

Members Present

Mr. Vickery, Mr. Stauffenberg, Mr. Tholen, Ms. Bernard, Ms. McBride, Mr. Washington, Mr. Flett, Mr. James, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Pagast, Mr. Tripp, and Mr. Hess

Members Absent

Mr. Olthoff and Ms. Polk

In Attendance

- **Board Members**

Mr. Bossert and Mr. McConnell

Department Heads

Mike Van Mill

- **Media**

Leigh Marcotte

Dimitrios Kalantzis

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Mr. Vickery, at 9:00 a.m. Quorum present.

2. Public Comment

3. Approval of Minutes – December 29, 2010

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Mr. James and seconded by Mr. Stauffenberg. Motion carried.

4. Building

- **2010 Building Permit/Code Enforcement Overview**

M. Pallissard gave an overview of the 2010 year-end report from the building division.

Mr. Washington made a motion to accept the report and Mr. Tripp seconded it. Motion carried with a voice vote.

Mr. James asked if it was state law that residents on an agricultural piece of property are exempt.

Mr. Pallissard stated that it is. The single family dwelling, as long as it is accessory to the farm/farmer, is exempt.

Ms. Bernard stated that she can understand exempting the building structures but everyone has to have a house to live on. Do none of them pay for permits?

Mr. Pallissard stated that if they are collecting by state statute an income off of that land, they are a farmer and are exempt.

5. Planning

- **Pembroke Township Revolving Loan**

Mr. Van Mill stated that in today's packet is a committee report from Pembroke Township Revolving Fund Ad Hoc Committee that was created as a result of an action taken by the PZA Committee at its December 28 meeting. At that time, the committee was made aware that there were some provisions of the revolving loan that was approved in September by the County Board that needed some modifications and the committee decided to have a smaller committee from this group to come up with recommendations on

three issues that the township supervisor made. The report goes into detail about what transpired during the meeting. Basically, the committee came up with three recommendations as a result of their deliberations. The township asked for an extended grace period to start the payment back on the loan. Originally, the loan agreement was six months after execution but the township has requested twelve months and the committee recommended that. The ad hoc committee also recommended that the payments be modified to allow for the repairs that were a result of the damage inside the facility which included the replacement of drywall, painting, and mold abatement. The third contingency was that part of the review at that time was the committee looking at the condition on the agreement that the state and the federal grants be reviewed in some audited fashion. Mr. Washington did set up a meeting with Mr. Gibbs and reviewed that and provided his report to the ad hoc committee making the recommendation that that satisfied that condition of the original resolution. With that, the committee unanimously recommended these three conditions be forwarded to the County Board in February.

Mr. Stauffenberg made a motion to approve and Ms. McBride seconded it.

Discussion

Ms. Bernard asked what the parameters for what is considered an audit in this case.

Mr. Van Mill stated that it was to review what was being paid out of the loan. That is what the committee was tasked to do at the time.

Ms. Bernard stated that her concern is that last week she called to look at copies of the documents that constituted the review or audit and the County does not have possession of any documents. We are talking about real money here that is going to be dispersed and the buck stops here. She is concerned that they are being asked to approve spending without having the documents in place and she thinks the documents should be available. She is uncomfortable voting without documents in place.

Mr. Washington stated that because the federal and state government would not allow the actual documents that were asked for they had to review the bank statements and checkbook for those things that are relevant to this examination. If they had been able to get actual documents from Pembroke they would have done so but they were not able to do that because those funds did not come from us. The major funds that went to the project did not come from us; therefore, we had no authority to demand those documents.

Ms. Bernard asked if there was documentation from the state and federal government that says that we are prohibited from looking at the documents. As far as she is concerned, whether we issued the money or not, these are public dollars we are talking about.

Mr. Franco stated that he has heard a lot about the documents not being available to whoever would want them. He wants the committee to know that anybody that wants to look at their documents, which is the contract, they can do so. If the committee wants to they can send Mr. McCarty over to look at their documents. To his knowledge, he thinks this was done as correct as possible. He cannot speak to their administration charges because he has never seen any of that. From everything that he has seen on the monies that came to the township, everything was done correctly. There have been a lot of problems with Pembroke in the past but he thinks this time it was done appropriately. He can't attest to the administration fees but he can say that all the monies for construction were handled in a very proper manner.

Mr. Vickery stated the federal and state grants are subject to their audits. The only thing that we are concerned about here is this \$46,000. It is CDAP funds that we are loaning and giving to Pembroke to finish out the project. In an attempt to help Pembroke, it was the committee's task to look at it and forward it on to this committee and he thinks we have looked at it from a committee's standpoint and from the revolving loan fund stand point and now it is up to PZA to pass it on.

Mr. Nixon stated that for the \$46,000 that the County is on the line for and for the amount of work and effort that has been put into this building, we need to look forward now and see if we can get this going and get businesses in there so we can get our \$46,000 back.

Ms. Bernard stated that it is her understanding that the work has already been completed so the payment to the general contractor should not be an obstacle to getting an occupancy permit. She wants to see Pembroke progress but the prudent thing to be done in this situation is if we are being asked to vote to disperse dollars the documents should be available to the entire committee. She would like to know who at the federal and state level said that we are prohibited from looking at those documents. She is very uncomfortable voting for this much money without the documents in her hands.

The original motion passed with a roll call vote of 12 ayes and 1 nay.

- **Kankakee County Regional Planning Commission – 2011 Work Program**

Mr. Van Mill stated that last night at its bi-monthly meeting the Planning Commission reviewed this draft work program and adopted it unanimously with one contingency. It was modified to include an element of solid waste which would be the update of the solid waste plan on pg. 2. The County Board created the Regional Planning Commission back in the 1970's and when he took over as director in 1997 they reconstituted the Planning Commission and from that point forward they have done a number of things including the update of the comprehensive plan, landfill hearings, and a number of other things. Over the course of the last three or four years, they have had some challenges because the growth and development has kind of stymied. In trying to find roles of the Planning Commission, they have tried different things over the last few years to make it effective. This year, they have a very straightforward work program that includes several components: public education, land use, environmental, transportation and solid waste. These are the elements in which the Planning Commission wishes to pursue in the upcoming year. The only way that they can do this based upon statutes and county code is that the County Board has to give them direction to do these studies. He is asking the committee to ratify and to charge the Regional Planning Commission and County Planning Department with these projects for the upcoming year.

Mr. Washington made a motion to move this forward and Mr. Tholen seconded it. Motion carried with a voice vote.

Ms. Bernard asked where sustainability comes in at.

Mr. Van Mill stated that that is the energy conservation side. Marilyn Campbell is going to be working on that section.

Mr. James asked what specifically are we going to be looking at under the solid waste program. Are we going to take a look at our County to see if we do have any land in the area that is suitable for landfill so we can present it as an economic development?

Mr. Van Mill stated probably not to that extent. There will be policies on everything from landfills to transfer stations to recycling to alternative energy. Those are natural elements of the solid waste plan that will be included. It is his understanding that you avoid predetermining specific sites.

Mr. James asked why we would avoid doing that if it would be an economic tool for our County if we had another landfill that would accommodate the waste from our own County.

Mr. Van Mill stated that would be a conversation to have as the plans start to develop. That is a policy that the County Board is going to have to establish.

Mr. James stated that it is his understanding that the reason that they defeated the last landfill was because of location and it was compromising the quality of the water.

Mr. Van Mill stated that that was the City of Kankakee. When the committee voted on the county landfill, it was voted down based on need.

Mr. Pagast asked what is being to done to make sure the recycling items are being processed in the correct manner.

Mr. Van Mill stated that will have to be followed up. One of the challenges that is going to come out of the solid waste plan itself is how do we implement it. Who is going to be the entity in the County that is going to make sure that this plan moves forward? One of the things would be an organization that would review the recycling ordinances that we have. He wishes this was done a year from now because he would like to have more data to look at the urbanized area and how much more recycling is going on with the new curbside services that are going on in Bourbonnais, Kankakee, Manteno, and Limestone. Now that recycling is much easier, he thinks it will increase considerably. Unfortunately, the timing of when we are putting together this plan, which we are mandated by the State to do, isn't going to allow us the opportunity to see what our recycling rates are going to be. That doesn't mean that a year from now, we can't do the recycling rates and see where we are at.

Mr. Pagast stated that the average person is expected to know what recycling item goes where and then when you put it all together he thinks that makes it very hard on the other end to clearly separate it as it should be done. He has his concerns.

Mr. Van Mill stated that we have been invited again to go up to the Hazel Crest Recycling Facility. It is a state of the arc facility which does a lot of separations. We should probably take them up on that invitation this spring and go up there and see it. They have people viewing their facility from around the world.

Mr. Vickery stated that as Kankakee County becomes more urbanized we will see an evolution in recycling. He thinks it is a matter of information, communication to people, and an adjustment to change. He thinks we will see a change in the next decade.

Mr. Pagast stated that he hopes we don't follow Chicago's evolution. They use to have the blue bags but you don't hear much about it anymore.

6. Transportation

- **Rural Transit – Replacement of Bus**

Mr. Lammey stated that today he is before the committee for a request for replacement of one of their buses that has gone beyond the allotted mileage for replacement. He is also asking for an expansion of a service that they would like to do in the City of Momence for some of the major employers out there which would need a 22-passenger bus. Right now Illinois does not have it on their list of things that are available. They have asked for it a couple of times and they are going to ask for it again and see what happens. They have gone for a grant to go for early morning service to Baker and Taylor in Momence starting at 3:00AM. There were a number of people at Baker & Taylor's early morning shift that expressed interest in that – as many as 15. They don't have a bus that handles 15 people. They think that they can get a 22-passenger bus that is big enough to handle that load and that bus would allow them to do some other things that they have not been able to do in the past. They are asking for replacement of one bus and an expansion of the fleet to cover one extra bus.

Ms. Bernard asked if Baker & Taylor is making any contribution towards this bus.

Mr. Lammey stated that this is public transit – anybody can get on the bus. The bus goes to Momence and Baker & Taylor is one of the stops on the route. It gets complicated when you try to get public and private entities on this.

Ms. Bernard asked if there are any transportation programs elsewhere in the nation where private companies make a contribution.

Mr. Lammey stated that in urban areas there is some of that.

Ms. Bernard asked if that was something we could explore down the road.

Mr. Lammey stated that they could but he prefers not to because it gets really complicated from the grant standpoint.

Mr. Bossert stated that SHOWBUS does solicit contributions from local governments such as townships.

Mr. Lammey stated that that request has been made to Baker & Taylor but not responded to.

Mr. James asked if there was a shared cost for the County.

Mr. Lammey stated that it the County does not pay a dime.

Mr. Hess made a motion to approve and Mr. Washington seconded it. Motion carried with a voice vote.

- **Open House Public Hearing – I-57/6000 North Road Interchange**

Mr. Lammey stated that he put an invitation in the committee member's mailboxes inviting them to attend a public meeting on the interchange at 6000 N Road meeting on March 3 at 4:00 – 7:00. He encouraged the committee to attend that meeting. They have been working on this project a long time – since 2000. They were told at the meeting that construction could begin 2014

Mr. Bossert asked Mr. Lammey to explain the funding status of that interchange.

Mr. Lammey stated that it is funded, not only the interchange itself but the State is willing to pay for the construction of 6000 N Road between Rt. 45 and Rt. 50. If the local units of government want to do certain things along the way; such as, overhead lighting or signal preemption they would have to be paid for it out of local funds. Bourbonnais is by far the major contributor of that. There are three local units of government involved in this – Manteno Township and Village of Bradley are also involved. The County has no money in it.

Mr. Bossert asked if it was really funded.

Mr. Lammey stated that this was in the mini capital bill that relied on pinball machines of some sort. It has managed to cross over into regular funding. He doesn't know how or when it happened but it is real money now. It expires somewhere in the FY2015 timeframe. He thinks that is why the State is talking about construction in FY2014.

7. Other

- **Historic Preservation – One Expired Term**

Mr. Van Mill stated that the Historic Preservation Commission has an opening.

8. Old Business

9. New Business

Mr. Stauffenberg asked if anyone in the Planning Department has looked into what is going on I-57 by the pond where digging and crushing are going on.

Mr. Van Mill stated that was brought up at the public meeting and he was told that Bourbonnais looked into it and there are permits for it.

Mr. Bossert stated that they were told that it is clean demo being hauled in to fill up pits.

Mr. Van Mill stated that they can see what kind of permits there are and report back what is happening there.

10. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:40 a.m. was made by Mr. Tholen and seconded by Ms. McBride. Motion carried.

Jim Vickery, Chairman
Joanne Langlois, Executive Coordinator