

APPROVED

**VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES OF MARCH 17, 2021, 7:00 P.M.**

Chairwoman Gassen called the March 17, 2021 of the Architectural Design Review Board to order at 7:00 p.m. and requested a roll call:

1. ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Chairwoman Gassen, Mr. Styczynski, Ms. Chalberg, Mr. Lerner, Mr. Reimer

ABSENT: Ms. Acks, Mr. Renner

STAFF: Stan Popovich, Community Development Director
Jason Zawila, Planning Manager
Flora Ramirez, Development Planner

VISITORS: David Hene, 5207 Main Street, Downers Grove
Erin Venezia. Downers Grove Downtown Management Corporation

2. APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 17, 2021 MEETING MINUTES

Motion by Mr. Reimer, second by Chalberg to approve the minutes of the February 17, 2021 meeting. Minutes were approved by voice vote. Vote: 5-0

3. OLD BUSINESS

Design Review Project – Ch. Gassen briefly reviewed the expected process that would be followed, stating the board would only be providing a recommendation tonight to the Village Council.

Design Review Process – Planning Manager Zawila explained tonight’s meeting was the culmination of meetings that occurred over the past eight months with four discussion items to be discussed, followed by public comment, and then a motion to follow after each discussion item. The motions would be recommendations to the Village Council.

Planning Manager Zawila recalled for the board that they completed two primary tasks during their meetings. The first was the update to the Downtown Design Guidelines, where the ADRB was closely involved with making changes and providing input. At this point, Manager Zawila asked if the members had any further input regarding the design guidelines.

Ch. Gassen invited board comments regarding the revised design guidelines. None followed except that she pointed out to staff that when an overlap between the design guidelines and items in the Village’s zoning ordinance occur, to reference the zoning ordinance in the design guidelines so that developers see the requirements/clarifications. Staff was supportive of the recommendation.

Ch. Gassen invited the public to comment on the design guidelines. None followed. She entertained a motion to approve the Downtown Design Guidelines.

APPROVED

Mr. Reimer made a motion that the ADRB recommend that the Village Council approve the updated Design Guidelines with the modification to include any reference to the relevant zoning ordinance and include the grammatical modifications previously submitted by Ms. Acks. Second by Mr. Lerner. Roll call:

AYE: Reimer, Lerner, Chalberg, Styczynski, Gassen

NAY: None

Motion passed unanimously.

Moving the discussion to the second primary task, which was to examine the review and approval process for design, Manager Zawila proceeded to present slides depicting the village's current review process and the feedback that was received from the board's last meeting.

Ch. Gassen invited members to provide further input regarding the review and approval process for design. Ms. Chalberg asked that a legend be listed on the zoning map. No further board comments followed.

Ch. Gassen opened up the discussion to public comment. No public comments were received. Ch. Gassen entertained a motion.

Mr. Lerner made a motion that the ADRB recommend that the Village Council maintain the status quo as it relates to design review for the following property improvements: interior remodel, fire suppression/alarm, waterproofing, lawn irrigation, roofing changes, fences, AC/generators, parking lot repairs, detached garages, sheds, new single family homes, special uses, and PUDs. Second by Mr. Reimer. Roll call:

AYE: Lerner, Reimer, Chalberg, Styczynski, Gassen

NAY: None

Motion passed unanimously.

In addition, Planning Director Stan Popovich reported there were no public comments received regarding tonight's discussion points. Ch. Gassen acknowledged that an email was sent to Downtown Management regarding tonight's meeting. Member Chalberg voiced her surprise to see no businesses commenting or attending.

Moving to the next topic of discussion: improvements that currently do not require a permit, Manager Zawila referenced slides on the overhead and recalled the current review process. He stated the ADRB agreed that five improvements were recommended to have some level of design compliance but did not necessarily have to comply: landscaping, paint, window replacement, siding, and door replacement. For those items, the property owner would be the decision maker while staff would act as a consultant.

Considering the process and having some form of a registration process, including a 10-day review process similar to permits, Manager Zawila reviewed the potential consequences that could take place: 1) it becomes a process that offers a line of communication with staff and the downtown stakeholders; 2) it would impact of the workload, such as reviewing landscaping; 3) stakeholders may not register their project with the village and therefore not get compliance; 4) the registration process could be seen as an additional government regulation; and 5) no guaranty existed that a stakeholder's plans would change based on staff's recommendation.

Mr. Lerner voiced disappointment that some of the options did not reflect the consensus of the board at the last meeting, especially for those items listed that affected the appearance of the downtown area and for the consultation to occur. He summarized that one option proposed

APPROVED

to do nothing while the other option proposed to establish a process that had no consequences. He emphasized that other communities appeared to make things work and suggested that the village may need to require a permit for such items but only after a consultation take place first. The owner would remain the decision maker but it forced the owner to discuss the design guidelines with staff. Ms. Chalberg expressed concern that if no consequences existed, it took the village back 10 years when no design guidelines existed at all. She supported a program that encouraged the guideline process. More creative ideas needed to be discussed.

Mr. Lerner inquired how many projects actually came up in the past that were issues in the business district, wherein Manager Zawila indicated the matter was subjective and no documentation existed on what buildings received more complaints than others. Comments voiced by the board included 1) the registration process could be over-reaching, 2) there needed to be a form of outreach program to the business owners, 3) if something was to be enforceable, it should include a permit, and 4) not recommend any of the five items as required unless one item stood out.

The goal of the outreach program would convey that the registration process was a consultation with staff. Compliance and motivation to comply would be key. Ch. Gassen voiced no support for an owner needing a permit to paint or landscape his/her property while the other three items (window replacement, siding replacement, door replacement) she could agree that compliance be gained because they impacted a neighborhood. Outreach could also include a quarterly newsletter sent to owners.

Ch. Gassen invited public comment. None received. A motion was entertained.

Mr. Lerner made a motion that the ADRB recommend to the Village Council that the Village establish a permit system for downtown property owners that desire to make the following improvements to their properties: 1) window replacement, 2) siding replacement, and 3) door replacement. Permits for these improvements will be granted following a brief consultation with village staff to review and recommend compliance with the Downtown Design Guidelines.

Given the above motion Manager Zawila offered a couple of options to the board to consider; and rather than using the term "permit", the board discussed using the term of "consultation."

Motion died for lack of a second.

Discussion then centered on whether the board wanted compliance with any of the three remaining items (window replacement, door replacement, siding replacement) with Ch. Gassen and Mr. Lerner supporting a consultation-type process. Mr. Lerner believed most business owners would do the right thing. Having a newsletter would be a positive. Manager Zawila, on the other hand, suggested that the board could recommend remain status quo for the improvements but recommend that the Village Council require a proactive outreach effort to communicate the guidelines/improvements to the community. A short dialog was raised about the poor types of siding, EFIS material, and the argument behind a permit versus consultation versus a \$5.00 permit fee charged versus a \$400 permit fee charged if compliance does not occur with the guidelines.

After the last comments received, Ch. Gassen entertained another motion.

Mr. Reimer made a motion that the ADRB recommend to the Village Council to maintain the status quo as it relates to design review for those improvements that do not

APPROVED

currently require a permit. In addition, Village Council shall provide direction to staff to increase the frequency for the outreach program, and consultation, related to compliance with the design guidelines that have been developed for the Downtown Business District. Second by Mr. Styczynski.

Ms. Chalberg expressed that siding replacement should be a permit review, given that mistakes could be long-lasting. Mr. Lerner preferred that window/door replacement and siding also be permit reviewed. **Roll call:**

AYE: Reimer, Styczynski, Gassen

NAY: Chalberg, Lerner

MOTION PASSED: VOTE 3-2

Moving to the fourth discussion item – improvements that require a permit currently – Manager Zawila walked through the current process for the ADRB. He recalled from the last meeting, board members discussed five improvements: new window or door, façade renovations (significant change to façade), additions, new multi-family structures and new commercial buildings. At that time the board agreed: 1) an owner should be required to comply from the design guidelines, 2) staff would be the decision maker, and 3) the ADRB would serve as the appealing body. A slide representing the process followed.

Reviewing the consequences of this process, Manager Zawila pointed out 1) staff's subjective judgment could fall under scrutiny of stakeholders and residents after approval was granted and the project started; 2) no public comment would be available unless due to the appeal process; 3) an increased administrative burden would exist on stakeholders/staff; and 4) the additional process could potentially discourage improvements from occurring. Alternatively, staff provided another option where the ADRB could make the final decision. If an appeal were to occur, then it would go before the Village Council for final decision.

Manager Zawila walked through a slide reflecting the past five years of permit data (2010 to 2016) noting those projects that would have fallen into the above process, i.e., 43 potential cases if the process was in the code requiring design compliance and going to the ADRB for a final decision. He also pointed out that awnings – sometimes used as signage -- could change the improvement. Currently, he estimated about one-half of the façade renovations were awning permits.

A review of the process, under the ADRB, and its potential consequences followed: 1) additional review time would be added to projects; 2) an additional cost to the applicant; 3) the focus of the ADRB would change and include additional cases not seen before; and 4) while the additional review process could discourage some owners, it could also result in a good design for the downtown which would become more common place. Manager Zawila proceeded to explain three optional motions the board could consider as noted in the staff report.

Questions followed if staff had certain (subjective) items that raised potential concern within the community and whether those items should be removed for review by a larger body other than staff. Wherein, Manager Zawila indicated that façade renovations, additions, new multi-family and new commercial were items that would have the largest significant changes and where the design guidelines would have to be applied. New window/new door would depend on the size of the opening. Ch. Gassen also added that most multi-family structures would fall under the Special Use category, which would have a great impact to the downtown community and the public.

APPROVED

Ch. Gassen invited board comments.

Turning to the potential consequences and staff's assertion that subjective judgment would fall under scrutiny of stakeholders and residents, Director Popovich explained the concern becomes the interpretation of an item from staff's perspective or a neighbor's perspective. Having a full board review allowed more feedback, open discussion, and comments from the public. Ch. Gassen also pointed out that one of the goals (in the entire process) was to have community awareness earlier in the process. She was fine with such improvements coming before this board for review and final decision. Dialog between staff and the board followed on how such cases would differ in review by the Planning Commission versus the ADRB. Mr. Lerner pointed out that decision standards would have to be developed. Director Popovich explained that such standards would have to be codified. Different scenarios were discussed.

Based on the 43 cases over the past five years, Mr. Styczynski inquired as to how much more would the ADRB have to meet if the above process were to be agreed upon by the board, wherein Manager Zawila relayed the ADRB would be expected to meet more frequently. An explanation followed.

Ch. Gassen opened up the meeting to public comment. None received.

Reviewing the topic of awnings, Manager Zawila reminded the board that the item would have to come through the process, if approved. Some of those cases would be covered in the zoning ordinance, as mentioned by Ch. Gassen. It was suggested that awnings be reviewed administratively by staff but if awnings were part of a façade renovation then it would come before the ADRB. A straw poll was taken and the board agreed to remove awnings by itself, unless it was part of a façade renovation. Ch. Gassen entertained a motion.

Mr. Reimer made a motion that the ADRB recommend that the Village Council require design compliance with the following property improvements: new windows/doors, façade renovations, additions, new-multi-family, and new commercial. The ADRB would serve as the decision maker, while the Village Council would serve as the appeal to ADRB decisions. Second by Ms. Chalberg. Roll call:

AYE: Reimer, Chalberg, Lerner, Styczynski, Gassen

NAY: None

Motion passed unanimously.

Manager Zawila reminded the board the next step in the process was to provide a compiled report to the Village Council, which date was unknown at this time. He appreciated the board's input. Ch. Gassen appreciated staff's work and thanked those that were in attendance. Per staff, a meeting was scheduled for next month.

4. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Gassen called for a motion to adjourn.

Ms. Chalberg moved, seconded by Mr. Lerner to adjourn the meeting at 8:34 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

/s/ Celeste K. Weilandt
(As transcribed by MP-3 audio)

APPROVED

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING

April 5, 2021, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Pro tem Maurer called the April 5, 2021 meeting of the Downers Grove Plan Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and led the Plan Commissioners and public in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Chairman Pro tem Maurer; Commissioners Boyle, Dmytryszyn, Johnson, Majauskas, Patel, Rollins, Toth

ABSENT: Chairman Rickard

STAFF: Planning Manager Jason Zawila, Development Planner Gabby Baldassari

MINUTES

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 1, 2021 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING WERE APPROVED ON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER BOYLE. SECOND BY COMMISSIONER ROLLINS. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chairman Pro tem Maurer reviewed the procedures for the public hearing and swore in those individuals who would be speaking on the following petition:

FILE 21-PLC-0008: A petition seeking Special Use approval to operate a personal vehicle repair and maintenance business. The property is currently zoned M-1, Light Manufacturing. The property is located on the north side of Wisconsin Avenue, approximately 500 feet west of Belmont Road, commonly known as 2300 Wisconsin Avenue, Downers Grove, IL (PIN 08-12-407-006). Omar Sharif, Petitioner and MacNeil Real Estate Holdings, Owner

Petitioner, Mr. Frasz, 1403 Midwest Club Parkway, Oakbrook, IL, introduced his colleagues and explained he was in the process of opening up a shop but doing business as AFA Performance with most of the shop being under the requirements of the special use. Hours of operation would be by appointment only from the hours of 12:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. with minimum foot traffic due to customers dropping off their vehicle and then picking it up later. The shop will offer high end detailing to high end vehicles. Mr. Frasz believed it was a good service to provide to the public and he would work within the environmental guidelines.

Commissioners were invited to ask questions. None followed.

Chairman Pro tem Maurer invited the public to comment. No comments received. The petitioner also provided no further comment.

APPROVED

Development Planner Gabby Baldassari summarized the special use request before the commissioners, recalling that the commissioners had seen similar petitions in the past. A map of the site followed. Staff believed the criteria for the special use was met and referenced the draft motion in staff's report.

Chairman Pro tem Maurer invited the petitioner to make a closing remark wherein Mr. Frasz thanked the commission for its time.

Hearing no further comments, Chairman Pro tem Maurer closed public comments and entertained a motion.

Discussion followed regarding test driving and the fact that it was listed as a condition. Staff explained that it wanted to be consistent with the condition even if test driving was not necessarily taking place at the site. The condition would not affect the petitioner's business. Dialog followed as to what other services were provided and the fact that test driving would take place. Per questions, Planner Zawila indicated an oil/water separator would be located at every space within the building. Planner Baldassari addressed Commissioner Boyle's question about the parking spaces, explaining that this specific use only required 6 parking spaces. Overall, positive comments were received and the fact that a precedence had been set for the use.

Chairman Pro tem Maurer entertained a motion

COMMISSIONER ROLLINS MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL APPROVAL OF FILE 21-PLC-00008, SUBJECT TO THE FOUR CONDITIONS ON PAGE 3 OF STAFF'S REPORT. BASED ON THE PETITINOER'S SUBMITTAL, STAFF'S REPORT AND THE TESTIMONY PRESENTED, THE PETITIONER HAS MET THE STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL FOR THE SPECIAL USE, AS REQUIRED BY THE VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE'S ZONING ORDINANCE, AND IT IS IN THE PUBLIC'S INTEREST.

SECOND BY COMMISSIONER PATEL. ROLL CALL:

AYE: ROLLINS, PATEL, JOHNSON, TOTH, MAURER, BOYLE, DMYTRYSZYN, MAJAUSKAS

NAY: NONE

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 8-0

Planner Zawila voiced his pleasure in seeing all of the commissioners in person. He asked the commissioners to contact him regarding their availability for the May meetings.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 7:21 P.M. BY CHAIRMAN PRO TEM MAURER.

/s/ Celeste K. Weilandt

Recording Secretary

(As transcribed by MP-3 audio)

APPROVED

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING

May 3, 2021, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Pro Tem Maurer called the May 3, 2021 meeting of the Downers Grove Plan Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and led the Plan Commissioners and public in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Chairman Pro tem Maurer; Commissioners Boyle, Dmytryszyn, Johnson, Majauskas, Patel, Rollins, Toth

ABSENT: Chairman Rickard

STAFF: Planning Manager Jason Zawila

MINUTES

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2021 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING WERE APPROVED ON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER BOYLE. SECOND BY COMMISSIONER ROLLINS. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chairman Pro tem Maurer reviewed the procedures for the public hearing and swore in those individuals who would be speaking on the following petition:

FILE 21-PLC-0009: A Petition seeking approval of a Text Amendment to allow for a drive through medical facilities as a Special Use in the O-R-M Zoning District and a Special Use to operate a drive through medical facility. The property is zoned O-R-M, Office, Research, and Manufacturing. The property is located on the northwest corner of Butterfield Road and Woodcreek Drive, commonly known as 2205 Butterfield Rd., Downers Grove, Illinois (PIN 05-25-414-013). Ryan Murphy, Petitioner, and SB 100, LLC, Owner

Petitioner, Mr. Ryan Murphy, 281 Forest Avenue, Glen Ellyn, Illinois, shared some background of the company and projects he works for – StoreBuild -- a national development company in Chicago. He introduced his team from Edward Elmhurst Hospital and described the special use he was seeking for a drive-through medical facility at the former Fifth Third Bank building located at Lacey and Butterfield Avenues. The current drive-through exists and a significant investment will be made into the building.

Mr. Mark Hoffman, 711 Fairfield, Elmhurst, Illinois, assistant director for real estate and ambulatory development with Edward Elmhurst Health, discussed the background of his healthcare company and the proposal. Currently, Phase I of the project was taking place in the 8,000 sq. foot location and included administering COVID vaccinations and testing. If this

APPROVED

proposal was approved, Phase 2 would allow for additional walk-up services with the drive-through service. Phase 3 would include additional interior work such as offices and some hospital services, etc. This specific project not only would allow services to both the Edward Hospital and Elmhurst Hospital populations, it would allow for the “touchless” service that came out of the pandemic, and was being requested by some of the patients.

Mr. Murphy returned and described the repurposing of such buildings being done by Edward Health and described the future of such medical services to the community. Reviewing various slides of the building, Mr. Murphy addressed how the building would look as a “store front” and said the drive aisles would have less stacking as the former bank. All concrete and existing drive islands would be removed. A handicap ramp and automatic door system would be installed. The proposed drive-through, as Mr. Murphy described, was consistent with the standards for special use, and, with the building’s improvements, the property values would also improve. Mr. Murphy believed the text amendment to the OR district for a medical drive-through would establish the village on the forefront of an adaptive reuse for such buildings.

Commissioner questions followed as to what was special about the drive-through and what services could not be done on Zoom, other than receiving a flu shot or taking blood wherein Mr. Murphy explained that annual flu vaccines, strep throat, picking up medical records, and picking up of glasses or contacts could take place.

Dr. Meziere, 26 S. Furlough Street, Hinsdale, explained that with the previous COVID testing and the drive-through, patients appreciated the convenience and suggested other services to offer, as well as extend the services from a Zoom visit. Examples followed. Dialog followed about an extension of the lease if the petition was approved, wherein Mr. Murphy confirmed a five-year lease was being proposed.

Regarding the opening/closing of the doors and the safety of the hospital staff, Dr. Meziere explained having the doors was actually safer for staff than the prior use of tents at her corporate location. Per Mr. Maurer’s question, the intention of the services was to assist patients in their vehicle; the ADA ramp was for safety and emergency cases. Vehicle stacking was addressed and a commissioner recommended screening from the roadway, wherein the petitioner pointed out the heavy screening that currently existed (view from Butterfield, facing south). Ventilation was also addressed. Asked if there was enough walk-in business for the clinic, Dr. Meziere assured that there was enough.

Addressing additional questions, Dr. Meziere explained that the drive-through lanes would be kept flexible so that traffic could be better managed. Asked how noise/horn beeping could be managed, Mr. Murphy explained a similar set-up was handled at the emergency department where an automated system could be set up, similar to ambulance bays. The vehicle bays would also be temperature-maintained.

Chairman Pro tem Maurer invited public comment. No public spoke; however, Planning Manager Zawila indicated that an email was received from a neighbor and the concern was addressed by the petitioner in his presentation.

Manager Zawila summarized the two requests: a text amendment to allow for a drive-through medical facility in the O-R-M Zoning District and a special use permit to operate a drive-through

APPROVED

medical facility. He reviewed Section 5-1 of the zoning ordinance and the allowed special uses for businesses, noting the change would now allow for drive-through banks and medical facilities only. Working with the petitioner, he believed the service could be offered in the ORM District in a highly professional environment, similar to other examples he cited.

As for the special use, Manger Zawila noted that the building was an existing bank, was vacant for many years, and was currently being used as a medical facility. The petitioner would be reducing the drive-through by one lane. A traffic study was completed and staff supported the study. The existing drive-through already met the village's requirements, the parking lot had excess parking spaces, and staff believe the standards for special use and the text amendment were met. Per a commissioner question, the definition of "medical" was explained by staff as well as an explanation of a use variance. Staff also confirmed with a commissioner that it could decline future locations and each petition would be reviewed on its own merits. Mr. Murphy and staff addressed the difference of a medical clinic and pharmacy. As a last comment, Mr. Murphy extended his appreciation for the commissioners' consideration.

Chairman Pro tem Maurer closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

All commissioners were in support of the repurposing of the building. Chairman Pro tem Maurer entertained a motion.

BASED ON THE PETITIONER'S SUBMITTAL, THE STAFF REPORT, AND THE TESTIMONY PRESENTED, AND HAVING FOUND THAT THE PETITIONER HAS MET THE STANDARDS OF APPROVAL FOR A ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT AND SPECIAL USE AS REQUIRED BY THE VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE ZONING ORDINANCE AND IT IS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST, COMMISSIONER ROLLINS MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL APPROVAL OF FILE 21-PLC-0009, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. THE PROPOSED SPECIAL USE FOR A DRIVE-THROUGH USE SHALL SUBSTANTIALLY CONFORM TO THE ATTACHED PROPOSED TENANT BUILDING AND ENGINEERING DRAWINGS PREPARED BY JTS ARCHITECTS EXCEPT AS SUCH PLANS MAY BE MODIFIED TO CONFORM TO VILLAGE CODES, ORDINANCES, AND POLICIES.**

SECOND BY COMMISSIONER JOHNSON. ROLL CALL:

AYE: ROLLINS, JOHNSON, BOYLE, DMYTRYSZYN, MAJAUSKAS, PATEL, TOTH, MAUER

NAY: NONE

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 8-0

APPROVED

Planner Zawila announced there will be a meeting in two weeks and a June 7th meeting was scheduled.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 7:40 P.M. BY CHAIRMAN PRO TEM MAURER.

/s/ Celeste K. Weilandt
Recording Secretary
(As transcribed by MP-3 audio)

DOWNERS GROVE FIRE DEPARTMENT

FOREIGN FIRE INSURANCE (2%) BOARD MEETING MINUTES

For Meeting Held on 18 March 2021

Meeting called to order at 0800 hrs.

2% Board Members in attendance: Lt. Mowery, PM Meister, PM Kairis, PM Nowak

Members Absent: Chief Pindelski, PM Kinney, PM S. Markowski

Guests: D/C Tasso (Chief Representative), B/C Werner, Lt. Cipra, Lt. Johnson

Approval of Last Meeting Minutes: Motion to approve the February meeting minutes sent out for review by PM Meister, 2nd by PM Kairis. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

<u>Treasurer Report:</u>	Beginning Balance:	\$235,056.77
	Ending Balance:	\$221,212.32
	Widows Fund Checking:	\$25,000.00
	Widows Fund CD:	\$28,104.03

Treasurer Nowak advised the main expense was for the bill for the Plymovent system upgrades, and we took in a small deposit for interest on the widow fund CD.

Motion to approve the treasurer report as presented by PM Meister, 2nd by PM Kairis. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Old Business: PM Meister advised that PM S. Markowski notified him of a snafu with the purchase of the approved pressure washers. The cost had gone \$7 above the approved amount, so this purchase would have to be authorized by the board.

The pelian case requested by administration is in. D/C Tasso has it and it is ready to go.

Station #101 received the curtains and snow shovels approved last meeting.

Station #102 received the towels and blender that was approved last meeting.

Cell phone reimbursement draft policy will be tabled until next meeting due to PM S. Markowski not being able to present the language due to emergency calls.

New Business: General Fund Request

A request was presented for temporal thermometers by EMS Coordinator Dan Rietveld. The request is for 8 thermometers at significant cost. It was relayed that the Chief did not sign the request for approval, so the board can not take any action on this request. A discussion was held regarding this request. PM Kairis advised we have been working on a solution to placing thermometers into patients mouths for over 6 months now. The idea was a low cost solution to this

problem, and the board is now looking at a large expenditure for what is felt by the board should be coming from the EMS budget. PM Kairis would be receptive to splitting the cost or having Dan come to the board saying he purchased 4 and can the board match this purchase with 4 additional items. PM Nowak is concerned about the thermometers being the type that actually has to contact the patient. Lt. Mowery asked about disinfection practices and if this was a valid concern. He also felt that a split cost option would be better received by the board. D/C Tasso advised that the budgets had been cut, but training was decimated, EMS was cut but not as bad. He advised that Dan may not have a lot of room for non-budgeted expenditures. This discussion was only for information in case this is brought up for purchase request again since no action can be taken at this time.

PM Meister asked for a motion to increase the pressure washer due to the unforeseen increase in cost. A motion to increase the not to exceed (NTE) cost by \$100 by PM Nowak. 2nd by PM Meister. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

PM Meister asked if we are currently reimbursing cell phone bills or are we waiting on policy language? PM Nowak advised we are reimbursing phone bills. He advised only one bill is needed since they are on multiple month plans, and the phone number on the bill is listed for Fire Department contact.

T.S.O. Werner advised that he and PM Kinney had looked at the tower and went over the idea of how they would like the roof prop. They also have designed some repel points that are only 10 feet off the ground for training new students. T.S.O. Werner advised that for reference the cost will be somewhere around \$30,000 to \$40,000.

Good of the 2% Fund: D/C Tasso asked if it is standard to purchase an extended warranty on purchases such as TV's, Washers, and the like? Lt. Mowery advised that it is in the by-laws that if there is an extended warranty offered, it is supposed to be included with the purchase. D/C Tasso is working on updating equipment in the stations and needs information on what is covered and where the paperwork is. PM Meister will work with D/C Tasso on this.

Next Meeting: 22 April 2021 @ 0800 hrs.

Motion to adjourn made by PM Nowak, 2nd by PM Kairis. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Meeting adjourned at 0847 hrs.

**DOWNERS GROVE PUBLIC LIBRARY
BOARD OF LIBRARY TRUSTEES
APRIL 28, 2021, 7:30 P.M.
ONLINE VIA GOTO MEETING**

MINUTES

1. **Call to Order.** President Graber called the meeting to order at 7:34 p.m.
2. **Roll Call.** Members present: Trustee Carissa Dougherty, Trustee Swapna Gigani, Trustee David Humphreys, Trustee Barnali Khuntia, Trustee Kim Stapleton, President Jonathan Graber. Absent: None.

Also present: Library Director Julie Milavec, Assistant Library Director Jen Ryjewski, Executive Assistant Katelyn Vabalaitis, Media Lab Coordinator Ed Bromiel, Resident Ed Pawlak, Resident Richard Barker Jr.

3. **Welcome to Visitors.** President Graber welcomed visitors and thanked them for their interest in the library.
4. **Approval of Minutes.**
 - a. March 24, 2021 Regular Meeting. It was moved by Stapleton and seconded by Humphreys THAT the Minutes of the March 24, 2021 Regular Monthly Meeting be approved as presented. Roll call: Ayes: Dougherty, Gigani, Humphreys, Khuntia, Stapleton, Graber. Nays: None. Abstentions: None.
5. **Financial Matters.**
 - a. March 2021 Financial Report. Library Director Milavec presented the report. The library is one quarter of the way through the year. Revenues do not reflect any property taxes yet, which is typical for this time of year. Generally, the first property tax payment is posted sometime in May. The Village of Downers Grove covers any operating expenditures that the library needs during the time period between the beginning of the fiscal year and when property taxes start coming in. Milavec noted that the April revenue report, which will be distributed in May, will include the FEMA grant that the library just received in the amount of \$20,499.46. This grant is a reimbursement for PPE and other expenses incurred due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Milavec thanked Assistant Director Jen Ryjewski for her hard work and commitment to helping the library secure this grant.

On the expenditure side, the library is at 21.2% expended in the first 25% of the year. As discussed in previous meetings, the Maintenance Supplies, Data Processing Services, Insurance, and Capital Equipment lines are all over budget due to annual invoices received at the beginning of the year as well as expenses due to COVID-19. Milavec noted the RGW Consulting invoice in the

May Invoice Edit List, which included the newly signed additional scope of work that is for three additional staff trainings, including recording and playback of those trainings for staff who are unable to attend live. This additional scope of work also includes six support meetings for the library's BIPOC staff support group that will include a consultant meeting with them on topics of their choice.

- b. April 2021 Invoices. It was moved by Humphreys and seconded by Dougherty THAT the payment of April 2021 Capital Replacement Fund invoices totaling \$3,496.50, the payment of April 2021 Operating Fund invoices totaling \$137,192.89, and the ratification of March 2021 payrolls totaling \$242,596.33 be approved. Roll call: Ayes: Dougherty, Gigani, Humphreys, Khuntia, Stapleton, Graber. Nays: None. Abstentions: None.

6. **Public Comment on Agenda Items**. President Graber invited comment. Resident Richard E. Barker Jr is a resident of Downers Grove and thanked the Board for giving him time to speak as well as for their service to the library. He was looking for guidance in terms of the Board's anti-racism statements of late. First, he wanted to make it very clear that he is in support of all anti-racism of all people of all stripes. He marched against racism in Chicago in the 60s and 70s and participated in the recent march in Downers Grove. He would like guidance on where the library derives authority to put out public statements on social, political, or legislative matters.

Library Director Milavec noted that she has spoken with Mr. Barker on several occasions in regards to this question. The Board is acting under its bylaws and under the statutes in Chapter 75 of the Illinois Compiled Statutes that govern library law. They are acting as they see fit as an independent governing body.

Mr. Barker felt the section of the bylaws covering the Board's ability to make statements is more linked to the idea of the Board speaking to the business of the library, or library matters. Mr. Barker commented that the Board has a powerful, influential voice, especially for a non-elected body. He stated that in particular, the Board's anti-Asian racism statement has many mischaracterizations and misstatements of fact. Mr. Barker believes the language of the bylaws seems to imply that statements should be made only on library business. He is concerned with the governmental issue of a non-elected body having authority to issue public statements. In particular, he feels this statement was not researched and sources were not cited. There is no liability. Mr. Barker asked for assistance in researching the actual language of the compiled statutes. President Graber commented that the actual language can be found in section 75 ILCS 5/4-7 of the Illinois Compiled Statutes. He noted that the Board has the power to adopt bylaws and in Section 1, Article 2 of the Board's bylaws, it says that they have the ability to communicate actively with local government and the general public.

Mr. Barker asked who regulates the Board of Library Trustees and Library Director Milavec responded that the Board is appointed by the Village Council and the Mayor and can be removed by the Village Council and the Mayor, and that is the totality of the Village's oversight.

7. **Public Comment on Other Library Business.** President Graber invited comment. Assistant Director Jen Ryjewski read aloud and verbatim a comment that was submitted electronically to the Board of Library Trustees from Brian Sewell. The comment is as follows:
When did the DGPL become an advocate for BLM (a Marxist organization) and other woke racial equity plays? The latest April 16th message from Ms. Milavec makes reference to "systemic racism" and asserts "The Black community's pain, fear, and anger is real." On what basis does she speak for these communities? She is also apparently an expert on evaluating policing techniques and feels her position is an appropriate venue to comment. These are opinions NOT facts, and she feels she is sending a message that is divisive to our community. The library receives its funding from our taxes and this new social agenda is unwelcome and divisive. What will be next Ms. Milavec, defunding the DGPD? We await your input.

8. **New Business.**

- a. Strategic Plan 2017-2020 Review. Library Director Milavec led a discussion on the progress made on the Strategic Plan 2017-2020. Milavec commented that doing this review of the plan brought home how far DGPL has come as an organization in the past three and a half years. This plan was approved in September 2017 and at that point, focus was on the long-term health of the facility, team-building, and cross-departmental cooperation and collaboration. Partnerships have grown in ways staff never could have imagined. Staff have been given a lot of latitude to innovate and to try things and do things that have never been tried before. The single action item of adding STEM kits to the Kids Room collection grew into an entire library of things that is now known as the Anything Emporium. One of the most important pieces is that equity, diversity and inclusion initiatives for the library started in this strategic plan and have grown into diversity audits and working on an Equity Strategic Plan.

Trustee Dougherty was not on the Board when the strategic plan was created, though she has seen how it has evolved during her time on the Board and appreciated all of the periodic reports over the years as well as all of the effort that went into creating the plan review. She would like to understand where the connection is between the actions and the eventual impact for some of the goals/focuses. How can we understand the impact of some of the bigger initiatives so that the next strategic plan takes advantage of all of that hard work? Milavec noted that this plan focused on deliverables at the action level rather than how the deliverables fed into the goals. The

new strategic plan will be more focused on impact and outcome rather than on specific actions and deliverables.

Trustee Humphreys viewed the strategic plan as a transition document. It had been a while since the library had a real strategic plan and there was a strong feeling that the library needed one. The first thing Library Director Milavec did after being hired was create a strategic plan. The library is looking outward into the community and is inviting the community to be partners with the library. He is thrilled to see the EDI movement come to fruition as well.

Library Director Milavec commented that the former Board that passed this strategic plan was adamant that it be created in-house and not through a consultant. The task turned into a team-building exercise and consisted of a cross-departmental staff committee that did key stakeholder interviews throughout the community, which was the basis for this plan. The Equity Advisory Team has started working on an Equity Strategic Plan for the library and the intention is that the plan will become the springboard for the larger strategic planning process.

9. Unfinished Business.

- a. COVID-19 Response and Phased Reopening Plan. The Meeting Room was converted into seven staff workstations and study rooms will reopen on Monday for public use. Non-reserved seating has been slowly reintroduced and some soft seating has been put back on the floor. There have been more visitors on a regular basis and most are adhering to the two-hour visit limit. Staff are looking forward to slowly reintroducing even more seating. Once study rooms reopen, tables will no longer need to be reserved. Summer reading will include some outdoor in-person programming, including the use of Fishel Park. Operating hours are slowly increasing and the plan is to return to regular operating hours on July 5.

It was moved by Gigani and seconded by Khuntia THAT the Library Director be reauthorized to make temporary policy changes in consultation with the Board President and within the parameters of the COVID-19 Response and Reopening Phasing Plan as presented. Roll call: Ayes: Dougherty, Gigani, Humphreys, Khuntia, Stapleton, Graber. Nays: None. Abstentions: None.

10. Library Director's Report. Library Director Milavec presented her report.

Library staff are working towards a partnership with CASA DuPage, which would allow the library to offer restricted use cards to children in foster care in Downers Grove. Building Operations Director Ian Knorr is on a medical leave and staff are hoping to have him back in a couple of weeks. Building Operations Assistant John Martin has been doing a great job in his absence, especially with the ceiling leak incident. Several other staff were on hand to assist, including Adult & Teen Services Manager Lizzie Matkowski, Children's Services Manager Allyson

Renell, and Circulation Assistant Manager Sandy Feuillan. Staff are continuing work on the land acknowledgement. The Aspen Discovery Platform, the library's beta catalog, was approved for a three-year contract to become the primary catalog.

11. Trustee Comments and Requests for Information.

President Graber asked how online public comment submissions are passed along and if they need to meet certain criteria before being passed to the Board. Library Director Milavec responded that to be read aloud at the Board meeting, members of the public must indicate in the body of the comment that it is a Board Meeting Comment.

Trustee Stapleton talked with Assistant Director Jen Ryjewski about Republic Bank doing a third display in the library. This third display is on the 20th anniversary of September 11.

Trustee Humphreys applauded the Board and library staff for exercising their responsibility to serve the entire community of Downers Grove and to occasionally audit themselves to be sure the entire community is being served.

12. Adjournment. President Graber adjourned the meeting at 8:36 p.m.