

MINUTES
WOODSTOCK CITY COUNCIL
July 15, 2014
City Council Chambers

The regular meeting of the Woodstock City Council was called to order at 7:00 PM by Mayor Brian Sager on Tuesday, July 15, 2014 in Council Chambers at City Hall. He explained the consent calendar process and invited public participation.

A roll call was taken.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Julie Dillon, Maureen Larson, Mayor Brian Sager, Mark Saladin, Joseph Starzynski, RB Thompson, Michael Turner

COUNCIL MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: City Manager Roscoe Stelford, City Attorney TJ Clifton, Finance Director Paul Christensen, Director of Public Works Paul Ruscko, Dir. of Economic Development Cort Carlson, City Planner Nancy Baker, Police Chief Robert Lowen, Sergeant Tino Cipolla, Officer Sharon Freund

OTHERS PRESENT: City Clerk Dianne Mitchell, Police & Fire Commission Chairman Ron Giordano

A. FLOOR DISCUSSION:

1. Charter Presentation – Woodstock Police Explorer Post #765

Chief Lowen stated that some of the scouts as well as Sergeant Tino Cipolla and District Executive of the Boy Scouts of America, Blackhawk Area Council, Nikesha Wilson, were in attendance. He stated that the Boy Scouts of America Police Career Explorer Post program started in 2012 was organized by Sergeant Tino Cipolla with the assistance of Sergeant Joshua Fourdyce, Sergeant Ray Lanz, Officer Jason Bernstein and Canine Officer David Dempsey. He reported that there are 24 youths involved in the program which provides educational training programs on the purposes, missions and objectives of law enforcement. He noted that the group will be helping with Gavers, Summer in the Park and McHenry County Fair. H reported that this is the third year that McHenry County Community Foundation has given them a grant of \$5,000 in support of the program.

Nikesha Wilson stated that she represents Blackhawk Area Council Boy Scouts and then presented the 2014-2015 Charter Renewal Agreement to Woodstock Police Explorer Post #765.

Sergeant Cipolla thanked City Council for their continued support and introduced scouts Stephanie Kroll, Kristen Lemke, Courtney Dalton, Brandy Jenkins and Explorer Lieutenant Alex Gockenbach. He acknowledged the hard work of the Explorers.

Mayor Sager thanked N. Wilson and the Boy Scouts organization for providing exceptional support to the program and for the partnership that they extend to the City of Woodstock and the Woodstock Police Department. He emphasized that it is a very fine and traditional method of learning and something that helps them in their chosen area of study and potential career path. He thanked Sergeant Cipolla for his leadership and noted that it is been an exceptional program. He congratulated the Scouts for their dedicated commitment and service and for choosing the program.

2. Swearing In of Police Officer Matthew I. Prentice and Introduction of Community Service Officer Keith M. Lee

Chief Lowen invited Officer Prentice to the podium and provided background information on his education, employment and military experience. Police & Fire Commission Chairman R. Giordano asked Officer Prentice to raise his right hand and recite the oath of office.

Mayor Sager thanked Officer Prentice for joining the Woodstock Police Department and for his service in the Marines and to the country. He stated that it is appropriate to have the swearing in ceremony at the public City Council meeting because it is a swearing in whereby he is determining to choose and commit himself in service to the community and its residents. He thanked him for taking the oath of office and then recognized his parents who were in attendance.

Chief Lowen invited Officer Lee to the podium and provided background information on his military, education and employment experience. He advised that Officer Lee's assignment will include late afternoon and evening hours with particular attention paid to the Square. Police & Fire Commission Chairman R. Giordano asked Officer Lee to raise his right hand and recite the oath of office.

Mayor Sager thanked him for serving our country through the armed services and for his continued services through the National Guard. He thanked him for choosing the Woodstock Police Department noting that our officers are front and center when working with residents, businesses and service organizations. He advised that in this specific role as community service officer it becomes even more heightened. He commended Officer Lee in that service and noted that through this oath he has sworn to protect and defend the community and as a community service officer he has the additional opportunity to make sure the City is doing everything it can to reach out in communications to our residents and businesses.

Public Comments

No comments from the public.

Council Comments

Mayor Sager reminded everyone of the Summer in the Park event taking place in Emricson Park this weekend. He encouraged everyone to go to the web site and to check the papers as well for all of the various activities. He stated that it is going to be fun-filled and will be an enjoyable, family, next-to-free opportunity. He thanked all the businesses, volunteers, sponsors and Staff. He advised that there are opportunities to volunteer and to contact City Hall. He stated that the event will be anchored by Gavers Barndance which is on Saturday evening and supports cancer research. He gave a special thank-you to Cindy Smiley and Monica Amraen who have worked really hard on the event.

Mayor Sager stated that R. Stelford confirmed that the aquatic center will remain open until Labor Day. He stated that they are grateful to Becky, aquatic center Manager, and Dave Zinnen who have worked hard to make it happen. He noted that it will be open weekends starting mid August.

CONSENT AGENDA:

Motion by J. Dillon, second by M. Larson to concur with Consent Agenda Items B-E5, E8.

- Mayor Sager removed Item E6
- M. Turner removed Item E7

B. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS:

June 17, 2014 Regular Meeting

C. WARRANTS: 3621 3622 3623

D. MINUTES AND REPORTS

Community and Economic Development Report – May 2014

Police Department Report – May 2014

E. MANAGER'S REPORT NO. 27

1. **Old Courthouse Change Order** – Adoption of Resolution 14-R-15 authorizing Change Order 007 resulting in a completion date of September 30, 2014 and Change Order 008 resulting in an increase to the contract of \$15,536.00.
2. **Zoning Variation – 303 Pleasant** – Adoption of Ordinance 14-O-43 varying Section 7A.3.C of the Unified Development Ordinance to allow construction of a deck within 12.2 feet of a yard abutting a street.
3. **Local Debt Recovery Program** – Adoption of Resolution 14-R-16 authorizing an Amendment to the Intergovernmental Agreement between the Illinois Office of the Comptroller and the City of Woodstock.
4. **Agreement - Water Billing Printing** – Approval of an agreement with Third Millennium to provide utility billing services.
5. **Water and Sewer Modifications** – Adoption of Ordinance 14-O-44 amending portions of Article 4C and 4D of Chapter 4, Municipal Water and Sewer, of Title 6, Public Ways and Property, of the Woodstock City Code Regarding Water and Sewer Utility Service.
8. **2014 Street Maintenance and Resurfacing** – Approval of an award of contract to the low bidder, Geske and Sons, Inc. for 2014 Street Maintenance and Resurfacing for the total bid price of \$808,978.99.

A roll call vote was taken. Ayes: J. Dillon, M. Larson, Mayor Sager M. Saladin, J. Starzynski, RB Thompson, M. Turner. Nays: None. Absentees: None. Abstentions: None. Motion carried.

Item E6 Agreement – Wireless Alarms – Approval of an agreement for Fire Alarm Monitoring with Fox Valley Fire and Safety

Mayor Sager stated that the item was removed because it is contingent upon legal counsel review of the actual agreement and advised that he is asking it to be approved with a contingency of legal review. TJ Clifton reported that there is one issue and noted that they reached out to the opposing counsel and hadn't heard back from them before the meeting.

Motion by M. Turner, second by J. Dillon to approve an agreement for Fire Alarm Monitoring with Fox Valley Fire and Safety contingent upon review and approval by the City's legal counsel.

In response to M. Saladin, R. Stelford reported that Staff has received minimal feedback and most of it is positive since they were able to reduce the costs for the businesses. He advised that in the onset there were a couple of alarms that were found with incorrect addresses on them. He reported that Fox Valley came out and checked all of the facilities to make sure the addresses all correspond with the board. He stated that it was an extra step that they took which Staff appreciates. He stated that they have been a good partner to work with.

A roll call vote was taken. Ayes: J. Dillon, M. Larson, Mayor Sager M. Saladin, J. Starzynski, RB Thompson, M. Turner. Nays: None. Absentees: None. Abstentions: None. Motion carried.

Item E7 Service Line Warranties Agreement – Approval to terminate the Marketing Agreement with Utility Service Partners Private Label, Inc. d/b/a Service Line Warranties of America (“SLWA”).

M. Turner asked for confirmation that this service is generally regarded as a positive service and R. Stelford advised that Staff doesn’t get too many complaints. He advised that most of the calls are more about confusion such as wanting to know if they need to take the program and if it is something the City is sponsoring. He advised that there are products out there that users can get but based on this marketing approach, they put it on City letterhead and made it look like it is a City product.

M. Turner questioned if the program can be changed and if we can tell them that they can still do the mailing via the City but it can’t look like its coming from the City. He stated that the other confusion that exists is who owns the line from the street to the house; he noted that the homeowner owns it. He stated that what this avoids is people coming in because they have a problem. He thought that when the program was very innovative and insightful and noted that he signed up for it.

M. Turner questioned if the 9,000 homeowners estimated in the City of Woodstock are single family homes or if it includes apartments. R. Stelford advised that it should include apartment buildings too but they would normally have only one connect to cover. M. Turner stated that 14% on a voluntary program like this is not a bad participation and advised that he hasn’t seen any other mailings offering this service. He stated that to him they were being proactive by putting this out there to create awareness and an avenue for homeowners to fund the risk through insurance. He questioned if it would be better dealing with the mechanical issues rather than ending the entire program.

P. Ruscko advised that the phone calls range from confusion of whether this is a service the City is providing, which the language clearly says it is a partnership, to don’t send this to my house anymore. He advised that there have been minimal complaints about not being able to pick the contractor. He advised that it is more confusion and frustration of understanding and noted that more often than not it turns out to be an opportunity to educate.

P. Ruscko stated that he has seen other companies that provide similar products noting that every single company has their disclaimers and limits; there are pros and cons to all of them. He reported that he spoke with Service Line Warranties of America regarding some of his concerns such as their request for his signature on their literature which he wasn’t comfortable with. He advised that they talked through some of the concerns with use of the letterhead making it look like a City document. He advised that they came to the agreement that Staff wasn’t going to put their name on it but noted that they believe one of the key mechanisms for people to pursue the option is to see that the City is endorsing it. He reported that he asked them if they would continue under a different scenario and all the feedback he has gotten has been “no” and if it’s not on City looking stationary then it’s not an option for them because they don’t see the market penetration and cost versus benefit.

M. Turner stated that they have gotten market penetration already. He questioned if there is a service or product of actual insurance where the City gives homeowners a choice to add a dollar amount each quarter onto their bill if they want to have insurance on the line. J. Dillon referred to Nicor and M. Turner stated that is a good example. P. Ruscko stated that he has not seen that and noted that the two companies he has seen are Nicor Home Solutions and Servpro. He advised that he hasn’t looked

into those two because they are direct market to home owners and aren't looking for a partnership. M. Turner stated that if Service Line Warranties of America are unwilling to consider the no logo thing then he supports cancelling it. He advised that he would like Staff to look at other options that are City coordinated, not necessarily sponsored, particularly the one of adding a line fee to the bill which allows for people to insure the line; it provides a service and helps keep the City out of the argument of who owns the line.

M. Larson asked if can be added to your home owners insurance. P. Ruscko advised that it depends on the insurance company. M. Larson stated that with the water bill changes that are coming there is some room to include bits of information. P. Christensen stated that with the new billing format, the City can put significant messages on it. He stated that for about \$0.03 they can put flyers in. He advised that one of the advantages to the new program is the City can educate its residents easier.

Mayor Sager stated that Council felt it is good idea to offer some type of opportunity because a lot of residents are unaware of the fact that they have responsibility. He stated that if there is an option for them to get insurance to help cover should the expense occur then it is a positive thing. He questioned if Council still believes that it is something they wish to support. He stated that in essence that when the City goes into an agreement, it means we have vetted a particular company which we believe is a company of standard and if the residents work with them they have a certain expectation that can be met. He stated that they are providing that service at a reasonable rate. He stated that the other thing to consider is that there are other businesses out there and questioned if the Council should be endorsing a given vendor or is it better to work strictly at the education side of things providing information because it is directly associated with City services in terms of the line. He stated that the Staff report is saying that maybe we should approach the educational aspect of it.

M. Saladin stated that he is assuming that back in 2011 the City vetted other companies and chose this company. He noted that the City picks contractors all the time so he doesn't see this as any different as long as that original vetting process was an open process. He believes there are three choices, one is to do nothing and the residents are on their own but educate them, we pick one or we give residents a list to choose from or we self-insure it. He questioned how many times it occurs in the city and suggested either adjusting the fees or do something to generate the funds to be able to cover it. He noted that this is an aggravating thing for homeowners and advised that every city does it different. He felt that maybe there is a way financially to do it that the City can take care of it.

In response to M. Larson, P. Ruscko advised that they don't hear about all the instances and noted that the data they received from Service Line Warranties of America for the 2 ½ years that it was in place, they spent \$40,000 on repairs. M. Turner feels that is really low and noted that one issue can hit five figures pretty easily.

M. Turner stated that if this isn't working for the City from the logo and process perspective then he is fine with killing it but he believes there is a need to come up with something else. He suggested that the City evolves it, re-bids or comes up with some other options like self-insure it and give residents the ability to add an amount to the bill for insurance and the City will cover them home to street, but if they don't take it then the City won't cover them. He stated that he doesn't know the solution but he is okay with terminating this if Staff really feels like they can't work it but he asked them to rebid it or come up with some other idea that attempts to deal with this issue; he wants to be proactive on this issue.

R. Stelford stated that Woodstock's policy has always been that it goes from the house to the line and a lot of residents are unaware of that fact so when they have a service line issue they call the City and

expect them to fix it, but the reality is that the City tells residents that under City code the service line is their responsibility. He stated that there are a lot of homeowners that aren't prepared to meet those types of bills. He stated that it is a problem for residents who have the problem and they become very upset because it is expensive to fix and they have to fix it.

J. Starzynski stated that the problem with Service Line is that there is a lot of confusion that people think in some way the City is endorsing it maybe because of the marketing. He suggested that the City can still continue to offer it but Service Line has to change the way it is marketed.

Mayor Sager stated that he is hearing that Council supports the program and because we want to try to provide the residents with some degree of protection, Council concurred to support "a" program. He stated that there is a legal issue because according to the agreement it automatically renews without a 90 day notice prior to October 18, 2014 so if Council doesn't take action by July 20th than it will automatically continue. He suggested considering accepting the Staff's recommendation in terms of termination but that can include notification to the company that it doesn't mean we won't work with the same company again but we are looking at options and addressing some issues.

M. Larson suggested offering the vendors the opportunity to put the flyer in our water bill and charge them. J. Dillon stated that she believes it brought a lot of confusion to residents because it appears like the City had endorsed them and she wants it to be a clear, educated decision by the residents.

RB Thompson questioned if they asked to use City letterhead. Mayor Sager advised that they used a similar letterhead which was negotiated by Staff. RB Thompson wanted to confirm that they did not put it out without our permission.

After discussion, it was decided that the information on alternatives would be ready for the second meeting in September.

Motion by J. Dillon, second by J. Starzynski to approve to terminate the Marketing Agreement with Utility Service Partners Private Label, Inc. d/b/a Service Line Warranties of America ("SLWA") and ask Staff to provide options at the second meeting in September.

Don Frick, 334 S Jefferson, Woodstock, questioned if terminating the contract terminates all the agreements that the individual homeowners have and Council advised that it just terminates the marketing agreement.

RB Thompson asked if City Scene has enough readership that an educational item could be in it. He feels that many people read the direct mail piece and questioned if the City Scene is going to be read to that extent. R. Stelford advised that City Scene is mailed to everyone, but whether they read it or not is another story. He stated that it does help drive people to the City's programs and noted that he believes back in 2011 an article was included in City Scene about the service warranties. M. Larson believes the water bill would be a better solution. Mayor Sager thinks the more they can do the better off they will be.

A roll call vote was taken. Ayes: J. Dillon, M. Larson, Mayor Sager M. Saladin, J. Starzynski, RB Thompson, M. Turner. Nays: None. Absentees: None. Abstentions: None. Motion carried.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

9. Old Courthouse RFP Review

Mayor Sager reported that the City received two specific proposals and that a task force was appointed to review the proposals. He stated that the task force includes M. Larson as Chairperson, RB Thompson, Historic Preservation Chair Allen Stebbins, Economic Development Commission member Arlene Lynes and Plan Commission member Jack Porter. He advised that the City has recently received a third proposal and a possible fourth proposal coming forward.

M. Larson stated that in order to have this move forward there have to be entities that take a risk and put a lot of effort, time and money into developing a proposal. She thanked the applicants that have done so in order to meet the proposal deadline. She thanked the committee who has spent a great deal of time going through the proposals and advised that they helped develop a list of questions for the applicants. She thanked Staff who has put a lot of energy into the building and have done a great job with it. She stated that we have a big vision for that Square and the building and to honor that history is important. She stated that it is a big task but it is easier now having concrete proposals.

Mayor Sager referenced the review criteria and the summarization table in the Staff report. He asked Council to start with the review criteria and the comparison chart. In response to M. Saladin, M. Larson advised that the petitioners did not make formal presentations.

RB Thompson referred to the Texas plan where it states that the City will provide one million dollars and questioned if the City has monetized the work it has done to say that it is our contribution. He stated that the City has made an immense contribution to the building far beyond what they are referring to as one million. He recognized N. Baker's professional work on the comparison table.

M. Saladin stated that conceptually he envisions a commercial use, restaurant use, some residential would be a unique component and a public room like the courtroom itself. He feels that the flavor is kind of there with what he envisioned but he questioned if they want to separate them. He doesn't mind doing that. He liked the follow-up questions to the Texas applicant with respect to his answers on that issue. He stated that conceptually yes those are some uses that he can see there.

M. Larson clarified that the flexibility in the Sheriff's house isn't whether or not they would be willing to let it go as much as how they would use it. She reiterated that the Texas proposal is for the entire Old Courthouse and Sheriff's house together; the flexibility is how it will be used.

J. Starzynski referenced the low income housing tax credits and stated that he thought there was a lot of back and forth on it noting that in the numbers of the financial if they don't do it that is another 2.38 million that they borrow or is their equity. M. Larson stated that she was surprised by that as well and noted that there will have to be some serious questions asked on how that would work, but the fact that they were willing to pull that off that table was significant to her. J. Starzynski stated that he isn't against low income housing, but he doesn't see it there. M. Larson agreed.

J. Dillon acknowledged the hard work of the Committee and stated that both of these presentations are so different. She liked the aspects of the Texas one with the mixed use but noted that she is totally against low income housing in that facility and noted that she thinks it should be higher end. She likes that the Creperie is local and has a feeling for what is going on. She feels pulled between the two and stated that she questioned the proposal from Texas and how much of a commitment and understanding they have. She's not really confident in their ability to pull off what they want to do. She doesn't feel terrific about either one.

J. Starzynski stated that if they have to put back in that 2.38 million and their developer equity becomes a little over 5 million, then they have some more skin in this.

M. Turner acknowledged M. Larson and the team for their work and stated that he is lukewarm on both but he is more willing to grant the consideration and work with the Creperie. He views it as being smart and good neighbors and investing time and consideration into somebody who has already put a great deal into the community.

M. Turner stated that he doesn't have a problem splitting the building up for the right proposal. He referenced the Texas people and stated that there is the potential for disconnect but he thinks 5 million is pretty motivational. He doesn't really care for the proposal and noted that low income housing does not have a place on the Square in that building; the public won't support it. He thinks the mixed use piece is great.

M. Turner stated that since the scaffolding came down, it looks beautiful and to the people that put it in place and the people that worked on it, it is an extraordinary accomplishment. He believes that if a private entity was going to move into it and be successful, then they would have a dozen proposals. It says to him that it isn't an easy building to fill. He stated that when he looks at the building and questions what goes there, he thinks of what went there, government. He questioned if there is another public usage or quasi-public usage. He thought it would be interesting if Woodstock City Hall was sitting in that building. It would solidify its function for decades if not longer.

M. Turner stated that he's not really thrilled with either proposal and he is willing to work with anybody that wants to be in one or both of the restaurants because it is a viable, economic part of the Square. He wonders if there is a step out of the box as to what this building can be used for.

J. Starzynski stated that it took five years to sell the Home State building and noted that they are only two years into this. R. Stelford stated that it was his understanding that it took five years and Home State Bank approached the City. N. Baker stated that Home State Bank came to the City in 1996. M. Turner stated that it was a completely, radically different real estate time.

Mayor Sager asked for consensus on three questions to help provide a sense of direction. He stated that the first question is whether they are willing to consider the parcels separately. Mayor Sager stated that he is supportive of separate parcels as long as they have complimentary uses. Council conceded with having a willingness to consider the parcels separately. N. Baker stated that in her mind it would have to be a perfect set of proposals. She stated that the two building represent the County's history together and you wouldn't have the Sheriff's House without the Courthouse. She advised that they are all part of a National Register designation and in talking to the State they could be separated and won't negatively affect the designation.

RB Thompson asked if the connections between the buildings can be removed and N. Baker advised that they have not walked through the buildings with a State staff person yet which they may do to get an understanding of what things are critical if someone wanted to use tax credits. She stated that the State would only have a say if tax credits were going to be used otherwise it is a City decision. She advised that with a National Registered building at some point they could withdraw the designation if someone makes horrible changes.

Mayor Sager stated that he is not in favor of physically separating the buildings but he is willing to consider complementary, quality separate uses for the building. He stated that he is willing to demolish the northeast, red brick square area. He asked if any Council members are willing to physical separate the buildings. In response to J. Starzynski, N. Baker advised that historically the buildings were separate until there was a passageway to move the prisoners added in the teens or

twenties. J. Starzynski questioned why they wouldn't consider it if they get two stellar proposals for each building with a walkway through from Throop St. M. Turner and M. Saladin advised that they would be willing to look at it.

M. Larson stated that they share drainage. N. Baker stated that they don't know the drainage well enough to know for sure where all the downspouts end up because they go underground but she noted that there is some shared drainage on the back side. M. Larson questioned if there is a west to east passageway on the first floor. N. Baker stated that it would go through the connection on the ground level and advised that the passageway is maybe 10 feet wide at the most. M. Larson remembered talking about it when they discussed a beer garden in the back. N. Baker stated that the passageway would go out into that area so it is a perfect place to bring people into the building.

Mayor Sager stated that he is hearing that Council would be willing to physically demolish part of the buildings to allow an open exterior passageway. J. Starzynski affirmed. M. Saladin would look at it and noted that the Courthouse and the Sheriff's House were independent buildings and they gerrymandered some passageways. M. Larson stated that the tax credits are important because it opens doors for money that can be put into the project, so with that in mind it would have to be with full understanding whether that would negate the possibility for that. She stated that if it didn't negate that or if the person didn't need it then she would consider it. M. Turner, J. Dillon and RB Thompson all affirmed. The majority consensus was a willingness to consider it.

P. Christensen questioned if Council would be willing to sell the buildings at different times. M. Saladin advised that there may be a legal decision as far as physically separating them and the kind of lot they are on and whether we need easements for the passageways; there are some issues. Mayor Sager stated that he believes Council would prefer, if they separate them, is to consider two quality proposals jointly before making that decision. J. Starzynski stated that he would prefer that and noted that he hates being in a position of going forward with the Sheriff's House and not knowing what is going to happen with the rest of it.

Mayor Sager questioned if there is a willingness to consider primary usage of either or the totality as residential. In response to M. Larson, Mayor Sager stated that primary would be two floors being dedicated to residential. J. Starzynski stated that if it is a good proposal. M. Saladin stated that with the right proposal you want to look at everything but his gut reaction is that he wouldn't envision two floors. M. Larson stated that two floors is not what she envisioned. She advised that the Committee stated that we need to have high-end patrons living near the Square to support the businesses. She reported that Jack Porter mentioned the economic viability of it and stated that if you have an all commercial space you have a lot more likelihood for vacancy. She thinks that whether it's primary or not, some residential is beneficial.

M. Turner stated that he isn't opposed to it but it has to be very high standard and high quality. He noted that he is open to looking at the proposal but it's not his first choice. He stated it isn't a upscale four-story row house that you find in Chicago so it's not going to have that big of an impact on the businesses. His biggest concern is not having this building become run down again. He stated that every proposal that comes past here, he is judging it on whether someone is going to back here in ten or twenty years from now going through it again. He stated that if you can show me that residential is viable then he will support it. He thinks it behooves Council to broaden their thoughts on it too with options or alternatives that may involve things that work better.

J. Dillon stated that she's not averse to looking at residential but she likes the mixed use better. RB Thompson stated that mixed use has an attractive element and he has a concern for residential on the

third floor on the Sheriff's House due to the spiral staircase. Mayor Sager stated that he isn't interested in the primary use being residential. He doesn't want to see it turned into, definitely not to lower income, predominantly condominiums and he thinks there are other options.

M. Larson stated that her vision of it is for it to be a buzz of activity, a draw to the Square, something that draws people from outside Woodstock. She stated that her ideal would be a brew pub and noted that if there are developers that specialize in that we should be continuing to look at that as a possibility. She stated that the applicants had to find a way to make this make financial sense and she noted that the building needs millions of millions of dollars and they figured out a way to make that happen and she gives them a lot of credit for doing it.

M. Saladin referenced the money that someone would have to spend to do the whole building and questioned allowing a condominium type of thing where you can separate the units. It would be the ability to compartmentalize if it is too big of a project for one. He noted that there would still be the idea of having them put money into fix it up so each level has to be responsible that the roof is going to be maintained and a condominium structure could do that. He stated that they wanted to get it into private hands but with that comes the risk of any private development; it can fail, turn ugly or change. He noted that Council is vetting the process right now and maybe their thoughts will have to change because maybe there is no interest in it.

M. Turner stated that when the City first took it over he wanted to get rid of it as soon as possible but now his opinion has changed because of the difficulty of the layout to fill a private function. He stated that to get only one proposal that deals with the entire building in a private function is eye-opening to him. He stated that it is an old building that needs millions of dollars of work that they don't want to get rid of because it is an important part of the city. He stated that they need to protect a building like that and to give it time to make it better than it is and to rehab it to the point where it can be functional and to seek out other potential uses. He thinks they should keep the RFP process open-ended and continue to look at it and the other discussions that are occurring in the community. He thinks they should consider a community based function or a government based function.

Mayor Sager asked if they are willing to consider a municipality contribution above and beyond or in addition to the improvements that they have already made or will be making to the building. He stated that one of the proposals is asking for a significant municipal financial contribution. M. Turner stated that he would as long as the City has a way to fund it that doesn't significantly impact other operations of the City. He understands that there may be a need for that in the right proposal noting that it would be with some level of influence over how it is going to be used. He recognizes that the City bought the building so we are going to have to take care of it and may take more money.

J. Dillon agreed and stated that she would consider it for the right proposal noting that we are the stewards of the building and she wants to make sure it gets handled the right way. RB Thompson stated that the primary usage should be restaurants. He stated that one reason that he didn't like the Texas one was because it was evicting the Creperie. He wants to have restaurants in both because they will be an economic driver to help facilitate whatever else is done to the building. He agreed to the financial contribution to a degree.

M. Larson stated that if we hold onto the building for another year or two we will have put in a much higher level and at that point would she questioned wanting to throw in additional cash; it depends on timing. She stated that the City is going to continue to do things that need to be done with the TIF money so it's not a blanket decision. M. Saladin stated that he would consider it but noted that he

wouldn't want to do it if he had a choice. J. Starzynski stated that he would prefer not to and would rather wait. He stated that if there is a proposal that knocked them out, he would be okay with it.

N. Baker referred to the residential question, and advised that they walked through the buildings with a representative from Landmarks Illinois along with a board member who is a developer. She stated that the developer felt that the Courthouse especially would be really difficult to do residential because of the high ceilings and the way the space is with load bearing walls that can't be altered.

Mayor Sager stated that Council is under no obligation to accept the proposals at this stage noting that they want to make sure we have the best possible proposal. He stated that he believes that Council would want to look at all proposals that might be forthcoming and stated that the task force will review the one that was recently submitted as well as another potential one that may be forthcoming. Council conceded.

Mayor Sager stated that Council will eventually want to come to consensus about the proposals because they can't leave people hanging indefinitely. He stated that they are aware that tonight is a discussion meeting. He referenced the vision statement and stated that it is open vision because they didn't want to limit ideas but as a result the vision is still relatively nebulous in a way. He believes they all have an underlying vision which is that they like the idea of mixed use, they like the idea of bringing a buzz to the community, they have an expectation that it's going to have financial viability that will contribute to the economy and maintain the building and the preservation of an important, historic building. Council conceded.

M. Turner suggested telling the Texas people that their proposal did not meet with a favorable response noting that he doesn't want to work with it anymore; however, if they want to come back with something different they would listen. In reference to the other proposal, he would like to engage with them on a further discussion. He stated that they are an existing user and it warrants consideration for some flexibility on how the City can continue to support their efforts because of how important a business they are to the building and the Square. M. Larson asked if his reaction to the Texas proposal is factoring in their answers to the questions. M. Turner stated that he doesn't feel that housing works and noted that N. Baker verified that the structure of the interior is questionable. He suggested telling them to remove the low income piece and provide more detail if they are so inclined knowing that Council's initial reaction was a bit skeptical.

M. Saladin stated that the lukewarm reaction to the Williamson proposal is adequate but with their willingness to further engage he thinks that if the process is going to continue they shouldn't just shut them down but further engage with them for the possibility of having them revise. He stated that since Creperie is an ongoing business, they have been there ten years, have added value and it's a great place to go you want to give them some consideration. He stated that Council has to view whatever else might be coming down the road in totality but noted that they should advise them that they are interested.

J. Starzynski stated that these are the first proposals and referenced the Williamson proposal noting that it is a first time thing and they can change or modify the proposal so he doesn't think they should just say no and that they aren't interested. J. Dillon stated that she concurs and advised that in both cases it is a first blush with the proposals. She thinks that if the Texas folks are willing to be flexible it is definitely worth talking with them and she agrees about the Creperie and would like to see someone local do something. She wants to keep the doors open and see the other options.

RB Thompson agreed and stated that Williamson has moved a lot on this from their response, but he thought their response was superficial in a sense and he didn't notice any meaty things. He stated that it still doesn't appeal to him that much and their financial package doesn't appeal to him. He stated that the Busse one does.

M. Larson stated that she is hearing similar reaction to what the committee had which was that the proposals tick different boxes. She stated that the Texas one has some serious money behind it and a package of ideas that they hadn't thought of like taking advantage of tax credits and experience with historic buildings. She stated that is one thing the Busse proposal doesn't have, no experience with historic buildings which is a significant factor they should be looking at. She stated that the Busse proposal was very creative and has local interest and local history but the Williamson one has the big guns, the money and experience with historic buildings so they meet different things.

M. Larson stated that wouldn't say no to Texas right now because she sees flexibility in their interest. She stated that with the Busse proposal concerned she is concerned with the level of money and historic expertise and no interest in tax credits. She stated that the Creperie has some leasing issues. She doesn't want to shut the door on Texas and she has some serious concerns about the other one. She stated that if Council doesn't say yes to either of these proposals and go forward, there are tweaks and improvement to do to the RFP to make it more on target and generate more interest.

J. Starzynski referenced the Busse proposal noting that one of the significant in the restaurant has an exit strategy to be gone in two years. He questioned how many times on the Square great people start up restaurants and then leave. M. Larson stated that the investor is committed to having a restaurant continue there but to make a decision based solely on that business would be short sighted.

Mayor Sager stated that the term lukewarm with regards to the Williamson proposal for him is spot on and noted that he isn't interested in predominantly residential in that building. He can see some residential as part of the larger mixed use but he has a real concern with it and is vehemently against low income at that location. He is not supportive of a million dollars of municipal dollars/tax payers' dollars going into the project. He doesn't want to totally close the door noting that they are incredibly grateful for the proposals and that he believes they will be able to take the comments of Council and Staff and make their own decisions as to what they want to do.

Mayor Sager stated that he is generally supportive of the proposal relative to the Sheriff's house. He think it really says something noting that there are a lot of "ifs", but they are willing to invest in this on a long term basis and they may not be intimately knowledgeable about historic buildings, however they can bring that expertise in, but what they are intimately familiar with is conducting a business in that building at that location. He stated that they are a known entity and they have a creative vision on how they can move it forward. He believes it needs to be considered in the context of another proposal. He thinks there is possibility there and he would like to continue the dialog.

Greg Hanson, The Backdrop owner, 106 Cass St., Woodstock, stated that he would say "no" and "no" to the proposals.

R. Stelford stated that it sounds like Council wants Staff to reach out to the applicants and pursue some of the concepts Council talked about and express their level of interest and see if they are willing to make some changes to the proposal. M. Turner stated that he is willing to defer to M. Larson and Mayor Sager to work with Staff to take the ideas from tonight and help define the feedback. Mayor Sager stated that there is another proposal that has already been submitted that needs to go to the task force and there might be a fourth group interested.

J. Starzynski questioned if they reply back to the Williamson proposal telling them that Council doesn't want the low income housing and is not interested in giving them another million dollars whether they would be willing to put the six million dollars into the whole thing. Mayor Sager trusts that Staff will be able to digest the commentary and get back to them. He suggested that Council doesn't have to construct a formal response at this time.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

In response to RB Thompson's question regarding the Creperie, R. Stelford stated Kathy Cappas would like speak to Council regarding recapturing some of her financial investment in the building.

In response to J. Dillon's question regarding the fiber agreement, R. Stelford advised it is for putting the fiber throughout the community with the County, the school district and the 911 Board.

M. Turner advised that he would like to have Council discuss the concept of an Ordinance that tracks the impact of work using prevailing wages. Mayor Sager asked the group if they are open to discussing an ordinance asking bidders to have a non-prevailing wage bid amount. The majority of the group was willing to discuss.

ADJOURNMENT:

Motion by M. Turner, second by RB Thompson, to adjourn the regular meeting of the City Council to the July 31, 2014 Retailer's Forum at 4:30 PM at Stage Left. Ayes: J. Dillon, M. Larson, Mayor Sager M. Saladin, J. Starzynski, RB Thompson, M. Turner. Nays: None. Absentees: None. Abstentions: None. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 9:22 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Dianne Mitchell - City Clerk