

Members Present

Mr. Nixon, Mr. Vickery, Ms. McBride, Mr. Washington, Mr. Stauffenberg, Ms. Polk, Dr. Pagast, Mr. Tripp, Mr. Hess, Mr. Tholen, and Mr. Flett

Members Absent

Ms. Bernard, Mr. James, and Mr. Olthoff

In Attendance

- **Board Members**

Mr. Bossert and Mr. Arseneau

- **Department Heads**
- **Media**

1. Call to Order

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

2. Public Comment

3. Approval of Minutes –February 29, 2012

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Mr. Washington and seconded by Mr. Tripp. Motion carried with a voice vote.

4. Planning

- **Historic Preservation Commission**
 - **Intergovernmental Agreement with Village of Bourbonnais**

Ms. Sadler stated that this is not ready.

Ms. McBride made a motion to table this until the agreement is ready and Mr. Tholen seconded it. Motion carried with a voice vote.

5. Transportation

- **Rural Transit Service Provider for FY 2013**

Mr. Lammey stated that at the last meeting they showed the committee a letter that was sent out to a number of potential rural transit service providers and a list of who they sent them out to. They only received one response back which was SHOWBUS. They have done a good job for us for a number of years and they are recommending that SHOWBUS be our rural transit service operator for FY 2013 and they are asking the committee to authorize the chairman to sign the purchase service agreement.

Mr. Tripp made a motion recommend SHOWBUS and authorize the chairman to sign purchase service agreement and Mr. Polk seconded it. Motion carried with a roll call vote of 12 ayes and 0 nays. Voting aye were Mr. Bossert, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Vickery, Ms. McBride, Mr. Washington, Mr. Stauffenberg, Ms. Polk, Dr. Pagast, Mr. Tripp, Mr. Hess, Mr. Tholen, and Mr. Flett.

- **Section 5311 & Downstate Operating Assistance Grant for Operating Funds Application to IDOT for FY 2013**

Mr. Lammey stated that 5311 is the federal money for rural transit and the Downstate Operating Assistance Grant is from the state. The total amount of federal money requested is \$187,000 and the total amount of state money is \$596,000. There are service contracts in the application totaling \$83,500 and

there are donations from local governments totaling \$69,500. They do not anticipate local funding from Kankakee County. They are asking that the committee authorize Chairman Bossert to sign the application and to sign the contract when it comes in.

Mr. Washington made a motion to authorize the Chairman to sign the application and contract and Mr. Nixon seconded it. Motion carried with a voice vote.

- **2012 Consolidated Vehicle Procurement Capital Assistance Application to IDOT**

Mr. Lammey stated that they started service to Momence at 4:00 a.m. two years ago. The state gave us money for the service but they did not give us a vehicle big enough to provide the service so they are now asking for a 22-passenger vehicle. They are asking the committee to authorize Chairman Bossert to sign the application and the contract when it comes in.

Mr. Hess made a motion to authorize Chairman Bossert to sign the application and the contract and Ms. McBride seconded it. Motion carried with a voice vote.

- **Section 5316 Job Access Reverse Commute Application to IDOT**

Mr. Lammey stated that this is the continuation of that service to Momence to Kankakee. They applied for it two years and those two years are almost over so they are applying for another two years. The federal funding for this is \$23,255 a year and the local funding is \$23,255 a year which comes out of that state operating assistance grant. They are asking the committee to authorize the chairman to sign the application and the contract when it comes in.

Mr. Stauffenberg made a motion to authorize the chairman to sign the application and the contract and Ms. McBride seconded it. Motion carried with a voice vote.

- **Section 5317 New Freedom Application to IDOT**

Mr. Lammey asked Laura Dick from SHOWBUS to come up and explain this as it is different from what they have done before. They have had some issues with trying to get people in the western part of the county to ride SHOWBUS. They do a pretty good job getting people in the eastern part of the county but not the western part. There are a number of people out in the western part who could use the service but nobody is going out there to reach them so they are going to get people to go and do outreach in that area.

Ms. Dick stated that they are going to try to kill two birds with one stone with this grant. The first part of the grant is the voucher program which allows them a pot of money to use when they are just unable to overcome certain barriers that people may have in using SHOWBUS. Probably the most common one that they have run into in the rural areas is people who have early onset of Alzheimer's. They may be fine living at home but when they get out into the community to go shopping they become very confused and pose a danger to themselves. The problem is that they really need someone to go into the stores or doctor offices to assist them. They have used the voucher program to pay for escorts for individuals to get on their bus and maintain their independence and it allows them to stay at home longer. The other problem is that they have not been successful in getting out into the western part of the county so they would like to use the voucher program as a door opener for people out in the western side and to begin discussions with nursing homes out there so they feel more comfortable allowing their people to leave the premises. They do have some difficulty in this county with that. Just because someone enters a nursing home should not mean that they lose all of their independence. It is not right and they work with nursing homes to make sure that they understand that. Being able to provide a paid escort to their clients makes them more comfortable with

that. The voucher program will be open to the entire county. It will not be limited to the west side; they are just going to use it more as leverage on the west side to get up their ridership on that side.

Mr. Lammey said that each of the agencies that want to use escort riders have to file a case management plan with Ms. Dick that she approves so she has an idea how many trips they are talking about and what kind of people they are talking about taking.

Mr. Arseneau asked if they are going to be doing seminars out there.

Ms. Dick stated that hopefully this will be a project that will make the nursing homes and churches interested enough to invite them to come out and present to their staff and make the program real to them.

Mr. Arseneau stated that he would think that he and Mr. Flett and Mr. Bossert would help her out with this. Is she talking about Reddick, Bonfield, Hescher, and Limesone?

Ms. Dick stated that she is. Any help that they could get would be much appreciated.

Mr. Lammey stated that they are asking the committee to authorize the chairman to sign the application and contract.

Mr. Hess made a motion to authorize the chairman to sign and Mr. Tripp seconded it. Motion carried with a voice vote.

6. Old Business

Dr. Pagast asked Mr. Van Mill how they are coming along with the Solid Waste Management Plan.

Mr. Van Mill stated that he was going to talk about that under new business.

7. New Business

- **One Opening on the Historic Preservation Commission**

Mr. Vickery announced the above opening.

Mr. Van Mill stated that last night the Regional Planning Commission met and he put on a presentation on the Solid Waste Plan as it was recommended by the Solid Waste Subcommittee. After the presentation and some conversation about it, the Regional Planning Commission voted unanimously to recommend the Solid Waste Plan as amended to the county board. Copies of the plan were distributed to the PZA committee for them to review for one month. They will come back to the next PZA Meeting to give the committee a presentation and to have discussion on it. The plan will also be on the website. The Regional Planning Commission members also suggested that they put the PowerPoint that was presented last night on the website as well, so that will also be done.

Dr. Pagast asked if anything had been done about the enforcement of the plan. He was told reminders were sent out to all the townships and all the municipalities reminding them that by March 31 they have to report their previous year's collection of solid waste.

Mr. Van Mills stated that it is not the local units of governments, it is the haulers. They did send out notices with the forms to the haulers.

Dr. Pagast asked if anybody responded yet. If they are not able to get that data from each hauler the plan is useless.

Mr. Van Mill stated that he would agree that portions of it are but there are a number of issues that are still applicable such as the policies for alternative energies, recommendations for education and for community outreach, etc. We will be lacking in waste generation rates and recycling rates. It is unfortunate that the state has just notified them that they will no longer be accepting recycling rates from local units of government. At a local level, communities are still saying that they are going to collect that data for their own purposes.

Dr. Pagast stated that if they don't get the total amount of waste material collected in the county they don't have a plan. The addendum states that every hauler in the county will present a yearly report on how much they have collected the previous year. If some haulers feel like they do not have to report it they should send a letter to the county board stating why they will not be part of this and then it could be addressed.

Mr. Van Mill stated that some of that conversation has already occurred in previous years. The position that some of the haulers have taken is that it is not legal to require proprietary information. They have not definitively addressed that issue but they have sent out the forms requesting participation in the data collection.

Dr. Pagast stated there should be a committee that oversees what data is collected. Calculations can't be made if only five haulers report.

Mr. Van Mill stated that they are not making calculations. In the draft that was handed out, all the additions are underlined that have been put into the plan as a result of the meetings that they have had that evaluated the plan and obtained and collected public comment, both oral and written. The plan is the deliberations of the subcommittee and the Planning Commission. It includes underlines for areas that have been added and strike-outs for areas that the committee decided to delete. They tried doing some estimates in 2011 but based upon conversation at the committee level it was felt that that was not sufficient data but only assumptions that they could not justify so they removed generation data that they estimated for 2011. The only real confident data that they do have at this present time is the 2004 data that indicates a 28% recycling rate, which is residential and composting. It does meet the 25% that the state asked them to do in 1988. The 2004 estimates suggests that we only had about 8% to 9% residential recycling back then. Since that time, they have met some of the objectives of the Solid Waste Plan for recycling; such as, convenience and accessibility.

Dr. Pagast stated that if they are not getting all of the collection data they will never have justification to apply for a landfill.

Mr. Van Mill stated that if a landfill would every happen, the efforts to justify that would be solely based upon the landfill's ability to argue the point that it is needed. For planning purposes, he is not discounting that they do need the solid waste rates. It is a key part of the Solid Waste Plan. Once they get the plan in place they can move forward with implementation. The county board is going to have to make a very serious decision on two things – administration (how they are going to do this) and how they are going to fund it. That has to be addressed. We have very limited resources. Do we add these responsibilities on to existing employees that already have a full plate of responsibilities? He doesn't know if they would be able to do that. Ultimately, when the plan gets approved, which he is hoping that

it does, serious conversations are going to happen with the policy makers to determine how it moves forward and who does it.

Dr. Pagast asked who would be able to see the collection data.

Mr. Van Mill stated that they contended that they would keep it private and only use the aggregate. Who sees the data will ultimately be up to the county board. When the plan is produced it is still open to who is going to be responsible for implementation. He has said that from the beginning. The question is going to come down to funding and administration and that is still an open issue.

Dr. Pagast stated that we should reapply for the grant.

Mr. Van Mills stated that there is no money. They don't do that anymore.

Mr. Bossert stated that he thinks that it is interesting, as Mr. Van Mill stated, that the State of Illinois is asking for less and less data just because funding wise the state is constrained as to what they can do with the data. All that the State is focusing on is landfill capacity, tonnage, and yards that are showing up in the landfills in the state. That is their entire report this year on landfill. Indiana has not updated their landfill capacity report for three years. They are probably having the same budget issues as far as being able to have staff and resources available to update that kind of data. We use to get data from Newton County, as about 80% of our garbage goes there and they do track county of origin, but for the last few years they have not been able to get that.

Mr. Van Mill stated that he thinks that they do have some decent data for 2010 to the Newton County landfill which they included in the plan.

Mr. Bossert stated that perhaps we could personally ask to meet with our haulers and so some encouragement that we would like to have the data and give them assurances that their proprietary information will not be released and see if that will help in the effort. We should also remind our municipalities that even though they may have franchise agreements with haulers part of their franchise agreement has some verbiage that the haulers will comply with all local ordinances. That may be a lever to put a little pressure on them. If we talk to our haulers he thinks that we will discover that our unincorporated areas in the county are also making great progress on recycling providing the single stream recycling. He thinks that even a higher percentage of our population has recycling available to them which has been our goal all along – to make it available and to make it easy.

Mr. Vickery stated that he recently read an article by the chairman of waste management and they seem to think that instead of putting this stuff in landfills they want to recycle it and sell it. The numbers that he gave were astronomical. He thinks that there is a big movement on the collection end to recycle. He was surprised at the amount of interest that was expressed in recycling. They are starting to use wood chips for fuel in some areas. One thing that was amazing to him is that there are eight billion people on this planet and one billion people live on more than one dollar a day and seven billion have no car or electricity and live on less than one dollar a day, according to this article.

Dr. Pagast stated that he would like to see transparency of the whole plan.

Mr. Van Mill asked him what is not transparent.

Dr. Pagast stated that it is the reliability of the data.

Mr. Van Mill stated that they are putting in there what they have. How is that not transparent?

Dr. Pagast stated that right now it seems to him that it is Patrick Engineering and basically very few people on the county board who actually see the raw data.

Mr. Van Mill stated that if they meet with the haulers and say that we are going to provide transparency to the point where we are going to show everybody where they are taking everything and how much that they are taking he doesn't know if that is going to defeat the purpose of trying to get them to give us real good data.

Dr. Pagast asked why we have an ordinance that says that we are going to do it and then don't do it.

Mr. Van Mill stated that they are saying "Let's get the plan adopted and then find out who is going to administer it and are we going to fund it." He thinks that Dr. Pagast's issues are duly noted. There will have to be budget adjustments to put a solid waste coordinator in place to carry it forward.

Dr. Pagast stated that he agreed – an individual or a committee.

Mr. Van Mill stated that they could put together a committee of county board members once it is adopted. If it is adopted at the county board then follow up with a motion to put together a solid waste implementation committee and have a small group that can meet and figure out how it is going to be implemented.

Dr. Pagast asked if that committee would have the freedom to see the raw data.

Mr. Van Mill stated that he did not know. Those issues can be addressed after the plan is adopted.

Dr. Pagast asked why would he adopt something if there is no clarity on who is in charge and who is seeing the raw data.

Mr. Van Mill stated that there might be various ways that they might be able to get that data, as Mr. Bossert said.

Mr. Vickery stated that he thinks Dr. Pagast's concern is duly noted by the committee and by all involved. If we find a way to get the data in a nonpublic way and have an aggregate then we should be able to work with the plan.

8. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:37 a.m. was made by Mr. Tripp and seconded by Ms. McBride. Motion carried.

Jim Vickery, Vice-Chairman
Joanne Langlois, Executive Coordinator