



AGENDA
Committee of the Whole
Board Room
33 S. Arlington Heights Rd
May 11, 2026
7:00 PM

- I. CALL TO ORDER
- II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
- III. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS
- IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
 - A. COW Minutes 4/20/2026
 - B. COW Minutes 4/13/26
- V. NEW BUSINESS
 - A. Village Board Compensation Analysis
 - B. Commencement of Terms of Office for Elected Officials
 - C. Electric Vehicle Charger Ordinance Discussion
 - D. Environmental Commission Single-Use Plastic Bag Report
- VI. OTHER BUSINESS
- VII. PUBLIC COMMENT

Anyone wishing to speak on a subject not on the Agenda may speak at this time. Please limit your comments to three minutes.

- VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The Village of Arlington Heights is committed to digital accessibility for all users. Persons with disabilities requiring auxiliary aids or services, such as an American Sign Language interpreter or written materials in accessible formats, should contact the Health & Human Services Department — located at 33 S. Arlington Heights Road, Arlington Heights, IL 60005 — at 847-368-5760 or ADA@vah.com.

**MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE-OF-THE-WHOLE MEETING OF THE
PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE
VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
April 20, 2026**

President Tinaglia called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: President Tinaglia; Trustees Bertucci, Dunnington, Gilbert, LaBedz, Manganaro, Schwingbeck and Zyck

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: Trustee Santa Maria

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Village Manager Randy Recklaus, Deputy Village Manager Diana Mikula

OTHERS PRESENT: Robert Brodecki, Richard Bondarowicz, Joe Footlik, David Hogaboom

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. Interview of Robert Brodecki for appointment to the Housing Commission effective May 1, 2026, term ending April 30, 2029

Mayor Tinaglia introduced Robert Brodecki explaining that Robert is a passionate resident who has spoken at several Village Board Meetings and is a great candidate for the Housing Commission.

Robert said that he wants to make sure that Arlington Heights is an inclusive community. He wants people to come here, build a life and finish a life here. Housing is an important part of that, and housing prices have gone up in our desirable community. We need to work to have housing options for new, young families as well as retirees. One option to achieve that goal is to use an affordable housing ordinance so when developments are made here, we push for affordability units to be included. Another option is to make it easier to develop properties of all different types – not just the larger developments or apartment buildings, but more starter homes or downsize homes for senior citizens.

Trustee Dunnington commented that she is familiar with Robert due to his involvement with Safe Streets and noted that he has a lot of enthusiasm and is a good candidate for this commission.

Trustee Zyck asked Robert how he thinks it is best to spend the money in the Affordable Housing Trust Fund. Robert would like to see it used to spur local development in a variety of different ways such as purchasing a piece of land to develop or make an attractive loan to a developer. Robert would like to see local developers who want to be part of building for the next generation with smaller lots or smaller developments so they can be built quicker and offered at a lower price point.

Trustee Bertucci asked Robert his opinion of House Bill 5626 which takes away local zoning abilities. Robert is familiar with it and explained that it is a sweeping, top-down bill. Robert prefers bottom-up work and local community work. He ~~was~~ wants to be proactive and start working towards some of the goals and set some guidelines on our terms. Trustee Bertucci asked Robert to clarify if he is in favor of the Bill. Robert said that there are parts of it that

are appropriate such as statewide ebikes rules, but he thinks the housing pieces should be kept at the local level, rather than the state level.

Trustee Manganaro agrees with developing houses at all prices points. He asked Robert to talk about his involvement with Strong Towns. Robert explained that it is a group that believes that towns should be built in a way to adapt to the times and puts the residents at the center of the focus to meet their needs.

Trustees thanked Robert for his willingness to serve our community.

Trustee Dunnington moved, seconded by Trustee Zyck to concur in the Mayor's appointment of Robert Brodecki to the Housing Commission, effective May 1, 2026, term ending April 30, 2029.

The following voice vote was recorded:

8 Ayes

0 Nays

The motion passed.

B. Interview of Richard Bondarowicz for appointment to the Design Commission effective May 1, 2026, term ending April 30, 2029

Mayor Tinaglia explained that he has known Rich for a long time and a lot of people in town know him as a unique developer and builder. His background will be unusual for this commission since the Design Commission has only had architects on it since its inception. Rich will be able to offer a slightly different perspective, through the eyes of a quality builder. He is creative and careful and recently won some awards for his work.

Trustee Schwingbeck is familiar with Rich's work and agrees with Mayor Tinaglia that his work is excellent. He asked Rich how he sees the transition of him being on the commission since he is the first non-architect. Rich explained that he has gone through the process of the Design Commission so can offer a different perspective. He understands the costs and he knows which slight changes can make a home more affordable. He also pointed out the height restrictions that we have and thinks that needs to be revisited. Some of the antiquated zoning that we have actually drives up the cost of redevelopment. He has lived in Arlington Heights for almost 30 years and is committed to making our village look great and be great for generations to come.

Trustee Manganaro asked Richard how he sees the Design Commission supporting the strategic priority to maintain the character of neighborhoods, especially in historic neighborhoods. Richard agrees that it is absolutely critical to maintain the historic integrity. He wants to encourage groups or homeowners to incorporate historical details on their homes. Sometimes those small pieces of "jewelry" make the home look historic and fit into the neighborhood.

Trustee LaBedz and Richard discussed trends and ways for homes to look timeless.

Trustees thanked Richard for his willingness to serve on this commission.

An audience member asked the Design Commission to review tear-downs to look at the character of the neighborhood and make sure that a tear-down would fit into the neighborhood.

Trustee Schwingbeck moved, seconded by Trustee Bertucci to concur in the Mayor's appointment of Richard Bondarowicz to the Design Commission effective May 1, 2026, term ending April 30, 2029

The following voice vote was recorded:

8 Ayes

0 Nays

The motion passed.

C. Interview of Joe Footlik for appointment to the Zoning Board of Appeals effective May 1, 2026, term ending April 30, 2031

Mayor Tinaglia explained that Joe has unbelievable knowledge and experience in this exact department and believes that Joe is a perfect fit for the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Joe Footlik wants to serve his community and knows that this board has a direct impact on the quality of life for all residents and businesses. He has 30 years of experience working for another municipality. He believes the purpose of local government is to make people's lives better. He is committed to the process and can bring an even-handed, practical approach to the board.

Trustee Schwingbeck was on the Zoning Board of Appeals for four years and noted that Joe's resume is impeccable. Trustee Schwingbeck explained that most people are nervous when they appear before the Zoning Board of Appeals, so he advised Joe to be compassionate to set their minds at ease. Joe explained that he has gone before a Zoning Board of Appeals and understands that it is nerve-wracking so will do his best to make sure the applicant feels heard and decisions are made with good reason.

Trustee LaBedz explained that this board is different than the other boards and commissions because the decisions of the Zoning Board of Appeals are final. Therefore, it is important to listen and be thoughtful.

Trustees thanked Joe for his willingness to serve on this Board.

Trustee LaBedz moved, seconded by Trustee Schwingbeck to concur in the Mayor's appointment of Joe Footlik to the Zoning Board of Appeals effective May 1, 2026, term ending April 30, 2031

The following voice vote was recorded:

8 Ayes

0 Nays

The motion passed.

D. Interview of David Hogaboom for appointment to the Zoning Board of Appeals effective May 1, 2026, term ending April 30, 2031

Mayor Tinaglia has known David Hogaboom since high school. Dave's experience comes from him having a business here and living in town for many, many years. Dave understands the culture and what makes Arlington Heights special.

Dave used the Hasbrook Park neighborhood as an example of change in this town. It used to be all starter homes but that neighborhood has changed dramatically. Dave understands that sometimes people in the community don't like change but sometimes change is exciting and it livens up a community. He is excited to serve on this Board.

Trustee Bertucci has known Dave professionally and personally for many years. He said that Dave has the full picture and will do what is best for our community.

Trustees thanked David for serving our community.

Trustee Bertucci moved, seconded by Trustee Manganaro to concur in the Mayor's appointment of David Hogaboom to the Zoning Board of Appeals effective May 1, 2026, term ending April 30, 2031

The following voice vote was recorded:

8 Ayes

0 Nays

The motion passed.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS - none

VII. PUBLIC COMMENTS - none

VIII. ADJOURNMENT – Trustee Zyck moved, seconded by Trustee LaBedz to adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 7:11pm.

**MINUTES
COMMITTEE-OF-THE-WHOLE
PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES
VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
BOARD ROOM
MONDAY, APRIL 13, 2026 7:00P.M.**

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: President Tinaglia; Trustees: Bertucci, Dunnington, Gilbert, LaBedz, Manganaro, Santa Maria, Schwingbeck and Zyck

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Randy Recklaus, Village Manager; Melissa Gallagher, Finance Director; Emily Rodman, Planning and Community Development Director; Cris Papierniak, Public Works Director; Ron Weber, Building Director and Kim Peterson, Recording Secretary

President Tinaglia called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Approval of Minutes

None.

New Business

A. Village Fees Review

Mr. Recklaus advised that this review of Village fees started several months ago and is a joint effort between the Finance, Planning & Community Development, Building and Public Works - Engineering Departments. The purpose of this review is to make sure all of the Village's fees are comparable to other communities, that they're transparent, that the fee structure still makes sense and that they serve as an offset to the different services that the Village staff renders to different developments. With the implementation of the new ERP process and changes in department leadership, staff felt this was a good time to take a look at this. Mr. Recklaus advised that this review wasn't designed to generate revenue, but because it has been so long since they looked at this, it will generate some net revenue that would be an offset to their reliance on property taxes. Staff is not looking for any final decision tonight.

Ms. Gallagher advised that this is a check in with the Village Board to gather some additional input, make any necessary revisions, and then bring it back to the Village Board sometime in the summer, with full implementation in 2027. This is a long-term approach and they want to focus on fees for the future for potential offsets to property tax increases in the future. Many of these fees haven't been adjusted since 2006 and

these fees help the Village recover a portion of their service costs. Some of the fees don't align with the Village's current service needs and a lot of the larger projects require more staff time. Ms. Gallagher advised that the largest fiscal impact would be on the Building Permit fees. Staff took last year's total cost of construction, across all of the fees last year, and did an analysis to see what that might generate for net new revenue, which is approximately \$722,000. The Village wants to be sure that they are comparable to their peers and also for better cost recovery. Moving forward, staff would like to do a regular review of the fees and make adjustments as necessary.

Ms. Gallagher discussed some of the working groups key findings, including ensuring that the permitting fees are reflecting the current environment, looking at the project complexity and making sure they align with the fees, as well making sure there is full transparency in the way the fees are communicated.

Ms. Rodman discussed the proposed impacted fees for the Planning & Community Development Department. Ms. Rodman advised that they began the process of reviewing their fees by first looking at their comparable communities to see if they generally align. This was very challenging when it came to zoning fees, as every community does it differently. The fees they are proposing to adjust are all of the Design Commission related fees, re-zoning fees, fees related to special use permits for restaurants, as well as special use waivers and then the variation fees. They are also proposing some new fees related to a number of different activities. Another item they are proposing is to put in place a requirement for development projects to provide a reimbursement of fees agreement and an escrow account. A deposit upfront would be provided to cover the Village's out of pocket costs, which are now covered by Arlington Heights taxpayers. Ms. Rodman also explained how they are looking to restructure some of their fees to ensure transparency and to simplify them.

Trustee Zyck asked if the \$722,000 Ms. Gallagher presented is a gain in revenue for the Village with these changes, which Mr. Weber advised that this is what the Village would have gained in revenue if these proposed changes were in place last year. Trustee Zyck advised that this all makes sense, as these costs should not have to be absorbed by the taxpayers. Trustee Zyck asked for clarification about the legal fees, which Ms. Rodman advised that with the exception of the Zoning Board of Appeals Single-Family variations, for all other projects, it would be a pass-through fee, which would be taken out of the escrow that was provided by the applicant. Trustee Zyck asked if staff is looking at these fees in how much it costs per hour to do these different things or if they're looking at what other communities charge, which Mr. Recklaus advised that it is somewhat of a balancing act, as the Village would like to cover its expenses but still be in the same ballpark as its neighboring communities.

Trustee LaBedz asked if these fees will help to offset the cost of hiring outside consultants, which Ms. Rodman stated yes.

Trustee Dunnington asked about the timing of these fees, which Ms. Rodman advised that the application fee would be paid at the time of application, which is how it works now, and the escrow amount would be paid up front as well.

Trustee Schwingbeck asked about the fee going in when they apply, which Ms.

Rodman advised that she is only speaking about the zoning fees and entitlement fees, which are paid up front when they apply. Trustee Schwingbeck stated that he is not worried about small residential projects, he is more concerned with the larger projects that consume a lot of staff time and then never go anywhere. He would like to see these projects hit up front with money, which can go towards final permitting. Mr. Recklaus advised that this is something that can be discussed in broader terms before these fees are implemented, if that is the will of the Board.

Trustee Bertucci asked about the proposed fees and if they should be concerned with the Village pricing itself higher than neighboring communities. Ms. Rodman advised that in regards to the Design Commission reviews, staff took into account the amount of time that goes into these reviews, as well as the fact that the Village pays an architect to do Design Commission work. The current Design Commission fees, as well as the proposed fees don't even come close to covering having the architect on staff, which is not the intention, but it is something to consider given the number of projects that go through the Design Commission. Trustee Bertucci asked what the Village's justification for the higher fees in comparison to other suburbs, which Mr. Recklaus advised that the Design Commission is a service our Village provides that other towns don't and our Village has higher standards. President Tinaglia stated that our Village's staff cares and has these commissions, that other towns may not. President Tinaglia stated that it comes down to who's paying these fees, the applicant or the residents. Trustee Bertucci advised that he agrees the applicant should pay for them.

President Tinaglia suggested that perhaps they should consider secondary Design Commission or Plan Commission reviews for the more complicated or problematic projects. President Tinaglia advised that in regards to extensions, he doesn't think \$500 is enough to make an impact, but a \$2,500 might motivate someone.

Mr. Weber discussed the Building Department's current fees and stated that they are complex, outdated and confusing. The ordinance refers to language that is not listed in the adopted codes, therefore they would like to eliminate some of the terminology and just do a lot of clean up in general. Mr. Weber advised that in regards to construction costs they are proposing the elimination of the current fee structure and replace it with a fee that equals 1.54% of the construction cost, which also includes the engineering fee. They are also proposing to require 10% of the permit fee up front to alleviate the risk involved with people retracting permits and if plan reviews are sent out to third party consultants, it's a requirement to get reimbursed. Mr. Weber discussed the proposed permit fees in greater detail, as well as how our Village compares to neighboring municipalities in terms of fees charged. Mr. Weber stated that Arlington Heights is not charging nearly as much as they are and is proposing that our Village be more in line with these comparable municipalities.

President Tinaglia advised that in addition to updating the permit fees, he believes that cleaning this up and deleting things that are obsolete is a good reason to do this.

Trustee Schwingbeck asked when payment is collected for permit fees under the current structure, which Mr. Weber advised it's due at time of permit issuance. The proposed fee structure would require 10% of the permit fee at time of application. Trustee Schwingbeck also asked if a project has to go to the Design Commission and

the Zoning Board, is that typically done prior to the issuance of a permit, which Mr. Weber stated that is correct. All zoning related entitlement is typically required before submitting for a permit. Ms. Rodman advised that anyone who needs to go before the Design Commission or Zoning Board would be required to pay zoning application fees as well as the escrow to cover out-of-pocket costs related to the zoning review process. Trustee Schwingbeck reiterated his early comment about the need for a significant fee when it comes to some of these larger projects that take a lot of staff time and out-of-pocket costs. Mr. Recklaus advised that they can definitely discuss options and develop some sort of threshold of when to explore this higher fee.

Trustee Gilbert advised that although he sees the need for basketball structures and fire pits to be installed correctly, he would like to see these fees be zero, as he would like to see more of these in town.

Trustee Zyck asked if a developer needs to have all of their plans and cost associated with the project before they apply for a building permit, which Mr. Weber stated that yes. Trustee Zyck then asked if a development ends up costing more than what was originally submitted, if the Village just absorbs that extra cost, which Mr. Weber advised it does if it's within 6% of the original construction cost. If it's grossly over that, then they might research it.

Trustee LaBedz asked if the permit fee for a fire pit includes an inspection to make sure it's safe, which Mr. Weber advised that it's very rare to get a permit just for a stand-alone fire pit, it's usually part of larger backyard patio projects, and there are inspections associated with those.

Trustee Santa Maria proposed the idea of waiving fees for nonprofits who are submitting building permits and consider different fees for affordable housing developments.

Trustee Dunnington asked Ms. Rodman to explain what types of properties go before the Housing Commission, which Ms. Rodman advised that there are typically only one to two projects a year that go through the Housing Commission in terms of reviewing the compliance with the inclusionary housing ordinance. The most recent one was in August of 2025 at the former site of International Plaza. Trustee Dunnington asked if having this step of going through the Housing Commission might discourage developers from building because other towns don't have it, which Ms. Rodman advised that she doesn't think the \$350 fee would discourage them, as the Village's requirement to provide inclusionary housing all together could be a deterrent. Trustee Dunnington asked if these could be nonprofits, which Ms. Rodman stated potentially. Mr. Recklaus advised that although staff is supportive of affordable housing, some of these projects have been some of the most demanding on staff than any other project. In addition, nonprofits are created equal now.

President Tinaglia asked Mr. Weber how he will calculate construction costs, as the numbers often change. Developing this calculation and where the numbers come from will be critical. President Tinaglia advised that when going through the project development review process, often times one needs to go before the other, and it's not always the same for every project. President Tinaglia suggested that perhaps the

process can be streamlined to prevent projects from going unnecessarily through one review just to get rejected at the next review. Ms. Rodman advised that they have made changes in terms of having their Planner, who's the staff liaison for the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA), and their Design Commission Planner working more closely together to review those to determine when that Design Commission application comes in, if it needs to go to ZBA, and then they send them through ZBA first. In regard to the layering of the Commissions, any project that requires a Planning Commission application, that needs to come in first, and then after a review of that application, staff will determine what additional reviews are required and what the order of those reviews should be. President Tinaglia suggested that perhaps there can be some consideration given to a resident who wants to put an addition onto his home versus someone who is coming in and tearing down and rebuilding a home as a profit generating business project, if the fee can be different.

Mr. Papierniak advised that the biggest challenge for his team is adapting to new homes and current standards and sizes into existing neighborhoods. New larger homes in existing older parts of town presents drainage challenges and his team spends a considerable amount of time reviewing drainage patterns, neighboring properties, existing elevations and doing a deep dive into the infrastructure to make sure the system can handle it. At a minimum, staff reviews one to two rounds of plans and roughly 13 inspections per single-family home, which is just engineering. Mr. Papierniak is recommending 10% times building fee for single-family new construction, which has been incorporated into the building fees. In terms of plan review and inspection for residential, non-single-family homes, the current fee is \$50, which Mr. Papierniak is proposing to raise it to \$125.

President Tinaglia stated that a lot of the calls and emails they get with new construction involve issues with drainage.

Trustee Bertucci asked if a contractor could face reinspection fees if a problem develops as a result of the project thereby requiring additional work, which Mr. Weber advised that there are reinspection fees if staff is required to go back out because of code violations, but as far as recouping time, some of these things are unforeseeable, therefore there are no extra costs. Fines can also be imposed for code violations.

Mr. Recklaus advised that there was a lot of work put into this and a lot of coordination between departments to try and identify better ways to do things. Mr. Recklaus stated that there is a new fee the Village is considering which is an amusement tax. This is something that would be imposed on a large entertainment venue as a percentage of sales. Staff will be doing more work on this, but they believe they will be proposing an amusement tax for any large entertainment venue. President Tinaglia asked if this would be on ticket sales, which Mr. Recklaus stated yes. This is not intended for the smaller venues we currently have in town.

B. Proposed 2025 General Fund Surplus Transfer

Mr. Recklaus advised that the staff is projecting a \$4.6 million surplus for 2025 and the best practice is to use the money for large one-time expenses and capital items or programs that are experiencing unique circumstances. Ms. Gallagher will walk through

what they are proposing,

Ms. Gallagher advised that staff worked closely with departments to strategically deploy the reserves, and as they have done in prior years when there are excess reserves beyond the current practice, they bring a recommendation to the Village Board for approval. This year, similar to last year, volatility, uncertainty and inflation still remain and will continue to remain. Ms. Gallagher explained how some of these transfers will augment and cushion, and also support, the capital planning process.

Ms. Gallagher advised that the Village's fund balance policy states that they have at least 25% of general fund expenditures every single year, up to a maximum of 40%. When they reach that 40% level is when they provide a recommendation. Ms. Gallagher discussed some of the past couple of years and how they processed reserves over time, highlighting the police and fire pension commitments. Ms. Gallagher advised that the transfers of surplus revenues generated by the general fund over time have saved the Village about \$10 million, in terms of an interest-cost perspective, because they have been able to augment to the capital funding through reserves. In 2025, the general fund did a little better for revenues, about 2% overall. Sales and income taxes did a little better than expectations and the new streaming tax provided a slight amount. The expenditures for the year came in just a little bit below budget, about 3%, and some of the factors for that continue to be staffing levels in police. Ms. Gallagher advised there is a \$4.6 million dollar surplus and the recommendations from staff, include a transfer of \$45,000 for a drone show to celebrate America's 250th birthday, \$500,000 to the Municipal Parking Fund to maintain and support the parking structures, \$500,000 to the Fleet Fund to help with the inflationary impacts they are experiencing and a transfer of about \$3.5 million is recommended for the Capital Projects Fund as well. Staff would like to focus their efforts on roadway improvements and add more dollars there. Mr. Recklaus advised that they will not be able to rely on surplus or reserves forever, but by using the surplus on this, it provides a cushion so there is not as steep of a ramp up on these construction costs. In regards to the parking fund, using surplus funds to support it is not a long-term plan and as part of the downtown master plan, there will be a review of the parking system and the way that it is funded. Mr. Papierniak advised without the capital fund, they would not be able to do any residential streets, because of the cost of the Euclid Avenue resurfacing project.

President Tinaglia asked Ms. Gallagher to explain why the decision was made to not transfer funds to the police and fire pension funds this year, which Ms. Gallagher advised that because they have been making these additional contributions in prior years and because early reviews of the actuarial report, there is not a need to do that. Mr. Recklaus stated that a couple of years ago, the Village and others experienced a very bad year for investments, and the pension is funded based on a three-year rolling average and they are finally losing that bad year. Therefore, it is not the biggest need right now. President Tinaglia advised that what he hears most often involves the condition of the roads and residents asking when they'll be fixed, so if the majority of this money is going towards roads and those types of expenditures, he is in favor of it.

Trustee Gilbert stated that he is unsure if he can support the \$45,000 drone show and

feels that it would be a waste of money and would rather give that money to some area that could really use it. He is in favor of everything else.

Trustee Zyck asked about the proposed transfer of \$3.5 million to the capital projects fund and how this additional money affects the budget this year. Ms. Gallagher advised that it won't affect the budget for 2026. It's a planning mechanism to start planning for 2027 and beyond. Trustee Zyck asked how it affects the 2027 budget, which Mr. Papierniak advised that his capital proposal for 2027 is an additional \$20 million and this will help him start funding this. Mr. Recklaus stated that maintaining the roads now saves the Village money in the long run, as resurfacing roads is much cheaper than reconstructing roads. Mr. Papierniak advised that construction costs have increased significantly in the last five years, and repairing residential streets and trying to take on more, puts a stress on the budget. Trustee Zyck stated that he understands these needs, but would like to know if there is a way to use this money in order to mitigate some of the rising expenses and possible levy increase. Mr. Papierniak advised that if he doesn't keep the base of the roads impermeable, the road is ruined and the repair goes from a resurface to a reconstruction, which is 2 – 3 times the cost. Mr. Recklaus advised that by the Village putting surplus money into the pension funds in prior years, property taxes were reduced. In addition, if the Village didn't put money into the parking fund, they would have to take it from the general fund, which puts pressure on property taxes. Every one of these dollars is money they have saved from increasing property taxes.

Trustee Manganaro stated that if you look at the last nine years and the \$37 million in surplus funds that has been transferred, are funds that could be looked at as excess taxes. He is concerned about the drone show, which Mr. Recklaus advised that this is an alternative to a more costly fireworks show and is a one-time expense. Mr. Recklaus advised that in terms of these other items, whether you pay for these with a surplus, take them out of reserves, or budget for them, you end up in the same place. Ms. Gallagher advised that this is a way to manage risk in liabilities and long-term investments, and Moody's mentioned in the last credit rating in 2024, the importance of how the Village budgeted and how they used their reserves. This is a very important part of the Village's credit review and by leveraging this strategic investment, they haven't had to raise property taxes for these types of activities. Trustee Manganaro asked when the Board has to make a decision on this, which Ms. Gallagher advised that it will have to be by next week.

Trustee Bertucci asked what the police and fire pension funding levels are right now, which Ms. Gallagher advised that they just received their actuarial report and are currently reviewing it, therefore she doesn't have the exact numbers, but the police are funded a little over 80% and fire a little over 75%. Trustee Bertucci explained how higher funding percentages would be more ideal and asked why they are not considering that this year. Ms. Gallagher advised that the need is not as great as it is for capital projects this year. Trustee Bertucci asked about the health insurance fund, which Ms. Gallagher advised it is still well funded, which is the same for liability insurance. Mr. Recklaus stated that staff did negotiate with both unions to increase the employee contribution for health insurance as well, which should help. Trustee Bertucci suggested that staff come up with a new way to phrase the drone show.

Trustee Dunnington asked Mr. Papierniak if with the cost going up so much for our roadways, is staff looking into ways to reduce the roadways so that they won't require as much maintenance. Mr. Papierniak advised that the width of the roadway is always in competition to make it wider, so what they do to make the cost more effective is by doing multiple facets of construction to extend the lifetime of the roads, as well as leverage federal funds to subsidize the costs. In addition, Mr. Papierniak advised that his department has changed the way they approach and plan their road improvement fund and projects. Every facet of Public Works and Engineering are now working together to ensure that any water main replacements or other work is being done before resurfacing a road. Trustee Dunnington asked if there are areas of roadway where cars are not driving, perhaps in a turn, that the Village doesn't have to incur that big expense, which Mr. Papierniak advised that they always review all road construction and developments for turning radius, which is dictated by fire equipment and cannot be controlled. Trustee Dunnington suggested a small, but meaningful change, to the \$4.6 million surplus, that the Village spend \$49,900, which is the same amount that they granted back in July during the Community Development Block Grant (CCDBG) hearings, so that they could match what they gave to those same 10 organizations whose programs and services are aimed at improving the lives of low-to-moderate income residents. She would like to lower the capital fund by \$49,900 to fund the grant requests that they weren't able to fully fund because of the cap limit. Mr. Recklaus stated that all of the groups who submitted requests are worthy and are all short of funding, however he would caution the Board about using General Fund money to support these types of entities, as the number of requests will be much larger next year and it will be difficult for the Board to say no. Funding these types of entities is not something currently that is within the defined mission of the Village Board and of the Village, although the Village Board can determine it should be, but it would have to be done very thoughtfully. President Tinaglia advised that he would love to be able to fund all of these worthy entities, but doesn't know if that's something most tax payers would think is more valuable than repairing the roads. President Tinaglia suggested that if the Board feels strongly about doing this, they can think about how they can put some sort of function together to raise this \$50,000.

Trustee Schwingbeck asked if the \$4.6 million in surplus funds would go into reserves if the Village found no need to transfer it, which Mr. Recklaus stated yes. Trustee Schwingbeck advised that while he has been on the Board, he has never questioned where staff wants to move the money, because they move it into areas of necessity, and this year he feels the same way. Trustee Schwingbeck advised that every year they maintain the top level of 40% and always have a large amount of surplus money, perhaps it would make sense to drop that percentage down a little and not have a tax increase. Mr. Recklaus provided some historical background as to why past Boards have chosen to be more financially conservative, but does understand if the current Board would like to run a tighter budget. Trustee Schwingbeck advised that he understands and agrees with staff about where they want to spend the surplus money, but residents are simply looking at the fact that their property taxes went up and there is a large reserve surplus.

Trustee Bertucci advised that the Board has to remember the lessons learned from history, especially when it comes to financial disasters, and have to continue to look long-term. He has no problem using fiscally responsible assumptions and knowing that

history typically repeats itself. Ms. Gallagher advised that the Board needs to be mindful that things happen in cycles and the reserves that they have achieved, have been due to some circumstances, and will most likely level off.

President Tinaglia advised that he feels good that these surplus funds will go to good use, especially when it comes to new roads, and is okay with a small levy again if this is the result. He likes what staff has done and is supportive of it.

Trustee LaBedz asked if this would have any impact on the rules and regulations having to do with CDBG funds, which Mr. Recklaus advised that this would be an expenditure of General Fund money to those organizations, which would be outside of CDBG and not having any impact on CDBG funding per se.

Trustee Zyck advised that he likes this idea because it means helping out these organizations who are helping out people in our community and if we could give them a little bit more money, it makes sense.

Trustee Schwingbeck asked if this could be just a one-time thing, which Mr. Recklaus advised that it could, however that won't stop people from asking and the Board may have to say no.

Trustee Dunnington advised that the Housing Commission already has this process set up with who should get money based on their priorities, which Mr. Recklaus advised that it's staff who does this, not the Housing Commission. Mr. Recklaus stated that this is not a financial decision, it is a mission decision, and if the Board wants to study how to do this, they can.

President Tinaglia asked if this is the appropriate mechanism for making this happen, or should they consider discussing this at another meeting and look to see where they can find the additional \$49,900. Mr. Recklaus stated that finding the money is not the issue, it's the broader philosophical relationship with nonprofits and how to fund them. Ms. Gallagher advised that there are other ways to fund this, and maybe this is not the moment, but staff can make this a priority item to be looked at soon.

Trustee Santa Maria advised that Health & Human Services is already doing so much work and perhaps that money would be better used in their department. Mr. Recklaus stated that speaking with them and some of the Village's Commissions would be helpful.

Trustee Gilbert asked Mr. Papierniak what losing the \$49,900 would do to him and his team, which Mr. Papierniak advised the hole is significant and is not sure if the \$49,900 would hit them that hard.

Trustee LaBedz stated that she would like to have a more robust discussion about how they can increase funding and hear from the Health & Human Services Department, as they should play a role in this.

Trustee Manganaro asked Mr. Papierniak how much road he can resurface with \$50,000, which Mr. Papierniak advised it would be a very small cul-de-sac. Trustee

Manganaro advised that he is happy to vote for the funds to maintain the roads, but likes this amendment because it can be very self-contained as there already is a mechanism to say no and it has opened up this discussion to fund nonprofits.

Trustee Dunnington moved, seconded by Trustee Manganaro, to amend Trustee Bertucci's motion to transfer \$49,900 to match the Community Development Block Grant funds for public services, and reduce the Capital Improvement Fund by that amount.

The Motion: Failed

Ayes: Dunnington, Manganaro

Nays: Bertucci, Gilbert, LaBedz, Schwingbeck, Santa Maria, Zyck, Tinaglia

Trustee Bertucci moved, seconded by Trustee Schwingbeck, that the Village Board of Trustees approve the Proposed 2025 General Fund Transfer of \$45,000 from the General Fund for a Light Show done by Drones as part of the celebration for the 250th Anniversary of the United States, \$500,000 to the Municipal Parking Fund, \$500,000 to the Fleet Fund, and \$3,555,000 to the Capital Improvement Fund.

The Motion: Passed

Ayes: Bertucci, Dunnington, Gilbert, LaBedz, Manganaro, Schwingbeck, Santa Maria, Zyck, Tinaglia

Nays: None

C. Draft Fund Balance Policy

Mr. Recklaus advised that this policy is something they adopt every year as part of the budget and is something that is reflected every year in the annual audit.

Ms. Gallagher stated that every single year, as part of the budget process, in the budget are their performance reserve goals, and it's also included in the annual audit, which is reviewed by the credit rating agency Moody's, along with the auditors. The reserve policy of 40% represents about five months of operating revenues on hand. Ms. Gallagher explained how property taxes were delayed last year by six months and they did have to dip into reserves while they were waiting on property taxes. Fund balance matters and because there are a lot of delays in revenue, liquidity is necessary, as it also helps with operational stability and short-term and long-term borrowing. It does give the Village the ability to respond quickly to an emergency, to unforeseen volatility and also helps manage revenue fluctuation. Having a fund balance also helps them respond to opportunities and challenges. The Village's practice has been funding a fund balance policy with a minimum of 25% up to 40%. This has been highly effective in their discussions with the credit rating agency when they have gone through bond issuance. Our credit rating is very strong, which gives

us a lot of flexibility and the ability to respond if we need to. The policy itself would be approved by the Board and reviewed on a routine basis, and establishes the minimum reserve of 25% with a target reserve of 40%. It also provides the ability, should there be a surplus, for the Village Board to reinvest. The 40% is a range and there have been some years when it has been 38%, but what is really important is how they use the reserves. Ms. Gallagher explained how they looked at peer communities and generally speaking they maintain reserves of 25 – 40%, depending on the community. Ms. Gallagher advised that the reliance on economically sensitive revenues is really important, as economies can change and it doesn't take much for things to fluctuate. She stated that the Village has a very high rated credit rating Aa1, which is one notch below Aaa. If the Board approves this policy, it would be reviewed regularly.

Trustee Schwingbeck asked if over the last 10 – 15 years, they have always maintained the 40%, which Ms. Gallagher stated generally speaking yes. Moody's looks at where you end up and if you have a policy and you're following it. President Tinaglia asked if it is likely during the year that we dip below 40% at times, which Ms. Gallagher stated yes. Trustee Schwingbeck asked in any given year, what is the lowest we have ever been, which Ms. Gallagher stated that it is typically around 25%, which is why they are proposing that to be the minimum.

Trustee Bertucci advised that with this favorable Moody's rating, when we issue bonds, our bond interest rate is more favorable and we pay less in interest.

Trustee LaBedz asked how much we had to dip in reserves this past year, which Ms. Gallagher advised that they did have to dip into reserves, but it was on the liquidity side and not into investments. Ms. Gallagher advised that there are ebbs and lows of revenue and having this range allows for flexibility.

Trustee Zyck asked if this policy means that they can never go below 25%, which Ms. Gallagher advised that Moody's will not study our cash flow to that level, and having the higher range is more preferable for our rating. Mr. Recklaus advised that during our last rating review, it specifically said that if our reserve level went down a couple of percentage points, it could affect our rating. Mr. Recklaus advised for the one-time benefit of reducing our fund balance by a few percentage points, you have that money once, but you're going to be paying that debt at a higher interest rate for a long time. Trustee Zyck stated that he understands the importance of the high Moody's rating, but questioned how Park Ridge can have the same rating we do, but they can come down 25% and we can't. Mr. Recklaus stated that without analyzing their budget, it's hard to answer that question. Ms. Gallagher advised that there are a lot of factors that go into this, including pension funding and how much debt they carry. Trustee Zyck stated that with the way the fund policy is set up right now, he will not be voting for it, as it is locking them into certain things that they can do with the fund balance. He suggested it should include verbiage to allow adjustment to offset budget spending, or something to this effect, as the Board should have the flexibility to not have to re-write the policy again.

Trustee Santa Maria asked if Moody's is saying that we have to have 40% or do we have to have a policy that says it could be a range that would include up to 40%, which Ms. Gallagher advised that Moody's is not telling the Village what policy to have.

The reason why they are bringing this forward tonight, is it's solidifying our past practice that has contributed to the ratings we have received over the last multiple years. Mr. Recklaus advised that the policy is related to the end of the year and there is nothing in this policy preventing the Village Board to make a decision at budget time to reduce the reserves to avoid a property tax increase. In addition, there is nothing preventing the Village Board in the future from changing this policy. Staff is just making the point that generally speaking it is not a good practice to reduce the reserves for an operating expense.

President Tinaglia reiterated that this is not placing the burden on the Village that they have to have 40%. It's a policy that establishes 25% as the minimum and 40% as the maximum.

Trustee Dunnington suggested that perhaps the target level can be a range of 35 – 40%, instead of 40%, with the excess level being over 40%. If they have that target level as a range, Finance can then provide them with a budget with a snapshot of what it would look like at 35%, what it would look like at 38%, what it would look like at 40%, and then the Village Board can decide at that point, based on what is going on with the economy, at the state and federal levels, what they want. Mr. Recklaus advised that per Village Code, he is tasked with providing a balanced budget to the Village Board every year. If it would be very challenging to do this if it varies that much from year to year.

President Tinaglia advised that you cannot ignore inflation and the only way to compensate for this is with excess funds from sales tax, income tax, etc. This policy formalizes the practice that the Village has been doing for the last several decades and positions the Village to maintain stability while planning for the future. It doesn't say they can't do something different in the future. Mr. Recklaus advised that there is no reason the Board has to pass this policy tonight. The Board can take the time and think about this further and if necessary direct staff to look deeper into this.

Trustee Manganaro stated that he thinks they need to have a much more substantive conversation, as he can't support the policy as written right now because he doesn't have enough information. He is interested in knowing what is different between our Village and its peer communities that gets them to the ratings they're at. In terms of the disaster response aspect of this, he would like to know where the Village was at in 2008 with reserves. Trustee Manganaro stated that every dollar the Village collects in excess taxes, is a dollar that's not in the pockets of residents for some other economic activity, and we don't know what the impact on our budgets would have been if these other dollars would have gone into our economy. If we were budgeting more accurately, instead of conservatively, that money could have remained in the economy and generated more economic activity rather than being collected as tax. President Tinaglia referred to the pension program and how the Village used surplus funds that had to be spent to increase their funding, which ended up saving the Village \$10 million that went directly back to the residents.

President Tinaglia asked if there is enough support tonight to codify a programmatic policy that the Village has been doing for decades, or is it better to put this hold and save a date to discuss this deeper at another time. Mr. Recklaus advised that a show

of hands can provide direction.

Trustee Bertucci stated that to Trustee Manganaro's point, you cannot assume that the money collected in excess taxes is going into the taxpayers' pockets, as the Village is going to get the money one way or another.

President Tinaglia advised that the idea of having something codified excites him, as he is done having this conversation. The Board has to decide if 40% is too high, and if it is, what should it be then, and what should the Village do with the excess funds.

Keith Moens, Arlington Heights resident, advised that he thinks 25 – 40% is too wide of a range and 35 – 40% is the right way to go. This gives the Village flexibility to meet unexpected expenses, but still be within the policy, and to meet what could be rapidly rising tax levies in the future.

President Tinaglia asked if staff could prepare a budget based on a range, which Mr. Recklaus advised that it would be really difficult to do, as the budget process is lengthy and difficult, and preparing multiple budgets would be very challenging. The goal is to create a budget that they think the Village Board will support.

Trustee LaBedz asked if the levy would be higher if they budgeted the \$3.5 million, which Ms. Gallagher stated not necessarily. In the process of formulating the budget, they could include transfers from the General Fund over to the Capital Projects Fund, rather than waiting for the surplus discussion. Trustee LaBedz stated what is always said as the budget process rolls along, make it as tight as possible and come in as low as possible, but be realistic in what is needed.

Trustee Zyck stated that Finance has been doing a fantastic job and this discussion has nothing to do with what they have been doing. Our Village is financially stable and he does not want to mess with that, however they need the flexibility to do things.

Trustee Bertucci advised there are a lot of unknowns and they have to be careful, as no one can predict the future. When you're projecting out, you have to use some conservative numbers and having a surplus is better than coming up short.

President Tinaglia stated that he prefers being conservative and have a little bit at the end than the other way around. He asked for a show of hands how many of the Board members are in favor of codifying this practice into a policy as it is written now, which two members raised their hands. The majority of the Board wants to talk about it further. Mr. Recklaus advised that they took notes and will rework it and bring it back to the Board for another discussion.

Janice Pleres, Arlington Heights resident, stated that the surplus is the taxpayer's money and if they were overcharged, it should be returned.

Other Business

None.

Public Comment

Keith Moens, Arlington Heights resident, advised that at last week's Committee of the Whole Meeting, it was asked if Commissioners have any orientation program prior to beginning their term, and the answer was no. All the Commissioners should be informed on meeting procedure and the rights they have as Commissioners, in particular the Chairperson. Mr. Moens referred to a memo put out by the Village's Legal Department on public comment guidelines, which allows the Chair to ask for public comment at the time the agenda item is hot, rather than waiting to the end of the meeting when everything is decided. Training on this should be considered. President Tinaglia advised that this is a valid point and staff could prepare a memo.

Adjournment

Trustee LaBedz moved, seconded by Trustee Zyck, to adjourn the meeting at 11:19 p.m. Upon a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.



VILLAGE OF
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
INC. 1887

Committee of the Whole
5/11/2026

Item: Village Board Compensation Analysis
Department: Integrated Services

Item Description:

Annual compensation for the Mayor and Village Board of Trustees has not been adjusted since 1996. Village staff conducted research of surrounding and comparable communities to understand the total compensation, average, median, and 75th percentile of salaries for elected municipal officials. The analysis indicates that the salaries for the positions of Mayor and Trustee are below market. Based on the length of time since the last increase, the size of Arlington Heights, and the time demands on elected officials, Village staff believe it is appropriate to increase the annual salary for the positions of Mayor and Trustee.

The Village Code and the Local Government Officer Compensation Act (50 ILCS 145) dictates that local governments seeking to change the fixed compensation of elected officials must do so at least 180 days before the beginning of the terms of the officers whose compensation is to be fixed. Additionally, the Open Meetings Act prohibits elected officials from discussing their own compensation in closed session.

Staff is seeking discussion and direction from the Village Board during the Committee of the Whole meeting. Staff recommends the Village Board direct staff to draft an ordinance for an upcoming Village Board meeting that increases the annual salaries for the positions of Mayor and Trustee to \$33,000 and \$11,000, respectively. Additionally, staff recommends delaying the effective date of all salary increases for the positions of Mayor and Trustee until after the swearing-in ceremony for newly elected municipal officials as a result of the April 9, 2029, consolidated election.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Village Board Compensation Analysis Memo
2. Ordinance Amending Code Regarding Elected Official Compensation



VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS

INC. 1887

Date: May 5, 2026

To: Mayor Tinaglia and Village Board of Trustees

From: Jack Cascone, Assistant to the Village Manager

Subject: Updated: Elected Officials Compensation Analysis

Attachments: 1) Elected Official Compensation Survey

Background

The two most recent adjustments in compensation for the Mayor and Village Board of Trustees in Arlington Heights occurred in 1973 and 1996. Village staff reviewed elected official salaries in 2017, but the Village Board opted to not increase the salaries outlined in Chapter 2 of the Village Code at that time. Additional information was provided to the Village Board in June 2025 based on a recent Northwest Municipal Conference survey and individual feedback was gathered. Based on the length of time since the last increase, the size of Arlington Heights, and the time demands on elected officials, staff believes it is appropriate to increase the salaries for elected municipal officials.

The Village Code and the Local Government Officer Compensation Act (50 ILCS 145) dictates that local governments seeking to change the fixed compensation of elected officials must do so at least 180 days before the beginning of the terms of the officers whose compensation is to be fixed. In other words, any salary increase for an elected official must be passed 180 days before an election, and the increase cannot go into effect for an individual elected official until after the next election when their position is on the ballot. The next consolidated election will occur on April 6, 2027, and the following will occur on April 9, 2029.

Finally, the Open Meetings Act prohibits elected officials from discussing their own compensation in closed session.

Analysis

Currently, the Mayor of Arlington Heights receives an annual salary of \$8,500 and Trustees receive \$2,800. In April 2026, Northwest Municipal Conference conducted another elected official salary survey with 22 communities responding. Of those 22, staff used data from 11 surrounding and comparable communities, including Arlington Heights, to understand total compensation for the positions of Mayor and Trustee, as well as compute the average, median, and 75th percentile salaries. Of the 11 communities, total compensation for Mayor ranged from \$7,800 – \$49,800; Trustee total compensation ranged from \$1,200 – \$15,000. Below is a summary table of the data, and a more comprehensive data sheet is provided in Attachment 1.

Elected Official Compensation Analysis – April 2026		
	Mayor	Trustee
Average	\$23,240	\$7,372
Median	\$22,033	\$6,000
75th Percentile	\$33,991	\$10,590
Arlington Heights	\$8,500	\$2,800

The analysis indicates that the salary for the positions of Mayor and Trustee are below market.

Traditionally, salaries for Village employees are set at the 75th percentile of comparable communities with some adjustments made based on internal comparability. The 75th percentile allows the Village to remain in a competitive position without being the highest paid.

The salary for the Mayor of Arlington Heights is just over three times that of a Trustee. Using the same methodology, for example, the Village Board could increase the salary for the position of Trustee to the 75th percentile of comparable communities - \$10,590. As a result, the salary for the position of Mayor would also increase to the 75th percentile of comparable communities - \$33,991, which is just over three times that of a Trustee. These figures could also be rounded to \$11,000 for Trustee and \$33,000 for Mayor, which brings the salary for Mayor to exactly three times that of a Trustee. Note: This is just one example of how the data can be analyzed. The Village Board may prefer to utilize a different methodology.

Finally, due to Village and State requirements for increasing compensation for elected officials, the Village Board will need to choose between two scenarios for when a potential increase goes into effect:

- 1) The salaries of the Trustees who are elected in the April 6, 2027, consolidated election will increase to the new compensation level at that time; however, the salaries for Mayor and Trustees who are not up for election in 2027 will remain at the current rate until after the April 9, 2029, consolidated election when their position is on the ballot.
- 2) The Village Board can choose to delay the increase in compensation for all positions until after the April 9, 2029, consolidated election so that the salaries for the Mayor and all Trustees increase at the same time.

Budget Impact

Any increase in compensation for the Mayor and Trustees will impact the budget by the difference between the current salary levels and the new salary levels.

Recommendation / Next Steps

Village staff believe that a salary increase is overdue for elected officials. Staff recommends the Village Board directs staff to draft an ordinance for an upcoming Village Board meeting that increases the salaries for the positions of Mayor and Trustee to \$33,000 and \$11,000, respectively. Additionally, staff recommends delaying the effective date of all salary increases for the positions of Mayor and Trustee until after the swearing-in ceremony for newly elected municipal officials as a result of the April 9, 2029, consolidated election.

Municipality	Population	Mayor's Annual Salary	Additional Annual Compensation Due to Duties	Annual Expense Account	Annual Car Stipend	Annual Per Meeting Stipend (36 meetings/year)	TOTAL MAYOR COMPENSATION
Arlington Heights	74,495	\$ 8,500.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,500.00
Buffalo Grove	42,482	\$ 7,800.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,800.00
Des Plaines	58,010	\$ 30,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 30,000.00
Elk Grove Village	31,350	\$ 40,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 40,000.00
Hoffman Estates	50,179	\$ 33,000.00	\$ 11,400.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,400.00	\$ 49,800.00
Mount Prospect	54,298	\$ 5,500.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,500.00
Palatine	64,869	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 6,875.52	\$ -	\$ 6,300.00	\$ 900.00	\$ 29,075.52
Park Ridge	39,656	\$ 12,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,000.00
Rolling Meadows	24,200	\$ 9,950.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,950.00
Schaumburg	75,750	\$ 30,482.07	\$ 3,600.00	\$ 1,200.00	\$ -	\$ 2,700.00	\$ 37,982.07
Wheeling	37,725	\$ 22,032.91	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 22,032.91

Average	Median	75th Percentile
\$ 23,240.05	\$ 22,032.91	\$ 33,991.04

Municipality	Population	Trustee's Annual Salary	Additional Annual Compensation Due to Duties	Annual Expense Account	Annual Car Stipend	Annual Per Meeting Stipend (36 meetings/year)	TOTAL TRUSTEE COMPENSATION
Arlington Heights	74,495	\$ 2,800.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,800.00
Buffalo Grove	42,482	\$ 4,200.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,200.00
Des Plaines	58,010	\$ 15,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15,000.00
Elk Grove Village	31,350	\$ 6,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,000.00
Hoffman Estates	50,179	\$ 6,600.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,400.00	\$ 12,000.00
Mount Prospect	54,298	\$ 2,750.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,750.00
Palatine	64,869	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 575.52	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 900.00	\$ 7,475.52
Park Ridge	39,656	\$ 1,200.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,200.00
Rolling Meadows	24,200	\$ 6,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,000.00
Schaumburg	75,750	\$ 10,586.67	\$ -	\$ 1,200.00	\$ -	\$ 2,700.00	\$ 14,486.67
Wheeling	37,725	\$ 9,180.37	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,180.37

Average	Median	75th Percentile
\$ 7,372.05	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 10,590.19

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 2
OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
REGARDING ELECTED OFFICIAL COMPENSATION

WHEREAS, the Village of Arlington Heights is a home rule municipal corporation in accordance with Article VII, Section 6(a) of the Constitution of the State of Illinois of 1970; and

WHEREAS, the Village President and Board of Trustees desire to amend Chapter 2 of the Municipal Code of Arlington Heights, Illinois, 1995, as amended (“*Village Code*”), to adjust the official compensation of Village elected officials; and

WHEREAS, the President and Board of Trustees have determined that it will serve and be in the best interests of the Village and its residents to amend the Village Code pursuant to this Ordinance;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS:

SECTION 1. RECITALS. The facts and statements contained in the preamble to this Ordinance are found to be true and correct and are hereby adopted as part of this Ordinance.

SECTION 2. OATH AND SALARY. Section 2-103, titled “Oath and Salary,” of Chapter 2, titled “Elected Officers,” of the Village Code is hereby amended further to read as follows:

“Section 2-103 – Oath and Salary.

Before entering upon the duties of office, the President shall take the oath of office prescribed by statute for municipal officers, and shall receive an annual salary of \$8,500.00 and no other compensation shall be allowed for that office; provided, however, that for any term of office of the President commencing after the 2029 consolidated election, the President shall receive an annual salary of \$33,000.00 and no other compensation shall be allowed for that office. Any ordinance providing for a change in the compensation of the Village President shall be adopted no less than 180 days before the beginning of the term of the Village President.”

SECTION 3. OATH AND COMPENSATION. Section 2-207, titled “Oath and Compensation,” of Chapter 2, titled “Elected Officers,” of the Village Code is hereby amended further to read as follows:

“Section 2-207 – Oath and Compensation.

Each Trustee shall take the oath of office prescribed by statute and shall receive compensation at the rate of \$2,800.00 per year, payable in monthly installments; provided, however, that beginning on the date on which the Trustees elected at the 2029 consolidated election take the oath of office, each Trustee shall receive compensation at the rate of \$11,000.00 per year, payable in monthly installments. Any ordinance providing for a change in the compensation provided for Trustees shall be 180 days before the beginning of the terms of the trustees whose compensation is to be fixed.”

SECTION 4. SEVERABILITY. If any provision of this Ordinance or part thereof is held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remaining provisions of this Ordinance are to remain in full force

Additions are bold and double-underlined; deletions are struck through.

and effect, and are to be interpreted, applied, and enforced so as to achieve, as near as may be, the purpose and intent of this Ordinance to the greatest extent permitted by applicable law.

SECTION 5. PUBLICATION. The Village Clerk is hereby directed to publish this Ordinance in pamphlet form pursuant to the Statutes of the State of Illinois.

SECTION 6. EFFECTIVE DATE. This Ordinance will be in full force and effect 10 days after its passage, approval, and publication in the manner provided by law.

AYES:

NAYS:

PASSED AND APPROVED THIS ___ day of _____, 2026.

Village President

ATTEST:

Village Clerk

Additions are bold and double-underlined; ~~deletions are struck through.~~



VILLAGE OF
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
— INC. 1887 —

Committee of the Whole
5/11/2026

Item: Commencement of Terms of Office for Elected Officials
Department: Integrated Services

Item Description:

The attached draft ordinance clarifies Chapter 2 of the Village Code to state that the term of office for newly elected municipal officials will begin at the first regular or special meeting in May following the election of said officials. This legal clarification is in line with historical practice, and removes potential ambiguity. Village staff recommends the Village Board direct staff to place this ordinance on an upcoming Village Board meeting agenda for approval.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. AH Ordinance Amending Chapter 2 of the Municipal Code

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 2-210
OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
REGARDING COMMENCEMENT OF TERMS OF OFFICE FOR ELECTED OFFICIALS

WHEREAS, the Village of Arlington Heights is a home rule municipal corporation in accordance with Article VII, Section 6(a) of the Constitution of the State of Illinois of 1970; and

WHEREAS, the Village has the authority to adopt ordinances and to promulgate rules and regulations that pertain to its government and affairs; and

WHEREAS, the Village President and Board of Trustees desires to amend Section 2-210 of the Municipal Code of Arlington Heights, Illinois, 1995, as amended ("*Village Code*"), to clarify the commencement date for the terms of office of the Village's elected officials; and

WHEREAS, the President and Board of Trustees have determined that it will serve and be in the best interests of the Village and its residents to amend the Village Code pursuant to this Ordinance;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS:

SECTION 1. RECITALS. The facts and statements contained in the preamble to this Ordinance are found to be true and correct and are hereby adopted as part of this Ordinance.

SECTION 2. COMMENCEMENT OF TERM OF OFFICE. Section 2-210, titled "Commencement of Term of Office," of Chapter 2, titled "Elected Officers," of the Village Code is hereby amended further to read as follows:

"Section 2-210 – Commencement of Term of Office.

The terms of all elected officials shall begin at the first regular or special meeting ~~in the month~~ **in May** following the election of said officials."

SECTION 3. SEVERABILITY. If any provision of this Ordinance or part thereof is held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remaining provisions of this Ordinance are to remain in full force and effect, and are to be interpreted, applied, and enforced so as to achieve, as near as may be, the purpose and intent of this Ordinance to the greatest extent permitted by applicable law.

SECTION 4. EFFECTIVE DATE. This Ordinance will be in full force and effect from and after its passage, approval, and publication in the manner provided by law.

[SIGNATURE PAGE FOLLOWS]

AYES:

NAYS:

PASSED AND APPROVED THIS ____ day of _____, 2025.

Village President

ATTEST:

Village Clerk



VILLAGE OF
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
INC. 1887

Committee of the Whole
5/11/2026

Item: Electric Vehicle Charger Ordinance Discussion

Department: Building & Life Safety

Item Description:

The increasing adoption of electric vehicles (EVs) and the recent increase in interest in multi-family housing construction necessitate a proactive evaluation of Village safety codes. The Village supports the use of green technologies and has already incorporated EVs into its own fleet. However, current construction codes do not adequately regulate electric vehicle charger (EVC) placement to mitigate the specific fire, structural, and life safety risks that they pose, particularly in multi-family residential building complexes. The Building and Life Safety Department, Fire Department, and Village Manager have been working over the past few months to identify and define these risks and to develop a safe way to manage this technology in a multi-family residential setting.

The attached memo outlines key concerns, strategic recommendations and fire safety regarding Electric Vehicle Chargers (EVC). The Fire Department has identified significant risks associated with EV battery fires that differ fundamentally from traditional vehicle fires.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Village Board direct Staff to pursue a safety-first approach to electric vehicle chargers (EVC) in new construction buildings by drafting code amendments and Home Rule exceptions to an IL Act related to EVCs in multifamily developments for consideration at an upcoming Village Board meeting.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. EVC Memo V3



VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS

INC. 1887

Date: April 13th, 2026

To: Randy Recklaus, Village Manager
Lance Harris, CFO, Fire Chief
Andrew Benkert, Deputy Fire Chief
Christopher Rymut, Division Chief, Community Risk Reduction

From: Ron Weber, Director of Building & Life Safety

Subject: Electric Vehicle Charger Ordinance

Attachments: 1) Electric Vehicle Charging Hazards.pdf

Background

The increasing adoption of electric vehicles (EVs) necessitates a proactive evaluation of Village safety codes. Unlike internal combustion engine fires, lithium-ion battery incidents involve thermal runaway, toxic gas release, and extreme heat. Recent data from the Fire Department (FD) highlights a critical shift in operational reality that underground EV fires will not be extracted due to toxic off-gassing and the high volume of flammable materials. Current construction codes do not adequately regulate electric vehicle charger (EVC) placement to mitigate these specific fire, structural, and life safety risks.

Research

FD Safety Concerns & Hazards

The FD has identified significant risks associated with EV battery fires that differ fundamentally from traditional vehicle fires:

- **Extreme Temperatures:** EV battery fires can reach temperatures approaching 5,000°F, compared to 1,500°F for gasoline vehicles. This heat significantly degrades the fire rating of concrete floors.
- **Structural Integrity:** These fires can burn for several hours, exceeding the standard hourly fire rating for floor assemblies, posing a high risk of structural failure and collapse.
- **Toxic Gas Release:** Thermal runaway produces flammable hydrogen gas and hydrogen fluoride gas, which forms lethal hydrofluoric acid upon contact and respiratory hazards.
- **Suppression Challenges:** Extinguishing these fires requires thousands of gallons of water and carries a high potential for re-ignition hours or days after the initial event.

Regional Municipality EVC Ordinance Comparison:

- **Des Plaines:** Limits EVC to surface lots or primary access levels. The Fire Code Official maintains discretionary authority for exceptions.
- **Elk Grove Village:** Prohibits EVC in underground parking structures beneath buildings. Mandates Extra Hazard Group 2 sprinklers and 50-foot utility clearances.
- **Hoffman Estates:** Evaluating a full ban on EVC in all parking structures and potential setbacks of 54 feet from building exits for surface chargers.
- **Rosemont:** Currently under a total moratorium on new EVC installations in parking structures following a 2024 parking structure fire.

- **Schaumburg:** Uses Home Rule to reduce the state "EV Capable" mandate from 100% to 20%; strictly prohibits Level 3 (DC Fast) chargers inside parking structures.

Level of Service Impact

These guidelines will support the FD's emergency response by ensuring strategic access, specific location banning, infrastructure protection, enhanced suppression, and automatic safety measures.

Budget Impact

- **Village Costs:** Minimal administrative costs for updating the Village Code and Home Rule modifications to IL Public Act 103-0053 and training plans examiners and inspectors on the new standards.
 - This will counter the sustainability/electrification efforts and intent of this IL Act.
- **Developer/Owner Costs:** Higher costs for mandated sprinkler upgrades and HMA reports.
- **Risk Mitigation:** Proactive restrictions reduce municipal liability. Allowing underground EVC despite known hazards could expose the Village to legal scrutiny regarding toxic gas exposure or structural failure.

Recommendation / Next Steps

Based on the FD's technical assessment, the Village will pursue a strict safety-first approach:

1. **New EVC Construction Ban:** Prohibit new EVC installations in all underground parking structures and any parking structures with habitable space above. Level 3 (DC fast) chargers are strictly prohibited inside any parking structure.
 1. **Note:** There is no proposal to regulate existing EVCs. There is no requirement for them to be revised unless a permit is submitted for required alterations of existing EVCs. At that time, the EVC would have to comply with current and adopted codes.
 2. Village-owned parking garages, like Vail Ave., will be assessed internally for their existing EVC locations and potential measures needed to counter existing concerns.
2. **Permitted Locations:** Limit EVCs exclusively to surface lots, the closest dedicated street level parking spaces from vehicle extraction points of open parking structures without mixed-used above, or the top level of open-air parking structures. Restrict EVCs to no less than 10 feet from pedestrian required egress exits and 50 feet from critical utilities (transformers, hazardous sources). The Fire Code Official maintains discretionary authority to grant exceptions if a developer provides documented safety safeguards (large-scale fire test that proves the design prevents fire spread).
3. **Sprinkler System Design Requirements & Supporting Documentation:** Require Extra Hazard Group 2 sprinkler systems for parking structures that include EVCs for the charging areas, doubling the water volume of current minimum requirements. Mandatory automatic de-energization upon fire alarm activation and requiring UL-listed equipment.
4. **Home Rule Authority:** Exercise Home Rule to modify the State's 100% "EV Capable" mandate (Public Act 103-0053) for multifamily developments, reducing the requirement to 0%-20%, depending on the scope of work, to align with safety thresholds.
5. **Residential Exception:** No intent to further regulate Single Family homes beyond current codes, as they present lower occupancy and extraction risks.

The Next Steps:

- **Village Board Meeting:** Schedule a presentation for the Village Board to review these safety parameters.
- **Draft Ordinance:** Draft building code amendments and coordinate with Legal for preparing Home Rule documents to amend "EV Capable" parking ratios for multifamily developments.

Thank you for your consideration of this recommendation.



VILLAGE OF
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
INC. 1887



FIRE DEPARTMENT MEMORANDUM

Date: March 26, 2026
To: Ron Weber, Director of Building and Life Safety
From: Lance Harris, Fire Chief
Subject: Electric Vehicle Charging Hazards

Background

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide an overview of fire and life safety concerns associated with electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure in below-grade parking structures. While electric vehicles are becoming more common and represent an important part of future transportation systems, lithium-ion battery fires present unique hazards that differ significantly from traditional vehicle fires.

Based on current research, national fire service guidance, and documented incidents, the Fire Department has identified several safety concerns related to the installation of EV charging stations in underground parking facilities.

Lithium-Ion Battery Fire Hazards

Electric vehicles use large lithium-ion battery systems. Damage to battery cells can initiate thermal runaway, an uncontrolled chemical chain reaction within the battery pack. According to research conducted by the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) and the UL Fire Safety Research Institute (UL FSRI), thermal runaway events can produce several hazardous conditions:

- Release of **flammable hydrogen gas**
- Release of **hydrogen fluoride gas**, which forms **hydrofluoric acid** when mixed with moisture
- Production of highly toxic combustion products
- Self-sustaining combustion once thermal runaway begins

Hydrogen fluoride gas is highly corrosive and immediately hazardous to life and health. When mixed with water, including moisture in the respiratory tract, it forms hydrofluoric acid, which can cause severe respiratory injury or death.

These gases pose particularly elevated risks in confined environments such as underground parking garages, where ventilation is limited and gas accumulation can occur quickly.

Fire Behavior Suppression Challenges

Research conducted by UL FSRI, NFPA, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) indicates that EV battery fires behave differently from traditional vehicle fires.

Key characteristics include:

Extreme Temperatures

Testing conducted by UL FSRI and NIST demonstrates that EV battery fires can reach temperatures approaching 5,000°F, compared with approximately 1,500°F for gasoline vehicle fires.

Extended Burn Duration

EV battery fires can burn for 60–90 minutes or longer, often requiring extended suppression operations.

High Water Demand

NFPA guidance indicates suppression operations often require thousands of gallons of water to cool the battery pack and prevent continued thermal runaway.

Re-Ignition Potential

Battery cells may continue reacting internally even after visible fire is extinguished, leading to re-ignition hours later.

Tactical Considerations

Guidance developed by the International Association of Fire Chiefs (IAFC) and UL FSRI notes that suppression tactics frequently involve allowing the battery to burn while cooling the vehicle and protecting surrounding exposures. These tactics become significantly more difficult to implement in confined environments such as underground garages.

Charging Infrastructure and Fire Risk

EV charging infrastructure introduces additional electrical and operational considerations. Research cited by NFPA indicates that 18–30% of EV fires occur while the vehicle is charging using one of the charging systems listed below.

- **Level 1 Charging:** 120-volt residential charging (40–50 hour charge time)
- **Level 2 Charging:** 240-volt residential/commercial charging (4–5 hour charge time)
- **DC Fast Charging:** systems capable of up to **350 kW**

Emerging research initiatives are developing ultra-fast charging systems capable of 500 kW to 1 megawatt, which may further increase electrical demand and infrastructure complexity.

Risks Associated with Underground Parking Structures

Below-grade parking garages present additional safety concerns when EV charging infrastructure is installed. These include:

- Limited ventilation for smoke and hazardous gases
- Restricted access for firefighting apparatus and personnel
- Structural exposure to prolonged high heat
- Potential damage to charging equipment from vehicles
- Fire protection systems designed around traditional vehicle fires
- Limited evacuation options for occupants

Many existing parking structures were built decades ago and were not engineered for the heat release rates associated with lithium-ion battery fires. Concrete structures can absorb and retain heat during prolonged fires, potentially impacting structural integrity.

Documented U.S. Incidents

Several incidents within the United States demonstrate the operational challenges associated with lithium-ion battery fires. Examples include:

In New York City, the Fire Department of the City of New York (FDNY) reported a significant rise in lithium-ion battery fires involving e-bikes and similar devices. In 2023 alone, the department documented over 200 battery-related fires resulting in multiple fatalities, leading to new safety regulations regarding battery storage and charging.

In Sacramento, California, four firefighters were transported to the hospital following exposure to hazardous gases while extinguishing an electric vehicle fire.

Additional EV fires in enclosed parking areas across the United States have required extended suppression operations and large water supplies due to continued battery involvement and re-ignition concerns.

Potential Liability Considerations for the Village

As municipalities evaluate the placement of EV charging infrastructure, it is also important to consider potential liability implications. Municipal governments have a responsibility to evaluate emerging risks and implement reasonable safeguards to protect residents, property, and emergency responders. As national fire safety organizations including the National Fire Protection Association, UL Fire Safety Research Institute, National Institute of Standards and Technology, and the International Association of Fire Chiefs continue to publish research outlining the hazards associated with lithium-ion battery fires, municipalities must consider how those hazards apply to local infrastructure.

Allowing EV charging installations in confined underground parking structures despite known operational hazards could potentially expose municipalities to legal scrutiny following a future incident involving fire, toxic gas exposure, or structural damage. Implementing reasonable restrictions on the placement of charging infrastructure, such as limiting installations to open air or above-grade parking areas demonstrates a proactive approach to risk management and public safety.

In addition, it is imperative to consider the health and safety concerns for firefighters involved in electric vehicle fire incidents, given the possible consequences of exposure to highly toxic gases. Depending on the severity of an incident, PPE (including turnout gear) worn by firefighters exposed to highly corrosive chemicals may not be salvageable and will instead require replacement.

Future Risk Considerations

Electric vehicles currently represent a relatively small portion of the overall vehicle fleet. However, EV adoption is expected to increase significantly over the next 10–15 years, which will likely increase the frequency of EV-related fire incidents. Municipal infrastructure decisions made today should consider the long term operational and life safety implications associated with expanding EV adoption.

Recommendation

Electric vehicles represent an important component of the future transportation landscape. However, research conducted by NFPA, UL FSRI, NIST, and fire service organizations such as the IAFC indicates that lithium-ion battery fires present unique hazards including:

- Extremely high temperatures
- Prolonged burn times
- Toxic gas production
- Significant water demand for suppression
- Potential for delayed re-ignition

These hazards are significantly amplified in below-grade parking structures, where ventilation is limited, firefighting access is restricted, and structural exposure may be increased.

Based on the available research, operational considerations, and life safety concerns, the Fire Department **does not recommend allowing electric vehicle charging stations in below-grade parking garages within the Village.**

If EV charging infrastructure is implemented within the community, it is recommended that installations be limited to:

- Open air parking areas
- Surface parking facilities
- Above-grade parking structures where ventilation and firefighter access can reduce risk.

The Fire Department will continue monitoring emerging research, national standards, and fire service best practices as EV technology and infrastructure continue to evolve.

References

National Fire Protection Association – Electric Vehicle Safety Resources

UL Fire Safety Research Institute – Lithium-Ion Battery Fire Research

National Institute of Standards and Technology – EV Fire and Battery Safety Research

International Association of Fire Chiefs – Electric Vehicle Emergency Response Guidance

Fire Department of the City of New York – Lithium-Ion Battery Safety Reports



VILLAGE OF
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
INC. 1887

Committee of the Whole
5/11/2026

Item: Environmental Commission Single-Use Plastic Bag Report
Department: Health & Human Services

Item Description:

The Village of Arlington Heights (VAH) Environmental Commission will present a report summarizing the results of a Benchmarking Study of state and local ordinances related to Single-Use Plastic programs and policies. The report provides research by the Village of Arlington Heights (VAH) Environmental Commission of 5 local communities which have implemented Single-Use Plastic programs and policies, as well as the relevant state legislation. Included in the report are policy mechanisms, including bag bans, bag fees, plastic bottle regulations, and food ware policies, along with common exceptions to these policies. Health and Human Services staff support the exploration of programs that reduce plastics and encourage eco-friendly business practices. Before decisions on new programs can be made, additional research would have to be done to get feedback from the public and business community and solicit feedback from other communities who have already instituted such programs on their implementation challenges.

Staff Recommendation: Village Board discussion to determine if they would like staff to further explore the feasibility of such programs

ATTACHMENTS:

1. VAH_Single-UsePlastics_Report_2025_final

Village of Arlington Heights Environmental Commission

Single-Use Plastics Programs Benchmarking Report

The Village of Arlington Heights (VAH) Environmental Commission is pleased to present to the Board of Trustees and the Mayor this report summarizing the results of a Benchmarking Study of state and local ordinances related to Single-Use Plastic programs and policies.

The VAH Environmental Commission has used this data to formulate several recommendations for the Board to consider.

Executive Summary

This report covers a benchmarking study by the Village of Arlington Heights (VAH) Environmental Commission of 5 local communities which have implemented Single-Use Plastic programs and policies, as well as the relevant state legislation. This report covers various policy mechanisms, including bag bans, bag fees, plastic bottle regulations, and food ware policies, along with common exceptions to these policies. The report includes a recommendation by the VAH Environmental Commission for the Village to draft an ordinance addressing Single-Use plastics in our community.

Introduction: Why Reduce Single-Use Plastics?

The pervasive issue of plastic pollution represents a significant global and regional environmental crisis. Single-Use Plastics, due to their persistence in the environment, contribute to litter and are a growing source of concern regarding microplastics, which have been detected in air, food, and drinking water and are generated by plastic bags and bottles as well other sources.⁸ In our own region, the Great Lakes are a significant source of drinking water for an estimated 40 million people, and studies have shown that nearly 22 million pounds of plastic debris enter these Great Lakes every year, making plastic pollution reduction a critical environmental and public health imperative.¹ Addressing this challenge requires comprehensive and adaptive policy frameworks.

Single Use Plastics -- Recycling Infrastructure and its Limitations

Despite ongoing recycling efforts, the persistent challenge of recycling single-use plastics - and particularly single-use plastic bags - remains. These items are typically not accepted in conventional curbside recycling bins because they are difficult to recycle and can contaminate recycling facility equipment. For example, single-use bags are often referred to as "tangles"

due to their tendency to become entangled in sorting machinery, causing process shut-downs and increasing maintenance time.¹⁵ In fact, Illinois EPA's guidelines explicitly state "No Plastic Bags" for standard recycling and advise consumers to return clean bags to retailers for specialized recycling.²⁰ While some communities like Arlington Heights offer specific local drop-off programs for plastic bags, these are adaptations to a widespread gap in recycling infrastructure⁷ and are not effectively capturing the majority of single-use plastic bags that are discarded. In Illinois, an estimated 3.7 billion single-use plastic bags are used each year,²³ but the US EPA estimates that 10% or less of plastic bags used in the United States annually are recycled.²² That means over 3.3 billion plastic bags are discarded every year in Illinois. The inherent challenges of plastic bag recyclability underscore the critical importance of source reduction policies, such as bans and fees, over sole reliance on recycling.

Alignment with Global and National Trends

Discussions around an international treaty to end plastic pollution indicate a growing global consensus on the need for systemic change in plastic management, including reducing single-use plastics.²¹ At this time, local public policies aimed at reducing single-use plastic pollution would align with broader national and international movements.

Illinois State-Level Legislative Measures for Single-Use Plastics

Illinois has taken steps to address single-use plastic pollution through statewide legislative measures, establishing a broader framework that influences and, in some cases, preempts local initiatives.

The Small Single-Use Plastic Bottle Act (SB2960)

The Small Single-Use Plastic Bottle Act (SB2960), signed into law by Governor Pritzker in August 2024, specifically targets small, single-use plastic bottles containing personal care products, which are commonly found in hotel bathrooms.¹

The core mandate of the Act prohibits hotels with 50 or more rooms from providing small, single-use plastic bottles, defined as plastic bottles or containers with less than a 6-ounce capacity, containing personal care products such as shampoo, hair conditioner, or bath soap, in individual sleeping rooms or public bathrooms.¹ The Act defines "hotel" according to the Hotel Operators' Occupation Tax Act.¹⁸ An important exception allows hotels to provide these personal care products in small plastic bottles upon request, free of charge, but only at locations outside of guest rooms and public bathrooms.²

The implementation of SB2960 is phased. Hotels with 50 or more rooms were required to

comply starting July 1, 2025. By January 1, 2026, the ban will extend to all hotels in Illinois, regardless of their size.¹

The primary goal of this legislation is to reduce the volume of plastic waste entering landfills and waterways, particularly the Great Lakes, which serve as a crucial source of drinking water in the region.¹ Proponents view this as an "upstream solution," aiming to curb plastic production and encourage the adoption of reusable alternatives.¹ The Act has garnered broad support from environmental organizations, including the Illinois Environmental Council, the Alliance for the Great Lakes, and Ocean Conservancy, as well as industry associations such as the Illinois Hotel & Lodging Association and the Illinois Recycling Association, which recognize both its environmental and economic benefits.¹

Proposed Single-Use Plastic Bag Reduction Act (SB1872): A Statewide Checkout Bag Policy

Another potentially significant piece of state legislation under consideration at the state level is the Single-Use Plastic Bag Reduction Act (SB1872), which aims to establish a statewide policy regarding checkout bags. The proposed Act would prohibit retail mercantile establishments from offering or making available single-use checkout bags to consumers at the point of sale.³ Instead, retailers would be permitted to offer recycled paper bags or reusable bags, for a fee.³ The bill also proposes a minimum fee of \$0.10 per recycled paper bag, which would be retained by the retail establishment.³ Exemptions include bags for certain governmental food assistance programs, as well as specific bag types such as those used for bulk items (e.g., fruit, vegetables, nuts), greeting cards, frozen foods, meat, fish, flowers, unwrapped prepared foods, prescription drugs, and bags sold in packages for garbage or pet waste.³

The legislative journey of SB1872 has seen several adjustments to its proposed effective date. Initially slated for July 1, 2026, the prohibition was delayed to January 1, 2028, and subsequently to January 1, 2029, through committee amendments.⁴ As of June 2, 2025, the bill's status is "Re-referred to Assignments".⁴

The proposed statewide fee structure of SB1872 suggests a state preference for a fee-based approach, which aims to reduce single-use bag consumption while retaining consumer choice, rather than implementing outright bans, which might face greater public or business resistance.¹⁵ Chicago's own history of repealing a ban in favor of a tax further illustrates this preference for financial disincentives over outright prohibitions.⁸

Municipal Approaches to Single-Use Plastic Management

Beyond state-level initiatives, several Illinois municipalities have implemented their own programs to address single-use plastic waste. The Village of Arlington Heights Environmental

Commission conducted a Benchmarking Study of several local communities with existing ordinances on single-use plastics. The results show varied approaches to the issue, with some communities implementing bans and other implementing fee-based approaches.

The results of the Benchmarking Study are shown in Table 1. Of particular note is the recent approval (August 4, 2025) given to city staff by Park Ridge alderpersons to develop an ordinance that would ban single-use plastic bags in that community.

Table 1 Benchmarking Survey of Illinois Communities with Single-Use Plastics Ordinances

Community	Policy Type	Effective Date (or Proposed)	Scope/Applicability	Fee Amount (if applicable)	Fee Retention/ Allocation	Key Exemptions
Chicago	Checkout Bag Tax	Jan 1, 2025 (current rate) ⁹	Retail sale/use of checkout bags	\$0.10 per bag ⁹	Store/wholesaler credit of \$0.01 per bag; \$0.09 remitted to city ⁹	SNAP/food assistance programs, constitutional violations ⁹
Evanston	Plastic Bag Ban & Paper Bag Fee	Aug 1, 2023 ¹²	Community-wide; retailers (>10,000 sq ft) & restaurants; plastic pre-checkout bags ¹¹	\$0.10 per paper bag ⁸	50% retailer, 50% to City's Solid Waste Fund for education/enforcement ¹¹	Prescription drugs, newspapers, restaurant carry-out, SNAP/food assistance ¹¹
Mount Prospect	Plastic Utensils ban (voluntary)		Restaurants & local businesses	N/A	N/A	N/A-voluntary
Oak Park	Single-Use Bag Fee; Plastic Food ware Restriction; Polystyrene Foam Ban	Bag Fee: 2018 (amended 2023); Food ware: June 1, 2023; Polystyrene: Jan 1, 2024 (Jan 1, 2025 for small businesses) ¹³	Bag Fee: Retail stores >5,000 sq ft; Food ware: Food establishments for delivery/take-out; Polystyrene: Food establishments ¹³	\$0.10 per bag (bag fee) ¹³	50% retailer, 50% to Village for sustainability initiatives (bag fee) ¹³	Bag Fee: Food assistance, prescription drugs, bulk items, restaurant take-out; Food ware: Vending machines, prepackaged items, non-profits; Polystyrene: Seafood/meat packaging, emergencies, prepackaged items ¹³
Northbrook	Single-Use Bag Fee	January 1, 2024 ¹⁵	Stores >3,000 sq ft	\$0.10 per bag ¹⁵	50% retained by retailer, 50% to Village ¹⁵	Restaurants, prescriptions, bulk items, wrapped foods, prepared foods, food assistance ¹⁵
Park Ridge	Single-Use Plastic Bag Ban (Proposed)	Aug 5, 2025 (discussion) ¹⁰	Large chain stores (proposed)	10-cent paper bag fee (considered) ¹⁰	N/A (proposed)	Small businesses (proposed exemption) ¹⁰

Factors to Consider when Drafting an Ordinance

Bans vs. Fees in Driving Behavioral Change, for Single-Use Plastic Bags

Illinois communities with ordinances on single-use plastic bags have primarily adopted two main policy mechanisms: outright bans or fees on single-use bags. Evanston's definitive ban shows immediate source reduction is a primary objective in their community.⁸ In contrast, cities like Chicago, Oak Park, and Naperville have opted for fee-based models which aim to change consumer behavior over time.⁹ The shift in Chicago from an initial ban to a tax suggests that a direct financial incentive or disincentive can be a more politically acceptable and effective mechanism for behavioral change than an outright prohibition, especially in larger, more diverse urban settings.⁸ Fees provide a more flexible approach that can generate revenue and may face less public resistance by offering consumers a choice. The prevailing trend towards fees indicates a preference for mechanisms that balance environmental goals with economic considerations and public acceptance.

Scope and Exemptions in Municipal Ordinances

The varying scope of these ordinances, particularly the common exemption for small businesses and specific bag types, reflects an attempt to mitigate economic impacts and address practical considerations, even if it creates loopholes in comprehensive plastic reduction. For example, Park Ridge's discussions explicitly consider not applying a ban to small businesses, and Chicago's initial ban also exempted smaller stores.¹⁰ This consideration for small businesses demonstrates political and economic sensitivity. Similarly, exemptions for specific bag types, such as produce bags, dry cleaning bags, or prescription bags, acknowledge functional necessities, even if they reduce the overall impact of the policy.⁶

Financial Models: Differences in Fee Retention and Utilization

The management of collected fees varies significantly across communities, reflecting different policy objectives. Most municipalities split the fee with the retailers, with half going to the city to fund broader sustainability initiatives such as education and enforcement in Evanston, or sustainability projects in Oak Park.¹¹ During our benchmarking process, the Commission learned that the annual municipal share of revenue for bag fees can range from \$75,000 (Northbrook) to \$200,000 (Evanston). The “splitting of revenue” approach balances easing the financial burden on businesses with collecting revenue for funding public environmental programs, which can enhance public support by demonstrating the tangible benefits of the policy.

Recommendations

The VAH Environmental Commission recommends that the Village of Arlington Heights adopts an ordinance on Single-Use Plastics in our community that:

- 1) Prohibits retail mercantile establishments from offering or making available single-use checkout bags to consumers at the point of sale
- 2) Exempts Small businesses and certain specialty uses of bags such as prescriptions, meat, poultry and fish products, produce, etc.
- 3) Allows the sale of paper bags (with minimum 40% post-consumer recycled content) to consumers at point of sale for a fee of 10 cents per bag, with 50% of the revenue retained by the establishment and 50% of the revenue paid to the Village
- 4) Exempts persons receiving SNAP/food assistance from the fee requirement

Further recommendations include:

- 1) Reaching out to the local Chamber of Commerce to solicit feedback from their members
- 2) Reaching out to large retailers located in Arlington Heights for their feedback on experiences with single-use plastic bag ordinances in other communities
- 3) Developing and implementing an awareness/education campaign for the Arlington Heights community prior to the effective date of the ordinance
- 4) Establishing baseline metrics on single-use plastic bag usage in our community prior to implementation of restrictions, and a plan to track and report on these metrics on a regular cadence

Works cited

1. Illinois First Great Lakes State to Reduce Single-use Plastic Bottles, accessed August 12, 2025, <https://ilenviro.org/illinois-first-great-lakes-state-to-reduce-single-use-plastic-bottles-in-hotels/>
2. Illinois Hotels Face Major Change as Single-Use Plastic Bottle Ban ..., accessed August 12, 2025, <https://mahometdaily.com/illinois-hotels-face-major-change-as-single-use-plastic-bottle-ban-takes-effect-july-1/>
3. ilga.gov, accessed August 12, 2025, <https://ilga.gov/Legislation/BillStatus?DocTypeID=SB&DocNum=1872&GAID=18&SessionID=114&LegID=161054#:~:text=Synopsis%20As%20Introduced,at%20the%20point%20of%20sale.>
4. Bill Status of SB1872 - Illinois General Assembly, accessed August 12, 2025, <https://ilga.gov/Legislation/BillStatus?DocTypeID=SB&DocNum=1872&GAID=18&SessionID=114&LegID=161054>
5. Comments: IL SB1872 | 2025-2026 | 104th General Assembly - LegiScan, accessed August 12, 2025, <https://legiscan.com/IL/comments/SB1872/2025>
6. SB1872 104TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY, accessed August 12, 2025, <https://www.ilga.gov/legislation/104/SB/10400SB1872.htm>
7. Recycling & Collection Of Special Items - Welcome to Arlington ..., accessed August 12, 2025, https://www.vah.com/residents/refuse_recycle_landscape_waste/collection_of_special_items.php
8. ADOPTION OF PLASTIC BAG ORDINANCES IN ILLINOIS: LESSONS FOR MUNICIPALITIES CONSIDERING LEGISLATION, accessed August 12, 2025, <https://www.uis.edu/sites/default/files/inline-images/06-Styles%20and%20Wang%201001.pdf>
9. Checkout Bag Tax (2737) - City of Chicago, accessed August 12, 2025, https://www.chicago.gov/city/en/depts/fin/supp_info/revenue/tax_list/CheckoutBagTax.html
10. Park Ridge To Consider Single-Use Plastic Bag Ban - Journal & Topics Media Group, accessed August 12, 2025, <https://www.journal-topics.com/articles/park-ridge-single-use-plastic-bag-ban-discussion/>
11. Updated Shopping Bag Policy | City of Evanston, accessed August 12, 2025, <https://www.cityofevanston.org/about-evanston/updated-shopping-bag-policy>
12. Retail Single Use Bag Tax - City of Evanston, accessed August 12, 2025, <https://www.cityofevanston.org/government/departments/public-works/policies/retail-single-use-bag-tax>
13. Single Use Bag Initiative | Village of Oak Park, accessed August 12, 2025, <https://www.oak-park.us/Community/Sustainability-Resilience/Sustainability-Initiatives-Policies/Single-Use-Bag-Initiative>
14. Single-Use Plastics and Polystyrene Foam Packaging | Engage Oak Park, accessed August

- 12, 2025, <https://engageoakpark.com/single-use-plastics>
15. Single Use Bag Fee | Naperville, IL, accessed September 15, 2025, https://library.municode.com/il/northbrook/ordinances/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=1201001
 16. Environment & Conservation - Arlington Heights Park District, accessed August 12, 2025, <https://www.ahpd.org/parks/environment-conservation/>
 17. Sustainability in Village Fleet - Welcome to Arlington Heights, IL, accessed August 12, 2025, https://www.vah.com/sustainability_in_village_fleet/index.php
 18. SB2960 103RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY, accessed August 12, 2025, <https://www.ilga.gov/legislation/103/SB/10300SB2960.htm>
 19. Chicago Plastic Bag Ordinance Passed - Chicago Chapter - Surfrider Foundation, accessed August 12, 2025, <https://chicago.surfrider.org/campaigns/Chicago+Plastic+Bag+Ordinance+Passed>
 20. Recycling Guidelines | Illinois EPA, accessed August 12, 2025, <https://epa.illinois.gov/content/dam/soi/en/web/epa/topics/waste-management/documents/recyclingguidelineshr-illinois.pdf>
 21. UN treaty to end plastic pollution could result in major changes, Chicago expert says, accessed August 12, 2025, <https://www.cbsnews.com/chicago/news/un-treaty-plastic-pollution-major-changes-chicago-expert/>
 22. Frequent Questions regarding EPA's Facts and Figures about Materials, Waste and Recycling, accessed September 7, 2025 <https://www.epa.gov/facts-and-figures-about-materials-waste-and-recycling/frequent-questions-regarding-epas-facts-and/>
 23. Illinois PIRG Summer 2024 Newsletter, accessed September 7, 2025 https://publicinterestnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/IllinoisPIRG_Summer2024_newsletter.pdf