

**Members Present**

Mr. Stauffenberg, Mr. Bertrand, Ms. Hertzberger, Mr. Hess, Mr. James, Ms. McBride, Mr. Marcotte, Mr. Scholl, Mr. Tripp, Mr. Whitten

**Members Absent**

Mr. Olthoff and Mr. Washington.

**In Attendance**

Mr. McLaren, Delbert Skimerhorn, Jim Piekarczyk, Mark Rogers, Leigh Marcotte, Don Pallissard, Michelle Sadler, Jim Greenstreet, Mike Lammey, Rich Howell, Laura Dick, Mike Van Mill, Dave Tyson,

**1. Call to Order**

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

**2. Public Comment**

Jo Ellen Gyorkos spoke concerning Solid Waste Inspections.

**3. Approval of Minutes**

There were no minutes to approve.

**4. Subdivision**

• **Masse Subdivision- Variances**

Mr. Scholl said pertaining to the subdivision, it was his understanding that it needs to be rezoned if subdivision is established.

Mr. Skimerhorn confirmed Mr. Scholl's question and said right now they are just asking for variances because if they don't get the variances, they will not move forward with the project.

Mr. Scholl then asked isn't standard procedure to get it rezoned first?

Mr. Skimerhorn replied, "Yes" and Mr. Scholl then asked why are they shortcutting the system which we are setup to give us the most sufficient way of dealing with it.

Mr. Skimerhorn replied that Mr. Van Mill allowed it.

Mr. Piekarczyk addressed definitions and terms:

Hot Mix Asphalt also known as HMA, referred to as blacktop, bituminous concrete, asphalt, asphalt concrete, Class I, I-11 and sometimes referred to as super pave. The material is made in an asphalt batch plant under high temperature where aggregates of various sizes are mingled together with bituminous material petroleum products under heat and they are delivered to the site in tarp trucks, typically under high temperature and as it cools, it solidifies.

**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.**

Bituminous surface treatment, also known as tar and chip, or chip seal or sometime seal coat or sometime oil and chip is applied with a distributor that shoots a quantity of oil on the surface where the surface treatment is to be applied followed by a truck that drops some aggregates, some chips into a spreader box and the spreader box advances over the top of the oil and then a roller follows up behind that and pushes the aggregate down into the oil. We sometimes refer to this as A1, A2 or A3, the difference being A1 is one (1) layer of chips, A2 would be two (2) layers and A3 would be three (3) layers of the applications of the oil followed by a coating of aggregate.

Subdivision Regulations – Section 173810B Instructural Design Section requires that when roads are built inside subdivisions that ten (10) inches of compacted aggregate base be put down first followed by three (3) inches of bituminous hot mix asphalt surface.

Section 173811A requires that these improvements that are required inside the subdivision be made to any roads that are leading to access of the new subdivision from the nearest collector street.

Mr. Piekarczyk said that the variances that are requested here, essentially, are asking that the Roads internally inside the subdivision and also for the township road that leads from County Highway No. 3 to the access point in the subdivision be allowed to construct the A3 bituminous Surface treatment in lieu of the three (3) inches of the hot mix asphalt.

The Road District response says that 6000 Road from County Highway No. 3 west to the proposed subdivision only be widened with an A3 surface. The rationale that the Road District gives that the township does not have the funds available to maintain a blacktop surface from Section 4 where the subdivision is located to the east of County Highway No. 3. It also mentions that minimal traffic would tend to make the road dry out and deteriorate rapidly.

County Engineer response is in harmony with the Kankakee County Subdivision Regulations. Basically, and ordinarily and regularly and routinely support those regulations and also, what the County Board's authority to grant variances in special instances. Unless there are extenuating circumstances and circumstances that would be in the best interest of the general public to vary from those subdivision regulations and the County Board's authority to grant variances and hopefully in doing so would promote a countywide consistency and uniformity and how the subdivision regulations and its variances are applied.

Aroma Township Road District currently rank about fifth among the seventeen (17) townships in terms of the numbers of miles of paved roads that they have. They got about 2.87 almost three (3) miles of hot mix asphalt pavements. Insofar as the A3 is concerned, you will allow between 5 to 7 years (depending on conditions between surface treatments A1) and that's currently running around \$9,150 per mile for an A1. You get twice the life out of a hot mix asphalt surface before you have to perform some resurfacing and rejuvenating a surface in comparison to the A3. If you apply the A1 surface treatment two (2) times in the lifespan of a

**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.**

hot mix asphalt resurfacing, you will run around \$20,000 per mile, roughly 7-1/2 times the cost to perform a routine resurfacing of hot mix asphalt pavement.

Why do the County Engineer suggest the hybrid design?

Keeping in mind the origins of the hot mix asphalt requirement in the subdivision regulations where the Road District Highway Commissioners requested the three (3) inches of hot mix asphalt in lieu of the A3 surface on their township roads because of the damage that they were incurring, and also, trying to keep in mind the desire of this road district highway commissioner, Mr. Piekarczyk suggested a hybrid design first of all to accommodate the highway commissioner's request for an A3. He wanted an A3 surface because he didn't have the money to spend on the cost that it takes to maintain a three (3) inch hot mix asphalt pavement. A hybrid design would allow for a A1 surface that looks like a tar and chip road on the top while still accommodating a hot mix asphalt base force underneath to maintain the structural number and the superior structural of a hot mix asphalt pavement. If that hybrid design were implemented, the highway commission could continue to maintain the pavement as he would ordinarily maintain an A3 surface.

Why is a hot mix pavement better?

There's a superior quality of that material and the depth of that material that helps transfer the load over a broader area beneath the surface. It reduces the surface deflection, it reduces the compressive intensil strain on the materials underneath and it results in a longer service life – a far and above superior product.

Will the road dry out?

Both the hot mix asphalt and the A3 surface are petroleum based product. So, they both subject to the chemical properties and they both can dry out. There's two (2) types of drying out, which is also referred to as "aging". There's something that's called sterrick hardening. It's a prolong standing that results in the formation of some crystalling light bonds at the inner molecular level in petroleum products. The good news is it is reversible heat and stress. Summer heat and traffic can break those bonds and rejuvenate the harden pavement. There is also the process of hardening called chemical oxidation. That results from exposure to air. The effects of sterrick hardening are minor in comparison to the chemical oxidation process. That's not reversible, it requires a rejuvenating agent or treatment to reverse the hardening that occurs because of chemical oxidation. But, it's applicable to both applications because they are both petroleum based products.

What is the leading cause of deterioration?

Application of repetitive axel and wheel loads. The relationship between axel weight and inflicted pavement damage is not linear but explanational. An 18,000 pound axel can do over three (3) thousand times more damage than a two (2) thousand pound axel, depending on the pavement type and structure in terminal surface ability. There is a considerable difference between a motor vehicle which is almost negligible in a service life of a pavement compared to that of trucks that were mentioned earlier that the road district highway commissioners were typically concerned about.

**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.**

Can bituminous surface treatments be applied to hot mix asphalt surface?

“Yes”. Application of A1 to hot mix asphalt rejuvenates an aging hot mix asphalt surface and adds service life to the HMA. They do it all the time in the County. The biggest obstacle seems to be public acceptance.

Can a hot mix asphalt be applied to surface treatments?

“Yes”. They do it all the time too. Upgrade pavements from an A3 surface course to something with a hot mix surface. It’s acceptable and works very well.

In conclusion, Mr. Piekarczyk said that he was not here to promote one over the other, he was just here to give the Committee some of the statistics and some of the data that came up at the meeting to help them formulate a decision.

Mr. Stauffenberg asked if you chipped and tarred that 3 – 4 times would it equal the three (3) inch bituminous eventually.

Mr. Piekarczyk replied that they are not a one-to-one equivalent. In fact, the aggregate here has a structural value of about .15 per inch and a hot mix asphalt, .4. So, “no” not unless you got considerably higher. The financial equivalent to successive layers of tar and chip would not be equivalent structurally.

Ms. Hertzberger thanked Mr. Piekarczyk for coming today and said that his visuals were great!

Mr. Stauffenberg thanked Mr. Piekarczyk for his impressive presentation.

Motion

A motion to deny the variance was made by Mr. Scholl and seconded by Ms. Hertzberger. Motion carried.

Mr. Scholl said that it bothers him that the process is shortcut. We have a process and everyone needs to be going through that same process and would like to motion to that effect.

Mr. Stauffenberg clarified and said that the process for them asking for the variances before getting it rezoned.

Motion

A motion to follow the same process was made by Mr. Scholl and seconded by Ms. Hertzberger. Motion carried.

Mr. Scholl commented that we need to be more diligent when people come in for variances we got to be more diligent in following the County policy so we adhere to it on an equal basis.

**5. Zoning**

- **ZBA Case #07-18**

**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.**

Per Mr. Skimerhorn, this is a request by Gary Dahn to rezone a five (5) acre parcel located in Limestone from A1 Agriculture to RE Rural Estate. The parcel was created in 1998 using the Plat Act. At that time they did not seek rezoning. There is an existing home on the property. It's part of the estate of Myrtle Burkard. Apparently, she divided the farm up into a five (5) acre parcel. The ZBA held a Hearing on this matter on November 19, 2007. There was no public comment and no objectors were present. They voted 7 to 0 recommend the approval.

Motion

A motion to approve was made by Mr. Hess and seconded by Mr. Marcotte. Motion carried.

## 6. Transportation

Mike Lammey addressed the following issues:

- **Freight Rail Tax Incentives**

Mr. Lammey advised that the Committee had in their packet a resolution supporting tax credits for freight and rail infrastructure. This came thru the Transportation Sub-Committee and the Regional Planning Commission a couple of months ago and last night it was passed by the full Regional Planning Commission. This County was founded the same time as the railroad and we have done fairly well by each other over the years. This resolution encourages its support of a House Bill which talks about tax credits for investments in freight rail and infrastructure.

Motion

A motion to accept this resolution was made by Mr. Whitten and seconded by Mr. Tripp. Motion carried.

- **5311 Bus Purchase**

Mr. Lammey advised that from time to time they have a bus in their rural transportation program that reaches what the State determines the end of useful life and at that time they can purchase another bus. He said the Committee should be aware that they do not intend to retire the bus that they are replacing (they intend to keep it in service to build up the fleet) and at this time he is asking for permission to submit a request to the State of Illinois to buy an additional bus for the Rural Transportation Service. There is no local share.

Motion

A motion by Mr. Tripp and seconded by Mr. James. Motion carried.

- **Riverfront Trail Public Notice**

Mr. Lammey advised that in the Committee's packet was information on a Public Information Meeting tonight to the Riverfront Trail Bike Path for the Phase I construction schedule. It's going to be held at KCC from 5:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. tonight. The program is from 5:15 p.m. to 5:45 p.m. and it will show you where the trail is going to be from Phase I which is roughly to Schuyler Avenue Bridge to Splash Valley.

**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.**

## 7. Other

- **Economic Development Manager-Position**

Mike Van Mill addressed this issue.

Mr. Van Mill advised that he had spoken to Mr. Kruse regarding this position and at this time wanted to give the Committee a “FYI” relative to this position.

Mr. Van Mill said that this position was approved by the County Board and budget for the last two (2) years and they put this on the Finance Committee Agenda for tomorrow where they will review it and hopefully adopt it to be posted. When the service agreement was put in place the position was somehow eliminated, but they need to put it back on so that they can keep their Economic Development Program up and running.

- **Business Retention Workshop- December 7, 2007**

Mr. Van Mill advised that this is just an announcement. The Committee had received an invitation to attend a Workshop on Friday December 7<sup>th</sup>. It will be at the new renovated KCC Workforce Center. One of the priorities under their Economic Development Program is Business Retention in Kankakee County. Many studies suggest that as much as 80% of new job creation is done by existing businesses. In order to ensure that we meet the needs of our existing businesses, we need to visit them on an on-going basis to continue the dialogue with them to find out what their needs are for the community. Retention is a process in which it is very important that we understand what kind of questions we ask, we can identify red flags if they are out there and find and identify common reds amongst our community businesses in order to make sure we have a good business climate. The workshop is the first part of that educational process and Mr. Van Mill felt that it was important that even though as a County Board Member you might not participate intimately with retention program, it would be nice if they knew what they are about, what they are going to do, how they are done and maybe, there is an opportunity for them to participate in the retention program as it moves forward.

## 8. Old/ New Business

Mr. Scholl addressed the statement made in “Public Comment” and said that he found it to be very disturbing. We were assured when the Delegated Agreement was put on hold that all existing sites would be continually inspected and checked by the IEPA. An insertion was made during public comment that there have been no inspections of these facilities. He asked if they could get some information on that and if it was valid/accurate. If there have not been any inspections, why have there not been any inspections.

Mr. Stauffenberg asked Mr. Van Mill if they could receive a report on that at the next meeting – what has happened in the past, if the comment that was made is true, inspections are not being done or are being done.

Mr. Stauffenberg asked Mr. Van Mill about the proposed ethanol plant that came before them for the Revolving Loan Fund. Is that a dead issue?

**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.**

Planning, Zoning, and Agriculture  
Committee Meeting  
November 28, 2007

Mr. Van Mill replied that he did not know, he had not heard that officially. Obviously, the County Board has given a deadline of the end of the year to expend or earmark those funds that after January 1<sup>st</sup> that \$850,000 will go back into the pot and we will be able to use it for other programs.

**9. Adjournment**

A motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:50 a.m. was made by Mr. Whitten and seconded by Mr. Marcotte. Motion carried.

Jim Stauffenberg, Vice-Chairman

Transcribed by Chris Richardson  
Administrative Assistant

**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.**