I. DECLARATION OF QUORUM.
With quorum present, Ald. Feldman called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING of April 25, 2005
Unanimous vote of approval by Alderman.

III. Citizen Comment
Attorney Merle L. Royce representing Tree 4 Lawn Preservers spoke to (A3.4) about the bidding process. He was the lowest bidder and not aware that there was another bidder and would like to address the Council about that. He read from and explained the bid their method and process and their offer. He compared our data sheets to his bid to show the commonalities.

Mimi Peterson, T.R.E.E. member mentioned a memo to the Council a week and a half ago. T.R.E.E. is not favorable of the 50/50 program and feels that everyone benefits from the elm trees and everyone should pay for it. She thanked the Committee for their ongoing consideration but the 50/50 program is not the best idea. The neglected trees will be quickly lost. The sanitation program alone is not saving the elms and we should take a strong action like
other communities. The money would be well spent and should be aggregated over all the community.

IV. ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION ON COUNCIL AGENDA

(A1) * City of Evanston Payroll through 05/05/05  
$2,237,577.97

(A2) * City of Evanston Bills through 05/10/05  
$3,449,285.93

(A3.1) Neighborhood Traffic Management: Approval of proposal for the installation of speed humps on Hull Terrace between Ridge Avenue and Asbury Avenue, and on Barton Avenue between Austin Street and Hull Terrace.

(A3.2) Neighborhood Traffic Management: Approval of proposal for the installation of speed humps on Judson Avenue between Hamilton Street and Greenleaf Street.

(A3.3) Approval of contract with Executive Partners, Inc. in an amount not-to-exceed $55,000.00 for Strategic Planning Services. Funded in the FY 2005-06 Operating Budget. Ald. Ann Rainey inquired about time frames and how is it going to work? City Manager, Julia A. Carroll replied that it would start with some staff planning this month and the first meeting with the Council beginning in June. It would be a series of two or three meetings and then a town hall meeting if you choose that option with a final plan by September, early October, approximately six months to get through everything because of the time in between necessary to have discussion on various aspects of it. Ald. Ann Rainey inquired about resident participation – how does it work? City Manager, Julia A. Carroll replied that the design is flexible, a few meetings, many meetings, a town hall meeting or a series of town hall meetings. She envisions neighborhood town hall meetings and business town hall meetings calling upon business community involvement. Input would be for Council consideration only. She emphasized that the plan is the Council's plan as to what the Council believes to be the future for Evanston. She reminded Council of the cost of having more meetings. Ald. Feldman commented on prior experiences and expressed concern about a “free-for-all”. Julia reminded Feldman that facilitation will be key. She suggests no more than a couple evenings and perhaps a Saturday to host facilitated sessions for a couple hours for a town hall meeting. The goal would be to prevent a complaint session and gain valuable community wide input. The idea is to draw the best “think” from the community but the Council will be the final decision makers. Ald. Jean-Baptiste believes in a number of non-centralized town hall meetings – meet in each ward. Centralized meetings would not bring out the desired results. He referred to his experience in strategic planning and the ability of the facilitator to bring out the commonalities in voices from each ward. Ald. Jean-Baptiste calls for at least nine town hall meetings. Julia’s response was that a concern with meeting ward by ward is that it doesn’t look at the broader perspective of the city. If nine meetings were wanted by the Council, nine meetings could be held. She thinks it might be better to host four meetings, two wards at a time. The concern is people may not focus on the bigger picture issues. Ward by ward would be compartmentalizing the city and that’s not what we want. Ald. Jean-Baptiste emphasized the role of the facilitator to set the
agenda, direct the process maintaining the focus and goal. Ward by Ward would allow the facilitator to see the common themes among the wards. He agrees the facilitator is key to getting the most that can be attained out of the meetings. Ald. Rainey posed a question of productivity using that method as opposed to issue-by-issue to Ald. Jean-Baptiste. She mentioned that everybody is not interested in everything in every ward. Focused groups in specialized areas of municipal activity may offer real good suggestions also. Ald. Jean-Baptiste agrees on topic discussion but still feels to get the thoughts of the people at large that face different realities, it’s best to get out to the community. Julia asked for clarity on the conversation she should have with the facilitator in holding more than a couple of town hall meetings which can be decided after the first Council meeting. One of the first meetings with Council will be to talk about the process. Ald. Rainey would like an opportunity to thrash this out with the vendor. Julia confirmed Ald. Rainey would have that opportunity.

(A3.5) Approval of sole source purchase from Boston Whaler Commercial & Government Products in the amount of $26,834.00 for one boat for the Aquatics Camp. Funded in the Fleet Services Fund. (Requires a vote of 6 Alderman for passage)

(A3.6) Approval of the lowest responsive and responsible bid from J.P. Bruno Corporation in the amount of $734,628.00, for the Mason Park and Field House Renovations Phase I. Funded by the FY 2003-04 CDBG ($150,000.00), FY 2004-05 CDBG ($150,000.00), FY 2004-05 CIP ($317,000.00), FY 2005-06 Open Space and Land Acquisition Development (OSLAD) Grant (estimated at $117,428.00).

(A4) Ordinance 54-O-05 4 way Stop at Lee and Ridge Court
Consideration of proposed Ordinance 54-O-05 amending Section 10-11-5, Schedule V (D) of the City Code, to establish a Four-Way Stop at Lee Street and Ridge Court. For Introduction

(A5) Ordinance 55-O-05 No Turn on Red When Pedestrians are Present for south bound Ridge at Hull Terrace.
Consideration of proposed Ordinance 55-O-05 amending Section 10-11-3, Schedule III (D) of the City Code, to establish a No Turn on Red When Pedestrians are Present for south bound Ridge at Hull Terrace. For Introduction

Items A1, A2, A3.1, A3.2, A3.3, A3.5, A3.6, A4, and A5 were considered on a consent agenda. Aforementioned items were motioned and passed unanimously.

Ald. Moran had a question about Ordinance 52-O-05 Amending Title 10 of the City Code. He was expecting more background information from staff and Parking Committee. Ald. Rainey agreed. They both were looking for background information immediately. Bill was under the impression that the ordinance would make it past the first reading and then more data would be included by the spring. He didn’t know it was expected for this meeting. Bill Stafford apologized for the miscommunication. Ald. Moran would like much more information before making any decisions and will not vote on it at this time. Bill asked the Council to “hold” it and the requested information will be
provided. Bill assured there would be no complications, there was just
miscommunication. Ald. Feldman confirmed the Committee's decision to “hold”
Ordinance 52-O-05.

(A3.4) Approval of the lowest responsive and responsible bid from Arbor Green,
Ltd. in the amount of $756,984.00, for the 2005 Dutch Elm Tree Injection
Program. Funded in the FY 2005-06 Parks/Forestry and Recreational
Department Operating Budget. Ald. Moran initially made a motion but had a
couple questions understanding the numbers in the American Elm Survey
Subway Data and options. Paul D'Agostino explained the 697 threatened
public elms. Ald. Moran was under the impression that the initial proposal
would not inject the elms that were threatened through root graft. Ald. Moran
paraphrased his question: “Is the number 697, the number of signature trees
on parkways that are threatened by root graft from any source.” Paul
D'Agostino replied, “Yes.” He added he did not crunch the numbers to see out
of the 697 what might or might not be inoculated. Ald. Rainey summarized what
the numbers mean: don’t have the disease, get inoculated if they’re within 50 ft.
Ald. Moran inquired about “where potential root graft = y.” Paul D'Agostino
explained “y” means yes. During the actual survey (another elm within 50 ft.
and potential root graft), the determination was either yes or no. Ald. Moran
asked was there any determination made amongst those that were within 50 ft
of each other that one or the other had signs of Dutch Elm. Paul D'Agostino
said that there was no way to tell at the time. Ald. Moran understood the
difference in numbers better.

Ald. Feldman called upon the visitor (see III. Citizen Comments). Ald. Feldman
interrupted the attorney and turned the floor over to Ald. Rainey. Ald. Rainey
addressed the attorney about why his client wasn’t selected. The attorney
began to explain the delivery system again. Ald. Rainey apologized for the
interruption but there are two more meetings scheduled and stressed the non-
responsive aspect and City staff having turned down the bid due to lack of
substantial historical data showing the effectiveness of ambersol on Dutch elm
disease. Ald. Rainey discussed and compared the numbers per inch and
annual injections showing how much higher his client’s bid is comparatively to
Arbor Green.

Ald. Jean-Baptiste asked if the Director had any more information that would
add clarity to the issue. Doug Gaynor stated there’s no more information
available than what is already included in the report. About checking
references, there were no references comparing Arbor Tech or chemicals
used. All injections are annual.

Ald. Moran questioned the size of injection holes and asked if staff had done
any research on this. University of Horticultural Departments feels that
repeated injections over time could cause damage. D'Agostino stated even
though the universities say what they say about repeated injections, he has not
personally seen that to be true. Ald. Moran questioned the concern of threat
of signature elms. D'Agostino responded we’re approaching with caution for
implementation and budgetary reasons. Doug Gaynor expounded on why the
City feels the recommended approach is the best approach. Ald. Feldman
pointed out the differences in conceptual approaches between Gaynor and
D'Agostino and posed the question that if there were no budgetary issues
would this still be a problem. Paul said no. Ald. Feldman pointed out the Council prioritizes and decides on how the budget is expended. D’Agostino apologized for the implication. Julia A. Carroll explained that not disrespecting the Council’s decision and respecting the staff’s report, there are issues with implementation in the 50/50 program. It is certainly the Council’s decision on the chosen program. Ald. Feldman thanked the City Manager for her comments. Doug Gaynor stated that recommendations made by the staff was based on research from the industry and surveyed cities and emphasized that nobody is doing all the elms.

Ald. Rainey commented on the feedback she has received from her ward after she mistakenly supported the 50/50 program. Her idea of a fair program would be to inoculate all the signature elms at the city’s expense. If a taxpayer has a signature elm in front of their home fitting the criteria and that taxpayer wants it inoculated, then the 50/50 program should be invoked. But every signature elm tree should be inoculated and paid for by taxpayers. She encourages further thought on this program.

Ald. Jean-Baptiste felt we have gotten way off track and seemed to be back at the beginning. Alderman pointed out that we are discussing the bid proposal along with the ordinance. He is for moving approval on what the staff has recommended. He suggested an amended ordinance so that all the citizens of Evanston participate in paying for the cost that the city has not allocated money for. This should be easily done by slight modification by the city’s legal department. We’ve already missed the May 15th deadline to begin inoculation. We’re going to lose more trees. Ald. Jean-Baptiste motioned for approval, Ald. Feldman seconded it.

Ald. Moran asked if the City Manager could expound on implementation issues. Julia A. Carroll began by clarifying staff’s understanding per the last meeting. Bill Stafford gave numbers on charging the utilities and spread out over three years. He also mentioned other influential tax bases that could be used (i.e. property). Equity and efficiency of the tax are factors in choosing the tax base. Julia mentioned the financial impracticality of billing monthly.

Ald. Rainey commented that the most important part is how we pay for it. If the ordinance can be amended so can the implementation program.

Ald. Feldman stated that the most important decision Council will make is not how we pay for it but whether or not we inoculate every single tree. He further shared the feedback of approval from his ward and turned the floor over to Mimi Peterson (see III Citizen Comment).

Ald. Feldman expressed concern over perpetual problems arising from neglecting trees.

Ald. Jean-Baptiste put a motion on the floor. Even though there are administrative costs to collect money eighteen times over the next three years, the pain should be shifted on ourselves and not on the citizens. If it’s $25 for the three year program then lets pay it over a stretch of time. Approximate numbers were given. We can get that done and overcome our issues.
Ald. Feldman began the motion and approval process, Ald. Rainey asked what was the motion. Ald. Jean-Baptiste clarified the motion was to pass A3.4 and A6 with a modification. Ald. Rainey is not in approval of passing a purchase item with an ordinance.

Items A3.4 was discussed and considered. Item was moved for approval by Feldman, seconded by Ald. Jean-Baptiste, and voted on 2 (I)-2(Nay). Item A6 was motioned by Ald. Jean-Baptiste to modify the Ordinance so that all the utility paying citizens share in the cost that is not being incurred by the city. The motion was seconded by Ald. Feldman, and voted on 2(I)-2(Nay).

IV. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

V. COMMUNICATIONS

VI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Committee and other meetings in progress requiring the Committees’ attendance, it adjourned at 7:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dolores Y. Cortez  
City Manager’s Office