

Minutes
Regular Village Board Workshop
Glen Ellyn Village Board of Trustees
January 18, 2010

Call to Order Village President Pfefferman called meeting to order at 7:07 p.m.

Roll Call Taken by Administrative Analyst Kristen Schrader: Village President Pfefferman, Trustees Comerford, Cooper, Hartweg, Henninger and Thorsell were present. Trustee Ladesic arrived at 7:17 p.m.

Staff in attendance: Village Manager - Steve Jones, Finance Director - Jon Batek, Building and Zoning Official - Joe Kvapil, Public Works Director - Joe Caracci, Planning and Development Director – Staci Hulesberg, Planner – Michele Stegall, Police Chief – Phil Norton, Suzanne Connors – Village Clerk and Administrative Analyst – Kristen Schrader

Public Comments None

Review Agenda for Monday, January 25, 2010
Regular Village Board Meeting

Items 1-5 and item 6A-6C are administrative items.

Consent Agenda:

Item 6D – Public Works Director – Joe Caracci requests permission to acquisition two parcels of land, at 800 and 715 St. Charles Road, so the Riford Road Reconstruction Project scheduled for the summer of 2010 can move forward. Parcel #1 is a 5500 sq. ft. piece of property of Ackerman Park. It's purchase is necessary to accommodate left turn lanes onto Riford Road from St. Charles Road. Parcel #2 is a 1350 sq. ft. piece of privately owned frontage road along Riford Road. This is needed to improve the current steep profile of Riford Road. The Village Board in an Executive Session on September, 14, 2009 gave direction to move forward on the purchase of these parcels.

Item 7 – Planning and Development Director – Staci Hulesberg discusses the renewal of annexation agreements for 32 properties in the general area of Marsten Avenue, Bemis Road and Birchbrook Court. All previous 20 year agreements have or will be expiring soon. In order to have Village water and sewer service, renewal annexation agreements must be received. A total of 29 properties have renewed their agreements. An additional three properties have not signed an agreement as yet and the Planning and Development Department is working with these owners to renew their annexation agreements. Notification of possible disconnection of services has been sent to those properties based on the Village's policy of having a valid annexation agreement. As long as these properties remain unincorporated they remain under DuPage County's zoning. Upon

annexation they will be classified as a residential zoning classification. The rezoning of these properties will become R1 or R2B. Trustee Thorsell asked if any of the three properties that have not submitted new annexation agreements could possibly be ready by next week. Director Hulesberg did not anticipate that happening by next week. Trustee Comerford asked for an explanation of R1 and R2B zoning classifications. An R1 is a lot that is around 14,000 sq. ft. and has a larger setback. An R2B is a smaller lot with a smaller setback, about 10,000 sq. ft. Trustees Hartweg and Cooper asked how does annexation work and Director Hulesberg explained. No Public Comments.

Item 8 – Planning Director Staci Hulesberg talked about the annexation of a 300 foot wide piece of Glenbard South High School property owned by Glen Ellyn School District 87. The Village has been working with District 87 since 2005 on an annexation agreement for this portion of their property. The property is located on the west side of Park Boulevard. There is only a message board sign located on the property, no building. The purpose of annexing a portion of the District 87 property is so that three businesses contiguously located at the NW corner of Butterfield Road and Park Boulevard can annex into the Village of Glen Ellyn for water and sewer services. Those properties which the Village currently has preannexation agreements with are: Church of God, Arden Court Alzheimer’s Facilities, and Dr. O’Carroll’s business. The Village and the School District reached an annexation agreement and the school district approved the agreement on December 14, 2009, not an actual annexation. The Village Board has the ability to give the School District 30 days notice to have them annex into the Village of Glen Ellyn at any time.

The annexation agreement has a number of terms:

- Agreement term is 20 years with the option to extend the agreement another 20 years.
- It calls for R1 zoning – the same zoning as the properties adjacent to the north.
- The rest of the Glenbard South High School property will not be subject to the agreement. The Village agrees to waive its subdivision authority and zoning control over the area in question, so the property can remain under the jurisdiction of one entity, for consistent zoning control and use control. As long as the property remains school property in the future.
- Also, because the sign is located within that area the Village has agreed to relinquish its sign authority over to DuPage County. The entire property will remain under the DuPage County building codes and zoning codes as long as it remains a high school.
- Glenbard South will continue to receive their water and sewer from the Village but will continue to pay nonresident rates because they are still considered outside the village limits.

- The Village has agreed to not involuntarily annex the remaining portion of the school property during the term of the agreement. However, it doesn't stop District 87 from coming to the Village to request annexation.
- The Village agrees to pay the school \$20,000 for the annexation and compensation for a number of things. Two \$10,000 payments will be made. First payment will be made within 30 days of approval of the annexation agreement and the second payment will be paid after the actual annexation of the property.

This will require a public hearing which will take place next.

Trustee Comerford asked if an annexation required a two step process. An annexation agreement followed by an annexation or how does this work. Director Hulseberg explained the process.

No public questions or comments.

Item 9 – Director Staci Hulseberg presented information on Contractor Registration. Currently The Village does not required contractors to register. Electrical contractors must submit a valid license and a \$5000 bond and roofing and plumbing contractors have to submit a valid copy of their state license. Planning and Development surveyed other municipalities to find out what they required and eleven out of 14 communities responded that they have some sort of contractor registration. Based on this research Planning and Development prepared some draft contractor registration guidelines that was presented to the Board in November and also proposed at the builders forum meeting held in December and the current requirements are now in the review of the Village attorney. Comments from the builder's forum and Village Board are incorporated in the proposed documents. One comment was to investigate online registration and online payment. Finance Director Batek reviewed this request and submitted a several page memo and he does not recommend implementation of an online system due to the cost and infrequent use. Hulseberg cited the payment of this registration can be done easily when building permits are requested and the department has become more customer friendly with the acceptance of credit cards and checks at their counter. Hulseberg did mention this at the builder's forum meeting and there was not a strong desire from the contractors to pursue an online system. However some suggestions at the builders forum were followed up and those were; multi year registration, reinstatement fees, and clarifying the list of contractors. Hulseberg continued that all these have been addressed with a two-year fee, clarified the reinstatement fees, and some exemptions for contractors listed on a building permit under a general contractor. Some requirements are a \$100 fee for general contractors and \$50 for an independent contractor. Registration will be required for any contractor doing work that requires a building permit. Hulseberg continued that homeowners that do their own work are exempt and a public utility contractor doing work in the village right-of-way is

exempt along with sub-contractors that are not required to have a license but are working for a general contractor who is licensed. Along with registration a \$20,000 surety bond and a certificate of insurance is required. Hulseberg feels this will be good because we will have additional information on the contractors that are working in the community and will allow the Village to revoke registration for those who have been convicted of a violation of the code. Hulseberg wanted to remind what registration doesn't do. It will not judge the quality of the work also it will not allow the Village to pass judgments on the contractor's qualifications and it won't allow the Village to become involved in disputes between contractors and homeowners. Trustee Thorsell questioned the amount of the penalty and Hulseberg said it was \$750. Trustee Hartweg asked about citations. Hulseberg explained if a citation is issued to a builder and we take them to court that is grounds for a suspension and if they are found guilty in court we can revoke the registration. Hulseberg added that suspension can be reinstated but revocation cannot. Hulseberg added that registration gives us more enforcement ability than we had before. Trustee Ladesic asked about terms and Hulseberg replied that the Village attorney will need to be comfortable with the terms that were proposed.

Public Comments - None

Item 10 – New Collective Bargaining Agreement by Police Chief Phil Norton. The Fraternal Order of Police ratified their eighth contract with the Village since 1989. Both sides compromised and came to an equitable agreement.

No public questions or comments.

Item 11 – President Pfefferman started the Adoption of Village Goals discussion, stating leading organizations have goals. The Village is a leading organization and has had goals for many years, they just haven't been publicized, tracked, prioritized and reevaluated in any regular way. But the Village Board and management team are now trying to do so. The current goals came from a Village planning retreat, including former Village Board members, current Village Board members and our Village management team.

Steve Jones, Village Manager commented that the Village actually has 74 goals but that he was going to talk about only 20 of them tonight. These goals are broken into four categories and will be asking the board to approve a resolution to address the top 20 list of goals:

1. Long Term Routine Goals
 - 1) Seek public commitment and sharing of the strategic plan. (Once approved it will be available to anyone.)

- 2) Target areas in the Village for redevelopment. (An economic development goal.)
 - 3) Do a better job demonstrating our transparency to citizens in the community.
 - 4) Develop a long term finance plan for operations and for capital in one document.
 - 5) Ethics as a long term goal.
2. Long Term Complex Goals
- 1) Execute the approved adopted downtown plan. (the next 10-20 years)
 - 2) Develop a marketing plan to go along with our vision of an aggressive economic development program.
 - 3) Resolve our longterm funding challenges.
 - 4) Assure the long term viability of our Glen Ellyn Fire Company.
 - 5) Improve the Village gateways in conjunction other plans and construction.
3. Short Term Routine Goals to be accomplished in approximately the next 12 months.
- 1) Resolve - make a final decision on an organizational structure for accountability in results of economic development.
 - 2) Come to a common understanding of what our core services are that we have to fund.
 - 3) Finish our emergency preparedness plan and conduct a bi-annual simulation
 - 4) Restore trust, ethics and credibility to the Village government and increase involvement in task forces.
 - 5) Monitor spending closely this year. (This is the Year of the Budget)
4. Short Term Complex Goals
- 1) Complete the phase I study for the downtown plan. (Done)
 - 2) Start looking for funding issues for local pensions. Get involved at the legislative level.
 - 3) Establish a policy for growth and redevelopment. (How do we attract developers in a strategic way?)
 - 4) Work to support or pass our County Special Service Area (SSA) for fire and EMS (achieved)
 - 5) Undertake a thorough study of the various units of local government that serve the Village to seek efficiencies and rationalize the current government service delivery models.

President Pfefferman said this was an important first step. Trustee Ladesic commented on the need for a note to allow the policy to be a fluid one that allows for flexibility over time. Jones said language can be added noting that priorities do change. Trustee Cooper added that the affect of this resolution is to put into effect our policy goals but not to the exclusion of

anything else. Trustee Thorsell asked who will decide which goes next? Pfefferman announced that all advice is welcome and encourages input from the Board. Cooper would like to obtain public input as well when looking at the issues and setting priorities. President Pfefferman asked Administrative Analyst Schrader about any response received when the goals were on the website in the fall of 2009. Schrader did not see any through the general Village email.

Public Comments – None

4) **Economic Development Discussion** President Pfefferman asked that specific questions be asked. What is important to the economic development perspective? Steve Jones began by pointing out questions from a strategic plan from 2007 that highlighted two goals to accomplish: The Downtown Strategic Plan and passing the Special Service Area (SSA). With both achieved it is now time to focus on good discussion focusing on these four questions.

1. How committed are we to the Economic Development program?
2. What is the scope of desired Economic Development programs?
3. Who is to be responsible?
4. How to Fund?

When commenting on number 1 President Pfefferman said Yes but asked Jones what are you looking for? Jones explained the level of commitment and the budget, time and effort. Pfefferman says the commitment tends to be strong with the recent passing of the SSA's and the long history with the Economic Development Corporation (EDC). Trustee Comerford added besides the recent SSA's last budget there was an additional contribution to the EDC and feels this Board is strongly committed.

President Pfefferman asked in regards to the scope, what do you envision? Hartweg mentioned that the EDC turned from retention on businesses to marketing and perhaps we want to look at the Chamber doing the marketing. Hartweg has heard from many people offering up different ideas but the one foundation is there has to be a change at the EDC. Trustee Comerford reminded that the economic development is broader than just the central business district (CBD) and recalled that the CBD is only 15 - 20% of revenue in the Village. Comerford's questioned if the Downtown Advisory Committee (DAC) is looking beyond the CBD? Jones answered no and offered an explanation of what the DAC and other groups do. Jones said the EDC looks at the whole community and other organizations like Go Downtown and the Alliance are specific to the CBD. Currently the DAC is looking at other successful downtowns and will make recommendations to the Board and perhaps suggest one single downtown organization. Jones continued that economic development is important outside of downtown and there could be a case for two organizations that look at economic development with different needs by the two different groups, Roosevelt Road and CBD. Thorsell commented that both organizations would need to look at economic development and be connected to the Village. Jones said that is an objective and there are many different scenarios including organizations as independent bodies or

having them in-house. Jones added that structure is the key and having the same goals so the focus is moving together. Thorsell added that the disconnect is businesses not knowing what organization to work with and that we need to streamline this. Jones agreed that competing organizations are not as effective. Comerford added why not include residential renovation, remodels and improvements in real estate under economic development. Pfefferman reiterated that we have mentioned a streamlined process and recruitment but what other types of activity should we look at? Trustee Ladesic said a pro-active organization one that would look at development sights and come to the Village rather than wait for an interested developer. Pfefferman asked when working with the different organizations we need to focus on goals and break down the barriers of confidentiality. Trustee Henninger asked how we get the biggest return on investment. We should be focusing on the properties with the most potential for sales tax revenue. Trustee Cooper expressed two concerns. First to ensure we know what the goals are that we want this type of organization to achieve and second by looking at consolidation of different entities isn't that duplicating what we asked the transitional DAC to do. Henninger added that we may need to define what successful economic development means in one year, two years and down the road. Henninger added that we also need to define what a successful economic development looks like now and years down the road. How will we measure that. Pfefferman disagrees on the DAC focus and thinks in the future its focus will be much more narrow. Pfefferman asked what successful economic development looks like. Thorsell added more press for shopping. Other ideas added were increased sales tax revenue, vitality, and less vacancies in the Roosevelt Road, Five Corners and CBD. Comerford suggested that we develop an acceptable vacancy rate for each area. Finding the right mix of retail and services was suggested and helping our successful businesses expand. Ladesic mentioned the water bill survey and the suggestions and how to use that information to target potential retailers. Pfefferman added that he would like to see the development of a "tool kit" for business retention and recruitment. Such as the façade grants, possible tax rebates to define what businesses can expect. Ladesic added that other communities are offering business assistance as part of their approach by reviewing business models, and business plans and looking for any gaps they may have. Cooper added there was not a sense that residents have a desire to increase taxes to support economic development. Pfefferman asked what other items in terms of scope. Marketing was discussed as the direct needs will change over time. Jones suggested that two types of marketing right now is community marketing which brands Glen Ellyn as a place to work, live and shop and business marketing that works directly with business for things like promotions. Hartweg noticed that we don't market enough with the College of DuPage (COD). He said we need to discuss the small business development tools they have, the interns we could use and obtain new ideas. Cooper added that COD represents a broad group of consumers that we don't do a good job of reaching. Cooper suggested a promotion where students use their ID to receive a discount. Pfefferman said we have

heard this several times but should the Village act like a landlord and put investment dollars to this type of service. Things like promotions, boutique services and snow removal. Is this an economic development priority for some entity to be responsible for. Comerford believes that we do have the responsibility to the residents to provide or facilitate this type of service but we have a choice to who executes the Village or EDC. Cooper added that we must agree that these boutique services are an objective. Ladesic added marketing what not-for-profits are doing each weekend in Glen Ellyn and optimize either radio or print to get the word out to whomever is gathering this type of information. Ladesic also mentioned the need for website optimization for the EDC which enables search engines to pick up links of interest for their publishing needs. Ladesic did not think it would cost a lot of money but is something that is critical in this day and age. Pfefferman reiterated the points made which indicated clear definition of roles. Pfefferman asked the audience for their reactions. Pat Malady, 285 Milton Street, past member of the EDC board, spoke of his disappointment in the discussion and failing to recognize the history of the EDC which began as a Chamber initiative. They created the SSA's to give them ownership of the project and at the time it was welcomed to not be under the supervision of the Village. Malady said economic development is hard to measure and it is just not the fault of the EDC for vacancies. Others play a part like realtors and landlords. Malady continued that the transitional DAC has visited two communities trying to see a variety of downtowns one is Batavia and the other is Wheaton. Both are different from our Village and receive different funding than we do. When the EDC was formed budgeting was always a concern. Malady believes the structure of the EDC is good and he has confidence with the people involved with economic development. When a potential developer comes through what we need a ombudsman. The EDC also had much to do with the development of the Baker Hill development. Malady feels that being independent from the Village allowed the EDC to speak freely when talking about how the Baker Hill project would positively affect the Village. A written contract was in place when the EDC began and Malady thought that could be helpful. Malady also mentioned that the EDC role has changed now that many undeveloped parcels have been developed. Malady also noted that if you have the role of the EDC within the Village then the continuation of the SSA is not legitimate. Malady urged to keep the EDC separate and have a contract. Sue Cleary, Paisley on Main owner, 494 N. Main Street, had conversation with Janie Patch about relocated on Main Street and selling the business. Patch was helpful in both endeavors. Through a series of events she moved her business to the current location on Main Street and changed the business completely and is very happy with Glen Ellyn and the retainment services the EDC has provided. Cleary values the one on one that Patch provides and encouraged the Board to stop in all the CBD shops to know what they have to offer. Cleary complimented Patch on knowing what is going on in her store and visiting often. Cleary stated that she did not think the Village needed to take on the role of the EDC. Her concerns were too much red tape and not providing personalized service. Cleary appreciated the marketing programs the EDC

has done especially the social media seminars. Façade grants, open banners and the shopping guide were also pointed out by Cleary as simple but effective things the EDC has done. Cleary stated the EDC has worked for her. Brad Webb, 2S645 Arboretum Road, a former business owner and former EDC member and president. Webb thinks there is an over emphasis on the CBD business compared to other business districts in the Village. Webb understood the CBD is the brand image to the Village and reminded that compared sales tax revenues other areas carry more weight. Webb reminded not to ignore the businesses on Roosevelt Road. Webb emphasized the need to be proactive and beat the competition to these properties that are available but acknowledged these properties come with unique difficulties. Webb also stated the need for creativity with ideas along with collaboration. Choose DuPage is one that came to mind for Webb. Webb mentioned the number of bonds out there that he was unaware of until Patch brought them to his attention. Webb also added that the only conversations he has had have been with Patch, never a Trustee or Planning and Development. Webb likes the independence and accountability of maintaining a separate EDC. Janet Avila, String Theory Yarn Co., 477 N. Main Street, and President of the Downtown Alliance. Avila wanted to discuss some of the overlap with the Alliance and has a great working relationship with Patch and the EDC. She sees no competition between the two organizations. Jim Meyers, 531 Stafford Lane, President of the EDC board. Meyers wanted to add some areas that need more thought. One is the vacancies. The EDC held interviews with stores leaving the Village to determine if there is a common theme for leaving. They really wasn't a common theme but it created a bubble of vacancies right before the economy changed. Meyers continued on the members of the EDC and how they meet and reminded that notes of these meetings are available on the website. Meyers also commented on the availability to talk with any of the board members. The EDC is willing to listen to review strategy. Meyers touched on sales tax revenue and how that is important as a goal but in a year where we lost a major source of revenue we were able to bring home good numbers with the remaining businesses we did have. Meyers believes that confidentiality should be respected and understood on a case by case basis since each developer has different needs. Meyers also warned about recruitment and shutting the door on potential businesses and explained that all areas of our Village should be explored when recruiting. Tax rebates can be used and should be used more and encourages us to look at tax rebates. Meyers commented that grants and facades and these programs are in place although some have not existed for very long. Meyers touched on retail mix and the water survey and how the EDC reacted after listening to the survey with core business hours, open banners and more. Meyers requested that the Board ask questions at anytime. Henninger asked if there were any set goals. Meyers replied no. Henninger asked how we will know that the EDC is successful. What are the important items that gauge your success. Meyers stated that you make that question directly to the EDC board. Marketing is difficult to measure but some things you can measure like the recent coupons in the Chicago Tribune. Ladesic asked if Meyers felt sales tax

revenues and vacancy rates cannot be used as measuring tools. Meyers thinks they can be used but not as an absolute and that we should drill down to determine the different reason for things like vacancies. Pfefferman asked what other measures for economic development are. Meyers explained one area is marketing and utilizing the cooperative effort. Meyers personally has seen emails stating how this has helped individual businesses. Meyers suggested also asking the EDC Board that same question and have them suggest ways to evaluate. Cooper spoke about Manager Jones' memo speaking about the scope of the economic development program. Business recruitment, business retention, community marketing, business incentives were mentioned and Cooper asked in Meyers opinion what should be the higher priorities and how we should be measuring things. Cooper clarified to ask what should the goals of the economic development program be. Meyers said a great opportunity for the DAC to get legs and move forward also he added the need for funding. Continue to move forward and be involved especially with tax rebates and other items that may come up. Neil Dishman, 395 Prospect, and served on the EDC for the last 2 1/2 years. Dishman complemented the good volunteers and that it has an independent board. The structure matters. Dishman believes if the EDC was folded into the Village the persons working on it would most likely be working on many other projects as well. What is unquietly good about the EDC right now is Janie does not have multiple hats to wear and answers to her own board, eight independent volunteers who specially give their time to help with one goal, economic development. Dishman added it is not just the people who matter, it is the structure. Dishman continued about the strength of the new grant program. Research was completed at other towns and the resources to getting new businesses to town. These communities had as much as the EDC's entire budget earmarked just to recruit new businesses. Dishman feels to put the EDC back into Village government would be a step in the wrong direction. Trustee Henninger left at 9:39p.m. Sandy Moore, 578 Hill Avenue, owner of AliKat, on the EDC board, Chamber member, and Alliance member, appreciates the process and it is important to hear what the Village wants from the EDC. Moore thinks our community does not know what good the EDC does. Moore explained as a store owner she now knows what great things the EDC does, but before that while being a resident she had no idea of their role. Moore was blown away by the amount of money other communities had to use for development and events. Also that two people worked for their EDC. Moore suggests we ask these towns how they measure the success of their EDC. Doug Armatrout, 565 Hill Avenue, EDC board member, said that retaining and recruitment is something that should be done. Iryl Torterella, spoke of doing her part when she was a business owner. Pfefferman thought this was a very good start to this discussion.

5) Other items

No

6) Motion made to adjourn the meeting by Trustee Comerford, and seconded by Trustee Thorsell at 9:49 p.m.

Submitted by,

Debbie Clewlow