



Gayle A. Smolinski Mayor  
Patty Burns Village Clerk

**AGENDA**  
**VILLAGE BOARD COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**  
**Tuesday, May 26, 2015**  
**Following Village Board Meeting**

***Meeting Chaired by Mayor Gayle Smolinski***

1. **Roll Call**
2. **Approval of Prepared Agenda**
3. **Citizen Comments/Questions** (Residents who wish to address the Board, please come to the podium, state your name and address, and limit your comments to three minutes.)
4. **DRSCW Member Agency Special Assessment**  
Presenter: Philip Cotter, Public Works Director
5. **H.R. Green Fee/Charge Study Presentation**  
Presenter: Jeffrey O'Dell, Village Administrator
6. **Town Center Plaza Repairs**  
Presenter: Philip Cotter, Public Works Director
7. **Executive Session**
  - A. Personnel
  - B. Collective Bargaining
  - C. Executive Session Minutes
  - D. Security Procedures
  - E. Real Property
  - F. Litigation
  - G. Risk Management
8. **Citizen Comments/Questions** (Residents who wish to address the Board, please come to the podium, state your name and address, and limit your comments to three minutes.)
9. **Other Business**
10. **Adjourn**

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, any person with a disability requiring a reasonable accommodation to participate in the meeting should contact Jason Bielawski, ADA Compliance Officer, 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, telephone: 630-671-2810, email: [jbilawski@roselle.il.us](mailto:jbilawski@roselle.il.us).



**AGENDA ITEM # 4**

**AGENDA ITEM EXECUTIVE SUMMARY  
Committee of the Whole Meeting  
5/26/2015**

**Item Title: DuPage River Salt Creek Workgroup Special Condition Work Plan**

**Staff Contact: Phil Cotter, Public Works Director**

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ACTION**

**Village Board discuss participation in the DuPage River Salt Creek Workgroup Special Conditions Work Plan and direct Staff to develop a resolution to participate in the Special Conditions Work Plan for adoption on June 8, 2015.**

**Executive Summary:**

The Village of Roselle is a member of the DuPage River Salt Creek Workgroup (DRSCW) which was formed in 2005 in response to concerns about the efficacy of regulations dealing with elevated levels of phosphorus and other pollutants in DuPage County's three watersheds: Salt Creek and the East and West Branches of the DuPage River. DRSCW membership is comprised of municipalities, publically owned treatment works (POTWs), private environmental organizations, engineering consultants, and various other agencies and organizations. The DRSCW seeks to collaboratively resolve waterway problems by implementing targeted watershed activities efficiently and cost effectively. The DRSCW developed a summary of environmental issues that it and its agency members have been seeking to resolve which has been attached hereto.

DRSCW agency members are public agencies holding a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, issued by the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA), for a discharge from a publicly owned treatment works (POTW) or from municipal separate storm sewer systems into the three DRSCW watersheds. Roselle's wastewater treatment facilities discharge into two watersheds: Botterman into the West Branch of the DuPage River and Devlin into Springbrook Creek (tributary to Salt Creek). Roselle's NPDES permits expired several years ago as the IEPA elected not to renew at the time the permits expired. The Village has continued to operate under the expired permit conditions which are expected to be renewed in 2015.

In recent years, the IEPA has been issuing permits with phosphorus limits to POTWs upstream of certain impaired waterways. All POTWs in DuPage County are on the list for such a limit. In most instances, compliance with these limits will require costly capital improvements within two to three years after permit issuance. Anticipating these reduced limits, the DRSCW and its agency members have worked closely with the

USEPA and IEPA with regards to deferring imposing phosphorus limits in conjunction with the development of a Special Condition Work Plan that involves water quality improvement projects within the three watersheds. Reference the attached list of projects and their estimated costs. The Work Plan proposes the completion of these projects over an eight year project assessment period that will end with the meeting of the limit by year eleven.

Each of the DRSCW's agency members have the option to participate in this Work Plan, and by electing to do so, agrees to incur its share of the costs to complete these projects. Reference the attached table summarizing annual dues and project assessments associated with the Work Plan. Roselle's cost share is based on the design flow capacity at both treatment plants. Subsequent to the completion of this Work Plan, Roselle would have an additional two to three years to design and construct capital improvements at Devlin and Botterman in advance of the IEPA imposing phosphorus limits.

The Village's new NPDES permits for Devlin and Botterman will include one of two provisions in accordance with the Village's decision to participate in the Work Plan:

1. If Roselle elects to participate in the DRSCW Special Condition Work Plan, the new permits will include the following requirements:
  - a. Complete feasibility study within 12-18 months of permit issuance
  - b. Deferral of meeting phosphorus limits to 2026

Additionally, Roselle would commit to contributing to its share of the costs towards the Special Condition Work Plan during the years 2015 through 2022 which would involve \$74,249 in annual dues and \$341,037 in project assessment costs over the eight year period. Reference the attached table that has been provided by the DRSCW. Roselle would then need to coordinate capital improvements at both treatment plants that would need to be completed and operational by 2025 at an estimated cost of \$9.3 million. Subsequent to the completion of these capital improvements, there will be additional annual operation and maintenance (O&M) costs.

2. If Roselle elects not to participate in the DRSCW Special Condition Work Plan, the new permits will include the following requirements:
  - a. Complete feasibility study within 12-18 months of permit issuance
  - b. Meet phosphorus limit of 1 milligrams per liter by 2018

Additionally, Roselle would need to coordinate capital improvements at both treatment plants that would need to be completed and operational within approximately three years after permit issuance at an estimated cost of \$7.9 million. Subsequent to the completion of these capital improvements, there will be additional annual O&M costs.

Cost estimates for capital improvements, along with the timing of these improvements, are included in the recently completed Facility Plan which contemplates participation in the Special Condition Work Plan.

The DRSCW is seeking united support from all agency members. Without unified support, it will be financially difficult to complete the projects specified in the Work Plan and, consequently, DRSCW's agency members would be subject to immediate phosphorus limits which would result in the construction of capital improvements within a two to three year timeframe. As mentioned previously, Roselle would be required to complete the necessary capital improvements within two to three years after permit issuance to comply with phosphorus limits. Therefore, it is Staff's recommendation that the Village of Roselle participate in the DRSCW Special Conditions Work Plan. Costs to participate in the Work Plan in 2015 are as follows: \$8,350 in annual dues and \$19,502 for project assessment. If the Village Board concurs with Staff's recommendation, it is requested that Staff be directed to develop a resolution and present to the Village Board for adoption at the June 8 Board meeting.

Representatives from the DRSCW will attend the May 26 Committee of the Whole meeting to answer questions about the DRSCW and the Special Condition Work Plan.

**Implications:**

**Is this item budgeted?** The FY 2015 Budget allocates \$6,500 (10912020 - 61715) for annual membership dues to the DRSCW, however, it does not allocate funds for the project assessments associated with participation in the Work Plan. Staff proposes to use Water and Sewer Operating funds for costs associated with project assessments.

**Any other implications to be considered?** Staff is preparing to conduct workshops at upcoming Committee of the Whole meetings with the Village Board to discuss the Water and Sewer Capital Improvement Plan. During those workshops, which will occur subsequent to the decision to participate in the Special Conditions Work Plan, we will discuss the timing of capital improvements in conjunction with compliance deadlines for the IEPA's pending phosphorus limits.

**Attachments:**

DRSCW Environmental Summary  
DRSCW Special Condition Work Plan - Project List  
DRSCW Proposed Dues and Assessments



# DuPage River Salt Creek Workgroup

Stephen McCracken  
smccracken@theconservationfoundation.org  
630.768.7427

May 11, 2015

## What is aquatic life and how is it measured?

Aquatic life refers to the fish, insects, fresh water mussels, crustaceans and other organisms that inhabit waterways. The health of a waterbody is best reflected in the number and diversity of those inhabitants. The State determines whether waterways are impaired by assessing the biodiversity of fish and insect populations. A healthy waterway meets certain standards for both of these populations. All river segments in the Upper DuPage River and Salt Creek watersheds, with the possible exception of the southern parts of the West Branch DuPage River, are not supporting adequate fish and/or insect populations. Illinois EPA places river segments not supporting aquatic life on the List of Impaired Waters, otherwise known as the 303(d) List, which increases scrutiny of municipal NPDES permit limits.



*Walleye, East Branch DuPage River. Most water quality restrictions in stormwater and wastewater permits are there to protect or improve aquatic communities.*

## Why should County and Village Boards be concerned about aquatic biodiversity?

Waterways not supporting aquatic life must come into compliance with state and federal laws. The majority of the requirements found in both stormwater and wastewater NPDES permits are there to improve conditions in local waterways for aquatic life.

Wastewater - Limits on Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD), ammonia-N, Dissolved Oxygen (DO), pH, chlorine residual and suspended solids in wastewater discharges are all there to protect aquatic life.

Phosphorous limits are currently being imposed on publicly owned treatment works (POTWs) throughout the state in hopes of reducing nuisance algae and improving aquatic life. Future nutrient requirements on wastewater quality will also primarily be driven by shortcomings in area aquatic life. At this time, DRSCW data analysis suggests that such limits will do little to effect nuisance algae or improve aquatic life in local streams.

Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) - The 2004 TMDLs for chloride and DO were developed to improve aquatic life.

Stormwater Quality- Current requirements for public works departments and construction sites are focused on improving and protecting aquatic life. While these requirements are currently quite conservative, anticipated future national restrictions on stormwater discharge rates and quality will be driven by the ability of urban waterways to support adequate aquatic life.

## **Why aren't local waterways supporting aquatic life?**

This is a complex question. A study carried out by the DRSCW over the last 4 years found that the principle reasons were the presence of low head dams, which create a barrier for fish passage, and a mixture of physical habitat and water pollution.

- Low head dams – Dams create conditions unsuitable for riverine fish and insects by impounding sections of river. Survey after survey shows that local low head dams cut off many fish species from upstream river segments. The local distribution of fish species shows that the water quality in the majority of our waterways could support much higher diversity but physical barriers (dams) account for the absence of these high value species. Such barriers exist, or have recently been removed, on all three waterways.
- Physical pollution- After dams, the clearest relationships to not supporting aquatic life were found with “physical pollution,” that is the alteration of the physical form of the waterway. More specifically, physical pollution that contribute to a lack of aquatic life include: a lack of riparian buffers (vegetated areas adjacent to the stream); a lack of pools and riffle runs; a lack of natural river forms; and a lack of gravel and stony bottoms.
- Chemical pollution – The pollutants that best explained fish and insect declines in local waterways were chlorides (from winter snow-fighting operations), some forms of nitrogen (ammonia –N, TKN), and biological oxygen demand (BOD).

While fixing all of these items would not necessarily guarantee a full recovery of aquatic life, the study suggests that if reduced or eliminated, they are expected to elicit the greatest increase on aquatic biodiversity and numbers.

## **So let's fix those things!**

Many of the improvements needed in area waterways are not presently covered by NPDES permits. State and federal laws tend to be prescriptive and focus nearly exclusively on chemical pollution in wastewater effluent. Even imminent increases in stormwater regulations are unlikely to include improving a waterway's physical form or dam removal/modification.

## **The Special Conditions**

The proposed DRSCW special conditions will change this scenario by allowing participating agencies to invest in dam removal/modification and improving physical habitat constraints rather than spending precious dollars on untargeted interventions with uncertain outcomes. There are a number of benefits to this approach:

- Dam removal/modification and habitat improvement will result in a much better improvement per dollar invested to fish and insect biodiversity than phosphorous removal. We will get more environmental and regulatory compliance “bang” for our bucks.
- Dam removal/modification and habitat improvement have limited maintenance and operation costs.
- The DRSCW's data analysis predicts substantial improvements to both indicators of aquatic life on all three waterways if our special conditions are implemented.
- Improvements to waterways will generate benefits beyond Clean Water Act compliance, such as improved aesthetics and making our local waters a more valued resource for fishing and paddling.
- Improvements in aquatic life will strengthen the position of local agencies in future permit negotiations in two ways. First, improving local aquatic biodiversity will potentially lessen the need for future regulations. Second, showing demonstrable improvements in aquatic life indicates we can improve local aquatic resources through stakeholder-led initiatives. As wastewater and stormwater regulations become increasingly restrictive, a strong history at producing measurable outcomes will better position efforts such as ours to improve the most critical deficiencies for aquatic life rather than being limited to a regulatory program focused on wastewater chemistry alone.

In order to meet the aquatic life goal of the Clean Water Act it will be necessary to resolve the issues identified here. The special conditions represent a rare chance to use our resources to resolve some of those issues and exert some local control on how we proceed in the future.

<u>Project Name</u>	<u>Estimated Project Costs</u>
Oak Meadows dam removal and stream restoration	\$2,250,000
Fawell dam modification	687,500
Springbrook dam removal and stream restoration	1,000,000
Fullersburg Woods dam modification and stream restoration	2,500,000
Southern WBDR physical enhancement	1,000,000
Southern EBDR stream enhancement	1,500,000
QUAL 2K model update for EBDR and WBDR	200,000
NPS phosphorus feasibility analysis	150,000
Nutrient Implementation Plan (NIP) and Trading Analysis	<u>500,000</u>
Subtotal	\$9,787,500
Contingency (5%)	<u>489,400</u>
 Total Estimated Project Costs	 \$10,276,900

The estimated project cost of \$10,276,900, therefore, now becomes the minimum funding level necessary to insure compliance with the special condition language. Under the most conservative approach, which includes only project assessments and excludes any local matches, a participation level of 65% of the recommended assessments of \$15,738,831 must be achieved before any POTW would consider accepting the special condition language in their NPDES permit. As previously stated on numerous occasions, the proposed project assessments contained in this plan are **not** subject to a reassessment process should participation by DRSCW Agency members which own a POTW be less than 100% or should local project matches not materialize at the 40% level. While the minimum funding level is necessary to initiate the funding plan; it does not diminish the overall target funding level of \$26,231,388 over the eight year assessment period and the DRSCW will strive to achieve that target.

### IGIG Grant

The DRSCW, in conjunction with DuPage County and the Forest Preserve District of DuPage County, received last fall a grant award from the State of Illinois for an IGIG grant in the amount of \$2,700,000 for the DuPage River Watershed Green Infrastructure Project. This grant project consists of the Oak Meadows dam removal and stream restoration, Fawell dam modification and Springbrook dam removal and stream restoration projects listed above. In January of this year, however, Governor Rauner announced a grant freeze, which effectively froze the DRSCW grant. While the DRSCW and its grant partners are attempting to unfreeze this grant, we cannot consider this grant amount as available to meet the minimum project funding level discussed above. If the grant should be received in a timely manner, the grant amount of \$2,700,000 would be applied to the minimum project funding level discussed above, which would reduce the minimum participation level in the recommended assessments of \$15,738,831 from 65% to 48%, or otherwise if the grant amount is different.

DuPage River Salt Creek Workgroup				TABLE 1		
Proposed Dues and Assessments				EIGHT YEAR PROGRAM TOTALS		
Summary by Eight Year Period				FY 15-16 THROUGH FY 22-23		
February 16, 2015						
			Total	Project		
		Total	Tributary	Funding		
		Tributary	POTW	Annual	Assessment	Total
		<u>Acres</u>	<u>MGD</u>	<u>Dues</u>	<u>Amounts</u>	<u>Amount</u>
<b>Current Agency members</b>						
Addison	6,053	8.50	\$169,297	\$852,591	\$1,021,888	
Arlington Heights	895		6,949	0	6,949	
Bartlett	3,765	3.68	80,756	369,122	449,878	
Bensenville	1,575	4.70	84,712	471,432	556,144	
Bloomington	4,413	3.45	80,714	346,051	426,765	
Bolingbrook	130	5.04	82,076	505,536	587,612	
Carol Stream	5,908	5.40	119,681	541,646	661,327	
Clarendon Hills	446		4,466	0	4,466	
Downers Grove	9,162		52,641	0	52,641	
Downers Grove SD		11.00	175,203	1,103,353	1,278,556	
DuPage County	46,189	12.50	454,115	1,253,810	1,707,925	
Elmhurst	6,504	8.00	163,915	802,439	966,354	
Glen Ellyn	4,274		25,626	0	25,626	
Glenbard WW Authority		16.02	254,245	1,606,883	1,861,128	
Glendale Heights	3,450	5.26	103,892	527,604	631,496	
Hanover Park	4,251	2.42	63,602	242,739	306,341	
Hinsdale	537		4,970	0	4,970	
Hoffman Estates	3,581		21,797	0	21,797	
Itasca	3,187	2.60	60,556	260,792	321,348	
Lisle	4,303		25,785	0	25,785	
Lombard	6,318		36,923	0	36,923	
MWRDGC	16,251	42.00	753,131	4,212,805	4,965,936	
Naperville	12,882		73,204	0	73,204	
Northlake	1,728		11,551	0	11,551	
Oakbrook Terrace	923		7,104	0	7,104	
Roselle	3,385	3.40	74,249	341,037	415,286	
Salt Creek SD		3.30	53,960	331,006	384,966	
Schaumburg	10,532		60,217	0	60,217	
Villa Park	3,039		18,799	0	18,799	
Warrenville	3,571		21,739	0	21,739	
West Chicago	8,199	7.64	167,617	766,328	933,945	
Westmont	2,465		15,625	0	15,625	
Wheaton	7,276		42,218	0	42,218	
Wheaton SD		8.90	142,138	892,713	1,034,851	
Winfield	1,645		11,093	0	11,093	
Wood Dale	2,095	3.10	62,391	310,944	373,335	
Woodridge	3,426		20,939	0	20,939	
Subtotals	192,358	156.91	\$3,607,896	\$15,738,831	\$19,346,727	
<b>Potential Agency members</b>						
Subtotals	31,136	0	\$220,154	\$0	\$220,154	
Grand Totals	223,494	156.91	\$3,828,050	\$15,738,831	\$19,566,881	
<b>Proposed Project Funding</b>						
Assessments				\$15,738,831		
Local matches				\$10,492,557		
Total Project Funding				\$26,231,388		



**AGENDA ITEM # 5**

**AGENDA ITEM EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**Village Board Meeting**

**May 26, 2015**

**Item Title:                   Miscellaneous User Fees and Charges Study**

**Staff Contact:           Jeffrey D. O'Dell, Village Administrator**

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ACTION**

- 1. Village Board hear a presentation by staff and Mr. Russ Loebe, HR Green Vice President of Governmental Services, on the completion of the Miscellaneous User Fee and Charges Study.**
- 2. Village Board accept the Miscellaneous User Fees and Charges Study, and based on the final report, ask the Finance Planning Committee to review and recommend future revenue generation opportunities and improvements to collection processes and procedures.**

**Executive Summary:**

The Village Board's 2014 – 2016 Strategic Plan includes a Fiscal Sustainability strategic priority. One of the initiatives of that priority is to complete a comprehensive review of miscellaneous user fees and charges. The Village retained the professional consulting services of HR Green last fall to conduct the study. The study has been completed and the findings of the report will be presented during Monday night's COW meeting.

The purpose of the study was to determine if certain fees and charges for services assessed by the Village appropriately reflect the impact of inflation over time, structural changes in the costs to provide municipal services, and how the Village's fees and charges for services compare to those established in other municipalities. The analysis completed by the consultant focused on 9 key user fees and charges, specifically, building and development fees, business and liquor licensing fees, and vehicle stickers and ambulance fees. The study provides 15 key user fee opportunity recommendations to improve revenue generation and operational efficiencies in how the Village collects and processes certain fees and charges.

The analysis for each of the 9 revenue items includes a description of the fee, previous Village Board action on each item, current collection processes and procedures, and opportunities for improving efficiencies and revenue generation. In addition, the consultant surveyed selected peer communities with similar fees and charges to establish a comparison of revenue production and rates. For some of the fees and

charges, the consultant tested our permitting and collection procedures and compared them to these peer communities.

The final report is comprehensive with many opportunities for future Village Board consideration. I would encourage the Village Board to consider having the Finance Planning Committee review the report and make final recommendations on any changes to the current fee and charge rate structure to the Village Board. Those recommendations should be made in conjunction with decisions related to other General Fund revenue sources, revenues required to keep pace with planned street and municipal building capital project improvements, and revenues required for projects recently presented in the Wastewater facility plan.

**Implications:**

**Is this item budgeted?** N/A

**Any other implications to be considered?** N/A

**Attachments:**

Executive Summary of Final Report

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This section summarizes the study's findings and analysis. Based on the research from this study we have noted a series of opportunities to improve revenue generation efficiencies and options for enhanced revenue generation.

#	<b>Opportunity - Key User Fees and Charges</b>
1.	<u>Building Permit Fee - Opportunity</u> – Roselle’s building permit fees are within range of the Peer Community Survey. Although the Village’s method of building permit fee calculation is typical of many communities some communities are using less complex methods to generate permit calculation. The Village may wish to explore these options
2.	<u>Building Permit Fees - Opportunity</u> - Consider creating a policy or ordinance amendment that would set forth criteria for non-profit fee waivers. Create a fee structure that would allow capturing direct costs or some nominal amount to offset actual expense on large more complex projects 2. Establish policy that would allow for fee waivers for certain classes of petitioners i.e. 501c3, 501c4 etc. 3. Allow staff to issue these without Village Board action minimizing staff time preparing for board action.
3.	<u>Contractor Licensing Fees - Opportunity</u> – Although Roselle’s fees are within range of the survey group they are below the average for each of the three major contractor categories. The Village could consider adjusting fees upward in these three contractor groups
4.	<u>Development Fees - Opportunity</u> - Consider creating a Minor Action Application with a flat fee for minor routine petitions and applications. The fee would cover the average cost of simple legal review, public notice publication, and other customary costs associated with these types of applications (items previously reimbursed)
5.	<u>Development Fees - Opportunity</u> - Consider creating a Pre-Application Evaluation Fee to help recover costs of staff time on minor annexations proposals. Staff conducts research and spends time with applicants in preparation of minor annexations only to have the petition dropped by the applicant prior to collection of any fees. The Pre-Application Evaluation Fee coupled with expanded public information would help to reduce the frequency of “false start” applications.
6.	<u>Development Fees - Opportunity</u> - Consider increasing the fee structure for the various zoning applications to better cover the true costs of processing these applications.
7.	<u>Development Fees - Opportunity</u> - Consider creating a new category of application / permit fees to capture the costs of providing engineering reviews on non-subdivision property developments. Under current code, only subdivisions are required to pay for (reimburse) engineering expenses.
8.	<u>Stormwater Fees - Opportunity</u> - Consider creating a Storm Water Plan Review Fee that would recoup the cost of the time spent by the village’s engineer in calculating these permits and conducting on-site erosion control inspections. There are numerous stormwater fee ordinances currently in use by municipalities in the region that the Village may wish to review in greater detail.
9.	<u>Business Licensing Fees - Opportunity</u> – The Village could consider increasing fees in certain categories and still fall within the Peer Communities ranges. Through our

	<p>evaluation of the Peer Communities we noted that some communities have rather long lists of licenses. Roselle has 75 (66 without Contractor Licensing) while two Peer Communities exceed 100 licenses categories. As part of this study we have collected examples of licenses other communities have adopted and have shared that list with Village staff. The Village could evaluate the appropriateness and application of these licenses categories additions.</p>
10.	<p><u>Liquor License Fees - Opportunity</u> – Roselle is within the range of other Peer Community liquor license fees. Additionally Roselle’s revenue per license issued leads other of Peer Communities totals. Liquor licenses categories, definitions and charges vary significantly from one jurisdiction to the next. Upon a more detailed analysis there may be opportunities to adjust certain classes of licenses however in general the Village revenue from liquor license fees fares well in comparison to the Peer Communities. We noted that the Village may benefit from realignment and revised categorization of the various licenses classes.</p>
11..	<p><u>Vehicle Tag Fees - Opportunity</u> – The Village could consider increasing the charge per tag and still fall within the range of the surveyed communities. Continue managing the vehicle tag data base following the previously reference procedures.</p>
12.	<p><u>Ambulance Fees - Opportunity</u> – Roselle is slightly above average in the survey group but below the maximum level charged. The Village could move some of these rates upward somewhat and still fall within in the survey range. Although any fee increase will be tempered by write-offs, adjustments, waivers and credits.</p>
13.	<p><u>Ambulance Fees - Opportunity</u> – Reaffirm the Villages policy of providing fee waivers to residents. Staff has indicated that the policy for providing fee waivers (subsidy) for Roselle residents is a long standing policy set by the Village board in 1999. This subsidy is in addition to the resident’s discount built into the Villages ambulance fee structure. A reduction in the amount of subsidy or a change in subsidy criteria could result in a substantial increase in revenue for the Village. However, any change in the resident fee waiver is clearly a policy issue that weighs extra revenue against the assistance provided to Roselle residents.</p>
14.	<p><u>Ambulance Fees - Opportunity</u> – Develop a written policy identifying procedures for processing billing waivers, reductions, and the associated authorizations. Many of the ambulance fee write-offs are Medicare, Medicaid, and insurance related issues that require no additional direction from the Village. However, Village staff and the third party billing contractor regularly process billing waivers (resident waivers, hardship, bankruptcy etc.) where the reductions require Village authorizations prior to approval. To help avoid any future confusion a formal written policy regarding the processing of these waivers would be beneficial.</p>
15.	<p><u>Parking Lot Fees - Opportunity</u> – Although Roselle’ rate structure falls within the range of fees in the survey for both daily fee and monthly permit parking, it appears that there are opportunities to explore monthly permit fee rate adjustments and still fall within the range of the Parking Fee Survey and those of nearby communities.</p>



**AGENDA ITEM # 6**

**AGENDA ITEM EXECUTIVE SUMMARY  
Committee of the Whole Meeting  
5/26/2015**

**Item Title:**           **Repair of Main Street Plaza Permeable Glass Surface**

**Staff Contact:**       Phil Cotter, Public Works Director

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ACTION**

**Village Board discuss repairs to the permeable glass surface located at the Main Street Plaza and authorize Staff to approve a proposal from Emerald Site Services to perform such repairs.**

**Executive Summary:**

In 2010, the Village oversaw a streetscape project that involved the installation of a permeable recycled glass paving surface on the lot located at the southeast corner of Main Street and Prospect Street. Christopher B. Burke Engineering was the design/build engineer on the project and Emerald Site Services was the contractor/installer. The installation of this permeable glass surface was part of a design-build contract for the Main Street Plaza that incorporated the installation of a new fountain, new sidewalk, street lighting and street improvements. The cost of the entire project was approximately \$340,000 and financed with the issuance of a debt certificate and a donation from the Janke family.

Recognizing that the surface of this lot has deteriorated through the years, Staff consulted with the engineer and contractor who both acknowledged that the glass surface is not as durable as originally thought it would be. They also indicated that the lot will likely require ongoing maintenance, and may even warrant replacement at some point in the future. The following alternatives are presented for discussion:

1. Perform maintenance and repairs as needed
2. Replace glass surface with asphalt or concrete
3. Replace glass surface with natural landscaping (turf grass, mulch, rocks, etc.)
4. Replace glass surface with permeable pavers
5. Do not repair or replace the glass surface

Staff solicited a proposal from Emerald Site Services to repair the permeable glass surface. The proposal includes removal of the loose material on the surface, application of a skim coat (with glass aggregate) to restore the damaged and worn areas, and a seal coat of the entire surface at a proposed cost of \$5,145. It is Staff's recommendation to accept this proposal and authorize the immediate repair of the glass

surface. Staff will continue to monitor the condition of the glass surface and, if the lot shows signs of significant deterioration within the next year or two, propose an alternative other than its repair.

**Implications:**

**Is this item budgeted?** The FY 2015 Budget does not allocate funds for these repairs, however, Staff recommends utilizing funds from the Capital Improvement Fund (General Capital) for the recommended repairs.

**Any other implications to be considered?** At the April 27 Village Board meeting, the Village Board accepted a donation of picnic tables for the plaza from the Taste of Roselle Commission. Installation of the picnic tables will be deferred until after the repairs to the glass surface are completed.

Both the engineer and contractor recommended that vehicles be kept off the glass surface and suggested the installation of bollards along the south edge of the lot (along the alley). There are decorative, removable bollards that could be utilized while still keeping with the aesthetic of the downtown area. Removable bollards are approximately \$250 each and could be installed by Public Works.

**Attachments:**

None