

SYCAMORE CITY COUNCIL

AGENDA

August 5, 2002

City Council Workshop and Committee Meetings

6:30 P.M. City Council Workshop Meeting to Discuss a Downtown Revolving Loan Program.

At the City Council workshop meeting of July 1, the Council heard a report from the City Administrator recommending the creation of an incentive program that might promote improvements to building facades in the downtown business district. After reviewing this proposal, the Council directed the Administrator to prepare a program description and supporting documents that would flesh out such a public incentive program.

The attached documents are in response to the Council's direction. The attachments include the following:

- a) A Program Description;
- b) A Checklist to aid the staff and the applicant in the completion of the necessary forms;
- c) An Application Form;
- d) A Finance Agreement;
- e) A Mortgage;
- f) A Promissory Note.

The basic features of the program are outlined below:

- ❖ The initiative would be based on a revolving loan system;
- ❖ The program would be funded initially from the FY2002 surplus in the amount of \$50,000;
- ❖ The program would extend loans of up to \$5,000 at no interest, payable in full in two years;
- ❖ Eligible properties would be in the downtown business district as defined in the Zoning Code as an area of special control (Section 12.01,d);
- ❖ Either a property owner or a business owner may apply. However, the property owner must sign the application form and grant consent for the tenant to pursue the funding as well as the proposed work on the building;
- ❖ Qualified work begun or completed in 2002 prior to the implementation of the program may be eligible provided the work complies with the program guidelines;
- ❖ Funding will be awarded on a competitive basis during a thirty-day application period beginning on May 1 and ending on May 31 of each year;
- ❖ An individual property owner or tenant may only receive funding for one project during a two-year cycle. More than one project may be approved for a particular building over time but not within a two-year period;
- ❖ The availability of funding would be annually dependent on the Council's authorization of capital spending for such purposes;

- ❖ Applications will be reviewed by a committee appointed by the Mayor with the consent of the Council;
- ❖ After the review of applications by the committee, recommendations will be made to the Council for action. The Council will make the awards.

Only exterior improvements will be eligible and must make a noticeable improvement to the building's appearance. Examples of eligible improvements include the following:

- Removal of incompatible facades and appurtenances;
- Restoration of historic façade materials;
- Restoration of an historic building in accordance with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation;
- Painting;
- Tuckpointing;
- Repair or replacement of exterior windows and doors, including storm doors and windows;
- Installation of new signage;
- Repair or replacement of appurtenances such as railings, stairs, awnings;
- Installation of handicap accessible entrances;
- Building cleaning using approved, preservation-based methods.

According to the draft documents, repairs or improvements that do not improve the appearance of a building will not be eligible. Examples of such improvements include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Roof sealing;
- Re-glazing;
- Demolition, except for the removal of architecturally incompatible facades or appurtenances;
- Incidental fees including architectural expenses, permit fees, and material testing costs;
- Most weatherization improvements.

Architectural Review Committee: According to the proposal the Mayor recommends and the City Council approves the appointment of a five-member committee responsible for determining the eligibility of projects and for making funding recommendations. Such recommendations shall follow the preparation of a staff report on each potential project. There are many ways to populate such a committee; the draft proposes the following:

- ❖ One member of the Discover Sycamore Group;
- ❖ One member of the Sycamore Economic Development Commission;
- ❖ One Council member;
- ❖ An architect or design professional;
- ❖ One at-large member.

The proposal requires each member to be a full-time resident of the City of Sycamore, with the exception that the architect or design professional may not be a local resident if such professionals are not available to serve. Members would serve a two-year term and can not succeed themselves, but may serve multiple, non-consecutive terms. Three of the

initial five members would serve only one-year terms. The committee would appoint a chair at the first regular meeting after May 1 of each calendar year.

There are many essential details in such a program. In the limited time since the Council's July workshop, careful thought has been given to such details but there are surely other variations and elements to consider. The Council's direction is welcome.

It should be noted that the program described above only applies to the downtown business district. A companion program that attended to façade improvements in other commercial locations was discussed at the July 1 Council workshop. The Administrator recommends that the Council proceed only with the downtown loan program in FY03-04 to provide a track record that can guide us if we decide to initiate a more ambitious program of financial assistance at a future date.

7:00 P.M. Ordinance Committee Meeting to Discuss the Regulation of the Outdoors Consumption of Alcohol at Restaurants.

The attached ordinance drafts attempt to create the regulatory framework for outdoor cafes that serve alcoholic beverages in the City of Sycamore. This matter was referred to the Ordinance Committee during the regular Council meeting of July 15.

With the advice of the City Attorney, there would need to be several ordinance changes: (a) the addition of descriptive and authorizing language in Chapter 2, "Liquor Control," of the City Code; and (b) revisions to Sections 9.02 and 9.03 of the Zoning Code.

The essential features of the proposed revisions are as follows:

1. the outdoor area shall be enclosed with a non-barricade type fence or other barrier that allows viewing of the area from the street;
2. the outdoor area shall be owned or leased by the licensee;
3. the outdoor area is included as part of the regular food service business located on the licensed premises and alcoholic beverages shall not be served without food;
4. access to the outdoor area shall be limited through the licensed premises or, if not practicable, through monitored entrances that are controlled by employees and/or reasonable fencing of the licensed premises during all operating hours and/or while alcohol is being served.
5. seating in the outdoor area shall not be included to meet the required guest seating capacity for any license classification as established in Section 3-2 of the City Code.
6. a sidewalk cafe license as provided in Section 7-1-18 of the City Code shall be required for any outdoor seating area conducted wholly or partially upon City controlled property.
7. music played in the outdoor area shall not exceed ordinance limits;

- 8. the hours of outside operation shall be restricted to 9:00 p.m. on weekdays and 11:00 p.m. on weekends;
- 9. outdoor service areas shall be permitted only on property zoned “C-2,” Central Business and “C-3,” Highway Business.

The Administrator is aware that many of these features invite several points of view (e.g. the serving of alcoholic beverages with food). The drafts are presented as a basis for debate and, eventually, consensus that will allow for the preparation of final versions for the Council meeting on August 19.

**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 July 15, 2002;
 - B. Payment of the Bills for August 5, 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. 2002.10—An Ordinance Concerning the Recommendation of the Plan Commission With Regard to the Request of B&B Development LP, an Illinois Limited Partnership, as Developer, and Fisk Farm Partnership, an Illinois Partnership, as Owner, for Approval of an Annexation Agreement for a Planned Unit Development Known as Sycamore Creek with Zoning**

Classifications of “R-1” One Family Residence District and “R-3” Multiple Family Residence District in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. Second Reading.

At the June 17 City Council meeting, the annexation agreement for the Sycamore Creek planned unit development was reviewed on first reading only. The development proposal had been recommended by the Plan Commission by a vote of 5-4 on June 10. During the Council meeting of June 17, none of the Council members present and voting expressed any dissatisfaction with the development plan or annexation agreement. However, there was concern about the fiscal impact on both the Sycamore Park District and the Sycamore School District. This concern led to a Council decision to postpone a second reading on the annexation ordinances until both taxing bodies could consider the project in their regularly scheduled meetings.

On June 18, the Sycamore Park Board reviewed the proposal and unanimously (5-0) supported the property’s annexation to the Park District. On July 23, the School Board considered the project at length and directed the school superintendent to meet with the developer, B&B Development LP, to address further questions concerning the developer’s offer to dedicate land for an elementary school site and, additionally, voluntarily donate a fee per unit over and above the impact fee required by the recently-revised Education Fee Ordinance. The meeting with the developer occurred on July 25. As a result of that meeting, a clearer notion of the developer’s intentions was gained. Specifically, B&B Development has proposed the following:

- ◆ A set aside of approximately 15 acres for an elementary school.
- ◆ A dedication of roughly 7 acres with a credit of \$75,000 per acre, per the Education Fee Ordinance (Ord. 2001.86) approved on April 15, 2002. This would yield the developer about \$525,000;
- ◆ A voluntary contribution by the developer of \$1,500 per lot over and above the required impact fee, to be paid at the time of permitting. This would yield the District about \$528,000, or essentially balance the credit owed the developer.
- ◆ A donation of the remaining 8 acres at no cost to the District in terms of a development credit.
- ◆ A voluntary contribution of \$1,500 per lot over and above any required impact fees on any future development B&B would envision. This contribution would be paid at the time each final plat is recorded, rather than at permitting, yielding a more rapid pace of contribution to the District.

The School Board took up this revised proposal on Tuesday, July 30, and unanimously approved it.

Section 15 of the annexation agreement has been revised to reflect this understanding (see attached).

Other features of the annexation agreement include the following:

- a) The term is 20 years.
- b) The City agrees to hold a public hearing for the “R-3” zoned property at such time as a mini-development plan is proposed for this area.

- c) The developer will provide an irrevocable letter of credit for the public improvements on the site.
- d) The developer is responsible for additional widening and reconstruction of Lindgren Road, and its re-configuration to better align with Plank Road and the future North Grove Road in accordance with the direction of the County Engineer.
- e) The developer is responsible for phased payments to DeKalb County for the construction of their portion of Airport Road abutting the property.
- f) The developer is responsible for a proportional share of the cost of traffic signals at Airport Road and Plank Road when they are warranted.
- g) The developer will be responsible for a proportional share of the cost of installing signals at the intersection of Plank Road and Lindgren Road when the traffic warrants are established.

City Council approval of the annexation agreement is recommended. Approval requires a two-thirds vote of the corporate authorities.

B. Ordinance No. 2002.11--An Ordinance Concerning the Recommendation of the Plan Commission With Regard to the Request of B&B Development LP, an Illinois Limited Partnership, as Developer, and Fisk Farm Partnership, an Illinois Partnership, as Owner, for Approval of the Preliminary Plan and Plat for a Planned Unit Development Known as Sycamore Creek in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. Second Reading.

The preliminary plan has been revised to depict the dedication of a 15-acre school site at the northwest corner of the planned development (please see the attached detail view). Retention for this parcel will be provided offsite (Parcel 12) to allow for the maximum flexibility in configuring the school building on the dedicated site. In addition to the school site, the plan features the following:

- A 220.21-acre development area, all but 4.09 acres of which would be designed for single-family detached housing and related amenities. The table below depicts the land uses:

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Single-Family Homes | 95.13 Acres |
| Private Park, Detention & Conservation Areas | 52 Acres |
| Public Park Area | 7.12 Acres |
| School Dedication | 15.12 Acres |
| Bike Pathways | 2.88 Acres |
| Townhouse Area | 4.09 Acres |
| Public Road Right of Way | 43.87 Acres |
| Total | 220.21 Acres |

- Density: With the school dedication the number of homes was reduced from 381 to 352, for a density of 1.63 units per acre. The first phase of home building is not expected until 2005. It is estimated that an average of 45 house lots will be sold each year.

- **Open Space.** The Comp Plan requires low-density, single family planned developments to provide a minimum open space of ten percent of the gross land area. The proposed development provides open space equivalent to 48 percent of the gross land area of the single family zoning (which includes rights-of-way).
- **Townhouse Area.** The 4.09-acre townhouse site backs up to the 7.6-acre townhouse development approved by the City Council on April 15, 2002. As the Council will recall, the developer of the adjacent townhouse area—John Castle Builders—has provided access easements to the proposed “R-3” zoning on the B&B plan.
- **Commercial Uses.** None.
- **Public Park Space.** One large publicly-dedicated park area is shown roughly in the center of the development plan, with street access around most of its perimeter as well as a bike path connection to the natural or conservation area featuring the Heron Creek watershed. A smaller public park with access around its entire perimeter is shown in the northeast quadrant. The developer proposed their dedication to the Park District, which accepted the dedication on June 18, pending the preparation of the proper annexation documents.
- **Private Park Space.** In addition to the public park area, B&B Development proposes private neighborhood parks plus a large conservation area that surrounds Heron Creek to the south.
- **Bike Paths.** One bike path runs along the south side of Lindgren Road and along Plank Road. It would be ten feet in width and would serve both bicyclists and pedestrians. Another bike path connects the public parks with Presidential Parkway and the trails in the large conservation area to the south. The internal bikeway and trail system will also serve a regional purpose. It will eventually be linked with the bikeway that the Land Use Plan dedicates on the east side of the future Airport Road extension, which will ultimately connect the development with the Great Western Trail.
- **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 storm release from the Heron Creek basin.
- **Lindgren Road Widening and Reconstruction.** Rather than have the developer improve only one-half the width of Lindgren Road—i.e. that half adjoining the subject property—the City staff and the developer have agreed that the developer will complete the entire width of Lindgren Road from Plank Road eastward to the east side of Presidential Parkway, which is the main entrance to the subdivision. The eventual developer(s) of property east of this point and on the north side of Lindgren Road will be asked to approach their public responsibility in the same fashion in order to provide a more finished roadway.
- **Water Mains.** The proposed plan would loop the northeastern reaches of the existing system serving the Heron Creek subdivision.

City Council approval of the revised preliminary plan is recommended.

C. Ordinance No. 2002.12--An Ordinance of Annexation for Property Known as Sycamore Creek in DeKalb County, Illinois. Second Reading.

If the Council approves the annexation agreement and the preliminary plat and plan for the Sycamore Creek planned unit development, it will be obliged to approve the annexation of the property. The Plan Commission voted to recommend the City Council's approval of the annexation on June 10.

City Council approval of the Plan Commission recommendation is requested.

D. Ordinance No. 2002.29—An Ordinance Approving the Execution of an Agreement Between the City of Sycamore, Illinois and Brian Bemis Automotive Group for Economic Development in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.

The City Administrator requests the City Council's consideration of a development agreement with Brian Bemis Automotive Group, Ltd. The firm maintains its headquarters at West Oakland Drive in Sycamore, Illinois and operates Brian Bemis Auto World at 1825 DeKalb Avenue and Brian Bemis Chevrolet Oldsmobile Geo at 1330 East State Street.

The firm has purchased the Honda, Volvo, and Mercedes Benz dealerships from the Sawyer family and proposes to move these franchises to the Auto World site in Sycamore, in order to consolidate their management with ongoing Bemis operations, and to develop a "power center" for vehicle sales at an established Bemis location. Recently, the firm approached the City of Sycamore for economic assistance toward the redevelopment of the Auto World location.

In 2001, the Brian Bemis Automotive Group accounted for approximately one-tenth of all the state (1%) retail sales tax proceeds received by the City of Sycamore. Mr. Bemis's intention is to redevelop the Auto World site featuring a new sales facility of approximately 19,300 square feet with separate show rooms for each foreign car dealership, at a cost of about \$2 million. This investment will bring new jobs to Sycamore and generate additional property tax of about \$6,800 in the first year of full assessment. However, the largest economic benefit will be in the form of expanded retail sales.

According to the terms of the attached agreement, the City and Brian Bemis Automotive Group would agree for a period of ten years to share sales tax revenue from the firm's redeveloped Auto World site. Since home rule taxes may be imposed on parts but not on vehicle sales, the greatest part of the sales taxes shares will come from the 1% Illinois Retailer's Occupation Tax. To insure that the City does not share sales tax revenues already claimed from existing car lines and parts sales on the Auto World site, the average annual sales tax proceeds from the site over the past three years was calculated from Department of Revenue forms to establish a base line of existing sales. The revenue-sharing calculation is as follows:

- a) the City will remit fifty percent (50%) of the 1% sales taxes generated on vehicle sales at 1825 DeKalb Avenue over and above the annual average of \$162,030 for the past three years;
- b) the City will remit fifty percent (50%) of the annual 1% and ¾% home rule sales tax proceeds generated from parts and miscellaneous sales at 1825 DeKalb Avenue over and above the annual average of \$15,600 for the past three years;
- c) the City's disbursements will be made on a monthly basis, following verification of the Retailer's sales and use tax forms (Form ST-1);
- d) for purposes of revenue-sharing, the term of the agreement will begin on the first day of the first month in which the new Honda, Volvo, and Mercedes Benz dealerships are open for business at 1825 DeKalb Avenue. The agreement will extend for a term of 10 years or until a maximum of \$1,500,000 in sales tax proceeds is remitted to the Retailer. The City will agree to extend the agreement in one-year increments thereafter if the Retailer's cumulative distribution is less than \$1.5 million.

The Council will note that the agreement will end immediately if the Retailer relocates any of the dealerships from 1825 DeKalb Avenue to another DeKalb County location.

In calculating the public purpose for such an economic incentive, the Council will want to consider (a) the economic impact of the new sales; (b) the economic impact of seeing the foreign car dealerships locate in another municipality; and (c) the prospect of the relocation of any of the existing Bemis sales to another municipality. The projected new sales taxes generated from the redeveloped Auto World site over the next ten to eleven years is about \$3.1 million, based on the conservative estimates of sales shown on the attached spreadsheets.

In preparing the attached agreement, the City Administrator has drawn from the City's prior agreements with Sycamore Ford, Sycamore Mitsubishi, and United Aviation Fuels. City Council approval is recommended.

E. Ordinance No. 2002.30—An Ordinance Approving an Amendment to the Curbside Refuse and Recycling Agreement Between the City of Sycamore, Illinois and Waste-Management-West. First and Second Reading.

As directed by the City Council at the last regular meeting of July 15, an ordinance has been prepared for Council discussion that reflects the terms of a proposal submitted by Waste Management to address continuing concerns about the type of household refuse containers that may be placed at curbside. According to the terms of the proposal:

- a) Everyone in town gets a 96-gallon rolling cart. The present contractual rental of \$2 per month is eliminated from the contract. If you already have a rolling cart, you can get a new one or keep the old one.

- b) In addition to the 96-gallon rolling cart homeowners can continue to use 30-gallon containers for extra refuse so long as they can be lifted by WMX drivers.

In exchange, the City would extend the following to WMX:

- a) A contract extension for three more years, with a cost-of-living increase in each of those years not to exceed 5%. From the City's perspective, this would be an improvement over the current contract which does not contain a cap on the CPI.
- b) An additional per-unit fee of 48 cents per month or \$5.76 per year for the balance of the current year. The current cost per unit to the City is \$12.50 per unit per month. This would increase the unit cost to \$12.98 and the base price for calculating the CPI in the following years.

The table below shows the comparable costs of the current contract and the proposed contract revision:

| Contract Year | Present Contract | Proposed Contract |
|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------|
| January 1, 2002-December 31, 2002 | \$12.50/unit/month (same as in the period 1/1/01-12/31/01) | \$12.98/unit/month |
| January 1, 2003-December 31, 2003 | CPI adjustment (no cap) | \$13.48/unit/month |
| January 1, 2004-December 31, 2004 | CPI adjustment (no cap) | \$14.00/unit/month |
| January 1, 2005-December 31, 2005 | CPI adjustment (no cap) | \$14.54/unit/month |
| January 1, 2006-December 31, 2006 | CPI adjustment (no cap) | CPI-U (5% cap) |
| January 1, 2007-December 31, 2007 | CPI adjustment (no cap) | CPI-U (5% cap) |
| January 1, 2008-December 31, 2008 | CPI adjustment (no cap) | CPI-U (5% cap) |

Looking behind the proposal, if the City did not pass along the hauler's increased fee per unit to the users, the City would initially see some increased costs. On December 17, 2001 the Council increased the consumer's refuse removal cost to \$10 per month effective January 1, 2002; \$12 per month beginning on January 1, 2003; and \$14 per month beginning on January 1, 2004. If the additional cost per unit was not passed along to the consumer, the City's cost for the 4-month period from September 1, 2002 through December 31, 2002 would increase by \$7,246.08 (.48/unit/month times 3774 units times 4 months). To put it another way, the difference between what the City charges the consumer and what the City pays Waste Management in 2002 would increase from \$2.50 per unit per month to \$2.98 per unit per month. In 2003, that difference would be narrowed to \$1.48 when consumers start to pay \$12 per month. In 2004, the difference would be erased because the user charge per month will be increased to \$14 on January 1, 2004, according to the ordinance approved in December, 2001.

It is difficult to precisely estimate the cost of this proposal to the City since the current contract proposes no cap on the annual cost-of-living increases charged by the hauler, and we do not know how our number of households will increase year by year. Assuming an annual cost-of-living increase of 3% for the balance of the current contract (or until December 31, 2005), and a 3% annual increase in the number of

households over the same period, the City's additional costs versus revenues are shown in the table below:

| Year | Households | Monthly Fee Income | Current Monthly Cost | City Balance Each Month | Proposed Monthly Cost | City Balance Each Month |
|------|------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| 2002 | 3774 | \$37,740 (\$10/unit) | \$12.50 x 3774 = \$47,175 | -\$9,435 | \$12.98 x 3774 =\$48,987 | -\$11,247 |
| 2003 | 3887 | \$46,644 (\$12/unit) | \$12.88 x 3887 =\$50,065 | -\$3,421 | \$13.48 x 3887 =\$52,397 | -\$5,753 |
| 2004 | 4004 | \$56,056 (\$14/unit) | \$13.27 x 4004 =\$53,133 | +\$2,923 | \$14.00 x 4004 =\$56,056 | +\$0.00 |
| 2005 | 4124 | ? | \$13.67 x 4124 =\$56,375 | ? | 14.54 x 4124 =\$59,963 | ? |

A 3.85% increase in the household fee in 2005 would keep the City in balance under the WMX fee proposal. In 2006, 2007, and 2008 similar increases (up to 5%) would be necessary.

The cost of the WMX proposal can be measured in dollars and in terms of aggravation. The provision of free rolling carts will reduce aggravation and anxiety for those who are wondering if their present non-conforming containers will be dumped after September 1 (the date when the temporary moratorium on stickers ends). Some households that purchased the wrong-sized containers may not be appeased, since they will not recover the cost of those containers.

On the other hand, the proposal for a contract extension with capped annual increases adds a level of predictability from a budgetary standpoint. If we could foretell the annual inflation rate in 2006, 2007 and 2008 we could estimate the value of this greater predictability, and measure it against the City's additional cost in the period 2002-2005. Any additional cost in the short run assumes that no fee increases are imposed until the three-year cycle of increases is completed in 2004.

In the end, the dollar differences may matter less than the non-economic and aesthetic concerns addressed by the free delivery and use of the carts. If we stand by the letter of the current contract the City will be obliged to enforce restrictions on the size and weight of new and existing containers. We learned several weeks ago what that will mean in terms of the volume of complaints. Both parties have been searching for a solution that removes the issue of "what" containers are acceptable. New rolling carts throughout our neighborhoods would do this and would enhance the appearance of neighborhoods as well as the convenience of most residents, as we learned in the pilot study in the Fourth Ward last year.

If the Council wishes to negotiate further, the focus might be the cost of the new carts.

City Council approval is recommended.

F. Ordinance No. 2002.31—An Ordinance Amending Title 3, “Business and License Regulations,” Chapter 2, “Liquor Control,” Section 3-2-6, “Classification of Licenses; Fees; Hours; and Days,” to Create a New Class G License. First and Second Reading.

This minor ordinance change is intended to permit special one-day events for not-for-profits. Recently, it came to the attention of City officials that an upcoming afternoon “celebration” by the Discover Group like the one held last year after the substantial completion of the streetscape project can no longer be insured at a reasonable cost through another liquor licensee’s dram shop insurance policy. The extension of coverage can still occur, but underwriters are more likely to charge around \$500 for extended liability coverage for such events rather than \$150. At such costs, local not-for-profits would not be inclined to foot the expense of an outdoor event that involves, for instance, the retail sale of glasses of beer.

This ordinance would make a not-for-profit a licenseholder for a day, and would significantly reduce the liability insurance costs. City Council approval is recommended.

12. RESOLUTIONS

A. Resolution No. 414—Authorizing the Execution of an Agreement Between the City of Sycamore and the County of DeKalb Regarding the Consolidation of Dispatching Services in DeKalb County.

In January of 2001, elected and appointed officials representing the City of Sycamore, the City of DeKalb, the County of DeKalb, and NIU met to discuss the prospect of a consolidated dispatch center. The consensus of the assembled officials was that a careful and methodical investigation of the pros and the cons of such a system was in the public’s best interest. Following this meeting, a joint press release was issued (see attached) to invite public interest in the process that was to unfold. The initial media reaction was positive (please see the attached clippings) and soon a request for proposals from qualified consultants was circulated to guide the local agencies through the process. Rich Tuma of the Regional Emergency Dispatch Center (“Red Center) in Glenview, Illinois was hired by the participating bodies to perform a feasibility study. All parties agreed that the process would be complicated by the number of agencies involved and the sensitive personnel and financial concerns it would touch.

The first phase of the investigation involved a gathering of facts from the Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) involved in the study. Such obvious concerns as current staffing patterns, operating costs, frequencies in use, the average number of annual calls for service at each PSAP, the state of the technologies in use, etc. were identified and evaluated. Different models for the organization of consolidated dispatching were also investigated and discussed, and public safety officials from the participating agencies made field trips to consolidated dispatching centers in northern Illinois and the Chicago suburbs for a first-hand look at such operations.

Following a brief interval in mid-2001 during which searches were in progress for a new Police Chief in Sycamore and at NIU, the investigation entered a more rigorous phase of analysis and negotiation. This process primarily addressed three unique but related questions: (a) how would a consolidated center be financed by the participating bodies; (b) how would the system meet our communication needs without subordinating the needs to the technology; and (c) what would be the staffing requirements and how would the transition to a new system be handled with respect to current employees. This discussion involved the E-911 Board because it serves as an important source of recurring monies for emergency dispatching needs. Each question was challenging. Despite the availability of models in place in other geographic locations, no one model was perfectly suited for the diverse needs of our participating agencies.

The City of Sycamore's representatives are now satisfied that all the critical information has been gathered and sifted. The City Administrator, Police Chief Thomas, and Fire Chief Riddle are obliged to make a recommendation. We recommend the consolidation of the City's PSAP with the County's PSAP for the following reasons:

1. The City's dispatch center is understaffed and technologically backward. In good faith, we cannot plan on going forward with such a system. In weighing the comparable costs for staffing a stand-alone PSAP offering two dispatchers 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year, with the most up-to-date technology available, versus a consolidated center offering the same service to Sycamore residents, it was concluded that there is a significant financial advantage in consolidation over time. To simplify a complicated question, and assuming that staffing costs were similar, it would be more expensive for our taxpayers to support two sophisticated and expensive technology centers whose equipment would be upgraded in regular cycles. With the consolidation of the County and City operations, the City of Sycamore would only be required to finance a proportional share of such upgrades, rather than the full share of any future capital upgrades.
2. Operationally, a consolidated center would ease communication between officers of different agencies. County sheriff deputies and City police officers often work together, and it is presently not uncommon to encounter communication difficulties because of confusion or uncertainty about proper frequencies.
3. The City's dispatch center is unacceptably small for the equipment currently in use, or the equipment (including computer-aided dispatching systems) we would be advised to install in the near future. Based on the investigation performed by our public safety officials and service technicians over the past year, we find that the County's dispatching space can be easily expanded to serve the City and County needs for the next twenty years.

To facilitate the consolidation of the City and County dispatching centers, the attached resolution is offered to memorialize the essential terms for the undertaking.

It authorizes the Mayor to enter into an agreement that identifies the reciprocal responsibilities of the two agencies with respect to staffing, funding, and the transition to the new system. Specifically, the agreement

- Locates the consolidated dispatch center in the County Sheriff's department;
- Confirms that the necessary new hires will be interviewed and hired by the County Merit Commission;
- Requires the County to afford an opportunity for Sycamore's current telecommunicators to test for the additional positions that will be established in the expanded County center;
- Establishes July 1, 2003 as the probable starting date. If the center is operational before that time, or if the City is unable to staff its present center up to that time, the City can transfer its communication center to the County at a cost of \$40,000 per month;
- Establishes an annual cost of \$494,000 for the City's participation in the first year, plus a one-time capital cost of up to \$75,000 for the City's share of the new consoles and expanded telecommunication equipment;
- Establishes a "Users Committee" to assure efficiency and periodically explore new technologies;
- Establishes an ad hoc committee to resolve disputes over the annual costing of ongoing services.
- Sets a five year term, automatically renewable for successive five-year terms, unless one of the parties notifies the other in writing of its intent to withdraw.

City Council approval is recommended.

B. Resolution No. 415—Awarding the Contract for the Purchase of a Self-Contained Leaf Machine to ODB Municipal Products in the Amount of \$27,270.10.

On Monday July 29 the Public Works department received four bids for a self-contained leaf collector. The department identified such a machine as an important FY03 acquisition during the budget deliberations last spring. For over ten years, the fall leaf removal program has been centered around two trailer-mounted leaf vacuums that blow leaves into dump trucks with about a ten-yard capacity each. When full, the trucks are disconnected and run to the dump site, then return for another load. This elementary system has been an improvement over earlier methods but has several serious drawbacks. First, it generates considerable "down time." More important, the dust and debris blown into the truck boxes hangs around the truck and the trailer while the vacuum is running and create a cloud that the Public Works personnel work in all day.

The self-contained leaf machine depicted on the attached flyer presents another and a more healthy approach. It has a thirty-yard box mounted with the vacuum and trailer. The leaves are blown backward into the box away from the direction that the laborers are walking, cutting down on the adverse effects of the dust. Further, the self-contained thirty-yard box provides a third more capacity to diminish the trips to dump

the leaves. Public Works Superintendent Fred Busse estimates that one crew of three could pick up as many leaves in a day as six laborers with two trucks.

A bid sheet is attached. The recommended contractor—ADB Municipal Products—did not submit the lowest bid. However, the unit provided by the firm exceeded the specifications in its blower size and in the construction of the leaf box. In the opinion of Mr. Busse, these features would justify the additional cost of \$720.

The funding for this acquisition comes from several places: the Public Works department budget (\$18,000; 751-8521) and the 2002 Bond Fund (\$9,270.10; 24-8540). City Council approval is recommended.

13. CONSIDERATIONS

A. Consideration of a Presentation by Ruth Anne Tobias of the DeKalb County Public Policy Committee Regarding the Committee's Legislative Agenda.

Ruth Ann Tobias is a County Board member from one of DeKalb's districts and serves on the Board's Public Policy committee with Pat LaVigne, Jim Barr, Ed Brown, John Dlabal, Eileen Dubin, and Jeff Metzger. Ms. Tobias is the chair of this standing committee.

The purview of her committee is intergovernmental relations and the ongoing investigation of relevant topics for the legislative agenda of the County and other taxing bodies. She has requested more than the three minutes allowed persons to be heard from the floor in order to explain her committee's charge to the Council and to solicit suggestions for the public agenda. Brief summaries of topics of recent interest to the committee are attached.

B. Consideration of an Engineering Department Recommendation to Award a Contract for the Replacement of the Roofing on the Street Division Garages.

On Monday, August 5, at 2:00 p.m. the City Engineer will open bids for the replacement of the asphalt roofing over the Public Works garages. He will prepare a bid sheet and will make a recommendation at the Council meeting.

C. Consideration of an Administration Recommendation for a Closed Session to Discuss Personnel Matters and Land Acquisition.

14. APPOINTMENTS

15. ADJOURNMENT