

**October 18, 2011  
Village of Sugar Grove  
Regular Board Meeting  
6:00 PM**

President Michels opened the meeting at 6:00 PM and asked that Trustee Geary lead the Pledge. President Michels then asked that the roll be called.

**Present:** President Michels, Trustee Bohler, Trustee Renk, Trustee Johnson, Trustee Montalto, and Trustee Geary.

**Absent:** Trustee Paluch

Quorum Established.

**Also Present:**

Administrator Brent Eichelberger, Finance Director Justin VanVooren, Police Chief Brad Sauer, Attorney Steve Andersson, Community Development Director Richard Young, Clerk Cynthia Galbreath, and Director of Public Works Anthony Speciale.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

None.

**APPOINTMENTS AND PRESENTATIONS**

None.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS SCHEDULED FOR ACTION**

President Michels called for any public comments on items scheduled for action (as read by President Michels) and hearing none, closed this portion of the agenda.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

- a. Approval: Minutes of the October 4, 2011 Meeting
- b. Approval: Vouchers
- c. Approval: Treasurer's Report
- d. Proclamation: Pro Bono Week October 23 through October 29, 2011
- e. Resolution: Authorizing Entering into a Contract Extension with Waste Management

Trustee Johnson moved **to approve the consent agenda as presented**. Trustee Renk seconded the motion. President Michels then called for a roll call vote.

AYE:	Bohler	NAY:	None	ABSENT:	Paluch
	Renk				
	Geary				
	Johnson				
	Montalto				

Motion Carried.

President Michels asked that staff ask if the toters could be delivered earlier than next August. Finance Director Justin VanVooren stated he will check.

**GENERAL BUSINESS**

**Acknowledgement and Acceptance of the FY10-11 Comprehensive Annual Finance Report**

Ms. Jamie Wilkey of Lautherbach & Amend, LLP, thanked the Board for having her and thanked Finance Director Justin VanVooren and his staff for their professionalism and assistance during the audit process. She then stated that the Village received an unqualified opinion. Ms. Wilkey gave a brief presentation of and highlighted the Management Analysis and the Statistical sections of the CAFR. The Board briefly discussed the report and thanked stff for being so thorough and budget conscious.

Trustee Johnson moved **Acknowledge Receipt of the FY10-11 CAFR**. Trustee Renk seconded the motion. Hearing no discussion President Michels called for a roll call vote.

AYE:	Renk	NAY:	None	ABSENT:	Paluch
	Bohler				
	Johnson				
	Geary				
	Montalto				

Motion Carried.

**Discussion – Kaneland Impact Fee Intergovernmental Agreement**

The Board discussed the Draft Kaneland Impact Fee Agreement. They stated that they were glad to see that there are No floor values for Capital Impact Fees, No fees for age-restricted housing, No Transition Fees and the Cash-in-Lieu of Land Dedication value of \$80,000 per improved acre has a way that it can be amended based on an appraisal.

The following items were further discussed;

Term. The original IGA was for 3 years. The current IGA is for 1 year. The draft is for 5 years. The IGA terms would cover the full typical 20-year length of any annexation agreement signed under its terms. The Board did not reach a consensus on length of the IGA. It is recognized that one year would be to short but five years seems to long, even though

Capital Impact Fee Implementation Percentage. The original IGA was at 100%. The current IGA is at 60%. The draft is at 100%. The Board would like to see the 60% level maintained.

Capital Impact Fee Ceiling Values. The original IGA was at \$6,000/\$2,500/\$1,200 for detached single family/attached single family/multiple family units. The current IGA is at \$3,600/\$1,500/\$720 (60% of the original). The draft is at \$6,000/\$2,500/\$1,200. The majority of Board members expressed concern with the ceiling at \$6,000. The current economy is hard pressed to support these types of fees and the developers will ask for reductions. The only fees left to reduce are Village fees. The Village has always been mindful of the needs of the school district however needs to remember that all entities

including the Village are in need these days. The opinion of most was that the Village needed to be responsible to itself and it's residents and business. President Michels asked that the Boar keep in mind that in the past everyone paid and that the resounding words were to make development pay for itself.

Trustees Bohler and Montalto expressed concern with the empty homes that are in the Village currently. Having people move in those homes would be great for the Village as well. They suggested that the Board have a discussion in the future regarding this. It was also discussed that there are a lot of empty buildable lots that need to be built on, and nothing new should be annexed until these were lowered and that the Board should concentrate on infill rather than growth.

Cash-in-Lieu of Land Dedication Payment Calculations. The original, current and draft IGA's all use students per school of 600, 900 & 1,500 and acres per school of 15, 35 & 80 for elementary, middle and high schools respectively. There is no specific documentation available to justify these levels. Other sources indicate a wide variance for these factors.

The Village Board discussed the options that they have regarding the IGA, 1) Support the draft proposed IGA extension as presented 2) Request that further changes to the draft proposed IGA be made and 3) Let the IGA expire without extension. As it is projected that annexation / building permit growth will not be an issue within the next 3 – 5 years the Board was divided on the need to enter into a new agreement that would tie their hands for a long period of time.

Mr. Jeff Schuler, Kaneland School District, asked that Board to remember that the original intent of this IGA was to keep the eight municipalities within the district on an even playing field when dealing with developers and to not place a burden on an one towns residents for increased districts costs.

President Michels asked if the Board would be willing to table the item and see what the Village of Elburn negotiates with a developer they are currently working with. The trustees stated that they would be okay with again discussing the IGA at a later date.

### **Discussion – Light Industrial Zoning**

Community Development Director Richard Young explained that what staff was looking for in this discussion is what the Board feels would correct uses for a light industrial zoning classification. He stated that typically in a Light Industrial Districts uses include; office and administrative buildings, corporate headquarter, office parks and planned developments, retail and wholesale display rooms, research laboratories, contractor's offices and shops, union halls, training facilities, indoor equipment and machinery sales and service operations, indoor sports facilities and limited indoor production and storage facilities. More intense uses would be called out as special uses and thereby must be approved by the Village Board following a public hearing before the Plan Commission.

The Board discussed proposed uses and asked staff if was necessary to also include a section on buffering. Staff answered that the code is quite clear on buffering and landscaping requirements so including in light industrial is not needed. Administrator Eichelberger stated that the Board should also keep in mind that as there is a possibility of annexing an area that would be light industrial and perhaps a rezoning the Board should consider if the use is acceptable with PUD approval should the annexation agreement expire (generally 20 years).

President Michels asked that the Board review the list and send their input to Director Young.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

Administrator Eichelberger stated that the Village of Montgomery has requested that Sugar Grove supports their application for a TIGER grant for rail improvements. The rail improvements will help the flow of traffic by adding additional rail lines. The Board stated that they supported the application and asked staff to send a letter indicating their support.

### **REPORTS**

Trustee Johnson gave a Chamber of Commerce and Kaneland Sports Booster update.

Trustee Geary reminded drivers to beware as deer are out and about.

Administrator Eichelberger stated that there was some concern with the recent roadwork that residents would again alter their curbs. Some residents have done this in the past as they don't like the "bump" however it adversely then affects the flow of storm water and therefore Village roadways. The Board stated that they had no problem with the residents being informed that they need to restore curbs if they alter them and that if they don't the Village will restore them and the resident billed. The resident should also be informed as to why, that it alters the flow of storm water.

Trustee Montalto suggested that staff attend an upcoming seminar regarding sharing/consolidating police departments on November 29<sup>th</sup>.

President Michels stated that the Chamber Luncheon speaker did a great job of explaining how the Fox Valley Career center operates, teaches and how they have worked to help enhance the community

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

### **Adjournment**

As there was no further business meeting was adjourned at 8:05 pm.

Committee of the Whole  
October 4, 2011  
6:00 P.M.

President Michels opened the meeting then asked that the roll be called.

**Present:** President Michels, Trustee Paluch, Trustee Renk, Trustee Johnson, Trustee Montalto, and Trustee Geary.

**Absent:** Trustee Bohler

Quorum Established.

**Also Present:**

Administrator Brent Eichelberger, Finance Director Justin VanVooren, Police Chief Brad Sauer, Attorney Steve Andersson, Community Development Director Richard Young, Clerk Cynthia Galbreath, and Director of Public Works Anthony Speciale.

Public Comment

None.

**Discussion: Refuse Contract Renewal**

The current Waste Management contract will expire on July 31, 2012. Waste Management (WM) presented an extension as follows:

- Keep the rate the same through July 31, 2013. At that time, the rate would increase between 3% and 5% based on the CPI for the Chicago-Gary-Kenosha, IL-IN-WI area (as included in the current contract).
- WM will provide 96 gallon refuse carts (64 gallon for seniors, upon request to WM) as of August 1, 2012 for all residents in Sugar Grove (included in the rate above). Residents would continue to have the 64 gallon recycling carts.
- Waste Management will provide 3 solar power refuse compactors and companion recycle bins (see attachment for more information) to be placed throughout the community at the Village's discretion.
- Waste Management would continue to provide unlimited refuse, recycling, and yard waste.
- Waste Management would continue to provide street sweeping services 8 times per year.
- Waste Management would continue to provide port-o-lets, sinks, and various size refuse containers for the Corn Boil.

Staff requested information regarding the availability of a senior rate for the Village. Although a senior rate is available, the Village would need to increase the cost to other users to cover the difference. Staff recommends that the rate be the same throughout the community.

Trustee Paluch stated that he has been asked by seniors for a discount. It was explained the cost incurred are still the same whether there is a small amount of garbage or more, the truck and the personnel still have to stop. Also everyone is struggling financially to keep up these days.

Trustee Montalto asked if the 96 gallon container is larger in circumference or is it just taller. Waste Management representative Matt Hernandez stated it is taller.

The Board approved of this item moving forward for approval.

#### Discussion: TIF

Administrator Eichelberger stated that following the August 16, 2011 Public Hearing for the then proposed TIF District the Board directed staff to cease to pursue that TIF and explore an alternative that would address many of the concerns raised with the original proposed TIF. The primary concern was the size of the proposed TIF. The length of time of the TIF was also a concern. Both of these concerns, and others, stemmed from fundamental concerns regarding all of the taxpaying entities ability to fund their operations in the years while the TIF would be in effect.

Follow-up meetings were held with the Kaneland School District and the Sugar Grove Fire District (SGFD) as they are the agencies with the most potential impact from a TIF. Staff has scheduled meeting with the other entities.

Staff currently recommends that the Village pursue two separate TIF's. The two TIF's would center on the focus areas for development and eliminate the need to include acreage purely for contiguity purposes. This would address the main concern with the prior TIF by reducing the size by almost 50%. Further refinement of the areas could result in an even greater reduction in size.

Proposed TIF #1 would not involve any annexation or rezoning. As drafted, TIF #2 would involve annexation and rezoning. By its location and size, TIF #1 significantly addresses the fundamental concerns raised.

There was some discussion by the Board regarding uses, staff reminded the Board that this is an industrial TIF and if in the future an area was designated as retail it would have to be removed from the TIF. Director Speciale stated that although there are businesses in the TIF that could benefit, this is a good thing as if you lose it a company because of things like that can get the services they need, such as high speed internet, they will leave.

President Michels asked the Board for their opinion on the following areas that are currently shown as within the TIF boundaries.

#### Aurora Airport 91 Acres

President Michels stated that he felt this acreage should be removed as this area is eligible for grant and federal funds and the Village does not receive much benefit from the hangers (in the way of property tax) anyway.

Trustee Johnson and Trustee Paluck could go either way, that at some time it may be designated for another use.

Trustee Montalto agreed that the 91 acres should be removed.

The Board discussed TIF's in general and noted that many communities are enacting TIF's. The discussion included the value of a TIF to a developer and how not having one in an such as this that needs infrastructure could very well put the Village behind when development picks up.

Trustee Geary asked about entering into an IGA with the other taxing bodies for developable funds similar to a TIF. This was briefly discussed but it is noted that a TIF is a known item to developers and is statutrarily bindable and is also marketable, unlike an IGA.

64 & 19 acre parcels

The Board discussed these and felt that perhaps the 19 acre parcel was to wet to build on and it may be better left out, the 64 acre parcel may not all be buildable but it has rail access so it should be left in.

The Board decided to move forward on TIF# 1 as presented, knowing that as they move forward they can remove areas if they so determine.

**Discussion: Water Meter Replacement Program**

Staff explained that there were 4,120 meters installed between 2001 and 2011. Each of these meters includes a 10 year warranty. When tis item was first brought to the Board the original recommendation was to replace all meters. Upon further review, staff is now recommending the replacement of the approximately 1,100 faulty water meters which are under warranty. The remaining meters would be replaced over time when they malfunction or cease operation, or when the warranty is up.

Staff further recommends the fixed point reading system. As meters are replaced, the new meters would be installed with an updated transponder with the ability to take advantage of the fixed point reading system. Until all meters are replaced, a dual reading system would be utilized.

Replacing the meters over time will allow the Village to utilize current resources, including the water meter program fee, to pay for these costs and save the additional interest cost of issuing bonds. It is anticipated that all water meters would be replaced and converted to fixed point read within five years.

The Board discussed the meter replacement program and agrees that it is time to move forward. Staff was directed to do further research on the meters and to present as soon as possible a replacement program.

**Discussion: 2011 Round Table**

The Board discussed the event and stated that they would like to host it once again this year. This year they would like the event to be an ice cream social.

**Discussion: Light Industrial Zoning**

Not discussed – tabled.

**Closed Session: Land Acquisition, Personnel, Litigation**

Trustee Geary moved to **Adjourn to Closed Session to discuss Personnel, Land Acquisition and Litigation, as Per the Exceptions to the Open Meetings Act, taking no action and to adjourn therefrom.** Trustee Johnson seconded the motion. President Michels then called for a roll call vote.

AYE:	Geary	NAY:	None	ABSENT:	Bohler
	Renk				
	Paluch				
	Johnson				
	Montalto				

Motion Carried.

Adjournment