



**VILLAGE OF BARTLETT
COMMITTEE MINUTES
November 3, 2016**

President Wallace called the Committee of the Whole meeting to order at 7:19 p.m.

PRESENT: Trustee Camerer, Carbonaro, Deyne, Hopkins, Reinke, and President Wallace

ABSENT: Trustee Arends

ALSO PRESENT: Village Administrator Valerie Salmons, Assistant Administrator Paula Schumacher, Interim Finance Director Todd Dowden, Director of Public Works Dan Dinges, Public Works Engineer Bob Allen, Community Development Director Jim Plonczynski, Grounds Superintendent Kevin DeRoo, Police Chief Kent Williams, Village Attorney Bryan Mraz and Village Clerk Lorna Giless.

PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE

Bluff City Industrial Park – Acton Mobile

Community Development Director Jim Plonczynski stated that this was a petition and Dean Kelley, on behalf of Bluff City LLC is representing them. The property is located in our Bluff City Industrial Park, in the internal part of the park. They would like to amend their preliminary PUD plan to allow for outdoor truck and trailer storage on a 10 acre parcel of land that previously had been dedicated for a concrete plant. Dean has entertained a contract with Acton Mobile Trailer corporation that would like to lease the space. He would like to amend his general site plan and allow for Acton to take over the west end of the property and to also include some outdoor truck and trailer storage on the east half of the 10 acre parcel of land. To do that he needs to amend his preliminary PUD plan and get a special use for revising the PUD. He would also like to clean up the property and add some landscaping. They are looking forward to moving this on to the Plan Commission.

Trustee Reinke asked how the land was being used today?

Dean Kelley stated that on the Acton parcel, Bluff City Materials has a maintenance facility and storage. They have secured another location in Elgin to move those operations and they also have some storage on the 10 acre parcel that they will consolidate into 5 acres, screen it a little better, clean it up. Acton will store and repair construction trailers inside the building and store the trailers outside. They are the typical office mobile trailers. He stated that this will have very little traffic impact.

Trustee Hopkins asked if they could talk a little bit about dedicating Graham Street.

Mr. Plonczynski stated that you have a confluence of two counties. Graham Street is fully improved and is a typical industrial park road. As it transitions into the Kane County



**VILLAGE OF BARTLETT
COMMITTEE MINUTES
November 3, 2016**

portion it becomes a driveway. There is a long-term plan in possibly realigning this road and coming out at a better location at Route 25, but it really is just a driveway at this point. It needs to be upgraded to our industrial park standard before they would accept it with storm sewer, etc.

Trustee Hopkins asked if any other businesses use that right-of-way?

Mr. Kelley stated that Welch Bros. uses it as well as some of their other users in Bluff City Industrial Park. They really have not talked about it but he did not see a need to upgrade. It would not be a benefit to them to upgrade at this point.

Attorney Mraz stated that under the underlining annexation agreement, it allowed them to keep that as a private drive. That was one of the terms since it was between their piece and the Welch piece. It is a secondary private access.

Trustee Hopkins asked if it is not a right-of-way for the Village, are there any problems that could occur from a Village standpoint.

Mr. Plonczynski stated "no", in terms of the use of it. He pointed out that Acton is going to increase some of the storm water detention. They have had some issues with ponding which is in unincorporated Kane County. If this were ever to be dedicated, they would like to make sure that this access road comes out in a better location on Route 25. The better route would be Kenyon Road which has a traffic signal.

Attorney Mraz stated that he was not concerned from a liability standpoint since it was a private road and they wouldn't really want it dedicated until it was built to our standards. As it stands, there is nothing to compel them to upgrade the road surface itself.

FINANCE & GOLF

2016 Proposed Property Tax Levy

Acting Finance Director Todd Dowden presented the 2016 proposed property tax levy. He stated that there are three reasons why they levy taxes and that is for the general fund with general expenses, the general obligation bonds, and the police pension fund. The state divides it between the three counties that we are in as follows: 38% in Cook, 61% in DuPage and 2% in Kane. The beginning of the levy starts with the budget that was approved for May 1st and this is to fund that budget. Once we approve the levy, the counties collect the money and they receive it next year for the 2016/17 budget. The general corporate levy remains the same as last year with \$6,433,094. The police pension levy will increase \$102,000 bringing it to a total of \$1,254,636 (this is to keep us on track for the required funding). The debt service levy will be the same as last year or



**VILLAGE OF BARTLETT
COMMITTEE MINUTES
November 3, 2016**

\$1,680,335. The total increase over last year's extension is approximately \$8,000 or 0.09%. A big part of our levy is the proposed debt service levy and abatements. The 2007 GO bonds for the fire station, the 2009 GO bonds were for refunding for street projects, Village Hall and water meters. The 2012 GO bonds were for the streets project. The \$80,163 that is being abated from the fire station bonds is \$29,880 from the TIF District and \$50,283 from the Fire District that kicks in for the portion that is outside the Village boundary. The second abatement in the amount of \$220,289 is just the remainder to keep the total levy flat. Again, the total levy is the same as last year at \$1,680,335. He went over a history of the EAV and stated that the estimated is \$1,022,397,743 and they are estimating that that will be up about 6.72%. Other communities that have been assessed last year were up about 12% so we are estimating the same. They are estimating about 4% for DuPage County. He spoke about the estimated tax rate for Cook County of which is anticipated to decrease by 11.06 cents. The estimated tax rate for DuPage County is anticipated to drop 2.9 cents. The overall EAV estimate for 2016 assumes that EAV will increase by 6.72%. In DuPage County, the estimate for EAV is an increase of 4%. The estimate for Cook County assumes a 12% increase in EAV (2016 is a tri-annual assessment year).

Trustee Reinke asked if moving forward, they will see increases in the police pension obligations along these lines.

Mr. Dowden stated that they get money from three different areas - the police officers contribute a part of their salary, investment income and property tax levy. He stated that the rate of return last year was only 4.5% and the assumed rate is 7.25%. Since they did not meet that they fell short and that is why they had to pick up a little bit more on the contribution side from the taxes. He stated that they are doing good and right now the new calculation is 77% funded.

Trustee Hopkins asked if they were going to levy any amount for the Northwest Mosquito Abatement District.

Mr. Dowden stated that the figures he presented did not take that into account.

Attorney Mraz stated that this was a previous discussion regarding the Cook County portion of the Village is double taxed in the sense that they pay taxes to the Northwest Mosquito Abatement District. Although it is not levied separately, it is part of the budget, and what was in the budget was roughly \$72,000 to pay Clarke for services they provide in DuPage County. He wrote a memo relative to the statute, relative to the abatement of taxes. The statute shows that you would levy an additional \$44,085. There are 8,300 taxpayers in DuPage County and 5,785 in Cook. The statute says that they shall abate taxes. He has met with the Cook County Clerk's office and the problem is that, practically speaking, they can't do it. They would have to abate on a pin by pin basis and their program does not allow for this calculation. They have a 40-year-old



**VILLAGE OF BARTLETT
COMMITTEE MINUTES
November 3, 2016**

mainframe and are in the process of upgrading their computer system. The most that they have ever processed for an abatement in 2004, the Chicago Housing Authority. They talked about rebates from the Village. This would be a burden on the Village and they would need manpower to address those issues. He did not advise staff to add the additional \$44,085 to the levy. He was reluctant to write a check to the Northwest Mosquito Abatement District for \$44,085 in the expectation that the taxpayers will not see it. If there is an abatement, there will not see a check to the taxpayers. Apparently, it will show on a tax bill, but would show zero dollars. It is not a good solution. The alternative is to process some kind of rebate from the Village.

Trustee Hopkins stated that he thought they needed to do something because right now we are in violation of the Illinois Statute and they need to address this issue. It starts with writing a check to Northwest Mosquito Abatement District and the burden is on them.

President Wallace stated that before they do that he would like to know if the entire Board supports this. He has heard that other Board members are not behind this. It can't just be one Board member wanting to do this. He suggested them doing a straw pull before they direct anyone to change the abatement.

Trustee Hopkins asked if he interpreted this as being in violation.

Attorney Mraz stated "no", he didn't think it was a violation. He thought there was an argument that they are in violation. He did not feel that they were in violation but it sets up a process that we could abide by and it would put the burden on the other taxing bodies. He hated to pay out \$44,000 and not accomplish what he is hoping to see.

President Wallace stated that if we are not in violation then the cost to cure this is potentially going to cost the taxpayers more money than what the actual expense is.

Trustee Hopkins stated that he didn't believe that was accurate at all. It is not our burden, it is on Northwest Mosquito Abatement.

President Wallace stated that the attorney verifies that sending them a check would be futile. He again suggested a straw pull to decide if the majority of the Board wants to continue discussions.

Trustee Reinke asked if there was a way to credit the Cook County tax levy.

Attorney Mraz stated that their district and their boundaries are bigger than the Village of Bartlett in Cook County. Any credit goes district wide and not to the portion of Bartlett. He stated that we could not abate on our tax levy because you cannot abate for half; you must abate for the whole Village and we are in three counties.



**VILLAGE OF BARTLETT
COMMITTEE MINUTES
November 3, 2016**

Trustee Reinke stated that you would then have 5,000 property owners coming to the Village Hall proving that they paid their property tax bill and asking for a check to be cut. He agreed that putting anything in the water bill would be a nightmare.

Attorney Mraz stated that you could do that and perhaps not everyone would come in for the \$5 to \$10.

Trustee Hopkins stated that some businesses are paying hundreds of dollars.

Trustee Reinke stated that he was behind him when it comes to the double taxation issue, but it just sounds like it would be so problematic for the staff. He agreed that it should be the burden of the Mosquito Abatement District. If we send them the \$44,000 and they sit on it and do nothing then what are we going to do?

Attorney Mraz stated that they are looking at two options: Write a check to the Northwest Mosquito Abatement District and trust that the County Clerk can figure out how to get this done or the Village process the rebate of which you would have to factor in the manpower and the cost of doing that.

President Wallace stated that neither one of these has anything to do with our levy right now.

Trustee Deyne asked what the \$44,000 equates to per taxpayer?

President Wallace stated that if you take 5,600÷\$44,000 it comes to about \$8 but that could vary depending upon parcel size. For homeowners it will be between \$5 and \$10 per year and for businesses it may be a couple hundred dollars.

Trustee Hopkins asked if they were going to write the check?

President Wallace stated “no”, that is not decided at Committee meetings.

Trustee Hopkins stated that he will be voting “no” on the levy if that is not included.



**VILLAGE OF BARTLETT
COMMITTEE MINUTES
November 3, 2016**

PUBLIC WORKS

Water Study

Administrator Salmons stated that this is a process that has been going on for several years. Last January, the Board selected a long-term option and it was not DuPage and it was not JAWA – it was Elgin-100%. They made that decision based on contractual negotiations with the then city manager and it was a very positive contract for us. The Board instructed them to get the contract and bring it back. They have spent the last frustrating year trying to do just that. Elgin has new staff and there was incremental additional items that were to be put in the contract that were not there with the original contract or the negotiated contract. These changes were new and the Board did not get to see them and more importantly, not reasonable. It was anything from additional studies that were very lengthy and expensive and we did not believe were our responsibility; minimum usage which we have never had and those things can be very problematic in the future of a 30 year contract. There were a number of those kinds of things and she finally decided that we needed to come back to the Board and look at other options. What has happened during that interim, fortunately, other options have morphed a little bit. We have DuPage that has new numbers and new ideas and are very much in the running and JAWA has reduced the rates, again. There are a lot of pros and cons on each option and she is hoping they can go through it again. A lot of it is information that the Board has seen but they want to highlight the changes in what we believe are two very important remaining options. We now have the consideration of time frames which we did not have last time. She doesn't think that Elgin would turn us off since we still represent some important revenue, but we are supposed to be out of there in 2019. Certainly, an additional element of our consideration is the ability to get the pipes in the ground and turn it on. Having said that upfront, she asked Dr. Burke to tell them what is different.

Dr. Christopher Burke from Christopher B. Burke Engineering stated that they were directed to work with Elgin and there has been a number of things that have transpired. There was originally an agreement that they would not put a surcharge if they purchased 100%. They also talked about fixing the annual rate of increase and that was taken off the table. There were also questions about the minimum. They wanted the Village to agree to always take more and more water which is a slippery slope since we are seeing water conservation measures; and also assess a second point of connection. When we were finalizing the agreement they wanted to make sure where it was and there was a lack of specificity as to where that would be. In order to get that answer, there was going to be an \$80,000 expenditure on behalf of the Village to get that analysis done. It was something that the Village was not interested in. In the middle of this, there was a taste and odor issue that came up from June 13th through mid-July. In order to mitigate the problem they went ahead and started using their wells. Prior to



**VILLAGE OF BARTLETT
COMMITTEE MINUTES
November 3, 2016**

that, we only had one other incident like that in 2013 and prior to that it has been a couple of decades. Their perspective was, it may be an anomaly.

They then began meeting with JAWA. They confirmed their submitted 2015 proposal which was \$5.60/1,000 gallons was still available. They reported that the City of Chicago had not increased the rate in July 2016 and talked about their agreements and where they were with the rate increase. That was the one issue, at the time, that put concern in some of the Board members. In October 2016, there was additional information provided by their executive committee that reduced the Bartlett rate to \$5.40 per 1,000 gallons from a previous \$5.60 per 1,000 gallons and they said that they would finance a portion of the water main improvements that are necessary to hook them up to JAWA. The Village would have to do some internal improvements but the portion of the improvements that brings in their water were going to be financed and added to the bill. This equates to about \$16.9 million.

They have also met with the gentlemen that are here today. Chair and Commissioner Zay met them along with Mr. Spatz and they identified the opportunity to finance the buy-in fee and include that with the water rate. They estimate that to be 30 years at 0% interest. They are consistent with how they handle all of the communities and there is no mixing of groundwater, well water and Lake Michigan water. The 50-50 option would not be an option. Mr. Zay already spoke about the benefits they offer and the relationship they have with the City of Chicago being the largest customer. They also indicated that the buy-in fee would be \$4.80 plus \$0.38 which is financing, and you will see \$5.18 on subsequent charts.

Dr. Burke presented the attached comparison presentation. He stated that it was provided to all three of the water providers and asked for their comments. They wanted to make sure that everyone knew how they got to the numbers that were presented here today. The issue here is that the Board now has two extremely viable, identical options for water and almost identical rates.

Trustee Camerer stated that if they were to pursue a 50/50 Elgin/JAWA split, they would not have to bring in a second connection for Elgin so they would save considerable money with that.

Dr. Burke stated that they would still have that first connection which would be increased and construct one leg of the JAWA line.

President Wallace stated that if the algae bloom comes up again, will we be able to shut off Elgin and go 100% JAWA?

Dr. Burke stated probably not because you can't force all of the water in on one line and pressurize the entire Village system. That is the downside of going 50-50.



**VILLAGE OF BARTLETT
COMMITTEE MINUTES
November 3, 2016**

The Board discussed having a 50-50 water supply and the problems associated with co-mingling and the fact that every resident does not have the same quality water supply.

Administrator Salmons stated that we have an emergency connection with Elgin now and they will be getting another one with Streamwood soon.

The board discussed fluctuations with the cost of construction.

Mr. Zay stated that after 30 years part of their cost, the buy-in cost, goes away. He felt that they were not comparing apples to apples. JAWA also has a buy-in cost if you want to be one of their members. If you are making a long term commitment, be part of an organization, have a say, have a vote. It may cost you a little more upfront but you would be part of our organization and have a right to the water. Wouldn't you want to have a say if rates are changing? There is simple because whatever everyone else is paying into DuPage, is what you are going to pay.

Trustee Camerer stated that one of the problems with JAWA is that they don't have an option to be a member.

Administrator Salmons stated that they have never had the ability to be a full member and have voting rights with JAWA. They knew from the very beginning that they would never have the ability to do that. They had the buy-in fee in place during the first review over a year and half ago and they have subsequently waived the buy-in fee which has no impact on being a member.

Dr. Burke stated that his figures for JAWA did not include the buy-in fee which would have to prorate the \$14 million over 30 years and this would be a minimum of \$0.38 per thousand gallons more than what was presented if they agreed to the 0% financing. He reiterated that after the 30 years the fee would go away and you would have a reduction in the rate.

The Board agreed that they would continue this discussion at the next Committee meeting to allow representation from the other suppliers.

Administrator Salmons clarified that the Village has been open about these discussions over the last three years and they have probably had fifteen Public Hearings and meetings. They have provided the same information, at the same time, to everyone since the beginning.



**VILLAGE OF BARTLETT
COMMITTEE MINUTES
November 3, 2016**

There being no further business to discuss, Trustee Camerer moved to adjourn the Committee of the Whole meeting and that motion was seconded by Trustee Hopkins.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO ADJOURN

AYES: Trustees Camerer, Carbonaro, Deyne, Hopkins, Reinke

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Trustee Arends

MOTION CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

Lorna Gilles
Village Clerk

LG/