Presentation of Plaque to Don Bean for his years of service to the Police Pension Board
Public Hearing

Ordinance authorizing the Mayor to execute a Pre-Annexation Agreement between the City of Collinsville and Robert Vogt for property located at 6832 Clay School Rd.
### Ordinance authorizing the Mayor to execute a Pre-Annexation Agreement between the City of Collinsville and Robert Vogt for property located at 6832 Clay School Rd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>6832 Clay School Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requested Action:</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan Goal(s):</td>
<td>Goal #1: “Preferred Place to Live”, and Goal #3: “Quality Infrastructure”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Applicant seeks to access City water service and, when available, sanitary sewer**
- **Standard Pre-Annexation Agreement**
  - Allows property owner to utilize City utilities (water & sewer)
  - Will be annexed once contiguous to corporate limits of City
  - Will have “R-1” Single-Family Zoning designation
- **Property is approximately 6,240 ft from Corporate Limits**
- **Ordinance authorizes the Mayor to enter into the agreement**
ANNEXATION PLAT

FOR A TRACT OF LAND IN THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF
SECTION 22, TOWNSHIP 3 NORTH, RANGE 8 WEST OF THE 3rd
PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, MADISON COUNTY, ILLINOIS

CLAY SCHOOL ROAD

ACADEMY ROAD

ROBERT VOOT
DOCS # 206761059

MILLER LIVING TRUST
DOCS # 201767742

DAVID & GEORGIA
WILDE
DOCS # 200007556

RANDY & LINDA
JEANNADS
DOCS # 200175869

LEGEND

EXISTING CORPORATE LIMITS LINE

SCALE: 1" = 1/20"
Residential Neighborhood Revitalization Program
What the Occupancy Permit Program is NOT...

1. Not a way to randomly inspect every residential property whenever there is an urge.
2. Not a way to make money.
3. Not a way to track what individuals live where.
4. Not a way to make all property building code compliant.
5. Not a way to negatively impact the home sale process.
6. Not a way to “not do” code enforcement.
OccuPancy Permit Program Questions

1. “Why do we need a program for both Owner Occupied and Rental properties?” - OR – “Can’t we just do rental occupancy?” – OR – “Most communities have an Occupancy Permit program for just rental properties.”

2. “Code Enforcement doesn’t work so why are we doing something new?”

3. “Do a better job at Code Enforcement and we don’t need an Occupancy Permit Program!”

4. “The City will have to hire a lot of new employees for this program.”

5. “What certifications will the City inspectors have?”

6. “The City is going to have to hire a lot of employees for this program.”

7. “The checklist is not picky and occupancy will be held up for minor code enforcement violations.”

8. “The “As-Is” provisions will put a screeching halt to home sales.”

9. “Realtors should be allowed to use a private home inspector for the Occupancy Permit inspection.”

10. “Why did the City switch from the 2012 ICC to the 2015 ICC after the April 23rd meeting?”
Why have Occupancy for all Residential and not just Rental?

1. Both categories of residential property have problems equally.
2. Owner occupied needs to be safe just like rental.
   • Just because a person can only afford a certain price for a home does not mean it should not be safe.
3. Just because a person can only afford a certain house the need for a safe living environment is not removed.
   • Is it ok for someone to live in an unsafe environment?
4. A number of problem properties are owner occupied and this is one opportunity to be proactive and ensure basic safety.
5. Including both rental and owner occupied is the most fair approach.
6. The majority of input from the community is focused on the need to address both owner occupied and rental. There are exceptions to this but most residents have expressed the need for both owner occupied and rental in the program.
What types of programs do other City’s have?

1. Illinois & Missouri municipalities
2. What type of program do they have?
   - Rental
   - Owner Occupied
3. Do they allow a private inspector to inspect rather than the City inspector?
Illinois Municipalities

No Program
Collinsville
Maryville

Rental Only
Edwardsville
Glen Carbon
Troy

Full Program
Alton
Belleville
Bethalto
Cahokia
Caseyville
Centreville
Columbia
Dupo
East Alton
East St. Louis
Fairmont City
Fairview Heights
Godfrey
Granite City
Highland
Mascoutah
New Baden
O’Fallon
Pontoon Beach
Shiloh
Swansea
Wood River

No municipality allows a private inspection in lieu of, or as a supplement to, the City inspection.
# Missouri Municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Program</th>
<th>Rental Only</th>
<th>Full Program</th>
<th>Maplewood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>Bellerive</td>
<td>Ballwin</td>
<td>Maryland Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkson Valley</td>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>Bella-Villa</td>
<td>Moline Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Peres</td>
<td>Country Club Hills</td>
<td>Bellefontaine Neighbors</td>
<td>North Woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenton</td>
<td>Crestwood</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Olivette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flordell Hills</td>
<td>Creve Coeur</td>
<td>Black Jack</td>
<td>Overland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontenac</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>Pine Lawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntleigh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bridgeton</td>
<td>Richmond Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charlack</td>
<td>Rock Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town &amp; Country</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dellwood</td>
<td>Saint Ann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildwood</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edmundson</td>
<td>Saint John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ellisville</td>
<td>Shrewsbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td>Sunset Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Florissant</td>
<td>University City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>Valley Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Green Park</td>
<td>Vinita Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hazelwood</td>
<td>Warson Woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>Webster Groves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kinlock</td>
<td>Winchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kirkwood</td>
<td>Woodson Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lakeshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No municipality allows a private inspection in lieu of, or as a supplement to, the City inspection.**
“As Is” Clarification

1. Allows the “seller” to put the inspection and responsibilities onto the “buyer” (provided both parties are in agreement).
2. Not a technical “As Is” that conveys inferior product or problems.
3. Added as an instrument to facilitate home sales.
4. Also allows a seller to not be required to go through the process of making repairs:
   • Think Grandma or Grandpa selling the family home.
5. Used in O’Fallon without issues and without complication.
The current Code Enforcement process doesn’t work so why are we doing something new?

1. What happens for a typical code violation (follow the process from start to finish).
2. There is not a code enforcement fairy godmother that waives her magic wand and makes violations disappear.
3. What is working?
4. What is not working and why?
5. What changes will be made/recommended?
6. How will the changes coupled with the occupancy permit program reduce the proliferation of code violations?
EXAMPLE VIOLATIONS

- Building, garage, deck, shed or fence leaning/disrepair
- Exposed wiring, damaged light fixtures, etc.
- Swimming pool hazards, sanitation, secure
- Excessive accumulation of rubbish or garbage
- Excessive accumulation of stagnant water
- Sidewalks, walkways, driveways in disrepair
- Weeds and grass in excess of 8”
- Insect/rodent infestation
- Inoperative/unlicensed/disassembled motor vehicles
- Exterior surfaces disrepair or marked with graffiti
- Trailer, RV, boat parking
- Unpermitted construction/remodeling, signage, etc.
THE ENFORCEMENT PROCESS

• Complaint Received (via telephone hotline, website, email, walk-up, etc.)
• Inspector visits site to assess the complaint
  – Typically within 0-3 days of receipt (dependent upon assessed hazard level)
  – If a violation is verified
    • Door hanger left (5 day courtesy notice) and/or
    • Letter sent providing the *legally-required* amount of time to remedy the situation with a court appearance date
• Municipal or County court
  – If the responsible party appears
    • Court may dismiss, issue a fine, *or grant additional time to address the problem*
  – If the responsible party does not appear
    • Judge/Hearing Officer typically continues the case for up to 30 days
    • No appearance at the continued date - a fine is typically imposed and notice is sent
  – Proceedings can continue for *several* months
  – Enforcement of Court finding (e.g. Fines, liens, etc.)
COMPLIANCE TODAY

• **Voluntarily Compliance**
  – National average: 88% of all resolved cases
  – Collinsville average: 88% of all resolved cases
  – National average: 39 days to compliance
  – Collinsville average: 43 days to compliance

• **Forced Compliance**
  – National average: 12% of all resolved cases
  – Collinsville: 12% of all resolved cases
  – National average: 169 Days to Compliance
  – Collinsville: 92 Average Days to Compliance

*Based on 2018 Year-to-date Collinsville figures and ICMA Center for Performance Measurement Research*

*National averages for the percentage of cases resolved voluntarily vs. forced for cities with 25,000 - 49,000 people*

*National averages for the days to compliance for all cities surveyed*
WE CAN DO BETTER

• Goal: More timely follow-up
  – Action: Improve Case Tracking
    • Centralize intake/dispatch
      – Centralized intake establishes case files for tracking
      – More consistent record-keeping
      – More efficient distribution of requests for service
    • Make better use of existing or invest in improved software
      – Electronic “tickler” reminder system

• Goal: Speedier Adjudication Process
  – Action: Update City Codes and Procedures
    • Implement revised procedures for “Home Rule Units”
    • Implement Illinois “Local Debt Recovery Program”
CITY CODE UPDATES

• **Current: Municipal Court as allowed for all Municipalities**
  – 30 (min) – 45 (max) days from notice to hearing date
  – Continuances are commonplace

• **Proposed: Municipal Court as allowed for “Home Rule” Municipalities**
  – 15 (min) days from notice to hearing date
  – Continuances may be constrained

• **Current: Unpaid fines or unresponsive offenders**
  – City has limited authority to enforce fines or punishment
    • Debt collection through liens (“Zero interest loan” until home sells)
  – Case can be dismissed and re-filed in County Court

• **Proposed: Unpaid fines or unresponsive offenders**
  – City adds additional enforcement mechanisms
    • Local Debt Recovery Program (State Comptroller may garnish state income tax returns, lottery winnings, wages, etc.)
    • Debt collection through liens (“Zero interest loan” until home sells)
  – Case can be dismissed and re-filed in County Court
2017-2018 ADOPTED STRATEGIES

• Staffing
  – Added one full-time Building Code/Property Maintenance Inspector
  – In process of filling existing part-time Property Maintenance Inspector vacancies (replace Kroder and fill vacant position)

• Community Compliance Patrol
  – Daily survey of key corridors for observable violations
    • Main, Clay, St. Louis/Collinsville, Bluff, Vandalia/Morrison, Beltline, Keebler

• Renewed focus on resolving “open cases”

• Rotate staff to different areas/cases to get “fresh eyes”

• Improved communication
  – Call-backs when requested*
  – General reminders via social Media, digital sign, City Scoop, etc.

• Code audit and update

• Continued procedural improvements based on diagnostic monitoring and evaluation

*Be advised: All information provided to the City is subject to Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests
POTENTIAL FUTURE STRATEGIES

• Community Clean-Up Day(s)
  – Annual or semi-annual beautification events (e.g. “Spring Cleaning”)
  – City assistance with disposal (e.g. rollaway dumpsters)
  – Neighbors helping neighbors
  – Community institutions (e.g. scout troops, churches, service organizations, etc.)

• Community Incentives
  – Prize raffle when the community has reached a particular clean-up goal
  – Neighborhood beautification grants (e.g. landscaping, signage, etc.)

• Individual Incentives
  – Fee rebates for new property owners who come into compliance within a specific timeframe after purchasing a property
  – Public recognition for major transformations

• Assistance Programs
  – Public-private partnership to help those in need
  – Forgivable loan programs (e.g. CDBG, façade improvement, etc.)

• Financial Disincentives
  – Vacant property registration program (e.g. Fees increasing over time)
1. Need a combination of proactive (inspection programs) and reactive (reported and observed violations) strategies to ensure property maintenance.

2. Code Enforcement alone is proven to not work – Collinsville is proof of that.

3. The City is so large that the Code Enforcement staff would need to be dramatically increased with little increase in effectiveness.

4. Code Enforcement will not facilitate that homes (owner occupied or rental) are safe for the inhabitants.
# Occupancy Inspection Checklist

The items highlighted below in red are the primary Life Safety Items checked during occupancy inspections and owners will be expected to address any issues identified. Individually, the remaining items found on the checklist will not prohibit occupancy; however, the additive effect of particular combinations of such violations could potentially impact occupancy. (C=Compliant, NC=Non-Compliant)

## Property Address: ________________________________

## Owner Name: ________________________________

## Owner Phone: ________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Occupancy Safety Items</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>NC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>304.1.1</td>
<td>Foundation/Structural/Unsafe Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304.10</td>
<td>Stairs &amp; Porches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304.12</td>
<td>Handrails &amp; Guardrails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304.13.2</td>
<td>Openable Windows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604.3</td>
<td>Electrical Systems Hazards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605.2</td>
<td>Receptacles (GFI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704.2</td>
<td>CO/Smoke Detectors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603.1</td>
<td>Furnace/Water Heater Venting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Exterior Structure &amp; Property</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>NC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>304.2</td>
<td>Exterior Painting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304.3</td>
<td>Street Numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302.1</td>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304.6</td>
<td>Exterior Walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304.7</td>
<td>Roof &amp; Drainage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304.9</td>
<td>Overhangs Extensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302.3</td>
<td>Sidewalks &amp; Driveways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304.13</td>
<td>Windows &amp; Door Frames</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304.13.2</td>
<td>Openable Windows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304.15</td>
<td>Doors &amp; Locks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302.4</td>
<td>Weeds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302.7</td>
<td>Accessory Structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303.1</td>
<td>Swimming Pool/Spa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302.6</td>
<td>Exhaust Vents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304.13.2</td>
<td>Openable Windows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604.3</td>
<td>Electrical System Hazards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605.2</td>
<td>Receptacles (GFI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704.2</td>
<td>Smoke/CO Detectors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Bedrooms #1 #2 #3 #4 #5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>304.13.2</td>
<td>Openable Windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604.3</td>
<td>Electrical System Hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605.2</td>
<td>Receptacles (GFI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704.2</td>
<td>Smoke/CO Detectors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Occupancy Determination

☐ Approved  Maximum Occupancy: ________  Inspector: ________________________________

☐ Denied (required corrections above) Date: ________________________________
City of Collinsville

Occupancy Inspection Program

The City of Collinsville’s Occupancy Inspection Program focuses on identifying Life Safety issues in need of correction. The following are the most common Life Safety concerns that must be addressed before occupying a space:

1. SMOKE DETECTORS: Smoke detectors are required on every level of the home, within 15 ft. of sleeping areas and inside each sleeping area. All detectors must operate when under a test. Some homes, based on age, may have “interconnected” detectors. These detectors are connected together (hard-wired) and will sound an alarm throughout when activated. Older homes may not have this wiring. If the home is equipped with interconnected detectors, they must function properly. If they do not initiate an alarm throughout when the test button is pushed, consult a qualified electrician.

2. CARBON MONOXIDE DETECTORS: Carbon Monoxide detectors are required within 15 ft. of all sleeping areas if the home has any type of fossil fuel burning appliance or an attached garage. The units can be battery operated, plug-in type or combination smoke/carbon type. There is no height requirement for mounting purposes; consult the manufacturer’s specifications. The detector will have a test button which is readily accessible that will be used to test the device to ensure proper operation.

3. INOPERABLE/MISSING GFCIs: Ground Fault Circuit Interrupters or “GFCIs” are required in unfinished basements, at all countertop areas in kitchens, garages, exterior areas of the homes, bathrooms, protecting Jacuzzi tubs and pools, and within 6 ft. of the leading edge of a sink.

4. WIRE COVERAGE/PROTECTION OF WIRES: 120/240 volt wiring located in the “zone” from the spot on the floor that you are standing on to 4 ft. in height must be protected by covering with at least ½” thick drywall. These include wires in garages, basements and other typically unfinished areas.

5. GFCI PROTECTION AT SWIMMING POOLS/HOT TUBS: All 15 and 20 amp, 120/240 volt pool pump motors must have GFCI protection. Underwater luminaires must also have GFCI protection if operating at more than the low voltage contact limit.

6. HEATING UNIT AND WATER HEATING VENTING: Vent pipes are checked for deterioration, blockage or separation of connections. Each connection must have three fasteners (generally self-tapping sheet metal screws). Evidence of decay or rusting may indicate improper draft. Vent pipes are checked to ensure they are not too close to combustibles.

7. WINDOWS/SCREENS: Windows must be in good repair and be weather tight. Glazing must be free from cracks and holes. Must be easily openable and capable of being held in any raised position without assistance. Every door, window, and other outside opening used for ventilation of habitable rooms, kitchens or food storage areas must have tightly fitting insect screens. Screens may not have tears or holes large enough to permit entry of insects.

8. FUSE/CIRCUIT BREAKER PANEL: There may not be any unused openings in the panel and all circuits must be labeled. Circuits may not be rated for more than 20 amps unless dedicated to an appliance requiring higher amps. Panel must have a 30-inch minimum working space in front and a width of not less than the width of the panel from the panel to 36 inches from the panel.

9. FOUNDATION/STRUCTURAL/UNSAFE CONDITIONS: The exterior of the home and its surrounding area must be maintained. This includes removal/repair of rotten structural wood members, foundation failure, and any structural issues, as well as broken guard rails, steps, or walkways that create a hazard or are unusable.
WORK DEMAND AND STAFFING

1. Address the projected work demand for the Occupancy Permit program.
2. Address the issue of current staff and what their current roles are.
3. Address the 2 part time inspectors and their roles.
4. Further the fact that the demand for inspections for rental will decrease after year 1 as the 2 year period will be in place and any turnover in occupancy will be exempt from further inspection during this 2 year period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: OWNER OCCUPIED UNITS AND TURNOVER PROJECTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turnover Percentages of Housing Stock</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspections/Business Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Time (Minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Time (Hours)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: RENTAL UNITS AND TURNOVER PROJECTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turnover Percentages of Rental Units</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspections/Business Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Time (Minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Time (Hours)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Owner Occupied Average Daily Inspections: 6.1
- Rental Average Daily Inspections: 4.8
- Total Average Daily Inspections: 11.7

- Average Inspections Per Inspector Per Day: 3.5
- Average Inspection Hours Per Inspector Per Day: 2.5

- Owner Occupied Average Daily Inspection Hours: 1.2
- Rental Average Daily Inspection Hours: 2.4
- Total Average Daily Inspection Hours: 7.6

**Assumptions:**
1. Business days are calculated on 52 weeks per year and 5 days per week for a total of 260 business days per year;
2. All estimated inspection times include travel time;
3. Rental units are assumed to be MFR or apartments with an average total inspection time of 30 minutes;
4. Inspection assumptions considers three (3) total available inspectors; and
5. Owner Occupied units are assumed to be SFI detached with an average inspection time of 45 minutes. Exceptions include:
   A. SFR home over 2,000 SF 1 hour inspection time (60 minutes); and/or
   B. SFR home with a pool 1 hour inspection time (60 minutes)
**Work Demand and Staffing**

### TABLE 1: OWNER OCCUPIED UNITS AND TURNOVER PROJECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turning Over Percentages of Housing Stock</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>15%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>35%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>45%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>6,540</td>
<td>327.0</td>
<td>654.0</td>
<td>981.0</td>
<td>1,308.0</td>
<td>1,635.0</td>
<td>1,962.0</td>
<td>2,289.0</td>
<td>2,616.0</td>
<td>2,943.0</td>
<td>3,270.0</td>
<td>1,798.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspections/Day</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Time (Minutes)</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>113.2</td>
<td>169.8</td>
<td>226.4</td>
<td>283.0</td>
<td>339.6</td>
<td>396.2</td>
<td>452.8</td>
<td>509.4</td>
<td>566.0</td>
<td>311.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Time (Hours)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 1: RENTAL UNITS AND TURNOVER PROJECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turning Over Percentages of Rental Units</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>15%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>35%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>45%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rental</td>
<td>4,497</td>
<td>224.9</td>
<td>449.7</td>
<td>674.6</td>
<td>899.4</td>
<td>1,124.3</td>
<td>1,349.1</td>
<td>1,574.0</td>
<td>1,798.8</td>
<td>2,023.7</td>
<td>2,248.5</td>
<td>1,533.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspections/Business Day</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Time (Minutes)</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>103.8</td>
<td>129.7</td>
<td>155.7</td>
<td>181.6</td>
<td>207.6</td>
<td>233.5</td>
<td>259.4</td>
<td>142.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Time (Hours)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Work Demand and Staffing

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied Average Daily Inspections</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Average Daily Inspections</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Average Daily Inspections</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Inspections Per Inspector Per Day</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Inspection Hours Per Inspector Per Day</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied Average Daily Inspection Hours</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Average Daily Inspection Hours</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Average Daily Inspection Hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumptions:**
1. Business days are calculated on 52 weeks per year and 5 days per week for a total of 260 business days per year;
2. All estimated inspection times include travel time;
3. Rental units are assumed to be MFR or apartments with an average total inspection time of 30 minutes;
4. Inspection assumptions considers three (3) total available inspectors; and
5. Owner Occupied units are assumed to be SFR detached with an average inspection time of 45 minutes. Exceptions include:
   A. SFR home over 2,000 SF 1 hour inspection time (60 minutes); and/or
   B. SFR home with a pool 1 hour inspection time (60 minutes)
Can a Private Home Inspector Perform the Inspections?

1. How could this work?
   - The full $50 fee would still be required to cover administrative costs (review of checklist and submitted final report for consistency) and the 2nd subsequent inspection would be performed by the City.
   - Inspector must be registered with the City.
   - Inspector signs an affidavit certifying the inspection
   - Inspector completes City checklist
   - Inspector provides City with copy of private inspection report

2. Issues
   - Will an inspector sign an affidavit or agree to the inspection?
   - An inspector would be issued a violation and fine as well as being disqualified from future inspections should deficiencies be found.
   - The City would perform any follow up inspections to ensure compliance and should any issues be found that were not identified the City would be who is blamed and not the private inspector.
   - Will an inspector agree to provide the City with a copy of the inspection report?

3. American Society of Home Inspectors (ASHI) indicates that they are unaware of any community taking this approach and see various associated issues.
**WHY DID WE SWITCH FROM THE 2012 ICC TO THE 2015 ICC?**

1. **The differences between 2012 and 2015 is minimal and the exemptions (concerns) remain the same.**

2. **Implications on the ISO rating for the City.**
   - We are currently on the 2006 ICC Code family (with the exception of 2009 IPMC) and are 12 years “out of date”.
   - ISO only gives credit for having codes within the most recent 5 year period so adopting the 2012 ICC Code family would not help us in the future evaluation, but the 2015 ICC Code family will still be within this window of credit.
   - Adopting the 2012 ICC Code family would put us 6 years out of date and would not aid in the ISO review which will happen again in 2 years.
**Inspector Certification:**
1. Property Maintenance and Housing Inspector Certification
2. Certification by ICC in the IPMC

**The City will not track who lives where but will assign a maximum occupancy number**
1. The program will not track individuals.
2. Each unit will be assigned a maximum occupancy number based on the formula contained in the code.
3. Maximum occupancy will only come up if the property owner has an issue with the number of tenants or if other complaints come to the City.

**CUSD 10 Fraud Minimization**
1. Do not need names for the permit to aid in minimizing fraud related to school enrollment.
2. Presenting the Occupancy Permit at registration will aid in fraud reduction.
3. While the City will not track the individuals, the individual will need the Occupancy Permit to register for school.

**Administrative Warrant for non-compliance**
1. Administrative Warrant would be sought in the event of non-compliance (either failure to adhere to the program or failure to address violations or occupancy if life safety issues are discovered.
2. Process will be included in the ordinance, but already available statutorily and used by other municipalities for compliance.
QUESTIONS?
COMMENTS
DISCUSSION
City Council Meeting
May 14, 2018
Orchard Shell
Request for NEBD Incentives
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Northeast Business District (NEBD) incentives are being requested by applicant, Steve Seuss, of Orchard Shell Service, LLC located at 1900 Vandalia Street. Orchard Shell plans to undertake a business improvement project with a total estimated cost of $133,369.64. The proposed improvements include the following:

1. Replacement of three fuel dispensers with pay-at-the-pump POS systems;
2. Concrete repair;
3. Replacement and upgrade of canopy light fixtures;
4. Repair and refurbishing of existing gas pump islands; and
5. Re-branding of existing canopy and gas pump islands to the VP Fuels brand.

Orchard Shell is requesting a reimbursement of 40% of their investment, which represents $53,347.94. It should also be noted that this improvement project is the second phase of the initial improvement project introduced by the applicant during pre-application discussions on May 2017. In July 2017, the applicant was awarded a NEBD Sign Grant totaling $10,903.11 to improve an existing free-standing pole sign.
### TABLE 1: REQUESTED INCENTIVE AWARD LEVEL AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL PROJECT/DEVELOPMENT COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENTAGE (%)</th>
<th>TOTAL PROJECT DEVELOPMENT COSTS ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$133,369.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$66,684.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>$60,016.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$53,347.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>$46,679.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$40,010.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$33,342.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$26,673.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$20,005.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$13,336.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$6,668.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEBD CRITERIA:

1. **Deteriorated Site Improvements**: “Site improvements in this context refers to non-structural improvements such as parking lots, driveways, walkways, outdoor lighting, freestanding signage, fences, retaining walls, curbing and drainage facilities and other privately owned improvements. Deteriorated and inadequate site improvements are a major issue within the District that affects the value, appearance and functionality of properties within the District. A large majority of the improved parcels in the Area (92 of 119 or 77%) have deteriorated site improvements in some form.

2. **Excessive Coverage**: “Excessive land coverage was observed on the majority (56%) of improved parcels in the District. On these parcels, an excessive proportion of the lot is covered by buildings and/or parking lot, such that there is a lack of adequate or proper access to a public right-of-way, lack of reasonably required off-street parking, or inadequate provisions for loading and service. The high incidence of excessive land coverage in the District helps explain the lack of adequate shared access drives and parking lots that constitutes inadequate street layout.”

3. **Obsolete Building**: “Renovation of other existing buildings and sites will ensure their continued viability in attracting and maintaining quality commercial uses.”
DISCUSSION POINTS:


2. The replacement of the POS system is a direct cost for operations and should be removed from the pump system as an “ineligible” cost.
   - *This was not provided in an itemized manner with project costs so this is an unknown cost at this point.*

3. The target reimbursement should be at 40% less the POS system cost.

4. The reimbursement should be made vis NEBD taxes paid on an annual basis.
   - *The City Council could consider an award in one lump some as an alternative.*
City Council Meeting
May 14, 2018
Collinsville Illinois 311
ENHANCED CITIZEN ENGAGEMENT
REPORT PUBLIC PROBLEMS
REPORT PUBLIC PROBLEMS (VIDEO)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Street/Sidewalk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Information:</td>
<td>Repair needed to lark alley off of onley st. Crossing Bryan ave. Alley is used by through traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Number:</td>
<td>1723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Status:</td>
<td>Resolved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** 2017-03-25  
**Time:** 12:34:26 pm  
**Location:** 104-182 Bryan Ave, Carterville, IL 62918, USA  
**Latitude:** 37.7681664  
**Longitude:** -89.077855  

Comments:
SIMPLER CONTACT

CONTACT US

- Department Supervisors
- Elected Officials
- Non Emergency Police
- Non Emergency Fire / EMS
- Water Billing
- After Hours Water Emer
- Collinsville Animal Control / Shelter
- Ameren Outage And Gas Odor
CONTACT OFFICIALS EASILY (VIDEO)
GET INFORMATION ON DEPARTMENTS & ORGANIZATIONS
GET INFORMATION ON DEPARTMENTS & ORGANIZATIONS (VIDEO)
Due to the high probability of rain, the Carterville Easter Egg Hunt has been rescheduled for this Sunday, March 25th at Cannon Park starting at 1pm.
QUICKLY GET TO IMPORTANT WEB PAGES
The End

Collinsville Illinois 311 – Public Participation simplified
Speakers from the Floor

*Speakers may address the Council under the terms of Ordinance No. 4765. Time is limited to 4 minutes per speaker. Please refer to the last page of the agenda for specific rules governing input.*
Consent Agenda

1. Motion to Approve Payment of Bills for the Period Ending May 4, 2018, in the Amount of $3,230,584.64.

2. Motion to Approve Payroll for the Period Ending April 30, 2018, in the amount of $595,174.38.

3. Motion to Approve Minutes of the April 23, 2018 Regular Meeting

4. Resolution Requesting Permission from the Illinois Department of Transportation to Close a Street for VFW Memorial Day Parade

5. Resolution Reappointing Members to the Collinsville Planning Commission (Dennis Hellige, Randy Mitchell, and Matt Popov)
New Business

1. Ordinance Amending the Regulations for Motel and Hotel Registrations

2. Ordinance Authorizing Professional Services Agreement with Thouvenot, Wade & Moerchen, Inc. in the Amount of $66,318 for Preliminary Engineering Services for Bridge Rehabilitation (replacing the superstructure) of Black Lane Bridge (Section 16-00102-00-BR)

3. Resolution in Support of the City’s Surface Transportation Block Grant Program-Suballocated (STP-S) Funding Application (Summit Avenue Reconstruction)
Ordinance Amending the Regulations for Motel and Hotel Registrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE:</th>
<th>Ordinance Amending the Regulations for Motel and Hotel Registrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REQUESTED ACTION:</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGIC PLAN GOAL(S):</td>
<td>Goal #2 – “Safest City”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Existing ordinance mandates release of hotel registers to police upon request
- City of Los Angeles, California v. Patel (2015)
  - Ruled this practice unconstitutional
- Amended ordinance in compliance with binding case law
  - Ordinance still mandates hotel operator to require identification of the registrant and retain this information.
    - Would be available to law enforcement with valid search warrant
- Amendment is necessary and staff recommends approval
1. Ordinance Amending the Regulations for Motel and Hotel Registrations

2. Ordinance Authorizing Professional Services Agreement with Thouvenot, Wade & Moerchen, Inc. in the Amount of $66,318 for Preliminary Engineering Services for Bridge Rehabilitation (replacing the superstructure) of Black Lane Bridge (Section 16-00102-00-BR)

3. Resolution in Support of the City’s Surface Transportation Block Grant Program-Suballocated (STP-S) Funding Application (Summit Avenue Reconstruction)
Ordinance Authorizing Professional Services Agreement with Thouvenot, Wade & Moerchen, Inc. in the Amount of $66,318 for Preliminary Engineering Services for Bridge Rehabilitation (replacing the superstructure) of Black Lane Bridge (Section 16-00102-00-BR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Ordinance Authorizing Professional Services Agreement with Thouvenot, Wade &amp; Moerchen, Inc. in the amount of $66,318 for Preliminary Engineering Services for Bridge Rehabilitation (replacing the superstructure) of Black Lane Bridge (Section 16-00102-00-BR).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requested Action:</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan Goal(s):</td>
<td>Goal #3: Quality Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Ordinance allows the Mayor to execute a contract with TWM for design services for the Black Lane Bridge in the amount of $66,318.
- Black Lane Bridge is in need of structural repairs as identified in a 2016 inspection.
- Project is a partnership with Madison County with a total cost of $680,000.
- Expected out of pocket cost to the City will be $135,000 paid for via MFT funds.
- Staff recommends approval of this item by the City Council.
**Ordinance Authorizing Professional Services Agreement with Thouvenot, Wade & Moerchen, Inc. in the Amount of $66,318 for Preliminary Engineering Services for Bridge Rehabilitation (replacing the superstructure) of Black Lane Bridge (Section 16-00102-00-BR)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title:</strong></th>
<th>Ordinance Authorizing Professional Services Agreement with Thouvenot, Wade &amp; Moerchen, Inc. in the amount of $66,318 for Preliminary Engineering Services for Bridge Rehabilitation (replacing the superstructure) of Black Lane Bridge (Section 16-00102-00-BR).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requested Action:</strong></td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan Goal(s):</strong></td>
<td>Goal #3: Quality Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Ordinance allows the Mayor to execute a contract with TWM for design services for the Black Lane Bridge in the amount of $66,318.
- Black Lane Bridge is in need of structural repairs as identified in a 2016 inspection.
- Project is a partnership with Madison County with a total cost of $680,000.
- Expected out of pocket cost to the City will be $135,000 paid for via MFT funds.
- Staff recommends approval of this item by the City Council.
New Business

1. Ordinance Amending the Regulations for Motel and Hotel Registrations

2. Ordinance Authorizing Professional Services Agreement with Thouvenot, Wade & Moerchen, Inc. in the Amount of $66,318 for Preliminary Engineering Services for Bridge Rehabilitation (replacing the superstructure) of Black Lane Bridge (Section 16-00102-00-BR)

3. Resolution in Support of the City’s Surface Transportation Block Grant Program-Suballocated (STP-S) Funding Application (Summit Avenue Reconstruction)
Resolution in Support of the City’s Surface Transportation Block Grant Program-Suballocated (STP-S) Funding Application (Summit Avenue Reconstruction)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE:</th>
<th>Resolution in support of the City’s Surface Transportation Block Grant Suballocated (STP-S) Funding Application (Summit Avenue Reconstruction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REQUESTED ACTION:</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGIC PLAN GOAL(S):</td>
<td>Goal #3: Quality Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Resolution allows the City to submit project to reconstruct Summit Avenue road to EWCOG.
- The City is requesting $573,870 in construction funding through the Grant Program as follows:
  - The City’s total cost of the project is $398,470;
  - $143,470 or 25% of the construction costs,
  - $225,000 in design and construction engineering fees, and
  - $30,000 in Right-of-Way Acquisition costs.
- This is in TIF 1, and these funds may be used to provide the City’s portion.
- Project includes the addition of sidewalks and bike lane.
Resolution in Support of the City’s Surface Transportation Block Grant Program-Suballocated (STP-S) Funding Application (Summit Avenue Reconstruction)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE:</th>
<th>Resolution in support of the City’s Surface Transportation Block Grant Suballocated (STP-S) Funding Application (Summit Avenue Reconstruction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REQUESTED ACTION:</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGIC PLAN GOAL(S):</td>
<td>Goal #3: Quality Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Resolution allows the City to submit project to reconstruct Summit Avenue road to EWCOG
- The City is requesting $573,870 in construction funding through the Grant Program as follows:
  - The City’s total cost of the project is $398,470;
  - $143,470 or 25% of the construction costs,
  - $225,000 in design and construction engineering fees, and
  - $30,000 in Right-of-Way Acquisition costs.
- This is in TIF 1, and these funds may be used to provide the City’s portion.
- Project includes the addition of sidewalks and bike lane.