



Committee of the Whole Meeting Minutes

Monday, August 12, 2024, at 6:30 P.M.
Wilmor Fire Station, 200 N. Wilmor Road, Washington, IL 61571

Mayor Manier called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m., in the training room with a quorum present.

Present: Alderpersons Adams, Blundy, Butler, Martin, McIntyre, Smith and Stevens

Remote: Alderpersons Brownfield (at 6:52 p.m. Alderperson Brownfield entered the meeting in person.)

Also Present: City Administrator Snider, P & D Director Oliphant, City Engineer Carr, Finance Director Baxter, Public Works Director Rittenhouse, Police Chief McCoy, City Treasurer Carol Crocker, City Clerk Brod, Attorney Keith Braskich

Alderperson Smith motioned to approve the remote attendance of Alderperson Brownfield; Alderperson McIntyre seconded.

7 Ayes: Adams, Blundy, Butler, Martin, McIntyre, Smith, Stevens

0 Nays:

Motion carried by roll call vote.

1. ALDERPERSONS WISHING TO BE HEARD: None provided

CITIZENS WISHING TO BE HEARD:

Bob Montgomery, Washington Township resident, shared that he noticed a person from millennia parked near his property. The gentleman told him they were looking for missing monuments. Mr. Montgomery noted there were no monuments in that area, a surveyor from the city marked a half-mile section with orange ribbon, his surveyor marked the same area with pink ribbons, and they matched. His comments are attached and made part of the minutes.

Melissa Heil from the Historical Society shared that she spoke to Mr. Oliphant and has had many meetings with the city regarding reimbursement of expenses. She shared that they are grateful that this will be addressed on tonight's agenda. She noted that they have asked to see the plans but they have not been provided to them. Her comments are attached and made part of the minutes.

Washington resident Kim Wade addressed the Jackson Street bridge project. She asked what else would be done at the site and stated that she feels it is ugly. She said it has more weeds than grass.

Leri Slonneger, from High Street wondered if she could get more signage in her alley to help direct traffic. She noted the end of the alley could be blocked by work trucks. She shared that Lonewolf has not come back to plant grass and there are now tall weeds and a piece of lumber in the area.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Alderperson Smith motioned to accept the July 8, 2024 Committee of the Whole meeting minutes; Alderperson Adams seconded. Passed by voice vote.

3. NEW BUSINESS:

A. *WACC Board Update Presentation* – Nicole Miller from the WACC board was present to provide an update. She will send out an invitation when their financials are ready in November. She shared the mission of Five Points, noting this is about wanting to live in a thriving community. Five Points drew her to move here six years ago. She briefly shared the history of Five Points, noting that it started about 17 years ago and was formed by a collaboration of community entities. She shared that the board looks for members with skillsets like finance, attorneys, and a variety of talents. They follow bylaws to stay focused with the original intent and have annual audits which have been clean every year. They have simple goals such as: keep promises, provide quality customer service, remain fiscally responsible and save for the future. The fitness center is the dominant revenue source. The banquet area has more rentals than ticket sales. They are working on providing different entertainment and cultural events. The operation expenses are about 1/3 of total expenses. Utilities are about 20% of total expenses. She shared that they saw a dip in income around the time of the tornado. They had a record year for their St. Jude fundraiser which raised over \$21,000. They had several years of summer concert nights that were free to the public with sponsors from the community. They have seen a higher usage of the senior room. They had a golf tournament and dueling pianos event to raise money for a better sound system. She shared that Amy Grant will be here soon and they added full-time staff to help with donor development. They offered free swimming lessons using a grant. She shared that the generational impact circle recognizes those who give more than \$1,000 per year which will help capital costs. They will have a founders week celebration this October which will be invitation only for donors. They are embracing a learning culture, committed to the town and look forward to City Council meetings taking place soon. She shared that they face challenges like cash position declining, fitness center dependency, and changing needs of their partners. They are working with the park district to bring the local art fair back, and they are collaborating with several different entities. She opened the update up for questions and none were provided.

B. *Proposed Successor Agreement with the Washington Fire Department 5/1/24 - 4/30/27* – Mayor Manier invited Greg Longfellow to provide an update, noting he is the president of the board. Mr. Longfellow

shared that they started negotiations for their three-year contract. They are asking for \$200,000 for cost-of-living increases, half of the new ambulance cost of \$400,000, and a permanent bunk house. He noted they are in a city owned building and they have four full time paramedics that sleep in it. They are also asking to replace the ladder truck, noting the current truck is 28 years old. The new truck would be \$2.2 million, it would take four years to custom build and would like the city to fund half of it. He noted paying for certain areas would help them receive a discount. Mayor Manier clarified the difference between a refurbished ladder truck versus a new ladder truck. Mr. Longfellow noted that they are having a hard time refurbishing their truck and it would be up to \$1 million to refurbish a truck. Administrator Snider shared that Finance Director Baxter provided a financial breakdown to help Council determine a revenue source. Finance Director Baxter explained the spreadsheet that was prepared using preliminary numbers. She noted the current contract expired on April 30, 2024. She shared that Fire Protection and Services shows a 6% increase as well as other increases. She explained that a bunkhouse has never been included in the contract. She noted that the property tax can be levied. Alderperson Blundy said that 24% comes from the current tax levy and the rest comes from other sources. Finance Director Baxter noted that there is a Fire Levy and Ambulance Levy that has evolved to be 24%. Alderperson Brownfield asked about the \$900,000 cost for the bunkhouse. Mr. Longfellow shared that they asked PJ Hoerr to put together numbers and that is an all-end price with furnishings. Alderperson Brownfield expressed concern with negotiating these numbers and Mr. Longfellow said he wouldn't pay \$900,000 for that square footage. Mayor Manier shared that the current bunk house was expanded when they took on Northern Tazewell. Alderperson Martin clarified that the new bunkhouse would be 1,400 square feet and sit outside the north side of the meeting room door. It was noted that this is just preliminary. Mr. Longfellow noted that Police Chief McCoy offered his budget money to add two more spaces upstairs. Mr. Longfellow noted that the storage area would hold medicines and vending machines. Alderperson Butler expressed concern. Administrator Snider shared that the negotiation committee is made of up Alderperson Adams, Chief McCoy and himself and they need guidance from Council. Alderperson Butler feels a refurbished ladder truck is not possible. Administrator Snider noted this will be a significant rise in property taxes as presented. Alderperson Butler noted that the City has never funded the ambulance increase because that is a revenue generating business. He also noted the cost per square foot for the bunkhouse is significant. He also expressed concern if the number of calls would support a new ladder truck. Alderperson McIntyre agreed that these are big numbers, but the numbers have increased for these items. He noted that the equipment isn't used often, but it is an important piece and is attributed to their ISO and noted that a refurbished truck might not last long enough. Alderperson Blundy agreed with them. He shared concern with a refurbished truck, and he would be leery of a non-certified provider. He feels there have been upgrades to technology and is worried about parts. Agrees bunkhouse is too expensive. He feels the need for more discussion about funding and is not in favor of a property tax increase. Mr. Longfellow shared that the ambulance was ordered two years ago, and they will order another one next year. If they wait on the ladder truck the price increase will be \$2.7 million. Alderperson Stevens feels these numbers are not accurate and noted that we don't pay our half of the ladder truck until it is delivered. She would like to know how often the ladder truck is used. She feels this is overwhelming. Mayor Manier noted that Pierce has a long turnaround time, and it might be harder to get a refurbished truck. Mr. Longfellow noted that every quarter it increases about 3%. Alderperson Martin and Mr. Longfellow discussed the low value of the old ladder truck. Mr. Longfellow shared that they would try to put \$1.1 million down to try to get discounted pricing and he appreciates the discussion.

- C. *Discussion - Public Works Storage/Evidence Building* – Administrator Snider shared a memo that provided clarity about the damaged building. Public Works Director Rittenhouse shared that our insurance company is asking what we intend to do with the building. We have received partial payment, but we need to let them know our intentions in order to receive depreciation. In addition, the period of restoration is limited to 24 months. The rental of evidence storage and streetsweeper would then be paid for by the city. Alderperson Butler asked about the cash value and if there is a replacement value. Finance Director Baxter noted the numbers are what we get if it is repaired. Alderperson Martin asked if a new location is determined for the evidence building, would this fill the need for public works storage. Public Works Director Rittenhouse noted they would use the whole building for storage. Alderperson Blundy noted the time frame of the decision. He feels a valued engineering study would help and asked if other police departments have remote storage. Alderperson Blundy shared how he feels evidence is processed when it is received. Public Works Director Rittenhouse asked for direction from Council so he doesn't start repairing the old building if the majority of Council doesn't want to move forward with it. Alderperson Adams feels at worst case, the old building should be used for public works. He noted the insurance money and the additional money that would come back if it were repaired. He noted the importance of public safety and feels we should move forward with the repairs and use it as public works storage. Mayor Manier noted that the property on Walnut cost \$102,000 to demolish and this building is bigger. Alderperson McIntyre feels we should repurpose it. Alderperson Blundy clarified that he is not in favor of demolishing the building but needs more information. Alderpersons Brownfield and Martin favor restoration. Alderperson Butler said we need to discuss Agenda Item D before making this decision.
- D. *Dewberry Evidence Building Discussion* – Chief McCoy shared that they were directed to have Dewberry rebid the project. He introduced Nathan Custer, Director of Design with Dewberry to provide information about the current building. Mr. Custer shared that they were given opportunities to reduce the bid while keeping applicable codes and best practices. They were asked to evaluate the current building and after consulting experts, he does not propose doing a study. He noted that once they start to try to bring in best practices, the recommendations would be excessive. He noted the building is concrete block without rebar and they would need to update that condition which would add 20% to the weight of the walls but the code only allows for 5% increase without rebuilding the foundation. He noted there is no insulation or vapor barrier in the current building. It also does not have humidity controls or a bathroom and the wood roof structure would need to be replaced. There is not a lot of the building that they could use. He feels it would be a poor use of Washington's tax dollars. Mr. Custer clarified that if they would like to look into using the current police building, it would require a study before he could provide an opinion on using it and that it is usually cheaper to build a standalone building. He noted that evidence is currently moved from the police department building to a second building and it would be ideal if evidence arrived at a

remote facility and processed within that facility. Engineer Carr shared that the current police department building cannot be expanded due to a floodplain and the railroad. Alderperson Brownfield would like to move forward with the rebid. He noted that the alternate places won't work and we cannot come up with \$21 million like East Peoria. He doesn't want to pay \$50,000 for a study. Alderperson Adams recommits his opinion to use money for public works storage and move forward with evidence building. Mr. Custer said in order to reissue the project, they would need to alter their documents. He said that when the project was bid the contractors were required to hold their prices for a specific time. The City could enter into a contract for a low-price value and then enter into a valued engineering contract and use a change order to help reduce the cost. He also noted the risk that the previous bidders may not rebid because their numbers are already out in public. Chief McCoy noted that Dewberry would help the contractor to reduce the costs. Engineer Carr shared that if Dewberry does the engineering, it would cost money as well. He explained that valued engineering would be reaching out to the bidders to see if appearance items could change, not structural items and there is no way out of paying for valued engineering. Alderperson McIntyre noted the bid time has expired. He wonders about accepting the original low bid and not paying the \$4,000. Attorney said he can review it to see if it is a viable option. Alderperson Stevens feels we are in this position because the project was over the budgeted amount. She noted it is to process evidence, not just storage. Chief McCoy shared that the valued engineering would be added to the cost. Mr. Custer noted that Dewberry currently has a contract for construction administration and this is normal communication to get the job done which could be a benefit instead of reissuing the documents that would be cause rebidding. Mr. Custer said they had 10 months for the construction but they hoped to avoid winter conditions. Engineer Carr noted that this will carry over until the next year and will no longer need a budget amendment. Alderperson Martin feels they should move forward with a new bid since they did not find other options. Alderperson Butler noted the conversation about the \$650 per square foot quoted for a bunk house and this is over \$800 per square foot. He noted the current building is 4,000 square feet and it is a divided space. He feels if the foundation would support a new building, it would work. Mr. Custer said there is no documentation on the old foundation and they would not use the old foundation. Alderperson Butler thinks there is enough space to store evidence and public works in the current building. Alderperson Brownfield asked about retrofitting the old building and would it require sprinklers. Alderperson Smith asked if we have looked at other locations that might be appropriate. Chief McCoy said they have looked into other sites and they are not suited. Alderperson Blundy said they can rebid at the existing location but as two separate buildings. He also wondered about the location on Constitution. Mr. Custer noted the Constitution site has issues with topography that would make it more expensive. The current location would need a soil study, utility design, structural design, and develop a site adaptation package. Chief McCoy shared that this has been a five-year project and it was started because they didn't have enough room in the old evidence building. Mr. Custer shared that the new design has options for future expansions and state and federal regulations are requiring them to store evidence for longer periods of time so the expansion may be needed in the future. Alderperson Stevens asked about the space behind the fire station that is 45 feet. Mr. Custer said they consulted with the fire department who desires the expansion of two additional fire bays. He also noted that they prefer to have 30 feet between buildings for fire ratings. Engineer Carr shared that there is not room in the current building to do a pass through, so the plans would have to be redone which is significant and could be costly. Mr. Custer clarified that two bays are needed; one for vehicle processing and the other for a sally port to securely deliver evidence. Alderperson Adams prefers that the Attorney look into redoing the bid.

- E. *Bid Report on RFQ on Council Meeting Furniture for Five Points* – Administrator Snider shared that a memo was provided and a tentative agreement has been reached with Five Points for the use of space. He noted the primary expense is the furniture. All furniture is able to be stored in a storage building. Administrator Snider shared that the low bidder was just over \$30,000. He noted the clerk's desk cannot match the Council desks, so they are looking for additional options. Public Works Director Rittenhouse feels his crew can construct a storage garage to use for storage. Administrator Snider recommended that we don't make the purchase until we have an agreement with Five Points finalized. Alderperson Stevens feels the Council was interested in livestreaming, then the furniture came into play after. She is not in favor of public works moving furniture for this price. Alderperson Brownfield clarified that the furniture is only moved if there is another event in that room. Alderperson Martin and Alderperson Brownfield clarified that there is no additional storage option. Alderperson Blundy wants to focus on the sound and recording equipment. He is okay with using current furniture. Alderperson McIntyre likes the look of the furniture but wouldn't want to put expensive furniture in a storage unit. He favors moving forward with just the audio equipment. Alderperson Adams said the purpose is to get information to the community, professionally. He is okay either way but likes the professional look. Mayor Manier confirmed that the majority favors live streaming only. Alderperson Martin said he would be okay if the furniture did not go in a shed. Alderperson Smith likes the furniture, but would prefer a permanent home.
- F. *Washington Historical Society Request for Financial Assistance for Building Improvements* – P & D Director Oliphant shared this is a request for assistance for their improvements. He clarified that while Ms. Heil stated this was the first request, this is only the first written request. He clarified that it was not staff's intention to not bring items to Council prior to this. He explained that he included a sentence that could be interpreted as maintenance, but they are being done due to the work going on next door. P & D Director Oliphant included cost breakdowns. He shared information about TIF fund. Alderperson Martin assumed that the developers were going to cover these items and we have already paid for these out of the TIF fund. He noted that he has heard different things from the developer than what is presented. Alderperson Stevens said they were provided a memo from Nathan Watson and she finds it interesting that the Historical Society is asking for money from the city but Nathan said he has offered to pay for it. She feels the agreement is not accurate because they are off schedule. Alderperson McIntyre noted a lot of drama about this building and wondered why these weren't discussed before the work was started. He read the letter and is confused with the information. He agrees with Alderperson Martin. He feels the Historical Society has incurred the expenses because of the new construction and feels we need to help them work together. Alderperson Butler noted the baseline for a variance in a C-2 district. He noted that the variance happened so that this building could match everything else on the square. Alderperson Butler said these items occurred because the Historical Society's items were encroaching on another property

and these were inherited when they purchased the building. He noted the meters were placed on someone else's property so that's why the costs were incurred. Alderperson Butler shared that Mr. Watson offered to do the windows at no cost but they refused. Alderperson Brownfield thinks this makes sense and it is great that this company is spending a lot of money in our town. He feels the City can help remedy some of this. He also noted the Historical Society can choose who can work on their building. Alderperson Adams noted the large investment and feels this is minimal for the large project. Alderperson Blundy doesn't feel the City is on the hook, but doesn't think the developer will do it so he would be okay with taking it out of the TIF. Alderperson Stevens read the memo about the city's liability to pay. Alderperson Smith asked about the \$380,000 that will be paid by December, and if we can take the money out of what we owe the Gristmill. P & D Director Oliphant said the agreement wouldn't allow for it. Alderperson Stevens asked if we get to see the interest before we pay it and P & D Director Oliphant said yes. Alderperson Smith is in favor of settling this. Alderperson Martin agreed but expressed concern that other neighbors will come forward. Mayor Manier thinks the developer was referring only to damages. P & D Director Oliphant will try to get an agreement drafted and approved by the Historical Society for next week. Alderperson Butler feels we should help to make peace for our City although the developer has nothing to do with what is on their land. Consensus is to pursue an agreement and help with the expenses.

- G. *S. Elm Street Easement Execution Consideration* – P & D Director Oliphant shared that staff was approached by Cana for an easement to provide better access. The lot was recently reconstructed after the City purchased it. He noted that it has turning issues. He noted that there is an ability to use it but there is no easement. This would assist us to be able to do snowplowing. Alderperson Smith feels it is a great idea. All agreed.
- H. *Jackson Street Right-of-Way Vacation Consideration* – P & D Director Oliphant shared that we received a request from the owner asking the City to vacate a portion of the property but there have never been improvements. Most of the area is forested and has a small tributary of Farm Creek. He noted that the City will likely never be interested in improving it. Staff feels we should keep a small portion for a maintenance buffer of five feet on the edge. P & D Director Oliphant pointed out that state law says that each of the property owners get half of the property but the Park District might not be interested. Alderperson Stevens feels this is important because this has to do with the berm. Engineer Carr shared that we have the equipment to maintain the channel which allows us to maintain the creek. Alderperson Adams agreed with the proposal. Alderperson Martin asked why we would give up the land. P & D Director Oliphant said we don't think we will ever put in a road. The family has shared that they take care of the green space. P & D Director Oliphant said we need at least five feet to ten feet. Public Works Director Rittenhouse noted that more space to get into that area is better. Alderperson Blundy is in favor of taking the ten feet to give a little more room. Alderperson Martin is the only disagreement. P & D Director Oliphant asked for clarification about the amount of feet. Public Works Director Rittenhouse shared that more access allows them to not encroach on someone's property. Engineer Carr shared that the staff doesn't have a recommendation as this is a request from a property owner. P & D Director Oliphant said if they were to make a recommendation, they prefer ten feet. Alderperson Stevens noted an area further down stream was vacated and it has had issues. Alderpersons Brownfield, Adams and McIntyre are okay with the proposal. Alderperson Martin asked about keeping a permanent easement. P & D Director Oliphant said it would have to be reviewed. General consensus was to move forward with the option of retaining ten feet.
- I. *Nofsinger/Dallas Road Naming Recommendation* - Engineer Carr explained that with the realignment, we are extending Dallas Road. A neighbor north of the bypass expressed concern regarding their address, bus pickup and driveway location. This discussion spurred discussion regarding the section of the new roadway between Cruger Road and US 24. With existing Nofsinger remaining from Cruger to just south of US 24, the new roadway would cause some confusion if it were to be named Nofsinger as well. Staff consulted with IDOT, the postmaster, and the 911 addressing liaison. The postmaster felt that the road should be Dallas Road from Cruger to US 24 and then remain Nofsinger on the north side of the Bypass. IDOT had no opinion. The 911 addressing liaison suggested that the new roadway should be named Dallas Road as well. Alderperson Stevens feels the dead-end portion of Nofsinger should receive a new name. Engineer Carr shared that that is not necessary as we have other roads with breaks in them. Mayor Manier shared that the road was named after the Nofsinger family for a reason. General consensus was to go with the recommendation to use the name Dallas Road.

4. OTHER BUSINESS: None provided.

- 5. At 9:14 Alderperson Brownfield motioned to go into executive session; Alderperson Martin seconded for the purpose of 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(1) The appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of specific employees, specific individuals who serve as independent contractors in a park, recreational, or educational setting, or specific volunteers of the public body or legal counsel for the public body, including hearing testimony on a complaint lodged against an employee, a specific individual who serves as an independent contractor in a park, recreational, or educational setting, or a volunteer of the public body or against legal counsel for the public body to determine its validity. However, a meeting to consider an increase in compensation to a specific employee of a public body that is subject to the Local Government Wage Increase Transparency Act may not be closed and shall be open to the public and posted and held in accordance with this Act.

8 Ayes: Adams, Blundy, Brownfield, Butler, Martin, McIntyre, Smith, Stevens

0 Nays:

Motion carried by roll call vote.

- 6. ADJOURNMENT: At 10:16 p.m. Alderperson Brownfield moved to adjourn; Alderperson McIntyre seconded. Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.



Valeri L. Brod, City Clerk

Aug 12, 2024, City of Washington, Illinois - Committee of the Whole

Bob Montgomery, owner of the field adjacent to the Cruger Rec Trail at N. Main St. In full disclosure, we dispute the Cruger Rec trail sloping from the back of the curb to our field for a full half mile.

The afternoon of August 6, 2024, we observed new survey laths with orange ribbons along the north side of Cruger Rd, adjacent to our field.

Earlier that day, we saw a "Millennia" pickup parked in our gravel lane beside our house. Steve Cannon & Austin, from Millennia, had set a transmitter on a tripod near the ditch. We approached them.

Steve stated that the City, a week earlier, had requested laths be placed at regular intervals along Cruger Rd at the property line. He stated they were Surveyors and had the right of entry without notice. He stated, the City claimed Section 11's Monuments were missing or damaged. He stated that they were going to walk the entire north edge of our field to establish the south edge of the Section. This seemed odd.

We know there are no pins or monuments where they intended to walk.

We told Steve that in the fall of 2023 our surveyor did not report any missing monuments along Cruger Rd. Therefore, we asked Millennia to not walk the north edge of our field without Bob present. And, we asked them to allow us time to contact our attorney.

Steve & Austin packed up, and cordially departed.

Later that day, we were pleased to see a surveyor for the City was in fact able to locate and mark Section 11's corner monuments at Cruger & Main. The surveyor marked the full half mile. In the attached photographs, the City's laths have orange ribbons, and our 2023 survey laths have pink ribbons.

In the future, we ask the City and its agents to contact us or our attorney of record prior to entering our farm properties.

Thank you, Bob & Allison Montgomery

Attachments:

- 1) Cruger & N. Main monuments 2 photographs
- 2) Washington Township 2018 plat map with section 11 highlighted.

August 12, 2024 Washington Historical Society Comments to Washington City Council regarding Grist Mill Restaurant Project

Good evening Mayor Manier and Councilmembers. Thank you for the opportunity to speak this evening. My name is Melissa Heil and I am the Executive Director of the Washington Historical Society. I am here to address our item on the agenda requesting reimbursement for some of our expenses related to the restaurant project that is next door our building. First, I'd like to say that I had a helpful conversation with Mr. Oliphant over the weekend and I'm sure not everyone would call me on a Friday evening. I certainly appreciate that. I believe that in his comments later he will address a couple of the issues that we discussed regarding his staff memo. I will leave those items to Jon to address later.

For my part, I would like to remind the Council that we have had many, many meetings and conversations with the mayor and city staff about what avenue we should utilize to protect our building and our organization, and in which we have continuously asked how we can get reimbursed for expenses we have incurred due to the project next door our building. Some of those conversations have ended with us being told a general, "it will all be fine; we're sure you will be made whole." Other conversations have ended with staff or elected officials basically washing their hands of the issue and telling us to take it up with the developer. At no point were we ever advised to submit our invoices to the City for consideration. That changed in the last month, and we are grateful for the opportunity to be here today requesting reimbursement for some of our expenses.

In our effort to finally move this along, we recently proposed to the City that we break down our expenses into three categories: 1. those that we incurred to fix damage caused by the negligence of the contractor next door and which should be reimbursed by the developer; 2. Those that we incurred to protect ourselves and that we will pay ourselves; 3. those expenses that we incurred to accommodate a two-story building that was allowed to be built next door. We believe those expenses should be paid by the City. Those are the expenses that we have submitted to you: the cost to seal up our rear windows and the cost to move utilities and gutters that extended off our building.

Jon asserted in his memo that these are not typical "TIF expenditures." We 100% agree. They are also not projects that we wanted to do. We liked our rear windows and frankly we miss the natural light that they provided. We certainly did not want to mess with our beautiful 125+ year old historic building to move gutters and utilities. Frankly, we believe the City should have anticipated those needs before approving the two-story building next door. Municipalities have a statutory responsibility to anticipate how proposed development projects will affect neighbors and then to mitigate or eliminate those possible negative impacts before approving any new development. That was not done in this case. I would also remind the council that throughout the planning of this project, both in public meetings for which minutes exist and in private meetings with city staff and council, the Historical Society raised concerns about how this new building would affect our historic building. We asked the City for help in protecting our building. We asked repeatedly to see the building plans so that we could see for ourselves how this project would affect our building, and we were always told that we could not see their building plans. So, we were forced to rely on the City to fulfill its obligation to protect neighboring properties. That did not happen.

In sum, we have already divided our expenses and have submitted to the City only those costs that we incurred as a direct result of the developer being allowed to build a two-story building right next to our building. Those costs total \$27,275.90. We are seeking 100% reimbursement of those costs to be paid by the City.

Thank you for your time. I'm happy to address any questions you have for me regarding our request.