

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE VILLAGE OF BEECHER, BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
TO BE HELD AT THE WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP CENTER,  
30200 TOWN CENTER DRIVE, BEECHER, ILLINOIS AT 7:00 P.M. ON  
TUESDAY, MAY 29, 2007**

**AGENDA**

I. PLEDGE TO THE FLAG

II. ROLL CALL

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

IV. VILLAGE CLERK REPORT

V. RECOGNITION OF AUDIENCE

VI. PRESENTATION: CONSIDER FINAL DRAFT OF THE TRIM CREEK WATERSHED PLAN. Joyce O'Keefe and Richard Mariner of Openlands and Scott Goldstien of the Metropolitan Planning Council wish to present the final draft of the Trim Creek Watershed Plan to the Village Board and to other governmental bodies which participated in the process. They will also be presenting the plan to the Grant Park Village Board next week. A motion may be needed to accept the report.

VII. PRESENTATION: CONSIDER A NEW HEALTH INSURANCE PLAN FOR VILLAGE EMPLOYEES. Jerry McCullough of Spectrum Insurance, the broker for the eastern Will County Council of Mayors, wishes to present to the Village Board a new proposal for employee health insurance. This new plan was placed in the budget for the coming fiscal year.

The current plan offers a PPO with a \$250 deductible, \$1750 max out of pocket at a 90/10 ratio. An HMO is also offered at 100% coverage after \$10 co-pays. The new plan proposed to eliminate the HMO, and offer a PPO with a \$1,500 deductible for single employee and \$3,000 deductible family with the out of pocket maximum being the deductible. The Village would self-fund the deductible portion for each employee by creating a Health Service Account and placing the deductible amount in these accounts for each employee. The theory is that the employer would rather give the employee the money to manage than to pay the insurance company the higher premium. This will all be explained further at the meeting by the insurance broker. A motion will be requested for adoption of this new plan after the presentation and all questions are answered.

VIII. CONSIDER A MOTION AUTHORIZING THE BEECHER FOURTH OF JULY COMMISSION TO PROVIDE PAYMENT FOR SERVICE AND MATERIALS NOT TO EXCEED \$20,000 TO ANY ONE VENDOR OR \$50,000 IN AGGREGATE BETWEEN JUNE 1<sup>ST</sup> AND SEPTEMBER 1<sup>ST</sup> 2007. This is an annual resolution request which allows for the payment of entertainment and other items which usually require payment upon receipt of the service.

IX. CONSIDER AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF A 10 YEAR INSTALLMENT CONTRACT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$380,000 WITH FIRST COMMUNITY BANK AND TRUST AT AN INTEREST RATE OF 4.19% FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO FIREMEN'S PARK. The OSLAD Grant program is expected to reimburse the Village for \$190,000 of this work approximately 6 months after the work is completed. Two bids were received for this contract and FCB+T was the lowest bid. There are several actions which the Village Board has to take and the Village Attorney will be present to walk us through these items at the meeting.

X. CONTINUED DISCUSSION ON THE FUTURE OF PARKS AND RECREATION IN THE BEECHER COMMUNITY. This will be a main topic of discussion at the intergovernmental meeting on Wednesday night. There are several options being discussed, and each option has its positive and negative arguments. The options all center on how to raise revenue for parks and recreation. The options that I am aware of are as follows, and some of the options could be combined to be "hybrids":

1. Park District. Provides a source of income through property tax and a separate elected board to oversee not only the grounds but the programs offered. This is the ideal form for providing parks and recreation, but recent surveys indicate a 2 to 1 opposition among the residents for this option due to the additional property tax. The creation of other taxing districts such as the library district were approved by referendum because other options were going to be imposed if the district was not created.
2. Village Property Tax for Parks. This would require a referendum and only Village residents would pay. The Village Board could run the park programs or just tax to maintain the park property it owns and charge user fees for the programs.
3. Township Park District. The Township could create a separate board such as the community hall building commission for parks and recreation and impose a tax for this purpose but this also may require a township-wide referendum. The Board would be elected but the power to tax may be subject to referendum.
4. Township Tax Levy for Parks. This is similar to option #2 and may require a referendum.
5. Village Imposes an Amusement Tax for Parks. This is an intriguing option once considered by the Village in 1997. The Village could impose 3% tax on gross receipts for amusement businesses such as the golf course, bowling alley, video store, etc. It is unknown what such a tax would generate. Also, this tax faced opposition in 1996 from amusement businesses. Also, the Attorney would have to investigate if this tax is even viable since state statute is very vague and may only apply to home rule municipalities. Before this option is even considered viable, a legal opinion should be tendered.
6. Village or Township Grants Commission Status for Parks and Recreation. This has been done successfully for the Fourth of July and Beautification, but we already have Beecher Recreation which is providing this service. The commission provides some insurance benefits, but also requires more control by the Village Board which may be a detriment and does not address the revenue issue.

These items are for discussion only.

**XI. CONSIDER TEMPLATE ANNEXATION AGREEMENT FOR RESIDENTIAL AND MIXED USE DEVELOPMENTS AS IT PERTAINS TO FEES.** Enclosed is the latest draft of the template annexation agreement which was never officially approved but contains the fees desired by the past Village Board for the three developments on the south side of the Village. This agreement and the fees to be charged at the sole discretion of the Village Board but in the past we have obtained input from the other taxing bodies on what these fees should be. We did have an approved agreement at a total fee of \$25,091 for single family home but over time these fees being requested began to rise. We did have a commitment at one time to pay a fee of \$28,775 per single family home but this agreement did not receive a vote of approval. Where is the Board on the subject of annexation fees for new developments? Where is our starting point, considering that most developers will have to negotiate down from what we first provide as our request. Do we tie architectural requirements to a decrease in fees? This is for discussion as well.

**XII. CONSIDER AN ARCHITECTURAL CODE FOR THE VILLAGE.** A committee of the Village Board proposed the enclosed architectural code for the Village in 2006 which was recommended for approval by the PZC. The Village Board decided to include this code as an attachment to future annexation agreements. Does the new Village Board support this code? Should this code be by ordinance or as an attachment to the annexation agreement? Should the Village reduce the fees being charged if the developer agrees to abide by these codes which increases the value of the improvements over the long haul? How much reduction should be provided if the code is followed? This is also for discussion.

**XIII. CONSIDER RE-AFFIRMATION OF THE MUNICIPAL FACILITIES PLAN FOR THE VILLAGE.** Enclosed is an outline of the municipal facilities plan for the Village which proposed a complex containing the Village Hall, police station and public works facility on a 5.5 acre site which the Village owns on the north side of Indiana Avenue in front of the Township building. At that time, the plan was approved by a vote of 4-2. Three of the four “ayes” on this plan are no longer on the Village Board, so this plan needs to be re-considered before we spend more time, effort and money on this project. Is this the location which the Board wants to put all of their facilities? Should the Village Hall and police station remain in the old downtown? Should the public works annex be built for a Village Hall on a short term basis to provide the police department more room at 724 Penfield? Should the Village Hall be relocated to leased space so the police department can have more room in the future? Do we just build a public works facility and remain in a holding pattern on the rest? A presentation will be made at the meeting to explain the planning process followed by a discussion of the options. A request to formulate a motion on how to proceed will be requested so that the planning process can head in the right direction before more funds are spent.

**IVX. CONSIDER RE-AFFIRMATION OF RESOLUTIONS PERTAINING TO THE THIRD REGIONAL AIRPORT NOW CALLED THE “SOUTH SUBURBAN AIRPORT” AT THE PEOTONE SITE.** This issue has had a long history and the Village’s positions have changed over time in response to the increasing threat of a major airport being constructed northwest of the Village. In the

past, our position has been in opposition to this airfield but at the same time we have agreed to work inside the process to ensure the Village has a seat at the table if this airport becomes a reality. Contained in your packets are a series of resolutions which have been adopted by Village Boards in the past and now warrant re-affirmation by the new Board:

1. Resolution #90-7 and #97-11: Opposed to an Airport within 15 miles of the Beecher Village limits.
2. Resolution #2001-01: Oppose land banking by the State until the FAA issues a record of decision.
3. Resolution #2005-14: Oppose the Use of Eminent Domain or Threats of Eminent Domain until after the FAA issues a Record of Decision.
4. Resolution #2005-15: A Statement of Policy on How State-Owned land in the Third Airport Footprint Should be Transferred in the Event an Airport is not Constructed.
5. Resolution #2006-01: Support For an Airport Authority if An Airport is Constructed Consisting of Seven Members; three from Will County Executive with one being from the eastern six Townships, two members from the five iron ring communities, one from South Cook and one from Kankakee County.
6. Resolution #2006-02: Support for the Eastern Will County Growth and Regional Cooperation Act (Development District).
7. Resolution #2006-08: Opposition to the Abraham Lincoln National Airport Commission (ALNAC)
8. Statement of Policy on Issues the Village of Beecher Presented to the FAA and IDOT Regarding the Master Plan for the Third Regional Airport at the December 19, 2006 Public Hearing.

These items can be discussed separately and at the next Village Board meeting an omnibus resolution will be drafted which would re-affirm all of these resolutions unless the Board chooses to modify them.

VX. CONSIDER RE-AFFIRMATION OF RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE ILLIANA EXPRESSWAY. This resolution was approved in 2006 and needs the support of the new Village Board.

XVI. CONSIDER RE-AFFIRMATION OF RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE RECONSTRUCTION OF CHURCH ROAD FROM DIXIE TO RACINE AS A CLASS II TRUCK ROUTE. This resolution was made to support our grant application to the federal government for \$2,000,000 in funding through the Will County Governmental League Transportation Committee.

This is the maximum amount of grant available, and this money has been pledged for 2012. However, the Village needs to fund the remainder of the project and this local match is now estimated at \$1.3 million. And, every year we wait the cost of the project will increase. This project can be pushed off each year, but when we decide to not push it off anymore the Phase I Engineering needs to be completed three years before construction at 100% Village cost (\$170,000) and Phase II must begin two years prior to construction (20% Village cost, or \$40,000 of the \$200,000). Is this a project the Village Board continues to support?

**XVII. CONSIDER RE-AFFIRMATION OF VILLAGE'S POSITION PAPER ON THE PROPOSED CENTERPOINT PROJECT AT THE SOUTH END OF CRETE.** On March 6, 2007 the Village President sent the enclosed letter to Centerpoint with the Village Board's blessing. Is this policy paper still the position of the new Village Board?

**XVIII. CONSIDER WHETHER TO CONTINUE SUPPORT FOR THE REED STREET IMPROVEMENT PROJECT.** Three years ago, the Village Board submitted a request for Illinois Transportation Enhancement Funds (Federal ITEP Program) to improve the old downtown area, which included Gould and Penfield Streets. Last year, we were advised the Governor approved a \$385,000 grant for the Reed Street portion of this overall project. This grant would require the Village to contribute \$97,000 toward construction for a total project cost of \$482,000. The Village would also have to fund about \$60,000 in up front engineering design costs for a total local match of \$157,000. This grant is available for a period of three years, and we are now into our second year without a green light on this project. \$60,000 was placed in the Water and Sewer Capital Improvements Account for this fiscal year with the caveat that the Village Board would have to approve the project this Summer. We would need to spend the \$60,000 this year and the \$97,000 next fiscal year if we want to complete this \$482,000 project. We do not need to make a decision at this meeting, but we will have to by October in order to obtain the grant. Is this a project the Village Board wants to pursue, or does the local match exceed the benefits we would receive from this project. This item is for discussion only. Please see the enclosed material.

**IXX. CONSIDER A STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS AND RESOLUTION OF GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR THE VILLAGE TO PURSUE.** In 1998, an intergovernmental committee met on three consecutive evenings and drafted the enclosed strategic plan for the Beecher community to be accomplished by the year 2005. This plan called for Beecher to plan for a population of 6,000 by 2005 with homes having a minimum value of \$150,000. There also seemed to be support for adult communities and senior-assisted housing units. This plan was coordinated by Chuck Eckenstahler, the Village Planner at that time.

In 2004, the Village Board met on two evenings to discuss more specific goals and objectives for the Village government. A five year plan was created, which stated many goals for the Village to achieve by 2009. Many of these goals and policies were put into place with Board support and this five year plan technically has two more years to go. As a result of this strategic plan, the Village Board adopted the 10/8/6/4 compensation plan, conducted a municipal facilities study, created a part-time economic development position (which was later eliminated), began regular intergovernmental committee

meetings, increased staffing, replaced watermain, slip lined aging sewer lines, committed to beautification efforts, adopted a strategy of increasing sewer plant and well pumping capacity without raising rates, established a park improvement fund, raised tap-in fees, and created a web site all as a result of this strategic plan. This plan was drafted using the Village Administrator as the coordinator, and proposals were submitted by the Department Heads and Board members for discussion, and was the measuring stick for all succeeding capital improvement plans and operating budgets.

There is a need to pursue some type of new strategic plan. Above are two examples of a very global strategic plan with all taxing bodies involved and the other a very specific plan drafted by the Village Board. Staff believes there should be two plans: one for the Beecher community as a whole and one specifically for Village government to pursue which does not conflict with the community plan. How should this be accomplished? Do we coordinate this effort ourselves or do we seek outside help? Who would facilitate the drafting of the community plan? If the Village takes the lead, the other taxing bodies may be leery of the process. There is no need for a decision on this matter at this meeting but some thought-provoking discussion should occur as to where we should be headed as a new Village Board. The various committees and employees of the Village need direction and without this direction the Village could become reactionary lacking a vision for the future.

This item was not placed on the agenda for the intergovernmental committee meeting on Wednesday night until the Village Board has a feel for what it wants to do.

XX. NEW BUSINESS TO BE BROUGHT BEFORE THE BOARD

XXI. ADJOURNMENT

XXI. OLD BUSINESS/NEW BUSINESS