

**AGENDA
CITY OF SALEM
REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING
6:00 PM JANUARY 21, 2019**

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Prayer and Pledge of Allegiance**
- III. Presentation of Petitions/Public Comments**
- IV. Mayor's Report and Presentations**

- V. City Council Action**
 - 1. Consent Agenda
 - a. City Council Minutes - 01/07/19
 - 2. Swearing of Craig Vieira as Salem Patrol Officer
 - 3. Approval of Intergovernmental Agreement with Schools for Placement of School Resource Officer(s)
 - 4. Approval of Additional Class G Liquor License at 1040 Vail Street
 - 5. Approval of Amendment to Zoning Code to Permit Retail Sales by Special Use in Non-Urban Districts
 - 6. Approval of Ordinance to Allow Remote Participation in City Meetings
 - 7. Approval of Bills Payable

- VI. City Manager Report**
- VII. City Attorney Report**
- VIII. Finance Director Report**
- IX. City Council Report**
- X. Executive Session**
 - 1. 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(6) – Setting Price for Sale of Real Estate
 - 2. 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(11) – Litigation

- XI. Adjournment**

Bill Gruen
City Manager

**CITY OF SALEM - REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING
JANUARY 21, 2019**

MANAGER'S COMMENTS

V. City Council Action

3. SRO: In lieu of any extended verbal presentation, please accept my notes and analysis below:

- ✓ The upshot is, it is my opinion that SROs should be placed in Salem schools and I want the Salem PD to be the department that sends those officers. I ask the City Council to approve the intergovernmental agreement with SCHS and Franklin Park/Hawthorn to allow for this.
- ✓ I have had pretty thoughtful discussion with people ranging from Council members, Chief Reynolds, Superintendents Foppe and Detering, and others. I don't think I've heard anyone say they just flat out oppose having police officers in schools, although a common position critical of the approach I present for approval is Salem schools should contribute the vast majority or all of the cost of the officers. Some schools and communities with SROs, though not all, take that approach, and I don't find it offensive. It's just not the approach I took subsequent to Brad Detering approaching the Chief and me about the matter. I saw SRO placement as something we should have in Salem schools, would be good for the community, and something I thought was important to which to contribute equally.
- ✓ I have a healthy amount of nervousness about the City entering in this agreement. However, I can and have demonstrated the City can fund the position through the next budget year, which ends April 2020. But beyond this time we certainly don't know what the City's financial future holds. However, my experience with Salem's budget is its complexity brings with it a mixed bag of simultaneously increasing and decreasing revenues and expenses that, even though they trend over years, create nuanced circumstances that have allowed the General Fund budgets to balance each fiscal year. It's more complicated and three-dimensional than a financial condition being "good or bad" or "high or low" and then eliciting an automatic budget response. Injecting two additional units of government will create additional capacity to cover costs related to SROs. Collectively, the City, SCHS, and Franklin Park/Hawthorn have budget capacity totaling \$19.1 million to cover the \$150,000 I expect the SRO program to cost in the first year.
- ✓ A corollary of this point is I'd like the City and the schools cooperate during the term of the agreement to offset any budget shortfalls which might occur among us in order to see the agreement through its term, at a minimum.
- ✓ A good question came up related to whether an SRO could be a part time position. With some help from Chief Reynolds, I offered answers and some analysis in an email copied in your packet. In summary, it's possible to make the SROs part time positions. If this is the approach, we might experience higher turnover than we'd want to experience related to trainings and certifications necessary for the position. At the risk of being ageist, retired officers looking for post-retirement employment may not be as quick or as strong as an officer in his/her prime holding the position. Additionally, part time status may not be sufficient for all hours desired for school coverage.
- ✓ I took some days during the week of January 14 to review collections on some important Gen Fund revenues through December 2018. Historical collections for January through April in prior years were also reviewed. Dept heads were given budget limits on about December 17, 2018 that add up to a \$5,569,715 General Fund total for the FY20 budget. This estimate is still good after last week's review. Please note that this FY20 budget does not rely on any one source of revenue to be higher than what we've actually collected in any prior fiscal year. We don't rely on "higher high" than we've collected previously.

- ✓ Additional points and miscellaneous information include:
 - The agreement includes a hard sunset in June 2022. The agreement automatically terminates unless all three units of government act to extend it, and there is no way around this. The agreement also calls for a report to be created prior to agreement expiration with information that may be useful to the schools and the City as they consider extension (see Section 9).
 - We cannot be certain, but a review of the current Salem PD roster indicates 2022 is a year when a number of retirements may occur. If the SRO program cannot be extended beyond 2022, this is projected to be a good year for it to end and for there to be a natural reduction in headcount through attrition.
 - Despite the June 2022 expiration, the agreement includes a 30-day termination provision (see Section 9).
 - The City and the schools will be compelled to apply for grants or other sources of financing that support SROs that we know about (see Section 10). If either of the schools are able to capture more school funding from the State to support the SROs, the agreement is written in a manner that they will seek those dollars and apply it to the program.
 - We are experiencing an era of really great cooperation and positive working relationships with Salem schools. An indication of this is that both SCHS and Franklin Park approved enterprise zone property tax abatements for the new zone we hope the State to approve for Salem. I hope we can keep that ball rolling with the SRO program.

4. **Approval of Additional Class G Liquor License:** Mike and Melanie Johnson request issuance of a Class G liquor license for 1040 Vail Street for their new business, Idyllwood Entertainment Center. I understand generally their plan is to reopen the roller rink facility as a multi-use business operation that offers more than just roller skating and related offerings. The facility is also sectioned in a manner which I understand they will use to “offer cultural and art classes, meeting space, and special event space for parties, showers, reunions, and receptions” in a space separate from the roller rink.

State law at 235 ILCS 5/6-11 restricts issuance of liquor licenses at facilities within 100 feet of a school, although there is a vast multitude of exceptions written into this section to allow a license. According to the County Assessor’s GIS website, the north property line of the property addressed 1040 Vail Street appears to be over 230 feet from what might be a south property line of Salem High School. State law provides for a base restriction against alcohol within public parks (with exceptions) but provides no prohibition for licenses next to parks.

The City Council appears to be concerned about the issuance of new, onsite consumption licenses due to the proliferation of video gaming positions. To address that concern, it may consider developing an informal policy on issuance of licenses allowing for onsite consumption licenses for projects which I’m confident Council members would like. A basic project condition might entail creation of net new business operations for which video gaming would be ancillary and generate revenues below a set or perceived threshold.

5. **Approval of Amendment to Zoning Code...:** We understand establishment of new business operations is underway on a 70 acre tract given the address 3734 Cross Road, which is at the SW corner of the intersection of I-57 and Cross Road. Although outside of the City, the location is well within the 1.5 mile radius within which the City has zoning and planning responsibilities. The property is owned by Roy and Beth Landers. The property is zoned Non-Urban. We expect the project to entail various activities associated with rodeo

events, many of which Salem's Zoning Code already approves by way of Special Use. One such activity planned for 3734 Cross Road would entail retail sales, about which the Non-Urban district is silent. The ordinance on the agenda, if approved, would allow retail sales activities to be allowed by special use. I anticipate the Council might approve this ordinance and allow the application for special use to go forward for consideration by the Planning Commission. The City Council's action does not pre-judge what the Planning Commission will do with the application.

6. **Approval of Ordinance to Allow Remote Participation in City Meetings:** It seems we've had at least a few instances in recent years in which City Council members have had cause to be rightfully excused from City Council meetings. The Illinois Open Meetings Act allows for remote participation in City meetings for reasons limited to illness or disability, employment (like business travel), or other emergency, if the City Council permits remote participation and sets up some basic rules. No member of the City Council has asked for this to be brought forward, but I thought you might want to consider it. Included in your packet is the ordinance from Effingham which seems to be well written. I ask for some direction on whether you'd like to consider its approval.
7. **Approval of Bills Payable:** Request approval.