

VILLAGE OF OAK LAWN
PUBLIC WORKS/WATER WORKS COMMITTEE

Tuesday, January 21, 2021

Village Hall Auditorium 9446 Raymond Avenue Oak Lawn Illinois 60453

MEETING MINUTES #2021-01

I. ROLL CALL Meeting called to order at 6:00 p.m.

Chairman: Alex G. Olejniczak

Members: Trustee Paul Mallo
Trustee Alex G. Olejniczak
Trustee William R. Stalker

Staff: William Palmer, Village Manager
Jeff Sebek, Public Works Director
William Meyer, Public Works Assistant Director
Brian Towne, Assistant Village Manager
Paul O'Grady, Village Attorney
Deanne Adasiak, Recording Secretary

Also in attendance: Trustee Terry Vorderer

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES #2020-4 DATED OCTOBER 27, 2021

A motion to approve the Meeting Minutes of October 27, 2021 #2021-4 was made by Member Stalker and seconded by Member Mallo.

Roll call: Stalker, yes; Olejniczak, yes; Mallo, yes.

Motion to approve passes: 3-0-0.

A motion was made by Member Stalker to advance the Agenda to start with Old Business – discussion on Oak Lawn Lake. The motion was seconded by Member Mallo.

Voice vote: All in favor, aye; All opposed, none.

Motion passes.

III. DISCUSSION ON THE FOLLOWING TOPICS

A.) Old Business – Oak Lawn Lake

Mr. Lee Fell, Civil Engineering Design, Christopher B. Burke Engineering, Ltd., 9575 W. Higgins Road, Suite 600, Rosemont, IL.

Mr. John LaPaglia, Project Manager, Christopher B. Burke Engineering, Ltd., 9575 W. Higgins Road, Suite 600, Rosemont, IL

Mr. Fell referenced the last Public Works meeting where he and Jed Anderson presented an update on Oak Lawn Lake. He pointed out that the Board had given direction to meet with goose harassment companies. Mr. Fell said they met with two companies: Wild Goose Chase and Rescue Me Goose Chasing. He said Wild Goose Chase is out of Chicago Ridge and Rescue Me Goose Chasing is out of Orland Park. Mr. Fell said the Board packet includes proposed solutions by both companies. He noted Wild Goose Chase recommended options include a Border collie dog and dog handler to remove the Canadian geese. In addition to the dog, they would also provide services in egg deprivation in the nest and follow the required State guidelines (a permit is required for egg deprivation). Mr. Fell said that they also suggested applying Flight Control Plus seed application and would also provide a handheld laser that the Village could purchase. Mr. Fell said the total package cost for Wild Goose Chase is \$12,000. He explained it is a menu of options available for geese control. Mr. Fell said Rescue Me Goose Chasing provided a cost for the Flight Control application and would also provide goose harassment using their dogs (Australian Shepherds). He said the cost by Rescue Me for those two options is approximately \$6,000.

Mr. Fell said both companies indicated that the geese can be harassed this year but it does not mean that they will never come back. He pointed out that Oak Lawn Lake is a large body of water and for Chicago and the surrounding suburbs there is not much for the geese to choose from so it becomes a long term issue. Mr. Fell said that they did call for references and that the references are listed in the packet. He also mentioned the customer serviced by both Wild Goose Chase and Rescue Me. Mr. Fell said based on the references and discussions with Village staff, if the Village chooses to spend funds on the geese problems they recommend Wild Goose Chase. Mr. Fell said their recommendation is to only do the Flight Control application and to test out the use of dogs to scare the geese. Member Stalker asked if the dogs actually go in the water. Mr. Fell responded that they do. Mr. Fell said that service is approximately \$900 over a 6-month period. He said with the application and the dog tactic it would be a combined total of \$8,000 for 1 year. Member Olejniczak said there is no guarantee. Mr. Fell responded that they might guarantee that they will take care of the problem for *right now* but that the geese may be back in a year or two. Mr. Fell pointed out that when he walked the perimeter of Oak Lawn Lake he noticed geese in a corner yard. He said he is not sure if a resident is feeding the geese but that he witnessed the geese "chowing down" in that area. Mr. Meyer said that Lee is referring to the corner house at 96th & West Shore Drive.

Member Mallo referenced the phone conversations in the paperwork that Jeff had with the geese harassment companies. Member Mallo said the paperwork for Rescue Me shows two references including a church without water around it and a large property next to Calumet Country Club that has a lot of water. Member Mallo said it appears that those referenced

companies have been using Rescue Me annually since at least 2013. Member Mallo commented that because of having a huge lake next to a golf course he understands why the geese in that area would be problematic for the last 7 years. Mr. Fell reiterated that both companies were up front in pointing out that there will be some type of maintenance required as the geese will most likely return. Member Mallo said it does appear that the dogs are very successful. He said Wild Goose has more references. Mr. Fell said he feels that Wild Goose is a local company and appear to be more professional. He pointed out that their references include three large visible areas including Chicago Botanic Gardens and the Chicago Bears Club. Member Olejniczak asked Member Mallo how he would like to proceed. Member Mallo said he would like to proceed with staff's recommendation as listed on page 2 of the paperwork.

Member Stalker said he is not opposed to the recommendation but he feels that we have to be aware that this likely could become a 3 year program. Mr. Fell commented that if both companies were here they would agree with Member Stalker's comments.

A motion was made by Member Mallo to move forward with staff recommendation of the application of Flight Control Plus and the use of trained dogs by Wild Goose Chase for a total cost of \$7,885.00. The motion was seconded by Member Stalker.

Roll call: Mallo, yes; Olejniczak, yes; Stalker, yes.

Motion passes: 3-0-0.

B.) 2021 Street and Alley Program

Mr. Lee Fell, Civil Engineering Design, Christopher B. Burke Engineering, Ltd., 9575 W. Higgins Road, Suite 600, Rosemont, IL.

Mr. John LaPaglia, Project Manager, Christopher B. Burke Engineering, Ltd., 9575 W. Higgins Road, Suite 600, Rosemont, IL

Mr. LaPaglia provided the pavement study status report. Mr. LaPaglia explained that the proposed report is currently in a draft phase. He said in November 2020 he drove the 164 center line miles of streets that the Village maintains. He said this did not include State or Cook County roadways. Mr. LaPaglia said no alleys or parking lots were evaluated at this time as that will be done separately in the near future.

Mr. LaPaglia said he literally did a visual inspection of all the streets and rated the streets on a scale from 10 (best) to 1 (worst). Mr. LaPaglia said this was also done back in 2013. He explained that they updated the analysis this past November in order to provide a full pavement condition report. Mr. LaPaglia showed a slide of the roadway conditions of different streets showing three Pavement Condition Index (PCI): PCI 3, PCI 6, and PCI 10. Member Mallo commented that he loved the larger map showing the pavement condition index of all the streets.

Mr. LaPaglia referenced the slide that shows the percentages of PCI ratings on the linear feet of Oak Lawn streets. He said the breakdown includes PCI 4 – 4%; PCI 5 – 16%; PCI 6 – 26%; PCI 7 – 26%; PCI 8 – 18%; PCI 9 – 6% and PCI 10 – 3%. Mr. LaPaglia explained that based on road segment ratings a PCI 5 street signifies an aging but a structurally sound pavement. He said routine maintenance is still necessary to maximize pavement lifespan. Mr. Fell commented that the findings were not surprising. Mr. LaPaglia pointed out that the overall cost of a pavement program of this magnitude averages \$7.135 million annually over 20 years and includes construction, engineering, and maintenance.

Member Olejniczak asked staff what is budgeted for streets. Mr. Meyer replied that Brian Hanigan budgeted \$2.5 million for streets this year. Mr. Meyer explained that he wanted to show the cost of a pavement program over the course of 20 years. Mr. Fell said this study would be a great guide to let the residents know what it takes for a street program. Mr. Fell said ideally this program would focus on the next five years and we can see what we can do based on budget numbers and fiscal constraint and after 5 years we will update and see where we are.

Mr. LaPaglia showed the preliminary 2021 street program list based on PCI ratings. He said that a PCI 3 or less rating is a full reconstruction; PCI 4 and PCI 5 would be full depth resurfacing (remove surface down to the stone); and PCI 7 – PCI 10 would be grind overlay. He said the proposed street list for 2021 includes all PCI 3 streets for full reconstruction with an approximate cost of \$2.6 million for construction and engineering. He said CBBEL recognizes that the Village budgeted \$2.5 million for the street program. Mr. Fell commented that the proposed list includes the worse streets found in town. Mr. Fell said the bids can be set up to meet the budget set at \$2.5 million and then we could hold a few streets over to the following year.

Mr. LaPaglia pointed out the Village's request for a few trial streets to receive Hot-in-Place resurfacing. He said there is a requirement of a minimum of 5.5" of existing asphalt in order to be eligible for Hot-in-Place resurfacing. He said the suggested Hot-in-Place resurfacing pilot program is based on the core information in our records and include 99th Street from Keeler Avenue to Karlov Avenue (+/- linear feet; +/- 6.1" of hot mix asphalt; resurfaced in 2010); *and* Kenneth Avenue from 97th Street to 98th Street (+/- 650 linear feet; +/- 7.0-7.5" of hot mix asphalt; resurfaced in 2014). Member Mallo asked if we know what the PCI ratings are for those streets. Mr. LaPaglia responded that those streets are PCI 8.

Member Olejniczak said he thought staff was pretty confident that we would want to incorporate the Hot-in-Place program into our street program for 2021. Mr. Meyer responded that we do but then the problem is available funds. Mr. Meyer pointed out that we are unable to do routine maintenance on the streets listed for the 2021 street program. He expressed that we want to do more but obviously that would require more money. Member Mallo said the percentage of PCI 8 streets is 18% and he asked if that is where we need to be to use the Hot-in-Place. Mr. Fell responded no. Mr. Fell explained that the Hot-in-Place can be used on any street as long as there is a minimum thickness of 5.5". Mr. Sebek

explained that those specific streets were chosen because CBEL actually had records from recent cores; he explained that instead of doing exploratory cores they knew these streets were suitable for the pilot program. Member Olejniczak asked if we could take the PCI 4's through PCI 6's and bring those streets up to a PCI 10 by using the Hot-in-Place. Mr. Fell responded that as long as we know there is a minimum of 5.5" of existing asphalt the answer is yes. Mr. Fell reiterated that the streets that they saw from the last 10 years that have the minimum thickness of asphalt were the two streets that were mentioned above. He said they can go back to other streets that may fit the category of PCI 5 and PCI 6 but there is no guarantee that when they do the cores that those streets will have that minimum requirement. Member Olejniczak said this year we will take care of the PCI 3 streets and then in 2022 take a look at PCI 4 and see if there are any PCI 4 streets we can salvage.

Member Olejniczak pointed out that part of the larger costs in a complete street reconstruction are curbs. He commented that if we look at the streets from a rating aspect he asked what the cost would be to do cores. Mr. Fell said it would cost approximately \$400 for each street and typically you do about every 500 feet. Member Olejniczak asked what if we take the PCI 4's and the PCI 5's and do the cores. Mr. LaPaglia said the cost to do those cores would be approximately \$70,000. Member Olejniczak said that might be a better way to spend funds to find how much of a layer we have for the Hot-in-Place. Member Stalker suggested starting with the PCI 4's. Mr. Fell asked Member Stalker if he is suggesting that in addition to the PCI 3's this year we proceed and do all the cores of the PCI 4's and PCI 5's to see what could be used for the Hot-in-Place for the second year. Member Olejniczak commented that we do not yet know about federal funding but perhaps there may be grant money that will pop up and if we are ready to go we may be able to use federal funding to incorporate into this year's program. Mr. LaPaglia mentioned that once you core a street and you do not resurface that street, 4-5 years later the core does not change. Mr. Sebek said it will be part of the study that we will have to do anyway especially for forecasting. Mr. Meyer said the plan was to get this information to this Board for recommendations. He said this is a preliminary list based on ratings. He said the plan is to return to the February meeting with a recommended final pavement list.

Member Olejniczak said we know we have to pave the PCI 3's and we know that we have money budgeted for those streets; he suggested that staff aggressively begin to move the bidding forward. He said he would like to start with construction earlier rather than later and to see what we can afford on the backside. He added that he would like to get the cores on the PCI 3's and PCI 4's for the Hot-in-Place program. Member Olejniczak said it would be worthwhile if we can do the Hot-in-Place for some of the PCI 3's or PCI 4's. Member Olejniczak said we need to see how we can use our budgeted funds and get better use out of it. Member Olejniczak asked staff how they would like to proceed. Mr. Meyer responded that with the details tonight that he and Jeff will start the bidding process for the PCI 3's and to do additional cores for the Hot-in-Place and then they can lay out a couple of sets of streets. Mr. Sebek said if the Board agrees with the list of streets then staff will stick with the plan; he added that as far as addressing all the PCI 3's that will be part of the scope of the program. He said the cores will be set up as part of the design phase and then we can consider the Hot-in-Place. Member Olejniczak said we do not need to do a beta of the Hot-in-

Place. Mr. Fell asked if it makes sense to come back with a proposal for the PCI 3 cores and then provide a recommendation based on those cores. He said if it determined that a PCI 3 street does not need a full reconstruction then it will fall into the Hot-in-Place program. He said doing that many cores will take some time but with a goal of April/May they will have the information in the event that federal funding becomes available. Member Olejniczak said he is not only banking on federal funds he wants us to use the funds we budgeted for this year. Member Olejniczak said if we find a PCI 3 street that we do not have to rebuild it will free up funds. He asked if we did not have to rebuild 5 streets how much more money would we have. Mr. LaPaglia replied that a recon rough number is \$151 a square yard. Mr. Fell said off the top of his head he cannot say; Mr. LaPaglia said he spoke to a contractor that does Hot-in-Place based on square yards and it is approximately \$5 per square yard. Member Olejniczak said we do not necessarily have to do the curbs. He asked who makes the decision on doing curbs. He asked why some sides of streets get curbs and some do not. Mr. Fell said typically staff will determine the structural condition of curbs. Mr. Meyer said curbs are only replaced if they are not pitched or if they are in unsafe condition. He said we also have to deal with the ADA's at the intersection and walkways. Member Olejniczak recapped and stated that we have \$2.5 million budgeted and we know there will be work on x-amount of streets; he said staff should not let time get away and should start the bid process to get out in front so that by April we can come up with Phase II.

Mr. Sebek said staff will focus on PCI 3's and carve out streets that may be suitable for Hot-in-Place. He said at the end of this year we will look at PCI 4's and beyond. Member Mallo said once we finish the PCI 3's we can look at the PCI 4's and get those streets started. Mr. Sebek said we might find a large amount of areas suitable for Hot-in-Place and that would be the best case scenario and he suggested a separate contract for Hot-in-Place. Mr. Fell said that would be his recommendation to bid the Hot-in-Place separately. Member Olejniczak asked staff if they have what they need to move forward.

Mr. Fell commented that they will use the list of PCI 3 streets and also cores for PCI 4 - 6 and come back next month with a full pavement study. He said they will also provide the background using a 20 year plan as a recommendation to have as a guide to follow; Mr. Fell said to focus on the first 5 years and as we gather more information we will update as the costs come down because of using the Hot-in-Place. Member Mallo asked if we core the PCI 5 streets this year will it affect or make a difference in 5 years. Mr. Fell said whatever section is cored "today" will remain as good information.

C.) Public Works yard expansion

Village Manager Palmer reported the purchase of 4 of the 5 homes for the Public Works yard expansion. He indicated that no plans exist for the expansion. He explained that the former Manager and the former Public Works Director had the idea to expand the Public Works yard because more space was needed to store equipment. He said the properties were purchased at the appraised value for the homes. Mr. Palmer said that we ran into an issue with the second house from the corner; he explained that the homeowner was asking a lot more for the property above the appraised value. He said at the homeowner's request a second

appraisal was done and that appraisal came back a little higher than the first appraisal. Mr. Palmer said the Village offered the homeowner a fair dollar amount but the homeowner did not believe our appraisal so she scheduled her own appraisal and her appraisal came back higher than both of the Village's appraisals. He said at that point the attorneys became involved and so she then requested a purchase price of \$403,000 for her property. Mr. Palmer said the Village's highest appraisal was \$315,000 for her property. He said the Village offered \$315,000 which was more than the original appraisal of \$290,000 but at that point communication broke down. He mentioned her initial asking price was \$430,000. Mr. Palmer said that the homeowner was advised that the Village would not pay more than the market value for the property. He said that the homeowner communicated through her attorney that she was going to put the house on the market in the spring.

Mr. Palmer said the Village does not have any plans for the expansion project as we were waiting to acquire all the homes so that we can get a footprint of the area in order to get a drawing/concept of the proposed building. He said since the Village purchased the Automotion property, the equipment that was stored at 92nd and Kilpatrick was relocated to the Automotion building. Mr. Palmer commented that the Village intends to sell or redevelop the Automotion property and he commented that although there are other ideas, we need space to store equipment. Mr. Palmer said he recommends that we move forward; he mentioned that Bill and Jeff did get demolition pricing for the homes the Village purchased. He said we are looking for direction on how to proceed; should staff move forward with the demolition process or do we sit on the properties for a while.

Member Stalker said he would suggest starting action especially since the homeowner wants to put the house on the market. He expressed that a buyer might purchase that property at full market value only to find it will be next to a storage yard. He said the only way to keep this moving is to start action. Mr. Palmer said the gas and power have been shut off. Mr. Meyer said he does not have a full demolition proposal but that the demolition company, ECC (Environmental Cleansing Corporation), has demolished other properties in the Village and are working on the proposal. He said the preliminary number is in the range of \$12,000-\$15,000 per property if we give ECC *all* 4 properties to demolish. Mr. Meyer said he did not want to complicate this but he recently had a discussion with Trustee Mallo about the Oak Lawn Baseball Field House. Member Stalker asked Mr. Meyer which building he was referring to; Mr. Meyer replied the facility is on the west side of the property that houses the concession stand and restrooms. Mr. Meyer indicated that Trustee Mallo has had a lot of issues with that building. Mr. Meyer explained that he just learned that the Village owns the building; Mr. Meyer said if we engage ECC with additional properties our numbers may drop. He said if we have the approval to move forward he can obtain a group rate; he mentioned that ECC will obtain all the EPA demolition permits. Mr. Meyer said water and sewer have been disconnected but there may be an additional cost from Nicor but that cost will be minimal.

Member Stalker asked Member Mallo about the issues with the facility at the Oak Lawn baseball field. Member Mallo responded that the building was built in 1954 and it is falling down; he said there are cracks in the building, mold, and at some point there was a water leak inside the walls. Member Mallo expressed that the facility is in bad shape. Member Stalker

asked about future plans. Member Mallo said the plans are to knock down the existing building and rebuild a facility to include a second story with batting cages and they would also have a concession area and restrooms on the first floor. Member Mallo said the building has to come down as he feels that it is a hazard. Member Stalker asked Member Mallo if he is expecting the Village to take the building down and if Oak Lawn Baseball will take it from that point. Member Mallo responded yes. Member Mallo said that Oak Lawn Baseball is waiting to hear back from the Illinois Department of Natural Resources about a grant and they would also fundraise in order to help fund a new facility. Member Stalker asked staff what is the responsible thing to do for this problem. Member Stalker expressed that he does not want to disappoint the Little League as he wants to do what is right but he needs to know what would normally occur. Mr. Meyer said this is a "rare case". He explained that Trustee Mallo had shared this information with staff. He said Oak Lawn Baseball leases with the Village for \$1.00 per year. Member Mallo commented that the annual \$1.00 lease has been established since 1954. Mr. Meyer said the question was raised because of the building issues that include exploding pipes. Mr. Meyer said the water has been turned off. He said he needs direction so that he can have the other utilities disconnected and take the building down. Mr. Meyer said he does not want to wait too long and he feels that we need to move forward. Member Stalker asked if this is the reasonable thing to do by the Village and if it is necessary that the Village take the building down because it is a liability. He asked staff if they feel that this is true. Mr. Meyer responded that based on what he has seen the answer is yes. Member Stalker said the Village is doing what is necessary to protect ourselves from liability. Member Stalker asked Village Counsel if the Village should take the responsibility since we own the building to clear up the damage and let Oak Lawn Baseball do what they want. Village Counsel said he has not seen the lease agreement but if the building is uninhabitable and not able to be used and people can potentially get hurt then yes. He said the Little League does not have a deep pocket and they are going to go to the Village. He said it will be hard to defend a lawsuit if we are on notice that there is a problem. Member Stalker said it will be easy for us to defend taking the building down. Village Counsel said if you take the building down there would be no more liability. Village Manager Palmer said the objective is to tear the other houses down in order to expand the PW yard and since the equipment is on site we should knock down the baseball facility. Member Stalker said that he wants to be sure that no one comes back and questions why we are doing this for the Little League. Member Stalker expressed that we are not doing this for the Little League we are doing this for our protection. Mr. Palmer agreed and reiterated that the demolition will be at a reduce cost if we do the homes at the same time. Member Stalker said we can do the demolition and the Little League will take over the improvements. Member Olejniczak said any improvements would have to be mutually agreed upon with the Village but that the improvements for the new facility would be the responsibility of Oak Lawn Baseball not the Village. Member Mallo said if Oak Lawn Baseball builds a \$100,000 to \$150,000 building someone will need to insure it. Member Mallo said he does not believe the Village has insurance on the building. Member Olejniczak asked staff if they are asking to demolish the Village-owned properties as discussed. Mr. Meyer responded yes. Member Stalker said as long as we have a Legal Opinion stating that tearing down the baseball facility is in the best interest of the Village. Village Counsel responded that he will prepare and asked staff to send him a copy of the lease

agreement. Member Olejniczak said this may be an opportunity to revamp a new lease agreement. Member Mallo said the current amended lease expires in 2025.

A motion was made by Member Stalker to proceed with full demolition at fair pricing for the acquired homes and the hazard facility at the Oak Lawn Baseball property. In addition, the motion includes a request to include a legal opinion for the demolition of the facility at the baseball field. The motion was seconded by Member Mallo.

Roll call: Stalker, yes; Olejniczak, yes; Mallo, yes.

Motion passes: 3-0-0.

Trustee Vorderer clarified that the demolition will include the four homes (will not include the one property not yet acquired). Mr. Palmer responded yes. Trustee Vorderer commented that he likes that idea.

D.) Update on Automotion facility

Village Manager Palmer explained the efforts in marketing the Automotion property as a potential location for Senior Development for senior housing. Mr. Palmer said when the land study was completed they learned some of the areas on and around the property are in a flood plain. He said the Village employed CM Lavoie, an Architectural firm that has experience in dealing with a number of flooding areas.

Mr. Chris M. Lavoie, P.E., CM Lavoie, 825 N. Cass Avenue, Suite 106, Westmont, Illinois.

Mr. Lavoie said that his firm has been looking at the Automotion property and their goal is to maximize the potential of that property relative to the flood plain and the floodway that exists now. He said they would like to approach MWRD to assist and mitigate the flood plain locations in order to improve the potential for the property. He said this includes other areas in proximity to the Automotion facility that could provide additional detention and storage. Mr. Lavoie pointed out the preserve area and commented on working with Army Corps of Engineers as far as excavation and cleaning of that area for more storage. Member Stalker asked who owns the floodway (Wolfe Wildlife). Member Olejniczak responded that the Oak Lawn Park District owns that area. Member Stalker replied that *they* do not know that. Mr. Lavoie expressed that this all should be looked at with a global perspective. Member Stalker asked who owns the bridge. Member Olejniczak responded that the Oak Lawn Park District owns that bridge. Member Stalker asked why the high school is repairing the bridge. Member Olejniczak commented about Oak Lawn Park District and the history of dealing with Park District improvements. He said the Park District is always in favor of improvements but they do not want to pay for the improvements. Member Stalker said he understands and pointed out that Richards H.S. is repairing the bridge. Member Stalker expressed that he feels it is important that we make sure that we understand who owns the property so we know who to communicate with; he said that with having MWRD on our side it will make it easier for us because MWRD has a big hammer. Mr. Lavoie said it is not only the ownership of that

parcel but other parcels in the area. He said the ownership changes as you go down the line. Mr. Lavoie said it will be important to review the language of what that preserve document legally states about what can be done in those areas and what is restricted. Mr. Lavoie said that they are doing their leg work and are on a fact finding mission to bring it all together and put the game plan together so that good decisions can be made.

Member Olejniczak asked about the Wolfe Wildlife area. He said that Mr. Lavoie mentioned that he has had success with creating detention by removing dirt. Member Olejniczak asked Mr. Lavoie if he believes there is more retention available in the Wolfe Wildlife area based on what he has observed. Mr. Lavoie responded yes. Mr. Lavoie said some of the areas have been left undisturbed for several years. He said they can take the wetland and rate the quality and potentially take a Level 3 to a Level 5. He said the level change would be based on the change in aquatic life, more flood storage, and the increased quality of the wetland. Mr. Lavoie expressed that they believe there is potential for taking the existing pond and modifying the pond at a very low cost without a total redesign and reconstruction. Member Olejniczak asked Mr. Lavoie if he will be talking to both the Park and School Districts. Mr. Lavoie replied that the Park District, School District, MWRD, the Army Corps of Engineers, and Village staff will all be involved. Member Olejniczak said one of the biggest issues Oak Lawn faces is that the Village does not have good instant water retention for a big downpour. He mentioned that he was at a meeting with MWRD at the Automotion property and that MWRD is interested in helping Oak Lawn with water retention especially in that part of town.

Mr. Lavoie commented about the infrastructure of the storm sewer system and said it was built based on a 10-year event 50 years ago. He expressed that a 10-year event 50 years ago is more like a 5-year event now. He stated that the system gets overburdened quickly but if we can incorporate a design, as a collective group, we can bring it together and maximize the potential for this site and other areas in proximity to this site.

Member Mallo pointed out that he saw that Mr. Lavoie's firm redesigned a failed storm sewer system in Mokena and asked if that is the same situation for Oak Lawn's sewer system. Mr. Lavoie responded yes. He said there a lot of failures because of the longevity of the system. Member Mallo asked if the resolution for Mokena was adding in bigger sewer systems. Mr. Lavoie explained that Mokena had issues with their root structures and a collapsed system. Member Olejniczak explained that they did not build bigger sewer systems rather they made sure that their systems were sound. Member Olejniczak said that is what we have started with our sewer systems. Member Stalker pointed out that Stony Creek is about 1/3 the depth of what it was 15 years ago just because of the silt build-up. Mr. Lavoie said a regular maintenance program should be in place so that silt does not inundate an area. Member Olejniczak said that is what we learned with Oak Lawn Lake and the work that we have done on Stony Creek at the north end.

Member Olejniczak asked staff if this is an introduction and if they need anything else from the Board. Mr. Sebek responded that it is an introduction and explained that the Village has contracted with CM Lavoie to look at our current efforts with our BRIC (Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities) grant application. He explained that the BRIC grant is going through Illinois Emergency Management Agency (IEMA) and ultimately will be reviewed and

funded by Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). He said the application is under review with the State. Mr. Sebek said CM Lavoie will assist with the grant as well as two additional tasks: 1) Coordinate with MWRD at the area of 109th & Kilpatrick. He explained that there is currently a study on that part of our system, and 2) to work with MWRD on a sanitary component specific to the outfall of our sanitary sewer system.

Mr. Lavoie reiterated that he is on a fact finding mission to gather information and correspondence with MWRD and all the other agencies and compile that information so he can bring it back to this Board with a game plan. Member Olejniczak asked Mr. Lavoie if he can return in February. Mr. Lavoie responded that he would like to be on the February agenda and report monthly updates. Member Olejniczak responded that it is important to keep moving forward.

E.) Bridgeview sewage matter

Village Manager Palmer said there have been several email discussions with both Mayor Landek and their Village attorney on the sewage matter. Mr. Palmer said the last communication from Mayor Landek transmitted from their attorney is that Bridgeview is not going to pay anything and would rather pay \$5 million to relocate the pipe. Mr. Palmer said our response back is “when they are going to start digging”. Mr. Palmer explained that Counsel is exploring the legal remedies including whether we could cap the pipe if we had to; he said we may be able to cap the pipe but we would not know what kind of liability we might incur as a result such as flooding the homes in that area. Mr. Palmer reiterated that the last communication with our Village Counsel is that we are working on different legal strategies in order to tackle the problem.

Mr. Palmer explained that back when the subdivision was built in the subject area a builder came to the village and presented a document showing access to the pipe. He said by our acceptance of said document there might be a legal loophole in that Oak Lawn accepted the document and therefore accepted everything that goes with it. Member Olejniczak commented that we may have accepted the document but it does not mean that they should not have to pay for it. Mr. Palmer said Bridgeview’s position is that water runs where it goes and Bridgeview is not responsible for it. Member Mallo asked if Bridgeview is collecting from their residents. Mr. Palmer responded that we believe they are and said that we are currently doing our due diligence and have submitted a FOIA to obtain those records. Mr. Palmer said what was also communicated to us is that the resident fee is to take care of the sewer system in that immediate area not to pay for the flow of the waste. Member Olejniczak asked Village Counsel if we have the right to collect from Bridgeview from the time we notified them. Counsel responded yes in theory. He explained there are some legal issues. He said he has not seen any document that was put in place way back when. He said there was not an agreement in place for anyone to pay but Bridgeview has been connected for a long period of time and Oak Lawn has never said anything. Member Olejniczak explained that the reason we did not say anything is because we did not know. Village Counsel responded that when the builder showed where they were going to connect, we said yes. Member Olejniczak said this came to the Board’s attention when we did the flow meter study. Counsel said to *this* Board.

He said the Village of Oak Lawn as a corporate entity was on notice whether we knew it or not; he added that people passed away or things got lost in the shuffle. He said whatever happened at some point the Village was on notice but then it went off our radar. Village Counsel said it was “rediscovered” through the flow meter study. He said Bridgeview’s position is they are not going to negotiate over it. Village Counsel said now the legal question is what rights we have to recover any monies; he said this is may be similar to what Chicago Ridge is paying the Village. Village Counsel said as we get a clearer picture and manage expectations he is not sure how strong of a case we will have. Member Olejniczak asked Counsel if we do not have a strong case what is our next step. Village Counsel responded that we are analyzing the case and there are some concerns. He stated that it does not mean there is no case. He restated that we may have a case but it may not be as strong. Member Olejniczak commented that Attorney Cainkar and Mayor Landek are telling us to pound sand. Village Counsel responded that there may be two legal remedies 1) money, and 2) telling Bridgeview that they have to disconnect from us. He said if Bridgeview is not going to pay us the next step is to go to court to ask for monies or we will disconnect. Village Counsel pointed out that Bridgeview owns the infrastructure and Oak Lawn owns a mile and a half of pipe.

Member Stalker asked what is the Village’s cost to take their sewage. Mr. Meyer responded that the fee structure is one of the problems. He mentioned that three different consultants looked this matter over. He said they agree that Bridgeview owes us something but the question becomes how much. Mr. Meyer explained that Bridgeview owns about a half of mile in one segment at 91st and Oak Park and we own a mile and a half. He said they are using our pipe for a mile and a half but that they own the other side on Oak Park. Member Stalker asked the cost to process the sewage once it comes into our system. Mr. Meyer responded that it does not cost us a direct fee. He explained that the sewage goes into an MWRD interceptor and that MWRD charges all residents or business owners the fees for the sewer system. Mr. Meyer said our damages are incurred by the removal. He explained that our capacity is severely diminished because we have another town’s sewage taking up space which in turn causes manholes in other areas to back-up and then our residents have back-up issues. Mr. Meyer said that he agrees that we should disconnect.

Mr. Palmer pointed out that in 2016 Mayor Landek stated in a letter, “Yes, we know this problem exists and we want to meet to settle up and come to an agreement.” Mr. Palmer said ever since then it has been a “kick the can down the road”.

Member Olejniczak said another approach is to ask Bridgeview to assist with the maintenance and the upgrade of our line. He said this would be another approach when they tell us to go pound sand. Member Stalker expressed that Bridgeview should pay for the improvement of our sewer system. Village Counsel said he believes Mayor Landek’s position is that Bridgeview has been connected for years and have never paid anything. He added that they find it unreasonable because it has always been free and it is only water and that they are paying zero. Village Counsel said their negotiations are “we are not negotiating with you”. Mr. Palmer told the Board that we are working on what we can to put the pieces in place to move forward and Counsel is exploring legal remedies. Mr. Palmer reiterated Oak Lawn’s last

communication that we are going to cap off or they have to pay us something. Mr. Palmer said when a decision is made he will bring it back to the Board.

F.) Speedway / OLCHS property transfer (closing off Austin Avenue)

Village Manager Palmer said he is looking for feedback on closing off Austin Avenue. He explained that Speedway wants to do a land swap with Oak Lawn Community High School (OLCHS). He said the Village owns Austin Avenue and Speedway would like us to vacate a portion of that street in order to change the layout of their gas station. Mr. Palmer expressed that the proposed change will address safety for the gas station. Mr. Palmer mentioned that OLCHS wants to close Austin off to use the road as another egress for their students. Mr. Palmer explained that Speedway wants to take half of the school's parking lot and move their building back and make that area on Austin accessible for Speedway traffic flow. He mentioned the fuel trucks for Speedway will have a better roundabout for traffic flow by entering on Austin and exiting onto McVicker. Member stalker asked if there are any drawings. Mr. Palmer responded yes and said the drawings were sent to the Board. Mr. Palmer said he believes that when McVicker was closed it was because of resident concerns of the impact of traffic from McDonald's. Member Olejniczak said the concerns were because of both McDonald's and the gas station.

Mr. Palmer said if Austin and McVicker are both closed it will impact traffic at 93rd Street. He said it is his recommendation to close Austin. He explained the benefits of the increase in retail and fuel tax from Speedway which will increase revenue for the Village. Mr. Palmer said that if we close Austin we may have to reconsider opening up McVicker specifically for emergency vehicles. Mr. Palmer said he does not want to close both streets. He added that we can conduct a traffic study with a few scenarios including closing *both* Austin and McVicker. Mr. Palmer is looking for direction on how the Committee feels we should approach this. He said based on recent communication he is hearing that both Speedway and OLCHS need to work this deal out but they cannot make this deal work unless the Village closes Austin. Member Olejniczak expressed that Speedway does not want Austin closed, the school wants Austin closed. Mr. Palmer agreed and said the overflow of traffic will go out to Southwest Highway. He said there is already a problem with school traffic on Southwest Highway. Mr. Palmer said if we reopen McVicker we may get a lot of feedback from the residents. Member Olejniczak said we *will* get feedback from the residents as that traffic from Austin will use McVicker. Member Olejniczak expressed that the high school is being unreasonable. He said what will work for the high school is not losing any land and consolidating their campus by closing off Austin. Mr. Sebek said it seems like a big ask. Mr. Palmer said Speedway wants to take half of the fenced parking area. Member Olejniczak pointed out that there is a parking lot agreement in place for JenCare (6101 W. 95th St.) that was required in order to grant JenCare a parking lot variance.

Mr. Sebek indicated that he has been in touch with Speedway's Project Manager and has seen the layout showing how Speedway's tanker trucks will ingress and egress; he said the tanker trucks will come from the west on 95th turning and then turn right onto McVicker. He said they will then come out onto Austin and will head westbound. Mr. Sebek said it is a well

thought-out and safe method for the tanker trucks. Mr. Sebek said instead of closing Austin completely he feels they could close just the north section and consider making Austin a one way southbound. Mr. Sebek expressed that this would reduce traffic and said they could also bump the curve out to make it a one lane southbound in order to allow anyone traffic coming from the high school. Member Olejniczak expressed that he agrees that it is a reasonable and great solution but reiterated that it is the high school pushing to close Austin. He said the high school wants to vacate Austin. Member Olejniczak said if the high school does not get what they want they will back out of the deal. Member Olejniczak suggested that staff go back to the High School Board and tell them we are not interested but that we can work with them. Member Olejniczak also mentioned that the cul de sac curbs allow for emergency vehicles to drive over. Mr. Palmer said he will pass the information forward. Member Olejniczak reiterated that the high school must be reasonable in the land swap deal.

G.) Parking Tower restraint fencing

Member Olejniczak commented that he asked that this item be placed on the agenda. He explained that recently a person jumped from the hospital parking tower and he feels that we may have potential issues at our train station parking tower. Member Olejniczak said if we are going to require the hospital to add restraint fencing perhaps we need a plan for our parking tower. Mr. Palmer said he wanted to ask Counsel if there is an increased liability if we do add restraint fencing and someone succeeds in getting past the fencing. Village Counsel replied no. Member Olejniczak asked what if we do not add restraint fencing. Village Counsel responded that it is an uphill climb; he explained that most jumps are related to suicide and it is hard to attach liability to acts of self-harm. Counsel said if you are going to add restraint fencing to one tower then you are going to have to do it to all the parking towers. Village Counsel expressed that it is not an issue with liability rather it is a social issue. Mr. Palmer expressed that financially we cannot afford to do this. Mr. Palmer said if someone wants to commit suicide they are going to do it no matter how much we try to restrict. Trustee Vorderer said if you restrain the 5th floor then you have to consider the 4th, 3rd, and 2nd floors. He said suicides are tragic and a terrible loss of life but that it is a mental issue.

H.) Regional Water System Update

Village Manager Palmer explained that we have some issues with the bidding process for the projects related to the RWS. He indicated that CDM Smith is the overall engineer, the provider of engineering services, and the provider of construction services for the project. Mr. Palmer said there have been a few complaints from the outside communities requesting to change the structure. Mr. Palmer said he is not sure if we have the capability to make the change as he feels it might have to be a collective determination with the other RWS communities. He said we can voice our opinion that we would like to see the change and ask for a vote to see if the other members of the consortium agree. Mr. Palmer said some of the concerns included a change to have a local company as part of the project services.

Member Stalker asked staff if there are other companies capable of providing the same services. Mr. Palmer responded that he has heard that there were two companies including CDM Smith that has the knowledge of doing a project of this magnitude. He said he is not sure of the other company. Mr. Palmer said when the project first began CDM Smith was brought in; he said there is a question on when they go out to the construction companies for bid if they are actually putting it out to enough companies to bid. He added that he also heard that when the bids go out the jobs are too big so that is why only one company replies back. Mr. Palmer said this is feedback that he has heard and he felt he should share it with this committee. Member Olejniczak commented that it is concerning when you start hearing concerns from downstream communities and expressed that we want to get it front of it.

Mr. Meyer said both he and Jeff have spent time with CDM Smith. He said the other firm is CBBEL (Christopher Burke) that can handle a project of this size. Mr. Meyer said he has heard the same feedback that a lot of the other communities do not like working with CDM. Member Olejniczak said some of the other communities have specifically stated that they want Christopher Burke. Mr. Meyer said that is correct – he said there are other firms that can do this type of work – he said at least 20 in the Chicagoland area – that can handle this project. He said he thinks the difficulty here is that they have the background knowledge from the base to the planning to the construction process; his recommendation is to break up those bid packages. His suggestion is to break them bid projects to a smaller size so it creates more competition. He said he has been told that CDM puts a threshold limit of \$20 million in cash reserves – a crazy number that companies are required to have in their reserves which pretty much negates 90% of the contractors. He explained if we break up the bid packages other firms can jump in and create the competition and prices may go down. Member Olejniczak said his concern is that CDM Smith is purposely adding that reserve requirement.

Member Olejniczak asked Village Counsel from a legal perspective if there are any concerns with the engineering firm. Village Counsel responded not really but that he understands the concerns. He explained that there is a comfort level with Christopher Burke. He questioned if we are you getting a fair price when only one company responds because other companies cannot respond because of the cash reserve component. Counsel said his understanding of the RWS contract is we want to be good wholesalers of water and that our relationship with CDM Smith, Chapman & Cutler, PFM, and the Village attorneys rests here with this board. Counsel said the contracts are with the Oak Lawn Board. He explained that when we make a change to the above mentioned firms, there is a process. He said the process is we have to let the other communities know. He expressed that it is more like advice and consent; we would let the other communities know we want to look at some changes and give our recommendation. He said at the end of the day it is really Oak Lawn's call. Village Counsel said he looked at the contract. He said CDM has a 30 day notice in their contract; PFM has no notice – no agreement no contract; and Chapman & Cutler is on a quarterly basis so they would need to know by March 1. Village Counsel said perhaps CDM stays in their role as the design engineer since we have gone half way down the pipe but the other "stuff" can be revisited. Mr. Sebek said CDM Smith was involved with the study since 2008 – 2010. He said this is a very large water main project and CDM has been involved with this project along with the modernization of the stations. He expressed that this far into the project he does not

recommend any change in the remaining design contracts. Mr. Sebek commented that the letters that we have received from the other communities are promoting Christopher Burke because they have used them as their own engineer. Mr. Sebek suggested that we keep CDM Smith as the design engineer but he agrees that they should not be doing the construction management. He expressed that there is less transparency and not enough separation if a construction problem comes up. Mr. Sebek said based on his history with projects he would not recommend having the same design and construction company. He expressed there are plenty of construction management companies that can do this type of pipeline work.

Mr. Sebek said they will put out an RFP for construction services for the sewer work. He indicated that there will be a general contract for bidding for the work and a separate RFP for consulting. Member Olejniczak said this is currently not being done. Mr. Sebek said he does not believe so. He said his recommendation is that we have a different construction manager that is not the same as the design engineer firm. The Board and Village Counsel briefly discussed the commencement of CDM becoming the construction engineer for the project.

Village Counsel said the power to make the change rests with this Board. Member Olejniczak said we have the decision making power but he wants to respect the downstream customers. He said if there are communities that are unhappy then we need to get in front of it and take construction management off of this project and put it out for RFP. Mr. Sebek said that will be great. Mr. Palmer clarified that the direction is to approach the other communities with the request of two separate firms for the design and construction engineers. Village Counsel said he will meet with Jeff to get the message out properly to our downstream customers.

I.) Sanitary Sewer Line – 9724 S. Major

Member Mallo explained that he and other staff met with the resident of 9724 S. Major. He said the resident requested that the Village pay *their* bill for a sewer line repair. Member Stalker asked staff if this is the Village's sewer or ours. Mr. Meyer replied that it is the resident's sewer. Mr. Meyer explained that the resident is not complying with current I & I codes and will not make changes that need to be made to correct the issues. He said the homeowner believes that the Village should pay this bill. Mr. Meyer said he did tell the resident and Trustee Mallo that if he were speaking on behalf of the Village he feels that we should not pay this bill. Mr. Meyer commented that anytime there are 50 or 100 year storms, we flood. He expressed that this is an act of God and no municipality could be held liable. Mr. Meyer added that the only time we could be held liable is if we receive a call of a report of water bubbling on a front lawn and the Village completely disregards the phone call and does not show up in a timely manner. Mr. Meyer said in this case we have records of less than a 20 minute response time. He noted that this was an overtime call that took place at 1:00 a.m. in the morning. Mr. Meyer said he explained to Trustee Mallo that this resident is a "frequent flyer" in other words the resident calls a lot. Mr. Meyer said he has been in this particular resident's home at least 3 times and staff has been to their home many more times. Mr. Meyer said we have always been very professional and we give the resident good advice to get them on the right track so they do not have flooding issues. Mr. Meyer said the resident is unwilling to pay the invoice. Mr. Meyer expressed that like a car, you have to do

maintenance on your home. Mr. Meyer said he does not believe the Village should pay out this invoice. He said this is a sanitary sewer and we cannot control what someone puts into the sanitary sewer. Mr. Meyer said the Village's job is that once we are notified of the problem, we go out to correct the problem. Mr. Meyer said Village staff did that in every case in response to this resident's call.

Member Stalker asked if the clog was in our sewer line that the Village maintains. Mr. Meyer said there are different occurrences. He said the first time staff went out and did not see the clog. He said the second time staff went out the resident said there was a clog but Village staff did not verify that there was a clog the second time. Mr. Meyer said if he felt the Village had liability he would say so. Member Olejniczak asked if staff's recommendation is to not pay this invoice as this is not our liability and this is a homeowner issue. Mr. Meyer reiterated that the Village did a great a job in responding on multiple occasions on the same day. He expressed that he does not feel there is a liability issue; he feels that the homeowners are not being reasonable or fair. Mr. Meyer said the homeowners do not want to listen to the recommendations that they are given. He added that they do not want to take staff's advice on what they need to do to improve their home. Member Mallo said this is where the 50/50 program would benefit. Mr. Meyer said the resident qualifies for it but will not take advantage of the program.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

Village Manager Palmer expressed that he is not sure if this is the proper venue but he wanted to brief the Committee. He reminded the Board that with budget constraints and the direction that staff has been given to cut where we can, we have reduced staff in a lot of different sections. Mr. Palmer said Jeff and Bill have approached him on numerous occasions about filling the vacancies that they have; he said they were given direction to restructure and to use their different divisions when they need them. Mr. Palmer said what he recommended to Jeff and Bill is to put together a proposal of their needs. Mr. Palmer expressed that he would love to hire if we could but we do not have the ability to do so that at this point. He said Jeff wants to show this Board where we are deficient and see if we can fill those positions. Mr. Palmer stated that he is looking for direction from this Board to take to the full Village Board a request to hire.

Mr. Sebek distributed a two page proposal and explained that the first page shows the staffing levels of each of the 4 divisions from 2003 through today. Mr. Sebek said we are currently at 50%-65% of the original staffing levels. He said because of the urgent nature of Public Work calls there is difficult response on water main breaks when pulling staff from Sewer and Streets to man a crew. He expressed that we are very stretched. He said there have been a lot of call outs and that we are at the bare minimum. He expressed this affects the other operations we have. Mr. Sebek said a lot of our other preventative maintenance programs go by the way side in order for staff to tackle the urgent issues on a daily basis.

Mr. Sebek said the second page of the promotional job postings represents the positions that were removed to help finances through 2020. He said it shows the current budgeted

positions and in some cases vacancies; he said he sat down with both the Budget and Finance Director to identify what is available in the 2021 budget. He said he hopes that jobs can be posted so we can begin staffing to some extent. Mr. Sebek pointed out that in Equipment Maintenance there were a few retirements. He said we are willing to forego the Crew Chief position in order to get lower level staffing. He said the retirement salaries would be available for lower level staffing. Member Stalker asked if that could be done through Union rules. Mr. Sebek said all the positions are L150 jobs. Member Stalker said he understand but that they are subordinate positions replacing a supervisory level job and he asked if that could happen. Member Olejniczak responded yes.

Member Olejniczak asked Jeff if he is going to fund the positions without going over budget. Member Sebek responded yes. He said the positions would fall under the current budget and that they are just a reallocation of funds. Member Olejniczak asked the Village Manager what his concerns are *as* the Village Manager since the positions are within the current budget. Mr. Palmer replied that both the Finance committee and the full Village Board directed that 2020 was a tough year and 2021 will be just as tough because we do not know where we are going to be. He said all Department Heads were told that even though we have a budget we need to weather the road. Mr. Palmer said the directive was not to lay people off or cut jobs but to go to the Department Heads and ask for their most critical positions and then we would staff those positions as needed. Mr. Palmer said we do not know where we will be at the end of this year. Member Olejniczak expressed that what he is understanding is that Public Works wants to hire 4 people and that we would pretty much be self-funding those 4 positions. Mr. Palmer responded that Public Works is asking to hire 12 positions. Member Olejniczak asked Jeff if he would give a breakdown of the must haves for each department.

Mr. Sebek said ultimately he would like to hire *all* 12 positions in 2021. Member Olejniczak said he would like to see a progressive plan over the course of the year. Mr. Sebek said his priority list includes a Crew Chief and Plant Operator for the Water Division and a Crew Chief for the Sewer Department. Member Olejniczak said he cannot speak for the full board but he does not feel anyone would have an issue in filling the positions. He added that this does not need full Board approval. Member Olejniczak asked Randy if he would have a problem filling 4 positions. Randy responded that he was given orders to cut the budget. Member Olejniczak replied that he understands. Mr. Palmer said he is looking for direction and he is not sure if this needs to go to the Finance Committee. Counsel responded that the staffing of these positions are budgeted spots and the power lies within the manager. Mr. Palmer said he agrees but he was told "what is in your budget is not in your budget". Member Stalker asked Jeff if these are critical positions. Jeff replied yes. Member Olejniczak said we would be staying within our budget. He said we do not know what will happen in 2022 but he feels that Public Works is in line for a budget surplus and he is concerned that 3 months from now we will have critical staffing concerns not met to service operations.

Mr. Meyer mentioned the recent firing of staff and said 2 of those 3 positions have not been replaced. He added that in 2020 we lost 8 positions because of retirements. Mr. Meyer said he feels it is an extremely conservative plan. Mr. Meyer said he brought this to Jeff and Randy numerous times. Mr. Meyer said to Member Olejniczak's point of being in a critical state and

not being able to function, we are already there. Member Olejniczak said without the coordination of a workforce - and he has heard that the salt plowing these guys are going above and beyond – that this is the first time in Village history that people in different departments are taking on new challenges. He said he likes that dynamic but this never happened before. He expressed that between now and March he hopes we do not have significant snow storms as it will stick out if that happens.

Mr. Meyer commented that he understands that we have to be very diligent with our funds but he needs this Board to know that he would not put this in front of them if he did not think it was critical. Member Olejniczak asked staff what it is that they are looking for; he said there are 4 positions and asked if we could we get 4 in the hopper and in another two months hire 2 more or should we put 6 in the hopper. Mr. Meyer replied that he would recommend 6. He said there has been so much turnover in the Water Department. He pointed out that the Sewer and Water Division are true utilities and by law there are staffing requirements that we must meet per the Water Agreement. Mr. Meyer expressed that he is all for running a tight ship but that we are so far behind on pot hole patching, street light repair, etc. Member Olejniczak expressed that that will come back to haunt us. Mr. Meyer pointed out that he is running two shifts and he shows up each day for both shifts. He said he is having a heck of a time between the four divisions. He said it is a burden not to have key supervisor positions filled as it is causing tons of grief. Member Olejniczak said he understand that Public Works need staffing. He said he understands from a Village Manager's side why he has to say no. He expressed that this has become a critical issue and he believes staff is saying this is critical. He said he has also heard from employees that he knows that it sounds like we are at that critical point. He asked staff if hiring 6 people will get us to a point to get us better. Mr. Meyer said that it will help tremendously. Member Olejniczak said if Public Works can breathe a little bit then we can come up with a plan for the future. The Board briefly discussed the promotional hiring process and the hiring of the entry level positions.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made by Member Mallo and was seconded by Member Stalker.

Voice vote: All in favor, aye; All opposed, none.

Motion passes.

The meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.