

SYCAMORE CITY COUNCIL
AGENDA
March 19, 2007

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 March 5, 2007.
 - B. Payment of the Bills for March 19, 2007.
 - C. Plan Commission Minutes for February 12, 2007.
7. **PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS, COMMUNICATIONS, AND BILLS.**
 - A. Presentation by Rich Neubauer regarding the brick pavers for the Main Street Park.
 - B. Presentation by Joyce Mathey in appreciation of community support for the Pay-It-Forward House on the occasion of the facility's second anniversary.
8. **REPORTS OF OFFICERS**
9. **REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**
10. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

A. Public Hearing on the Proposed Amendment to the Herst Farm Annexation Agreement to Revise the Preliminary Plan.

A public hearing will be held to formally invite public comment on the proposed amendment to the Herst farm annexation agreement, which was approved in September 2005. A similar public hearing was held before the Sycamore Plan Commission on February 12, 2007. Please see the background under Ordinance No. 2006.62, below.

11. ORDINANCES

A. Ordinance No. 2006.62--An Ordinance Concerning the Recommendation of the Plan Commission With Regard to the Petition of John Hall Homes to Amend the Original Annexation Agreement between the City of Sycamore and Freda R. Herst to Include a New Preliminary plat, Zoning Revisions and Certain Zoning Variances. Second Reading.

On February 19 the City Council heard this matter on first reading. On March 5, the Council tabled further discussion in the absence of two aldermen.

The preliminary plan and plat presented by John Hall Homes is a refinement of a plan that was presented to the Plan Commission on August 14, 2006, the City Council on October 16, 2006, and the Plan Commission on January 8 and February 12 of 2007. In addition, two special workshop sessions have been held to familiarize interested citizens and businesses with the unique features of the proposed development. The first special workshop was a “brown bag” lunch held on Tuesday, January 23 from noon until 1:30 p.m. in the lower level of the Sycamore Center for the benefit of Sycamore Chamber members. The second was held on Monday, February 26, at 7:00 p.m. at the request of Alderman Grace Adee to afford an opportunity for Third Ward constituents to take another look.

The proposed plan would amend the preliminary plan presented with the September 2005 annexation. In addition, the Council’s attention is drawn to the proposal to re-zone the neighborhood commercial (“R-1”) and surrounding multiple family (“R-3”) zoning to “C-4” Mixed Use-Commercial.

Background

The 97.21-acre Freda R. Herst farm was annexed and zoned on September 19, 2005 by a Council vote of 8-1 (Bauer objecting). The farm is located at the northeast corner of Plank Road and Lindgren Road. In the fall of 2005, Freda Herst was not interested in developing her family farm. However, city officials engaged Ms. Herst and her attorney, Robert Krupp, in a series of discussions concerning the dedication of a realigned Lindgren Road to accommodate a planned elementary school in the nearby Sycamore Creek subdivision. In these discussions, the impact of a road realignment on any future development of the Herst property naturally arose. Over the course of this discussion, Ms. Herst and her counsel determined it was in the family’s best interest to petition the City to annex the farm property to the City of Sycamore and to provide for both the realignment of Lindgren Road and certain additional conditions (e.g. zoning) in an annexation agreement. Among the additional considerations was an understanding that any future development would be reviewed under the City’s planned unit development regulations as a special use, with all required public hearings pertaining to preliminary plats, final plats, rezonings, etc. This

important provision prompted the workshop sessions in August 2006, October 2006, January 2007, and February 2007 with John Hall Homes.

The Proposed Preliminary Plan from John Hall Homes

The attached preliminary plan and plat present the following key features:

- a) The realignment of Lindgren Road (see review comments below).
- b) Land Uses. To better represent the Comp Plan's expectations for a mix of commercial and low-intensity commercial uses near the intersection of Lindgren Road and Plank Road, the "C-4" Mixed Use Commercial Business District was suggested by the City staff. This is a change from the original concept plan to conform to the UDO's stricter guidelines for mixed use developments under the C-4 provisions. All of the proposed "C-1" and "R-3" zoning would be combined in the planned development format as a special use, "C-4" Mixed Use Commercial Business District. Such a zoning designation anticipates planned unit developments designed to accommodate compatible residential and commercial uses on larger tracts of land and to maximize opportunities for orderly economic development. Typical mixed use designs include a core of community facilities (e.g. not-for-profit agency offices, day care centers, etc.) small retail establishments (e.g. corner market, dry cleaner) and commercial office uses (e.g. dentists, attorneys, etc.) adjacent to, or surrounded by, a variety of housing types including single family attached homes such as townhouses or zero lot line units. In such zoning districts, public or open space to promote public gathering is encouraged, in contrast with utilitarian open space such as stormwater detention ponds or undevelopable areas such as floodplains or wetlands.
- c) Commercial and residential condominiums. In the proposed C-4 zoning area, two-story and three-story buildings will house commercial units on the ground floor with the option of residential or commercial condominiums on the second floor, depending upon market interest. The mixed commercial/residential buildings would have roof profiles to blend with the nearby residential buildings.
- d) Courtyard homes. These units are part of the C-4 zoning area and are adjacent to the commercial uses. As an alternative to townhouse construction, courtyard or "zero lot line" homes are built on smaller lots and feature courtyards between the units. This approach departs from the repetition in design and the close living quarters that typify even the most expensive townhouses in our community.
- e) The 4.5-acre townhouse area is left unplatted to await market interest. A future revision of the preliminary plan and plat would be required if and when there is sufficient market demand to warrant such housing, as depicted in the original concept plan of August 2006.
- f) Park space. Park District director David Peek sees the two dedicated parks in Sycamore Creek II, immediately east of the Herst farm, as adequate to the needs of residents in this area. One of the B&B parks, the three-acre Columbia Park, would be directly east

of the Herst farm on Des Moines Street. A larger regional park in Sycamore Creek II—the 13.86 acre Washington Park—is just to the north and east of the smaller park. Sycamore Creek II can begin development in 2010. A photocopy of the adjacent portion of the Sycamore Creek development plan is attached to illustrate the proximity of the parks.

- g) Bike Paths. The Commission and City staff have been insistent upon bike path linkages since the 2000 Comp Plan process. In this instance, the regional pathway that is to be built on the south side of Lindgren Road would be linked at Schumaker Way (the main Lindgren Road entrance) to bring a dedicated pathway to the single-family zoning area.

Variations

1. Minimum Yard Setbacks. The neo-traditional look proposed by John Hall Homes introduces a number of features such as alleys and “old-town” frontage looks that conflict with the City’s conventional zoning setback requirements. The differences between the current code provisions and the developer’s proposals are highlighted in the following tables:

Townhouses (“R-3”)		
	UDO Requirement	Proposed
Front Yard	25’	25’
Corner Side Yard	25’	25’
Side Yard	7’	7’
Rear Yard	30’*	30’
Zero Lot Line Houses (“R-3”)		
	UDO Requirement	Proposed
Front Yard	25’	10’
Corner Side Yard	25’	10’
Side Yard	7’	0’/7’
Rear Yard	30’*	22’
Single Family Detached (“R-1”)		
Front Yard	25’	25’
Corner Side Yard	25’	20’**
Side Yard	10’	7’
Rear Yard	25’	25’

*20 feet if garage is attached to rear of unit for alley access. Detached garages may be 3 feet from any side or rear lot line.

**If the house has a side-loaded garage, the corner sideyard setback has to be 22 feet so a vehicle parked in the driveway does not encroach upon the sidewalk right-of-way.

2. Minimum Residential Lot Size. The zero lot line or courtyard houses would be unique in Sycamore. They are an alternative to rows of attached housing that have a repetitive look. Zero lot line houses align one building wall on a common lot line and set the opposite building wall off the adjacent lot line by at least the required seven feet in order to create a small courtyard between units. The walls built on the lot lines would have to be designed without windows for fire protection purposes. A depiction of these quaint houses is attached. If this approach is acceptable, a variance from the minimum lot size of 9,000 square feet would be required.

3. Second Floor Residential Condominiums. To permit the introduction of second floor condominiums in a “C-4” zoning district, a variation from the provisions of Table 5.3.1 of the UDO would have to be granted to allow such uses by right. Presently, second floor residential uses above ground floor commercial uses are only allowed in the “C-2” Central Business District.

4. Building Height. To permit a third floor residential loft in the “C-4” zoning area, the developer requests a variance from the building height limit of 35 feet to permit a height of 45 height. This would also accommodate the unique cupolas and roof lines illustrated in the developer’s three-dimensional renderings (see attached).

5. C-4 Uses. The developer proposes additional commercial uses that might qualify as “neighborhood” commercial uses in the “C-4” zoning area. From the staff perspective, the commercial uses in the table that follows compare favorably with permitted uses identified in “C-1” or “C-4” districts. The developer asks that the Council also consider the commercial uses identified in an attachment to this agenda item.

Type of Commercial Use	Permitted	Special Use
Veterinary Clinic		S
Financial service/counseling office	P	
Insurance agency office	P	
Bakery shop	P	
Delicatessen	P	
Package liquor store		S
Butcher shop	P	
Accountant office	P	
Attorney office	P	
ATM kiosk	P	
Barber shop	P	
Beauty parlor/hair salon	P	
Business office	P	
Dental clinic	P	
Medical clinic	P	
Commercial mailing service	P	
Day spa	P	
Physician’s office	P	
Engineering service office	P	
Dry cleaner	P	
Locksmith office	P	
Licensed massage therapy	P	
Management services	P	
Optician’s office	P	
Printing (xerographic) services	P	
Shoe repair shop	P	

Tailor shop	P	
Tanning salon	P	
Tax preparation services	P	
Health club		S
Recreation equipment showroom	P	
Art gallery	P	
Book store	P	
Camera/photographic sales & supplies	P	
Clothing store	P	
Gift shop	P	
Stationery/greeting card store	P	
Office Supply Store (2,500 sf or less)	P	
Bicycle shop/rentals	P	
Bed & Breakfast Inn	P	

6. The “40%” rule. In the descriptive language concerning “C-4” Mixed Use developments in Section 6.5.2 of the UDO, there is an expectation that the commercial uses “shall not be greater in area than forty (40) percent of the planned mixed use development.” With respect to the overall site plan, the designated neighborhood commercial area comprises 15% of the overall site (14.62 of the overall 97.21 acres). However, within the “C-4” zoning designation that includes the neighborhood commercial uses as well as the courtyard homes, townhouses, and about one-half of the open space, the commercial uses comprise about 58% of the land area. The developer requests a variance from the 40% rule, because the mix of building types and avenues proposed in the neighborhood commercial area requires slightly more land area to establish than “boxes” of a more conventional design.

Phasing and Zoning

In terms of the pace of any residential permits, the applicable regulatory framework is Ordinance 2003.65 (Ordinance 2005.60 was not approved until November of 2005). According to Ordinance 2003.65, building permits for residential construction may be issued annually as follows:

Number of Dwelling Units on the Preliminary Plan	Dwelling Units Permitted Per Year as a Percentage of the Total Lots on The Preliminary Plan	Time Limit Before New Building Permits Are Issued Following Annexation
0 to 50 dwelling units	No Limit	No Time Limit
51 to 100 dwelling units	No More than 35 per Year	One Year
101 to 200 dwelling units	25% or 40, whichever is lower	Two Years
201 to 300 dwelling units	20% or 50, whichever is lower	Three Years
301 to 400 dwelling units	18% or 60, whichever is lower	Four Years
401 to 500 dwelling units	15% or 70, whichever is lower	Five Years
Over 500 dwelling units	10% or 75, whichever is lower	Six Years

Ordinance 2003.65 permits the phasing or sequential development of tracts which have less than 100 acres in total area. In this instance, the developer hopes to develop commercial

uses simultaneously with the various types of residential units, but the market for the commercial uses may not evolve at the same pace as the demand for the residential units. Accordingly, the developer proposes two phases. The C-4 zoning area constitutes one phase, and the R-1 zoning constitutes another phase. The permitting of the first single family home in the R-1 zoning could occur two years after the date of Council approval.

Review Comments

Based on the Plan Commission's suggestions at the February 12 Plan Commission hearing, the petitioners have agreed to make the following revisions to the preliminary plan to accommodate the technical concerns of the Commission and the City staff:

- Access to the C-4 properties from Lindgren Road shall be limited to full access at the National Street intersection, and a right-in only roughly between Plank Road and National Street, on both sides.
- The portion of Lindgren Road which will be vacated once the realigned Lindgren Road is constructed shall be shown as being incorporated into Lots 305, 306 and 307 with the same C-4 zoning since the approved annexation agreement provided that all of this vacated road would go to the Herst property.
- The alley at the rear of the courtyard homes will be a private alley.
- The green buffer area along Plank Road will also adjoin the C-4 Lots 300-305.
- The location of the proposed bikepath linking National Street with the regional path on the south side of Lindgren Road will be shown.
- Ten feet (10') of additional right-of-way should be shown along the north side of Lindgren Road adjoining Lot 300 for construction of a right turn lane. Also, an additional ten feet (10') of right-of-way will be shown at the radius at Plank Road.
- Setback lines for the C-4 lots will be shown on the plat.
- Street standards for residential collector streets and commercial streets shall conform to the requirements contained in the City's Unified Development Ordinance.
- Since the project is larger than 40 acres, the storm water storage shall be designed using an approved hydrograph method rather than the rational method.

Recommendation

At the regular Plan Commission meeting of February 12, the Commission voted 7-2 (Henderson, Evans opposing) to support the proposed preliminary plan and plat and rezoning, plus the variation requests with the addition of the following commercial uses: day care, a convenience store (limited to 4800 s.f.); a specialty grocery (limited to 4800 s.f.); an electronic store (limited to 2400 s.f.); a floor covering store (limited to 2400 s.f.); a hardware store (limited to 4800 s.f.); a pet store, restaurants (with a special use requirement for outdoor dining); and drug stores by special use only. Because the developer's plan constitutes an amendment to the original plan accompanying the annexation agreement of September 2005, a two-thirds vote of the City Council is necessary to approve it.

The City staff recommend approval of the attached plan and plat, including the proposed variations, subject to the changes recommended by the Plan Commission. The petitioners' plan conforms to the City's Comprehensive Plan and Urban Design Guidelines. It also

represents a substantial improvement over what might be acceptable based on the provisions of the 2005 annexation agreement in terms of density, the compatibility of residential and commercial uses, and traffic design.

Nevertheless, we have heard some concerns that the proposed plan would result in a development that “lowers city standards.” This assertion is unsupported by the facts, and the facts have been presented with patience and at numerous public workshops and hearings in recent months. None of the proposed variations seeks a dilution of the City’s building and life safety standards, or a lower threshold in terms of the overall appearance of the buildings to be built, or the landscaped environment to be created. In fact, quite the opposite is true. The Council is invited to review the City’s “Urban Design Guidelines,” which are part of our Comprehensive Plan (Appendix A, pp. 60-74; see attached). The proposed Hall plan intelligently pursues these guidelines, both with respect to the appearance of the proposed commercial buildings and the appearance of the courtyard homes and detached single family homes. In terms of the original annexation agreement, only the proposed variations offer a basis for dispute, since the plan conforms to the original agreement in all other respects. Any further debate on the proposed plan might constructively be approached in the context of the “Urban Design Guidelines,” both in general and in detail. On that basis, the proposed development will be fairly judged.

B. Ordinance No. 2006.70--An Ordinance Concerning the Recommendation of the Plan Commission With Regard to the Petition of B&B Development for the Approval of the Final Plat for Unit Three of the Sycamore Creek Planned Unit Development in the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.

The attached plat defines Lot 1 of Unit Three which consists of 15.507 acres and will be the site of the Sycamore School District’s new elementary school. The approval of this plat will allow B&B Development to convey Lot 1 to the Sycamore Community Unit School District No. 427 as it prepares for the design and construction of the new school. Parcel A, consisting of 0.244 acres at the southwest corner of National Street and Lindgren Road, will afford some space for a school sign and landscaping.

The Plan Commission reviewed this plat at its last regular meeting of March 12 and recommended its approval by a vote of 8-0. City Council approval of the Plan Commission recommendation is requested.

C. Ordinance No. 2006.71—An Ordinance Amending Title 9, “Building Regulations,” Chapter 2, “Building Codes,” Section 9-2-1, “Building Code,” Paragraph B, “Building Code Amendments,” to Add Sections 1812.5, 1812.5.1, 1812.6 to the BOCA National Building Code/1999 of the City Code of the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.

Building Commissioner Lyle Doty has recommended the following revisions to the locally-adopted national building code to clarify the distances between various building elements and the surrounding or exterior grades:

- a) Add the following:

1812.5 Top Of Foundation. In order to prevent degradation of the building elements from moisture including interior framing, face brick, stone, wood and metal siding, etc. the top of the masonry or concrete foundation wall must be *elevated to at least 6 inches above the level* of the adjoining finished grade including sod, mulch, stone, sidewalks, patios, driveways, etc. that surround the building.

Exception: *A raised reverse brick ledge may be provided which would elevate the outer portion of the foundation wall 6 inches above the adjoining exterior grade and which would allow interior wall framing to be brought down to finished floor level with slab on grade construction.*

b) Add the following:

1812.5.1 Grading Around Buildings: There shall be at least 6 inches of pitch away from the building in the first 10 feet (5%) around the perimeter of the building for all sod, mulch, stone or other pervious surface areas and then the slope shall be not less than 2% on all other pervious surface areas on the property, including proper swales which can be provided around the building to divert surface water away from the building.

c) Add the following:

1812.6 Foundation Anchor Bolts. Foundation anchor bolts must be cast in place, unless otherwise approved, and when in contact with pressure treated lumber must be ½ inch or larger stainless steel or hot dipped galvanized bolts, washers and nuts.

City Council approval is recommended.

D. Ordinance No. 2006.72--An Ordinance Amending Title 9, "Building Regulations," Chapter 2, "Building Codes," Section 9-2-2, "Dwelling Code," Paragraph B, "Dwelling Code Amendments," of the City Code of the City of Sycamore, Illinois. First and Second Reading.

Building Commissioner Lyle Doty has also proposed the following amendments to the locally-adopted dwelling code (the International One and Two Family Dwelling Code, 1998 edition):

a) Add the following:

403.1.4.1: Foundation anchorage with Pressure Preservative-Treated Sill and Sole Plates. Foundation anchor bolts must be cast in place, unless otherwise approved, and when in contact with pressure-treated lumber must be ½ inch or larger stainless steel or hot dipped galvanized bolts, washers and nuts.

b) Section 404.1.6 shall be deleted and amended to read:

404.1.6 Height above finished grade. In order to prevent degradation of the building elements from moisture including interior framing, face brick, stone, wood and metal siding, etc. the top of the masonry or concrete foundation walls must be *elevated to at least 6 inches above the level* of the finished grade including sod, mulch, stone, sidewalks, patios, driveways, etc. that surround the building.

Exception: *A raised reverse brick ledge may be provided which will elevate the outer portion of the foundation wall 6 inches above the adjoining grade and which would allow interior framing to be brought down to finished grade level.*

c) Section 404.1.6.1 shall be added as follows:

404.1.6.1 Grading around buildings: There shall be at least 6 inches of pitch away from the building in the first 10 feet (5%) around the perimeter of the building for all sod, mulch, stone or other pervious surface areas and then the slope shall be not less than 2% on all other pervious surface areas on the property, including proper swales which can be provided around the building to divert surface water away from the building.

City Council approval is recommended.

12. RESOLUTIONS--None

13. CONSIDERATIONS

A. Consideration of the Preliminary FY2007-2008 City Budget.

The City Manager has distributed copies of the proposed FY2007-2008 City Budget to the City Council. Copies will also be distributed to the media and a copy will be placed in the reference section of the Sycamore Library where it will be on record for interested citizens to review.

The proposed FY2007-2008 City Budget will simply be received and filed on March 19. A special Council Finance Committee workshop will be convened at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers on Wednesday, March 21 to review the budget document. All Council members are welcome to attend and participate as in previous years. On March 21 the General Fund departments will be reviewed as well as the Water Department and Treatment Plant budgets. The City's department heads will be on hand to assist the City Manager in this review. If these operational departments are covered to the Council's satisfaction on March 21, the Committee will be asked to review the special and capital funds, and hopefully the bond funds. If time does not permit the full review of the special, capital and bond funds on March 21, the Committee will continue its work on Thursday, March 22. A public hearing on the proposed budget, which may be revised following the Finance Committee workshops, will be held on Monday, April 2 and action on the budget will be recommended on Monday, April 16.

B. Consideration of a Public Works Department Recommendation to Order a New Tandem Axle Dump Truck.

The proposed Fiscal Year 2007-2008 capital budget that was presented to the Council on February 19 included an allocation for a new, tandem axle dump truck for the Public Works department. Since that time, Superintendent Fred Busse has learned that the state purchasing contract between Prairie International and the State of Illinois is open for price negotiations after March 31. To be able to take advantage of the pricing quoted in February, the City would need to place an order before March 31. The additional advantage of an "advance" order would be an accelerated delivery in June rather than in the

late fall. In the current fiscal year, a large dump was ordered in the middle of May 2006 but was not received until December 2006.

As Superintendent Busse writes in his background memorandum, the proposed vehicle would be the City's first tandem axle truck. Over the last several years the department has seen a need for such a truck, whose large bed and horsepower can reduce the time and expense for hauling material from the gravel pit as well as sludge to farms in the fall. This truck would also be outfitted with a nine foot "wing" mounted on the front of the truck. Along Bethany Road and a lot of the newer subdivisions, snow drifts build along the edge of the roadway. The City's present fleet basically throws the snow just beyond the curbing or shoulder at the lower speeds our drivers must travel for safety's sake. With a wing, a truck can push the snow back an additional six feet. This action will reduce repeated trips to tend to drifts, and the greater "throw" improves the visibility for the driver during drifting conditions. In the past, Sycamore Township and Cortland Township have assisted the City in plowing back areas of Bethany Road that are typically assigned to the Sycamore crews. However, on other City streets such as Prairie Drive, Lindgren Road, North Grove Road, and Johnson Avenue our crews usually have to work alone.



In the proposed FY08 Budget, the funding for this truck will be shared between the Capital Fund (06-8521) and the Sewer Fund (752-8521). The total budgeted amount for the truck with all of its equipment is \$130,000.00. In order to qualify for the lower-priced truck chassis before March 31, Superintendent Busse is seeking the Council's approval for a commitment of \$63,600.00 which would be charged against the FY08 budget when the chassis is received. Bid specifications for the remaining equipment such as the dump body, plow, wing, and spreader will be created and submitted for approval at a future meeting.

City Council approval of this advanced funding request is recommended.

C. Consideration of a Public Works Department Purchase of a Tractor for Applying Sludge.

Public Works superintendent Fred Busse has been searching the market for a good deal on a tractor that can pull the manure spreader purchased in February. As the City Council will recall, Mr. Busse was authorized to purchase the spreader at the February 5 Council meeting with the expectation that another \$40,000 might be spent on a used tractor in good working condition. Since that time, the prices of used and new tractors have spiked, owing to (a) predictable high demand as the plowing and planting season approaches and (b) the additional inflationary impact of corn prices related to the growing demand for ethanol. For a tractor with sufficient horsepower to pull a fully-loaded spreader, the market for recent models in good condition now starts in excess of \$75,000 (see the attached sales flyer).

In recent days, Mr. Busse, the City Manager, and Finance Chair Alan Bauer have reviewed a number of options including the leasing of a new or used tractor, the purchase of a late model or used tractor, or the purchase of a new tractor. For the purpose of this assessment, a 20-year time frame was used since it represents the normal life span of such a piece of equipment with the limited annual use demanded by the City. As a result of the review, it was determined that the most reasonable financial option for the City was to purchase a new tractor if one could be purchased with the 20% discount afforded by the state purchasing system. A breakdown of the two most likely scenarios is shown in the table below:

Option A: City leases tractor for 20 years	Option B: City purchases new tractor for about \$78,000 (including state purchase discount of \$20,000)
Lease Cost: Yrs 1-6: \$66,000* (\$11,000/yr for 6 yrs)	Upfront Purchase Price: \$78,000 (plus title and delivery charges; no tax)
Lease Cost: Yrs 7-20: \$56,000 (\$4,000/yr for 14 yrs)	
Fuel (included in lease) \$0.00	Fuel \$ 4,000
Maintenance (incl in lease) \$0.00	Maintenance \$ 6,000**
Labor \$0.00	Labor \$ 12,000
Total: \$122,000	Total: \$100,000
Average cost per year: \$ 6,100	Average cost per year: \$ 5,000
City does not own tractor after 20 years	City owns tractor after 20 years with market value of about \$50,000

*Larger annual lease payments in initial years are required to reduce financing costs.

**Assumes City uses tractor in the range of 25-40 hours per year.

Mr. Busse has searched the northern Illinois market through dealers and internet sales outlets for a new or slightly used tractor similar in specifications to the tractor presented in the attached sales flyer. He has found such a tractor in Rochelle at Johnson Tractor in the amount of \$78,985. The entire purchase price can be absorbed by the FY07 Treatment Plant budget (\$40,000--#751-8399; \$38,985--#752-8633). Because this particular dealer—as with other farm implement dealers—could not hold the tractor on a verbal commitment in the face of very active market interest, the City Manager, after consultation with Alderman Bauer, authorized Mr. Busse to secure the tractor with a City check in line with the aforesaid budget allocations voted by the Council.

City Council approval is recommended.

D. Consideration of an Administration Request for a Closed Session for Possible or Imminent Litigation and Land Acquisition.

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