

**November 19, 2019**  
**Board Meeting**  
**Held in the Board Room**  
**10 S. Municipal Drive, Sugar Grove Illinois**  
**6:00 PM**

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

**Physically Present:** President Michels, Trustee Walter, Trustee Lendi, Trustee Herron, Trustee Konen, Trustee Koch, Trustee Montalto

**Quorum Established.**

**Remote Attendance:** None.

**Also Present:**

Administrator Eichelberger, Attorney Wilson, Clerk Galbreath, Community Development Director Magdziarz, Public Works Deputy Director Merkel, PW Director Speciale Finance Director Anastasia, Management Analysts Murphy, Chief of Police Rollins, Attorney Julian, Engineer Piotrowski

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**2019 Tax Levy**

President Michels opened the Public Hearings for 2019 Tax and called for any public comments. Hearing none President Michels then closed the public hearings at 6:02.

**APPOINTMENTS AND PRESENTATIONS**

None.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

President Michels read the agenda items and then called for comments on those items on the agenda.

Audience member A expressed concerns with adding a data center as a use to the zoning ordinance.

Audience member B spoke about taxing district and the amount in Sugar Grove.

Audience member C expressed concerns with adding a data center as a use to the zoning ordinance.

Administrator Eichelberger explained why the zoning amendment was being proposed and clarified that at this time no rezoning's are proposed.

Audience member D, spoke to why ComEd get calls regarding development

Hearing no further comments President Michels closed this portion of the agenda.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

- a. Approval: Minutes of the November 5, 2019 Meeting
- b. Approval: Vouchers
- c. Approval: Treasurer's Report

- d. Ordinance: Declaring Surplus
- e. Ordinance: Establishing a Public Hearing Date for TIF II Amendment

Trustee Lendi **moved to Approve the Consent Agenda with the removal of item a.** Trustee Herron seconded the motion. President Michels then called for a roll call vote.

AYE:	Konen	NAY:	None	ABSENT:	None
	Herron				
	Lendi				
	Koch				
	Walter				
	Montalto				

**Motion Carried.**

**Approval Minutes of the November 5, 2019 Meeting**

Trustee Lendi asked that the roll call reflect that Trustee Konen voted Nay and Trustee Walter was absent on the vote taken for the Approval of the Tax Levy. Trustee Herron **moved Approve the November 5, 2019 Minutes as amended.** Trustee Koch seconded the motion. **President Michels then called for roll call.**

AYE:	Konen	NAY:		None	ABSENT:	None
	Herron					
	Lendi					
	Koch					
	Montalto					
	Walter					

**Motion Carried**

**GENERAL BUSINESS**

None.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**Data Centers as a Permitted Use**

The following information was presented to the Village Board.

The Illinois Department of Commerce & Economic Opportunity regularly notifies communities of potential development opportunities. Village staff reviews the opportunities and submits potential sites when appropriate. Through this process Sugar Grove was recently a finalist in the site selection process for a data center. While the Village was not selected, the selection process revealed a number of shortcomings. Staff is asking that the Village Board consider addressing these shortcomings in order to be able attract this use in the future.

The site selection team indicated they will likely be seeking a second site in 9-12 months and would consider Sugar Grove again.

PLEASE NOTE: These minutes are not a word-for-word transcription of the statements made at the meeting, nor intended to be a comprehensive review of all discussions. They are intended to make an official record of the actions taken by the Village Board, and to include some description of discussion items. Written reports for items on the agenda and the complete audio for the meeting can be viewed on the web agenda page.

The site selection team identified two primary concerns with Sugar Grove. 1) The time and uncertainty of both the rezoning process and water system improvements were stated as creating unacceptable risk. 2) The cost of sanitary sewer system improvements, road extensions and land prices were also cited.

Given the exponential growth in this use for the foreseeable future, and, as we have learned, that Sugar Grove possesses essential infrastructure for this type of use, it is likely the Village will receive attention in the future by this and other companies that provide and/or operate this type of facility. Staff's research indicates that a data center could fit well with community expectations.

If the Board concurs, Village staff will initiate a process to explore amending the Zoning Ordinance to add data centers as a permitted use in one or more of the industrial zoning districts and a process to evaluate water system readiness. Water system readiness evaluation will require consultation with the Village Engineer. Staff could start that process and present the Board with a Professional Services Agreement should any major engineering efforts be recommended.

The Board discussed the concept of a data center. The Crown Property was used an example as it is a suitable site for this type of development. The access to natural gas, electricity, dark fiber, and transportation were noted.

Staff stated that if the Crown Property was considered a desirable site the addition of a data center as an allowable use could be achieved 2 ways, annexation agreement amendment or updating the zoning ordinance to make data centers either an allowable use or a special use within a specific zoning class. Updating the zoning ordinance does not change the procedures that need to be followed in a request for rezoning. Other items such as parking, number of employees, cooling needs were discussed. Administrator Eichelberger reminded the Board that the focus should be on data centers and not specific parcel zoning. Staff is looking only to see if the Board is favor of the concept of data centers.

The Board directed staff to begin the process of exploration of costs for water expansion and do more research on data centers and bring back recommendations for consideration.

### **Kane County Bike Share Program**

The following information was presented to the Village Board.

The Village Board approved a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Kane County Department of Transportation (KDOT) for a proposed Bike Sharing Program. The MOU is not legally or financially binding.

Kane County had awarded the vendor contract for the Bike Share Program to Koloni. Kane County is now asking its municipal partners to consider the next steps of the program and, if participating, declare their intent by January 20, 2020.

The Kane County Bike Share Program will utilize a hybrid system that allows for more flexibility as to where bikes can be returned. Hybrid stations are created using existing bike rack infrastructure or by installing new racks (see attached). The hybrid system uses a virtual boundary to determine rental zones and to monitor returns. Koloni staff will operate and oversee the fleet on a full-time basis and will return bikes to their home stations within 24 hours.

Participating Local Public Agencies will be responsible for all financial obligations for the stations they purchase. KDOT will not own or operate any stations. The estimated annual cost per bike is

PLEASE NOTE: These minutes are not a word-for-word transcription of the statements made at the meeting, nor intended to be a comprehensive review of all discussions. They are intended to make an official record of the actions taken by the Village Board, and to include some description of discussion items. Written reports for items on the agenda and the complete audio for the meeting can be viewed on the web agenda page.

\$1,500. Bikes are usually purchased in sets of two with a four-bike station being the norm. E-bikes may also be purchased. The cost of an e-bike is typically \$1,300 more per year, totaling \$2,800 annually. Contracts with Koloni for the bike share program will be two years in length with a third-year option. KDOT will subsidize some costs of the program for all who participate in the initial phase of development.

Staff suggests that Sugar Grove would be best served by the bike share program, Village staff proposes the Bliss Woods Forest Preserve at the Virgil Gilman Trail (see attached). The Bliss Woods Forest Preserve is owned and operated by the Forest Preserve District of Kane County. Per KDOT, the Forest Preserve District is planning to participate in the program.

Staff recommends that the Village encourage the Forest Preserve to locate a station at Bliss Woods and the Village offer to contribute up to 25% of the cost for the initial two-year contract. The Village could also encourage the Sugar Grove Park District and Township to similarly participate. The Board concurred with staff's recommendation.

### **Blackberry Creek Bike/Pedestrian Bridge**

The preliminary design report for the Blackberry Bike / Pedestrian Bridge Crossing determined that a crossing was viable. The bridge would be located on Forest Preserve District of Kane County (FPDKC), property with access through Sugar Grove Park District (SGPD), property.

The Village has applied to several grant programs over the past few years without success. Project readiness is a factor in some grant programs. To improve project readiness, the Village, SGPD, Sugar Grove Township, and the FPDKC funded Phase I Engineering. The Phase I report is currently at IDOT for review.

With Phase I Engineering virtually completed, the Village and the partner agencies should determine the next step.

Six potential grant programs for the project have been evaluated. Three were identified as good fits for the project, the Recreational Trail Program (RTP), Bike Path Program (BPP), and Illinois Transportation Enhancement Program (ITEP). RTP provides an 80% match up to \$200,000, BPP is 50% / \$200,000, and ITEP is 80% / \$2,000,000.

Given the funding limits of the programs, staff believes that ITEP is the only practical opportunity for grant funding.

EI has provided a Phase II Engineering proposal at cost of about \$150,000. The preliminary estimated cost of construction is \$843,700. The total estimated cost to complete the project is \$993,700.

A successful ITEP grant could pay up to \$794,960 leaving a local share of \$198,740. The Village unsuccessfully applied for an ITEP grant for the project in 2008, 2017 and 2019. The next grant application date is expected to be in late summer/fall of 2020.

With the pending completion of Phase I Engineering a future application will receive readiness points. The project would receive additional points if Phase II Engineering is in progress, however starting Phase II Engineering will remove the \$150,000 cost from grant eligibility.

PLEASE NOTE: These minutes are not a word-for-word transcription of the statements made at the meeting, nor intended to be a comprehensive review of all discussions. They are intended to make an official record of the actions taken by the Village Board, and to include some description of discussion items. Written reports for items on the agenda and the complete audio for the meeting can be viewed on the web agenda page.

If all four agencies equally share in all costs going forward the cost for each will be about \$50,000 if Phase II Engineering is part of a grant. If Phase II Engineering is funded 100% locally, each agencies share will be about \$87,000.

There is no guarantee that a grant will be received with or without Phase II Engineering be funded locally. The Village and other agencies are faced with several options. Staff recommends a meeting with the other agencies to determine the best course. Prior to such a meeting the Village Board should provide direction as to the Villages position on several items.

- Should the project continue to be pursued?
- Should a grant(s) application be submitted? To which programs?
- Should Phase II Engineering be started prior to any grant application?
- Should the Village continue to be the lead agency?

The Board discussed the bridge and felt that Phase II should not be completed at this time. Staff should meet with the partner agencies to find if they feel the funding should be sought through a grant and who should be the lead agency.

## **REPORTS**

### **Staff**

The Board talked again about the tax levy and the need to continue to provide the core services. The cost of items such as roadway salt and Police Pension fund rise as do other costs that the Village must pay for. The taxes and the entities they are appropriated to township and county wide were also discussed. The desire to attract businesses to offset some taxes was also discussed along with how the EDC is working toward that goal. Building permit fees and fees from Fox Metro and the County road impact were discussed and the only item within the Village's ability to negotiate with a proposed developer is building permit and other internal fees.

### **Trustee**

Trustee Herron asked about Hankes Road Bridge as it is also getting ripples. Staff reiterated that the Bridge is a state/township responsibility and that the state performed the repairs.

Trustee Montalto encouraged people to attend paramount function. He further stated that grooving in the Grove may have to scale back productions as Fox Valley Park District is selling their stage. Trustee Konen stated that the committee is need of a fund-raising chairperson.

President Michels sated he had the pleasure of being a Judge at the WCC Chili Cook Off. He also stated that the Village has been informed that Route 47 from Finley Rd to Baseline should be repaved next year and that ramps at 88 and 47 should be open mind December

## **AIRPORT REPORT**

No Report

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

An Audience member thanked trustee Konen for speaking out against higher taxes.

Representative Lauren Underwood staff person spoke to what the Representative can help constituents with.

An audience member asked about the flow of information to the Village Board and Public.

PLEASE NOTE: These minutes are not a word-for-word transcription of the statements made at the meeting, nor intended to be a comprehensive review of all discussions. They are intended to make an official record of the actions taken by the Village Board, and to include some description of discussion items. Written reports for items on the agenda and the complete audio for the meeting can be viewed on the web agenda page.

**Closed Session**

Trustee Montalto moved **Adjourn to Closed Session to Discuss Personnel and to Adjourn therefrom taking no action as per the exception to the Open Meeting Act ( Appointment, Employment, Compensation, Discipline, Performance, or Dismissal of Personnel [5 ILCS 120/2(c)(1)]**). Trustee Herron seconded the motion. **President Michels then called for roll call.**

AYE:	Konen	NAY:		None	ABSENT:	None
	Herron					
	Lendi					
	Koch					
	Montalto					
	Walter					

**Motion Carried**

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion to adjourn made by Trustee Herron and seconded by Trustee Koch. Meeting was adjourned at 8:04 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE: These minutes are not a word-for-word transcription of the statements made at the meeting, nor intended to be a comprehensive review of all discussions. They are intended to make an official record of the actions taken by the Village Board, and to include some description of discussion items. Written reports for items on the agenda and the complete audio for the meeting can be viewed on the web agenda page.