



Report to CLIPP

Agenda Item: CLIPP recommendation report

Meeting Date: August 4, 2025

Referring Body:

Committee Contact: Trustee Charneski

Staff Contact: Pete Wegner

Report Prepared by: Ken Charneski

AGENDA ITEM: CLIPP recommendation report

OBJECTIVE(S): To inform the Committee of the outcomes of previous CLIPP recommendations.

HISTORY/BACKGROUND: A couple of months ago at a Planning Commission meeting, the request was made for staff to report back to PC on the ultimate outcomes of items that PC recommended to the Board. This was intended to give feedback to the Commission as to the effectiveness of their work, and basically out of plain old curiosity on the PC members' part.

I thought that that request was a good idea, and plan on reporting back to CLIPP in the same way and for the same reasons.

At the May meeting, on **Item 6M** we recommended the RFP for garbage collection services as follows from the minutes:

M. "Upcoming Garbage Contract Motion by Leff/Charneski to send RFP to APC with the changes we discussed. (3 and 5 year option with 2 year extension option) Motion carried by voice vote. 5:0. Discussed possible companies, size of garbage bins, changes to RFP, trick pick-up and time options."

Outcome: APC decided against the RFP but instead opted for renewing the contract with Harter's if the new contract would represent a price increase below a certain amount (3% in discussion).

The new contract came to the Board with about a 12% increase, and up to 5% per year increase after that. So the Board moved to send out RFP's.

At the June CLIPP meeting, the committee made two motions to the Village Board. The first was **Item 5H** requested by President Baker to gather information on future road reconstruction and resurfacing for budgeting purposes.

H. Estimated Costs to Maintain Roads at a PASER Rating of 6 or 7.

The minutes have not yet been prepared for the July meeting, but the audio recording has a recommendation to the Board that

They get core samples for Maple Ridge, South, Forest, and Autumn, and if the budget and time allows, move ahead with resurfacing Peplin [road], and once we have the core samples budget accordingly.

This motion passed 5-0.

Outcome: This motion never made it to the Board, but instead someone it replaced with a different item and it was presented to the Board by President Baker like this:

AGENDA ITEM: Core Samples of Maple Ridge Rd.

OBJECTIVE(S): To determine the level of work needed on Maple Ridge Rd

HISTORY/BACKGROUND: Staff had presented CLIPP with a 5-year CIP and Maple Ridge

Rd. is a road of higher priority to be reconstructed. With the long process of doing engineering studies, financing the project, and the design/construction process; staff is seeking core samples to be done on Maple Ridge Rd. The core samples are the beginning aspects of a project to determine the quality of the base material in which the road was constructed on. Pending on the results we will have an accurate price point on the cost of reconstructing the road. With the results of the core samples staff will work with CLIPP of a possible timeline of construction. The cost to have core samples done are \$4,500

The Board moved Forward with this item on Maple Ridge Road, but obviously was not made aware of CLIPP's motion so it took no action on the rest of the roads or resurfacing of Peplin Road.

Due to this change in the item, the original intent of providing the requested information for budgeting for a longer term road maintenance plan has not been accomplished.

At the same meeting we had another item, Item 6 O to discuss beneficial vs dangerous/detrimental effects of injecting fluoride chemicals into the Village's drinking water.

O. Water Fluoridation

The Motion to the Board was to

recommend that the Village discontinue injecting fluoride into the drinking water.

The motion passed 5-0.

Outcome: This item went to the Board for discussion only on July 14, and I included the CLIPP recommendation in the report. Some Board members asked about the cost of taking a survey of water customers.

As an additional note, the question of taking a survey on the fluoride issue had also gone to the **Utility Committee** back in April. They voted unanimously against the survey due to the unreliability of the results, and likelihood of unnecessary drama that it would cause. These aspects were also discussed at the July 14 Village Board meeting

The item came back to the Board for action on July 28, and the Board went ahead voted to approve the plan of sending out survey postcards at a cost not exceed \$2500.

So this issue will not be resolved for several months.

PROPOSAL:

RECOMMENDED ACTION: For information only, no action to be taken.

FINANCIAL

Financial Consideration/Action:

FUNDING SOURCE: N/A

Account Number/Title:	#
Current Adopted Budget:	\$
Spent to Date:	\$
Remaining Budget:	\$
Requested Amount:	\$
Remainder of Budgeted Amount, if approved:	

ATTACHMENTS: