

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEETING
MONDAY, JUNE 25, 2018 – 6:30 P.M.
MUNICIPAL SERVICES TRAINING ROOM
MINUTES

I. ROLL CALL/CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Raymond Buschmann called the meeting to order at 6:30 P.M. Aldermen Melanie Rummel and Michelle Moreno were in attendance.

Staff in attendance included Michael Thomas, Director of Public Works; Bob Ells, Superintendent of Engineering; Robert Kiely, City Manager; Chuck Myers, Superintendent of Parks & Forestry; Mike Strong, Assistant to the City Manager and Jim Lockfeer, Management Analyst.

Also in attendance was Carlo Cavallaro, ComEd External Affairs Manager; Paul Hamann, Resident of 511 Beverly Place; Tristian Sosa, Resident of 599 Beverly Place and Jay Pridmore, Resident of 609 Beverly Place.

II. APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 11, 2018 PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Alderman Rummel moved to approve the April 11, 2018 Public Works Committee meeting minutes. Alderman Moreno seconded the motion. Chairman Buschmann abstained from the vote due to him not yet being a part of the Public Works Committee on April 11, 2018. The motion carried.

Chairman Buschmann explained that he found the minutes very detailed. He explained that these minutes are more detailed compared to City Council meeting minutes. He inquired if the level of detail was a desired attribute or if the minutes should be outlined in a more summary fashion. Chairman Buschmann asked Jim Lockfeer, Public Works Management Analyst and Public Works Committee minute taker, about his preference on the level of detail of the minutes. Jim Lockfeer explained that he does not have a preference as to how detailed he records the meeting minutes. He explained that when he was hired for the Management Analyst position the previous Management Analyst explained that there was a staff and Committee preference for detailed minutes. Chairman Buschmann explained that the detail of the minutes did help him in preparing for tonight's meeting. He explained that at this point, the Public Works Committee will continue to request that the minutes remain detailed.

III. COM-ED UPDATE REGARDING CUSTOMER-OWNED FACILITIES – MIKE STRONG

Assistant to the City Manager Mike Strong explained that the information presented to the Committee tonight is for informational purposes only. He explained that the last time the Committee reviewed the topic was at the February 21, 2018 Public Works Committee meeting. He explained that at the February meeting, ComEd representatives in attendance explained their process in reviewing the customer-owned facilities challenge. He explained that ComEd informed the Committee at this meeting that their review is going to take time to collect all the data that is necessary to develop proposals. He explained that since that February meeting ComEd has had a change in leadership. He explained that ComEd Representative Carlo Cavallaro is in attendance tonight to provide the Committee further insight to the process ComEd is currently

undertaking, as well as the proposed options they are reviewing to help address the issue.

Assistant to the City Manager Mike Strong reviewed the issue. He explained that through the typical development process a developer will pay ComEd to install the necessary electric infrastructure to support the properties within a development. The ComEd standard for owning and maintaining infrastructure is for infrastructure within 150 feet of a property. He explained that on some occasions some subdivisions were not built within the ComEd standard. He explained that if a property lot is located outside the 150 foot ComEd standard additional utility poles are needed in order to supply electricity to that property. These additional utility poles and lines are classified as customer owned facilities and these facilities are the responsibility of the customer to maintain. He explained that this scenario is much more common in rural agricultural areas, however, customer owned facilities do appear in some residential areas. He explained that in the Beverly area the distribution lines were located on the east side of the tracks. Additional utility poles needed to be installed in order to bring electricity from the main distribution line to some of the lots in the subdivision. This has affected approximately 35 properties in the area. He explained that some of the properties in the Beverly area have moved forward in moving the infrastructure underground, however, the vast majority of the properties are being supported through a shared high voltage overhead service line. He explained that in March of 2017, a resident in the area lost power during a storm. A tree branch had fell and hit the line. The resident contacted ComEd and ComEd determined that the infrastructure that had been damaged was privately owned. The onus of making the repair to the line fell onto the property owner. ComEd's maintenance responsibility is from the distribution line to the first utility pole located within their 150 foot standard. Unfortunately, in this case the tree branch fell further down the line and beyond that first utility pole.

Chairman Buschmann inquired about the distance between the main distribution lines to the homeowner's property. Assistant to the City Manager Mike Strong explained that it depends on the property, however, generally speaking for this Beverly area it is between 300 to 450 feet.

Assistant to the City Manager Mike Strong explained that there was intent to subdivide the Beverly lots and have right-of-way along the Western Avenue train tracks that could have potentially supported additional ComEd infrastructure. He explained that the area never subdivided and the right-of-way was vacated to the property owner lots. He explained that ComEd staff and representatives have come out to the Beverly neighborhood to meet with the residents affected by this issue. He explained that it is not easy for a resident to have maintenance responsibilities on high voltage lines. It is very difficult to find a high voltage electrician who is willing to work on these lines. After meeting with the Beverly residents, ComEd began to have internal conversations about how to handle this issue. He explained that through this process, the Beverly neighbors and the City were successful in having ComEd address the issue. He explained that the issue made its way to the President of ComEd who then directed ComEd staff to create an internal subcommittee to further examine the issue territory wide. This subcommittee was tasked with developing proposals to help create solutions to this issue. For the past several months this subcommittee has been collecting

data territory wide on the number of occurrences where power was lost in a residential setting due to an issue with customer owned facilities. ComEd provided this process update with the Public Works Committee at the February meeting and at the request of the Committee, ComEd agreed to come back to the Committee during the summer to report on some of their findings and on some of the proposals that they are developing.

Alderman Rummel explained that in March, 2017 some of the residents in the Beverly neighborhood affected by this issue were without power for up to three days. She explained that another challenge these affected residents face is working with their neighbor when an issue arises with their shared privately owned line. She explained that there was no notice on any of the property documents that would have alerted the potential buyer to ownership of customer owned facilities.

Chairman Buschmann inquired if the reason behind the extended period of time an affected resident's power was out was due to their responsibility to work with a high voltage contractor. Alderman Rummel explained that it is due to that reason. Chairman Buschmann inquired if ComEd could be hired by an affected customer to fix a private line. Assistant to the City Manager Mike Strong explained that ComEd does not currently offer this as a service. He explained that the reason why it is very hard for residents to have a contractor work on their private line is because damage to all lines, both private and public, tends to occur during storms and high winds. A majority of the certified high voltage independent contractors are utilized by ComEd for their own storm restoration response. The independent contractors are not available for private residential services until they complete their ComEd related work.

Alderman Rummel explained that she was aware Paul Hamann, Resident of 511 Beverly Place, filed a court case in federal district court in an attempt to have ComEd take responsibility of the private infrastructure. She explained that it was her understanding that the court dismissed the case.

ComEd External Affairs Manager, Carlo Cavallaro, explained that the ComEd storm response process involves identifying the main distribution lines that impact the most people. ComEd's highest priority is to restore power to distribution lines that affect the most people impacted by an outage. He explained that as these high priority issues are resolved ComEd can then designate crews to respond to issues that are only affecting one or two customers. He explained this exacerbates the residential issue for homeowners who own private infrastructure. Like any customer in the ComEd territory, ComEd has to first respond to the major outage issues before moving on to the issues where only one property is affected. That process takes time and when the issue of privately owned infrastructure arises it adds additional time. He explained the issue is further compounded because 90% to 95% of the certified high voltage electricians are responding to ComEd storm restoration efforts. He explained that ComEd has been working on reviewing this issue for several months after being directed by leadership to explore potential options in addressing the issue.

He explained that ComEd is regulated by the Illinois Commerce Commission (ICC) and any proposal ComEd recommends would need to be approved by the ICC. He explained that ComEd is also developing more interim solutions that may not require ICC approval. He explained that there are thousands of ComEd customers who own private infrastructure much like the Lake Forest Beverly residents. ComEd has been working to identify these properties in their billing system so that the properties are properly identified and are shown to have customer owned facilities. He explained that this will help ComEd on the front end when a customer calls in to report an outage. ComEd will be able to signal to the customer that the outage may have occurred on their private infrastructure and that an independent contractor may have to work on their line to resolve the issue. Identifying this on the front end would potentially allow the customer an opportunity to begin working with a private contractor much sooner than under the current process. He explained that ComEd has also field visited several hundred areas where private infrastructure exists. There has been mixed feedback to the extent a property owner is aware of their private ownership and maintenance responsibilities. Some property owners are fully aware of their customer owned facilities and some property owners had no idea at all. These findings further supported ComEd leadership in researching and developing potential plans to help resolve the issue. One plan that ComEd intends to move forward with is a notification process. After the private infrastructure is documented within the ComEd billing system, notice to these customers would be sent informing the customer that they do own customer owned facilities.

Mr. Cavallaro explained that the ComEd subcommittee did start with six proposals that were discussed as potential solutions. Two of those proposals were identified as not feasible due to the unlikelihood of the proposals being approved by the ICC. Two of the other proposals are still being discussed amongst the internal ComEd subcommittee. He explained that currently there are two proposals that are gaining the most traction in resolving some of these issues.

Mr. Cavallaro explained that one of these solutions is working with the private high voltage electrical contractors so that once their ComEd work is completed, ComEd can transition them to work privately with property owners who are experiencing issues with their customer owned facilities. He explained that ComEd did explore potentially offering their services at a cost to the customer to fix a customer owned facility. He explained that the proposal was deemed not feasible because ComEd service costs were much higher than those of independent contractor.

Mr. Cavallaro explained that the other proposal ComEd is working on an amendment to the standard that would allow for the undergrounding of privately owned facilities to be accepted as new business. ComEd could then accept the work and take over ownership and the maintenance responsibilities of the facilities.

Chairman Buschmann inquired about the ownership of infrastructure once a private customer owned facilities are moved underground. Mr. Cavallaro explained that the proposal would need to be accepted by the ICC. If it is

accepted and a service is moved underground and the necessary easement is provided, ComEd will accept the infrastructure.

He explained that this proposal still needs to be vetted in order to bring the proposal to the ICC. The proposal is still being reviewed by the internal ComEd departments. He explained that the amendment to the standard creates an incentive scenario, where these customer owned facilities are treated as a new installation. The proposal would give affected customers an opportunity to have ComEd take over the customer owned facilities if the facilities go from overhead to underground. He explained that if a customer is interested in pursuing this work ComEd will provide a quote via their new business department. He explained customers could also pursue a private contractor to bring the service line the necessary connection distance and then ComEd will make the connection. He explained that often times this is a far cheaper way to pursue undergrounding facilities. He explained that once the conversion to underground occurs the customer will no longer have privately owned facilities. He explained that ingress and egress easements would need to be obtained from the property owner for maintenance purposes and access.

Alderman Rummel inquired about the easement difference between overhead and underground infrastructure. Mr. Cavallaro explained that ComEd has both types of easements. He explained that ComEd has no easements or other property rights to any customer owned facilities. Alderman Rummel inquired why ComEd is finding underground infrastructure more acceptable to take over versus the existing overhead infrastructure if in both scenarios easements would have to be obtained. Mr. Cavallaro explained that a change needs to occur in order for ComEd to consider these customer owned facilities as their own infrastructure. He explained that ComEd is creating a scenario where these privately owned facilities will be treated as new business. He explained that ComEd anticipates that the ICC would be far more receptive to this process instead of ComEd proposing to take responsibility of all of the privately owned facilities outright, not knowing the condition of the facilities. He explained that from a rate base scenario ComEd leadership has determined this type of proposal to be unlikely to be approved by the ICC.

Chairman Buschmann inquired that if this new business proposal moves forward and a resident moves facilities underground, if ComEd need an easement. Mr. Cavallaro explained that an easement will be needed for maintenance and access.

Alderman Rummel inquired if this proposal would need ICC approval. Mr. Cavallaro explained that this proposal would need to go through the ICC regulatory process due to the creation of a new standard. He explained that as part of this standard ComEd is not going to allow any more privately owned facility installations. If a developer is looking to service a property that is beyond that 150 foot standard, ComEd is going to require that the developer pay the costs and provide the proper easements so that ComEd can install the necessary infrastructure in order to accept ownership of the facilities.

Alderman Rummel inquired about who will be paying the costs of conducting all the necessary surveying and deed revisions that will need to occur to establish the necessary easements on existing customer owned facilities. Mr. Cavallaro explained that he did not have the information he needed to answer the question. He explained that ComEd has an internal real estate department that handles easements. He explained that this department constantly works with utility easements within private and commercial properties.

Alderman Moreno inquired that if ComEd does bring the proposal to the ICC and it is approved, if there was an anticipated timeframe that the proposal would be implemented. Mr. Cavallaro explained that this proposal is being proposed for the entire ComEd territory and rate base. He explained that if the ICC approves the proposal ComEd will allow customers with privately owned facilities to begin working with their new business department to underground their private facilities at the cost of the customer. ComEd will not be requiring or forcing any customer to move their facilities underground. A customer may find that the cost of moving their facilities underground outweighs the risk of keeping their facilities above ground and owned privately. He explained that if a customer's overhead facilities are not in any danger of tree branches causing damage to the lines, and if their utility pole is in fine shape, that the customer may see keeping their customer owned facilities overhead as being more cost effective than spending money to convert underground. He explained that ComEd is still working internally to have the proposal reviewed by all of the ComEd departments. He explained that at this time, he does not have an exact timeframe as to when these reviews will be complete and when ComEd anticipates moving forward to bring the proposal to the ICC. He explained that a change in ComEd leadership has also caused a slight delay in having internal departmental leadership review the proposal.

Alderman Moreno inquired about the ICC process in reviewing this type of proposal. Mr. Cavallaro explained that he believed this type of proposal would not be a long drawn out regulatory review by the ICC. He explained that this ICC review could be as short as 75 days.

Alderman Rummel inquired about the legal process and about notice being on a residential property's deed so that it is made clear at the time a home is sold that the new homeowner will own customer owned facilities. She asked if ComEd would be able to communicate with the City which customers move forward in converting their customer owned facilities underground. She explained that communicating this information would be important. If a homeowner moves forward in undergrounding their customer owned facilities and ComEd's new business department accepts ownership, then the property would no longer have to be recorded as having customer owned facilities. Mr. Cavallaro explained that ComEd would maintain records as to which properties are converted to underground through their new business department. He explained that ComEd does not keep records of home and property ownership changes. Alderman Rummel inquired if this is something that could be tracked and recorded through City processes. Assistant to the City Manager Mike Strong explained that the City could send out a notification letter to homes that have been identified as having customer owned facilities. This letter could be

documented and kept in a property's house file. He explained that there are approximately 110 properties that have customer owned facilities in Lake Forest. He explained that a resolution could also be recorded against the identified properties. He explained that at this point many of these properties have not been officially confirmed as to having customer owned facilities. In order to obtain confirmation, the facilities would need to be field verified. He explained that the City could flag the identified properties and could develop notice that outlines that the property may or may not have customer owned facilities.

Alderman Moreno inquired if ComEd still allows the installation of customer owned facilities within new construction. Mr. Cavallaro explained that when ComEd brings their proposals to the ICC they will be recommending that the installation of customer owned facilities is no longer allowed. Alderman Moreno inquired if this the installation of customer owned facilities within new construction is allowed within City Code. Director Thomas explained that he believed it was not allowed and that he would follow up with the Community Development Department.

Alderman Moreno inquired if the City had any public property for which the City owned these customer owned facilities. Director Thomas explained that the Senior Center might be a property where this issue exists. Alderman Moreno requested that further research into public properties is completed so that it is known where this issue might also exist.

Alderman Moreno inquired about the ComEd timeline to bring their proposals to the ICC. Mr. Cavallaro explained that the original goal was to bring all the proposals to ComEd leadership for their review and approval by June. He explained that unfortunately that goal has been missed. He explained that the goal now is to get the proposals reviewed internally during July.

Chairman Buschmann inquired if underground facilities are more reliable than overhead facilities. Mr. Cavallaro explained that underground facilities are not as vulnerable to outages as overhead lines. He explained that repairs to underground lines take longer to complete than overhead lines. He explained that ComEd is concerned with the frequency and duration of outages. He explained that underground lines experience less frequent outages but longer outage durations than overhead lines.

Assistant to the City Manager Mike Strong explained that he would continue to keep the Committee updated and notified of ComEd progress in working on their review of the proposals.

Chairman Buschmann inquired if there were any members of the public in attendance at tonight's meeting who would like to comment on the topic.

Paul Hamann, Resident of 511 Beverly Place, explained his concerns and frustrations in dealing with the customer owned facilities issue. He explained that it is very hard to get into a contact with a private contractor who is willing to complete this type of private high voltage work. He explained his efforts in bringing the issue to court.

Tristian Sosa, Resident of 599 Beverly Place, explained that he has lost power due to issues with his customer owned facilities twice. He explained that in both instances it was very difficult and expensive to have private contractors come out to his property to complete the necessary repairs.

Jay Pridmore, Resident of 609 Beverly Place explained that he has lost power due to his customer owned facilities three times over the past five years. He explained that he was hoping for better proposals from ComEd in resolving the customer owned facilities issue. He explained that having residents maintain high voltage lines is a public safety issue. He explained that he felt that the City should play a larger role in looking to resolve this issue.

Mr. Cavallaro explained that ComEd is an incorporated company and that they are publically regulated rate based utility. He explained that ComEd cannot work on privately owned utilities because it is liability issue. ComEd does not have any rights to work on customer owned utilities. He explained that there is a lot of cost that goes into maintaining the ComEd rate base. He explained that these customer owned facilities are currently not within the ComEd rate base. He explained that while a proposal for which ComEd takes over ownership for all the customer owned facilities would be great, it isn't feasible to bring that proposal to the ICC because that large cost in doing so would have to be absorbed by the entire ComEd rate base. He explained that is where the proposal would fail.

Alderman Rummel explained that what ComEd is suggesting is that they would make private contractors more available to customers who own private facilities if an issue with their private facilities arise. She explained that ComEd is also going to works toward proposing that if customer moves forward in undergrounding their facility, ComEd would consider this a new installation and maintain the facilities going forward.

Assistant to the City Manager Mike Strong explained that the City can maintain and share a list of private contractors who would accept and complete this type of work with residents affected by the issue. Mr. Cavallaro also explained that if a resident owns customer owned facilities that he recommends the resident work with a private contractor to have the contractor review the facilities and complete some preventive tree trimming. He explained that this preventive maintenance is very important and something that ComEd completes on their facilities regularly. It is far more costly to pay for emergency repair work than preventative maintenance work.

Chairman Buschmann explained that the two ComEd proposals are not alternatives to each other but two different proposals that will help customers in dealing with privately owned facilities.

Chairman Buschmann inquired if ComEd anticipates any pushback from the ICC in pursuing their proposal of treating a customer who undergrounds their customer owned facilities as new business. Mr. Cavallaro explained that he did not believe that there would be any public objection to the proposal. He

explained that ComEd is confident that if the ICC asks any questions about the proposal ComEd will be able to respond.

Alderman Rummel inquired if the timeframe for the completion of the review would be completed in July. Mr. Cavallaro explained that ComEd's internal review would be completed in July. After the internal review is complete ComEd will package the proposals and will bring it to the ICC for their review.

Assistant to the City Manager Mike Strong explained that the next step for ComEd will be to complete their internal review of both proposals. He explained that City staff will continue to keep the Public Works Committee updated on status of ComEd's proposals. He explained that he will be requesting that Mr. Cavallaro lay out a timeline that will show the ICC process and when these proposals might begin to roll out and be made available to customers.

Alderman Rummel inquired if the ICC takes public testimony. Mr. Cavallaro explained that he believed it would be an internal ICC review.

Chairman Buschmann explained that it would be helpful if ComEd could develop something so that the cost component of converting overhead facilities underground is better understood. He explained that this information would be helpful to homeowners. Assistant to the City Manager Strong explained that staff plans to host another neighbor meeting after the proposals are approved and a clear customer process is outlined. At this time, if a resident is interested in converting their facilities underground, information on the process and potential costs can be reviewed and shared. He explained that when an initial neighbor meeting was held with the Beverly neighbors during September of 2017, the issue and potential costs of undergrounding facilities was reviewed.

Alderman Rummel inquired if a number of neighbors were to collaborate and underground their facilities at the same time, if they would see a potential cost savings. Mr. Cavallaro explained that if the neighbors came together and treated it as one project and hired one contractor, they would most likely experience better costs than if they were to pursue undergrounding their facilities individually. Assistant to the City Manager Mike Strong explained that a lot of potential cost savings would come from contractor mobilization costs.

Alderman Rummel inquired if Mr. Cavallaro assisted in helping Mike Strong address a disabled resident power issue. She explained that it was her understanding that there was no priority given to restoring power to homes who had handicapped people. Mr. Cavallaro explained that those homes are identified by ComEd, however, if the outage only affected that one home it still drops below the priority of a multiple customer outage due to multiple customers might not having the ability to contact 911.

Alderman Moreno inquired if the residents in the Beverly area were interested in collaborating together as one project, if the project could be financed through a Special Service Area project (SSA). Assistant to the City Manager Mike Strong explained that this project could potentially be set up as a SSA project. He explained that some legal framework would still need to be examined and

researched in order to confirm that. He explained that the application of a SSA, per the statute, would need to be reviewed.

Chairman Buschmann thanked Mr. Cavallaro and the residents in attendance for attending tonight's meeting.

IV. DISCUSSION OF PROCESS / NEXT STEPS FOR LEAF BLOWER TOPIC – CHUCK MYERS

Superintendent of Parks & Forestry Chuck Myers explained that there are a lot of different opinions that people have on the topic and a lot of different scenarios that could be recommended in moving forward in addressing the topic. He explained that the intention of reviewing the topic tonight is for staff to get direction from the Committee about the review process moving forward. He explained that included in tonight's meeting packet are pages of compiled comments from residents and Alderman. He explained that he found one comment from Alderman Preschlack very useful in discussing the topic tonight. Alderman Preschlack suggested that better data was needed on where resident's stand on changing the landscaping equipment hours of operation. He explained a more broad based approach in getting additional resident feedback, possibly through a survey, could be helpful when the Committee and City Council further review the hours of operation of leaf blowers and lawn maintenance equipment. Superintendent Myers explained that a short survey could be developed and sent to residents to gauge how they would feel if the hours of operation changed. He explained that the City also maintains a database of all the landscaping firms that are licensed to work within the City of Lake Forest. He explained that another survey could be sent to firms to gather data on their opinions on potential changes. He explained that whatever recommendation the Committee provides tonight would most likely not affect the hours of operation this summer as the summer landscaping season is coming to an end. This allows plenty of time to further gather data and investigate potential options that could be implemented before next year's landscaping seasons. He explained that the landscaping firm survey could be completed fairly quickly by using the existing landscaper database. The resident survey may take a longer amount of time to complete.

Alderman Rummel inquired what the cost would be for a resident survey. Superintendent Myers explained that he does not have an exact cost but in speaking to a consulting firm who just completed a survey for the Parks & Recreation Department, it would not be that much. He explained that he believed that a very simple survey could be developed. He explained that he is currently working with the firm to gather more information on cost.

Chairman Buschmann explained that he reviewed Superintendent Myers PowerPoint Presentation that had information from a 2015 survey that was sent to landscaping firms. He explained that the survey was sent to 38 landscaping firms and that only eight firms responded. He explained that his take away from that was the landscaping firms opposed moving the hours of operation back to a later start time. He inquired if landscaping firms would still feel this way.

Superintendent Myers explained that he did reach out to a few larger landscape firms prior to tonight's meeting. He explained that the firms he spoke to did not express a lot of concern in pushing back the starting time. He explained that one firm specifically explained that the most of the complaints their firm receives stem from them starting before 9:00 A.M. He explained that this firm expressed that they would be ok if the start hours were pushed to 9:00 A.M. He explained that these firms are very aware of potential more drastic changes that other communities have adopted. Landscaping firms are much more receptive to changes to the hours of operation than outright bans of equipment.

Chairman Buschmann inquired about the proposed resolution that previously went to City Council and why it stated that golf course and City operations would be excluded. Superintendent Myers explained that he oversees the City golf course and the Parks Section. He explained that all public and private golf courses are currently excluded from the existing ordinance. The biggest reason why golf courses are excluded is because the nature of their business. Early tee times require very early maintenance activities to be completed in order for the course to be ready for customers. He explained that in speaking to the City's golf course staff, they had never received a complaint from an adjacent residential property about operating maintenance equipment too early. It was explained that if they did receive a complaint, they would adjust their operating schedule to complete another area of scheduled maintenance. They would then return to the complaint area at a later time. Superintendent Myers explained that golf course staff has no desire to upset their neighbors. He explained that when the topic of hours of operation of lawn maintenance equipment had been discussed in the past, the City received feedback from many golf courses within the City requesting to exclude them from the ordinance or their operations would be adversely affected. He explained that municipal operating sections do all that they can to avoid residential complaints. He explained that there are times and emergency situations that will require the use of equipment to be used outside the existing hours of operation. He explained that the majority of City operating sections begin their days at 6:30 A.M. He explained that he does direct his operating sections to use common sense in operating their equipment early in the morning. He explained that employees are expected not to operate a leaf blower first thing in the morning right next to a resident's home. He explained that the exclusion of municipal operations stemmed from Alderman Tack's recommendation at a previous Public Works Committee meeting.

Alderman Rummel explained that she felt that the conversation of electric maintenance equipment was somewhat lost in the conversation. She explained that the Committee previously discussed changes being only for gas powered equipment. She inquired about changes in the decibel level between a gas powered leaf blower and an electric leaf blower. Superintendent Myers explained that there are a lot of variables that go into determining the difference between the two. He explained that depending on the make and model of an electric or gas powered blower the decibel levels will be different.

He explained that he estimates that newer electric blowers tend to be ten decibel levels lower than the gas powered leaf blowers.

Alderman Rummel inquired if the City would ever pursue buying electric powered equipment. Superintendent Myers explained that this has been a topic that staff has continually researched. He explained that the City's Forestry Section has purchased and implemented a chainsaw and a blower system that is battery powered for bucket truck operations. He explained that at Forest Park, the City's contractor only uses electric and battery powered equipment. He explained that the City has implemented this equipment in some areas of operation and will continue to research implementing this type of equipment going forward. Alderman Rummel explained that electric and battery powered equipment is much more environmental friendly than gas powered equipment.

Alderman Rummel explained that if the City is going to look to send out a survey, the questions should focus on all lawn maintenance equipment. She explained that a question on prohibiting the use of landscape equipment on Sundays and holidays should be included. Chairman Buschmann explained that the issue in asking the question about a ban on Sundays is that most people would respond that they would be in support of a quiet Sunday. However, the City will still have residents who maintain their own landscape and these residents might only be able to complete the work on Sundays. Alderman Rummel explained that if this ban was in place, these affected residents could purchase electric equipment to still complete the work on a Sunday. Chairman Buschmann explained that trying to develop a list of all equipment decibel levels would be a herculean task due to all the different variables that affect decibel level. He explained that the current City Code outlines these hours of operation for all landscape equipment and not just blowers. He explained that he believed that classifying all lawn maintenance equipment under landscape equipment is a much better idea than complicating City Code by breaking different types of equipment out and into different hours of operation.

Chairman Buschmann explained that he did not think the current hours of operation were creating that many problems. The Police Department has only received two formal complaints and one of the complaints was for municipal operations. He explained that he would not be in favor of generating surveys because they might provide data that further complicates the topic. Alderman Moreno explained that she was also not in favor of using surveys. She explained that she believed that the Committee and City Council had enough data to move forward in discussing the topic and in making a decision. She explained that she believed a simple approach needs to be taken in addressing the topic. She explained that civility and individual responsibility is a huge component in discussing the issue. She explained that neighbors need to respect each other. She explained that if she had a neighbor who constantly used a leaf blower early every Saturday morning she would be upset and would discuss the issue with the neighbor. If a neighbor came to her to say that he or she needed to leaf blow early one weekend morning to accommodate for a party, she would

understand and be completely fine with that. She explained that she respects those residents who work six days a week and may only have Sunday to maintain their landscapes. She explained that she would not want to limit these residents who have to do this. She explained that she does not want to unnecessarily restrict residents.

Alderman Rummel inquired if Alderman Moreno would support no restrictions. Alderman Moreno explained that she supported the current restrictions and hours of operation in the City Code. Chairman Buschmann explained that some minor adjustments could be made to the existing City Code and hours of operation. He explained that a concern he has is that if major adjustments are made to the City Code and the Code becomes more restrictive, the bigger landscaping firms may be able to absorb these changes, while the smaller firms will have a much more difficult time in doing so. He explained that he would be very disappointed if a City regulation drives out these smaller firms.

Alderman Buschmann inquired about snow blowers and other construction activities and if there are restricted hours for those types of activities and equipment. Superintendent Ells explained that there is a general City noise ordinance that details the hours of operation for these activities. Alderman Rummel inquired if the general noise ordinance should include landscape equipment. She explained that the hours would be the same and further simplified. Alderman Buschmann explained that both ordinances have not received a lot of pushback and that he would prefer leaving the two separate. Chairman Buschmann inquired if there were any regulation on noise from snow blowers. He explained that he understood that restricted hours for blowers and plows may not make sense as snow could fall at any time and regardless of the time; roads, sidewalks, and driveways need to be plowed. Superintendent Ells explained that the noise ordinance does call out snow operation activities. Superintendent Myers explained that the landscape hours of operation are specific to landscape equipment.

Director Thomas explained that in speaking to Police Chief Karl Waldorf, the Police Department would prefer a simple approach that would allow for easy enforcement of the ordinance. If the ordinance is complicated and there are many different hours of operation for different landscape equipment, the ordinance becomes much more difficult to enforce.

Chairman Buschmann inquired what the exact noise ordinance states. Superintendent Ells explained that the noise ordinance states,

“It shall be unlawful to cause or to make unreasonable loud noise in any depot, store, theater, street, alley, sidewalk, park or other public place or any place frequented by the public in the city. It shall further be unlawful to cause or make unreasonable loud noise at any point on or beyond the boundary of any lot, whether privately owned or public, which such unreasonable noise interferes with the quiet enjoyment of adjoining lots or lots within 1,000 feet of the location

from which the noise is emanating. It shall be unlawful to carry on or conduct any manufacture, trade or business, engage in any activity, or use a vehicle, machine or other equipment in said city which, by occasioning loud noises or sound shall be offensive or prejudicial or dangerous to the health of individuals or of the public of the city or which shall disturb or break the rest, sleep or quiet of persons in said city before 7:00 a.m. on weekdays and 8:00 a.m. on Saturdays, Sundays or holidays, and after 8:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays, Sundays or holidays, except as authorized by the City Manager. These restrictions shall not apply to snow removal equipment, including, but not limited to, snowplows and snow blowers. It shall be unlawful to cause or make loud noise through the operation of lawn maintenance equipment including, but not limited to, lawn mowers, tractors and gasoline-powered leaf blower equipment before 7:30 a.m. on weekdays, 8:00 a.m. on Saturdays and 10:00 a.m. on Sundays and holidays after, 7:30 p.m. on all days, except as authorized by City Manager. This restriction shall not apply to golf course maintenance operations."

Alderman Rummel proposed drawing back on the end time of the permitted weekday hours of operation for landscaping equipment. Alderman Moreno explained that she thought the larger issue was occurring with the weekend times. Alderman Rummel explained that she felt 7:30 P.M. was too late to be hearing the use of equipment during weekdays. She explained that she felt as though most of the commercial crews were finished. She explained that this may be the time when homeowners might have to maintain their landscapes. Superintendent Myers explained that from what he has read and heard, residents who maintain their own landscapes do not support changing and further restricting the hours of operation during the weekdays because the later evening hours or weekends is the only time they can complete this work.

Alderman Rummel explained that she found Lake Bluff's operating hours of Monday through Friday, 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M., and weekend and holiday hours of, 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M., interesting. She explained that she felt the way their hours were structured was simple. Alderman Moreno explained that she felt ending the weekday hours at 5:00 P.M. was early and that might restrict some residents who maintain their own landscapes.

Chairman Buschmann inquired if there should be two separate hours of operation for landscaping firms and residents. He also inquired about the exclusion to the existing ordinance "except as authorized by the City Manager". He asked City Manager Kiely if he has had people come to him to seek approval for the use of equipment outside of the permissible hours in the noise ordinance. City Manager Kiely explained that he has only ever had experience with this for construction projects. He explained that contracting firms have occasionally requested approval for work before or after the permissible hours. He explained that he has approved requests if enough justification was provided. He explained that he has never had a resident make a request for approval for using lawn maintenance equipment outside of the approved hours of operation.

Alderman Buschmann provided City Manager Kiely with a scenario about a resident who makes a request to work and operate landscape equipment outside of the approved Sunday hours and if Mr. Kiely would be ok with being involved in this type of request. City Manager Kiely explained that he would rather not be involved in this type of request because it could become difficult to manage on a case by case basis. He explained that approving requests could make for a very slippery slope. He explained that he believed the entire topic is being driven by a few residents. He explained that the existing ordinance and hours of operation have been in place for a number of years and the City has continued to receive few complaints. He explained that he agreed with Alderman Moreno in that a policy like this, common courtesy and respect amongst neighbors needs to prevail. He provided the example of one of his neighbors who had reached out to him and other neighbors about a metal roofing project they were going to begin. The neighbor came over to discuss the project with him and that it would be pretty noisy at his property the next few days. City Manager Kiely explained that he really appreciated the neighbor's courtesy in coming to speak to him. He explained that he would prefer to do more on the education side and less on the regulation side in addressing the landscape equipment hours of operation.

Chairman Buschmann explained that he would be in favor of cutting back the current 7:30 P.M. end time for the weekend hours of operation. Alderman Rummel agreed that the end time for weekends and holidays could be cut back. City Manager Kiely explained that the complaints he has heard are a result of people operating equipment in the evening hours. Chairman Buschmann explained that he believed the start time for the weekend hours was ok and not too early. He explained that he believed that any changes should be simple and enforceable. He explained that he did prefer leaving the "except as authorized by the City Manager" as an exception if a resident needs to work outside the permitted hours of operation. It would be on the resident to provide enough justification to the City Manager to accept their request.

Director Thomas explained that City operations occasionally work outside the hours permitted in the noise ordinance. He explained that last week the City's contractor working on road patching began working before the permitted start time. Approval was given to the contractor to start work early so that they could complete work on Deerpath Road. This was the best time to complete the work because traffic was much lighter than if the contractor waited to start within the hours outlined in noise ordinance.

Chairman Buschmann explained that at this point the Committee does not recommend pursuing a resident survey. He explained that the other conversations around the topic can remain open and can be discussed at a later date. Alderman Moreno explained that she would be in favor of leaving the current ordinance as is and not revisiting it. She explained that she would defer to Chairman Buschmann and Alderman Rummel on how they would like proceed with the topic. Chairman Buschmann explained that since the issue has

been discussed by City Council something should be done. Alderman Rummel agreed and felt that an adjustment to the weekend ending time could be adjusted. She explained that she would be in favor of cutting back on the 7:30 P.M. end time. Chairman Buschmann requested that staff survey the landscaping firms for their thoughts on adjusting the weekend hours. He explained that he would propose the idea of a 5:00 P.M. end time on Saturday and a 4:00 P.M. end time on Sunday. Alderman Rummel proposed an end time of 5:30 P.M. on Saturdays and a 5:00 P.M. end time on Sundays and holidays. Chairman Buschmann requested that staff makes an inquiry to landscaping firms about Alderman Rummel's proposed changes. Alderman Rummel suggested that the hours remain 7:30 A.M. to 7:30 P.M. on weekdays and the hours change to 8:00 A.M. to 5:30 P.M. on Saturdays and 10:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. on Sundays and holidays. She explained that these hours would be for all landscaping equipment.

Superintendent Myers explained that he will provide landscaping firms a survey to provide input on these proposed hours in both Spanish and English. He explained that he would bring the results back to the Public Works Committee.

Chairman Buschmann inquired about the exception to the golf courses and City operations. Superintendent Myers explained that if the Committee would like to keep the policy the same, golf courses would be exempt and City operations would not be. He explained that City staff would continue to work within those permitted hours of operation as the weekday hours are not being changed.

Chairman Buschmann explained that as part of the education efforts, the City should educate residents on common courtesy and using the loud equipment only when it is necessary. Superintendent Myers explained that in the last quarterly dialogue there was a featured article that was all about leaf blower courtesy. He explained that the current landscape certification program could be used to share these type of educational materials with the landscaping firms.

Alderman Rummel inquired about the communities who completely restrict their hours of operation during summer months. Superintendent Myers explained that these communities have implemented what is referred to as a partial blower ban. They do not allow blower use during the summer months but do allow use during the spring and fall. Alderman Moreno explained that she would not support restricting leaf blowers in the fall because they are very important in leaf collection. She explained that leaf collection is very important in keeping catch basin inlets clear.

V. DISCUSSION OF SMOKE TESTING PROJECT & PROCESS IF VIOLATIONS ARE FOUND – BOB ELLS & JIM LOCKEFEER

Management Analyst Jim Lockefeer reviewed a PowerPoint on the topic with the Committee. He reviewed background information and explained that in March of 2018, the Finance Committee first reviewed the Smoke Testing Project. In April of 2018, bids for project were received and reviewed. In total, two bids

were received and the low bid came from the engineering firm RJN group. He explained that RJN group had conducted past smoke testing for the City. He explained that in May of 2018, City Council awarded the smoke testing project to RJN Group in the total not-to-exceed amount of \$102,330.

Mr. Lockefer explained that data collected through testing will be used to address stormwater inflow & infiltration into the City's sanitary sewer system. He explained that the inflow & infiltration data will be available by address and by type. He explained that there is existing City Code that will support City efforts in making sure these illegal and prohibited connections are addressed. Current code allows for the City to turn off a resident's water if an issue is not corrected in a reasonable amount of time.

He explained the reason why staff wanted to bring the topic to the Committee tonight was to receive direction on details not specifically identified in City Code. He explained that staff was looking for direction on notifying residents via certified mailing of prohibited connections issues; in the mailing, requested repairs would be expected to be completed within 90 days; waiving the building permit fees for repairs; and due to minimal infiltration volume, not requiring the repair of residential sanitary service line laterals.

Chairman Buschmann inquired if the smoke comes through a resident's sanitary service if that is a result of small crack or breaks in the line. Management Analyst Jim Lockefer confirmed that he was correct. Superintendent Ells explained that if there are larger breaks they show much more smoke. He explained these would be noted and the City would request that a repair is made.

Alderman Rummel inquired if there would be any potential repercussions to the homeowners as the smoke testing is occurring. Director Thomas explained that there are no potential repercussions that a homeowner could face while the smoke testing is occurring. He explained that it is a fairly quick process and the smoke is non-toxic and non-hazardous.

Chairman Buschmann recommended that any follow up mailing to the residents is more educational rather than accusatory. He explained that the letter should be positive. He inquired about the permit fees associated with waiving a potential repair and how much the fees are. Superintendent Ells explained that he believed that most issues will be on private property. He explained that there is a residential sewer fee and that he wasn't sure of the exact amount, however, he believed the fee was minimal. Chairman Buschmann recommended using the waiving of the fee as an incentive for a homeowner to complete a repair within the 90 days.

Alderman Rummel inquired what the follow up would be with homeowners who do not respond and make a repair within the 90 days. Superintendent Ells explained that after the initial 90 days expires, a second certified letter will be mailed. The letter would state that if a repair is not made within a certain amount

of time, water will be shut off. Chairman Buschmann explained that the second letter should escalate the issue. He explained that before the water is turned off, there should be a second letter that acts as a warning.

Chairman Buschmann recommended that the first letter offer information on the next steps a homeowner needs to take in order to address the issue. Superintendent Ells explained that information from RJN group about the resident's specific issue can be included in the letter. He explained that there will be City staff contact information included in the letter. Management Analyst Jim Lockefer explained that a frequently asked question guide could be another potential document enclosed in the initial letter.

Alderman Rummel inquired about past smoke testing areas overlapping with upcoming smoke testing areas. She inquired why that would be necessary if the past areas should have already been notified and corrected their issues. Director Thomas reviewed an intensity map of the areas in the City where staff received the most calls for flooding during the July and October 2017 flooding events. He explained that this map was used in developing the smoke testing areas. A past smoke testing area was an area where staff received a high intensity of calls. He explained that while the area was smoke tested in the past and residents may have made repairs to correct the issues, homeowners may have since unknowingly made new illegal connections. He explained that he also believed that in the past the follow up to smoke testing may not have been as clear as staff is recommending tonight. Director Thomas explained that he believes that we may see existing problems in the areas that have been smoke tested in the past.

VI. REVIEW & APPROVAL OF PROPOSED IGA WITH HIGHWOOD FOR SHARED WATER PLANT OPERATIONAL SERVICES – MICHAEL THOMAS

Director Thomas explained that the existing and proposed agreements with Highwood are within tonight's meeting packet. He provided background of the topic and explained that approximately a year ago, Highwood staff reached out to Lake Forest for some assistance with their water plant. He explained that Highwood had two water plant operator employees and recently lost one of these employees. He explained that he and City Manager Kiely met with the City Manager of Highwood to see if for a period of time Lake Forest could logistically provide assistance with operating their water plant. He explained that the City came to an agreement with Highwood and at the same time agreed that both organizations would continue to explore the possibility of Lake Forest selling Highwood water. In order to supply Highwood water, Highwood would need to invest in a transmission water main. A cost estimate was developed and shared with Highwood. Highwood has since explained to Lake Forest that they would not be able to afford the cost of installing a transmission main at this time. Highwood staff explained to Lake Forest staff that they have kept their water rates low for their residents for a long period of time. Highwood explained that they would have to increase their rates significantly in order to pay for the transmission main. It was explained that at this point in time, Highwood was not ready to commit to this. He explained that the meeting concluded with

Highwood requesting that Lake Forest continue the existing agreement to help Highwood operate their water plant.

Director Thomas explained that in discussing the topic with Superintendent Martin and the City's Water Plant Chief Operator, the discussion on current water plant employees and potential upcoming retirements was reviewed. He explained that new water plant operator employees take time to learn the system. He explained that it is a complicated system that requires a great deal of knowledge. He explained that through these discussions the idea of hiring a new, additional, Lake Forest water plant operator while at the same time give operating hours to Highwood was developed. He explained that the proposed IGA with Highwood would increase the rate of operator pay to \$80 an hour and would outline approximately 1,000 hours a year of operating time at the Highwood plant. Director Thomas explained that the current cost of a City of Lake Forest operator, with benefits included, is \$88,600. He explained that Highwood would be paying 90% of the cost of this new employee. He explained that this new operator would not be spending any time at the Highwood water plant. Their time would be spent at the Lake Forest water plant learning the Lake Forest water plant operations and the system. He explained that the Lake Forest employees who are nearing retirement will be utilized at the Highwood water plant. He explained that all the details are outlined in the proposed IGA.

Director Thomas explained that the proposed Highwood operation would occur Fridays and Saturdays from 5:00 A.M. to 1:00 P.M. He explained that Highwood's operation is essentially filling their one water tower on a daily basis in the morning and then leaving for the day after it is at capacity.

Director Thomas explained that Highwood has a separate agreement with Highland Park that designates a Highland Park water plant employee as the Highwood Chief Water Plant Operator. This Chief Operator fills out all the necessary state and federal paperwork.

Alderman Rummel inquired about the proposed idea of Highwood shutting down their water plant and the City of Lake Forest supplying them with water. Director Thomas explained that this was something that was discussed, however, when Highwood received and reviewed the cost of the transmission main installation they explained that at this point they could not fund that type of investment.

Director Thomas explained that the drafted IGA is for a three year period with the option of opting into two additional years. He explained that by that time, Highwood may be more ready to consider shutting down their current system and pursue the transmission main option.

Chairman Buschmann inquired about the minimum amount of Lake Forest employee supplied operating time not appearing in the drafted IGA. Director Thomas cited section 3-A of the IGA that specified the specific working hours.

Director Thomas explained that he has and will continue to check in with the Lake Forest Chief Water Plant Operator to review how the employees are doing

at Highwood. He explained that the current agreement with Highwood has been working well.

Alderman Rummel explained that she thought the agreement was fine. She explained that her only concern was section 5 "Waiver of Claims". She requested that the City Attorney review that clause. She explained that she believed there should be indemnification language. Director Thomas explained the City Attorney created the IGA and that Highwood's legal counsel was currently reviewing the document. He explained that he would share the comments with the City Attorney.

Alderman Rummel moved to recommend approval of the proposed IGA with Highwood for shared water plant operational services. Alderman Moreno seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

VII. REVIEW & APPROVAL OF THE LOW BID FOR THE OLD MILL SANITARY SEWER FORCE REPLACEMENT PROJECT – BOB ELLS

Superintendent Bob Ells explained that the drafted write-up that will appear in the upcoming City Council meeting agenda was included in the Committee's packet tonight. He explained the project went out for competitive bid and IHC was the low bidding firm. He explained that the bid was much lower in cost than the City estimate.

Chairman Buschmann inquired about the previous work IHC has completed. Superintendent Ells explained that the firm has not completed work directly for the City before, however, they have completed work for other firms like ComEd within the City.

Chairman Buschmann inquired how comfortable staff was with the firms experience and qualifications. Superintendent Ells explained that staff was very confident in this firm's qualifications and past experiences.

Alderman Moreno inquired about the request for the fully budgeted \$400,000 if the project total with a 10% contingency was less than the \$400,000 amount. She requested that it changes to \$380,000 or \$385,000 instead of the \$400,000. Superintendent Ells explained that he would look to make that adjustment for the City Council packet.

Alderman Rummel moved to recommend approval of the low bid for the Old Mill sanitary sewer force replacement project. Alderman Moreno seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

VIII. NOTIFICATION OF THE CITY OF LAKE FOREST'S REQUIRED IEPA STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN – JIM LOCKEFEEER

Management Analyst Jim Lockefeer explained that Stormwater Management Program Plans (SMPP) outline existing procedures and practices that are implemented by a municipality to reduce the discharge of pollutants within stormwater runoff. He explained that the purpose of SMPPs is to meet the minimum standards required by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

(NPDES) program. He explained that federal regulations through the USEPA require that all Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s), located partially or fully in urbanized areas, obtain stormwater permits for their discharges into receiving waters. He explained that information found in the City's SMPP include outreach efforts and education efforts, the City Stormwater Management Policy, and City operations that could impact stormwater runoff. He explained that City staff developed the Lake Forest SMPP by utilizing a SMPP template provided by Lake County SMC. City staff also had the help of a consultant with prior career experience with the IEPA and USEPA. He explained that the City SMPP can be found on the City's website.

Chairman Buschmann inquired about City outfall monitoring efforts. Management Analyst Jim Lockfeer explained that the City does have a visual outfall inspection program. Chairman Buschmann inquired about the frequency of the outfall inspections. Management Analyst Lockfeer explained that minimally, dry weather inspections of City outfalls are required every five years. Superintendent Ells explained that the City is currently a part of the SMC group developing the master plans for the North Branch and Lake Michigan watersheds. He explained that as part of this group member communities will collaborate and identify one firm to complete all the inspections throughout the entire watersheds. He explained that completing the inspections this way will be much more cost effective for all the communities within each watershed.

Alderman Rummel inquired if water is treated within the stormwater sewer system. Superintendent Ells explained that the water is not chemically treated like sanitary sewage.

Director Thomas explained that last Thursday the IEPA came out to the City and spent a long period of time reviewing all the City's stormwater management policies and SMPP with Jim Lockfeer and the Water and Sewer Section Supervisor. He explained that the City received very good feedback about the City stormwater management program from the IEPA representative who completed the inspection.

IX. OTHER – MICHAEL THOMAS & MIKE STRONG

• POSSIBLE LAKE ROAD CURB / GUTTER / STORM SEWER SSA

Director Thomas explained that a few residents on Lake Road, between Spruce and Woodbine, have reached out to the Mayor expressing interest in the installation of curb and gutter in their area. After the Mayor received the initial inquiry, the Mayor along with City staff, met with the interested neighbors to review the installation of curb and gutter. An estimate on total project cost was also shared with the residents. He explained that the special service area (SSA) funding process was reviewed. This group of three to four interested residents believed that there is a strong majority of homeowners in the project area that want the installation of curb and gutter to occur. Director Thomas explained that City staff is going to host a neighbor meeting to gauge interest. He explained that if the City obtains a petition from the homeowners that clearly shows that the project would be supported, the official SSA process would begin. It was the

hope of the residents who staff already met with that construction would begin and finish next summer. He explained that as part of the project, the residents expressed interest in also having the ComEd utility poles and infrastructure removed and buried. The cost to do this would also have to be included in the total cost of the SSA.

Chairman Buschmann inquired what the cost estimates were. Director Thomas explained that the initial estimate is for \$1,000,000.

Alderman Rummel inquired what prompted this group of residents to pursue the project. Director Thomas explained that the group of residents expressed that they have wanted to pursue this project for a long time. The residents explained that they have reached out with interest to the City before and were told no.

Director Thomas explained that the Army Corps of Engineers may need to be involved with the project since stormwater infrastructure would be discharging into the ravines. He explained that this topic still needed to be reviewed in detail with the City Engineer.

Alderman Rummel inquired about the ravines the stormwater sewer infrastructure would discharge into. Director Thomas reviewed a map with the Committee and pointed out the two ravines that the stormwater would discharge into. He explained that the infrastructure would not discharge into the North Beach Access Road ravine.

Assistant to the City Manager Mike Strong explained that next steps would include hosting a neighbor meeting to discuss a potential project, the SSA process, and project cost per parcel. He explained that different SSA funding options can also be reviewed. He explained that staff will request that if the neighbors are interested in moving forward with the project, a signed petition is submitted to the City demonstrating a majority of homeowner support. If that is submitted to the City, the SSA process would move forward.

Director Thomas explained that if the neighbors show that there is majority interest, staff will begin to proceed with developing preliminary engineering.

Chairman Buschmann inquired if the preliminary engineering was something that the City would have to pay for. Director Thomas explained that it would and that it was initially explained to the interested resident group that staff believed the design was straight forward and could be completed in house. However, the process may have to change if the Army Corps of Engineering becomes involved.

• POSSIBLE STONEGATE CURB / GUTTER / STORM SEWER SSA

Director Thomas explained that the possible Stongate SSA is not as far along as the potential Lake Road SSA. He explained that the neighbors there have become frustrated with people over time cutting their turns short. That has

resulted in the adjacent right of way becoming affected. He explained that he did not necessarily believe that this project would evolve into an SSA.

Superintendent Ells explained that the neighbors in the area have not requested an SSA.

Chairman Buschmann inquired what the plan was moving forward with this issue. Director Thomas explained that staff is still reviewing the issue as the issue was brought to staff's attention a few days ago. He explained that the Engineering Section is currently reviewing the issue.

Alderman Rummel inquired what the current issue in the Lake Road area was that the neighbors were trying to correct in installing curb and gutter. Director Thomas explained that he believed it was in large part due to the residents growing frustrated with people parking on the parkway grass. She inquired if their inquiry had anything to do with drainage. Superintendent Ells explained that their request does not have anything to do with solving a drainage issue, however, if curb and gutter is installed on City streets, the installation of a storm sewer is also needed. He explained that it is needed to move the water off the road.

X. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no additional public comment.

XI. NEXT MEETING – July 23, 2018 – 6:30 p.m.

Director Thomas explained that prior to concluding tonight's meeting staff would like to review a new business topic with the Committee that did not originally appear on the agenda. He explained that the topic of Everett and Waukegan Road improvement project would be reviewed by Superintendent Ells.

Superintendent Ells explained that the topic will also appear before City Council at the next City Council meeting. He explained that the City recently received the agreement back from the state for execution for Phase II design of the intersection improvement project. He explained that City Council will need to authorize the Mayor to sign the contract with Civil Tech and to authorize payment of the City's 20% share of Phase II design which is \$65,745.

Chairman Buschmann inquired if this was the same improvement project that was reviewed with City Council previously. Superintendent Ells explained that he was correct.

Superintendent Ells shared and reviewed a map of the project area with the Committee.

Chairman Buschmann explained a topic that came up at the Fourth Ward meeting about the proposed improvement. He explained that the traffic flow problem at this intersection is attributed to the west flow traffic on Everett coming up to the stop light and not having a right turn lane. Superintendent Ells explained that when the initial traffic studies were completed by the State for the project, they designated the traffic level at grade C. He explained that this

grade is viewed at an acceptable level. He explained that when the proposed projects options were reviewed by City Council in 2013, the opportunity for a right turn lane was not even an option that was presented. He explained that additional traffic studies have been completed since the original study was submitted and similar traffic data was collected.

Director Thomas explained that the City completed Phase I design for the improvement project. Those design concepts were shared with IDOT in order to gain their support and financially fund the project. He explained that the City spent about \$228,000 on Phase I and that it is not reimbursable by IDOT. Once Phase I design was complete and accepted by IDOT, a grant was applied for and obtained for Phase II design and construction. The awarded grant dollars are for improvement project plans that were presented in Phase I. Phase I design did not have a right turn lane concept within the plans. Superintendent Ells explained that Phase I was approved by City Council, Metra, IDOT and the ICC. He explained that as a general reference, a lane, the buffer, and the sidewalk would have to move approximately 25 feet to accommodate a right turn lane. Director Thomas explained that if the City makes significant changes to the proposed improvement project design at this point, the City could lose the grant and the 80% match.

Alderman Rummel inquired about applying for a future grant to install a right turn lane. Director Thomas explained that a future grant could be applied for. He explained that trying to incorporate a right turn lane as part of the project, would result in the state pulling the grant funds for not following what was agreed upon in Phase I design.

Chairman Buschmann explained that if the proposed development in the area does not move forward and other opportunities are examined, that the City should work with the proposed development to provide easements to accommodate a right turn lane.

Alderman Rummel inquired about the total City investment for the project. Superintendent Ells explained the City has already invested \$228,000 for Phase I. He explained that in going forward with the project, the City will invest 20% of the Phase II design and 20% of the construction costs. He provided the Committee with a breakdown of the costs.

Director Thomas explained that staff wanted to bring this to the Committee tonight to ask for their recommendation to City Council to accept the grant and the City's financial obligation as part of the grant agreement. He explained that the project has also not been budgeted because the grant had not yet been awarded by the City's March budget meeting. Therefore, once the grant was received staff has to go back to City Council to request the grant and financial obligation of the 20% match for Phase II design and construction is accepted. Superintendent Ells explained that the City match for construction will appear in the FY20 budget.

Alderman Rummel explained that if the project is not approved the \$228,000 investment for Phase I would have been for nothing. Chairman Buschmann

asked the Committee if they felt as though the project was a good project for the intersection even though it may not solve all of its problems. Alderman Moreno and Alderman Rummel agreed that the project was a good improvement that will help the north and south traffic at the intersection. Chairman Buschmann explained that there are still problems that can be addressed at the intersection in the future.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Alderman Rummel moved to adjourn the meeting of the Public Works Committee at 10:08 P.M. Alderman Moreno seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Lockefer Jr.
Management Analyst