

The meeting was called to order at 6:45 p.m. by Chair D. Schwartz.

1.0 Roll Call – Present: Chair D. Schwartz, Trustees: M. Bennett, L. Bergan, R. Brinkmeier, K. Meleski, M. Stahl and Pres. D. Besson. Administrator S. Kulik, Public Works Director M. Martin, Library Director P. Laughlin, Library Board members: C. D’Acquisto, L. Hertel and B. Ludwig. Other Audience (4).

2.0 Public Comment – Matthew Eternicka and Lauren Klich, 9432 W. Garden Ct, Hales Corners addressed the Committee regarding desire to review the ordinance regulating the keeping of chickens in the Village. Consensus to place on the March Committee of the Whole and to direct staff to provide minutes from past meetings regarding this issue for the March meeting.

3.0 Agenda Items

3.1 Appointments: CDA – P. McGlenn & R. Stollenwerk – D. Besson reported on his request to re-appointment these members and their desire to continue serving. Motion (Besson, Stahl) to forward to the Village Board for approval; unanimously approved.

3.2 Review of Building Code – Chapter 3 – Building, Chapter XI Garages, Section 3.43 General Requirements, (3) Area & (6)(c) Construction – S. Kulik reported on memo included with packet regarding the construction elements of an accessory structure greater than 720 square feet that is currently required to be of masonry versus wood frame construction. An attached garage must be constructed of the same materials as the primary residence and if an attached garage is greater than 720 square feet then it would not necessarily be attached to a masonry home. There have been four requests on this issue in the past month. Roland Dittus-Plath and Morris Dittus-Plath, 6088 S. 92nd Street, Hales Corners addressed the board with their project. Project as presented is over 1,300 square feet and 29.5 feet in height and includes an artist studio. They requested to know if the Committee would be in favor of reviewing the building code to allow a wood frame construction for a structure greater than 720 square feet. S. Kulik commented that the current height limitation is 15 square feet and she feels there is no real interest in changing that. M. Bennett asked whether this was something that the Village Attorney was working on for a different Building Board discussion. S. Kulik reported it was not that the Village Attorney had worked on zoning and use issues and that the building code construction was not something that could be appealed as a variance. M. Bennett commented that there has not been any interest in modifying the height beyond the 15 feet. M. Stahl inquired about the outcome was for the other requests. S. Kulik reported than two were withdrawn, one is making some final determinations on whether they would combine a lot with a CSM and was exploring other options. M. Bennett asked whether attached structures had height limits. S. Kulik reported that attached could match the roof line of the home and may be higher than 15 feet but detached was very specific. K. Meleski suggestion to have Building Board and Plan Commission review the matter. D. Schwartz commented that he believes we need to find out what other communities are doing with this. D. Besson asked the Committee to decide if they want to review Chapter 3 or not. S. Kulik question to M. Bennett on what she feels is the role of the Building Board related to construction details. M. Bennett commented that the Building Board is concerned with “aesthetic” look and not the details behind the construction elements. M. Bennett felt it should be added to the January Building Board and Plan Commission agendas for discussion. M. Bennett stated she felt that the Plan Commission review was probably good. S. Kulik commented that the code amendment, rather than re-write the entirety of the code, could be an element for the Plan Commission to review them on a case by case basis. M. Stahl feels we need to review what works for the neighborhoods and work with people towards a better code. S. Kulik commented she

would need to contact GRAEF and request a quick review of what other communities are doing and report back. D. Besson commented he would like to add this to the January Plan Commission and Building Board agendas for their input. D. Schwartz requested D Besson to bring the matter up to the ICC. Consensus to have GRAEF review the matter and report back at the March Committee of the Whole.

- 3.3 **Minutes December 2, 2019** – no corrections noted. No action taken.
- 3.4 **Change of Agent Request – Jetz #4526** – S. Kulik reported on agent change. Motion (Stahl, Meleski) to forward to Village Board for approval; unanimously approved.
- 3.5 **Automatic Aid Fire/Emergency Agreement** – S. Kulik reported that the Village Attorney was unable to be present for this item but that both the Public Policy Forum and the Village Attorney will be on the agenda for this discussion on January 27, 2020.
- 3.6 **Root-Pike Watershed Initiative Network (RPWIN) Communication and Outreach Program** – M. Martin addressed the Committee. RPWIN had been receiving grant funding which they did not get awarded for the upcoming 2020-2021 cycle. Public Works Storm Water Utility 2020 Budget includes this funding and no increase is needed to award. The RPWIN group will do the advertisements for the initiative on behalf of the Village. S. Kulik commented that the resolution included budget elements that based upon the comments from Director Martin were not needed and she would need to revise the resolution prior to board action. Motion (Stahl, Meleski) to forward to the Village Board for approval with changes to the draft resolution as noted by staff; unanimously approved.
- 3.7 **Storm Water Facilities Management Agreement – CHIFest – 5600 S. 108th Street** – M. Martin presented agreement and noted that he had discussions with the Village President regarding the use of the “should” versus “shall” or “will” and would get the items reviewed by the Village Attorney. D. Besson commented on the language and requested that if approved it be reviewed by the Village Attorney prior to presentation for approval. S. Kulik commented that it may not be ready for the first January BOT depending upon how long it takes the attorney to review. Motion (Besson, Stahl) to forward to the Village Board for approval after review and approval by the Village Attorney; unanimously approved.
- 3.8 **DPW Facility Update** – M. Martin commented that they hope to have final occupancy by the end of January 2020.
 - 3.8.1 **Request to Purchase Appliances** – M. Martin reported on three quotes obtained and the desire to purchase a stove, refrigerator, microwave, dishwasher and a washer and dryer for the new facility. The previous facility had all but the dishwasher and they were scavenged items. D. Besson commented that he felt the range and the dishwasher were not needed but that he understood about the washer/dryer, refrigerator and microwave. He stated that doing dishes etc. should be on their time. He has concerns that in his experience, the stove is not used often and they don’t get cleaned regularly. Motion (Besson, Brinkmeier) to deny purchase of range and dishwasher but approve the washer/dryer, refrigerator and microwave. K. Meleski commented that with the hours that they work sometimes at certain times of the year they are longer and could benefit from the equipment and that the \$500 dishwasher in a multimillion dollar building that should save time and that the idea is to load and go. M. Stahl commented that if they rinse and load the dishwasher people are less likely to get sick. M. Bennett stated that she thinks it is more efficient to put them all in now and that the amount compared to the total value of the facility make sense. Roll Call Vote: Aye: Besson, Brinkmeier, Nay: Bergan, Bennett, Schwartz, Stahl, Meleski. Motion fails. Motion (Bennett, Meleski) to approve purchase as presented. Ayes: Bergan, Bennett, Schwartz, Stahl, Meleski. Nay: Besson, Brinkmeier. Motion passes.

- 3.9 **Library Request for “other funds” discussion** – Library Director P. Laughlin and C. D’Acquisto addressed the Committee. The report of funds pledged to date was reviewed and the request to use residual funds from other capital projects which are complete towards the building project architectural rendering project was proposed. M. Bennett question regarding what happens to the funds normally. S. Kulik reported that the funds stay in the various accounts unless they are re-appropriated for other projects or they are closed and go to the undesignated fund balance. S. Kulik reported that \$1,000 of the residual was a donation and is restricted for the building project. M. Bennett requested clarification on \$6,265 as what was being asked for to be re-allocate to the building project. K. Meleski inquiry about what the \$50,000 budget was at the bottom of the worksheet. P. Laughlin reported that the Library Board did not make a final decision regarding the MCFLS residual funds and that it will be back on the agenda for the January 23, 2020 meeting. The Friends of the Library pledge of \$2,000 would likely be revisited and that all the pledges and funds identified to date are approximately \$42,000 towards that \$50,000 goal. Motion (Bennett, Stahl) to re-allocate the funds to the building project. K. Meleski inquiry about the balances that remain and that the projects that they were identified for are likely to be ongoing. P. Laughlin commented that the monies were for very specific projects and not maintenance and that they are complete. K. Meleski commented that the roof still needs to be fixed and perhaps other maintenance needs. P. Laughlin commented that the roof is not fixed and the design is flawed so there is no point in allocating any additional funds to it at this time. K. Meleski commented that he appreciates what they are trying to do with renovating the Library, he has seen the presentation on it. however, he feels that this is putting all the spare monies that they can in order to get the architectural rendering completed so they can get to referendum. P. Laughlin commented that it is also so the Friends group and study committee want to be able to do fundraising. D. Besson commented that his original request for the \$15,000 that was giving to get it to this point was contingent upon any additional monies needed would have to go to referendum and now they are coming back and asking for more. He made a promise to the Board that it would go to referendum. He feels if we give them more then at what point does the referendum motion finally begin. K. Meleski commented that it’s not just the \$6,000 they still need as the building is going to cost millions. C. D’Acquisto commented that what he heard was that for the \$6,000 more that they would have to go to referendum. K. Meleski commented that they agreed when they accepted the money for the study that it was their choice and that they knew that any additional funding would have to go to referendum. M. Stahl commented that this is money from their budget that they are asking for. D. Besson commented that this is not Library money, its Village money for specific funding for their projects. M. Stahl stated that this is left over funding. D. Schwartz commented that this is just a way to get to the next step in the process and that they are close. M. Stahl commented that it is difficult to do fundraising when they don’t have anything to show donors what they are raising funds for. D. Besson commented that the \$19,000 in pledges he does not believe is wholly accurate. D. Schwartz asked if we are really going to make them go to referendum for \$6,000. K. Meleski commented that this total of \$70,000 in funding that could have been used for maintenance. He asked when they are looking to move with this and that he looks at the Village as a whole and that a \$20 million dollar high school and the \$6 million on a very much needed public works garage and that the tax payers are going to pay this with their taxes. Further, we want to do road projects of like \$6 to \$9 million on top of a Library project is too much and he doesn’t feel like this is the right time to do the Library. He stated if he votes in favor tonight that is an endorsement of the project. D. Schwartz commented that he is endorsing the process not the project. K. Meleski says he hopes a referendum is successful but that until that happens he doesn’t feel we should be giving them additional monies. M. Bennett question regarding what has happened in the past with other departments. S. Kulik commented that other departments have had

funds reallocated or they lapse and close to the undesignated funds. The Police \$42,000 project was from older police projects and undesignated funds that are from various departments. C. D'Acquisto commented that in addition to coming more frequently to the Village Board with status updates that they have commitments from the Community towards the next step based upon pledged monies and that if the Board members were on the Board when the original funds were agreed to is an endorsement of the project too. K. Meleski question about how long the plans/designs would be good for as they have been studying this for years. P. Laughlin commented that the original space needs was done years ago but that the project has been moving forward since 2017. S. Kulik offered that if the concern that this was an outright endorsement for the project, that the resolution could be crafted to include wording that it was not an endorsement and a statement that the Board understands what they are trying to accomplish but this resolution is not to be interpreted as endorsement of the entire project. M. Bennett commented that she felt that was inherent in the original motion and she agreed with the suggestion on crafting wording. She stated she had in the past stating giving any more funds would be like an endorsement but she is looking at this different as we have made a conscience effort to allocate funds to the Library for purposes that are now complete and that she does not have a problem re-allocating these funds. Further, she stated that the referendum is a different issue and should the Library come back and ask for more money that had not previously been allocated to them she would be another discussion in her mind. R. Brinkmeier commented that these funds do not belong to the Library and that these projects are complete and should be lapsing back to the fund balance. D. Besson commented that the original \$15,000 that was agreed to he pledged to the Board that everything else would be a referendum and the Board approved that. M. Stahl commented she remembers that original motion included the referendum requirement. D. Besson commented that if they move forward with this that he is then released from that promise if they approve this and he wanted it on the record as such. K. Meleski questioned how long the plans would be good for. S. Kulik commented that where the Library is at is similar to the public works projects where we spent \$25,000 for needs and then \$50,000 for design drawings to go to the Plan Commission and to know approximately what it would cost. K. Meleski commented that the difference is the public works site was built in the 50's, D. Schwartz commented that is was actually the 40's, that everyone understood was in dire need of replacement. He commented that the library was built in approximately 1985 or so and it has a leaky roof. P. Laughlin commented again that the design flaw is not something that should have any more funding put into it as it needs a redesign. K. Meleski stated he understands what they want but that knowing what the maintenance issues are along with the commitment from D. Besson for referendum he couldn't support what they are asking for. M. Bennett asked what if the funding could be reallocated for maintenance issues. S. Kulik commented it could not be used for maintenance. Roll Call Vote: Ayes: Bergan, Bennett, Stahl, Schwartz. Nay: Brinkmeier, Meleski, Besson. Motion passes 4-3.

3.10 **Request for Audit Proposal** – S. Kulik reported that it was time to go out for bids again and that the item under 3.11 for banking services be done at the same time. D. Schwartz question regarding whether an Ad Hoc committee would be developed. S. Kulik commented it would be but she would like it to be the same as the banking services proposal next on the agenda. Motion (Besson, Bergan) to approve RFP for audit services; unanimously approved.

3.11 **Request for Banking Services Proposal** – S. Kulik reviewed the comments in her memo regarding the lack of any contract and the expense being incurred due to the lack of ability to direct pricing. Further, she requested the Committee to approve eliminating the two bank process they currently operate under as it was inefficient and did not address the FDIC insurance amounts guarantee anyway. A list of area banks was provided. M. Bennett commented she preferred to stay in Hales Corners to give local businesses the

Village business. That still allows for 3 banks to bid on our proposal as we can always reject them. M. Stahl concurred. S. Kulik commented if you reject them, in order to redo the RFP, it would need to be changed in a substantial way as the 3 banks would already have had one chance to submit. D. Besson commented that it makes sense to just capture the larger area the first time but we can add points for being local. S. Kulik also wanted to clarify that she does not want to continue to use 2 banks or there is no reason to go out for RFP. Motion (Besson, Stahl) to solicit to 5 banks as proposed and to not accept 2 banks; unanimously approved.

- 3.12 **February 2020 Calendar** – S. Kulik request to move 2/24/2020 BOT to 2/26/2020 due to election conflicts for the Plan Commission and the Fire & Police Commission. Motion (Bennett, Meleski) to move BOT to February 26, 2020 and if nothing material is needed it may be cancelled but shall be scheduled as such at this time; unanimously approved.
- 3.13 **December Code Enforcement Report** - S. Kulik reported on activities and noted that the majority of the efforts in December were on right of way encroachments.
- 3.14 **2019 Non-Represented evaluations – Deputy Clerk/Treasurer, Administration Clerk(s), Police Lieutenant, Code Enforcement Specialist/Police Aide, Public Works Director, Deputy Superintendent, Mechanic, Labor-Operators and Health Director.** The Committee did not convene in closed session. S. Kulik reported on completed evaluations and pay for performance scale recommendations. No action necessary on the review rates with the exception of the Deputy Clerk/Treasurer as she is at the top of her range and an opening in the Village of Greendale for the same position with their rates being close to what is being proposed is requested. Further, the resolution and policy is to move an incumbent to the mid-point of a upgraded range, not a new range. S. Kulik reported that this could be accomplished with zero budget impact if the board would revisit her raise that was approved at 2.25% and reduce that to 2.0%. K. Meleski commented that he appreciated the willingness to reduce the rate but thought it could be done regardless. S. Kulik reported she is making the request and felt it was more than fair to address the Village needs as a whole. K. Meleski thanked her for the dedication. Motion (Besson, Bergan) to forward to the Village Board for approval as recommended to modify the grade for the Deputy Clerk/Treasurer and reduce the Administrator rate increase to 2.0%; unanimously approved
- 4.0 **Adjournment-** Motion to adjourn (Stahl, Meleski) at 8:32 p.m.; unanimously approved.

Submitted,



Sandra M. Kulik, Administrator