

PLAN

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF A PUBLIC HEARING
 BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
 PLAN COMMISSION

COMMISSION

RE: NORTHWEST CROSSINGS - 1501 WEST SHURE DRIVE - PC# 19-011
 PUD AMENDMENT, VARIATIONS

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
 Arlington Heights Plan Commission Meeting taken at the Arlington Heights Village
 Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 3rd Floor Board Room, Arlington Heights,
 Illinois on the 28th day of August, 2019 at the hour of 8:02 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

TERRY ENNES, Chairman
 LYNN JENSEN
 MARY JO WARSKOW
 JOE LORENZINI
 BRUCE GREEN
 GEORGE DROST
 SUSAN DAWSON
 JOHN SIGALOS

ALSO PRESENT:

SAM HUBBARD, Development Planner

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Our next hearing is Northwest Crossings, Petition No. 19-011. Is the Petitioner here? I'll take that as a yes.

MR. BAUER: Yes, sorry. I assumed that you wanted me to identify myself.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes, that's fine, I know. Welcome. Would you please state your name and spell it for the court reporter?

MR. BAUER: Good evening. My name is Steve Bauer, last name is spelled B-a-u-e-r. By the way, I'll just mention that I have reviewed the Staff proposed conditions of approval and find them agreeable with the exception of one modification which I've already confirmed with Staff about. I'll explain that in great detail as part of my presentation.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, Steve. Go ahead with your presentation.

MR. BAUER: Thank you. So, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, as I said, my name is Steve Bauer. I'm an attorney with Meltzer, Purtill and Stelle. I'm here this evening on behalf of TNC Lot 1, LLC, which is the owner of 1501 West Shure Drive, which is the, or I should say a portion of the former Motorola campus located at the southeast corner of Shure and Wilke. For those of you who were on the Plan Commission a few years ago, you may recognize this image as being reflective of some of the relief and associated approvals that were sought and granted in 2015 for the property located at 1501 and 1421 West Shure Drive.

As I said, the property is located at the southeast corner of Shure and Wilke, again referencing the 1501 property and the 1421 which you can see on the upper portion of the bounded area. The subject property for tonight's discussion is the 1501 property. Overall, however, the PUD in which the 1501 property is located is approximately 64 acres. The property that's bounded in blue, however, which again is the subject property for discussion this evening is approximately 22 acres. As you can see, the 1421 property is to the immediate east. The reason I keep mentioning the 1421 property is because like the requests that were before the Commission in 2015, the requests now before you this evening for the 1501 property are very similar in that they are entirely driven by tenant requirements.

Quickly looking at the, this is a plat of subdivision, but generally speaking for survey purposes, quickly looking at the overall 1421 and 1501 property, you can see that the 1501 property is located on the west portion of the site. It's identified as Lot 1 in the Northwest Crossings subdivision. I'm showing you this slide primarily for purposes of showing you improvements or what were existing improvements in 2015 when this plat was approved. You can kind of see, although it's a little faint, on the Lot 1/1501 property sort of a square-shaped building. It is a building in the northeastern corner of the property. That was, at the time, an approximately 430,000 square-foot building which, as part of the 2015 amendments, was reduced in size by eliminating roughly 225,000 square feet of the northernmost portion of that building which then resulted in a building of 195,300 square feet as identified in the slide, and then 802 parking spaces located to the immediate west and to the immediate south of that building.

As I mentioned, the 1501 property is the sole subject of the request tonight. Since the 2015 approvals were sought and granted, this building has sat idle, not occupied. However, the property owner now has a confidential tenant, and I mean that respectfully and I can explain to whatever extent you desire, for this property which is seeking certain modifications to the site which are generally depicted here, the most significant of which pertaining to parking lot modifications which as you can see to some extent from the grayed

areas include parking lot, drive aisle modifications, widening, apron or curb cut widening, and then associated circulation lanes.

The proposed parking lot modifications are proposed in two phases. Phase I consists of 559 total spaces which is a reduction from the 802 spaces that were approved as part of the 2015 PUD amendments. That 802-space, or that reduction from 802 spaces is a product of the grayed areas that you see where additional circulation routes are added which are a means of ensuring security in conjunction with guard houses and security fencing that's proposed which I'll explain to some greater extent.

The proposed use for the property is a backup network operation center and a business resumption training suite. These types of modifications that you see here are proposed as part of applicable federal regulation. So, moving then to phase II, if the tenant occupies the entire portion of the building, there would be an additional 342 spaces constructed. Those would all be located on the north side of the building, for a total of 898 spaces, inclusive of the loss of three spaces from the phase I parking necessary to connect the phase I parking area and the phase II parking area.

As part of the tenant's requested modifications, as I said, there are parking lot changes as well as fencing and mechanical equipment variations, accessory structure variations in the way of the proposed guard houses, driveway width variations to facilitate those parking lot modifications, all of which are again sought as part of the tenant's specific requirements for the site in accordance with federal regulation and security protocol. The most significant of those requests, as I said before, really pertain to parking lot modifications and fencing or screening to some extent.

So, with that in mind, this slide identifies the proposed areas for some sort of fencing or screening. In particular, there is an eight-foot tall security, open security fence that's proposed around the perimeter of the site. Thanks, Sam. As Sam is indicating, it's proposed to entirely envelope the site for security purposes. Second is an eight-foot tall chainlink fence with slats to secure and to some extent obscure transformers that are proposed on both the north and south sides of the site shown in blue. A 17-foot four-inch tall CMU or concrete masonry unit cinder block screen wall to secure generators that are proposed are on both the north and south sides of the site shown in green; a six-foot tall CMU screen wall to secure, northeast corner I think, yes, to secure the gas meters that are proposed for the building; and then lastly, a six-foot tall and an eight-foot tall CMU screen wall on both the south and east facades of the building, respectively, for the purposes of securing AC condensing units.

This slide shows images of the proposed fencing with the exception of the CMU walls. The CMU walls are quite simple, as many of you may be familiar with, cinder block type construction methods. What's important to note specifically about those walls is that they will be painted with a color to match the building so that the walls don't appear as afterthoughts or appendages to the building that are out of line with the building's architecture. The image on the left is the proposed perimeter security fence which, as you can see, is quite tastefully designed by contrast to, for example, the traditional chainlink fence with barbed wire on the top. The image on the right is the proposed kind of chainlink fencing with slats for the transformer enclosures that I mentioned, which again are the areas shown in blue on this slide.

I want to mention that with respect to the chainlink fencing and slats for the transformers, we learned through the project electrical engineer's communications with IDOT, that IDOT really doesn't want their transformers to be obscured in any respect. So, while

they're okay with fencing, they're generally not agreeable to any type of opacity that would preclude the ability to, you know, plainly view the transformers. However, they have agreed that the slat type material proposed and shown in this image is acceptable for purposes of aesthetics.

As I said, we have reviewed the proposed conditions of approval. We are in agreement with them with one clarification, which again we've worked with Staff to confirm as acceptable at least from the Staff perspective. That pertains specifically to condition number three which is concerning landscaping. So, what this slide depicts is that the Applicant is agreeable to installing 13 additional shade trees within the parking lot landscape islands in the areas that are shown with green circles on this image, so hopefully you can find those if I describe them in a little further detail. I'm speaking specifically about the four north of the building, the two on the west side of the building, and then the seven on the south side of the building.

I will mention that there are two locations where shade trees would otherwise be required by code in parking lot islands but cannot be constructed, or rather installed at those locations as a consequence of impervious surface improvements that are proposed, specifically sidewalks. Those are depicted in the areas shown with a red circle with the X. As a result, that necessitates an additional variation which is contemplated by the plain language or general language of the notice of public hearing.

So, that's all that I have, but I'm happy to take any questions you may have of me.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: That's it for the time being. Why don't you please have a seat while we hear the Staff report?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes. Thank you, Chairman Ennes. So, as you've heard -- sorry, I have a little trouble with the computer here.

As you've heard, the subject property is located at 1455, 1421 and 1501 West Shure Drive. That property is zoned in the M-1 Research Development and Light Manufacturing District. The proposed use at the 1501 West Shure Drive building falls under the envelope of an office and that's a permitted use in the M-1 district. So, the proposed use is compliant with the existing zoning as well as the Comprehensive Plan.

Due to the proposed site changes, an amendment is needed to the original PUD ordinance that granted the three-building campus which was the former home to Motorola. That original ordinance has been amended several times over the years, most recently in 2015 to allow a subdivision, and then again in 2015 to allow demolition of a portion of the 1501 West Shure Drive building.

As per the request, multiple variations are required as outlined in the Staff report. Due to recent conversations with the Petitioner that took place this week, we've identified the need for another variation that is not included in the Staff report. That's the variation to the landscape island shade trees, as you heard the Petitioner allude to in his presentation. Sorry, I'm having some problems here with the slide show.

The Petitioner has appeared in front of the Conceptual Plan Review Committee last month on July 24th. They did receive positive feedback and have moved forward with their application for the proposed changes to allow the confidential tenant to locate in the 1501 building. Here is just another overview of the site. You can see the two buildings, 1421 and 1455 not outlined in blue, and then the blue outline shows the 1501 West Shure Drive

building. The red outline shows the overall PUD.

Here is an aerial of the subject property as it exists today. I'm going to overlay the proposed changes here so you can see the multiple changes to the parking lot on the south side to allow for the three new entries, gated entries and guard houses, and then the relocation of the drive aisle on the north side, and then the addition of the parking area north of the building. So, generally speaking, the area outlined in red is what's considered the phase I work, and the second parking area is what's contemplated during phase II.

So, again here is the site plan and I want to go quickly through the requested variations. First, we have the perimeter fence that's proposed at eight-foot tall with sharp points that requires a variation. Then you have the eight-foot tall chainlink fence that encloses the two transformers, and said fence includes slats which also requires a variation. Then we have the fencing of the generator, and also on the north side and the south side of the building which I don't believe is highlighted. We have the eight-foot tall screen of the mechanical units on the east side of the building, and also the mechanical units there require a variation due to location. We have the variation for the guard houses in the green, and for the drive aisle width in red also shown at the bottom of the screen, or not shown is highlighting rather, the two drive aisles at the bottom.

I would mention that during the Fire Department review of this, they found that there were some pinch points in the entry for fire truck turning purposes, and they have asked the Petitioner to make some changes. The Petitioner has shown, I believe, that they can make these changes, and then there were some concerns about the turning in the phase II parking area. We're currently working with the Petitioner to make some changes as requested by the Fire Department for turning into the phase II area.

Due to recent analysis of the landscape plans, we identified the need for two variations, here you can see in the red circle, where landscape island shade trees would be required, but shade trees are not feasible in these locations due to the transformer and the building entrance. Staff is amenable to the variation request to waive the requirement for the shade trees in those two locations.

Here you can see the floor plan for the build-out, it's a little bit difficult to see. Basically, everything that's hatched in gray is what's considered phase I. The phase II area will remain unbuilt, and that's the area shaded in orange.

Relative to parking, the phase I area includes roughly 127 square feet -- I'm sorry, the buildout of 127,000 square feet of floor area, as well as an improved parking area, and the phase I build out will require 423 parking spaces. The phase I parking lot change would yield 559 spaces, so more parking provided than required by code which is great. However, if the phase II build-out were to occur, that would require 228 parking spaces in addition to the phase I parking. That would be a total of 651 parking spaces required. Without that phase II parking build-out, there would only be 559 spaces provided which would be a deficit to code requirements. So, Staff has recommended a condition of approval that build-out and occupancy of the 68,253 square-foot phase II area is to occur simultaneous to construction of the phase II parking area.

Just to clarify that condition, the intent is not to require the opposite to also be true, i.e., that construction of the phase II parking area is required to occur at the same time as the build-out and occupancy of the phase II area. So, basically, what that's saying is that there is no outright prohibition of the phase II parking area from being constructed prior to

the build-out and occupancy of the phase II floor area if, for example, there was a need for that parking to be constructed without the actual build-out of the phase II area. That's fine and that could occur in compliance with this condition. There may be some questions if that were the case being, you know, why is there such a surplus of parking needed relative to code requirements. But as long as it's justified, there is nothing in the specific language of the condition that would prohibit the build-out of that phase II parking area without also build-out and occupancy of the phase II floor area.

The Petitioner has requested a variation to waive the parking and traffic study because of the surplus of parking relative to code requirements. We are supportive of that variation. I would note that there has been an overall reduction of over 200,000 square feet in this three-building campus over the years. So, there's a lot less traffic demand based on the lower square footage, and so we're supportive of waiving the requirement for a traffic study.

Finally, we are recommending approval of the application subject to four conditions. I would note that we've changed condition three based on recent conversations and the addition of certain missing shade trees and the variation to waive the shade tree requirement in two locations. The motion sheet in front of the Plan Commission this evening is reflective of the additional variation needed to waive the requirement for the shade trees. It's also reflective of the change in language for condition number three relative to adding the missing shade trees.

Finally, I would note, as the Petitioner was going through their presentation this evening, variation three actually needs a slight adjustment to accommodate for an eight-foot tall solid screen outside of the generator area at the south of the building. So, that would read a variation to Chapter 28, this is, I'm sorry, this is variation number three. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.13-3B.2, *Corner Lot*, to allow an eight-foot tall open and solid fence, that's the change that is needed to accommodate for the variation to allow that solid fence. So, I apologize for the last minute clarifications here, but Staff believes that all the necessary criteria for variation approval has been met and we are supportive of the application subject to the four conditions.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Sam, just one quick question before we vote on your report. The Petitioner had indicated that there was one of the conditions, I don't know if it's a condition and/or a variation, is that this number three?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, this clarifies it with the open and closed fence around the electrical unit there?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, and I would add, too, I'm sorry to interrupt. I would add that all public notices have been made for this application.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. Can we have a motion for approval of the Staff report?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll make that motion.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Second?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: And a second. All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Anyone opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, thank you. Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes, I have a question. First of all, I want to commend both the Petitioner and Staff on their presentations. I found it especially very helpful to have the visual representations of the variations since there are so many of them. I thought it was very useful, made it a lot easier to understand what was being requested.

Going to your recommendations and the first condition, it seems to state it in the opposite of what you said in your remarks. It seems to say in that first condition that you can't build out the, that you have to build out the building simultaneous with the parking space. But you said the parking space in phase II could be built out earlier than the building. So, I think this wording needs to be adjusted.

MR. HUBBARD: Sure. Yes, I've had the same conversation with the Petitioner. I thought it was clear. I'm realizing that maybe it's not as clear as I had hoped. What's common is that the Village attorney will massage the language in the conditions of the actual ordinance to make it clearer. I believe we've adequately illustrated the intent this evening. So, rather than wordsmith it tonight, I will just leave it up to the Village attorney.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Right. So, the sense of it is you can build out the phase II parking area whenever you want to, but you can't build out the building unless you had built out the parking space in phase II as I understand that.

MR. HUBBARD: Exactly.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes, so whatever works, but I think you need to do it, I think that needs to be changed. I think it's a great project. I have no problems.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Good catch, Commissioner Jensen. Commissioner Warskow?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I don't have any questions, thank you.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: No questions.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: No questions, okay.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: My only question is did you mention a 17-foot tall CMU block? And I think you said a four-inch CMU block?

MR. BAUER: Well, I hope, sorry, were you done with your question?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Just as an architect, I'm saying a 17-foot, four-inch wide concrete block wall, you better have your engineer look at that. That's all, and I'm an architect.

MR. BAUER: Sure, I appreciate that.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: You said four-inch block and I'm whoa.

MR. BAUER: No, I think what I said, I hope what I said was 17-foot four-inch. So, 17 feet and four-inch tall wall.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Oh, okay, I understand. Some had good catches, some had bad. I have no problem. I think it's a great project.

MR. BAUER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: John?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Can we go to that slide that shows the parking? There it is. It seems like we have a significant abundance of parking stalls, if you look at either with the phase I or phase II, and certainly with the combined phases. We have too many surpluses. Is that necessary? Why are we building all those parking stalls? Are we not better to have more green space? Even if it's needed later to add to the parking lots.

MR. BAUER: I appreciate, you're saying add it later as opposed to doing it in two phases with the second phase?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: No, but I'm saying as opposed to, I mean this is like an awful lot of additional surplus of parking stalls that may not be required. That's a lot of impervious surface.

MR. BAUER: Sure, I appreciate the question because honestly I had the same question for this particular tenant. The response is it's a product of the difference between what the Village code contemplates on a per square foot basis for parking and what this tenant contemplates by the way of employee density. So, to say that differently, this tenant contemplates a higher employee density in the building than what the code contemplates exactly.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: That answered my question.

MR. BAUER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: No, I have no further questions. I think it's great, I'm glad to see this being developed.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Commissioner Dawson?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Just kind of along those lines, is this currently impervious surface where you knock down part of the building? It looks like it's dirt but is that what it is?

MR. BAUER: Where the 220,000 square-foot portion of the building was knocked down on the north side?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Right, where you're going to be putting the, like I can't --

MR. BAUER: It's currently soil, right. Unfinished soil.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: It is, okay. I just, I saw it in gray and couldn't tell if it was all completely soil. Are you going to be leaving it in that condition until potentially putting the parking there?

MR. BAUER: No. Not only will it be finished, you know, with turf, but in addition there will be landscaping around the perimeter of the parking lot in accordance with Village code.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay, so we'll have some green space then. No further questions, but I did just also want to comment that, just like Commissioner Jensen did, that the detail of the presentation and showing, breaking down all the variations and showing all the information is really what leads to not having so many questions. It was a very thorough, well done presentation. Thank you.

MR. BAUER: Thank you, although I wish I had Sam's PowerPoint skills with respect to the slide images.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes, he's really good at that.

MR. BAUER: He is.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Commissioner Drost?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I concur with that. One question, do we know who the occupant is? As far as this kind of, you know --

MR. BAUER: I do, and I will gladly share that with you off camera and not publicly.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Okay, I was just curious with the kind of --

MR. BAUER: The secrecy associated with it?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: We're not on camera.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I just want to make sure we're going to be safe enough.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: We're not on camera though, but it's in the minutes. There's no camera here.

MR. BAUER: I can tell you, oh, right, minutes, whatever. Out of the public context is what I'm trying to say.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Got it. Yes, sure.

MR. BAUER: But I can tell you it's not, like for example, a recreational marijuana dispensary or something like that.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll just leave it at that.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: It could be a government agency.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Along that same question, this was a question I had is if we don't know what the real use is, how do you approve this with the zoning which is hard. My real question would be somebody in the Village knows what the use is?

MR. BAUER: Yes. So, I'm glad you said that. Staff is well aware of the proposed user which, by the way, is an office type user. So, this building, despite the security characteristics of the project as proposed, will operate much like a typical office space with computer monitors and, you know, the same types of things you would otherwise expect in a class A office building.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Did you initially comment that that usage is, it's going to be bringing something?

MR. BAUER: No, I don't think I said that. It will be, I'm trying to think of what I can say to hopefully address your question without disclosing the type of operation. It will be something that we all rely upon without necessarily even having knowledge of it in conjunction with -- I probably can't say that.

COMMISSIONER DROST: It's not a McDonald's.

MR. BAUER: Yes. You know, it's funny that you say that because I was going to stand up and say pun intended that this project is not nearly as appetizing as the last project. But at least I've gotten your attention.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Ah, look at that.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, well, you've been beating around the bush here, but as long as somebody within the Village understands what the usage is, then we're good with that. Because we're approving the changes, that doesn't mean somebody is going to get a business license to get in there unless somebody knows and is satisfied with that.

MR. HUBBARD: Correct.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: With that, can we have a motion?

MR. HUBBARD: Is there any questions from the public.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I should say, yes, we have one person in the back of the room who is listening and writing. Do you have any comments?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: No.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: No, okay. I'll close the public portion. Do we have a motion to approve?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I would like to make that motion.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC# 19-011, an Amendment to PUD Ordinances 88-60, 15-016, and 15-040 to allow certain modifications to the approved development plan, and the following variations:

1. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.13-3A, *Front Yard*, to allow an eight-foot tall open fence with sharp points, a 17.3-foot tall solid fence enclosing a mechanical unit, an eight-foot tall chainlink fence enclosing a transformer, and a six-foot tall solid fence enclosing certain gas meters, all in a front yard.
2. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.13-3B, *Side and Rear Yards*, to allow an eight-foot tall open fence in a side yard and an eight-foot tall solid fence in a side yard.
3. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.13-3B.2, *Corner Lot*, to allow an eight-foot tall open and solid fence, an eight-foot tall chainlink fence enclosing a transformer, and a 17.3-foot tall solid fence enclosing a mechanical unit, all in a rear yard.
4. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.13-3C.1, *Exterior Side Yards*, to allow an eight-foot tall open fence in an exterior side yard.
5. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.13-2F, *Materials and Type of Construction*, to allow slatted chainlink fencing.
6. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.12-1, to waive the requirement for a traffic and parking study prepared by a qualified professional engineer.
7. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.6.-5.1, *Table of Permitted Obstructions*, to allow central air conditioning units to be set back 8.5 feet from a side property line where code requires a 97.4-foot setback.
8. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.5-2, to allow certain accessory structures (guard houses) within a front yard and to allow five accessory structures on the subject property where only four are allowed.
9. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 10.2-9, *Access*, to allow certain driveway entrances in excess of the maximum allowable driveway width of 36 feet.
10. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.15-1.2B, *New Landscape Requirements*, to waive the requirement for shade trees in certain landscape islands on the subject property.

This recommendation shall be subject to the following conditions:

1. Build-out and occupancy of the 68,253 square-foot phase II area must occur simultaneous to construction of the phase II parking area.
2. Prior to building permit issuance, the Petitioner shall work with the Village to revise areas within the parking lots where fire truck turning may be difficult, to the satisfaction of the Fire Department.
3. The Petitioner shall add all missing shade trees to the landscape islands on the subject property, except for the island on the south of the building adjacent to the building entrance and the island on the north side of the building adjacent to the transformer.
4. The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state, and Village codes, regulations, and policies.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Roll call vote.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Chairman Ennes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, you have a 100 percent approval.

MR. BAUER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: We're rolling along tonight. Good luck with the project. Sooner or later we'll find out who's in it.

MR. BAUER: You will, although not without a little digging. There won't even be signage.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, so thank you.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I'll call Sam for information later because I think he knows. Look at that smile. Look at that smile over there.

MR. BAUER: Thanks again.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you.

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 8:32 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: We have one other item on the agenda, and that's our budget.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes, we're getting a pay cut, what's that all about?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Did you read your memo? George. It worked in reverse there, George.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes, George, you've got to do a better negotiation.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: George, you're always negotiating for raises for us.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I think it was Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: That's what it was.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Because he demanded that --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: The entire budget.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Right, when he noticed we weren't being paid timely.

COMMISSIONER DROST: That the finance department account for every meeting we attend.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: It doesn't make any difference. They don't pay us anyway.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I agree with --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, actually a proposal for an increase to use up some of that surplus that's in every one of our budgets was submitted. From the looks of this, it was denied.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Well, we're getting a party instead which should be --

COMMISSIONER DROST: For a party.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I know, yes. I did not, when did the memo come out?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: This weekend, right?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes, but that was just the survey results. The actual memo was just a few, like four or five pages. Yes, and then there was just all the survey results for the rest.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, if it didn't say -- on it this week, maybe the next one.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, I don't think we're going to have to take any action on that because that memo is at such odds with what you have in this budget.

MR. HUBBARD: We can move forward with the budget as proposed. The memo is just future plans. There is no guarantee that that would happen, so we'll move forward assuming that that won't happen. If it does, we can adjust.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, if it does though, we'll be taking the 3400 line out all together, and I have always argued that you have to take note of photocopying since we don't photocopy much. So, you're going to have a very small budget.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Have you seen this line here? There's photocopying.

MR. HUBBARD: I think that the intent of the new plan would be to have a lot more training, so whereas, you know, you guys may take a hundred percent pay cut, you know, that money and funds would be used for training.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes, I don't know that it's on the agenda so that we should be really fully talking about it. But to whatever end that people will be reading these minutes, I really appreciated that training being put in place. I mean I've, you know, been on the Commission long enough now I've finally figured it all out, not all of it, but I still learn everyday. But in the beginning, I had no idea what I was doing when you get up here, you know.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: About PUD and, yes, like --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Right. You do the best you can.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: But the training has been --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Not really, not back when I started.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I had no training. I showed up.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, do you read any of the publications we get, I don't know if we still get those.

COMMISSIONER DROST: We don't.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, well, in those publications, there were courses and there were, and I submitted a request and it got approved.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: You're a better Commissioner than I am.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I mean it's, you know, to --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No, no, I'm not teasing you. I'm saying it genuinely.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: -- go to the schools and the associations that have programs and I found that that really helped.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I understood the commercial real estate aspect, special use, the zoning, all of that. But what I didn't have training on was my fiduciary obligations and how to make assessments on behalf of the Village in some of these decisions. That's really the learning I'm talking about, right? I think that's the piece that is important, because I came from housing. Yes, a lot of that. So, I thought that the memo was well, for me it was very well received. I thought it was all a good thought process.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I agree with you.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I'm taking a pay cut, you know, my \$15 a meeting is going away, I'm very upset. That's the only reason I come here.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I completely agree with Commissioner Dawson, because when I first came on the Commission, I thought, I made a comment on the size of offsets in the budget and other things, until I figured out that --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Right. Right.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: But also we have the increased cost in printing.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: To produce a copy.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: What we used to get --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: They do --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, I don't think there's anything else that we have to say because we can submit it but we don't approve it. Apparently, I didn't solve it although I

heard about a lot of the changes.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Sam, what do we need to do with this exactly?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: We need to make a motion.

MR. HUBBARD: You just need to make a motion and you can do like a voice vote.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, if there's anybody who would like to make a motion to accept or not?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I'll make a motion to accept the budget.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Do we need a --

MR. HUBBARD: You can do a voice vote.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: -- roll call?

MR. HUBBARD: No, voice vote is fine.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, all in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Anybody opposed? Aye.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: George?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Same, yes, I'll oppose.

MR. HUBBARD: Two opposed.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Two opposed.

MR. HUBBARD: It's five in favor, motion passes.

COMMISSIONER DROST: It's a contentious item.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Very.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Can we know why you're opposed?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I guess, it's basically we need to improve our pay grade. That doesn't necessarily include it in the budget.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: No, the raise is going to go the other direction, George.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Right, it's going to zero. I mean you can fight for those important emoluments of our office.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: And we have our fiduciary responsibilities.

COMMISSIONER DROST: We do.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Like spring budget or something.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Just filling out those reports from the Village and the county.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes. Correct.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Disclosing all of our private and personal information. Anyways --

COMMISSIONER DROST: I have one comment before we adjourn, and that is I made a mistake. I was at the meeting on July 10th. In fact, I made the motion for the petition for Arlington Market, how is that? And I vote yes on the minutes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Do we make a motion to adjourn? I'll make a motion to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes, please.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: This meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:41 p.m.)

DRAFT

DRAFT