

Members Present

Mr. Olthoff, Mr. Stauffenberg, Mr. Bertrand, Ms. Hertzberger, Mr. James, Ms. McBride, Mr. Scholl, Mr. Hess, Mr. Washington, Mr. Whitten and Mr. Marcotte.

Members Absent

Mr. Tripp.

In Attendance

Mr. Kruse, Mr. McLaren, Mr. Bossert, Ms. Bernard, Mr. Enz, Mr. Yates, Erik Rayman, Donna Shehane, Mike VanMill, Bonnie Schaafsma, John Bevis, Tom Curl, Keith Runyon, Darrel Bruck, Helen Evers, Brenda Gorski, Jamie Boyd, Mike Lammey and Ron Hansen.

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

Helen Evers spoke regarding the Solid Waste Plan.

Darrel Bruck spoke regarding the Solid Waste Plan.

Keith Runyon spoke regarding the Solid Waste Plan. Mr. Runyon distributed information to the Committee. Nothing given to the Recording Secretary to be placed with these minutes.

Ron Hansen spoke regarding the Solid Waste Plan.

3. Appointment of Supervisor of Assessments

Mr. Kruse addressed this issue.

Mr. Kruse said that as everyone is aware, Shelia Donahoe is retiring and Monday is her last day. He said that they have taken the steps to have two (2) tests given in the County. It has been advertised six (6) different times in the Journal and advertised statewide because of the specific qualifications that are needed for the Supervisor of Assessments. Messrs. Liehr, McLaren, Kruse and Cagle did interviews and at this time, Mr. Kruse makes the recommendation that they appoint Steve Beatty to the Supervisor of Assessments.

A motion to appoint Steve Beatty to the Supervisor of Assessments was made by Mr. Kruse and seconded by Mr. Scholl. Motion carried.

4. Economic Alliance of Kankakee County - Approval of Resolutions

Mr. Olthoff advised that there are two (2) resolutions regarding the Economic Alliance of Kankakee County which they need approval of to send on to the County Board, contingent upon review of the State's Attorney.

Note: These transcribed minutes are a synopsis of information derived from the meeting. If you need verbatim information, please contact the County Clerk about obtaining a recorded tape.

A motion to approve the two (2) resolutions entitled, "Economic Alliance of Kankakee County" and "County Government Staff and Financial Support for the Economic Alliance of Kankakee County" was made by Mr. Scholl and seconded by Mr. James. Motion carried.

Mr. James said it says that we are going to have a multi year agreement and he was concerned as to the time table what a multi year stands for. He felt that we should have a sunset clause in this with a renewal application – it looks like it goes on forever.

Mr. Kruse said right now we're just discussing it multi year. There will be more information forthcoming, hopefully, during the next month with the services agreement that is being looked at by the State's Attorney. Right now, it is either a three (3) or five (5) year agreement. So, there is a sunset in it that we will review as we move forward with the process that is included in more material that will be coming.

5. Solid Waste & Environmental

• Solid Waste Plan

A motion to approve the Solid Waste Plan was made by Mr. Stauffenberg and seconded by Mr. Washington.

Mr. Olthoff said that they were going to hold off on the motion until after the presentation.

The motion was rescinded until after the presentation.

Mr. Stauffenberg withdrew his motion.

Mr. Washington withdrew his second.

Donna Shehane said that she was looking forward in presenting this today so that they could move forward on the 2005 Solid Waste Plan.

A copy of the "Solid Waste Management Plan Update" was distributed and is placed on file.

Ms. Sheehan discussed the following:

- Background
- Kankakee County Population Projections
- Kankakee County Employment Projections (1998-2020)
- Kankakee County Municipal Solid Waste Generation – 2004 (Tons)
- Sources of Municipal Waste in Kankakee County
- Kankakee County Waste Generation Rates for 2004
- Disposition of Kankakee County Municipal Solid Waste – 2004

Note: These transcribed minutes are a synopsis of information derived from the meeting. If you need verbatim information, please contact the County Clerk about obtaining a recorded tape.

- Sector Recycling Rates in Kankakee County (2004)
- Waste Reduction and Recycling Recommendations
- Kankakee County Waste Generation Projections: High Growth Scenario
- Projected Solid Waste Disposition: High Growth Scenario
- Kankakee County Waste Generation Projections: Low Growth Scenario
- Projected Solid Waste Disposition: Low Growth Scenario
- Kankakee County Area Pollution Control Facilities
- Transfer Station Economics – Direct Haul vs. Transfer
- Conceptual Cost Analysis for 400 Ton per Day Transfer Station
- Transfer Station Recommendation
- Federal Landfill Standards at a Glance
- Landfill Recommendations
- Siting Application Fee and Host Agreement
- Comparison of Conversion Technologies to Landfilling
- Traditional Waste-to-Energy and Alternative Conversion Technologies Recommendation
- Other Recommendations and Issues

Ms. Shehane went through the changes to the Solid Waste Plan Update with the Committee. A copy of the recommended changes was distributed and is placed on file.

Mr. Boyd said that his office/department does not approve of the plan in its current form. That's one of the matters that they have issues with. It has been brought to this level and they find that the plan needs to be completely rewritten – it was written by engineers and not lawyers. There are parts of the plan that just don't need to be there and, in fact, may subject us to litigation at some point, but those are matters that he figures they will deal with if this Committee was going to approve it between now and County Board. In its current form, particularly with the suggestion these amendments are going to be included, but have not been included, their office has not approved of it in its current form and he was not sure if this is the place at all for compost.

Motion

A motion to approve the recommended changes and send to the State's Attorney's Office for review and come back to this Committee was made by Mr. Whitten and seconded by Mr. James.

Discussion on the Motion

Mr. Scholl said that he has problems about the burning ordinance. He said that a number of issues have come up and what is proposed here, these burning ordinances issues has not been addressed, i.e., rural burnings. He didn't see it addressed.

Mr. Van Mill explained that this is a County regulation and is not a County policy, which is a separate issue.

Ms. Bernard asked what are we mandated to do as part of our Solid Waste Ordinance; what are we mandated to include; is everything in here mandated?

Ms. Shehane responded as far as she knows, "yes".

Ms. Bernard said that she wanted to point out that this is a plan – it is not an ordinance – it is an advisory and that's part of the Board's role is to issue policy. Our role is an advisory role. She said she was troubled that we're saying that this has to go to the State's Attorney's first because we don't know when it is going to come back at. Considering that this is an advisory document, considering it is the Board's role to set policy, I think we should proceed right to the County Board.

Mr. Boyd said to let him be clear if this Committee doesn't want their office to review it, they understand -- you can leave yourselves out there. He said his concern is the State Law requires approximately eight (8) matters to be specified in a Solid Waste Plan. This Solid Waste Plan includes many things beyond those eight (8) matters. He said he does not want to weigh in on policy (that's not his position), the policy should be dictated by your subcommittees and your committee is up to the Board and whatever the policy is it is, however, he believed their job as the State's Attorney and he providing legal advice is to appropriately phrase your policies so that you are protected in the event that someone has an objection to the results of your plan in the event that someone makes a siting request and they then attempt to enforce the policies within the plan that those policies be such that they will meet appropriate scrutiny from courts so that they are in fact protected in their position. That is why he believed that their office should review it. If this Committee or the County Board doesn't want their office to review it, he certainly understands --- they are not looking for work.

Mr. Enz said that he had a problem with item 19 on page 70 and item 23 on page 118. As you read through here, it says, "other criteria may be included". He said he would like to see that changed to, "other criteria will be included". He felt the other criteria are very necessary.

Mr. Olthoff said, duly noted. By common consent the Committee agreed to change Items 19 and 23 to, "other criteria will be included".

Ms. Hertzberger said her concern was on page 69; a recommendation for development of one privately owned and operated landfill within Kankakee County. She said she would like to see the capability that are owned by the County landfill that is privately operated where that we pay someone to operate it for us and she would like to see something in there to say that we could look into that alternative just to see the feasibility of it. Her other concern was on page 116, in her mind a good transfer station and a good recycling center may be all we need at this time

Note: These transcribed minutes are a synopsis of information derived from the meeting. If you need verbatim information, please contact the County Clerk about obtaining a recorded tape.

and on page 116 it talks about the inconsistency of a transfer station for this plan and she would like to see us look into the feasibility of getting another good transfer station and a good recycling center.

Ms. Shehane said that she will take Ms. Hertzberger's concerns under advisement. Right now, she was recommending a landfill and to move this forward. You can't go back and research all these alternatives that will take us a lot of years. If the Board votes that is what they want to do, then that is what we will do.

Ms. Hertzberger said she would like to see some language in here to leave us open for that.

Mr. Van Mill said that plan is advisory. If we get to a Committee and he says now is the time to do that, I think that we can.

Mr. Scholl said that it was very prudent to get a legal interpretation from the State's Attorney's Office.

Mr. James said that he would like to make an amendment to the motion. On page 69 as Ms. Hertzberger pointed out where we got privately owned that we do add, "or County owned". We are going to be sending in her recommendations that she has given us, why can't we add on some of our recommendations and let the State's Attorney review those at this time.

Mr. Scholl said that he would be opposed to adding all of it because he would like to add that he is opposed to any landfill. If you get all three (3) of them in there, we are indicating the whole purpose. So, let's send it to the State's Attorney first, get a reaction back from the State's Attorney and then deal with the issue, so if we want to amend the plan or recommendation at that point, we can do so.

Call for the Question

A motion to call for the question was made by Mr. Scholl and seconded by Mr. Washington. Motion carried by a roll call vote of 10 ayes and 2 nays (Hertzberger and James).

Mr. Olthoff asked Mr. Boyd will there be a time frame.

Mr. Boyd replied that he would get back to him with a time table after he and his staff have time to meet.

Outcome of the Original Motion

Motion carried by a roll call vote of 10 ayes and 2 nays (Hertzberger and James).

Planning, Zoning, and Agriculture
Committee Meeting
April 27, 2007

6. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Stauffenberg and seconded by Mr. Marcotte at 10:30 a.m. Motion carried.

William Olthoff, Chairman

Transcribed by
Chris Richardson

Note: These transcribed minutes are a synopsis of information derived from the meeting. If you need verbatim information, please contact the County Clerk about obtaining a recorded tape.