

**Members Present**

Mr. Olthoff, Mr. Vickery, Ms. Bernard, Ms. McBride, Mr. Washington, Mr. Flett, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Pagast, Mr. Tripp, and Mr. Hess

**Members Absent**

Mr. Stauffenberg, Mr. James, Mr. Tholen, and Ms. Polk

**In Attendance**

- **Board Members**

Mr. Bossert and Mr. Arseneau

**Department Heads**

Mike Van Mill

- **Media**

**Leigh Marcotte**

**Dimitrios Kalantzis**

**1. Call to Order**

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

**2. Public Comment**

**3. Approval of Minutes – February 23, 2011**

**A motion to approve the minutes was made by Mr. Washington and seconded by Mr. Nixon. Motion carried.**

**4. Subdivision**

- **Country Springs Subdivision, 2<sup>nd</sup> Addition**

Mr. Skimerhorn stated that this is a nine lot addition to Country Springs which is located in St. Anne Township. They sent it out for a 45-day review period and received several comments which are in today's packet. Those comments will all be addressed during the next phase which is the design phase. Back in October two variances were approved on this. One was to reduce the right-of-way in the subdivision from the required 80' to 60' and to change the pavement surface from a hot mix asphalt to an A-3 surface. Today they are asking for approval of the preliminary plat.

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

Mr. Nixon asked if things have changed given the number of considerations from Gingerich.

Mr. Skimerhorn stated that back in 2008 they changed the subdivision ordinance which changes the process of how they do things. It used to be that the comments had to be addressed before the preliminary plat was approved, but now they are taken care of during the design phase which is the next phase.

Mr. Skimerhorn stated that one of the reasons that the variances were approved is because this is an extension of an existing subdivision so to make the roads match what is already there they asked for those two variances.

Mr. Vickery asked if Highway and Bridge has taken a look at this.

Mr. Skimerhorn stated that they have; they had a few comments and will take care of them in the next phase.

Ms. Bernard asked at what point does the Health Department review the sewage treatment.

Mr. Skimerhorn stated that it will be done in the design phase.

## **5. Transportation**

- **6000 North Interchange Project - Presentation**

Mr. Lammey gave a PowerPoint presentation detailing the 6000 North Interchange Project.

Mr. Nixon stated that he has already raised some questions about the 200 feet between the southbound Rt. 50 interchange and the rail crossing. He has been promised that there has been considerable study in safety measures and ICC; as well as, the Railroad has examined it, but he has gotten no conclusive results that it would be safe. His concern is that we want to keep as many situations as safe as possible and relying on electrical signals may not always be fail proof. He would hate to see the amount of traffic flow going through that intersection ten years from now and a major incident happen like it did 12 years ago in Bourbonnais. When you rely on electronics and just the standards, it worries him.

Mr. Lammey stated that there is suppose to be an electronic tie between the signal at 6000 N Road and the railroad crossing gates. There are nonmountable medians so supposedly no one can drive around a gate when it goes down. That doesn't necessarily guarantee that a third semi in a row doesn't find himself halfway across the tracks when he thinks he is going to clear it when he pulls in. Is it the safest it could possibly be? Probably not. Grade separation is probably the safest but that would add another \$15 million dollars to the job. He doesn't know if that would kill the job. They will be in Phase 2 very soon and that is an issue he is sure will be discussed in that phase also.

Mr. Nixon stated that IDOT has indicated that there is going to be pre-signals in addition to the controls at the gates. Even with the thought IDOT has put into it, he has cause for concern.

Mr. Olthoff asked what the distance was on St. George Road.

Mr. Nixon stated that it was 700 feet from railhead to Route 50. The old intersection at 4500, where the accident happened, with the new expansion after they moved Route 50 is 397 feet from the railhead to the interstate.

Mr. Lammey stated there is certainly time to make comments and he would encourage people to do so. Public comment period for Phase 1 has closed but that doesn't mean that comments cannot be made in Phase 2.

Ms. Bernard asked where this project stands in priority with Exit 312 and Exit 315.

Mr. Lammey stated that Exit 315 is under contract and Exit 312 is after the 6000 North Interchange Project.

Ms. Bernard stated that she thinks it should take priority over the interchange project.

Mr. Bossert asked if this design is a result of discussions with Vulcan. Could we squeeze another 50 feet out of Vulcan?

Mr. Lammey stated that he thinks it is. He does not know if that is possible.

Mr. Nixon stated that there are some issues with mine safety. They are already taking 200 feet from the Vulcan's yard.

Ms. Bernard asked if Vulcan has been a big proponent in getting this interchange done.

Mr. Lammey stated that he has no knowledge of that.

Ms. Bernard asked if someone could approach Vulcan to help underwrite some of the cost of this.

Mr. Lammey doesn't think that will happen.

Mr. Olthoff asked if this intersection would be safer than it is now. He would say that it would be safer.

Mr. Vickery asked how high-speed rail, which seems to have moved up a notch in the priority list, is going to affect this.

Mr. Lammey stated that there is a meeting tomorrow at 10:30 in this room and that question may be answered. It depends whether it goes below or above ground.

Mr. Olthoff asked Mr. Piekarczyk if he thought that it would be safer than it is now.

Mr. Piekarczyk stated that certainly the County of K3 through the Planning Department and Highway Department has recommended and encouraged IDOT to build a grade separation at this location because they feel that is the safest alternative. According to IDOT, to build such a structure would be cost prohibitive so what IDOT has done here is used conventional means to mitigate the safety concerns of having an at grade crossing where there is direct conflict between the locomotives and the vehicular traffic. It is a very elaborate system using quad gates and barrier curbs. Is it 100% foolproof? No – none of our intersection safety systems are foolproof. They have taken some steps to mitigate the potential conflict between a locomotive and a vehicle. There is insufficient room to build enough storage between the rail and the Route 50 intersection to accommodate all of the vehicles that might lay in wait while a locomotive is passing through the intersection so they have done other means to do that. Theoretically, you could say it would be safer because today you can drive around the gates and the distance is shorter for storage. You can't always protect people from themselves but certainly it does look like they are doing everything that they can, short of building a grade separation, to make this intersection as safe as possible.

Mr. Nixon stated that he is by no means an engineer and he has to rely on feedback from other people and other sources for his opinion so when he brings up his concerns he does not want to naysay this project. This is going to bring jobs and industrialization and he is not against the whole plan but he has a personal stake in this and he wants to make sure this is safe and acceptable for a huge amount of traffic that will use it 10 years and 15 years from now.

- **Rural Transit Declaration of Interest Letters**

Mr. Lammey stated that at the last meeting he told the committee that they had sent out a number of letters asking for interest in our rural transit program. He received one response back which was from SHOW BUS.

- **Application for Section 5311 (federal funding) for FY 2012**
- **Application for Downstate Operating Assistance (state funding) for FY 2012**

These two applications are in one document. They are asking that the committee authorize Chairman Bossert to sign the application and to sign the contract that will be issued as the result of the approval of that application.

**Mr. Vickery made a motion to give Mr. Bossert the authority to sign the application and contract and Mr. Washington seconded it. Motion carried with a voice vote.**

- **Purchase of Service Agreement with our Service Provider (SHOW BUS)**

Mr. Lammey stated that this is a contract document between the Kankakee County and SHOW BUS. They are asking for the committee to authorize Chairman Bossert to sign it.

**Mr. Vickery made a motion to authorize Chairman Bossert to sign the agreement and Mr. Hess seconded it. Motion carried with a roll call vote of 10 ayes and 0 nays.**

- **Vehicle Lease**

Mr. Lammey stated that the vehicles with which SHIOW BUS provides rural transit in K3 County are owned and titled to K3 County. In order for SHOW BUS to use these buses, we need to have a Motor Vehicle Lease Agreement with SHOW BUS. They are asking the committee to authorize the Chairman to sign this document.

**Mr. Washington made a motion to authorize the Chairman to sign it and Mr. Vickery seconded it. Motion carried with a voice vote.**

## **6. Other**

Mr. Vickery handed out some pictures of a situation out in his area. It is a piece of property on Rt.1 and Rt.17 going into Momence that is in foreclosure and there is debris all over. He stated that he just wants the committee to be aware of it. Mr. Pallissard is going to do some research on it.

Ms. McBride stated that she has called the people who are suppose to be holding this but they never respond to her phone calls. Her understanding is that a bank is holding it because there are some loans on it.

Ms. Bernard stated that several months ago Karen Schmidt had brought in some sample ordinances from other parts of the country that deal with properties that are in foreclosure and are not being maintained. She thinks there are about 20 properties in the County with these kind of problems. She is suppose to meet with Mr. Van Mill to try and get something on the books so that we can hold whoever is holding the papers to the property responsible for the condition of the property. What other areas are doing is that whoever holds the mortgage of the foreclosed property has to register with the local unit of government and pay a registration fee and list who is going to maintain the property.

Mr. Olthoff asked if we had a program in place where we hire the clean-up done and then a lien is placed on the property.

Mr. Pallissard stated that he has heard that that is a possibility but there is no program in place.

Mr. Tripp stated that we should let the other departments do their job first and then let them report back to us.

Mr. Pallissard stated that he has talked to Mr. Bevis and it is an open case in the Health Department.

Mr. Bossert stated that he wanted to make it clear that the problem with the debris did not develop after foreclosure. It was already there. The foreclosure may actually help the problem.

Ms. Bernard stated that she feels it is necessary to put something on the books to protect the County. It is more cost effective to identify the owner and pay an upfront fee than to go in and clean up the property then put a lien on it and collect the money later.

## **7. Old Business**

## **8. New Business**

## **9. Adjournment**

**A motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:37 a.m. was made by Mr. Hess and seconded by Mr. Nixon. Motion carried.**

Bill Olthoff, Chairman  
Joanne Langlois, Executive Coordinator