

# SYCAMORE CITY COUNCIL

## AGENDA

March 18, 2002

### City Council Committee Meetings

**6:45 P.M. Meeting of the Ordinance Committee.** At the last regular City Council meeting of March 4, Ordinance Committee chair Cheryl Maness agreed to submit two topics for discussion by the Committee on March 18. One was prompted by recent complaints about property owners who do not remove the snow and ice from residential or commercial sidewalks in a timely manner; and the other concerned whether vehicles parked on public ways should be moved on a periodic basis. The two topics are treated separately, below:

A. Sidewalk Snow Removal And Sidewalk Maintenance.

Presently, the City Code addresses snow removal in several ways:

- a) Section 7-1-15, A. This section prohibits the dumping of snow on private or public property in a manner that obstructs the vision of motorists;
- b) Section 7-1-15, B. This section prohibits the depositing of snow from private driveways onto public streets.

Illinois communities have differing approaches to public sidewalk maintenance. Few expect public works employees to keep them clear of ice or snow. Most communities have an unwritten understanding with their taxpayers that homeowners or businessowners should keep the frontage sidewalks clean. It is generally understood that the alternative—regular maintenance performed by public employees—would require a substantially higher tax burden. When sidewalk sections deteriorate and need replacement, the same communities often have an assistance program that pays part of the replacement cost. Sycamore's program offers \$2.25 per square foot of sidewalk replaced, upon the approval of the Building Commissioner (Section 7-2-10).

However, some communities have experienced difficulties in gaining voluntary compliance and have imposed penalties for a propertyowner's failure to "do the right thing" when sidewalks are slippery or covered with snow. They have done so by declaring unmaintained sidewalks nuisances and resorted to their police powers to remedy the nuisance by either (a) imposing fines; (b) authorizing the summary abatement of the nuisance by public employees within a certain time frame; or (c) both. To offset the cost of a summary abatement (i.e. using city crews to shovel or scrape the sidewalks until clean), codes are often written to permit the city to attach a lien to the property. State statutes provide the authority to regulate the upkeep of sidewalks (see the attached 65 ILCS 5/11-80-13).

Following the snow event of March 1-2, a Downtown property owner whose commercial properties lay astride two major intersections failed to take steps to remove snow from the adjacent public sidewalk. As a public safety measure, City crews abated the nuisance

on March 4 and have billed the owner for the negligence. Ideally, such extraordinary steps will be infrequent, as they have been in the past. Immediately after snow events, City crews have many pressing duties aside from abating nuisances that private property owners might reasonably be expected to address. Imposing fines on property owners may prompt some to take steps the next time, but the processing of fines through the mail usually leads to long and unacceptable delays in the actual removal of the nuisance at hand.

Committee direction is recommended.

B. Parked, Operable Vehicles That Are Not Regularly Moved From One Street Location To Another.

This matter is quite different from the first. Several local residents have contacted City offices to complain about vehicles that have been parked in the same place on a public residential street for weeks or even months at a time. These vehicles are operable and licensed but, for whatever reason, their owners do not move them. The complainants have noted that such vehicles are not typically in good condition, and serve as a poor advertisement for other properties in the neighborhood.

With respect to enforcement, Sycamore has no codes that prohibit such practice. We have provisions dealing with the ticketing and towing of vehicles after significant snowfalls (Section 6-2-7); provisions prohibiting the parking of commercial vehicles, vans, motor homes, etc. in excess of one ton on City streets and alleys (Section 6-2-9); codes prohibiting the parking of inoperable or unlicensed vehicles on any street or exposed to view on private property (Section 6-7-2, revised in October 2000); and regulations against the parking of vehicles on an unapproved surface on private property (Section 6-2-1, revised in October, 2000).

Communities that consider vehicles that are seldom moved on public streets nuisances have to establish for the courts that they are not moved regularly. Hearsay is no proof in this instance. Typically, some marking that shows the tires have not moved in relation to the adjacent road surface is needed to set the baseline. Oftentimes the spraying of an iridescent paint across the bottom of the tire and the adjacent road surface is the method of choice. A photo is then taken of the marking with a date superimposed on the photo in the event the matter ends up in court. A week or so later, another photo is taken to establish the time frame. The allowable time frame is of course a matter of debate. Such enforcement efforts are time-consuming but necessary to establish the evidence needed to prosecute such a nuisance.

Committee direction is requested.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Regular City Council Meeting  
7:30 P.M.**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **INVOCATION**
3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
5. **AUDIENCE TO VISITORS**
6. **CONSENT AGENDA**
  - A. Approval of the Minutes of the Regular City Council Meeting of March 4, 2002;
  - B. Approval of the Closed Session Minutes for the City Council Meetings of April 16, 2001; May 3, 2001; May 7, 2001; June 4, 2001; June 18, 2001; July 16, 2001; August 6, 2001; October 1, 2001; October 15, 2001;
  - C. Plan Commission Minutes for the Meeting of February 11, 2002.
  - D. Payment of the Bills for March 18, 2002;
  - E. Monthly Budget Report for the Period Ending February 28, 2002.
7. **PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS, COMMUNICATIONS, AND BILLS.**
8. **REPORTS OF OFFICERS**
9. **REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**
10. **PUBLIC HEARINGS--None**
11. **ORDINANCES**
  - A. **Ordinance No. 2001.75—An Ordinance Concerning the Recommendation of the Plan Commission With Regard to the Request of Barbara Louis Messinger and Dan Jahns, co-Trustees of Trust No. 100, and Wiseman-Hughes Enterprises, Inc. for Approval of an Annexation Agreement for a Planned Unit Development Known as Reston Ponds at the Northeast Corner of Bethany Road and Somonauk Street with Zoning Classifications of “R-1” One Family Residence District and “C-1” Neighborhood Business District in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.**

At the regular Plan Commission meeting of March 11, the Commission held a public hearing on the proposed annexation of what is commonly known as the Jahns farm, a 203.18-acre parcel at the northeast corner of Bewthany Road and Somonauk Street. The developer, Wiseman-Hughes Enterprises, Inc., intends to create a planned unit development that primarily features “R-1” One Family Residence zoning with

detached single-family homes, with the exception of a 5.05-acre area to be zoned “C-1” Neighborhood Commercial, adjacent to the intersection of Bethany Road and Somonauk Street. The development which will be known as “Reston Ponds” was first discussed in a Plan Commission workshop meeting on January 14, 2002. The proposed terms, conditions, and plan for the new development are variously described in the annexation agreement, preliminary plat, zoning plan, and landscape plan which are attached for the Council’s review.

The City Council is well aware that the proposed planned unit development falls entirely within the Bethany Road Regional Planning Area. The intent of the regional plan is to

- Encourage an attractive entryway to the City;
- Protect existing, contiguous neighborhoods from dissimilar uses and structures with elaborate transitional buffers;
- Establish corridors for major collector streets that provide efficient access to Bethany Road and Somonauk Street while minimizing the impact of through traffic on existing neighborhoods;
- Incorporate parks and recreational space within easy walking and biking distance of new dwelling units;
- Link major open spaces within the planning area to the Sycamore Community Park through bike paths and a variety of walkways.
- Encourage construction of regional retention facilities with capacities appreciably in excess of minimum subdivision requirements.
- Foster cooperation among landowners within the planning area and encourage cooperation between landowners and interested developers.

The Plan Commission assessed the proposed preliminary plan and annexation agreement with these purposes in mind. The principal features of the text and plan for the annexation that were agreed by both the Commission and the developer are as follows:

**1. The Plan.**

- a) Overall Area. The plan depicts a development of 203.18 acres.
- b) Land Uses. The table below displays the land uses in the proposed plan:

Single-Family Homes	97.65 Acres
Park Sites	17.81 Acres
Bike Pathways	1.75 Acres
Ponds and Detention	35.53 Acres
Landscape Buffers	3.98 Acres
Neighborhood Retail	5.05 Acres
Right of Way	41.41 Acres
Total	203.18 Acres

- c) Density. The density of the residentially zoned area is 1.97 units per acre (391 single family units divided by 198.13 acres). The allowable density of the area is three (3) units per acre.

- d) Single-Family Homes. A total of 391 single family detached homes are planned. The average lot size is 10,800 square feet.
- e) Transitional lot sizes. The critical transition points are at the northwest, north, and northeast corners of the development area. The adjacent lot sizes are noted on the attached chart. The Commission agreed that the transitional lot sizes are acceptable.
- f) Commercial Uses. In terms of uses, the 5.05-acre commercial corner would be constrained by the Regional Plan. No variances from these uses have been requested. The uses identified in the Regional Plan include the following: antique shops, beauty shops, drug stores, florist shops, gift or novelty shops, ice cream shops, professional laundries, convenience grocery stores without gasoline sales and service, professional offices, and day care centers. The Council will note that the developer has reduced the size of the commercially-zoned area from the allowable maximum of 12 acres.
- g) Park Space. Two park areas are shown that the developer wishes to dedicate to the Park District. One is the large central park area of 12.54 acres (Lot 399 on the preliminary plan). The other is a 2.5-acre site shown as Lot 404, which would connect with the 2-acre park space in Krpan's Parkside Estates plan.
- h) Bike Paths. A bike path is shown that runs northward from the intersection of Bethany Road and Somonauk Street along the east side of the drainage easement to a point north of Lot 156, then eastward across the subdivision to the Fenstermaker property. This path will eventually link with the bike path required in the Krpan subdivision. The developer is in discussion with the Sycamore Park Board about the dedication of this path and adjacent easement to the Park District for long-term public use and maintenance. This bike path will serve a regional purpose. It will eventually be linked with the DeKalb Sycamore bikeway that presently ends in the Prairie Business Park, and with the Great Western Trail to the east via bikeways through the Krpan subdivision and the Sycamore Community Park. Whether or not the bike path will feature lights is a matter that will be addressed with the Park District.
- i) Single-Loaded Street. As recommended by the Regional Plan, the proposed preliminary plan depicts a single-loaded street (Fulton Lane) featuring detached single-family homes. As a result of the Plan Commission discussion, the developer agrees to provide 5 basic "Victorian" facades for the Fulton Lane frontage that will be judiciously interspersed to avoid a monolithic look while serving the local interest in some historic architectural resonance.
- j) Detention basins. The plan includes a system of drainage basins that would provide regional storm water storage that includes the runoff from the development area and the release from the Bethany Road regional detention pond. At this writing, City Engineer John Brady is still working out the precise requirements for the storage capacity with Wiseman-Hughes. The Council will note that the drainage ponds and drainage easements are numbered as lots (Lots 392-406). Lot 399 might be used for park space, but would be privately maintained because its drainage role will limit its usefulness during rain events.

- k) Landscaping. A tree-planting plan is attached. The development will feature a landscaped median at the main entrances off Bethany Road (Reston Boulevard) and Somonauk Street (Becker Place). The proposed landscaped median on Waterman Drive (name to be changed) will be removed because of the difficulties posed for snowplowing on the curve.
- l) Somonauk Street widening and reconstruction. The east side of Somonauk Street will be widened to include 12-foot turn lanes. Additional right-of-way to a point 50 feet from the street centerline shall be dedicated with additional right-of-way at the intersection of Bethany Road and Somonauk Street.
- m) Bethany Road widening and reconstruction. The developer is also responsible for widening and reconstructing Bethany Road to a width of 41 feet back-to-back of curb, except for widening at the intersection of Bethany Road and Somonauk Street. A recapture scheme is introduced in the annexation agreement to establish a fair means to gain financial assistance from future developers of adjacent properties. The City staff are agreeable to removing the arbitrary time limit of five years on this recapture scheme.
- n) Traffic signals. The developer will install signals at the corner of Bethany Road and Somonauk Street as warranted.
- o) Water systems. As with previous development plans for this area, the proposed plan would accomplish a looping of the water main system that will improve the quality of water for the east end of town.
- p) Maintenance of common areas. A homeowners association will be responsible for the maintenance of the plan's large open spaces and common areas not otherwise dedicated to the Park District.
- q) Front yard setbacks. The City's Zoning Code prescribes a 20 foot front yard setback. The City Engineer has asked for a 25 foot setback as the City did with Heron Creek and Townsend Woods (the Krpan's Parkside Estates plan shows 30 foot setbacks). The Reston Ponds plan would need to be revised on this point if the Council supports the City Engineer's recommendation.

**2. The Subdivision name.** The proposed name of the subdivision--“The Enclave at Reston Ponds”—has significance in terms of Sycamore’s history. Pamela Schawel of Wiseman-Hughes spent some time at the Joiner History Room and learned that one of the City’s most prominent historical figures was William Fulton, who served as an Illinois Supreme Court Justice. His daughter, Sally Reston, was married to Scott Reston, the former publisher of the New York Times. Although her husband never lived in Sycamore, Sally grew up in Sycamore and regularly corresponded with friends in the City during the 1940s and 1950s, recounting her travels and observations of world events in correspondence that is collected in the Joiner History Room. During the Plan Commission meeting, the Commission recommended the shortening of the subdivision name to “Reston Ponds” to avoid the exclusive connotation suggested by the word “Enclave.”

### **3. The Annexation Agreement.**

The long list of changes identified in the attached staff letter of February 28 have generally been resolved to the satisfaction of the Commission and the staff. The revised annexation agreement is attached. The key points in the agreement are as follows:

- a) The term is 20 years.
- b) The City agrees to hold a public hearing for the C-1 zoned property to be rezoned to R-1 One Family residence in the event that no commercial uses have been established within five (5) years.
- c) The developer will provide an irrevocable letter of credit for the public improvements on the site.
- d) Sidewalks are not required along the Somonauk frontage where the bike path will go.
- e) The developer is responsible for additional widening and reconstruction along the Somonauk Street frontage. The developer will create a 12 foot northbound turn lane into Becker Place. This widening shall begin with the first phase of the project and shall be completed from the Becker Place entrance southward to a point 150 south of the Georjean Court centerline. The balance of the widening south to Bethany Road shall be completed within seven years or whenever 300 single family homes have been permitted, whichever comes first.
- f) The developer is responsible for widening and reconstructing Bethany Road to a width of 41 feet, with turn lanes at the intersection with Somonauk Street. The developer will be able to recapture a share of this cost as the property on the south side of Bethany Road is developed. There will be no limit on the period for recapture.
- g) The developer will establish an escrow account for a proportional share of the cost of installing signals at the intersection of Somonauk Street and Bethany Road.
- h) The developer will be permitted to introduce a mobile sales office which will be accessed from the new entrance off Bethany Road, and will be able to maintain the sales office until permits for 95% of the single family lots have been issued.

### **4. The Traffic Study.**

As John Brady explains in the attached memorandum, Intech Consultants of Downers Grove completed a traffic impact study for the developer. The firm projected 3700 vehicles per day from the residential zoned area and 2200 vehicles per day from the small commercial zone once the development is completed. It is the staff's opinion that the consultant overestimated the traffic to and from the commercial site, with the limited variety of uses allowed in that area in order to reduce traffic. About 36% of the traffic would travel to and from the Becker Place intersection, and 32% from the Reston Boulevard intersection with Bethany Road. The internal traffic would be widely distributed over the thirteen streets with access to the development area.

## **5. The Fiscal Impact Study.**

The City Administrator completed a fiscal impact study using the proposed new impact fees and updated assumptions based on recent City and School budgets. The development is projected to have a positive fiscal impact on City finances, but a negative fiscal impact on School finances. The negative annual fiscal impact in terms of the School District is largely due to the pace of new construction projected for the development (i.e. 75 homes per year, on average).

## **6. The Park District Review and Annexation.**

The developer will petition the Park Board for annexation on March 19. The Park Board reviewed the concept plan for the development at its February meeting but no decision was made regarding annexation.

## **7. Proposed Variations From Policy or Past Practice.**

The developer proposed a number of variations from standard City practice. The proposals, and the Plan Commission's recommendations, are listed below:

- a) Street Widths. The developer proposed a reduction in the minor residential street widths from 35' to 31'. The staff opposed this request. The Commission supported the staff position but concurred with the Administrator's suggestion that this matter might be discussed with local residents as the City revises its Comp Plan later in the calendar year.
- b) Impact Fees. The developer accepted the proposed new level of impact fees but asked for protection from any further increases for the next five years. In consideration of the Impact Fee Committee's recent recommendation to review impact fees in three years, the Commission accepted a compromise proposal to cap the fees for the next three years, with the requirement of a six-month notification period for any changes thereafter.
- c) Storm Water Storage Requirements. The developer and the City Engineer agree that the storage requirement should be double the City's standard in Section 8-6-7 of the City Code. There is still a professional disagreement over how to calculate that doubling of the storage capacity. The Commission reasoned that if there is no resolution to this difference before the Council meeting of March 18, then the Council should not act to approve the annexation agreement or preliminary plat or annexation until such time as the City Engineer is satisfied with the developer's design.
- d) Traffic Signal Costs. The developer agreed to pay his fair share of the traffic signals that will one day be installed at the intersection of Bethany Road and Somonauk Street when warrants arise, but asked to have his share quantified now so it could be factored into the sale of the lots. The Commission and City staff agreed to calculate the present value of the signalization, then have the developer escrow the funds to accrue interest against the future inflation of the signal installation costs.
- e) Commercial Zoning. The developer agreed to show the neighborhood zoning at the southwest corner of the parcel, next to the intersection of Bethany Road and Somonauk Street, but wishes to reduce the size of the commercial area

from the 12 acres shown on the Regional Plan to 5.05 acres. The developer also asked to be able to rezone the property to “R-1” One Family Residence after five years if no commercial interest arose. The Commission and the staff agreed to this variation since the nearby neighbors were never keen on the commercial zoning and since five years was a reasonable period to invite some commercial interest in the corner.

- f) The Sycamore Look. The developer agreed to comply with the Regional Plan’s requirement of a row of historic facades along the Somonauk Street frontage, but expressed concern about the potential uniformity of the look. The Commission and the staff recommended, and the developer agreed, to market five distinct facades to potential buyers of lots along Fulton Lane, with a requirement that no two adjacent houses would look alike, and that more than five options could be considered.

### **Recommendation**

In the time between the Plan Commission meeting of March 11 and the final drafting of this background memorandum during the evening of March 13, efforts were made by the developer to provide revised plans and a revised annexation agreement. The attached redlined version of the annexation agreement and the attached revised versions of the plat and plan were received after 3:00 p.m. on March 13. The City Administrator and City Engineer then proceeded to review these important documents. At this writing (late evening, March 13), it appears that there are still a number of discrepancies between the language and mapping recommended by the Plan Commission and the documents revised by the developer.

With respect to the preliminary plan and plat, the following issues remain:

- ◆ A new name for Reston Court has not been provided to prevent confusion with Reston Boulevard by emergency services as well as visitors.
- ◆ The east-west portions of Brower Place and Fulton Lane have not been renamed per the City Engineer’s recommendation.
- ◆ The front yard setbacks remain 20 feet.
- ◆ The bike path running southward along the easement to Bethany Road has not been clearly shown.

With respect to the annexation agreement, the following changes need to be made:

- ◆ Dan Jahns and Barb Messinger need to be mentioned as owners, jointly and severally, as in the original document.
- ◆ In Section 13.6, seven lines up from the bottom, the phrase “shall be provided” needs to be inserted after “gutter.” Also, the last sentence needs to be deleted.
- ◆ In Section 14.1, line 10, the word “probably” should be changed to “probable.”
- ◆ In Section 18, the cash or land donation should be in accordance with City Council Resolution No. 404 and related District action.
- ◆ In Section 32, line 5, the phrase “and maintenance of plantings” needs to be inserted after “mowing.”

- ◆ In Section 33.2, at the end of line 5, the new sentence should begin: “The *street*, sanitary sewer . . .” Also, in line 18, Exhibit “H” should be Exhibit “D” according to the Exhibit List.

In addition, the City Engineer and the developer’s engineer have not had an opportunity to resolve their professional differences over the storm sewer storage requirements. Because of the scope of the proposed planned development and public improvements, the staff would prefer to avoid a rushed and less than careful review. Accordingly, the staff recommend that the Council receive Ordinances 2001.75, 2001.76, and 2001.77 on first reading only, and hold over a consideration of their merits until a second reading at the regular meeting of April 1.

**B. Ordinance No. 2001.76—An Ordinance Concerning the Recommendation of the Plan Commission With Regard to the Request of Barbara Louis Messinger and Dan Jahns, co-Trustees of Trust No. 100, and Wiseman-Hughes Enterprises, Inc. for Approval of the Preliminary Plan and Plat for the Planned Unit Development Known as Reston Ponds in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.**

The preliminary plan and plat for Reston Ponds has been reviewed above. The Plan Commission reviewed the plat in detail at its regular meeting of March 11 and unanimously recommended its approval with the following conditions:

- a) that Commercial Street should connect with Becker Place;
- b) that the typical minor residential street width should remain 35 feet back-to-back of curb, with the exception of the single-sided Fulton Lane, which can be 31 feet back-to-back of curb;
- c) that new street names should be submitted for the east-west portion of Brower Place and the east-west portion of Fulton Lane;
- d) that new names should be found for Elmwood Street, Waterman Street, and Turner Lane since these are duplicates of existing streets;
- e) that, aside from the raised and landscaped medians at the Becker Place and Bethany Road entryways, the raised medians should be removed from interior streets.

As noted in the previous agenda item, some revisions remain to be made on the revised preliminary plan that followed the Plan Commission meeting of March 11. The City staff recommend that the Council receive and file this ordinance on first reading only, and hold it over until April 1 for detailed discussion on a second reading.

**C. Ordinance No. 2001.77—An Ordinance Concerning the Recommendation of the Plan Commission With Regard to the Request of Barbara Louis Messinger and Dan Jahns, co-Trustees of Trust No. 100, and Wiseman-Hughes Enterprises, Inc. for Approval of the Annexation of the Planned Unit Development Known as Reston Ponds in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.**

If the Council approves the annexation agreement and the preliminary plat and plan for the Reston Ponds planned unit development, it will be obliged to approve the annexation of the property. The Plan Commission voted unanimously to recommend the City Council's approval of the annexation, provided the developer revised the preliminary plat and plan and annexation agreement in line with the recommendations made at the Commission meeting of March 11. Because a number of points remain at issue, the staff recommend that the Council receive and file this ordinance on first reading only, and hold it over for detailed discussion and a second reading on April 1.

**12. RESOLUTIONS--None**

**13. CONSIDERATIONS**

**A. Consideration of the Mayor's Veto of the Council's Motion to Approve Contractor Bids for the Sycamore Community Center Roof Replacement Project.**

On March 8, 2002 Mayor Swedberg vetoed the action taken by the City Council on March 4, 2002 to approve a contract with Bruns Construction of Rochelle to remove and replace the roofing, fascia, soffits, gutters, and downspouts at the city-owned Sycamore Community Center for \$126,260 plus an additional per square foot cost for the replacement of roof decking and sheathing as considered necessary by the City Engineer. According to Illinois law (65 ILCS 5/3.1-40-50 and related passages), the Council shall receive the Mayor's veto at the next regular meeting, which in this case is the meeting of March 18. At the next regular meeting following the meeting at which the Council receives the Mayor's written objection (April 1), the City Council may reconsider the motion approving the roofing contract in the interest of passing it over the Mayor's veto. If, after reconsideration, two-thirds of all the aldermen then holding office agree to pass the motion, notwithstanding the Mayor's refusal to approve it, then it shall be effective. Conversely, if two-thirds of all the aldermen do not vote to pass the motion over the veto, the contract with Bruns Construction will not be executed. A voice vote is required.

At the request of Alderman Chambon, an opportunity to reconsider the motion will be presented to the Council at the regular meeting of April 1. Council discussion concerning the Mayor's action may occur at either the March 18 meeting or the April 1 meeting, but no vote shall occur until the April 1 meeting.

Since the use and maintenance of a City-owned building are matters of public policy, it might be constructive to review the relevant policy questions and for the Council, as a body, to take positions on each. For the fairest test of the corporate authority's position, all Council members should be present and voting. The logical sequence of policy questions is as follows:

- A. Should the Community Center be torn down?
- B. If not, what is the most constructive use for the building?
- C. If the proposed Midwest Museum is the most constructive use, should the City repair the roof?

These questions are similar to those at the center of the Council's debate in October, 2001. The attached decision tree was a focus of that debate. Clear direction on each of these public policy questions is recommended on April 1.

**B. Consideration of the Preliminary FY2002-2003 City Budget.**

The City Administrator distributed copies of the proposed FY2002-2003 City Budget to the City Council on March 7 for review. A copy of the preliminary budget document has also been presented to the reference department of the Sycamore Public Library where it is on record for interested citizens to review.

The preliminary Budget will be formally presented to the City Council on March 18 to receive and file. The Budget review will begin at a special Finance Committee meeting on Tuesday March 19 at 7:00 P.M. and continue on Wednesday March 20 at 7:00 P.M. The March 19 meeting will focus on the General Fund departmental spending as well as the Water Department and Treatment Plant budgets. If these operational departments are covered to the Council's satisfaction on Tuesday night, the Committee will be asked to review the special, capital, and bond funds on March 20.

**C. Consideration of an Administration Request for a Closed Session to Discuss Pending Litigation.**

**14. APPOINTMENTS**

**15. ADJOURNMENT**