Village of Lombard

Village Hall 255 East Wilson Ave. Lombard, IL 60148 villageoflombard.org



Meeting Agenda

Thursday, October 15, 2009

7:30 PM

Village Hall Board Room

Village Board of Trustees

Village President: William J. Mueller
Village Clerk: Brigitte O'Brien

Trustees: Greg Gron, District One; Keith Giagnorio, District Two;
Zachary Wilson, District Three; Peter Breen, District Four;
Laura Fitzpatrick, District Five; and Bill Ware, District Six

I. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

II. Roll Call

III. Public Hearings

IV. Public Participation

090647	Proclamation - Red Ribbon Week
	Attachments: procredribbon2009.doc
090648	Proclamation - Lights on After School
	<u>Attachments:</u> proclightsonafterschool2009.doc
090664	* Proclamation - John "Jack" T. O'Brien Day
	<u>Attachments:</u> procjackobrienday2009.doc
090667	* Proclamation - Change Your Clock, Change Your Battery

procchangeyourclockchangeyourbattery2009.doc

V. Approval of Minutes

VI. Committee Reports

Community Relations Committee - Trustee Laura Fitzpatrick, Chairperson

Economic/Community Development Committee Trustee Bill Ware, Chairperson

Environmental Concerns Committee - Trustee Dana Moreau, Chairperson

Finance Committee - Trustee Zachary Wilson, Chairperson

Public Works Committee - Trustee Greg Gron, Chairperson

Transportation & Safety Committee - Trustee Dick Tross, Chairperson

Board of Local Improvements - Trustee Richard J. Tross, President

Community Promotion & Tourism - President William J. Mueller, Chairperson

Lombard Historical Commission - Clerk Brigitte O'Brien

VII. Village Manager/Village Board Comments

VIII Consent Agenda

•

Payroll/Accounts Payable

A. 090644 Approval of Village Payroll

For the period ending September 26, 2009 in the amount of

\$831,135.85.

B. 090645 Approval of Accounts Payable

For the period ending October 2, 2009 in the amount of \$1,614,782.00.

C. 090652 Approval of Accounts Payable

For the period ending October 9, 2009 in the amount of \$569,744.64.

Ordinances on First Reading (Waiver of First Requested)

*C2. 090666 Appointing Directors of the Lombard Public Facilities Corporation

Appointing Ed Murphy as Director of the Lombard Public Facilities

Corporation.

<u>Attachments:</u> LPFC Murphy Appointment.doc

LPFC Murphy Appointment Memo.doc

Ordinance 6405.pdf

090666.pdf

Other Ordinances on First Reading

D. 090604 ZBA 09-08: 228 W. Willow Street

Requests that the Village grant a variation from Section 155.407(F)(1)(a) (1) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to reduce the front yard setback to thirty (30) feet where 33.93 feet is required to allow for an enclosed front porch within the R2 Single-Family Residence District. (DISTRICT #1)

Attachments: apoletter 09-08.doc

Cover Sheet.doc

DAH referral memo.doc
PUBLICNOTICE 09-08.doc
Referral Let 09-08.doc

Report 09-08.doc
Ordinance 6410.pdf

090604.pdf

E. 090605 ZBA 09-09: 1107 Woodrow Avenue

Requests approval of the following actions on the subject property

located within the R2 Single-Family Residence District:

1. A variation to Section 155.205(A)(1)(c)(2) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to allow a six-foot (6') high fence in a required corner side

yard where a maximum height of four feet is permitted; and 2. A variation to Section 155.205(A)(1)(c)(3) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to allow a six-foot (6') high fence in a required front yard abutting the front yard of an adjacent lot where a maximum height of four feet is permitted. (DISTRICT #5)

The ZBA also recommended that the public hearing fees be waived.

Attachments: apoletter 09-09.doc

Cover Sheet.doc

DAH referral memo.doc

PUBLICNOTICE.doc

Referral Letter 09-09.doc

Report 09-09 2.doc

Ordinance 6411.pdf

090605.pdf

Tim Hogan, 1107 Woodrow Avenue, owner of the subject property, presented the petition. Mr. Hogan stated that he purchased the subject property in 2003 and the fence was already on the property. He added that he did not know about the fence requirements when he purchased the property. Mr. Hogan stated that he is a member of the Lombard Fire Department and he is required to stay overnight at the fire station for sometimes 60 hours per week. He added that the fence provides safety for his family while he is gone. He stated that he has invested money into the property to make it more presentable. He added that he put in new windows and siding. He stated that he is also going to install new sidewalks. Mr. Hogan stated that the neighbors love the fence because all of the neighborhood kids play in the back safely. He then submitted a petition signed by all of the neighbors in favor of the fence. He added that there are 14 sex offenders within a one and a half mile radius of his property. Mr. Hogan then stated that he would have gotten a permit for the fence had he known about the requirements. He added that the fence would be costly to take down and his wife is currently unemployed, due to medical reasons. He reminded the ZBA that the fence was preexisting. Lastly, he stated that he is away from his family a lot, but he always makes sure to check on his family, whenever possible.

Chairperson DeFalco opened the meeting for public comment.

Jim Kartholl, 1117 W. Woodrow Avenue, spoke in favor of the variation. Mr. Kartholl stated that he has lived at his property (across the street from the petitioner) since 1996 and there has always been a fence located on the petitioner's property. He also stated that the fence was there, prior to the petitioner purchasing the property. Mr. Kartholl stated that all of the neighbors appreciate the fence because the neighborhood children all play in the petitioner's back yard.

Chairperson DeFalco then requested the staff report.

Michael Toth, Planner I, presented the staff report. The subject property is located at the southwest corner of Woodrow Avenue and Third Avenue. The petitioner is requesting a variation to maintain a solid vinyl fence at a height of six feet (6') where only four feet (4') is permitted.

The petitioner purchased the subject property in June, 2003. According to the petitioner, the subject fence was already present on the property when the property was purchased. Staff researched the permit history of the property and found that no permit was ever issued for the fence. Since the petitioner wishes to maintain the fence as constructed, a variation is required.

The fence is six (6) feet, where only four (4) feet is permitted in the corner side yard; therefore, the fence is considered nonconforming by Code standards. Staff notes that the house itself is also nonconforming with respect to the side yard required setback as it is located only eleven (11) feet from the property line along Third Avenue, where twenty (20) feet is required. A small portion of the fence is also located within a clear line of sight area, which originates from the neighbor's driveway to the south. The fence also abuts the front yard of that same property directly to the south along Third Avenue, which would require the fence to be four (4) feet or less along the thirty (30) foot rear yard area.

On the southeast corner of the existing fence, a six foot (6') portion is located within the twenty foot (20') clear line of site area, which extends north, from the property to the south's driveway. As such, the petitioner has agreed to address the issue by placing the fence on an angle, as to not interfere with the aforementioned clear line of sight area. By replacing the fence, the property would no longer have any clear line of sight issues.

Although the petitioner raised several issues within the Response to the Standards for Variations with regard to privacy and safety, staff does not support the petition since there is not a demonstrated hardship involving the physical characteristics of the property. As the six-foot high fence is within the corner side yard, staff is concerned about the obstruction it creates. Furthermore, the fence blocks the view from the front yard of the neighboring property; as such, staff is recommending denial of the petition.

Chairperson DeFalco opened the meeting for discussion among the members.

Mr. Bedard asked the petitioner if the fence had previously existed and if there would be any changes made to the fence.

Tim Hogan replied that the fence would remain the same with the exception of the corner piece that was cut out to make way for the clear line of site area.

Mr. Young asked why this petition is before the ZBA.

Mr. Toth responded that the fence was found to be in violation of Code with respect to the height in the corner side yard and rear yard, abutting the neighbor's front yard. He stated that there was no permit required for fences prior to 2000, but they still needed to meet the Code requirements.

Mr. Young asked the petitioner if the fence had previously existed.

Tim Hogan replied, yes.

Mr. Tap asked if the neighbor to the south was okay with the fence.

Tim Hogan replied, yes, that his neighbor's name is on the submitted neighborhood petition.

Chairperson DeFalco mentioned the fence case on Washington that was in

excess in height in the corner side yard. He added that the ZBA recommended denial as the fence was new and it blocked the neighbor's view from their house. He then mentioned that this case differs because this is a new property owner, who did not erect the fence. He then asked staff where the clear line of sight area is measured and if it is sufficient.

Mr. Toth described the clear line of site area on the subject property. He then stated that the petitioner did properly correct the clear line of site area as it pertains to the fence.

Chairperson DeFalco asked staff if the petitioner could use a fence that was 75% open construction.

Stuart Moynihan, Associate Planner, stated that a fence taller than four feet and of 75% open construction could only be done if the property abutted another corner lot, which in this case it does not.

Chairperson DeFalco mentioned the past fence case on School and Division. He stated that it was a new home with a fence in excess of the required height. He stated that the variation was denied and the fence had to be cut down to the required four feet.

Dr. Corrado asked the petitioner if their fence could be cut down.

Tim Hogan replied by stating that the fence could not be cut down because it is constructed of vinyl panels.

Mr. Tap asked staff why the petitioner was required to have a permit.

Mr. Toth stated that regardless of the outcome of the variation, a fence permit is required - whether or not they have to cut it down or relocate it.

Chairperson DeFalco stated that the case before the ZBA is for a preexisting fence. The survey from 2002 already indicates that a fence was located on the property; therefore, there was a fence at that location prior to 2002.

Mr. Bedard stated that he does not believe that the petitioner should be held accountable for the fence as it was there when he purchased the property. He then asked how this issue just came about now.

Mr. Toth stated that it was found in violation based upon a complaint to the Code Enforcement Department. He then reminded the ZBA that the four foot fence height requirement in the corner side yard is code and it has been supported time-and-time-again by the Village Board. He mentioned the ZBA meetings involving the Board, pertaining to fence height.

Chairperson DeFalco asked what would happen if the variation was not granted.

Mr. Toth stated that the fence would then have to come into conformance with Village Code. He stated that the fence would either have to be lowered, moved or taken down.

Mr. Bedard stated that he was ready to make a motion to recommend approval of the variation. He stated that a condition should be added which states that if the fence is damaged or destroyed by more than 50% it would have to come into

conformance with Code. Mr. Bedard also stated that he recommends that the petitioner's public hearing fees be waived as the fence was there when he purchased the property.

Mr. Toth stated that the ZBA does not have the authority to waive public hearing fees. He added that only the Village Board can waive those fees.

Chairperson DeFalco stated that he would be ready for a motion of approval, which may include a condition of approval, should the ZBA vote for approval.

Mr. Bedard made the motion of approval, which was seconded by Mr. Tap.

Chairperson DeFalco stated that he wanted to comment on the case before a vote was to be taken. He stated that the ZBA has historically been strict on fence height variations. He then mentioned the September 18, 2008 special meeting of the ZBA and Village Board regarding fence height. He then added that the Trustees have the authority to change the Ordinance, which they have not done. He then made representation that there are justifiable means to grant a variation and he is concerned with the strict interpretation of code. He stated that because the petitioner did not construct the fence and it has been located at that location for a number of years, a variation could be justified. Lastly, he stated that he would go against his usual voting on this matter and vote in favor of the petition.

Mr. Young stated that he agrees with Chairperson DeFalco's comment.

*F. Video Gaming (Moved to IX-C)

Ordinances on Second Reading

G. 090487 ILWARN and IPWMAN Mutual Aid Agreements (Two Ordinances/Two

Agreements)

Recommendation to participate in the proposed Mutual Aid Agreements.

Attachments: Ordinance 6394.pdf

Ordinance 6395.pdf

090487.pdf

Goldsmith reviewed with the committee members. Frerichs: is this relatively new? Goldsmith: yes it is. It is definitely picking up steam. Gron: after taking more than 20 hours of NIMS training, I can vouch for these. Mahal: who

would be our representative? Goldsmith: I would be.

H. 090600 PC 09-25: 1060 E. Roosevelt Road (Discount Tire)

Requests a conditional use pursuant to Section 155.417 (G)(2)(a)(4) of the Zoning Ordinance, to allow for outdoor display and sales of products for the subject property located within the B4A Roosevelt Road Corridor District. (DISTRICT #6)

Attachments: apoletter 09-25.doc

Cover Sheet.doc

DAH referral memo.doc

PUBLICNOTICE 09-25.doc

Referral Letter.doc

Report 09-25.doc

Ordinance 6396.pdf

090600.pdf

Charles Snyder, 1060 E. Roosevelt, presented the petition. Mr. Snyder stated that he is the manager of Discount Tire and the property is owned by Halle Properties. He stated that Discount Tire is requesting approval for a tent sale permit. He mentioned that the displayed tent would be approximately 10×10 , which is similar to what would be in a backyard for a party. He added that there are two exhibits on the plan. One would be located by the bay doors, and the other would be located by the marquee sign outside. He added that both exhibits are marked "A" & "B". He then stated that they are requesting use of the tents for approximately 10-15 times per calendar year for customer draw. He mentioned that he has additional copies of the exhibits available. He also described the safety requirements.

The petitioner showed a diagram of spot A, which is in front of the first bay area where they conduct the air checks. He stated that spot B is by the marquee sign. He added that the tent size is 10×10 and is the type that can be bought at a local store. He then stated that nothing will be located in the grass area and everything would be secured.

Chairperson Ryan asked the petitioner to explain the handout. The petitioner stated that the handout explains what they do with the tent sale. The second handout is the safety guidelines and he explained how those guidelines apply to 755 stores nationwide. He added that the documents are essentially an in-house

disposition of Discount Tire Company's safety aspect and in-house sales program.

Referring to the handout, Commissioner Sweester indicated that it noted there would be a banner hanging from the tent and questioned if that was going to be used. The petitioner responded by stating that there is a small 4' x 18" banner that they would usually secure to this tent; however, the tent already displays "Discount Tire" on it as this is a nationwide tent sale. In this case, that banner would only be 4' x 18" and secures under the tent. Commissioner Sweester asked about the total amount of signage they are looking at. The petitioner stated that everything is located in that 10 x 10 area, nothing outside.

Commissioner Burke confirmed with the petitioner that he was not applying to put up any signage because the signage was already on the tent. The petitioner stated, yes that's correct. Commissioner Sweester verified that the 4' x 18" banner would not be used. The petitioner stated that is correct.

Commissioner Nelson asked the petitioner if Discount Tire is having a concrete access drive worked on. The petitioner stated that the work being done on the east side of the property is that of the homeowner in back of their property. He added that the neighbor to the north is having sewage lines installed, which is being done by the neighbor, not them.

Chairperson Ryan opened the meeting for public comment. There was no one present to speak in favor or against the petition.

Chairperson Ryan then requested the staff report.

Michael Toth, Planner I, presented the staff report. Staff drafted the IDRC report to submit to the public record in its entirety. The subject property is an existing automobile service establishment located within the Roosevelt Road Corridor. The petitioner, Discount Tire, wishes to set up a temporary tent, during a specific time period, to display products associated with the business. The outdoor display and sales of products is listed as a conditional use within the B4A - Roosevelt Road Corridor District; therefore, a public hearing is required.

The petitioner is seeking to erect up to two (2) temporary tents in front of the building along the Roosevelt Road frontage. As the petitioner mentioned, the proposed tents would be 100 square feet each (10×10) and would showcase stacks of tires and wheels that are for sale. The petitioner has also represented tonight that they will also have concessions where they will serve refreshments.

As the petitioner has indicated, the proposed tent sale would occur on occasional weekends (Friday and Saturday only), during summer months, which is more frequent than the Special Event Permit allows (no more than 4 times/year). As such, the petitioner is applying for conditional use approval to allow the outdoor display and sales of products to occur for a designated period of time. As a condition of approval, staff recommends the time period for the tent sale be restricted to the times outlined by the petitioner - Fridays and Saturdays during the months of June through August.

Staff finds that the conditional use for outdoor sales can generally be supported. However, to ensure that the outdoor sales and display of merchandise is appropriately sized and located, staff offers the following considerations:

1. At least four feet of walkway between the building and tent should be

maintained at all times.

- 2. Sales and display areas must not impact vehicular traffic. This includes automobiles and Fire Department apparatus.
- 3. Clear line of sight areas must be maintained.
- 4. Outdoor sales and display of merchandise must remain ancillary to the principal land use of the establishment.

As the subject use is a combination of retail and service, the use complies with the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan.

The subject property is located along the Roosevelt Road Corridor and is surrounded on two sides by other commercial properties. To the west is Trinity Lutheran Church, which occupies the entire block. The area to the north is zoned for single-family uses and is currently made up of single family residences. This property is within the Roosevelt Road Corridor, which includes a large number of automobile service uses. Although this property abuts residential land, this occurrence is typical along Roosevelt Road and, as such, it can be considered compatible with surrounding land uses. Moreover, the proposed merchandise displays will be located in front of the subject business and not visible to the adjacent residential properties to the north. It is important to note that there is an existing fence along the north property line that is in disrepair. Staff recommends that a condition be added to ensure that the fence be maintained in good state of repair at all times.

Staff finds that the petition meets the standards for conditional uses; therefore, recommends approval of PC 09-25 subject to the eight conditions noted in the staff report.

Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners.

Commissioner Burke noted he had not seen the petitioner's handout which was submitted to the Commissioners tonight. He indicated he had concerns about approving anything in those documents that they are seeing for the first time.

Village Attorney George Wagner stated that according to the handout, it does indicate that there is a banner of some sort on the tent. If that is within the sign code, then it's not an issue. He added that if it's an issue with the sign code, additional approval would then be required.

Christopher Stilling, Assistant Community Development Director, stated that code would relate to a banner if it is located elsewhere on the property, which would be subject to the provisions of the Sign Ordinance. He added that there will be ancillary marketing, which can be looked at as part of the conditional use process. If it is a separate sign attached to the building or tent, we would want to review that banner in accordance with the Sign Ordinance.

Commissioner Burke stated that the banner is only one part of that document in question and doesn't know how germane other items might be to the petition. Being that the 4'x 18" banner would not be used because they already have a manmade tent with their logo on it, he questioned the relevance of the other items contained within the handout. Commissioner Sweester stated that they need to know what the logo is on.

Commissioner Burke suggested that the handout be displayed for all to see. The petitioner then displayed the document on the overhead projector. Chairperson

Ryan stated that it appeared to be an internal document used in each store.

Mr. Stilling stated that the second page contains instructions to the trainer. He added that it's more of an internal document for those working the event.

Village Attorney Wagner indicated that the Commissioners could add a condition of approval that the logo is permitted on the tent, no other banner would be approved, and all other signage would require approval by permit.

Commissioner Sweester then questioned Condition #2, which states that spot B shall be revised so as not to impact vehicular traffic. She wanted to ensure that the petitioner acknowledged and understood that the tent cannot be located in that spot. The petitioner stated that spot B, is actually located where there are four parking spaces and is approximately 65 feet away from Roosevelt Road so there are no issues with traffic going in or out.

Commissioner Sweester stated that she is not sure what the staff report is implying. She wants the petitioner to understand that if it is placed there and Condition #2 says it can't be placed there, it would have to be located elsewhere. The petitioner stated that spot B will only be used for the NASCAR display so it wouldn't be close to any type of traffic or continuous movement of traffic flow. Commissioner Sweester asked the petitioner to work with staff because where spot B is currently located implies that it would interfere with traffic somehow.

Mr. Stilling stated that if you look at the exhibit, it provides general locations for the tents. He added that it appeared it might impede on the drive aisles; however, after review, it appears it would be in a parking space so that would be fine. Mr. Toth stated that the parking lot to the west is not shown on the survey and that spot B might impede on the drive aisle leading to that parking lot.

Commissioner Burke stated that he wanted to add a Condition #9, which would state that the tent is allowed to have an integrated sign panel that says Discount Tire, but no additional banner is allowed.

!. 090602 PC 09-27: 850 N. DuPage Avenue

Requests that the Village grant a conditional use, pursuant to Section 155.418 (C) of the Zoning Ordinance, to allow for an athletic training facility within the I Limited Industrial District. (DISTRICT #1)

Attachments: APO letter 09-27.doc

Cover Sheet.doc

Cover Sheet.doc

DAH referral memo.doc

PUBLIC NOTICE 09-27.doc

ReferralLetter 09-27.doc

Report 09-27.doc

Ordinance 6397.pdf

090602.pdf

Peter Becker, 1117 N. Main Street, presented the petition. He stated that his business, The Olympian Centre, is seeking a conditional use to relocate its

facility from 1117 N. Main Street to 850 N. DuPage Avenue. The site is approximately the same size but will be more affordable.

Chairperson Ryan asked if there would be any changes associated with the relocation. The petitioner stated there would be none.

Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for public comment. No one spoke for or against the petition.

Chairperson Ryan requested the staff report. Jennifer Henaghan, Senior Planner, stated that the petitioner is proposing to operate an indoor athletic training facility within the I Limited Industrial District. The facility is currently located at 1117 N. Main Street (as approved by PC 07-21).

Public Works noted that the certifications for this property's backflow prevention devices are out of date and the property owner has not responded to the Village's multiple requests to bring the building into compliance with Cross Connection Control Ordinance 51.08. This deficiency should be remedied prior to occupancy.

The Building Division and Fire Department had a number of comments relating to the need for building permits and the classification of the facility as an assembly use. The petitioner is aware of these comments and will address them directly with the applicable divisions and departments through the building permit process. The petitioner has indicated that the building already has fire sprinklers.

Ms. Henaghan stated that in 2007, the Village Board approved a text amendment to the Zoning Ordinance adding athletic training facilities as a conditional use within the I Limited Industrial District. Subsequently, conditional use approval was granted to The Olympian Centre for the property located at 1117 N. Main Street. The new space is approximately 7,800 square feet in area and the petitioner has indicated that the new location will better suit their needs.

The Comprehensive Plan calls for this area to be developed with light industrial land uses. The property as developed complies with the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed use is also in compliance with the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan in that the Plan suggests that industrial properties attract diverse tenants. The property is surrounded by light industrial uses on all sides. Other uses within the building include a warehousing/distribution facility and a steel cutting die manufacturer. Many of the trips generated by the proposed training facility will occur after 5:00 p.m., which is after the typical operating hours of the surrounding businesses. All activities associated with the use will occur indoors. Staff finds that an athletic training facility is compatible with the surrounding land uses.

Staff finds that the proposed use meets the Standards for Conditional Uses. No exterior improvements are proposed. The indoor nature and primary operating hours of the business will not conflict with the surrounding uses and there is a surplus of parking on the site. The training facility will conform to the I District requirements in all other respects.

Chairperson Ryan opened the meeting for comments from the Plan Commission.

Commissioner Sweetser asked about the hours of operation and the ages of the

students. The petitioner stated that the youngest students are eight years old and they are primarily there for private coaching. The student age range goes up from there into the 60s. The majority of the students come in during the evenings and are finished by 9:00 or 9:30 p.m., but there are also a number of small daytime classes.

J. 090628 Liquor License Amendment-Lombard Grill, 1300 S. Main Street

Amending Title 11, Chapter 112 of the Alcoholic Liquor Code reflecting an increase in the Class A/B 1 liquor licenses granting a liquor license to Lombard Grill. (DISTRICT #2)

Lonibard Onii. (Dio 111101 7

Attachments: ordincrease.doc

Ordinance 6398.pdf

090628.pdf

K. 090620 BOT 09-02: 700-710, 712, 714 and 718 W. Hill Avenue

Authorizing the execution of Disconnection Agreements and Disconnecting the properties located at 700-710, 712, 714 and 718 W.

Hill from the Village of Lombard municipal boundaries. (DISTRICT #1)

Attachments: Cover sheet.doc

DAH referral memo2.doc

Hill Ave.jpg.pdf

Email11-6.pdf

Ordinance 6399.pdf

Ordinance 6400.pdf

Ordinance 6401.pdf

Ordinance 6402.pdf

Affidavit- 700-710 & 712, 714, 718 W. Hill.pdf

090620.pdf

Resolutions

L. 090624

US Mayors Climate Protection Agreement and Cool Cities Program Recommendation authorizing the Village President to sign the US Mayors Climate Protection Agreement and to join the Cool Cities program.

Attachments: 090624.pdf

R 38-10.pdf

Agreement Mayors Climate.pdf

Gorman: reviewed the memo with the committee members. This matter was forwarded to the board in 2006 and tabled by a vote of 4-2. The 4 members that voted to table are no longer on the board. The committee is already doing most of the things that are required. Reviewed the Milestones in the memo. Lonnie Morris, Chairperson of Cool Cities Program, in attendance to address committee. Morris: this commitment would be for all of Lombard. It can help bring the community together and join in the efforts. This would be a very exciting time for the committee to sign on. Possibly an intergovernmental Green Committee could be formed. Discussion ensued as to why the item was tabled in 2006. Morris: what the committee decides to do is totally up to you. There is a lot of flexibility. Durdic: are you looking for a recommendation for joining both? Cooper: it looks like you need to be a member of one to be a member of both.

Durdic: as a committee we would like to pursue the Cool Cities Program. Mason: how do we go about doing it, does it need to be a sub-committee? Asked staff to bring this information to the next meeting.

Cooper: does the state of Illinois have a energy bank program? Gorman: I have not seen anything like that. Cooper brought ideas to the table involving new options for green infrastructure. Durdic: do we have people that explore ideas for grants and funding? Gorman: yes, the Village does have people that do that. Durdic: why is there no cost in the audit? Gorman: the municipality does not pay for this. Durdic: if we put in energy efficient items, could we get a rebate from ComEd? Gorman: they presently do not have any program like that. They are, like everyone else, trying to do more with less. Gorman: we are installing some LED lights - first group is on West Rd. Gorman: next month we will have an Energy Plan that will be brought to the committee.

M. 090633 Olde Towne East Phase 3, Resident Engineering Contract Amendment No. 2

Approving Amendment No. 2 to the contract with Baxter & Woodman in the amount of \$28,595.00 for resident engineering services. (DISTRICT #4)

Attachments: 090633.pdf

R 39-10.pdf

N. 090646 Olde Towne East Phase 4 Final Balancing Change Order No. 2
Authorizing a decrease of \$11,783.71 and a time extension of 44
calendar days to the contract with John Neri Construction Company.
(DISTRICT #4)

Attachments: 090646.pdf

R 40-10.pdf

Change Order 2 Neri.pdf

Dratnol reviewed the change order. The requested time extension was incorrect

on the agenda, it should read 44 days.

O. 090653 Olde Towne East Phase 3 Final Balancing Change Order No. 3

Authorizing a decrease to the contract with Brothers Asphalt Paving in

the amount of \$2,325.22. (DISTRICT #4)

Attachments: 090653.pdf

Change Order #3 Brother Asphalt.pdf

R 41-10.pdf

Dratnol reviewed the change order.

Other Matters

P. <u>090623</u> Multi-Family Recycling Grant

Recommendation to approve a grant request for Park Avenue

Condominium Association in the amount of \$470.52. (DISTRICT #1)

Attachments: 090623.pdf

Gorman: reviewed the grant submitted by Vanguard Community Management. Cooper: is there an amount set aside for this specific program? Gorman: we have money put in one big fund and it is about \$10,000. Durdic: for this amount of money it is a no brainer. Gorman: fees are set up in the contract schedule for commercial refuse. We do have a meet/compete clause. Durdic moved to approve. Adams asked for further discussion. Adams: will this be enough for them? Jendras: they are just starting out. We approve this amount that they requested. Adams: this is just a start up program. Mason: would be interested to know how the program works for them.

Q. 090625 DuPage Water Commission Water Conservation Campaign

Recommendation to endorse the DuPage Water Commission Water

Conservation Pledge.

Attachments: 090625.pdf

Gorman: hopefully everyone knows that we get our water from the DuPage Water Commission. DPC has a pledge that they would like the committee to sign. Something that we would like to do for next year is purchase rain gauges. Another thing is dye tablets. We already use these for someone with a high

spike in their water bill.

*R. Village Bond Counsel (Moved to IX-D)

IX. Items for Separate Action

Ordinances on First Reading (Waiver of First Requested)

A. 090641 FYE 2009 Final Budget Amendment

Final Budget Amendments requested for the FYE 2009 Budget. (2/3

vote required)

<u>Attachments:</u> Ordinance 6403.pdf

090641.pdf

B. 090650 FYE 2010 Budget Amendments

Amendment to the General Fund to increase the budget for the Helen M. Plum Library's social security, medicare and IMRF payments, as they

are converting to a public library district. (2/3 vote required)

Attachments: Ordinance 6404.pdf

Final Judgement Order.pdf

090650.pdf

Other Ordinances on First Reading

*C. <u>090649</u> Video Gaming Ordinance

Ordinance banning video gaming in the Village of Lombard.

<u>Attachments:</u> videogamingmemo122809toth.doc

Ordinance 6442.pdf

090649.pdf 090649.pdf 090649.pdf

Video Gaming.pdf

Ordinances on Second Reading

Resolutions

Other Matters

***D.** <u>090651</u> Village Bond Counsel

Authorizing Shanahan & Shanahan, LLP to serve as Village Bond

Counsel.

Attachments: 090651.pdf

A. 090657 Downtown Lombard Market Analysis

Request to approve the Downtown Lombard Market Analysis report and provide comments in regard to completing the final tasks associated with the RTA Community Planning Grant. (DISTRICTS #1 and #4)

<u>Attachments:</u> MarketAnalysisBOTMemo3.doc

downtown market analysis report approval with RTA comments.doc

090657.pdf

090657 - 10-15.pdf

Downtown Lombard Market Study.pdf

XI. Executive Session

XII. Reconvene

XIII Adjournment

.