

Members Present

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

Members Absent

Mr. Nixon and Ms. Bernard

In Attendance

- **Board Members**

Mr. Arseneau

- **Department Heads**

- **Media**

Laura McElroy

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 – September 28, 2011

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

4. Zoning

ZBA Case #11-09; request for a Rezoning from R1-Single Family Residential District to I1-Light Industrial District, on parcel generally situated in Section 07 of Kankakee Township. The petitioner is Wayne Offerman, property owner and applicant.

Mr. Van Mill stated that the site consists of a manufacturing operation called Offko Tools that has been in existence for about 35 years. The site is located on Kensington Road and it is on the west side of the road. Adjacent to the site to the south are a number of other industrial properties. Over the years they have had a couple of rezonings along the same corridor roadway. The Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) voted 6 to 0 to recommend the rezoning of the property to I1-Light Industrial.

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

- **ZBA Case #11-10; request for a Text Amendment to County Code Section 121-285 (Fencing for Public Service Facilities). The petitioner is Kankakee County.**

Mr. Van Mill stated that this is a request that they brought previously to the committee to revamp their fencing requirements particularly around public service facilities; such as, communication towers, utilities, transportation equipment, control facilities, etc. They had found that there is a trend occurring where these facilities wish to have heightened security around them which include barb wire and other types of fencing necessary to control access. There was a motion to take this zoning amendment through the public hearing process through the ZBA. The conditions of this proposal are:

1. Fences for these facilities shall not exceed 12 feet in height and are allowed to the maximum height in all yards.
2. Barbed and concertina type wire shall be allowed providing it is no lower than 7 feet from ground level in the R1, R2, & RE Districts.

3. Fences on corners of vehicular intersections shall comply with Section 121-282(c)
4. Fence shall not extend beyond the immediate area of the equipment or structures being protected when practical, as determined by the Planning Director or his/her designee.

This provides them with better flexibility to issue permits for these types of facilities. Today they are not allowed to permit fences with barb wire in residential districts. Today they are asking for it to be changed to allow for that. The ZBA took the petition under consideration and voted 6 to 0 to recommend approval of this zoning request.

Mr. Stauffenberg asked if this raised the height too.

Mr. Van Mill stated that it does and the barb wire can't be lower than 7 feet in the residential district.

Mr. Olthoff asked if this is common with other counties' ordinances.

Mr. Pallissard stated that they did make some phone calls and discussed it with them and they are following ordinances similar to other counties. He also called out East to Homeland Security. The pipeline people out there are also suggesting this; as well as, around the natural gas pipelines. That is how they came up with this recommendation.

Mr. Olthoff asked if it is a requirement from us for certain facilities.

Mr. Pallissard stated that it was not.

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

5. Planning

• U.S. EPA Brownfield Assessment Grant Application

Mr. Van Mill stated that last year they applied for a grant for the U.S. EPA to do a countywide brownfield study and they did not get chosen. This year they do plan to reapply and they are asking for permission to do that.

Marilyn Campbell stated that we did not get it last year but was very close. Had the amount of funding for EPA not been cut we probably would have been funded. They were very impressed with the first application that was submitted. They are going to make a few changes to make it better and hopefully get it this year. A brownfield is property that either has the presence or potential presence of hazardous wastes or other contaminants. This is a three-year community wide assessment grant. It would be funding for us to have community meetings to help identify potential sites and then pay for Phase 1 & 2 assessments. Phase 1 assessments are more like getting the history of where possible sites would be and Phase 2 is actually testing to see what sites qualify as a brownfield. This would give them the basis if they do find contamination that they could go on and later apply for funds to clean-up. It is a \$400,000 grant - \$200,000 for hazardous and \$200,000 for petroleum and there is no monetary match by the county. There is leveraging so they would do in-kind things such as giving office space and paper, etc.

Dr. Pagast asked if a brownfield area is found do they go back and find the history on it.

Ms. Campbell stated that in Phase 1 they go all the way back in the records to see what has been on that property so they know what was there.

Dr. Pagast asked if it can be retro active to be investigated why it became a brownfield.

Ms. Campbell stated that there are records of what was there that made it a brownfield and then in Phase 2 they do environmental testing. It has to be identified as a brownfield for there to be any chance of getting funding to clean it up and ultimately put it back on the tax rolls and create jobs. It will be used as economic development to create jobs. They will end up with a plan on how to reuse those properties.

Mr. Washington stated that Gould Batteries is now closed and he knows for a fact that old batteries were taken out to the back and sulfuric acid was dumped on the ground. That would be a brownfield.

Ms. Campbell stated that there is a priority of ways that they look at property. If it is municipally owned, it has priority because of the access. Privately owned property is looked at whether it is trying to be sold or how long it has sat there. They look at a lot of information. One of the reasons that the property has probably sat there is because nobody wants to put the money into it to clean it up.

Mr. Olthoff asked if sites have been identified.

Ms. Campbell stated that they have identified about 25 potential sites. Once they have community involvement and start getting input from people a lot more will be identified.

Mr. James asked what happens if they end up with 30 sites that have been identified but don't do anything further. They have now red-lined a piece of property.

Mr. Van Mill stated that most of these are already that way. These properties are not going anywhere because people want to avoid them and until you can get Phase 1 done to clarify what the situation is and get to the remediation where there is grant money and Revolving Loan Fund money they will stay that way. It is a way that a community tries to get properties that are basically left and nobody wants to touch back into the community to become productive again.

Mr. Tholen stated that we all know that there are sites that are pretty obvious that are potentially contaminated. What if it is in a neighborhood property and someone is utilizing a potential site?

Mr. Van Mill stated that if it is being utilized it probably would not be considered a brownfield. When they say brownfield they mean it is vacant and being avoided and it needs to be productive in the community again.

Mr. Tripp asked who they go see if they have questions on some properties.

Mr. Van Mill stated that they can go to him or Marilyn.

Dr. Pagast asked if there is a time limit on properties being investigated if illegal activity made it a brownfield.

Mr. Van Mill stated that he is not an attorney but he knows that the process can follow a previous property owner. The existing property assumes some liability, as well. Other communities that he communicates with have huge manufacturing facilities that have basically disappeared. There is nobody to go back to so it then falls on the responsibility of the public body to move forward and try to get something done which is where they are seeing this brownfield program going. We were an industrial area for hundred years and

there will be sites that they obviously know and want to make them a productive piece of ground that they could raise the value on and get it to a better use in the future.

Ms. Campbell stated that there has to be permission to go on the property to test it.

Mr. Olthoff asked when they would know about the grant.

Ms. Campbell stated that it has to be submitted just before Thanksgiving and they will know in the spring. It is a three year grant.

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

6. Transportation

• Illiana Study

Mr. Lammey stated that they have had five meetings now. The study is three counties – Lake County in Indiana, Kankakee and Will County in Illinois and it is 1000 sq miles which is a very large study area. A month ago there were 70 people in the room who were asked to mark corridors on the map and there were many, many different corridors put up on the map. Some of the lines were way outside the study area. Almost all of them tied into 65 on the east and 55 on the west. Some went through obvious environmental places that would never work. The consultants came up with a number of corridors and are running models trying to figure out what the transportation implications of each of the corridors are. If the truck drivers don't find a useful route we have wasted \$2 million for a road that doesn't do any good. They thought it should be relatively straight east to west and relatively close to the intermodals. They don't think that it can go north of the airport and go through all the corporate boundaries which kind of limits where it could be. There will be a public meeting in Matteson on December 14. He will let the committee know the time when it gets closer. He would encourage the committee to go to the public meeting because it will tell the history of how they got to where they are at and where we are going from here.

Mr. James asked if an inventory of the traffic coming and going has been done.

Mr. Lammey stated that they have done that and have gone to every intermodal facility and taken their destinations of where the trucks left the intermodals. They have traffic counts on every road and have modeling for thirty years in the future. His concern is that when they put a route in and try to figure out what the traffic is they are not thinking about the development that will be drawn to it. Wherever it is put whatever railroads don't have an intermodal already he suspects will have one.

Mr. Arseneau stated that Mr. Bossert and he attended a luncheon Monday with Senator Kirk who is on the transportation committee. One of the biggest things that he talked about was the third airport. The question came up whether it was really ever going to happen. He does think that it is going to happen someday. He said that he is promoting Will County to be the one running the airport and in connection to that will be the Illinois Expressway. Senator Kirk is pushing hard for the corridor for us and he thinks that is a very positive thing.

Mr. Van Mill stated that they are starting to build a coalition for the southern corridors. He thinks that is important. They did pass a resolution here at the county and they also went out and got every municipality in Kankakee County to support a resolution saying that they want a continuous alignment from 65 to 55

and they want it south of the airport. He thinks we are starting to build some critical mass at the ground level.

Mr. Arseneau stated that we have a Will-Kankakee County authority that is working on this and we are trying to make that authority be the representation for this.

Mr. Washington stated that the third airport could mean 18,000 to 20,000 jobs setting up the airport and another 25,000 once the airport is operational. That would draw people from Kankakee County as well as Will County and possibly Iroquois County. It is a big deal. It could be the most important job issue the Kankakee County will experience in the next 20 to 30 years.

7. Old Business

8. New Business

Mr. Van Mill stated that last night the KCRPC Subcommittee on the Solid Waste Plan met for the second time to review the draft that is out right now for consideration. The first meeting that they held was during the day and a number of the public came to provide comment. One of the suggestions was to have a night meeting which was held last night. They again solicited comments from the public. There were a number of county board members there. At this time the committee is going back to review a number of things that they would like to see the plan include. A lot of the discussion is centered around the landfill policy discussion. Right now there is a couple different alternatives. One is to do nothing and leave the policy the way that it is. The second one is to say no new landfills and rely upon transfer stations for the future handling of our waste and third is to propose that we will entertain a landfill in a suitable site. Those are three very general options that are being looked at. It could be a combination of some of those in some form or fashion. The committee has gone back to get a feeling of where they want to go with it. The next meeting is on November 15 at 6:00 p.m. in this room where that discussion will go further. The process will go from the subcommittee who will come up with a final plan through a public hearing which will be submitted to the full planning commission and then to this committee for consideration and then on to the full county board. The plan is on the website for review and a hard copy is available upon request.

9. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:36 a.m. was made by Mr. James and seconded by Mr. Washington. Motion carried.

Bill Olthoff, Chairman
Joanne Langlois, Executive Coordinator