

Members Present

Mr. Tripp, Mr. James, Ms. McBride, Ms. Schmidt, Ms. Barber, Mr. Hess, Mr. Tholen, Mr. Washington, and Mr. Whitten

Members Absent

Mr. Olthoff, Mr. Stauffenberg

In Attendance

- **Board Members**

Mr. Liehr, Mr. Enz, Mr. Scholl, Mr. Mulcahy, and Mr. Bossert

- **Department Heads**

Mr. Van Mill, Lori Gadbois, Jim Piekarczyk, and Jamie Boyd

- **Media**

Leigh Marcotte

Laura McElroy

Dimitrios Kalantzis

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by the County Board Chairman, Mr. Bossert, at 9:00 a.m. Quorum present. Committee Chairman, Mr. Olthoff, and Committee Vice-Chairman, Mr. Stauffenberg were both absent so County Board Chairman, Mr. Bossert, presided over the meeting.

2. Public Comment

- Jim Ryan commented on the cell phone tower.
- Jerry Enright commented on the cell phone tower.

3. Approval of Minutes – December 23, 2009

A motion to approve the December 23, 2009, minutes was made by Mr. James and seconded by Mr. Washington. Motion carried.

4. Planning

- **Kankakee County Regional Planning Commission – Land Use/ Transportation Subcommittee 2010 Work Program**

Mr. Van Mill stated that the Regional Planning Commission met last night with the hopes of being able to forward to this committee the approved work program for 2010, but unfortunately, there was no quorum last night. The approved work program will probably be the same as the one in the committee's packet today, but in order to get it ratified they will have to wait until the next time they meet.

Mr. James asked what has been the productivity of the work program.

Mr. Van Mill stated that he can give an update of the status of the 2009 work program at the next meeting.

5. Zoning

- **ZBA Case #09-11; request for Rezoning from A-1 Agriculture to A-2 Agriculture Estates, on parcels generally situated in Section 07 of Salina Township. The petitioners are Antoni J. and Susan L. Neven, property owners and Robert D. and Donna L. Bottger, applicants.**
Mr. Skimerhorn stated that this case is a rezoning from A-1 to A-2 on a 15-acre lot in Salina Township. Back in July of 2009, this case was tabled by this committee at the request of the applicant's attorney. The reason for that was at the zoning board hearing it was denied 5-0 by the Zoning Board because of drainage issues on the property. They did indicate at that time that they would reconsider this matter if a drainage study was done. They recently received the drainage study and the applicant's attorney is now requesting that this committee return this matter back to the Zoning Board of Appeals for further consideration.

Mr. Tripp made a motion to return this back to the Zoning Board of Appeals and Mr. James seconded it. Motion carried with a voice vote.

Discussion

Ms. Schmidt asked if this was a legally separated 15-acre parcel of land. She asked what the drainage study said.

Mr. Skimerhorn stated that it was. He just received the study and has not had time to review it. That is why it is being sent back for further consideration.

Mr. Scholl asked when the 15-acres were cut out from the original parcel and when the 5-acres were cut out.

Mr. Skimerhorn stated that he did not recall. The original parcel was 15-acres. It has been that way for a long time. He will have to look that information up.

Mr. Scholl asked if it would be possible for the committee to see a copy of the drainage study.

Mr. Skimerhorn stated that whoever is interested can request a copy.

- **ZBA Case #09-17; request for a Special Use Permit Section 121-209.b.1, 121-208.b.1, and 121-183.b.11 (Federal Firearms Licensed Internet Sales Business) in a C2-General Commercial District, on parcel generally situated in Section 23 of Manteno Township. The petitioners are ENDOR, Inc, property owner and William C. Cunha, Vice-President, applicant**

Mr. Skimerhorn stated that this is a request for a special use permit for the purpose of internet gun sales. The property is located at 8446 N 4000 E Road in Manteno Township. They intend to use about 20% of that building for the purpose of internet gun sales. There will be no customer traffic to the property; all sales will be through the internet. The only traffic will be delivery trucks bringing product in and out. They intend to store the products in two fire-proof lockers. This matter was heard by the Zoning Board of Appeals and they voted to recommend approval 5-0 with the following conditions on the special use permit:

1. The special use be limited to the commercial building/pole barn located in the northeastern part of the property.

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.

2. The owner of the facility shall obtain and maintain all Federal, State, and local permits required to operate a firearm sales store.
3. The special use be limited to Endor Inc. and/or William Cunha for the sole purpose of the internet sale and storage of firearms, ammunition, and related accessories.
4. The owner shall store volatile inventory, such as ammunition and gun powder in a manner that is both fire and theft resistant.

At the hearing, neighbors, John and Joanne Grecius, spoke about the matter and most of their concerns were rectified with the conditions that the Zoning Board placed on the special use permit.

Mr. Tholen made a motion to approve and Mr. Whitten seconded it. Motion carried with a voice vote.

Discussion

Ms. Schmidt asked if they have the permits and how are follow-ups done on the permits. Once they are granted that special use are they going to come back and show that they have the permits? She asked if the committee could see them and she asked if we are going to follow-up on the security of the guns.

Mr. Skimerhorn stated that they have applied for the permits. They have to prove the zoning is in place before they can finalize the application. This process has to be done first before they can get their federal permits.

Mr. Van Mill stated that he is sure that there is a condition on our reasonable request of the County that we can inspect and ensure that the conditions are met. It could be added if deemed appropriate.

Ms. Schmidt stated that she thinks it is appropriate.

Mr. Skimerhorn stated that their application says that they intend to install an alarm system.

Ms. Schmidt asked if that could be made a condition, also.

Mr. Skimerhorn stated that we will make a condition for inspection by the County.

Mr. Hess asked if they are planning to put up a sign.

Mr. Skimerhorn stated that the applicant said that he is not intending to put up a sign.

6. Building

- **Pembroke Township Building Department – Intergovernmental Agreement**

Mr. Bossert stated that last month Pembroke Township came and proposed an agreement to be entered into with the County concerning inspections and activities of the so-called Township Building Department. It seemed appropriate to bring this matter back before the board for action one way or another. This issue has been thought over and discussed at length.

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.

Ms. McBride made a motion not to pursue an intergovernmental agreement with Pembroke Township and Mr. Washington seconded it. Motion carried with a voice vote.

Discussion

Ms. Schmidt asked why Ms. McBride made that motion.

Ms. McBride stated that for one thing she does not know anything about this building department except what she has heard so far. She has had a lot of calls and a lot of complaints about the way that things have been done. She thinks that further investigation needs to go into this before we pursue it any further.

Mr. James stated that his feeling is that the intent is good; however, the process we will not endorse because it is not a legal program. He can't see us committing to support a program that is in violation of the laws. He is in favor of not proceeding with this until such time that this thing becomes corrected. He thinks there were some fees illegally collected because they don't have the authority to do it and we can't afford to get involved with it at this time.

Mr. Bossert stated that he wanted to be clear that we are not commenting on legally or illegality of any matters. The direction we are taking is not to enter into any agreement with Pembroke Township.

7. Transportation

• **Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) – Grant Request**

Mr. Lammey stated that this is to take people to jobs in communities away from the main community in the area. Since Ground Hog Day 2009, they have been providing service to Momence from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. for SHOWBUS. There were a number of major employers in Momence who wanted to be able to provide service to those people to go to jobs. We thought 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. would be enough, but it turns out that it is not enough. Major employers in Momence start shifts as early as 5 a.m. and they have found that they are not providing adequate access. Baker and Taylor starts shifts at 5 a.m. and they have had inquiries from other businesses that also have earlier shifts. The request before the committee has service that starts before 4 a.m. in the morning and arrives for a 5 a.m. shift and a 6 a.m. shift in Momence. The request is for funds for the hours before 6 a.m. because after that service is already in place. The amount of money that they are asking for is \$95,000 in federal funds for a bus that would be big enough to handle all the people that would be using the service and for operating funding of \$63,000 for three years with a 50% local match to be paid out of state funding.

A motion to support this grant request was made by Mr. Washington and seconded by Mr. James. Motion carried with a roll call vote of 10 ayes and 0 nays.

Discussion

Ms. McBride asked if this service goes to Pembroke.

Mr. Lammey stated that they have service to Pembroke five days a week right now.

Ms. McBride asked how to get a schedule.

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.

Mr. Lammey stated that she could call 1-800-525-2454 to find out any information she needs.

Ms. Barber asked if we have done a survey with these companies to have an idea on the population.

Mr. Lammey stated that they have talked to the employees at Baker & Taylor and the 5 a.m. shift who are predominantly Hispanic female and every one of them said that they would ride the bus. He thinks they have a pretty good indication of the interest.

Mr. Scholl stated that he thinks this is a vital program. We are in a situation economically that we need to get people to work and this is going to provide an opportunity for minimal income individuals to get to work.

- **Illiana Expressway Support Resolution**

Mr. Van Mill stated that last night he had the opportunity with Chairman Bossert to speak in front of the K3 County Mayors Association and give them an update on a number of things that we are working on. One of the items that they discussed was the Illiana Expressway. At that time, he was able to give them an update since August when the Cambridge Study came out and many of the mayors were familiar with this, but not entirely. He showed them since August what was happening. The results of that study showing three proposed alignments. The southern alignment which is entirely in Kankakee County, the middle alignment which is in the south side of the footprint of the south suburban airport, and then a northern alignment that takes a northerly route that ends somewhere just south of the Monee area. The study that was conducted was done primarily by the State of Indiana who paid Cambridge about one million dollars to do. Noting that the State of Illinois has no skin in this and their concern primarily being how do you connect 65 to 57? In their discussion with the mayors, they indicated that this idea has gained a lot of momentum at the state level. They have had a number of meetings with Will County officials on this matter and state officials have been talking about this being a primary priority for the State of Illinois. One of things that came out of their meeting last week with the mayors is the concern that we need to ensure that our positions are known. One of them primarily being that any alignment that is to be established for this north/east roadway encompass the connection to 55. Obviously, the initial study that Indiana commissioned they really didn't care about it going to 55 they just wanted to make sure it got to 65 to 57. Our concern and support is that the study and the corridors be studied all the way to 55, that there is continuity between 65 and 55 to ensure efficient traffic flow, and to ensure that whatever corridor is selected best benefits the Kankakee County region. With that being said, the direction of the mayors was to put together some sort of resolution of support that we could all agree upon and make sure that our message is sent to the appropriate state and federal agencies. This idea of an east/west expressway is not new. We have been talking about a roadway of this magnitude at the county line. If you look at our comprehensive plan you will see that we have identified a major east/west expressway at the county line and the county has supported that by endorsing the plan itself. In drafting the resolution there were several items that we wanted to ensure were encapsulated in this. First is the acknowledgement that the truck traffic is growing and continues to grow in Kankakee County and continues to be a serious issue of public safety. Acknowledging that a lot of the growth of truck traffic is the result of the urbanization of Will County, the logistic

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.

centers that are currently established, and the growth of logistic centers that are proposed in the Will and Grundy County areas. We also suggest that the support letter indicate that we support a continuous alignment and also that the study incorporate the entire study from 65 to 55 and not do it in phases.

Mr. Whitten made a motion to support and adopt this resolution and Mr. Tripp seconded it. Motion carried with a voice vote.

Discussion

Mr. Liehr stated that this kind of a transportation issue is going to have a major impact and is already having a major impact on this county. We need to be pro-active and he thinks this is a very well-written resolution and it needs to be approved.

Mr. Washington stated that this not only impacts our communities, it impacts all the communities down from Interstate 80. When we are successful at getting this done, it is going to make a huge difference in the traffic flow patterns throughout this county as well as southern Will County. He is strongly in approval of proceeding with this project.

Mr. Bossert stated that one of the points of discussion is that the language under one of the “be it resolved” points to a route south of the proposed airport. There could be a bit of debate whether we identify a particular route or are we just in concept supporting a complete study that makes sense economically. If we get into the business of endorsing and supporting a particular route, there is potential that we will have some conflict with our neighbors from the North. What we keep hearing and what we keep repeating at some of these meetings is that we do not want to allow this discussion to devolve into a matter similar to the airport where there are factions fighting over a particular plan or route. On the other hand, perhaps the middle route makes most sense to us. Do we identify that or merely propose language that would encourage a complete study?

Mr. James stated that he thinks the approach we are taking is the correct one. The main objective is that we get the thing and not get into a contest of where it is going to set. We know the value of it if it would come through on any one of these corridors. The main thing is to get it in place.

Mr. Bossert stated that if the northerly route is picked there is going to be trouble getting that connection clear over to 55. You have limited your opportunities short of taking a southwesterly route to get around the south end of the arsenal.

Mr. Washington stated that at this point and time he thinks it is most important to get a study going rather than narrowing it down to one particular route.

Mr. Bossert stated that some language may be refined in the resolution before it comes back to the full board. He asked if that was acceptable if we in principle adopt this resolution and perhaps later refine the language.

The committee agreed with that.

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.

8. Old Business

9. New Business

In response to the discussion regarding the cell tower siteing, Mr. Van Mill gave a presentation on the process of siteing such a structure. This is for our educational benefit.

10. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:45 a.m. was made by Mr. James and seconded by Mr. Hess. Motion carried.

Mike Bossert, County Board Chairman
Joanne Langlois, Executive Coordinator