water system from the more complex commercial, industrial and residential processes that traditionally require check-valve systems. It is these complex check-valve systems that require inspection and regulation.

Over the past ten years, Public Works has identified over 1,552 locations where backflow prevention devices are required. We have confirmed the pressure of backflow prevention devices in approximately 770 locations. Examples of water supplies that would require Cross Connection Control devices are doctors, dentists, mortuaries, manufacturing, restaurants, fire sprinkler systems and irrigation systems. Therefore, there may be at least 780 locations where backflow prevention devices are needed, but are not currently installed.

Glen Ellyn, as the owner of a community potable water system and the local governing authority, is required to ensure backflow prevention devices are installed where necessary, inventory backflow prevention devices, perform periodic inspections and surveys of potential cross connection locations and create a program to monitor the proper installation and maintenance of these devices. This is rationale for developing a Cross Connection Control Ordinance. Additionally, it should be noted that the IEPA has conducted inspections of the Village's water systems previously and strictly noted the need for a cross connection control ordinance and management program.

Most communities that utilize third party management have the homeowner select and pay a plumber to perform the cross connection inspection. The plumber files the inspection report with the third party program manager and pays the filing fee directly to the third party manager. This program is quite popular among communities and does not cost the community anything to facilitate. These companies also manage the survey process and handle any reports required for the IEPA.

A smaller percentage of communities pay the fee directly out of their water fund. The down side of a plan like this is that it is subsidized by everyone even if their home does not require a backflow preventer. With the current survey information indicating that approximately 1552 locations requires backflow prevention devices; this would cost the water fund approximately \$30,000 on an annual basis.

Superintendent Greenberg stated that the Ordinance is not in place, it is required by the State of Illinois in Title 14. The plumbers who do this are required to have a Cross Control License.

The Village Board is requested to review and consider how the Village should fund the program and inspections required through the cross connection ordinance. Should the Board wish to work through a third party company, Management will issue an RFP in mid to late February to appropriate vendors to begin the process of finding a company to manage the program.

Trustee O'Shea asked about the approximately 800 locations where backflow prevention devices are needed, but are not currently installed and if the fee can be added to the water bill. Director Hansen responded that these can be identified and the Finance Department would be involved.

Trustee Clark asked if the approximately 1,600 locations are accurate; Director Hansen responded that the number of locations is very accurate.

Trustee O'Shea commented that he has a backflow prevention device and is contacted by vendors. He stated that the correspondence needs to be legal, and not appear as an advertisement as much of the correspondence he received appears.

Superintendent Greenberg stated that the biggest threat with the backflow prevention devices is with regards to commercial properties.

President Demos commented that the homeowner needs to hire the plumber. Superintendent Greenberg responded that the plumber should send the certificate to the Village; they should not rely on the homeowner to forward to the proper authority. The plumber is certified, this is part of their training and their test.

Trustee McGinley inquired about other options such as adding this fee to the annual vehicle sticker. Director Hansen responded that managing and administering the program in house would require a full time employee to do so. Due to the nature and scope of this program, they are not confident handling this program and believe that a

third party would be preferable, at least until the program gets off the ground. Furthermore, other options would involve other departments. The focus of this program is to protect water quality.

Trustee Elliott stated that out of the approximately 1,600 locations identified; one half are doing something and one half are not. We need the ability to confirm the most cost effective way to get this done. The half that are not in compliance are a priority. After that is addressed then we can focus on a cost effective annual program. However, we need to pass the Ordinance to have the legal authority to comply.

Trustee O'Shea stated to get the letters out; and to get into compliance.

Trustee Elliott stated that the Board needs to approve the Ordinance to give the Village the legal authority to comply.

Director Hansen suggested getting a Request for Proposal for third party vendors just to make sure that all bases are covered.

President Demos requested that the RFP define who owns the data; the vendor or the Village.

Trustee Ladesic commented that the letters need to be sent and the proposed Ordinance needs to address disconnections. Utilizing the GIS was suggested. Manager Franz responded that the GIS is still being developed.

Trustee Elliott asked what the IEPA needs. Superintendent Greenberg responded that the IEPA needs to know that this is being done annually, and that the Village is keeping records.

Trustee O'Shea commented that he does not see the value of a third party. Trustee McGinley commented that there is an entire Administrative Department to handle this. Manager Franz responded that since the Village is playing catch-up, he recommended getting an RFP to ensure this is done quickly and to get up to speed. This is an administrative task that can be done after the first year.

Trustee Elliott commented that the letter cannot be sent out without the Ordinance.

Mr. Tom Staroske, Aqua Backflow, Inc., 977 Elizabeth Street, Elgin, Illinois approached the Board to summarize the services his company provides. They send out the letters, provide a list of certified plumbers and provide public education. Mr. Staroske further stated that the Village does not have tracking software. They follow-up with failed backflow preventers and everything is documented and sent to the IEPA annually. Village letterhead is used for the first two years. Some of the Municipalities currently served by Aqua Backflows, Inc. include Lombard, Geneva, St. Charles Park Ridge and Batavia.

President Demos requested that Staff draft two different Ordinances. Superintendent Greenberg confirmed that the IEPA mandates that there be an Ordinance.

Superintendent Greenberg stressed the importance of this Ordinance. Manager Franz also stressed that this is an unfunded mandate that needs to be addressed.

Superintendent Greenberg stated that in 2008 when first discussed with the Board, this was not accepted by the Board. By 2011 the IEPA has been aware that the Village does have an Ordinance. Trustee McGinley asked: what is the rush.

Trustee Elliott stated the Board first needs to address the Ordinance; second, **send** an effective letter to the residents. An RFP is needed to determine if it is more cost effective to handle this in house or out of house. An RFP is needed to determine the cost.

Agenda Item 4 B. – Updated Facility Needs Analysis for the Police Department and Civic Center

Village Manager Mark Franz and Dewberry Senior Associate Design Director Brian Meade presented an updated Facility Needs Analysis for the Police Department and Civic Center.

Beginning in 2008, the Police Department has led an effort to improve upon the deficiencies in the current Police facility. Noting that the Civic Center, built in 1929 to serve as a school building, held structural elements that limited the operations of Village staff as well as the Police Department, funding was approved to complete a space needs assessment. This analysis is best defined as a systematic study of a building and its occupants to determine if the existing design and size of the structure meet the needs of the occupants. Outside factors delayed the study until 2011.

In 2011, the Village contracted with the architectural firm Dewberry, Inc. to complete the facility assessment. The final Facility Needs and Assessment Study was presented to the Village Board on July 23, 2012. See the Village's website for a copy of the study that details some of the deficiencies of the building and alternative ways to meet these critical needs. The study produced four schemes, or conceptual designs, that offered potential solutions to the deficiencies identified through the analysis.

The original schemes are summarized below:

Scheme 1 included minimal changes within the existing building footprint. This scheme demonstrated a "limited, low cost" approach. At the time, this scheme received little support, as it offered only temporary relief to a small percentage of the identified needs.

Scheme 2 proposed a 10,500 sq. ft., one-story addition on the south side of the Civic Center for police use. This plan introduced heavy reconstruction of the gymnasium, built as an addition to the original structure in 1940. Scheme 2 showed the relocation of Planning and Development to the first floor, where they would occupy a portion of the Police Department space. Lastly, this scheme included the consolidation of the Finance Department into one location on the first floor.

Schemes 3A and 3B feature the construction of a layered, structured parking facility to replace the existing parking lot. Scheme 3B offers the greatest increase in parking at the Civic Center, with 108 total spaces, 30 spaces over the current parking lot. Schemes 3A and 3B include a three level addition for police, large enough to accommodate the programming, while further freeing up enough space within the Civic Center to address the needs of the other Village departments. Schemes 3A and 3B included significant design challenges, such as providing for recommended security setbacks and number of access points for police vehicles.

Schemes 4A and 4B both center on a plan to move the Police Department into a newly constructed off-site facility. This option offers the greatest increase in space improvements and uses of a police facility, efficiently meeting the needs as determined through the Space Needs Study. Simply stated, a new building provides the greatest opportunity to design the necessary safety and security into the Police Department, while providing optimum efficiencies for workflow, long-term storage and training.

Scheme 4, or any “green-field” construction site, creates opportunities to phase in renovations to the Civic Center. In addition, the relocation of the Police Department away from the Civic Center is equivalent to an immediate 40% increase in parking for Village employees and other central business district users. It is also important to understand that construction away from the Civic Center eliminates any potential impact to the routine delivery of municipal services. In contrast, construction at the Civic Center would likely bring about the relocation of Police and some Village operations during construction.

In April 2013, the Department learned the Park District might vacate the Spring Avenue Recreation Center. The Village contracted with Dewberry for developing an additional scheme using the Park District property at 185 Spring Avenue. Scheme 4C is summarized below:

Scheme 4C assumes a demolition of the current structure, originally constructed as a grammar school. Scheme 4C offers all of the programming needs accomplished through Schemes 4A and 4B. While a significant portion of this site is contained within the flood plain, Scheme 4C contained a 40,000 sq. ft. facility, with adequate parking and two access points built on a smaller footprint the current structure. This site would allow for future expansion, if necessary. The cost estimates included in Scheme 4C did not include site acquisition costs.

Staff has met several times with Dewberry in order to complete the options as requested. Four new schemes resulted, all that include input and direction from the Village Administration and Police Department. These four new/modified schemes bring the total to eight (8) conceptual plans that have been developed to address facility needs. A brief summary of these new plans are as follows:

Scheme 2A revisits the original Scheme 2. The intent of this scheme was to repurpose the Civic Center with minimal expansion beyond the original building footprint. A concerted attempt focused on improving public access to the police department, internal adjacencies, and wayfinding through the new police space. The final draft continues to fall short in all three of these areas, hampered in part by the grade variations throughout the Civic Center property. Furthermore, this scheme lacks a firing range, reduces Civic Center parking and fails to address essential access and security elements.

Scheme 2B was a new approach to repurposing the Civic Center property. This plan removes the 1940’s gymnasium and the 1970’s addition, returning the Civic Center to the original shallow, linear school building. A new 37,000 sq. ft. addition is shown on the south side of the building, designed specifically for police use. This plan meets many of the programming needs but also falls short in addressing security setbacks, access elements, and further reduces an already lacking parking supply.

Scheme 4B shows a new 37,000 sq. ft. police facility at Panfish Park. The building and required parking are positioned on property owned by the Village. While the scope of services did not include internal programming and configuration, the original Scheme 4 design aptly demonstrates the desired programming is achievable. Security setbacks and multiple access points to the facility are present in this scheme.

Scheme 4C shows a new 37,000 sq. ft. police facility at the Spring Avenue Recreation Center location. The modification to the original Scheme 4C reduces the original building size to meet Schemes 2B and 4B.

Trustee Ladesic stated that he is beyond anymore remodeling plans for the Civic Center, the police department is growing.

The Panfish Park pros for the police department include two entrances with a Wilson Avenue entry that can connect to Taft. It is closest to Roosevelt Road where the majority of calls are.

Trustee Ladesic asked where is the option of acquiring the Church of God property on South Park Boulevard. Manager Franz responded that the Board did not direct staff to include the Church of God property in their study. Trustee O'Shea responded that he is in favor of Panfish Park since the Village already owns it.

Manager Franz stated the Glen Ellyn Park District has not responded yet to their space needs analysis to determine if they can vacate the Spring Avenue Recreation Center (SARC).

Trustee Ladesic stated that the Village's largest planning district is south of Roosevelt Road. He does not want to see the Church of God property out of the equation. Trustee O'Shea responded that the Village owns Panfish Park. We need to make a decision and move on.

Trustee Elliott stated that staff needs direction from the Board and a funding plan needs to be determined to move the Police Department from the Civic Center. Trustee Elliott is looking at Panfish Park as the place to go. We need to review wants vs. needs. However, a decision needs to be made first.

Trustee O'Shea inquired about moving the Civic Center and the Police Department to Panfish Park and selling the Civic Center.

Manager Franz stated that they need to drill down on additional uses of the Civic Center once the Police Department vacates the property.

President Demos asked if they should even be spending the money. Manager Franz responded that the Capital Improvements Commission identified \$10 million in the next 10 years in projects that can be deferred. Furthermore, this proposed property is within a TIF District.

Trustee Ladesic asked if Homeland Security has grants available for a new police department. Chief Norton responded that Deputy Chief Action is researching available grants. Chief Norton also stated that the range could be used as a potential funding source for classes.

President Demos commented that a referendum is not a palatable option. Panfish Park is a favorable option. The Church of God property is too far south, plus the cost of land acquisition. President Demos polled the Board for a consensus on Panfish Park: all Board members were in favor of the Panfish Park option.

President Demos also asked for all proposals to include a good, better, best option with regards to features, benefits, and costs.

Trustee McGinley asked about looking into moving the Civic Center along with the Police Department. She stated that the Civic Center could be a prime area for development.

President Demos asked for an ad hoc committee to deal with this project. The members include: Manager Franz, Assistant Manager Stonitsch, Chief Norton, and Trustees Clark and O'Shea.

Adjournment

At 9:26 p.m. Trustee McGinley moved and Trustee Clark seconded the motion to adjourn to Executive Session for the purpose of setting the price for sale or lease of property and adjourning thereafter without returning to open session.

Upon roll call, Trustees Burket, Clark, Elliott, Ladesic, McGinley and O'Shea voted "Aye." Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Galvin,
Village Clerk