

SYCAMORE CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA
March 2, 2009

CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE MEETINGS
No Meetings Are Scheduled

REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING
7:00 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 for the Regular City Council Meeting of February 16, 2009.
 - B. Payment of the Bills for March 2, 2009.
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. 2008.74—An Ordinance Concerning the Recommendation of the Plan Commission With Regard to a Petition to Annex Property at the Northeast Corner of Peace Road and Brickville Road and Rezone the Property to “R-2,” Two**

Family Residence District, Planned Unit Development, with a Special Use Permit for Single-Family Attached Dwellings and “R-3,” Multiple Family Residence District, Planned Unit Development with a Special Use Permit for an Assisted Living Facility and “R-1,” One Family Residence District in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. Second Reading.

The City Council considered this project on first reading on February 16, 2009 and also held a public hearing on the same date.

Background

At the December Plan Commission meeting, John Pappas presented a revised concept plan for the development of the Walters and Cambier farms at the northeast corner of Peace Road and Brickville Road. On September 2, 2008, the City Council had voted 5-4 to oppose a planned development and annexation brought by Mr. Pappas which featured detached single family homes and an assisted living facility immediately west of the Stonegate townhouse development (six votes are needed in the case of annexation agreements). The new concept plan retained an assisted living facility and featured duplex lots for persons 55 years of age or older. The Commission was interested in his new direction and encouraged him to return with a formal petition. The development plan and annexation agreement formally reviewed and recommended by the Plan Commission on February 9, 2009 is summarized below.

The Development Plan

The proposed development plan has the following features:

1. Land Uses.
 - An assisted living facility on a 2.874-acre site adjacent to the Stonegate development.
 - 144 duplex lots for persons 55 years of age or older. This is the principal difference from the plan reviewed by the Commission and Council last summer. In the September 2008 plan, a total of 108 single family lots were proposed with an average size of one-half acre. The new concept shows 144 smaller lots with an average size of one-third acre (90 feet x 165 feet). The ability of Mr. Pappas to restrict ownership by age is based on the provisions of the Fair Housing Act of 1995, and the Housing for Older Persons Act of 1995. These federal enactments permit developers to require that buyers be 55 years of age and over, and have no children in their units under the age of 19 for more than 30 consecutive days or 45 days in any six month period. These provisions effectively preclude the possibility that school-aged children will remain long enough to be enrolled in the local school system. In June 2004, the Council approved the one and only age-restricted housing development in Sycamore, Gracious Living Homes (a.k.a. Somerset Farms), which is located on a 17-acre parcel south of Bethany Road and immediately west of the City’s regional detention pond.
 - One (1) single family lot of about 0.75 acres to provide a more agreeable transition to the existing homes on the present Brickville Road.
 - A clubhouse area on a 1.5-acre site near the project’s main entrance and backing up to the proposed detention lake.
 - Public park land totaling 3.174 acres.

2. Gross Density. The density of the duplex portion of the development (approximately 76.5 acres) is 3.76 units per acre (288 units divided by 76.5).
3. Access. There are essentially two access points. The chief access point is at the re-aligned Brickville Road and the other connects the proposed subdivision with the Stonegate development and Frantum Road to the east. To minimize the impact of new traffic on Brickville Road as it winds toward Peace Road, Mr. Pappas has collaborated with the Sycamore Township Road Supervisor, Tom Reynolds, to develop a dramatic re-routing of Brickville Road (see the attached concept plan). The developer would build a new roadway of 2,050 feet at the developer's sole expense (estimated to be about \$500,000) that would course more directly toward Motel Road. After its construction, the new roadway would become a City street and be named appropriately. The Township would continue to maintain Brickville Road (to retain its name), which would experience a remarkable decline in usage.
4. Bikepaths. The attached concept plan shows a dashed brown line along the south side of Stonegate Drive connecting to a bike path along the east side of Brickville Road that connects to Motel Road on the west end of the property and Peace Road to the east.
5. Open Space. The plan dedicates 17% of the overall land area to open space, either in the form of conservation areas to be maintained by a homeowner's association, or public park land. The City requirement for open space in a low-density planned residential development is 10% (UDO, Article 4.3.4.B.11 "Planned Development: Residential").
6. Buffer Areas. The rear yards of the homes on the north side of the present Brickville Road are buffered from traffic on the re-aligned Brickville Road by either natural or detention areas. The west, north and east sides of the development adjoin mature tree stands which will remain undisturbed. The inability to serve the adjacent land areas in terms of future sanitary sewer line capacity will sustain the presence of these trees.

The Annexation Agreement

The principal terms of the annexation agreement are as follows:

1. The Name. "Vellagio Estates."
2. The Term. The agreement runs for twenty years (Section 24).
3. Performance Guarantees. The Owner may provide an irrevocable letter of credit or bond security for the public improvements on the site (Section 5.3).
4. Impact Fees. The Owner shall comply with the City's annexation and impact fees (Section 5) and Park fees (Section 16.3) as they may be amended from time to time. *In accordance with the Council's direction of February 16, the agreement has been revised to more clearly delineate the obligation of the developer to comply with the City's Park land/cash ordinance, and for the permit holder (i.e. builder or owner) to pay Park impact fees as the building permit for a duplex unit is issued. In addition, if the Agreement is ever amended to remove the senior living ownership restrictions outlined in Section 4, herein, all impact fee contributions defined in the UDO or by City ordinance, as amended from time to time, shall apply to all housing units permitted after the effective date of such amendment with the exception of units within the assisted living facility.* Because of the effective age-centered restrictions, no School impact fees are proposed, but the transfer tax of \$5 per thousand dollars of value upon the transfer of

property shall apply (Sections 16.1 and 16.2). Finally, in the event the City enacts an ordinance which creates a transportation impact fee for addressing the fiscal impact of development on the City's transportation system, the amount of such impact fee as amended from time to time shall be payable at the time a building permit is issued for each duplex unit (Section 16.4).

5. Other Developmental Regulations. The Owner is not required to comply with the time limitations on the issuance of the first permit as defined in Ordinance 2005.60, but is required to comply with the limitations on the number of permits that may be issued annually, per Ordinance 2005.60 (Section 17.1).

6. Water Main, Storm Sewer and Sewer Main Extensions. The Owner shall provide proper storm sewer, sanitary sewer and water main systems in accordance with the City's standards and at the developer's sole expense (Section 12).

7. Variations. No variations from the City's codes and ordinances are requested, except as noted above.

Traffic Study

Wendler Engineering performed a traffic study for this project in September 2008. The traffic study showed the total ADT from the developed site at 1,260 vehicles with an estimated 70% to the entrance from Brickville Road and 30% to Stonegate Drive. It was assumed that the morning and afternoon traffic volumes would be the same. Of the 880 vehicles to and from the Brickville Road entrance it was estimated that 800 vehicles would go to and from Peace Road and the remaining 80 vehicles to Brickville Road to and from the north. The change from single-family detached housing to senior housing would normally change some of the assumptions about average daily trips. However, the additional number of units in the senior housing project probably offsets the lower number of daily trips assigned to individual senior housing units. In short, it has been assumed that the traffic impacts outlined in the September report are still generally valid.

Fiscal Summary

The age restriction effectively removes any potential negative fiscal impact on the school district, and adds a significant property value for the taxing purposes of all local taxing bodies. In the absence of floor plans, this preliminary conclusion is based on the following working assumptions:

- ✓ 144 duplex lots, of which three-fourths (108 lots or 216 units) are assumed to be occupied by owners who would qualify for the senior citizen homestead exemption. This exemption is available to persons 65 years or older who live in and own their home. This exemption is worth \$4,000 off the assessed value of the property, in addition to the owner-occupied exemption of \$5,500.
- ✓ Each duplex unit is valued at \$225,000 to \$250,000 (an average of \$240,000 is used for illustrative purposes).
- ✓ An average of 1.85 adults per duplex unit. The City's ongoing occupancy survey (see attached) which has been running since December 2005 shows 1.85 adults per occupancy. The actual number may be less because of the bias toward householders without children.

- ✓ The assisted living facility will have an occupancy level of 54-61 residents and an EAV of \$1,577,728. This is a very provisional assumption using the EAV and the occupancy of the Grand Victorian facility on Somonauk Street.
- ✓ 75% of the duplexes will have two bedrooms and 25% will have three bedrooms. These assumptions are relevant to the Park impact fee calculation. The City impact fees for sewer and water connections will also apply because water and sewage impacts are expected no matter the age, sex, or education of the occupant.

A potentially significant service obligation on the part of the City attends the long-term maintenance and repair of the public subdivision streets shown on the concept plan. However, either the imposition of a transportation impact fee or the inclusion of such a fee obligation in the annexation agreement could offset the capital cost of such infrastructure work over time. An assessment of the potential property tax revenue from this development is shown in the tables that follow.

Property Tax: Senior Owner Occupied Attached Homes (75% or 216 units)			
Home Price:	\$240,000		
Gross EAV:	\$80,000		
Owner Occupied:	-\$5,500		
Senior Exemption:	-\$4,000		
Net EAV:	\$70,500		
Tax Bill/Distribution:	Tax Rate*	Extension:	216 units:
City of Sycamore	0.58178	\$410.15	\$88,593.46
Kishwaukee College	0.54965	\$387.50	\$83,700.70
County	0.84486	\$595.63	\$128,655.28
Forest Preserve	0.06768	\$47.71	\$10,306.31
Sycamore Schools	4.78311	\$3,372.09	\$728,371.99
Sycamore Library	0.18598	\$131.12	\$28,321.03
Sycamore Park	0.41622	\$293.44	\$63,381.98
Road and Bridge	0.22567	\$159.10	\$34,365.03
Sycamore Township	0.10888	\$76.76	\$16,580.25

Property Tax: Non-Senior Owner Occupied Attached Homes (25% or 72 units)			
Home Price:	\$240,000		
Gross EAV:	\$80,000		
Owner Occupied:	-\$5,500		
Senior Exemption:	\$0		
Net EAV:	\$74,500		
Tax Bill/Distribution:	Tax Rate*	Extension:	72 units:
City of Sycamore	0.58178	\$433.43	\$31,206.68
Kishwaukee College	0.54965	\$409.49	\$29,483.23
County	0.84486	\$629.42	\$45,318.29
Forest Preserve	0.06768	\$50.42	\$3,630.36
Sycamore Schools	4.78311	\$3,563.42	\$256,566.02
Sycamore Library	0.18598	\$138.56	\$9,975.97
Sycamore Park	0.41622	\$310.08	\$22,326.04
Road and Bridge	0.22567	\$168.12	\$12,104.94
Sycamore Township	0.10888	\$81.12	\$5,840.32

Property Tax: Assisted Living Facility			
Net EAV:	\$1,577,728		
Tax Bill/Distribution:	Tax Rate*	Extension:	
City of Sycamore	0.58178	\$9,178.91	
Kishwaukee College	0.54965	\$8,671.98	
County	0.84486	\$13,329.59	
Forest Preserve	0.06768	\$1,067.81	
Sycamore Schools	4.78311	\$75,464.47	
Sycamore Library	0.18598	\$2,934.26	
Sycamore Park	0.41622	\$6,566.82	
Road and Bridge	0.22567	\$3,560.46	
Sycamore Township	0.10888	\$1,717.83	
*Uses proposed 2008 City Tax Rate and 2007 Tax Rates for other taxing bodies.			

Total Residential/Assisted Living Property Tax			
Net EAV (upon completion):	\$22,169,728		
Tax Bill/Distribution:	Tax Rate*	Extension:	
City of Sycamore	0.58178	\$128,979.04	
Kishwaukee College	0.54965	\$121,855.91	
County	0.84486	\$187,303.16	
Forest Preserve	0.06768	\$15,004.47	
Sycamore Schools	4.78311	\$1,060,402.48	
Sycamore Library	0.18598	\$41,231.26	
Sycamore Park	0.41622	\$92,274.84	
Road and Bridge	0.22567	\$50,030.43	
Sycamore Township	0.10888	\$24,138.40	
*Uses proposed 2008 City Tax Rate and 2007 Tax Rates for other taxing bodies.			

Impact Fee Calculation:

	2 BR ATT	Total 2BR (216 units):	3 BR ATT	Total 3BR (72 units):	Total Impact Fees:
Library	\$82.25	\$17,766.00	\$120.32	\$8,663.04	\$26,429.04
Park District	\$1,311.00	\$283,176.00	\$1,917.00	\$138,024.00	\$421,200.00

City Revenues:

	Acres	Per Acre:	Total:		
Annexation Fee	94.95	\$3,000.00	\$284,850.00		
State Shared	Population*	Per Capita**	Total:		
Income Tax	587	\$92.40	\$54,238.80		
Use Tax	587	\$14.10	\$8,276.70		
MFT Tax	587	\$26.30	\$15,438.10		
*Assumes 1.85 people per household, 54 adults in Assisted Living Care.					
**Uses IML estimates for State of Illinois FY2010, released 10-31-08.					
Sales Tax*	Audit FY2008	Population	Per Capita	Less 20%	
State 1%	\$2,834,383	15,500	\$182.86	\$146.29	
GF Home Rule .50%	\$951,090	15,500	\$61.36	\$49.09	
Restaurant/Bar	\$738,492	15,500	\$47.64	\$38.12	
Estimated Sales Tax Generated Per Year*					
	Population*	Discounted Per Capita	Total		
State 1%	533	\$146.29	\$77,972.96		
GF Home Rule .50%	533	\$49.09	\$26,164.18		
Restaurant/Bar	533	\$38.12	\$20,315.68		
Capital HR .25%	533	\$24.54	\$13,082.09		
Road Fund HR .50%	533	\$49.09	\$26,164.18		
Total Sales Tax			\$163,699.09		
*Does not factor in those in Assisted Living Care.					

Recommendation:

Since the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) went into effect on May 1, 2005, all planned unit developments have been reviewed as special uses with all the public scrutiny and detailed documentation that such uses deserve. Section 4.3.4, B, “Planned Developments,” Subsection 9, “Effect of Denial of a Special Use” of the UDO (p. 60) requires a significant revision if a development plan is to merit further consideration as a planned unit development within one year of a Council denial of a special use petition. The proposed age-restricted development is a significant departure in terms of site layout and fiscal impact and merits the Commission’s attention.

The proposed development is welcome in these economic times. The fiscal benefits, along with the street realignment at the developer’s expense, are measurable and positive contributions. The additional benefit of diverse housing for seniors who will shop our stores and use our medical, social, and recreational services is likewise significant. The Plan Commission considered this petition on February 9. The Commission voted 11-0 to recommend the Council’s approval. In recent years, the Council has preferred to consider residential annexations over several sessions in order to gather the widest possible public opinion. Consistent with this approach, the City Council considered this proposed annexation on first reading only on February 16, 2009.

The City Manager recommends City Council approval of the Plan Commission recommendation on second reading on March 2.

B. Ordinance No. 2008.75—An Ordinance Annexing a 94.95-Acre Parcel Located at the Northeast Corner of the Intersection of Brickville Road and Peace Road in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.

This ordinance separately considers the Pappas annexation for recording purposes. Final action on this ordinance will be contingent upon action on Ordinance 2008.74.

C. Ordinance No. 2008.76—An Ordinance Approving a Collective Bargaining Agreement Between the City of Sycamore and Local 3046 of the International Association of Firefighters. Second Reading.

The Council has several issues to consider.

A. Action on the Fire Contract.

Since the City Council meeting of February 16, representatives of IAFF Local 3046 and the City Manager have met on a number of informal occasions to attempt to resolve differences regarding the proposed contract extension. These meetings have been productive. The City Manager believes the following terms are the basis for a tentative agreement on all outstanding issues:

- Retroactive wage increases of 4% for Year One (the fiscal year May 1, 2008 to April 30, 2009). All other City employee groups received this increase on May 1, 2008.
- A wage increase of 2% for Year Two (the fiscal year beginning on May 1, 2009 and extending through April 30, 2010).
- A wage increase of 1.75% for Year Three (the fiscal year beginning on May 1, 2010 and extending through April 30, 2011).
- A complete re-opener in Year Three, with the exception of wages.
- Approval of the tentative agreements achieved during negotiating sessions in 2008.
- Beginning with the effective date of the Agreement (May 1, 2008) and ending on April 30, 2011, the City agrees that no current IAFF employees will be laid off and no IAFF positions will be lost to attrition.
- Approval of a Memorandum of Understanding which recognizes that the attached agreement is controlling in all respects, notwithstanding Arbitrator Hill's opinion and his award dated February 19, 2009 (see the attached MOU).

During the recent negotiations, and in the spirit of compromise, the union's chief negotiator offered to take no wage increase in Year Two, and a 3.75% increase in Year Three. For financial reasons, the City preferred a 2% increase in Year Two and a 1.75% increase in Year Three, because of the uncertainty surrounding the City's revenues at present and the greater uncertainty as we look ahead a year or more. The City Manager supports the terms that are outlined above and has inserted them in the attached draft agreement. At this writing (February 25), the membership of IAFF Local 3046 has not yet debated or ratified the attached agreement.

City Council approval of the attached Agreement is recommended.

B. Action on the Arbitration Panel’s Decision.

The Arbitrator’s opinion of January 3, 2009 was not formally submitted to the two members of the Arbitration panel for their signatures until February 18. Aside from Arbitrator Hill, the panel consisted of City Attorney Keith Foster and IAFF attorney Dale Berry. Panel member Berry concurred in all respects with Arbitrator Hill’s opinion on February 18, 2009. On February 19, 2009 City Attorney Foster filed a partial dissent. Since two of the three panel members concurred, the Award as presented in the Council’s packet is consistent with Arbitrator Hill’s opinion.

The City’s partial dissent was specific to the Arbitrator’s wage opinion and was based on the changed economic circumstances that now confront the City and the region. A copy of that dissent is appended. According to Section 14 (n) of the Illinois Public Labor Relations Act (IPLRA), if the governing body (i.e. the City Council) affirmatively rejects one or more terms of the arbitration panel’s decision, it must provide reasons for such objection within 20 days of such rejection and the parties shall then return to the arbitration panel for a supplemental hearing. The clock, in a sense, has been running since February 19. The Council should support the City Attorney’s dissent and reject the Arbitration panel’s award as it relates to wages and the EMT/Paramedic bonus with a 3/5 vote, on the basis of changed economic circumstances. If the City Council approves the attached collective bargaining agreement but IAFF Local 3046 does not ratify the agreement within 48 hours of the Council’s action, it is recommended that the City Attorney prepare and submit an argument for a supplemental arbitration hearing no later than March 6 to assure the City’s statutory opportunity for such a hearing.

Summary

The coming together of union and management officials in the past two weeks was prompted, in no small measure, by the public-mindedness and good will of the union president, firefighter Dan Marcinkowski, and the union’s chief negotiator, Lt. Kurt Mathey. Both men will be involved in ongoing discussions to find ways to economize Fire operations while maintaining the high professional quality of service our community enjoys when the Fire department responds to a call.

D. Ordinance No. 2008.77—An Ordinance Concerning the Recommendation of the Zoning Board of Appeals With Regard to the Petition of Norm Adshade at 224 Charles Street for a Variance from Article 3.2.2 of the Unified Development Ordinance in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.

On Tuesday, February 24, the Sycamore Zoning Board of Appeals considered a variance request from Norm Adshade who is trying to sell a single family property at 224 Charles Street. The property is zoned “R-2,” Two Family Residence District but is an undersized lot with a single family residence. The parcel does not have a garage, and the petitioner would like to install a garage for off-street parking, but the UDO’s provisions (Section 3.2.2) prohibit the construction of an accessory structure on a nonconforming lot. In this case, the nonconforming aspect is the lot’s gross area, which is 250 square feet short of the minimum lot area for parcels platted before 1996. Mr. Adshade has proposed a 1-1/2 car garage that would be 15 feet by 20 feet and would not be attached to the residence. The prohibition of parking on the south side of Charles Street contributes to the petitioner’s sense that any new

occupants of the residence could not enjoy the convenience of parking in proximity to the house, whether off-street or on-street.

The Board considered the petitioner's request and concluded, by a vote of 5-0, that the plight of the petitioner was due to unique circumstances. Before modern zoning and widespread auto ownership, a small lot such as the one owned by Mr. Adshade provided ample room for what earlier generations considered a family-sized house with suitable amenities. The narrow street was also typical of an earlier time and did not account for two-sided parking along with safe travel. The location of a garage is possible without adversely affecting the neighborhood, provided the construction is done with care and without inconvenience to the neighboring property owner. It is interesting to note that one of the adjoining lots is also nonconforming in area but has a detached garage of the type proposed by Mr. Adshade which was apparently built with the house in the 1950s.

City Council approval of the Zoning Board recommendation is requested.

12. RESOLUTIONS

A. Resolution No. 515—Authorizing a Representative to Sign Loan Documents From the Illinois Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund.

Resolutions 515, 516 and 517 are related. As the City Council is aware, the City has assertively investigated its potential eligibility for portions of the federal stimulus package, particularly in the areas of transportation improvements and public safety. The City has applied for assistance with the reconstruction of Bethany Road from Peace Road east to Somonauk Street, the realignment of Lindgren Road, the construction of a Police department addition, and the upgrading and expansion of the City's wastewater treatment plant. Our contacts at the Illinois EPA have informed us that IEPA may receive up to \$170 million in stimulus funds, distributing about one-half in grants and about one-half in no-interest or low-interest (2.5%) loans. Applications for these funds are due almost immediately.

As the Council briefly discussed at the February 16 meeting, it had been the City's plan to finance much of the Phase I sludge-handling improvements with internal funds such as accrued impact fees and Sewer Fund reserves, relying on a deferred increase in impact fees and user fees several years from now to finance a low-interest loan for Phase II, which involves the expansion of the treatment plant's capacity from 2.97 gallons per day (MGD) to 4.99 MGD. The Phase I improvements are estimated to be \$5.5 million in construction plus about \$1 million in equipment, with another \$659,000 in engineering and contingency costs. The Phase II improvements are estimated to be about \$6.5 million with \$1.05 million in engineering and contingency costs.

The very accelerated federal schedule for the award of stimulus grants and loans to Illinois communities requires some preliminary authorizations from eligible communities. More careful financial planning and fee modeling along with extended public discussion will precede any commitment to higher user fees in the future. For now, the authorized use of internal funds to repay Phase I loans will position the City to qualify for very favorable loan terms.

City Council approval is recommended. The Council may take all three resolutions in omnibus fashion.

B. Resolution No. 516—Resolution of Intent Regarding National Flood Insurance With Respect to Loans From the Illinois Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund.
See Resolution No. 515, above.

C. Resolution No. 517—Authorizing a Certification Regarding Project Performance Standards With Respect to Loans From the Illinois Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund.
See Resolution No. 516, above.

13. CONSIDERATIONS

A. Consideration of an Administration Recommendation Regarding Bids for the Erection of an Elevated Water Storage Tower on the Former Engh Farm.

At 2:00 p.m. on Monday, February 9, bids were opened for the construction of a 1 million gallon elevated water storage tank on the Engh farm site. Bids were invited for a single pedestal elevated tank with four options, a prefabricated valve vault, and other miscellaneous items of work. The bids did not cover a new well or appurtenances. The responsible bids were as follows:

Bidder	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Caldwell Tanks, Louisville, KY	\$2,692,000	No Bid	\$2,990,000	\$3,533,000
CB&I, Bolingbrook, IL	\$2,359,000	\$2,990,000	No Bid	No Bid
Phoenix Fabricators, Sebree, KY	No Bid	No Bid	\$4,117,600	\$4,806,700

- Option 1: 1.0 MG steel elevated tank (engineer’s estimate: \$2.7 Million)
- Option 2: 1.5 MG steel elevated tank (engineer’s estimate: \$3.4 Million)
- Option 3: 1.0 MG concrete/steel composite elevated tank (engineer’s estimate: 3.2 Million)
- Option 4: 1.5 MG concrete/steel composite elevated tank (engineer’s estimate: 3.9 Million)

At the February 16 Council meeting, no Council action was taken to permit the City staff more time to evaluate the bids and make a recommendation. The City staff are satisfied that the lowest responsible bidder for the 1.5 million gallon tower—Chicago Bridge and Iron of Bolingbrook, Illinois—will be able to complete the project on the City’s timetable. The projected completion date is October, 2010.

City Council approval of a contract with Chicago Bridge and Iron is recommended.

- 14. OTHER NEW BUSINESS**
- 15. APPOINTMENTS**
- 16. ADJOURNMENT**