

**JOURNAL OF THE PROCEEDINGS  
OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF PARK RIDGE, ILLINOIS  
AT 505 BUTLER PLACE, PARK RIDGE, ILLINOIS  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
April 2, 2007  
CALLED TO ORDER BY Mayor Howard P. Frimark  
at 7:30 p.m.**

The following indicated their presence at the meeting on roll call vote:

Ald. Crampton, Machon, DiPietro, Markech, Bateman, Jones, Radermacher, Allegretti, Baldi, Anderson, Ryan, Parker, Wsol, Cox and Mayor Frimark.

A quorum was present.

The City Council and guests pledged allegiance to the flag.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES** (March 19, 2007)

Mayor Frimark requested approval of the minutes from the regular City Council Meeting held March 19, 2007.

Moved by Ald. DiPietro. Seconded by Ald. Allegretti.

**On voice vote, the motion passed.**

**CONSENT AGENDA** (Motions included in the consent agenda are discussed in the body of these minutes)

Mayor Frimark read the consent agenda items into the record.

- Proclamation – Sexual Assault Awareness Month
- Approve warrants, reviewed by Ald. Crampton, for the period ending March 30, 2007 in the amount of \$1,681,715.73

Ald. Markech requested the Sexual Assault Awareness Proclamation be removed from the consent agenda and read into the record.

Moved by Ald. DiPietro. Seconded by Ald. Cox.

On Roll Call Vote:

AYES: Ald. Baldi, Anderson, Ryan, Parker, Wsol, Cox, Crampton, Machon,  
DiPietro, Markech, Bateman, Jones, Radermacher and Allegretti

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

**The motion carried with 14 favorable votes.**

**MAYOR**

Mayor Frimark read the Proclamation regarding Sexual Assault Awareness, which explained many different kinds of assaults, that anyone can be a victim of sexual assault and what the community can do, as a whole, to prevent sexual assault and how to help those who have become a victim. Mayor Frimark urged all citizens to commit to taking action against rape and sexual assault.

**PUBLIC SAFETY – Ald. Anderson** (Action Plan for New Police Facility: 1. After thoroughly analyzing the economic impact and redevelopment opportunities of proposed building locations in Target Area 4, staff shall be directed to commence the process of acquiring the necessary adjacent properties at a cost, which is fair to the City and to the current owners, and to pursue all appropriate avenues to effect such acquisitions. Upon securing the necessary properties, staff shall sell the Courtland property and apply the proceeds toward financing of the new construction of a facility on the selected location. 2. Staff shall be directed to commence an RFP process to identify and select a qualified architect/construction consultant to design the new police facility, and to oversee construction and related efforts. The firms invited to participate shall include the “finalists” from last year’s Police Facility Needs Analysis competition. 3. An aesthetically pleasing and efficiently functioning facility shall be designed and constructed. The facility shall consist of approximately 37,000 square feet of “people” space and approximately 12,000 square feet of secured vehicle parking, and shall be otherwise generally consistent with the recommendations set forth in the SRBL findings. Where economically feasible, “green” technology shall be incorporated. The committee understands that these sizes may be revised and the numbers are not meant to be final figures. 4. Costs are to be held to the minimum necessary to provide for a facility consistent with paragraph 3 above. Financing shall be provided primarily through proceeds of a bond issuance structured to result in zero upward change in the ongoing cost to taxpayers (or if possible, a lower payment stream than currently in place for the 1998 Public Works Service Center/alley bonds). 5. Facility Completion shall be targeted for calendar 2008 / Approve a Resolution Declaring the City’s Official Intent to Reimburse Certain Capital Expenditures from the Proceeds of Future Debt Issues)

Ald. Anderson moved approval of the 5-point action plan for the new Police Facility:

1. After thoroughly analyzing the economic impact and redevelopment opportunities of proposed building locations in Target Area 4, staff shall be directed to commence the process of acquiring the necessary adjacent properties at a cost, which is fair to the City and to the current owners, and to pursue all appropriate avenues to effect such acquisitions. Upon securing the necessary properties, staff shall sell the Courtland property and apply the proceeds toward financing of the new construction of a facility on the selected location.
2. Staff shall be directed to commence an RFP process to identify and select a qualified architect/construction consultant to design the new police facility, and to oversee construction and related efforts. The firms invited to participate shall include the “finalists” from last year’s Police Facility Needs Analysis competition.
3. An aesthetically pleasing and efficiently functioning facility shall be designed and constructed. The facility shall consist of approximately 37,000 square feet of “people” space and approximately 12,000 square feet of secured vehicle parking, and shall be otherwise generally consistent with the recommendations set forth in the SRBL findings. Where economically feasible, “green” technology shall be incorporated. The committee understands that these sizes may be revised and the numbers are not meant to be final figures.
4. Costs are to be held to the minimum necessary to provide for a facility consistent with paragraph 3 above. Financing shall be provided primarily through proceeds of a bond issuance structured to result in zero upward change in the ongoing cost to taxpayers (or if possible, a lower payment stream than currently in place for the 1998 Public Works Service Center/alley bonds).
5. Facility Completion shall be targeted for calendar 2008.

Seconded by Ald. Baldi

In summary, Ald. Anderson indicated the Public Safety Committee approved the plan with a 5-1 vote. A new police facility is needed to keep the community safer, protect the taxpayer from liability lawsuits, and provide our police department with a proper facility needed to do their job. According to Ald. Anderson, the proposed facility would be of appropriate size (37,000 feet) to direct the community's needs.

Commander Jogmen displayed a site plan for the proposed Police Department on the projection screen.

Ald. Parker referred to Section 3: He offered an amendment to include a parking facility for commuters, shopping and business employees.

Ald. Parker's amendment did not receive a second.

Clerk Henneman read an email received from Stuart Rifkind who was unable to attend the meeting. He believes the current facility is too crowded for optimal functioning. It is undetermined how many employees have left due to this reason. There is no room to expand for technical equipment. The facility needs the ability to install high tech interoperable communication equipment and have a well-equipped Emergency Operations Center.

All written comments (below) pertaining to this discussion have been made a part of the minutes.

#### **Letters Submitted Regarding Police Station**

Dear Mayor Frimark and City of Park Ridge Aldermen:

Unfortunately I cannot be attendance tonight to speak on behalf of the proposal to build a new police station, so I am providing this statement to be read into the record at the proceedings this evening. I believe that the existing facilities are far too crowded to allow for the optimal functioning of our police department. The inefficiencies of the cramped and inadequate quarters must be resolved. Also, the PD must have the ability to hire and keep the highest quality staff. We have no way of knowing how many of our officers leave because of the frustrations and challenges they encounter daily in the present location. The existing station has no room for new equipment, and/or technological expansion. Among the more important upgrades the City must have is the ability to install high tech interoperable communications equipment, and a fully functional and well equipped Emergency Operations Center (EOC) of sufficient size to plan for and respond to any event be it natural, technological or manmade. Improvements such as these cannot be retrofit into the current station. Progress is never inexpensive. We must continue moving forward in order to have a "state of the art" police headquarters. I would be happy to discuss these opinions in further detail if you contact me directly.

Thank you, **Stuart A. Rifkind**

---

As most of you know from the news, I lost my husband a few months ago in a shooting incident that took place out in front of our home. Our family now grieves the loss of our father, soul mate, brother and friend. I wanted to take this opportunity to express in writing my deepest appreciation for the hard work and professionalism of our Park Ridge police department. I have witnessed first hand their dedication, commitment to justice, and compassion for their fellow man. I cannot tell you how much it comforts me to know that such a fine bunch of individuals are working to solve the crime that was committed against my husband and our family. Unfortunately, the fine work of the Park Ridge police department is hampered by their poor working conditions. During my time at the police station, I have been disheartened to see the facility the police department occupies in the basement of City Hall. Their office space is cramped with low ceilings and stuffy rooms. They have insufficient space for interrogations, and some of our discussions had to be conducted in meeting rooms at City Hall. The MCA T taskforce was brought in to help with our case but could not be accommodated at the Police Department, so the Public Works facility was used to house the extra manpower required. During one of my visits to the police department, I noticed that one of the investigation rooms was so small that the door would not open without hitting the light fixture. The rooms are hot and cramped, and although interrogations are- , not meant to be pleasant, they are nearly unbearable for both the police as well as those

being questioned. Officers are crammed into shared office space with little room to maneuver. Certain areas of the police facility were inaccessible to us because of insufficient space to house prisoners, and this made it difficult to maneuver through the facility. While the officers continue to do an excellent job and make the most of their limited quarters, overall I was appalled at the conditions in which these officers must work every day. In modern society, where technology plays an important role in helping police solve crimes, our officers deserve a clean, modern facility in which to do their important work.

As Park Ridge residents consider the need for a new police facility, I hope they will investigate thoroughly the current conditions of the police department before arriving at a conclusion. I write this letter, not to take sides in a political debate, but to share my personal experiences with those of you who have not had the misfortune of needing the police department's services as I have. I hope none of you will ever know the sorrow of losing a loved one in such a tragic way. But, rest assured that if you do need their help, you will find yourselves in the presence of an outstanding group of law enforcement professionals who give their best every day on behalf of our citizens. I am deeply grateful for all they do and support wholeheartedly their need for better working conditions in which to maintain the security and safety of our wonderful community.

Sincerely,  
**Cathy Dhamer**

---

#### **Statement to City Council - The Rotarian Four-Way Test**

Rotary International was founded in Chicago in 1905 as a business organization. It adopted the motto "Service above self" and, in 1943 it adopted a code of ethics called the "Four Way Test" which was formulated 11 years earlier by a Park Ridge resident: Herbert J. Taylor. The Four-Way Test of decision-making and conduct has been translated into more than a hundred languages and published in thousands of ways. It asks the following four questions:

1. **Is it the TRUTH?**
2. **Is it FAIR to all concerned?**
3. **Will it build GOODWILL and BETTER FRIENDSHIPS?**
4. **Will it be BENEFICIAL to all concerned?"**

I am not a Rotarian. But our mayor is, and so I thought it might be useful to apply the Four Way Test to tonight's resolution that asks this Council to authorize the construction of a new police station.

##### **1. Is it the truth?**

Park Ridge has spent \$55,500, collectively, on two consultants. The first one, by a fellow named Moyer, told us in 2001 that we supposedly "NEED" between 40K-46K SF. The second one, by Ray Lee of Sente Rubel, told us in 2007 that we supposedly "NEED" between 37K-49K SF. If we take those reports at face value, we "NEED" as little as 37K SF or as much as 49K SF. That's not only a 12K SF difference but also, at the dollar-per-square-foot values these consultants have given us, it is about a \$3 Million difference.

Which figure is "the Truth"?

Three years later, in 2004, with the 2001 Moyer report already in hand telling us we "NEED" between 40 and 46K SF, the City Council – on the recommendation of Chief Caudill and City Mgr. Schuenke – voted to buy the 15K SF building at 515 Busse Hwy for a new police station. Before the deal could be done, however, it was abandoned because of an alleged breach of realtors ethics by the listing broker that our City Attorney believed "bordered on fraud." But in the City's formal written complaint to the Illinois Dept. of Banks and Real Estate about the broker, our City Attorney wrote that City Manager Schuenke believed that the 15K SF property (approx. 1/3 the size of the Moyer recommendation) was "ideal" for the City's purposes.<sup>[1]</sup>

Was *that* "the Truth"?

Two years later, in May 2006, our City Staff stated that some kind of "adjusted summary" indicated that the Police Dept. "NEEDED" 43,699 SF.

Is *that* figure "the Truth"?

And just one week ago, Mayor Frimark wrote a memo to me in which he insists, repeatedly, that our Police Department – despite the current 9K SF facility and "atrocious conditions"- is 'GETTING THE JOB DONE" by "working harder and smarter."

Is *that* "the Truth"?

So how much space do we really NEED? Whether it's the Mayor insisting that our Police are getting the job done from a 9K SF facility in admittedly bad condition, or whether it's the Council voting only 3 years ago to buy a 15K SF building across from the Public Works Center, or whether it's the hired-gun consultants telling us we "NEED" 5 TIMES the current space, the one thing that is clear to me is that NOBODY in this room tonight – if they are being truly honest with themselves and with the taxpayers of this community – KNOWS with reasonable certainty what "the Truth" is about just how much space our police need to effectively serve and protect our community.

The only "Truth" that seems to be undisputed is that the **condition** of the current station is unacceptable. And THAT'S the main problem that this Council should have been addressing years ago.

## **2. Is it fair to all concerned?**

For years our police officers have been left waiting for improvement in their working conditions, and that is certainly **not** a "FAIR" way to be treating them. They have had to endure cramped and deplorable conditions – including reports of insects and rodents throughout the facility - for far too long. Everybody that has sat on this Council for the past decade should be embarrassed about that situation.

But it is also not "FAIR" for our elected officials – whether out of guilt or shame from ignoring these unacceptable working conditions for so long – to now impose on the taxpayers of Park Ridge an irresponsible, knee-jerk multi-million dollar space "solution" to what appears to be primarily a "conditions" problem.

How is it "FAIR" to those taxpayers to increase their long-term bonded debt by as much as 50% - from the current \$50 Million to as much as \$75 Million? How is it "FAIR" to saddle them with as much as \$14 Million in additional interest payments when debt service already represents almost 10% of our total annual expenses, and consumes almost 10% of our total annual revenues?

How is it "FAIR" to continue to put off the completion of our relief sewer project when people's basements keep flooding? Or to delay and defer street paving, curb and sidewalk repairs, alley paving, and all the other infrastructure maintenance which residents of first-class communities deserve? Or to continue to raise fees for sewer, water, ambulance service, garbage pick-up, and all the other services a first-class community should provide?

And how is it "FAIR" to our police officers if we OVERBORROW AND OVERSPEND on mere bricks and mortar when just the interest payments alone could make a substantial improvement in the lives of those officers through better training, better equipment, tuition reimbursements, and better pay. Not only would that be more "FAIR" to our officers, but it would also result in a substantial benefit – directly and indirectly – to our residents and taxpayers.

## **3. Will it build goodwill and better friendships?**

Unscrupulous "politicians" often try to buy the goodwill of the people with the smoke-and-mirrors trick of providing amenities without raising taxes. Of course, all that does is conceal the cost from the taxpayers and delay the day of reckoning, usually until after the unscrupulous politicians leave office. As noted by Chris Edwards, writing for the conservative CATO INSTITUTE:

"In practice, when politicians are given the power to issue debt, they have an incentive to issue far too much because it allows spending without the political constraint of having to tax current voters...High levels of debt make government finances less transparent to citizens. Ultimately, debt financing is more costly to taxpayers than pay-as-you-go financing."

In my opinion, that's the kind of "goodwill" that the people of Park Ridge would be far better off without.

On the other hand, we do not build goodwill with our police officers, especially the rank and file, when we respond to their legitimate complaints about the conditions of the current facility with a shiny new over-sized structure that for the next 20 years will consume those financial resources that could better be used for better training, better equipment, better pay and better benefits for those officers.

That's the kind of "goodwill" that I suspect our police would really appreciate.

#### **4. Will it be beneficial to all concerned?**

Under-trained, under-equipped and under-paid police officers are likely to feel under-appreciated, and rightly so. Properly trained, equipped, and compensated police officers are not only happier police officers, but they are better able to serve our community. That is truly a benefit for all concerned.

A big and expensive pile of brick and mortar with a shiny plaque may be a superficial benefit for a mayor and a handful of aldermen, but it will be a long-term financial drain and detriment to both the police and to the taxpayers. It is fiscally irresponsible because it consumes financial resources in substantial disproportion to the benefits provided; and it fails the "beneficial to all concerned" test because it is likely to eventually pit taxpayers looking for tax relief against police officers looking for compensation and benefits.

#### **Conclusion:**

Make no mistake about it: Our police deserve a better police station than what they currently have. But being "better" doesn't mean it has to be 5X bigger, or that we have to commit to \$35 Million (when you figure in the land costs and debt service) for a 40-50K SQ. FT. building – especially when just 3 years ago we were THIS CLOSE to buying a 15K SQ FT. building for a little more than \$1 Million; and especially when just one week ago Mayor Frimark was insisting that our police were "getting the job done" in the current 9K SQ. FT. station by "working harder and smarter."

The equation is simple: The more we spend on a police station, the less we'll be able to spend on the police themselves. The big expensive proposal embodied in this resolution is the equivalent of shooting a sparrow with an elephant gun. It's a waste of the taxpayers' money and, in the long run, it will hurt the police themselves. There are a number of better ways to improve this situation, and it's time we stopped taking the lazy, wasteful approach of simply blowing a bundle of money on a big new building.

That's why I will be voting "No."

Submitted by Ald. Markech

---

#### ***Statement of Mary Wynn Ryan at City Council Meeting 4-2-07 (Public Safety Committee, Police Facility Action Plan)***

For at least the past year, as a member of the Public Safety committee, I have been involved in most of the committee's discussions about the police facility and have attended most of the presentations on proposed solutions. I also served with Chairman Anderson on an ad hoc subcommittee to essentially keep an eye on the process Sente Rubel used to develop the currently proposed rough plan.

Regrettably, I saw and heard nothing that made me able to endorse a police facility totaling 49,000 square feet (37,000 in "people" space and 12,000 in secured parking) and costing in the neighborhood of \$19 million (plus interest of \$11 million) to be used by a total of 80 employees and a handful of residents over two shifts.

I'd like to point out once again that this is a City with a median household income of only \$73,154 and an average household income of only \$87,795.

This is a City that, a little while ago, was considering cutting \$11,000 from our contribution to local charities. This is a City that repairs streets and alleys at a snail's pace and trim trees every 20 years despite residents' pleas, because we simply can't afford to do what needs to be done.

This is not a City that can afford to build a police facility of the scope and cost being proposed, regardless of what Niles or any other suburb with a huge economic engine can afford.

We are told that two experts have come up with a range of 37,000 to 49,000 sq. We are told these are "standards" that cannot be abridged.

No one doubts the need for a sally port, adequate lockers for female officers, soundproof interrogation rooms, etc.

But we are told that even with 4 other workout rooms in town – 2 at fire stations, 1 at Public Works and one at the Community Center – the new police station "needs" a 400-square-foot workout room.

We are told that, in a building with a conference room that seats 10-12, plus a conference room that seats 20, we still "need" two management offices that include 4-person conference areas.

And then, we are supposed to feel ashamed for quibbling about such small amounts of space.

But if we take Sente Rubel's word for it that construction will cost at least \$250 a square foot, we have 400 square feet x \$250 = \$100,000,

Multiply that across the whole project, and, as Senator Everett Dirksen famously said, "A million here, a million there, and pretty soon you're talking about some real money."

But make no mistake: We seriously need a bigger, better police facility. So I am proposing an amendment to the existing proposal, consisting of two simple changes:

**In a., Action Plan for New Police Facility Item 3 should read, in its entirety, "An aesthetically pleasing and efficiently functioning facility should be designed and constructed. The facility shall consist of approximately 28,000 square feet, inclusive of both "people" space and police vehicle parking."** As a side note, there should be separate consideration of parking for commuters, shoppers, etc., pursuant to the Master Plan. This parking, although not the police parking, would be TIF-eligible.

**In b., Resolution to Reimburse Capital Expenditures, etc., the maximum principal amount of debt should be changed from "\$19,000,000" to "\$10,000,000."**

If the Council accepts these amendments, we will be much more able to provide enhanced compensation, benefits, training and equipment that matter most to our police force. If we follow the original plan and bond for \$19 million, we will be binding the City to a total of nearly \$30 million in principal and interest, and other police needs as well as many more resident needs will be deferred indefinitely. **Instead, I ask my fellow Council members to vote for a total of 28,000 square feet and a maximum principal debt amount of \$10,000,000. This is a win-win proposition we can get started on immediately.**

###

---

Ald. Ryan's amendment did not receive a second.

---

As councilmen, it is our job to balance our city's resources with its needs.

Among other things, our city needs improved streets, alleys, sewers, communications facilities for the 21<sup>st</sup> century, aggressive forestation management, and enlightened strategic property redevelopment...all of which, sooner or later, are going to cost real money. This and former

councils have not taken on these expenditures because they have feared the negative reaction of voters to the property tax increases that would have been necessary to fund them.

Why is it, then, that so many are so quick to approve a commitment of over \$1.5 million per year for the next 20-25 years to build a new and elaborate police station? In my view, the key factor is because the bonded debt service of \$1.6million/year needed to build it just happens to be virtually identical to the \$1.6 million annual debt service obligation that the city incurred in 1998 to build the public works service center. Surprise of surprises, that service center obligation will be ending just about the time that the bonds for this new police station will be kicking in. If they were here, I wonder how the members of the 1998 council would rationalize their 10 year commitment morphing into one that will last for 30-35 year years. More to the point, I wonder how the taxpayers of this community will feel if and when they find out about it.

I'd be more open to participating in this fiscal sleight-of-hand despite the fact that it will benefit, basically, only members of our police force and not the community at large -- as would alternatively be the case if we were to aggressively attack our infrastructure backlog -- if to build this proposed station were necessary to achieve the level of security and police protection that the community needed, but did not now possess.

But, of course, we do possess it. Despite the known limitations of the city's present police facility, ours is a safe, secure and desirable community because policemen (and other civil servants) find Park Ridge a good place to work, because they are committed and take their jobs seriously, because they are fairly compensated and otherwise supported and because they function without political interference -- and the numbers don't lie. Park Ridge has a very low crime rate generally and that is especially true of violent crime. There has never been a representation by any supporter that building this facility will reduce crime. Not a surprise. It is already about as low as it can go.

To help keep it that way, in recent years Park Ridge has proactively invested in police manpower and support services to be vigilant in protecting our citizens, especially the young, from the criminal behavior associated with illegal drugs.

Park Ridge is known to have one of the most aggressive traffic enforcement policies of any community in our entire region. Per capita, Park Ridge issues as many or more tickets and obtains as many or more convictions as any comparable community.

For every police officer vacancy that arises through voluntary termination of service, disciplinary action or retirement, literally hundreds of qualified candidates apply for that vacancy. To my knowledge, Park Ridge city councils have never declined to fund appropriate departmental requests for personnel training, equipment or technology improvements. I don't see that support dwindling in the future.

We need to recognize and accept that virtually none of these key indicators will be either negatively or positively affected by building the proposed facility. It is the quality of the personnel, not the bricks and mortar, along with the character of the community generally, that make the difference. So far as I can tell, once they get beyond square footage standards that the consultants recommend, the station's proponents rationalize the project as being a kind of comprehensive insurance policy...that if we build it we'll prevent bad things from happening in the future, e.g. our police personnel will be better marksmen and in better physical shape or that liability and/or property insurance claims will be more easily defended. As to the first point, while inconvenient to the men and women of the force, shooting and fitness alternatives are available nearby and at little or no cost to the individual officer, the department or the city. Also, the present conditions were not unknown to the folks that have in the past and now populate the police department at the time that they applied for, were offered and accepted employment, nor will they be unknown to those who join the force in the future. As to the second, the continuing training and equipment the department has always and will continue to provide are the principal bars to future on-site accidents that could occur, could give rise to lawsuits and could create damage awards against the city. I acknowledge bad things could happen... just as they could even if this facility were to be built. These arguments are shallow and demagogic. No one can predict the future, not me, not even the supporters of this new facility.

We simply don't need and I will not support building a police station, the projected \$19million price of which is very high, may go higher and offers essentially no tangible benefits to the people who pay the bills, especially in light of the fact that the funds which are earmarked for it should go



either to the pressing infrastructure needs of the city, returned to the pockets of our increasingly hard pressed property owners or some combination of the two.

But, none of these facts can mask the city's failure to maintain and adapt the existing facility to the growth in the department over the past 10-15 years, during which time the city's expectations for police productivity have increased along with its expenditures for support, training, technology and the like. Some things need to happen. Our city hall facility must comply with both evidence retention requirements and acceptable and equivalent locker room standards for both female and male personnel, must upgrade prisoner/witness holding and interview facilities, must add a functional sallyport.

The city needs to pay for these things and can do them now for a small fraction of the cost of this proposed facility. This outcome can be achieved through relocating police department administrative and management functions to other areas of city hall and relocating displaced departments to other city properties, especially the PWSC.

If, down the road and for whatever reason, these changes prove insufficient, if it turns out that Park Ridge needs a new station to maintain an acceptable level of safety and security for its citizens, it can always build a new police station. It can't unbuild one that it doesn't need. Oh, by the way, these changes will be disruptive. I seriously doubt, however, they will cause something north of \$15 million worth of disruption.

Some, with our mayor, may call such an approach "scrimping." I call it responsible management of the relatively scarce resources that this city has at its disposal, a responsibility that I believe comes with this office even when it hurts...unless, of course, one is comfortable just telling our citizens that they'll just have to pay more, that they're just going to have to pay big money for things that the police, the consultants and politicians want, but they're going to have to wait just a little bit longer for the things, either improved conditions or money in their pockets, that they have to live without every day.

---

**Submitted by Ald. Crampton**

---

Mayor Frimark indicated Ald. Markech's use of the Rotarian's 4-way test was an insult to Rotarian's worldwide.

Deputy Chief Swoboda, Michael Tinaglia (former Alderman and Chairman for the Public Safety Committee, 161 Michael John Drive), Tony Amelio (Liquor Board Commissioner, 2201 Mary Jane Lane), Paul Adlaf (Heritage Committee, 431 S. Cumberland Ave.), former mayor, Michael MaRous (1027 S. Western Avenue), and Officer Jodi Broderick all spoke in favor of a new police station with the following thoughts: need of obtaining grant money for monetary assistance; lower level facility hasn't changed since 1950 (cramped space; lack of meeting space for community and police professionals; and getting it done and on budget in 2008.

Robert Trizna of 716 N. Merrill is concerned of how the 20 million dollar cost would impact the schools.

Ald. Bateman, Ald. DiPietro, Ald. Radermacher, Ald. Wsol, Ald. Jones, Ald. Allegretti and Ald. Machon all spoke in favor of a new facility with the following comments: would not be ashamed of taking action in the future; passionate about the need for a new station; review of great accomplishments of the City in taking necessary steps forward; unfair to ask police to continue doing their job at the current facility; current facility a potential liability; and the problem has a solution – needs to be acted upon.

Charles Baldacchino indicated it should be the responsibility of the next council to make the decision. He also indicated a monetary amount was missing from the report.

Mayor Frimark indicated a new facility is needed for the residents and children. He promises to move forward on this project after placement of the new council.

On Roll Call Vote:

AYES: Ald. DiPietro, Bateman, Jones, Radermacher, Allegretti, Baldi, Anderson, Parker, Wsol, Cox and Machon

NAYS: Ald. Markech, Ryan and Crampton

ABSENT: None

**The motion carried with 11 favorable votes.**

A 10-minute recess was taken at 10:31 p.m.

The Council reconvened at 10:40 p.m.

Ald. Anderson moved the City Council approve a Resolution declaring the City's official intent to reimburse certain capital expenditures from the proceeds of future debt issues. Seconded by Ald. Wsol.

Charles Baldacchino, 10 N. Summit voiced his concern of the effect this would have on the TIF and other taxing bodies.

On Roll Call Vote:

AYES: Ald. Bateman, Jones, Radermacher, Allegretti, Baldi, Anderson, Parker, Wsol, Cox, Machon and DiPietro

NAYS: Ald. Markech, Ryan and Crampton

ABSENT: None

**The motion carried with 11 favorable votes.**

**PUBLIC WORKS – Ald. Jones, Chairman** (Approval of the Contract for the 2007-2008 Street Program / Approval of the Contract for the 2006-2007 Relief Sewer / Watermain Program / Approval of the 2007-2008 Suburban Tree Consortium Purchase Order / Approval of the Sale by Public Auction of Personal Property Owned by the City of Park Ridge (Ordinance Prep.) / Approval of a Six-Month Extension to Water Meter and Water Supply Contract)

Ald. Jones moved approval of the contract for the 2007-2008 Street Program.

Seconded by Ald. Bateman.

In summary, the project is for rehabilitation of 7.3 miles of roadway. The low bid was \$1,224,080.28 being received from J. A. Johnson Paving of Arlington Heights. The amount budgeted for this project was \$1,277,500.00 (\$740,200 from the Motor Fuel Tax and \$527,300 from the Water Fund).

On Roll Call Vote:

AYES: Ald. Bateman, Jones, Radermacher, Allegretti, Baldi, Anderson, Ryan, Parker, Wsol, Cox, Crampton, Machon, DiPietro and Markech

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

**The motion carried with 14 favorable votes.**

Ald. Jones moved the City Council approve the Contract for the 2006-2007 Relief Sewer / Watermain Program. Seconded by Ald. Cox.