

**COMMITTEE-OF-THE-WHOLE
MINUTES
March 31, 2020**

Mayor Gallo called the Committee-of-the-Whole meeting via Zoom Teleconferencing to order at 7:30 p.m.

COUNCIL IN ATTENDANCE REMOTELY: Aldermen Mike Cannon, Nick Budmats, Kevin O'Brien, Jenifer Vinezeano, Jon Bisesi, John D'Astice and Lara Sanoica

COUNCIL MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE REMOTELY: Finance Director Melissa Gallagher, Deputy City Clerk Judy Brose, Police Chief John Nowacki, Fire Chief Jeff Moxley, Director Public Works Rob Horne, Assistant Director Public Works Jo Ellen Charlton and City Attorney Melissa Wolf

Before we start I'd like to have a motion to suspend the City's Open Meetings Act (OMA) requirements and electronic attendance requirements in section 2-114 to allow for electronic attendance for members of the City Council to facilitate these meetings, I do want to suspend the Open Meetings Act for all future meetings until the State of Emergency has been lifted by the Governor. Is there a motion? Alderman Sanoica has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Vinezeano. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye; those opposed say nay. It's unanimous.

I'd like to let the members of the public know who are joining us, they will be afforded the opportunity for public comment so long as you provided your contact credentials and the subject you wanted to speak on before the deadline on these issues can only one the matters specifically on this evening's agenda. We ask that persons who do speak address the City Council and keep their comments to 5 minutes in length. Comments must be addressed to the Council as a whole through the Mayor, and profanity may not be used in any form.

Please note, items were not discussed in the order as listed on the Agenda

1) Meacham Road Improvement

Rob Horne, Director Public Works – As the Council will recall, in December of last year, Staff provided a report related to the Plum Grove Road/Meacham Road corridor improvement, in response to a letter received from the Village of Schaumburg. The Village of Schaumburg provided the letter to the City in response to the Illinois Department of Transportation's Multi-Year Plan, which identifies a project on this section of roadway. Based on the funding identified in the plan (\$667,000), the project is expected to resurface the subject roadway only. As this project has shared jurisdiction and importance to both the Village and the City, the Village of Schaumburg was interested to see if the position of the Council had changed, especially given the significant changeover in seats held from 2016, when the project was not supported.

Since that meeting, the Village of Schaumburg has reached out again, pursuing support from the City, in a letter drafted to the Illinois Department of Transportation requesting that they defer the resurfacing project, in favor of a reconstruction project. As Council had not made their position known at the time, Staff suggested that the Village of Schaumburg request that the Illinois Department of Transportation defer their decision to bid the proposed work until after the Council has had an opportunity to reevaluate the original decision. To date, staff has not received any feedback from the Village related to IDOT's response.

At the request of the City Council a roadway life-cycle cost analysis was developed by the City Engineer. These costs reflect anticipated costs that might be expected through the life-cycle of the roadway. A roadway life-cycle

is typically 18 to 20 years, before the roadway is “reborn”. The City performs \$1,000,000 in resurfacing roadways annually. This is the maintenance practice performed at the end of a life-cycle to allow a roadway segment to start a new life-cycle and avoid a complete reconstruction.

The costs provided by the City engineer are provided as a comprehensive cost assessment over a single life-cycle, with several assumptions. Staff further broke the costs down to review annual costs based on the maintenance projected in the engineering life-cycle analysis which is included as attachment B in the agenda packet. The City Council had several questions in preparation for (and during) the December meeting. Staff attempted to capture those questions and provide answers which are included as attachment C in the agenda packet.

We did receive numerous inquiries about how a three lane road is safer than a four lane road or a five lane road. The City Engineer was able to provide a memorandum over the last two days from a study that was performed in 2017 on a section of roadway in Lake County which is very similar to Meacham Road, its Deerfield Road. They determined that the total crashes on a road segment similar to Meacham Road would be an annual crash data of approximately 55 crashes per year. With a three lane roadway in the same road segment it was 27 per year, it was a drop of over 50%, a four lane roadway was 32 crashes and a five lane was 29 crashes. It was shown through a pretty significant engineering study that the three lane roadway was actually the safest and most cost prohibitive option available. Obviously, I didn’t get this report until late, it’s quite extensive, while the memo is only two pages the report is over 30 pages. I tried to outline the information that we had and I’ll be happy to answer any questions.

Alderman Vinezeano – The numbers that the engineer put together, what type of lanes were those numbers put together for? Three lane, four lane? Just so we have an idea what to base that on and if it was in there I apologize, I just didn’t see it.

Rob Horne, Director Public Works – The entire discussion has been on the premise of a three lane cross section.

Alderman D’Astice - I’m looking at the collision statistics that you provided and it says we had 37 crashes in five years but on the other road you were saying 27, 37 or 57 in one year? Did I misunderstand what you said?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works – You did not misunderstand what I said. I thought the report said annually.

Gary Rozwadowski, City Engineer - The report that Rob was referring to was a report that we did for Deerfield Road that is very similar to Meacham Road two lane road. The average daily traffic (ADT) for Deerfield is about 20,000 and Meacham is currently around 17 or 18,000 so it’s comparative. What that predictive accident report shows was that annually if nothing was done to Deerfield Road it would continue to show 55 accidents per year. If Deerfield Road was widened to a three lane section you could expect an average of 27 accidents per year.

Alderman D’Astice - I’m looking at the information that was provided shows that Meacham only had 37 accidents in five years and that seems to be significantly less than Deerfield Road.

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - I can’t speak to what scenarios were used. As I said, it’s a 30 page document where I believe they use some software to make those determinations. I counted the accident reports that were filed with the police that the Police Chief provided to me directly. I know that our information is accurate with the reports that were written in the City. The point that I was hoping to make was to show that you can expect about a 50% reduction in crash incidences as a result of adding the third lane. That’s simply all I wanted to provide.

Alderman D’Astice – I’m looking at page 22 of the packet that was provided and it says the collision statistics for our road, am I misunderstanding that?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works – No, that's correct. The statistics that I provided in the memorandum was 37 over 5 years which were provided to me directly from the Police Chief.

Alderman Bisesi – If we did nothing, what would be the impact?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works – No improvement on crashes, no potential economic value by improving the roadway but most importantly IDOT generally doesn't resurface a roadway and then come back and improve it beyond the resurfacing. The concern that I wanted to present to the Council that if they do resurface it that is likely all that will happen for at least one lifecycle. It could be 15 to 20 years before any improvements were made that were not initiated specifically by the City or the Village of Schaumburg. Once IDOT contributes \$750,000.00 to the project, they are not likely going to do anything with that roadway whether it's lighting, bridge improvements, pedestrian improvements and drainage improvements. They're likely not going to do many of those things if they're including money to do a resurface only.

Alderman Bisesi – If they were to do just a resurface they would not expand the road or anything like that?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - No, it would be very similar to Algonquin Road where they just grind off the top 2 inches, a few curb repairs and perform ADA improvements at any pedestrian crossings that are existing. They wouldn't add anything and they wouldn't improve anything beyond the limits of the existing roadway.

Alderman Budmats - The computer model where there's 55 crashes, is that for the whole length of road or just the portion in Rolling Meadows?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - It was actually 37 crashes in the five years and that was only for the Rolling Meadows section because it specifically involves all responses by our Police Department which they would only respond to our jurisdiction.

Alderman Budmats - I'm not questioning our data, I'm questioning the computer model for Deerfield Road based on comparison they said 55 crashes, is that for the whole length of road which would bear it out seeing that we probably have about 70-80% of the road whereas the rest is in unincorporated or in Schaumburg?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works – Yes, as I'm reading the memorandum it talks about the Deerfield Road analysis that includes 12 roadway segments and 11 intersections between US 45/21 Milwaukee Ave. and Saunders Road, that's a substantially longer section of roadway than Meacham Road.

Alderman Budmats - There's no reason to think that we wouldn't experience the same percentage drop in accidents, correct?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works – I agree. Almost every police report that I read was a rear-end or a head on collision as a result of a left hand turn, people turning across the road into a subdivision or a roadway.

Alderman Budmats - The bridge is 100% not in Rolling Meadows. I drove the road again today and it seems that the bridge is presently wide enough to handle three lanes, is there any truth to that?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - I know there were discussions about the bridge, Alderman Cannon brought that up previously, and I did try to secure some information regarding the bridge but I don't recall that off the top of my head. I think some bridge improvements were required but unsure.

Gary Rozwadowski, Christopher Burke Engineering - I have no information that bridge.

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - I don't know what resolution they came to in the past regarding the bridge.

Alderman Cannon - To go along with the last comment you made, the little knowledge I have of the Loeber Farm property that's located just on the south end of that bridge. Most of the proposals that have come to date in front of Schaumburg to my knowledge, they have a roadway that they want to put in along that creek going from Meacham Road west. The problem is that it is in a flood plain and they want to get as close to the creek so they can fit more houses or whatever else they're going to put in there. If that came to fruition, there has to be a right-hand turn lane into that subdivision and therefore that bridge would have to be widened. When that bridge was done 12 to 15 years ago it was widened but I don't know if it was widened enough for three lanes. At that time Loeber Farm was still an actual farm. Rob, I'd like to compliment you and your staff for putting this whole report together along with Gary and the rest of his team at Burke Engineering. I thought we asked before but I don't see an answer for it, were you able to identify, if we did this, what would happen to the stoplight at the corner of Meacham/Old Plum Grove Road? Would we take possession of that streetlight?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - One of the things that I didn't bring up in the original presentation which I probably should have is that I've made several attempts to have discussions with the Village of Schaumburg staff and IDOT staff related to the potential scenarios that could occur. There is so much noncommittal that I feel it would be irresponsible to give the Council the information related to those conversations. Everything I've heard is up in the air depending on whether we pursue it or not. Again, I don't think it would be out of the question to discuss the potential of not having to take control of those traffic signals. IDOT staff has been noncommittal about indicating one way or the other.

Alderman Cannon – Does that mean, at this moment, that the state actually owns the stoplight and maintains it?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - I believe they do but I would have to check with Don Wenzel. That is a question I did ask so I would be happy to provide that response to Council when I get that information.

Alderman Cannon - I would like to bring forward my feelings on this whole project. Mr. D'Astice and I went through this whole scenario 5 or 6 years ago and we had multiple citizen meetings, there were dozens of them. Most of the people from unincorporated Palatine and the people in our town attended and voiced a lot of opinions. With that said, my feelings have not changed since the last time we talked about this. If the state wants to remodel it into the fashion they want to do it that's fine. I don't think the citizens of Rolling Meadows should be on the hook for any money for this. Rob, I would imagine that you have spent multiple hours putting together this whole presentation and Burke Engineering has billed us for more hours, which they should because they did work for us. We probably already spent a couple of thousand dollars just on this report alone. My point is, money is not the only consideration I worry about, the biggest consideration I worry about is all the staff time that you and Jo Ellen and the rest of your staff have to put in if this project goes forward. It's not just dollars and cents, it's time you won't be using on other projects and I know it will be extensive hours. I am not for this project going forward with us participating. To all the people who might be listening from unincorporated Palatine, for the last six years the gentleman who is your Highway Commissioner has never chimed in on this, they have always been a non-voice. I know a lot of people in that area have concerns, your voices are not heard the way they should be because your Highway Commissioner has done nothing to help facilitate this process one way or the other. I would encourage you to reach out to that person and get him involved so you have a say with what's going on. At this point, I'm selfish and geared toward the people of Rolling Meadows, it's not that I don't have feelings for you in unincorporated Palatine or Schaumburg, this is a very costly project and it will just add costs for us. Our budget

has already been budgeted to the max already and we made a couple purchases in the last couple weeks that's going to stress our budget even more for this year. I just want to voice my opinion, I'm not interested in spending a dime more on this project.

Alderman Sanoica - I have three items that I would like to discuss. Director Horne, when you were reviewing the 37 accidents, did any of those accidents involve pedestrians or cyclists?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - I don't recall. I was trying to keep an eye on that but I don't recall seeing any. My guess is that there weren't any because there are no pedestrian facilities in that area or very little. I did not notice pedestrian crash reports.

Alderman Sanoica - This is for Assistant Director Charlton regarding economic development and if she can provide any additional recommendations as far as the importance of that corridor and any impact of widening that corridor would have on the City of Rolling Meadows?

Jo Ellen Charlton, Assistant Director Public Works - I think back in December Director Horne did mention the incredible benefit that this could provide for the commercial intersection to the north of this particular area. As we know it has the type of transportation or traffic count that is pretty typical of more successful commercial areas and it is fairly underutilized and the commercial uses are little obsolete. One of the things that we considered in the transportation corridor leading up to that intersection would be how much of an improvement we could potentially make to the commercial businesses in the area and how much more marketable it might make some of those properties including a property that the City owns in that particular area. That's one of the things that we are very interested in supporting for the City of Rolling Meadows is to create a more vibrant area in that particular area. One of the other things that you noted was the pedestrian and bicycle traffic. Right now many people who live in that area pretty much obligated to hop in a car and travel to any destination. Creating an improvement and cross-section of a three lane and bicycle/pedestrian amenities could also provide opportunities for residents in the area to travel by bicycle or by walking (*inaudible*). I know a lot of people that live in that area to avoid going south because of how congested and busy it is in the Schaumburg area which is only really going to get worse as the development of the Motorola property gears up. I think if we look towards supporting something that could potentially support development at the Euclid intersection that could be potentially advantageous economically for the City.

Alderman Sanoica – As a follow up to that is for our City Engineer regarding the estimate studies and whether or not those estimate studies include ADA compliant and pedestrian walkways or bike paths?

Gary Rozwadowski, Christopher Burke Engineering – Are you referring to the estimate of the \$7 million that Rob referred to a while ago?

Alderman Sanoica – No, I'm referring to the maintenance of the roadway that was presented in attachment A.

Ryan Lindeman, Christopher Burke Engineering – The maintenance does assume that the three lane section would have pedestrian improvement, sidewalks or bike paths. It's included in the resurfacing incidentals.

Alderman Budmats – From my own personal experience, I will avoid going south on this roadway because of the typical traffic backup. Is there any thought to the impact that this will have on Old Plum Grove Road, actually getting less wear and tear because it seems like it gets a lot of traffic that splits off trying to avoid the traffic and it's a shortcut to Algonquin? I find myself traveling up Roselle and taking Old Plum Grove to get to the area in question where the stop light is that Mike is talking about rather than coming up Meacham. Any thoughts as to what that would save us in costs in terms of that roadway if we were to improve this roadway?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - I don't think any of us would be able to put a dollar amount on it at this time but I am quite certain that it will reduce traffic on that road. We did have conversations about that and I know we talked about the potential for decreased speeding through that area which is also adjacent to a school. That is certainly something that would be recognized so an actual dollar amount would be just a guess and it would probably be better if we went back to the drawing board and look at what potential costs would occur. It would definitely reduce the wear and tear on old Plum Grove Road.

Alderman Sanoica - My question is for Alderman Cannon and Alderman D'Astice regarding their previous time on the Council when this item came up in 2014 and 2015. I would just request some clarification as to the reasons why they voted against this project, if it was solely based off of aesthetics from residents or if it also involved other considerations regarding public safety and economic development.

Alderman Cannon - To answer the question, it's the same reason as I'm offering now. Our budget keeps on getting stretched, we've taken over a number of other roadways already, we just did Kirchoff last year and it cost us a lot of money out of our budget even though we get some help from the state, we had to get in line to get that money. If we do this this time, it sounds like our share would be \$500,000 or more plus all of our employee time to get this project done if we took it on and then we're stuck with the maintenance on it going forward. The State gives us no money, they don't lower our taxes and they don't give us a rebate every year to take over the roadway just like they didn't with Kirchoff Road. My reasoning is strictly financial. I think I would speak for a lot of people in a sense, I think a lot of people would love to have the road redone but why should we have to pay for it when it's not our road.

Alderman D'Astice- What I heard over the years is similar to what Mr. Cannon just said. The people in that area absolutely spoke against it. They did not want it. There was a conversation at one point about a five lane, than a four lane and it was Mayor Rooney who brought up the idea of possibly a three lane thinking that would be a good compromise, however all the residents who live around there were very vocal against it. That was part of my decision and part of it was the extra money it would cost us. I'm sure that the State can improve that roadway and if they wanted to improve that with our input and pay for maintenance of the roadway, I'm all for it. Why should our residents have to pay for a street that the majority of them probably don't even use? That's just a couple of the thoughts that were discussed over the years on that area.

Alderman Sanoica - I would like our Director of Public Works, Rob Horne to clarify regarding our obligations for the jurisdictional transfer and whether or not that is still on the table as opposed to a requirement for this project to go forward if we were to pursue a three lane.

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - I would contend that our efforts should be focused on if the Council were to want to move forward it would certainly be conditional on not accepting full jurisdiction of the roadway. I don't think the resurfacing cost should be the responsibility of any municipality especially given that the available grant funding for resurfacing seems to be drying up. It would also be my contention that staff would work with Schaumburg to address one of Alderman Cannon's points, we would certainly request that the Village of Schaumburg would be the lead agency which would alleviate a lot of our staff time, not all of it but a lot of it, and we would also request that multiple funding opportunities be explored. I think in the packet of questions I provided a list of several potential funding opportunities. Again, I think I said it at the December meeting, Meacham Road is a regional roadway that affects not only Rolling Meadows residents, not only Palatine Township residents, not only Schaumburg residents, it impacts an entire region so it would be an attractive project for grant funding. I can't guarantee that but I certainly would not be interested in recommending to the Council that we try and get involved

with a project that requires hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars by the City as was referenced by both Alderman D'Astice and Alderman Cannon.

Alderman Sanoica – It sounds like to me in the interest of public safety and economic development being able to decrease 37 crashes essentially critical crashes to under 20 is a worthwhile endeavor that we should be taking seriously as a Council.

Mayor Gallo – A lot of that is substantially arguably true.

Alderman Bisesi - I know Rob just said that he would definitely recommend not having the jurisdictional transfer. I noticed something in the packet, does that raise any dollar value in there substantially? The line that says if we don't do the jurisdictional transfer (*inaudible*) number.

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - Throughout the entire process the City Council would have opportunities to avoid pursuing it further but it is my understanding from the Village of Schaumburg staff that there may be an opportunity to move forward on this project without jurisdictional transfer which is not common for IDOT projects. Again, we would request that IDOT either partner with the Village and City in pursuing grants or make up the difference that they were willing to make up in the previous proposal to alleviate that concern to the City and the Village of Schaumburg. We certainly would bring it to the Council for consideration with any significant costs associated with this project for approval before we proceeded with any kind of real commitment.

Mayor Gallo – At this time, I'm going to open the floor to the residents who have signed in in advance and after the residents are done speaking I'm going to ask that Council help me with addressing their requested feedback that staff has put forward. There are four items here and some of them appear to be contingent on another and so at that time after public comments we'll address these and get through this subject.

Mayor Gallo opened the floor.

Steve Holish - Basically the only question I have, I submitted those other questions for you based on the other conversations we had over the years on this reconstruction of Meacham. I understand Mr. Horne got the information on Deerfield Road just to stipulate that if you go to three lanes you reduce the number of incidents. I would like to see that report because clearly it's a longer road, its more intersections, but at least it will illustrate that there is a reduction in backend crashes. You can get that same information for four lanes, five lanes but I guess my overall question now, what will the state do if we don't go ahead with three lanes, will they just resurface it or would they look at actively increasing the width of Meacham because of the increased traffic from the Motorola complex and all the other stuff that's going on down there, with the Loeber Farms property being developed if it ever does, what's the probability? Would they just resurface and be done with it and wait 20 years? I appreciate all the information that Rob provided in December because he does present an interesting case on how it would make the road look better but again do we really want to do that and spend the money, I don't think so. If Rob could answer that question, what's the probability, 50% that the state would resurface it and be done with it? Or would they actively look at increasing the lanes?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works – I would just add that we can only go by the information we're given to date and to date they have identified funding to resurface the road only. We would have no reason to believe they would consider anything else unless it was pursued by another community.

Howard Pohl - Thank you all very much, I am one of those residents in unincorporated Palatine Plum Grove Estates area and I'm part of the Rolling Meadows Park District. Before I get to my point I might give you some

perspective since I live very close to the bridge and that question has come up very often, the bridge would probably handle three lanes but there is no way it could possibly handle sidewalks or anything else like that or shoulders so that might give you a perspective and it took forever to build that bridge when it was reconstructed a decade ago. I have three points I'd like to make if I could and perhaps have some discussion. One is on traffic, right now drivers on northbound Meacham nearing Algonquin now logically avoid Meacham north of Algonquin and turn west to either Quentin or Roselle to move north or turn east to go on Algonquin to go to Route 53. In my opinion, widening Meacham from Algonquin North to the firehouse would probably only exacerbate the traffic and would simply move any of the bottleneck north to Illinois where it would go to two lanes again and lead to downtown Palatine. Has a traffic study been done on all aspects of this project? The second point is construction, many of you will recall about 10 years ago or so, about 1 mile of Plum Grove Road was widened to four lanes from the firehouse at that time to Illinois. For the person who was asking about economic development, that widening crushed your economic development around Euclid because no longer could anybody turn left from northbound Meacham/Plum Grove Road it to what was the Pizza Hut or many of the other establishments there and similarly couldn't turn left into the east side. I don't think this widening would do a thing to that since that's where all of the development is. As another point, that whole project was in my opinion an absolute disaster, it took over two years to complete. The same period of time the Illinois toll road added to lanes in each direction from Elgin to Rockford which is about 40 miles and we couldn't complete 1 mile in two years. There were constantly equipment laying there with no workers and no work being done. Who actually builds this road and who would be supervising? Hopefully, it wouldn't be the same contractor who did Meacham south of Algonquin where if any of you travel on that road towards the tollway or Woodfield you'll notice that Meacham was falling apart with concrete constantly grumbling. It's was a very poorly done project. My other point was as several people have mentioned, the farm being developed north of International Village on the west side of Meacham, when that does happen it's going to require substantial intersections and other things to the west and if those aren't being planned now you can bet there will be a whole other reconstruction at that time when all that comes through. From my standpoint, in today's economic environment I'm all for capital improvements and I'm all for road construction and improving roads but with budgets being down, (*inaudible*) like your finance director probably facing substantially lower income from taxes on restaurants and everything and who are having a difficult time, I can't see that now would possibly be the time anybody would consider putting any money in to a road construction project like this. Thank you again so much for inviting comments.

Mayor Gallo - Thank you. I will open this up to Director Horne, I captured two of the three questions, I'm not sure if third question was finally asked. Director Horne, the first question, was a traffic study conducted for the whole road? Then, who would build the road and who would supervise?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works - Those were the only two questions that I think I could respond to because I wasn't here when they did the previous construction. The answer to the first question is that we have not done an engineering study of the entire roadway at least since I've been here. Obviously, we would want to do that this time so it's relevant information. In regard to the work, that project would be publicly let by the Illinois Department of Transportation. As a result, a qualified contractor that meets all of the Illinois Department of Transportation regulations, they would be awarded the project. They would have a resident engineer that would be responsible for the project but the lead agency would also have a resident engineer that would be managing the day-to-day project activities similar to when we secured Christopher Burke Engineering, Ryan who is on the phone right now, to do the resident engineering of Kirchoff Road on behalf of IDOT. That's how that project would be managed.

Jay Andrew - I'm a resident of unincorporated Palatine at Forest and Meacham right at the corner so this would directly impact our house with construction easements and things like that, it would but up to our yard and cause us a lot of headaches. When this was brought up back in early 2010's, I organized a group called the Residents Against Meacham Expansion to try to keep the road from being expanded past its current footprint was our goal.

We have about 100 residents in that organization that are like-minded and don't want to see a five lane road and don't necessarily want to see a three lane road. Some people want a three lane road and they would be okay with that. The problems with that are it creates a suicide lane in the middle. The proposal they did at that time, they did drawings and spent a lot of money to put together the drawings and have meetings. That proposal has a suicide lane in the middle with no stoplights or stop signs for any of our intersections for our housing developments. We cannot get in or out of our neighborhoods if there's no way to stop the oncoming traffic. Currently, when the traffic stops at Old Plum Grove Road, the cars back up at the intersections, people leave a space for you to turn in. That backup only happens because the light turns red at Old Plum Grove Road and then it backs up. A couple of the things that I wanted to address, in your packet is kind of misinformation. The car counts that you are giving of 17-18,000 that's not accurate. Your own police department did a car count and it's in your December 5, 2019 City of Rolling Meadows redlight report, the average daily traffic at Kirchoff and Plum Grove Road is 11,950 cars and that was in 2014, it started out as 32,800 in 2006. That's the other thing, the packet gave some of the history, the original funding on this went back to 2001 so we're almost 20 years into this and this is the third time I've been involved with it with the City of Rolling Meadows. You guys have voted it down twice before and I don't understand why you keep bringing this back up and spending time and assets on this. It doesn't make any sense, the residents do not want it. Mayor Rooney told us that the state was never going to resurface it so we had to agree to a three lane road because if the state came in they were going to put five lanes in. Now the state is saying that they will resurface it and you guys are blocking that from happening and that's now affecting us because we're not getting the road resurfaced and it does need it. The county does a good job of maintaining it, they plow our snow, they plow the road and they fill the potholes and I don't have a problem with it. Several years ago the county commissioner was trying to do away with unincorporated areas and get some of these things off of the county ledger. I'm sure she's probably still trying to push that but it really has gone nowhere in those five years she's been at the helm but that doesn't concern me. My concern is that this road gets taken over by Schaumburg or Rolling Meadows. Rolling Meadows you have a tight budget and have a lot of roads to maintain and that you're not going to put the dollars towards the continuous maintenance of the road moving forward. The economic impact is kind of funny because she asked a question and then everyone explained how everybody avoids going south, that's good for Rolling Meadows because you're to the north. If you create where people are going south, you're going to make it easier for them to go to Woodfield and Schaumburg and spend their money. Right now, I go to Rolling Meadows all the time, I live at Forest, I work on Emerson, we have a business there. Most of the businesses at that intersection are full, the paint store is out and the restaurant is out. The restaurant was not the right type of restaurant to have in that neighborhood. So you're going to hurt your economic impact by opening this up and letting people go south to Schaumburg and that's why Schaumburg wants it. They want people to come there and spend their money. I just don't see the logic behind it. The car crash data, you're trying to use Deerfield Road that's not similar at all. The engineer did this the last time he wrote this report, he goes out and pulls these crazy things that don't apply to this area and tries to fit the round peg into a square hole.

Becky Booth - I've lived in Dawngate for 35 years and my husband and I have attended countless meetings on Meacham Road before tonight. I'm here to say the Council made the right decision not to widen Meacham Road. With the Meacham Road topic recently reopened to satisfy the interest of Schaumburg, I have a reminder for the Council. You are all elected to represent the best interest of Rolling Meadows residents not those of a neighboring community. I talked to many other Rolling Meadows residents who are also angry about this. There was no reason to revisit this issue a few weeks ago and there's even less reason today. I contend that much of tonight's previous discussion is irrelevant in light of Covid-19. We are all experiencing an unprecedented and uncertain economic future caused by the pandemic. There will be unpredictable fallout but one certainty is no one can possibly foresee the outcome yet, other than increased taxes and harder times ahead. I'm sure Rolling Meadows taxpayers agree with me. This is hardly the time to obligate our City for a massive expenditure either directly or indirectly. So tell Schaumburg this Council stands firm on the decision you made before they applied recent pressure. Please don't waste any more staff time on this issue. Thank you very much.

Mayor Gallo closed the floor.

Mayor Gallo – That concludes the public speakers on this subject. For those who can see my monitor right now, I have up the series of questions that staff is requesting feedback on. Like I mentioned, it appears that one or two have contingencies on the other. What I'm going to do first is read through all of these so we can identify those contingencies specifically the third and fourth one.

1. Does the Council desire to support a roadway project that would widen Plum Grove Road/Meacham Road to a three-lane cross-section originally proposed in 2012, subject to certain conditions (no jurisdictional transfer, IDOT participation, bridge ownership, etc.)?
2. Does the Council have any interest in pursuing a five-lane cross-section widening/improvement, instead of the originally proposed three-lane cross-section? *If so, staff will work with the City Engineer to provide updated figures.*
3. Does the Council desire that staff enter into discussions with both the Village of Schaumburg and the Illinois Department of Transportation, regarding widening/improving Plum Grove Road/Meacham Road?
4. Does the City Council want staff to begin to research funding opportunities that could be pursued at a more appropriate time? *If so, staff will work with the Village of Schaumburg and the City Engineer to identify and apply, for appropriate grant funding to account for the local share costs.*

It looks like for questions 3 and 4 there's a request to participate in dialogue with the Village of Schaumburg and if we did engage in dialogue with Schaumburg then we pursue joint funding opportunities to a certain degree. I'm not sure if one or the other would cancel out based on votes. By a show of hands, does the City Council desire to support a roadway project that would widened Plum Grove Road/Meacham Road with three lane cross-section as original proposed in 2012 subject to certain conditions? All those in favor? Opposed? 4 in favor; 3 opposed.

Does the Council have any interest in pursuing a five-lane cross-section widening/improvement, instead of the originally proposed three-lane cross-section? If so, staff will work with the City Engineer to provide updated figures. All those in favor? Opposed? 1 in favor; 6 opposed.

Does the Council desire that staff enter into discussions with both the Village of Schaumburg and the Illinois Department of Transportation, regarding widening/improving Plum Grove Road/Meacham Road? All those in favor? Opposed? 4 in favor; 3 opposed.

Does the City Council want staff to begin to research funding opportunities that could be pursued at a more appropriate time? If so, staff will work with the Village of Schaumburg and the City Engineer to identify and apply, for appropriate grant funding to account for the local share costs. All those in favor? Opposed? 3 in favor; 4 opposed.

If there's any quick conversation that requires question and answer from staff on any one of these please raise your hand.

Alderman Cannon – With part of the discussion with the State, can we actually talk to them that we would like them to go ahead and repave the road?

Mayor Gallo – Director Horne, do you have feedback on our ability to engage in dialogue readily and easily with the State on repaving?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works – Yes, I think based on the feedback we received per the questions you asked, it at least provides us with some ability to have meaningful dialogue with both IDOT and the Village of Schaumburg to ask some of those critical questions that would probably be determining factors whether the City Council wanted to move forward. Again, as I said it's been hard to get any kind of meaningful conversation out of anyone from either party without some sort of commitment by the City.

Mayor Gallo – Correct, to be clear this is noncommittal, this Committee of the Whole conversation, this is to provide staff with the appropriate direction they need and then come back with more concrete information so Council can make an affirmative decision.

Alderman O'Brien - I think if we don't do our due diligence by at least having the conversation I think it was pretty clear that nobody's open to doing the five lane expansion but I do think it's probably worth our due diligence. There are some residents, none that were able to join us tonight, that have reached out that would be interested. That's why did vote in favor of option one and option three because I think from our perspective to do due diligence for when a decision is made that it would be worthwhile to talk with IDOT and the Village of Schaumburg to see if there is any consensus. It may end up learning that Schaumburg isn't interested, IDOT, the funding, etc., it may be a moot point at that time. I am too from a financial perspective is to make sure that the funding would be available, it's fair share. I think it would be the best due diligence. At lease enter into a conversation. It is staff time but I think it would be staff time well spent. It might be a couple hour conference call with the right parties. It might be a moot point at that time for us to approve or deny any further action. That's why I voted in support of due diligence to make sure we look at all options before taking the vote.

Alderman Sanoica – To follow up with Alderman O'Brien's comment, does staff have any recommendations at this point to pursue a five lane roadway?

Rob Horne, Director Public Works – No, I don't. That was simply put in because there was previous conversation in a 2016 meeting with the Council at that time that a five lane roadway might be considered either by IDOT or future construction (*inaudible*). It was just to make sure that we were all on the same page (*inaudible*).

Alderman Sanoica – I would also like to have additional information regarding that option before completely ruling it out.

2) Administration & Finance Operation Update – COVID – 19

Melissa Gallagher, Finance Director – This is information provided to the Mayor, City Council, residents, businesses and the community.

City Hall and Public Works Offices are temporarily closed to the public, based on health guidelines issued in response to the Covid-19 outbreak. All public safety operations will continue, including services provided by the

Fire Department, Police Department and Public Works Department. While City Hall is closed to the public, City services continue to be delivered and our Community Development and Finance Departments remain open remotely by phone at (847) 394-8500 or by email at finance@cityrm.org.

The City's Emergency Planning Committee and all City Departments are tracking COVID-19 activities and expenses. Please understand that with this rapidly changing environment the most up-to-date information is on the City's website at www.cityrm.org.

Additional Information:

- ✓ The Administration, Finance & Community Development Departments continue to operate at this time via phone and email (see www.cityrm.org for various emails).
- ✓ Payments are accepted by the following methods:
 - Online at www.cityrm.org;
 - White Drop Box (City Hall Parking Lot);
 - By mail (City of Rolling Meadows, 3600 Kirchoff Road, IL 60008).
- ✓ There are **NO LATE PENALTIES** for any types of bills.
- ✓ There are **NO WATER SHUT OFFs for Water Bills**.
- ✓ To further assist the public, within days of the shut-down, at the direction of the City Manager, the City immediately created new, online payment options. We added online payment options for Real Estate Transfers, Local Motor Fuel Taxes, Food & Beverage Taxes and Building Permits. In addition, we created a one-page summary for the new procedure for Real Estate Transfers (which has been helpful for sellers, realtors and attorneys).

The City made a difficult decision to postpone plans to launch our new utility billing invoices and our online customer service payment portal. This decision was done in order to ensure the health and safety of our residents and employees due to Covid-19.

Rolling Meadows mailed, a four-page informational piece (in a green envelope) detailing the new billing platform and the new online payment portal's features to all utility billing customers, just this week. This mailing went out well before the shut-down occurred. We ask that residents put this information on your fridge or a bulletin board for future reference.

For our Automatic Bill Pay customers (those who pay with a credit card or a bank account on the 20th of each month). The City's current auto payment system remains in place for customers already enrolled. There are no changes to your payments at this time.

Be advised, that paper bills will continue to be mailed to residents. When the new platform is available, residents will always have a choice of receiving a paper bill or an electronic bill (there is no cost either way). If you receive a paper bill today, the only way to change it to an electronic bill is through the portal (when it becomes available).

Please see the City's website for information and the April E-News & Views for information.

Mayor Gallo – I know this was simply an update but if there are any questions from Council that relay back to residents. I know Alderman Bisesi asked a question about late penalties for utility bills, this is addressed here. If there are other questions from Council at this time that they can receive from this update now is the time to raise your hand. I don't see any hands going up. I appreciate the update and I do appreciate staff's work in putting these updates on our City's website and doing a good job pushing those updates out to social media. Like I mentioned last week at the City Council meeting, I do want to start posting a five minute vlog now that I've gotten solid information from our local businesses from last week's data collection through the Chamber of Commerce on how this is impacting them and our community specifically. The Cook County Department of Health has also gotten their website up that provide us with real time data for infection rates those under supposition of infection versus confirmed cases and this information will be posted as well. Now that we're getting this in real time I do want to make sure that too is pushed out regularly to the community.

3) 2020 Census – April 1st

Mayor Gallo – Tomorrow April 1st is the official Census Day. However, myself and the others who have been working like Alderman Sanoica, Finance Director Melissa Gallagher and Lori Ciezak and quite a few Complete Count Committee members who have volunteered their time. We had to suspend some of our field operations to now re-shift our focus in to more strategic digital marketing campaign. Before I get into it, what I want to do is use this time and technology to provide a two minute video of what the Complete Count Committee did with some additional hands here. The video is on the City's YouTube page and we push that out through social media.

Municipalities throughout the country, including the City of Rolling Meadows, are ramping up to April 1st. The data collected from the census is used to ensure equal political representation and fair allocation of government resources. Census data determines the number of congressional seats each state receives; the distribution of over \$700 billion in federal government resources; and the funding of public services and infrastructure.

The U.S. Census Bureau has sent out and will continue to send out correspondences, specifically the 2020 census. You can complete the census online, by telephone or my mail. Fill out your online survey using any internet-enabled device (cellphone, computer, tablet, etc.).

The 2020 Census will count every person living in the United States regardless of their country of origin or immigration (citizenship) status. Every person residing in your household on April 1, 2020 should be counted. This includes children, newborn babies, grandparents, friends, non-relatives, and anyone else living in your home.

I want to give thanks and praise to staff who has been participating in this Complete Count Committee as well as Alderman Sanoica for your efforts.

Alderman Sanoica – I just wanted to remind everybody that on the City's website, if you click on the Census item there is also a link that will take you to the Census Bureau counting map that will actually show by tract how responsive our City is thus far based on estimates. We have some Census tracts that are already at 50% which is excellent, it means that many individuals have already responded via phone or online. We have some tracts that are struggling that are actually below 20%. For those tracts that are struggling that's where the Complete Count Committee has focused most of its efforts and ensuring that we are using the grant funds that we received through Cook County to create materials and outreach and have other volunteers as well to make sure that we're explaining what the Census is and how to complete it and making sure it's assessable through paper and other means for those households and families that don't necessarily have internet access at this time. Also ensuring that community leaders can help their neighbors with filling out the materials before the April 15th date which was pushed out and also to avoid Census workers going to homes given the COVID-19 pandemic at this time. If your household has

not yet filled out the Census you can fill it out now by going to www.my2020census.gov or www.cityrm.org and click on the Census link and follow the instructions to fill out the information. You will be asked to put in a code that you may have received in the mail but not everyone necessarily needs that code if you enter in your address, it should take you where you need to go. Any questions please feel free to call the City and we'll be happy to help.

Mayor Gallo – Again, one of the unfortunate things about this is we had to suspend our local field operations. Before knowing that that was going to happen we had purchased a lot of market materials, cloth tote bags and hand sanitizer which ended up being a very hot commodity. It all didn't go to waste, we were able to use the cloth bags and distribute them to local school districts and food pantries where they can distribute their meal programs for students in those Census bags to remind all the students and their parents that the Census is coming up and it's important to fill out. Then with the food pantry it was a green way for individuals to utilize a reusable bag and be reminded of the Census as it stood anyway. Even though we didn't get to use them for our original purpose at physical events where we would have a physical presence and hand these things out, we were still able to repurpose them with the same primary mission of getting the word out about the Census. Again, I just appreciate the level of on our feet thinking that we have had to do to adapt to this situation and still use our resources appropriately in order to get the message out effectively. Thank you all again for participating in the Complete Count Committee. We're not over and it's not done yet.

4) Re-Discuss G1 – 3 Mile Radius (Alderman O'Brien)

Alderman O'Brien – I wanted to circle back, as Mayor Gallo did point out, about revisiting a portion of the G1 Ordinance as we discussed over the last several months. At the direction of having some conversation during one of the Council meetings and asking for this to be brought back, I did work closely with Attorney Wolf on this. I do want to go through and provide highlights of the materials, the main changes that we're looking for and my intent on this was to bring some consistency for a couple reasons, to help city staff because I know how many hours that each of us has spent on this let alone the time that staff has as well. To make it very clear to accomplish a couple things, to confirm the areas within the City of where we would allow the G1 licenses as well as the distance between but working with Attorney Wolf we did get a little more script and put down exact street areas. It should also help staff time hopefully from an efficiency standpoint and our time as a Council going forward, that should this move forward for an official agenda item and an official vote at a future Council meeting, it would allow staff the right to engage with potential business customers early on saying we are currently closed for the gaming licenses and if one comes available we'll keep their name on file. It will help staff at the beginning versus tying up staff time for research as well as coming to the Council. In the redlined version that's posted in the packet, I just want to highlight in working with Attorney Wolf is that we did identify four key areas within the City where gaming is allowed and that's what I'm proposing and looking for support of tonight. The four areas are as follows and are all commercially zoned:

Area 1: Kirchoff Road Corridor (Kirchoff Road between Wilke Road and Rowling Road).

Area 2: Meacham/ Plum Grove Road Corridor (Meacham/Plum Grove Road between Bryant Road and Old Plum Grove Road).

Area 3: Golf & Algonquin Road Corridor (Golf, Algonquin and New Wilke Roads, in the vicinity of Meadows Town Mall Shopping Center).

Area 4: Algonquin / Route 53 Corridor (intersection of Algonquin Road and Route 53).

March 31, 2020

COW Minutes

Page 15 of 35

The questions I have tonight, are you fine with the areas? Are you fine with the number of establishments in the above mentioned areas? Are you fine with establishing a cap as proposed as 12?

During some of the research I learned that Elk Grove currently has 33 gaming licenses and their companies are struggling to survive. They are getting into that over saturation where they are having a hard time keeping their doors open.

In the proposal, based on conversation that we had at the Council before and feedback, in areas 1, 2 and 3, we would allow 3 G1 licenses. We do know that in the caveat with the zone 3 we referenced Golf/Algonquin, there is currently 4 (Isabella's, Grande Jakes, Bigby's and Bulldog Ale House). The caveat would be, should one of those establishments go out of business it would then reduce back to 3. It's grandfathered currently at 4 but should one of the entities dissolve that it would recap at 3.

In the Algonquin/Route 53 area is that based on density and some of the information we looked at the proposal would be to cap that at 1.

That was some of the questions that I received from residents and some of the business owners since Friday. The numbers currently are at 10 but there are 12 on the list. As you scroll through the maps, there are 12 because there are 2 are pending but really 3 that are pending. Lulu's we passed 1st reading and Picante Bar and Grill as well as Shelby's who have not come before the Council but I included them in the 12.

The other thing I want to point out in the write up is because some of the feedback that I received from residents and that I've voiced it at other meetings in the past, they are in support of it but they don't want one of our thoroughfares to turn into a Las Vegas strip. That was a something that we did add in there is that for strip mall areas or multi-tenant land areas that we wouldn't have more than 1 in a strip mall, so that there's not 3 gaming parlors in one strip mall. That was one of the caveats we put in there and it was based on residential input that I received over the last several months that we've been talking about that.

At this time I would like to open up the floor for overall questions, do you feel fine that the areas that's identified in the City where they currently are and we would just add the identified areas to the Ordinance.

Mayor Gallo – The first question is, are these areas fine?

Alderman Bisesi – I think they did an excellent job. I think they're fine.

Alderman Sanoica – I just want to clarify with the justification behind the areas themselves regarding density. Alderman O'Brien when you were determining density was there any specific methodology that you were following for that?

Alderman O'Brien – Density might have been the incorrect word, it's basically where they are currently located, not population density as I didn't look at how many residents were in each part of town.

Alderman Sanoica – I'm looking at area 4 which is on page 13 of our packet and it appears to be smaller in area just in square mileage but the types of services that are available are quite varied and there's two separate buildings as well. I'm uncertain as to whether the ownership is the same or different. That would then speak to the second issue which is the numbers that we're looking at. I would say that if we're looking at this by area then one establishment might be sufficient but given the diversity of services that are provided in this diversity of establishments and clientele then I would propose increasing that from 1 to 2 available G1 licenses for that area.

Alderman O'Brien – I believe currently in area 4 that is two different land owners. Is that correct Melissa, is that what we were able to confirm?

Melissa Gallagher, Director Finance – That is correct.

Alderman O'Brien – It is two separate land owners.

Alderman Bisesi – I do want to second Alderman Sanoica's thought and agree that maybe area 4 should be 2. I think it really does pertain to one of the other questions further down where we look at whether we're going with 10 or 12. I think that area 4 at 2 given we go with 12, if not then it should probably stay at 1.

Alderman Budmats – In talking about the area 2, if you stand in the cemetery you can look at all 3 of these visually they will be on top of each other. I don't see the need for 3 gaming facilities literally within 100-125 yards of each other and all visible from one point. It seems to be overkill, I would think that the third one would for sure would knock at least one of the other one's out of business. It seems way too much for that small of an area, we're talking literally one corner...

Mayor Gallo – I'm sorry to interrupt but you mentioned a very important thing knocking one of them out of business. Are we knocking their restaurant out of business or their profits from gaming out of business when you say this?

Alderman Budmats – The only one that I think that's a restaurant, like number 3 was a restaurant prior to becoming a gaming facility, number 8 did not exist as a restaurant prior to becoming a gaming facility and number 12 doesn't exist as of yet. Quite honestly when we passed this we said we were doing this to help our existing restaurants remain competitive, that was the whole impetus behind passing the G1 and instead what I really see is the impetus is being getting "new" restaurants that aren't even willing to open up until they can get a gaming license. So they're not really restaurants they're gaming halls.

Mayor Gallo – I do have a letter from some of the establishments which I'm going to read at the first segment at opening up the floor to the public and then I'll provide some feedback and I'm pretty sure this will also initiate a lot of other dialogue from Council men and women on this subject.

Alderman Budmats – For this area I just don't see any reason to have 3, 2 is sufficient, actually more than sufficient.

Alderman D'Astice – I want to thank Alderman O'Brien for doing this, it looks like he put some time and effort into it. My only question would be on Algonquin Road between Route 53 and where the Walmart is, would we allow any kind of establishments in that area or did they fall out of place somehow (*inaudible*) because that is commercial? I'm just wondering why we eliminated that?

Alderman O'Brien – I think a lot of it was around current conversations which I do see now on the agenda behind this, it's really car wash establishments, laundromats, that's how we narrowed it down to where they currently were versus up opening up larger, going back to Alderman Sanoica's question, we wanted to make sure it's in a limited area of the City and we just looked from where they currently are and expanded slightly from that. I wouldn't be opposed to going wider if we thought we needed to but as we looked at that there is the assisted living facility, the car wash, laundromat so that's really how we narrowed it down and that was our first draft at it.

March 31, 2020

COW Minutes

Page 17 of 35

Melissa Gallagher, Director Finance – I just wanted to comment on area 2, the Shelby's location at 2164 Plum Grove Road, I believe that the construction permits have been approved for that location. I'm just adding that to the conversation so that the City Council is aware and I also wanted to say that this layout helps everybody visually. Thank you Alderman O'Brien and Attorney Wolf.

Alderman Cannon - If you remember when we had the discussion, we actually talked about the new Aloft Hotel because they have a full service restaurant to be a potential spot, not that they've asked for it, but I wouldn't want to block them out at this time because their main business is a restaurant there's no question about that. I would just like them to have the opportunity. In conjunction with that, just an FYI, unincorporated Cook County in the strip center on the south side of Algonquin has a slot machine place called Kelly's that's open now, it's about a block from the Stadium.

Mayor Gallo – I don't know if you recall when we held the special meeting to talk specifically about the G1, I did bring up Aloft and other hotels and the possibility or opportunity or what this presents for them and this is something we did discuss at length at the special meeting. Alderman O'Brien, is there anything further for this question about area or do you want to move on to the next question?

Alderman O'Brien – I'm comfortable to move on to the second one and I do have a little bit of background that my help with the questions that were deferred to this topic.

Mayor Gallo – We'll take your opening comments for the next question, are you fine with the number of establishments in areas mentioned?

Alderman O'Brien – This will also be confirmed with the letter that Mayor Gallo has mentioned. The questions came up regarding the current status of Shelby's and Picante but as Melissa Gallagher let us know is that the remodeling permits have been pulled and paid for Shelby's because this is some of the questions that I received today as well. For Picante, they currently hold an A2 liquor license but other than that besides the letter we all received just before the start of the meeting, they're requesting but there has been nothing other than that from a Picante perspective. We haven't been approached by Picante other than the letter we received this evening.

Alderman Cannon – I know Picante has been added in here and we have a letter from the owner but up until this time we haven't heard a word about this project. I'm curious as to when they started the building process and how long have we been involved? With so many other people we've dealt with, we dealt with them a year or more and I don't recall ever having a discussion about Picante. I'm curious if someone can fill me in on what's going on and why they're in the mix all of a sudden?

Mayor Gallo – I'm happy to elaborate a little bit. I believe we all received the same email with the last sentence slightly modified to the recipient. I forwarded it to Barry because I found it a little bit unorthodox that this type of message was coming directly to me instead of coming from staff to me which is the normal process. A business patron would start the process in City Hall and then City Hall would then filter out to Council and Mayor. Barry, in his absence this evening, he did provide us with a memo on this enterprise/establishment. A little bit of the establishment is brand new and I think at the time it was provided to us it was also right at the time of the COVID-19 pandemic and so I think all of our train of thought was quickly shifted but we did receive a memo about this company a couple of weeks ago.

Alderman Cannon - It sounds to me like they are almost done building out? How long ago did they start that process?

Mayor Gallo – I would defer to someone in the Community Development Department to speak on that and the timeline. I don't know that but I know that they've been in process with the property for quite a long time since they owned it but I don't know where they are with the permits.

Alderman Cannon – Last year they gave up their liquor license and closed the business running at that time. I'm just curious of how it all unfolded so quickly and now they're in front of us all of a sudden.

Rob Horne, Director Public Works – I don't have any of the information being requested. If the permit came in without any G1 discussion that wouldn't be something that would have triggered our Supervisor in that division to notify me that it was in. If there was a previous discussion about their G1 license request I would have not have known about it. I can't speak intelligently about when they submitted and when they started the process.

Mayor Gallo – If you could possibly get some of that information and provide it to the Council that would be really helpful.

Alderman Budmats – I'm a little bit curious but it feels to me that if we get a business who puts in a building permit that kind of gives them the opportunity to get a G1 license? It doesn't make sense to me if all it costs is a couple hundred dollars in building permits to get a G1 license because they have a building permit in the process we should be giving them some kind of preference? Quite honestly, I wouldn't build a building knowing that I couldn't secure the license for what I'm trying to sell. If they're not going to get a G1 license before they begin, to me they were foolish to start building something until they had the license in hand. The other side of that coin, if we had a restaurant that wanted to be a restaurant and start their restaurant and then afterwards apply for a G1, now we have a known entity and all of us as Aldermen can walk inside, see what it looks like and get a flavor for what it is and what it isn't and if we wanted to have a G1 license we can grant it or not. Just because Shelby's or whoever it is got a building permit to build something out and we don't know what the status of that is or how much they spent on lumber or all they did was apply for a permit that doesn't really entitle them to a G1 license.

Mayor Gallo – Thank you for that but if can focus on the question about the number of establishments in the areas as mentioned then we can circle back after public comment on specific issues such as this.

Alderman Bisesi – The way I see it, a lot of it is going to depend on the answer to the next question. Currently, we have 9 establishments and 1 that's gone through first reading and that theoretically fills most of the areas especially if we take area 4 and leave it at 1 and area 2 and go with Alderman Budmats suggestion of bringing it down to 2. I think the 2 questions are kind of interrelated.

Mayor Gallo - Instead of waiting to read the letter at public comment time, I think this will actually help shape the conversation with regard to these three questions.

Good evening City Council Members,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and share with you our beliefs on item #3 on tonight's COW agenda. Item #3 proposes the limitation of Video Gaming establishments within certain geographical areas, and also proposes a limitation (or cap) on the total number of Video Gaming establishments.

We (Rep's Place, Daisy's, Stadium Sports Club, & Grande Jake's) share the same views and concerns in regards to these two topics, so we would like to comment as a group. The restaurant business is not easy. Video Gaming revenue helps with our monthly utilities, rent, payroll, etc. It's time to put limitations in place so the existing establishments with video gaming can continue to survive and be successful within the City of

Rolling Meadows. An oversaturation of video gaming establishments will make it extremely tough to compete and survive, which is why we feel this is an extremely important time to address this issue.

There are currently 9 video gaming establishments within the city, and 1 establishment that is up for a second G1 license reading. If that second reading passes, that's a total of 10 establishments with G1 licenses. This is where we believe it should stop and be capped. Putting this cap in along with limiting the number of G1 establishments within the presented geographic areas will help our businesses greatly, and allow us to continue to give back to the city and community for many years to come.

Thank you for your time,

<i>Todd & Tim Yormark</i>	<i>Mike Reppe</i>	<i>Jake Rodriguez</i>	<i>Vince Buffalino</i>
<i>Daisy's</i>	<i>Rep's Place</i>	<i>Grande Jake's</i>	<i>Stadium Sports Club & Pizza</i>

I just want to remind everybody that if we were to read this a couple of years ago, it would have said thank you for the opportunity to consider video gaming for my restaurant, we are struggling to compete to our neighbors who have them and we're losing business. Please consider opening up your doors to video gaming in our restaurant so we can thrive. Now I want to be cautious that this is an open market and forgive me for saying this but I just received this letter just before this meeting started but it sounds rather oligarchical to say that we are now set with our gaming license so don't allow others to come in with it. I think we have to keep our mind set on the fact that this is a privilege to our restaurateurs and if another restaurant wants to open up in that proximity they should have the ability to open up gaming as well. If they qualify and if they're food and beverage could substantially quantify the fact that they're a restaurant over a gaming parlor. We have to be cautious in how we go about this now. With this letter I want to open the floor with discussion on it.

Alderman O'Brien – I am a fan of putting some type of cap and that's why I'm glad we're discussing this tonight. I really do think, and I can only reference Elk Grove, they are really struggling with 33. You have a very valid point Mr. Mayor, a new restaurant comes in, can they get gaming? Not right now if we do if we put limitations there but if one were to become available we certainly can. I am in favor of a cap at either 10 or 12 but that might be a question for Attorney Wolf and I think Alderman Budmats has a great point that maybe some of the areas put the cart before the horse. They took out the permits with the expectation of eventually get a G1 license so I'm in agreement with Alderman Budmats on that. The question is for Attorney Wolf, is there any type of repercussions that should it be capped at 10 if Council makes a motion to move that portion forward instead of 12? That there's anything from a legal perspective that the two entities that have been discussed that don't have their G1 license yet could come back to the City?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney – No, there is no vested right that applicants have at this time. Without a license there is nothing that would preclude the City Council from making a determination regarding a limitation cap on licenses. There's no vested right they would have with respect to the City Council's decision on that.

Alderman O'Brien – In my personal perspective too, if that's what it really was then that's not going back to the Mayor's previous point, we want restaurants and offsetting because of the gaming that might help also. It really does confirm that we want people here as a restaurant so if that wasn't their initial intention that helps from that perspective too.

Mayor Gallo – You do realize and I know that you see this but what restaurant in their right mind is going to come in to any one of these geographic locations knowing they're unable to qualify at this time because it's closed and there's a cap because they couldn't even be competitive as a restaurant to their neighbor who has gaming. What we've done is limited any future restaurant development in these areas by capping it, if we approach it this way.

Originally, when we had this conversation and I don't want to deviate to it but we needed to show the restaurants and the restaurants needed to show us that the significant portion of their revenues was from food and beverage and the gaming was supplemental which is helping them stay viable and competitive because our neighboring communities had it. Now what we've done is that guys that have restaurants and gaming, they're good and all that's going to come out of it is that no other restaurant is going to try and enter into this market if they can't have gaming just to be competitive with their neighbor. So we're in a really tough situation here.

Alderman Vinezeano – I agree with you in will we deter future restaurants from coming into our community and that's one that I keep going back and forth with because we do want to bring new businesses here. I think we all have the best intentions of keep the gaming parlors out, our residents don't want it and we don't want it. So what is the best way to go about doing it? We've all thrown out several ideas in ways to do that. Putting a cap on it, I don't know if that's the best solution, I like the idea but I don't want to see 33 gaming parlors in town either and I know our residents don't either. Maybe doing the wait limit of the 6 months for someone to apply for the G1 license to establish as a business, we will know then what kind of business that they are. Are they a true restaurant? Are they a gaming parlor? We will know at that point because they will have been open for 6 months and then there is no underlying expectation that I submitted a building permit, I should be expecting to get my G1 license. That could be taken off the table and put on the back burner. I did talk to Attorney Wolf about this, there was some confusion, at least on my end, that if we did put a cap on how many licenses we allowed, we also have the open/shut on the license. We open it up, we allow one and then it closes again, how does that interfere with us putting a cap on? She explained it to me because I was quite confused, I thought it was one or the other. I will let her explain that.

Attorney Wolf – You are correct in relaying our conversation, they are two separate and distinct requirements. One doesn't impact the other. It is still a shut license and the revisions that are proposed at the present time have no implication on that. So the licenses are still shut until the City Council decides to open them up. By putting a cap on there, there's no implication that the City Council is required to grant as many licenses that would meet that cap. It is still individual determinations made by the City and there would be no impact by putting a cap or not putting a cap. You can have both, they're mutually exclusive from each other.

Mayor Gallo – I think that we're barking up the wrong tree. I think we have to have tighter criteria around what constitutes a restaurant in order to allow that restaurant to receive a G1 application and potential final permit, if we're trying to limit the amount of gaming parlors in the community because residents don't want that. I don't think the geographic limitations or this approach is going to do the best interest for us at this time. I definitely don't want to see super saturation like everybody else here. I'm all in favor of reducing and eliminating that but I think but I think this is the wrong avenue to approach this way.

Alderman Sanoica – I want to remind the Council about Alderman O'Brien's statement when he was presenting this item to us tonight. He stated that he noted that our current situation is such that we seem to have miscommunication between staff, miscommunication with businesses coming into the City and miscommunication on the Council as to what was being acceptable for a G1 license and to remedy that specific issue, I think this is a really a clear-cut solution that is something that would increase transparency and make sure that our communication is effective with businesses that come in and come out. I would be in favor of this for a trial period and allow us to have additional time to be able to be more critical with the subjectivity that comes with determining what we consider to be an acceptable restaurant that we want in the City and that's going to make money and that's going to compete and should be given a privilege of a G1 license. For those reasons, I would be in support of an Ordinance at this time and then for the Council to revisit it at a later date given the feedback that we receive internally with city staff and also with residents as well who would like us to place more speed bumps in G1 licenses and not necessarily less.

Mayor Gallo - With your idea of a trial period, what does that look like and if we tried something how do we roll that back if it's ineffective? How do we change that because these are businesses and those businesses invest quite heavily financially? So what does it look like as a trial period and if we find that it's right or not right how does that look?

Alderman Sanoica - Without any additional data in front of me, if we were to state that the recommendation that we have before us which is to show everyone that is pending or at least in discussion with city staff at this point regarding a G1 license, we're essentially freezing and we've frozen applications in the past regarding the G1 license to give us enough time to be able to discuss the subjectivity of a restaurant, we did that earlier in 2019 and that took us about a quarter. Maybe we would want to pursue something that's longer than a quarter which would allow us to have these discussions and then also let restaurants know coming in that this is the situation, this is a cap we have for something a year or so.

Mayor Gallo - I understand the freezing part and can do that all day but unfortunately with these businesses like the one that has been sitting on the retail location for a year now, their rent doesn't freeze with our decision to freeze and I know that we necessarily can't be cognizant of but we also can't be so unfriendly to business in their investment that they sink here. I just want to be careful what we do in trials and how we can make sure that if it's not working we can reverse it but we're not reversing it at the detriment of an individual whose invested a small family fortune of theirs into their future. I don't have an answer either.

Alderman Bisesi – It seems like I'm going back into a bad nightmare. I think we've started to come around full circle to the fact that we've been unable to define a restaurant. In the meantime, I do believe that something needs to be done until we can determine that. I would be in favor of going with whether it's a cap by area or a cap overall and do that for now. I would also be in favor of having a discussion regarding some sort of a period of time where the business is open and we can actually see what kind of a business it is. I know there are some businesses that in their business plan the only way they can justify opening is having the gaming. I think we need to at least address the concerns that some of our residents have regarding too many establishments right next to each other. Right now we're doing nothing.

Mayor Gallo - So to your point and to Alderman O'Brien's questions and they are contingent on each other, you're fine with the established cap of this proposed 12? Do you think it would be an effective tool in the immediate?

Alderman Bisesi - I think it would be whether it's 10 or 12.

Alderman O'Brien – I'm comfortable with 12 but I wouldn't be opposed to 10 or 11. I worked with Attorney Wolf to draft it as 12 and let anyone in the hopper. I don't have the silver bullet but some type of freeze on it that we would let the 12 that are identified but I do like the idea of some type of trial period. That was my intention or hope that the way it was drafted at 12 so anyone that's currently working with the City would be okay under this and then we could go from that. If another company wants to come in and build a restaurant that this wouldn't be applicable, do you have thought it might be as to a different solution? If we don't do a cap and do open/close or these areas, what would also meet the request we've all been hearing?

Mayor Gallo - My original sentiment for this will always go back to the fact that this started for our current restaurants needing to stay viable and competitive to restaurants in the surrounding communities. To define a restaurant that means that their revenues from food and beverage are greater than the revenues from supplemental gaming. The moment that the gaming revenues supersede food and beverage they're no longer restaurant they're a gaming parlor that serves food and beverage on the side. It's not what we wanted to be. It should always in my

opinion go back to quantifying a restaurant by the financial output of its revenues and that their finances are revenues related to food and beverage are greater than that which is their gaming system, then they're a restaurant otherwise they're a gaming parlor.

Alderman D'Astice - I just have a question, 10 or 12 seems just a number which is fine but how do we control our liquor licenses? We don't cap that, don't we look at them on an individual basis. I'm not suggesting that we do away with caps but could we not do the same thing for the G1's like we do for a liquor license? Mr. Mayor, you brought up a really good point about putting a cap on it and a really nice restaurant wants to come to town but they need the gaming to supplement them and now we're not being business friendly because we put a cap on it. I think your point is really well taken, it's a tough decision.

Alderman Cannon – I would agree with some of the things that Mr. D'Astice just said. I think you made a good point about competition. We are a free market society for good or bad, if we have another company that wants to come in here and build a facility but can't get gaming, anybody that's ever started a business or had anything to do with starting a business understands you try to put together the financials at the beginning to try to make ends meet. In today's world the restaurant business is brutally tough, the virus thing that we're going through right now is going to make it even harder even on the most successful restaurants. I think all of them look at the video gaming as just a supplement to help them get them over the top and make a profit. As much as I understand the want of maybe putting a cap on it, I think we really put our (*inaudible*) handcuffs because some people might even look at it and say I'm not even going to consider coming to Rolling Meadows. I think we sure don't want to cut off discussion with potential businesses of any kind coming into our City and I fear that might be the outcome of this. I completely understand the letter that was sent from the four businesses that are already up and running and I appreciate where they're coming from. I just think as a City, I agree with you Mr. Mayor, we have to be very careful where we're going here because we sure don't want to stop people from coming and I see that as a real potential if we do this.

Mayor Gallo - That's the truth, we cannot be discriminate of who we allow in and our market they have a natural equilibrium and I think it's very unfair for us as a Council to be that natural judge in this case. These nine survived and we don't allow anymore introduce into the economy because we're not going to give them the tools they need to exist sufficiently. Then I think we tampered with the naturally equilibrium's that exist in a capitalistic free market in society.

Alderman Vinezeano - I'm not opposed to raising the cap. I do like that we had proposed at one point the not more than half mile radius, we don't want to see several in one shopping center or one on each corner of one block. I'm not opposed to raising the cap however with a contingency that we do put a six month waiting period on that because I think that will curb some of the gaming cafés from coming. If they know they have to wait they're not going to survive because they're not a restaurant. They don't have a food and beverage to sustain them for that six months, we're not saying businesses can't come, we're still telling them they can come in as a restaurant and open for six months just like all of our other restaurants have come and done before, there's resources for them to do that. I don't think a business needs to have a G1 in order to open, I think that's a poor business model and I would hope if that's what they're banking on then they need to reevaluate.

Mayor Gallo - I would strongly favor a waiting period because I think it would flush it out. Then I started thinking that if I am a restaurant and I want to come in here and my neighbor who is also a restaurant that has gaming, I'm already at a disadvantage so it does provide or introduce additional skepticism to the investor to want to put their enterprise in that location in our community. A waiting sounds good to prove themselves, it also limits us opportunity because the investor is going to think twice and think it's still a difficult challenge because profit margins are razor thin and I'm also going to deficient of gaming which my competitor/neighbor has and why would

they come specifically for food when they can go out for food and entertainment. It's tough, it's up to the restaurant to define themselves as a restaurant by revenues being greater in food and beverage than gaming. If they don't, they better work at it in six months to change that ratio back to demonstrate they're restaurant or a gaming parlor and we don't allow gaming parlors. I would take a different approach.

Alderman Budmats - I'll submit that we have Ramen House, Gus's, Chef Ping, these are restaurants in town that are restaurants and they survived without gaming. If they came to us and asked for gaming to stay competitive I think we can walk into those establishments and say they're a restaurant. The fact that these other businesses say I want open up a business in your town and it's going to be a restaurant but I really can't do it unless I have gaming, that's not a restaurant that's a gaming parlor using a restaurant as a camouflage. Quite honestly, I think waiting six months is the only way other than we have discussed and it was voted down to analyze revenues and we were all told it was too difficult to analyze their revenues. I can walk into an establishment and know if I'm inside of a restaurant or not or know if I'm inside of a gaming parlor, it's pretty easy to feel within five minutes. If we're going to vote on someplace, I don't want to have to go out to Island Lake to their other facility and see what it looks like or I don't want to have to go out to Hoffman Estates and see what their facility there looks like, I want to be able to walk in to Rolling Meadows restaurant and say they bring a lot of value to our town and we want to make sure they stay here, I'd love to give them a G1 license so they can stay in business. It doesn't make any sense to me to give new untested unknown commodities a license based on the hope that they might bring us a restaurant. It hasn't worked and we have a couple of gaming parlor in town let's be honest.

Mayor Gallo - Point taken. Any other's with comments on this? I know we did deviate, but the question about capping it at 10 or 12 is where we are. Alderman O'Brien, from you proposing this and sponsoring this back again, what would you like to see here for Council direction?

Alderman O'Brien - I would actually like to see if it's okay with keeping the defined areas and I do think I can support based on conversations I had with Alderman Vinezeano and what Alderman Budmats had said. We talked about even with the owners, the amount of time city staff that would be taken up to compare revenue from gaming versus restaurants and then what control do we have? Do we tell them they have to shut off their machines for three weeks until they get that number back to 51% revenue and 49% gaming? I don't know how we can manage that. I'd still like to keep the areas in play, I would like, with consensus of the six month waiting period, we could increase the cap because everyone that spoken about that. My only concern there is that it is an established restaurant, to Alderman Budmats point, if Chef Ping or Ramen House and we were capped at 12 but they would like to do it too that does kind of pigeonhole us since we can't differentiate between which ones we want to pick and which ones we don't. I would like to move forward with the defined areas and potentially also include the six month waiting period but that would have to be new establishments. If Chef Ping came in or another restaurant that's already existing came say in June 2021 they wouldn't have to wait. This Ordinance would become effective after our May or June meeting for any new establishment. I was trying to get at the amount that we've taken, that city staff has taken, that up front city staff can say that we want to verify that it's a restaurant, you can apply for a G1, nothing is guaranteed, but you have to wait six months. The only concern is that, I don't know if we would get any here, but there are some big entities that fund these and they may wait the six months but I think that's the only step we can take is include that and hopefully that would be some type of control.

Alderman Vinezeano - I appreciate Alderman O'Brien pulling this back to us. The six month waiting period is really a passion. Speaking with residents and trying to curb some of these gaming parlors especially with one potentially moving right into our Ward. I definitely would like to see that any coming forward to us that this would be, obviously we have to pass this Ordinance with the six month waiting period, unless it's an established business with revenue tax dating before June 2018 would be an established for at least six months in our community is how I would like to see it.

Mayor Gallo - Attorney Wolf, do you have any feedback you'd like to provide based on those parameters where existing businesses can apply beyond the cap with criteria constitutes an existing business?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - Not at this time. I think I'm understanding the feedback provided by the Aldermen.

Alderman Cannon – A couple of concerns I have. For people in our group who have ever opened their own business, most companies have an excruciating pain no matter how successful they are in having cash flow the first year they're in business. To put a six month timeframe on it would cut off a lot of people from even thinking about coming here, that's just my opinion. Again, we're forcing people to do something. If we do the six month wait, are we automatically going to give them a license after six months? Because then we have a whole other set of problems, what if someone doesn't like what they're doing or whatever reason we come up with. Are we automatically going to give them a license after six months?

Mayor Gallo - No, that's what Alderman Vinezeano was saying that even know there is a six month waiting period there is no guarantee that they qualify. It does, it makes a gamble on an investor that much more risky and which reduces the opportunities for our community as a result.

Alderman Cannon - Do other communities put on handcuffs like this to potential customers coming in as businesses?

Mayor Gallo - I don't know that from other communities.

Alderman Cannon - I didn't mean to put you on the spot, I just didn't know if you did or not.

Mayor Gallo – To Alderman Budmats point, for an existing business that is a restaurant they're separate from this conversation. I think we have to look at these two things as separate, like heads and tails of the same coin, because how much new economy do we want to enable in the food and beverage environment, the restaurant retail environment, versus how many of the current existing restaurants do we want to see still prosper and maintain. The Chef Ping's of the world they've proven that they don't need gaming in their restaurant to exist or other restaurants that exist here but it limits our new investors.

Alderman Cannon - We had an established company that had a big facility in our town already and we really gave them hard time to open up and they were an established restaurant. To my knowledge, I think in most cases we've had staff go out look at other facilities for these people who've come in to the City and I think the question asked by staff is what do they have going right now and they physically got into the car and looked at their facilities and made a judgment that they were restaurant in almost every case to my knowledge. I think if we start putting a six-month moratorium on them, we're putting another obstacle up in front of a potential investor. They can go to another town without these obstacles.

Mayor Gallo – You're right. If we were to pursue this through a trial period, we would put more pressure on our Business Advocate and our Chamber of Commerce to better understand the potential businesses that are coming in with these new restrictions or limitations set up and current businesses that are considering it as well. We would need to have our ear much closer to the ground from our business level individuals who act as that informational conduit, if we put this in place, to see how it is truly impacting Rolling Meadows as desirable community to invest in or if it has no impact at all and we can go ahead and continue down this road. That's all we could do is potentially try it, just means that our Chamber of Commerce and Business Advocate need to be far more involved in potential businesses and current businesses after that.

Alderman Bisesi - I believe in one of our prior discussions it was mentioned that there are other towns that are doing the waiting period, it's probably in our minutes somewhere from one of those marathon discussions. It would be interesting to find out after, it's been several months since, maybe getting some feedback from them on how that's working.

Mayor Gallo - Maybe if you have some available time to do a search in the minutes and find one of those communities and then we could reach out. We have to start somewhere, if you want to own that.

Alderman Bisesi - Yes. I'll try to go back through the minutes and see what communities were referenced.

Mayor Gallo - You could just search's keywords too without having to open up specific ones, it just takes a little bit time. You could do that for us if you'd like.

Alderman Sanoica - I would like to propose that we define what we want for a new establishment versus what we want for an existing establishment because maybe that will help two items which is transparent and clear communication for anyone that wants to invest. So instead of saying that there is a G1 license but there's no guarantee and then we can also then say this is kind of what the criteria is, this what the Council is looking for and that would be expanding upon the Ordinance that already exists. It might be something like we're taking into consideration geography, these are the commercially zoned areas that we're looking at, there are already three or four establishments and therefore this is a consideration or something along those lines. Then have a separate set, similar to what we had proposed in 2019 to say you've been operating within the City for at least two or three years then you have a separate set of criteria that we would consider in order to make ensure that you can remain competitive. So if Chef Ping's approaches us then we would be judging them on a different set of criteria that would be in the Ordinance.

Mayor Gallo - I do recall actually using the date of the G1, the creation of the G1 Ordinance in 2018 where business restaurants that were here prior to the creation of that were an existing enterprise and then everything thereafter came because they were coming in on the segway of the opening and allowance of the G1 opportunity. We could choose a different date but I think we had already discussed that at some point in one meeting, that the creation of the Ordinance and prior to that was existing establishments and then anything after the Ordinance was created was new restaurants coming in.

Alderman Sanoica - With that in mind, perhaps we could apply that distinction of pre-and post G1 to the area caps that are being proposed by Alderman O'Brien for new businesses.

Mayor Gallo – It makes sense. Any other Council men or women have an opinion on that?

Alderman Vinezeano - Really quick, if I recall we got that six month waiting period idea from the City of Aurora, if that helps Alderman Bisesi.

Alderman Bisesi – Thank you.

Alderman O'Brien - Just an idea too, going with what Alderman Sanoica suggested, I think it's a great idea if we can differentiate between the two. An option that a resident reached out to me, and I'm guessing for new establishments, is could we do something by seating capacity? Is that there gaming area can't be more than 15% of their occupancy area? If it holds 100 people that it could be only be allocated, I know it might be something that we have to look at in more detail because gaming just increased to six machines so we would have to take into

March 31, 2020

COW Minutes

Page 26 of 35

account that the State may increase the number of gaming terminals but it's an idea that a resident shared during some of the discussions is maybe to keep it as easy as it could be, even if there's such a word as easy with what we're working with. It could be based on square footage of space, they must have 75% of their usable space for dining or food and only 25% for a gaming area. Just a thought I wanted to share with the group.

Mayor Gallo - That's more for defining a restaurant versus gaming establishment?

Alderman O'Brien – Correct, for going forward.

Alderman Budmats - The Village of Schaumburg passed a thing for their existing businesses and then for new businesses it's a one year waiting period. They also identified what a video gaming café is and separated that out as a separate license from video gaming within restaurants. Recognizing that there are two classes of people who want to have these establishments and some of them are just typically gaming cafés and then some are really restaurants. We might want to look to that as well and see how they're doing it. They somehow or another enacted a one-year deal and they still have restaurants coming to Schaumburg.

Mayor Gallo - It's interesting that they categorically divided their restaurants from gaming parlors with subsequent different licenses respective to each.

Alderman Budmats - Different fees as well.

Mayor Gallo - Of course, they're two different animals, they truly are.

Alderman Sanoica - I would be in favor of us breaking out our G1 license to gaming parlors and what we're going for aesthetically for restaurants because I think it would speak to the original issue that I have is a lack of transparency and effective communication between Council, staff, and the business community. If we are all using the same vocabulary I think it would help our policy as well.

Mayor Gallo - I agree and appreciate that too, I think it does help for lines of communication and distinguishing as to what entity type we're talking about. I don't know what that does here or if that's putting the cart before the horse too much right now for this conversation. Right now we're focusing on geographic areas and then a cap of 10 or 12. Then maybe we can revisit the license and sub license for restaurant and gaming parlor at another time. It's not necessarily in this topic.

Alderman Sanoica - Sure, let me make the connection. Referring to these areas I would suggest that they be associated with new business and then with new businesses we apply these areas specifically for gaming cafés and caps on gaming cafés as opposed to restaurants and have a different associated cap for those. That's what I meant for this particular discussion.

Mayor Gallo - With that, we would definitely have to define our restaurants and gaming cafés. Right, that's much like Schaumburg did, they have definitions for each and that way we know how to allocate a given license. There's quite a little bit more work involved with that but I can see how it ties in with this but a little bit separate at this moment. Alderman O'Brien, we need to get some clarity here and some straw votes. You want to start with the geographic areas if you are still fine with categorically identifying them as they are?

Alderman O'Brien – Yes, I am comfortable doing that if we could move forward on the straw vote for the areas as defined.

Mayor Gallo – Okay. I like to have a show of hands of those in favor with the areas as defined as in Alderman O'Brien's presentation. All in favor? Opposed? 6 in favor; 1 opposed.

The number of establishments, Alderman O'Brien are you okay with starting a straw vote on the number of establishments as mentioned or do we need to try and redefine what the establishments are?

Alderman O'Brien - I'm comfortable moving forward with the numbers in each area but it is a valid thing that I really do think, to Alderman Sanoica's point, that we do breakout something for old versus existing. I don't know if we move this yet again to another COW to differentiate between the two. I haven't even thought about segregating or delineating between a regular G1 and a gaming G1, it sounds like an idea. To keep this moving I would like to look at the numbers knowing that we may need to do some additional work for current businesses as well as new ones coming in. We don't want to prohibit or limit any people reaching out to Rolling Meadows to open up restaurant.

Mayor Gallo - Would you like a straw vote set up at this time?

Alderman O'Brien - if we could, I think it would give us some direction. If people don't like the idea of a cap then maybe we could look at pursuing further, it would help delineating between the two if the Council thinks there should be a cap or that there shouldn't be.

Mayor Gallo - So you want me to ask the question specific to just establishing a proposed of 12 that you have identified?

Alderman O'Brien - Yes and then #2 would be a moot point if we take care of the third question.

Mayor Gallo - By a show of hands of those in favor of establishing a cap proposed at the number 12. All in favor? Opposed? 4 in favor; 3 opposed.

At this time for continuity, I think we've gotten some straw votes and direction. I think it's time to open the floor.

Sheraz Rana – I opened up Picante Bar & Grill 3.5 years ago. I surrendered my retail liquor license last year for my grocery store next to my restaurant, the business was not doing well and the renewal fees were too much for me. I had an impression that I had to get an Illinois Gaming Board license first and then apply to the City. It took almost a year to get the Illinois Gaming Board license. In December when I received my Illinois license, I went to the City and met with Mr. Barry and Martha Corner and they said I had to bring it to a Council meeting and then the Council meeting was postponed because of COVID-19. That is the scenario, I'm a 3.5 years old business and I'm in area 4. It has only one license and that is Stadium and I have no competition with them, they are good people, they're big but I'm not that big, I'm a small restaurant. The gaming license would bring extra revenue for me to survive. I wrote a letter and I mentioned it in that too. My restaurant size is 1/5 to the Stadium. I know my area is limited to one license only and when I went to the City in 2017/2018 I was told to apply for a G1. I'm 3.5 years old and that was my fault, I went Illinois Gaming Board first to get the license and they issued me the license and then I went to the City. That would be a big help with the revenue, for my negative revenue to become positive. I don't know after this COVID-19 what will happen. I would like to request that you allow me to have the G1 license and add one more license in area 4.

Mayor Gallo – Thank you for sharing at this time and for providing some background. These remarks will obviously be taken into consideration by all the Council. At a COW meeting there is no action taking place, this is round table discussion, straw votes are just a recommendation and direction, much can change as people

contemplate this discussion overnight and over time and we'll take action the City Council meetings. I appreciate you sharing here.

Sheraz Rana – One more thing, I was told I had to make a separate wall, I made everything separate according to the City Codes and I am done with that. I was waiting for that to apply.

Mayor Gallo – Thank you. You can work with our Community Development Department on the technicals for that but I appreciate you taking the time here for us.

We know have our straw vote directions. I think we have a little more to do offline of this but we have some decent direction. Thank you all for the straw votes. Are there any further questions on this particular item number or can we move on to the next discussion of G1 discussion prohibiting gas stations, car washes and others for consideration?

Alderman O'Brien – Would it be appropriate or can we do a straw vote for the six month waiting period? Since there was discussion about that as I'm working with my colleagues as well as Attorney Wolf, do we have verbiage to see when we're working on things to bring back if there would be potential support of the six month waiting period to support some of the other items that we were going to revise? Would we be able to do that since it wasn't officially one of the questions at this COW? Are we able to do a straw vote on that?

Mayor Gallo – We can bring it up now. Attorney Wolf, do you have difference of opinion?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney – No, you can do the straw poll on that issue.

Mayor Gallo – The one reason I was reluctant, I didn't know if we were also going to be exploring the difference/distinguishing between a restaurant G1 and a sublicense of gaming cafes and if they both have a waiting period. Those in favor for a six month waiting period please raise your hand. All in favor? Opposed? 5 in favor; 1 opposed.

5) G1 Discussion – Prohibit Gas Stations, Car Washes and Others for Consideration

Melissa Gallagher, Finance Director – Rolling Meadows is a home-rule community. As a home rule community the City has the ability to take actions not specifically prohibited by state statutes.

With a G1 license, the City would now like remove the following businesses from even being considered by the City for a G1 License: liquor stores, grocery stores, car washes, coin laundry, dry cleaners, gas stations, repair/service stations, tobacco stores, massage parlors, cigar shops, banks, and hair stylists or the like service businesses. The City Council may consider adding additional other businesses for inclusion to this listing.

Also, no group or business may seek a location that was utilized as the above to open a G1 business. As an example, a car wash or gas station that closes to open a restaurant for the G1. In addition, the City ought to restrict a business which portions off a section of the property or business for the G1 purpose.

This is being presented to the City Council for consideration and discussion. The City's next steps would be to bring forth an Ordinance amending the G1 License to include these prohibited uses for a G1 License.

Mayor Gallo - Is this list of prohibited locations comprehensive enough, liquor stores, grocery stores, carwashes coin laundry, dry cleaners, gas stations, is this comprehensive from the Council's perspective? Is there other enterprise that should be included that's not mentioned here?

Alderman O'Brien - I think it's probably pretty inclusive. I would fully support this, anything that goes back to your point, the initial intent was for restaurant establishments. This really helps put some clarity around to make it a more efficient process from the City perspective and Council perspective. I would be in support of this. The only one I was trying to think of is anything to do with autos because I know we have Sal's Place, we have a couple of car rental agencies and I know that's probably seen as a service but that was the only one that was coming to mind. I think we could probably prohibit, your local car rental or body shop or maybe it does fall underneath the gas stations.

Mayor Gallo - I think we'll look in the diction of that type of business and see if it applies to NAPA's or Auto Zones and Jiffy Lube and Enterprise Rental.

Alderman Cannon - The question I have since the discussion we had tonight was all restaurant based, can't we just say you have to be a full service restaurant to be able to get a license? I don't have any problem with what's been written but why don't we just simplify it. If you're not a full-service restaurant you can't get one.

Mayor Gallo - I think there's a point there but I don't know if every restaurant has a liquor license or some of the criteria, I don't know it's a good question.

Alderman Cannon - Mr. Budmats brought up a lot of good points about Schaumburg. It would probably be helpful for all of us if we got a little more information. When we compare ourselves to Schaumburg I always get a little bit nervous because when national companies want to come and build a restaurant they look at Schaumburg first because their demographics are so much better than anyone else around them. Maybe we can look at other neighboring towns that aren't quite as large and dominant as Schaumburg and see what they're and give us a little more insight as to other towns are doing video gaming versus restaurants. It might just be helpful for all of us.

Mayor Gallo - I do believe staff has done that exercise at a point in time in the beginning but I think they could dust off the documents that they have for us.

Alderman Budmats - In regards to locations to include on the list, convenience stores because some of them serve food and have liquor licenses and then potentially in the future vehicle charging locations there may become a time where that becomes where people are looking to charge their vehicles and do something while they wait. In response to Alderman Cannon's comment about Schaumburg, their law is very interesting, I've been reading through it, they've also taken the time to define where the ownership of the potential licensee are if it's local or not, all kinds of different things. We should take a look at their law, it's true they're much bigger than us, but there is some interesting things that they put in their law which we may want to include.

Mayor Gallo - Thank you for bringing up convenience stores to Alderman O'Brien's point about automotive type of locations and vehicle charging stations.

Alderman Vinezeano - I like this list, I think it's pretty encompassing. The only one that I do not want to see on this list because I don't think we have come to a consensus is hotels. We kind of touched on it a little bit and I just want to make sure that it's not included in any of the wording.

Mayor Gallo - Good point. I guess that becomes a question of and maybe Alderman D'Astice knows this, if the restaurant that's typically attached to the hotel is part of the hotel or a separate enterprise or sometimes one in the same. That could determine whether or not we eliminate hotels.

March 31, 2020

COW Minutes

Page 30 of 35

Alderman D'Astice - To answer your question about hotel restaurants, it could be any of the above. The hotel restaurant can be owned and operated by the hotel or the restaurant in a hotel can be a separate entity.

Mayor Gallo - Our language should read something about removing hotels entirely at this time or say hotels are allowed if they also own the attached restaurant?

Alderman D'Astice - If it's a restaurant whether it's owned by the hotel or it's a separate entity, if it meets the criteria by having a liquor license and it's a restaurant, do we really care if the hotel owns it or whether a separate entity owns it?

Mayor Gallo – No, I guess you're right, the liquor license would be associated with the restaurant and not the hotel, right?

Alderman D'Astice – Yes, if it's a separate entity. If it's not then the hotel would hold the liquor license.

Mayor Gallo - It would be difficult to differentiate if it's a case where the hotelier owns the restaurant as well and the liquor license is associated with the hotel and not the restaurant.

Alderman D'Astice - Right.

Mayor Gallo - Attorney Wolf, do you have any sort of parameters to help guide us through hotel conundrum?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - I was just going to go on the City's website to see what actual license from a liquor license perspective would be granted to a hotel in that situation and then I could provide some more guidance.

Mayor Gallo - Then we could revisit this later.

Alderman D'Astice - I really think this list can get pretty long because none of the businesses on the list currently hold liquor licenses from what I can tell. That being said, you don't have funeral homes, pawnshops, spas. Do we want to continue to add to this list or do we want to try and define restaurant and just say you have to be a restaurant to get it?

Mayor Gallo – No, you're right and I think the question goes back to we started this by the qualifier which was having a liquor license A1, etc. and the problem is that the liquor store kind of comes up in this area where they have a liquor license but they're not a place where we want people loitering to play gaming in our community. I think it's an easy way to say if you don't have a liquor license you do not qualify right off the bat and just specifically prohibit liquor stores because, you're right, we could probably go on and on with any other establishment where patrons visit. I think we should just stick to those enterprises that have a liquor license opportunity but we do not want to see end up with gaming terminals in them like grocery stores and liquor stores. We should limit it to those who serve liquor but not a loitering, I don't know. I'll ask Attorney Wolf's feedback on that as well when she has time.

Alderman Bisesi - I agree with Mr. D'Astice that list can get very long and I also agree with you Mr. Mayor. It probably all comes with a definition of what a restaurant is. I have heard there are carwashes, laundromats and such that are looking to put restaurants or small food bars in their establishment, get a liquor license and then try and get a G1. That is actually happening where people are thinking of doing that. At some point we had talked about banquet halls and what we would want to do with banquet halls because technically they have the whole kitchen

March 31, 2020

COW Minutes

Page 31 of 35

and they serve food. We had a whole discussion on this before but I just think it's germane to what we're discussing right now.

Mayor Gallo - You're absolutely right, I just don't think we want to prohibit. Is that a business we want to prohibit right off the bat or do you think eventually over time they should qualify to give their patrons another avenue of entertainment while in their banquet hall?

Alderman Bisesi - I think there's a really strong argument to go both ways so I would probably side with the consensus on that.

Melissa Gallagher, Finance Director - To your point earlier about those who serve liquor and what to exclude, I think the whole point of the G1 is the restaurant focus and we had discussions internally too as far as when we were developing this write up, perhaps you're not looking to prohibit unless list prohibitions with the permitted uses are and doing so within the parameters which you already have listing. Just adding to the conversation.

Alderman Vinezeano - To bring up our discussion about the banquet halls, Alderman D'Astice brought up a good point that most often than not the person that's there during the day is like a salesman or saleswoman looking to book events and that the rules of the State licensee requires that someone is monitoring the machines and there's cameras and then during events is there young children around them. I believe during our discussion we opted to say that it's really not an appropriate venue due to those circumstances, if I'm recalling our conversation. We opted at that point at our special COW meeting to say that we did not want banquet halls.

Mayor Gallo - Banquet halls are not currently on the list here. As we are to go down this road with the G1 developing over time evolving, if we miss things here we have to open it back up to have the same series of dialogue and then engaging in the Council meetings to vote to add new prohibited locations or is there some mechanism that when we identify them the Council can include it in the Ordinance?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - It kind of goes along with what Melissa Gallagher was speaking to and it may be a better way to go to identify those uses that are specifically allowed for with respect to this G1 license and then exclude all others. As we continue to think about this, we're identifying other uses that the next person hasn't thought of and if you don't specifically exclude it you do run into a problem if you are excluding the whole entire list and you eliminated some kind of business from that list. But if you go the other route and identify the businesses that are allowed and all others are excluded you're not leaving yourself open for failing to exclude.

Mayor Gallo - Have we not done that sufficiently yet with it being a restaurant and then the liquor license types that they have to have in place and then we just need to specifically prohibit grocery stores, liquor stores, businesses that carry liquor but don't qualify?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - No I don't think you have. Those retail liquor license holders are not listed in G1 as being able to have a G1 license. If you have these new establishments like a laundromat that is now going to serve liquor, you're going to probably have to draft some kind of amendment to allow for that original liquor license and I wouldn't add that liquor license as one that qualifies for a G1.

Mayor Gallo - But don't they also have to serve food? According to our ordinance they have to serve food and they would have to open themselves up to having health inspections and a kitchen in order to do that and I know we're going down this hypothetical road.

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - Yes in addition to the fact that they have to hold a certain type of license there are other existing elements just like you said.

Mayor Gallo - Are we on the wrong path here with this discussion about identifying which to prohibit? Are we going down the wrong road?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - I think that it's a good discussion to have so we know the direction that the City Council wants to take and as we continue to create the language that ultimately going to consider we want to make sure that we're protecting against these particular types of businesses from having that kind of gaming so the discussion is worthwhile. Although, I don't know what will ultimately get into an ordinance with having a list of excluded businesses.

Mayor Gallo - So at this point with that in mind should Council action actually be to refine our G1 definition? And then we don't have to create or establish these laundry lists of businesses should they start evolving to have liquor in them or currently have liquor but not serve food yet or also serve food like a grocery store but not qualify for a gaming license?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - Yes, I'll do a close analysis as to the licenses that are allowed for a G1 and those that we want to prohibit as a City and make sure that they're consistent with each other.

Alderman Bisesi - What might be needed to give the best direction is maybe we do a straw vote that says would we rather look at what we're prohibiting or would we rather redefine what we're allowing? To see which way we want to go.

Mayor Gallo - That's what Attorney Wolf and I were just saying. Attorney Wolf, is there a priority in specifically prohibiting these at the immediate time? Are we facing any conversations where one of these entities listed are looking to obtain a license right now?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - No, there's no exposure. I don't think there's exposure right now as to the way the Code is written. In addition, there's no exposure in the sense that, I don't think there any applications on file in this regard and further the City Council has sole authority in opening up these licenses. As we talked about earlier, all the liquor licenses including the G1 license are closed until the City Council opens it up.

Mayor Gallo - I think that's what we should do, I'll put it to a straw vote. I think we need to refine our definition of a G1 and especially if we're going to look at Schaumburg's ordinances and their licenses to see if we should start adopting anything further. Can I have a quick show of hands to demonstrate that you would prefer that we just refine and revise our current definition of what qualifies for a G1 license? All in favor? Opposed? 7 in favor; 0 opposed. It's unanimous, so I think we have our direction for this.

Alderman Budmats - At this point seeing that we're redefining the wheel in terms of G1, does that mean that we're going to place a moratorium on applications that are in house?

Mayor Gallo - Let's defer to legal.

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - We're not going to do that today. We would have to consider that at the upcoming City Council meeting. Yes, it is something that can be entertained. I will work with staff if that's something the Council would like to consider doing we have a straw vote today on whether they want to consider that and making sure to place that appropriately on the Council agenda just so that it doesn't interfere or completely eliminate the

opportunity for the applications that are already on file, it will just postpone them and keep them on hold but we do have, as you may remember, one application that went through first reading that would be up for second reading at the next City Council meeting. I would want you to consider that and consider how to handle that one.

Mayor Gallo - That will be April 14th at the next City Council meeting. So I guess we will have a straw vote to propose the moratorium, Alderman Budmats do you have a specific way you want me to pose the question or just a show of hands to pose a moratorium?

Alderman Budmats - When we talked about the one that's even supposed to come up on April 14th we said it was going to be dependent upon our conversation tonight, that we're trying to come up with and establish our criteria of what we're trying to accomplish so it shouldn't be a surprise to anybody that this is something that we are going to entertain. It sounds like we're getting closer to flushing this whole deal out and we really want to move forward from here out so before we approve more licenses of questionable potential nature because we just haven't flushed out our program. A straw poll to place something on the next agenda that places a 90 day moratorium on any new G1's so that gives us a time to finish flushing this whole deal out.

Mayor Gallo - When you said the 90 days I want to defer to Attorney Wolf and ask if there is any recommended guideline? This is a business that's trying to invest in our community, I'm not being sympathetic completely I want to factor these things in, as there a preferred recommended timeframe that we should propose with this 60 days, 30 days, 90 days that you've seen from other communities?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney - I think 90 days is the longer end of moratoriums that I've seen but you have authority to do it for as long as Council determines. It's really just a matter of how long it will take us to get our G1 license refined. If you think it's going to take more than the next Committee of the Whole meeting we should take that into account. If we could do it at the next one then maybe it doesn't need to be 90 days.

Mayor Gallo - I'm going to propose 60 days and hopefully we can flush it out here much more ambitiously than that but if not there is a safeguard in place. Again, this is just a straw poll for this evening.

Alderman D'Astice - Can we have discussion on this?

Mayor Gallo - Would you like to discuss putting a moratorium on it?

Alderman D'Astice - Yes.

Mayor Gallo - Okay, since you're on the mic you have the floor.

Alderman D'Astice - I am opposed to doing this. You have one company that's halfway through the process and now we want to go back and tell a company that's ready to go that no they have to wait for a while because we still have to define it. They applied under the existing definition. Someone else who may not have applied yet, that's fine but for one company that's already in process I don't think we can put a moratorium on them. I don't think it's fair to them and I also think from outside looking in people are going to say what kind of business community is Rolling Meadows. I just have a real bad feeling about this, I think it makes us as a community look really bad to businesses.

Mayor Gallo - I appreciate your opinion on that. I don't like opportunists coming into this community to put on gaming cafés in the community in a guise of a restaurant given the menu is definitely not a restaurant and if they wanted to be a restaurant they had full opportunity to build that out over this time. I do appreciate that and everything I've said prior to this this evening has been in favor of wanting to see investors come in and invest in

the community but I do think people are taking certain advantages of this G1 in our community and opening up gaming parlors not restaurants.

Alderman O'Brien - I wanted to confirm when we take the straw vote, are we putting the moratorium on the ones that would be new submitting because I'm in agreement with Alderman D'Astice on this one. My understanding and maybe we can get some clarity around it, there's the one that we've all been talking about this would be the second time they're delayed is Lulu's. They're through first reading and they're at second reading and maybe that's the compromise. I don't know we can do that but since it's been officially applied, it's gone to Council for first reading and will be at second reading, that the moratorium would be for the other ones that have not come official applications on file in queue come to the Council. I think that's the delineation that we could stand pretty strong on is that this is their intent but they haven't brought it yet so the moratorium would be in effect for them but not for Lulu's that we been talking about for several months now. Let's assume it's going to take us 60 days, that's already backed up to June because it will take April and May to discuss it in June's COW. It will be July before any of this stuff gets done. I'm with Alderman D'Astice. I don't think it's business friendly for ones that are in queue. The ones that we talked about earlier tonight I have no problem pushing the moratorium and my understanding from what Melissa Gallagher explained to us they have not officially submitted any paperwork for a G1.

Mayor Gallo - Just vote on it we don't need to debate it.

Alderman O'Brien - That's why I'm asking for clarification, are we voting for a moratorium on the ones that are in queue or anyone new after March 31st that's what my question was.

Mayor Gallo - Everyone in queue based on Alderman Budmats conversation that he did say that we as a Council articulated at the time of the last Council meeting when we put their discussion on postponing for the Committee of the Whole and we had our first reading last week at Council and now we're having the Committee of the Whole right now that there was no guarantee out of any of this for them right now. If they want to be restaurant they could have opened a long time ago. If you don't agree with it just vote no.

Alderman O'Brien - I just wanted clarification.

Alderman Cannon - I think there is a big difference between the one that's in for second reading and the rest. I think it's a huge difference. I suggest we do both.

Mayor Gallo - So you suggest we do a straw vote of a moratorium on new versus those that are in the queue right now?

Alderman Cannon - Correct me if I'm wrong, there's only one in the queue.

Mayor Gallo - That's what I said, the one in the queue?

Alderman Cannon - Yes versus the rest of them.

Alderman Budmats - No matter what, with the Governor extending the COVID-19 for the next 30 days, there's no gaming parlor that's going to open in the next 30 days. We have time to have another meeting and basically it's going to cost two weeks because in the next four weeks there's no gaming parlor that's going to open at all in the State of Illinois because they are all shut down. It's foolish for us to pass something because they're in the queue. Honestly, they can't open anyway so in six weeks or whenever our next Committee of the Whole meeting is will

be prior to the opportunity for them to open anyway. So we might as well get it done and have the COW meeting and flush all of this out whether they're in the queue or not because they can't open anyway.

Mayor Gallo - The COW meeting will be virtually now on April 21st.

Alderman Budmats - So why are we going to bother voting for a business that can't open anyway?

Alderman Vinezeano - I would remind Council that we did this very same thing to an established business in the end of 2019. We put a hold on their application for months to an established business when we knew what kind of business they were because we wanted to reevaluate this G1 and get it right and what we wanted and that didn't pass so then the application came back to us after that. That was several months that we put an established business on hold application. To say that we're holding something up, we're not saying that they can open, by all means open as a restaurant but we're putting the G1 license on hold until we can establish as a City what our G1 license looks like and to get it right and correct.

Mayor Gallo - Thank you both for putting this into perspective here. We did in fact do that to a business that was established here for quite a number of years before we put them on hold to be competitive with their neighbors

Alderman D'Astice - I think Mr. Budmats brings up a good point. All restaurants are basically closed for the next 30 days so there's really no need to put a moratorium on anything because nobody can open up. You can't have restaurant open for seating and if you can't have it for seating obviously you can't have gaming so there's no reason to do a moratorium, the Governor has taken care of that for us.

Mayor Gallo - Terminals are turned off anyway from the State. We should have thought about our current state of affairs before even going down this road to request a straw vote on a moratorium. Given the current nature of the State we don't need to do that we will just revisit this topic on April 21st via Zoom unless anything dramatic changes and the doors are opened and we are allowed to go back in society. So no need with that. Anything further? Attorney Wolf, do I have another straw vote that needs to be put out there right now regarding the refining of our G1?

Melissa Wolf, City Attorney – No.

Mayor Gallo – Is there a motion to adjourn? Alderman D'Astice has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Bisesi. All in favor say aye; those opposed say nay. The ayes have it and the meeting is adjourned.

There being no further business, by unanimous consent the Committee-of-the Whole meeting was adjourned at 10:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted: Judy Brose, Deputy City Clerk

March 31, 2020 Committee-of-the-Whole Minutes Approved by Council on April 28, 2020.

Judy Brose

Judy Brose, Deputy City Clerk