

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2011
NINE THIRTY A.M.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
STATE OF ILLINOIS
COUNTY OF WILL

County Executive Walsh called the meeting to order.

Member Gould led the Pledge of Allegiance to our Flag.

Member Gould introduced Pastor Herbert Brooks, St. Johns Church, Joliet, who led the invocation.

Roll call showed the following County Board Members present: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Argoudelis, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

Absent: Deutsche. Total: One.

COUNTY EXECUTIVE WALSH DECLARED A QUORUM PRESENT.

Member Babich made a motion, seconded by Member Traynere, the Certificate of Publication be placed on file.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Argoudelis, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-four.

No negative votes.

THE CERTIFICATE OF PUBLICATION IS PLACED ON FILE.

Member Moustis made a motion, seconded by Member Weigel, to Approve the Appointment by the County Executive of David Izzo to the Will County Board District #2 Vacancy.



LAWRENCE M. WALSH
WILL COUNTY EXECUTIVE

WILL COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING • 302 N. CHICAGO STREET • JOLIET, ILLINOIS 60432

Phone (815) 774-7480
Fax: (815) 740-4600

APPOINTMENTS BY THE WILL COUNTY EXECUTIVE

November 2011

Will County Board District 2

David Izzo

19618 Greenview Place, Tinley Park, IL 60487

New appointment – Replaces Laurie Smith

*Mr. Izzo is a resident of County Board District 2 in Will County and is qualified to serve.

Note:

Mr. Izzo was recommended by the Will County Republican Chairman, Richard J. Kavanagh, Will County Board Chairman Jim Moustis & Will County Majority Leader Jim Bilotta.

Submitted to the Will County Board November 4, 2011

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Argoudelis, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

APPOINTMENT BY THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE OF DAVID IZZO TO THE WILL COUNTY BOARD DISTRICT #2 VACANCY IS APPROVED.

County Executive Walsh asked Mr. David Izzo to come forward.

Mr. David Izzo came forward and County Clerk Voots administered the Oath of Office.

Member Izzo stated first of all I just want to thank Mr. Richard Kavanagh the Will County Central Committeeman for appointing me to this position. I also want to thank Member Moustis as well, County Executive Walsh and County Board Members. I really look forward to the opportunity of working with each and every one of you. As we all know, these are very tough economic times. I think it is imperative for all of us to work together in such a way that we can create an environment here in Will County to not only attract new business, but to retain business as well. So I look forward to representing the District #2 Members and working with all of you. Thank you very much.

Member Argoudelis made a motion, seconded by Member Gould, to Seat Newly Appointed County Board Member David Izzo.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Argoudelis, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

MOTION TO SEAT NEWLY APPOINTED COUNTY BOARD MEMBER DAVID IZZO IS APPROVED.

Member Winfrey made a motion, seconded by Member Wilhelmi, to approve the Minutes for the October 20, 2011 County Board Meeting.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Argoudelis, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-six.

No negative votes.

THE MINUTES FOR THE OCTOBER 20, 2011 COUNTY BOARD MEETING ARE APPROVED.

Elected Officials present were: Auditor, Duffy Blackburn; Circuit Clerk, Pam McGuire; County Clerk, Nancy Schultz Voots; County Executive, Larry Walsh; Recorder of Deeds, Karen A. Stukel; Sheriff, Paul Kaupas; and State's Attorney, James Glasgow.

News media present: Jon Seidel, Sun Times Media; Alice Fabbre, Chicago Tribune and Michael Cleary, Farmers Weekly Review.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

County Executive Walsh announced, we have citizens to be heard, we have some citizens signed up and at the appropriate time they will be given the opportunity. Today we have a presentation of the 2012 Program and Budget from the RTA. County Executive Walsh asked who is going to make the announcement, Mr. J.D. Ross?

Mr. J. D. Ross stated thank you County Executive Walsh. Actually the presentation is going to be made by our Deputy Director and Chief Financial Officer, Ms. Grace Gallucci.

County Executive Walsh asked if you would both state your name and address for County Clerk Voots.

Mr. J.D. Ross replied 119 Inwood Drive, Joliet.

Ms. Grace Gallucci replied 1616 Arlington Street, Bolingbrook.

County Executive Walsh said thank you.

Ms. Gallucci began her presentation, Good morning, my name is Grace Gallucci, and as Director Ross stated, I am the CFO of the RTA. I am pleased to have the opportunity to talk to you today about the financial situation of public transit in our region.

As 2011 comes to an end, the Service Boards – CTA, Metra and Pace are on track to end the year with balanced budgets. 2011 has been marked by several positive financial performance indicators. Sales tax revenues have come in stronger than expected, after two years of decline, ridership has stabilized and is estimated to be approximately 1% ahead of last year on a regional basis. In addition, there were no fare increases or service cuts in 2011. However, the Service Boards did each need to transfer capital funding to the operating budget, a practice that has weakened our ability to maintain and repair our extensive capital infrastructure.

With regard to the development of the 2012 operating budget, challenges continue and the Service Boards have had to face some very difficult decisions. Although sales tax receipts have been coming in better than budgeted in 2011, sales tax revenue remains significantly below the levels anticipated when the new RTA funding and reform legislation was passed in early 2008. In addition, the City of Chicago Real Estate Transfer Tax, a funding source designated just for the CTA, has been more depressed than the regional sales tax. The economy is still struggling after the 2008 down turn and budget balancing measures that included one-time savings will no longer solve the shortfall in public funding that the Service Boards are confronted with. Fare increases were implemented at CTA and Pace in 2009 and service cuts in 2010. In addition, as mentioned,

the Service Boards have relied on capital transfers to operations, a practice that really no longer sustainable.

I am pleased to report that the 2012 budgets for each of the Service Boards do not include any transfers of capital funds to the operating budget. To balance 2012 budgets; however, Metra has approved a 25% fare increase and CTA is proposing work rule changes through negotiations with its unions that will result in more efficient operations. Pace Suburban Service has been able to develop a balanced budget based on previous restructuring and reductions in fixed route service and a 2009 fare increase. Pace ADA service has benefited from the passage of new legislation in 2011 that amended the RTA Act to re-establish the ADA fund at a level that is sufficient to cover operating costs.

The five-year RTA Capital Program emphasizes bringing the system into a State of Good Repair. For the five year period of 2012-2016, \$3.87 billion of funding is budgeted with the largest sources still Federal funding at 41% and State funding at 26%. In the State Capital Program, 38% of the funding will be dedicated to rolling stock projects and 31% to track and structure projects. These are two areas that are considered to have the greatest direct impact on transit users.

As we struggle to deal with budget shortfalls, it is important to retain our focus on customers and their needs. The RTA has worked to develop coordination among the public transit services in the region, they have optimized capital investments, increasing operational efficiencies, and enhancing customers' experience. We have partnered with the Service Boards, CTA, Metra and Pace on a variety of initiatives that have required collaborative efforts.

In cooperation with those Service Boards, we have advanced the development of a regional asset condition assessment that documents the funding needed to bring our infrastructure into a state of good repair over the next ten years. That amount; however, is \$24.6 billion and unfortunately, the funding over that same time-period is roughly one-third of the need. With funding from the Federal Government, we are developing a capital prioritization tool to assist us in the development of capital program that will be focused on strategic capital investments. Thus, although we are looking at a \$25 billion capital need, as compared to about an \$8 billion revenue flow we are looking at the best ways to optimize and leverage those funds for the projects we need most. We are working with the Service Boards, for example to enhance customer experience through the implementation of a five-year project for traffic corridor optimization. We have improvements in transit technology that can provide riders with regional real-time travel information and trip planning, and we are programming improved signage in downtown locations to help customers navigate the transition between commuter rail and urban transit services. Also, the development of a regional open fare payment system is underway that will make the system easier to access for both our regular and occasional users of our system. Currently, we are implementing a region-wide customer satisfaction survey that will assist in the development of action plans that respond to customers' priorities.

The RTA and Service Boards remain committed to provide our customers with the best possible service. On behalf of the RTA, I would like to thank you for your continued support of public transit in Northeastern Illinois. I would be happy to answer any questions at this time.

County Executive Walsh asked are there any questions from Board Members?

Member Maher asked do you go out to bid for the ADA services...for the different...I see you are trying to freeze...your are working with them to try to freeze the rates for your ADA services. Do you take that out to bid? Am I reading this correctly, is this strictly restricted to the City of Chicago in those services?

Ms. Gallucci replied I will answer very briefly, but actually Pace is the operator of that service and they are making the next presentation. But, generally speaking, yes, all of our services...

Member Maher stated I apologize for that...

Ms. Gallucci replied not at all, it is very confusing and one of the reasons we are trying to conduct our Public Hearings jointly, is to help the public to understand how the systems work together. The RTA is the oversight agency of public transit in Northeastern Illinois. So we are responsible for funding, financing, planning, coordination and general oversight. The Service Boards, CTA, Metra and Pace are responsible for the actual operation of the service. They also set the fares. They develop their budgets, but we are responsible for approving their budgets and allocating that funding.

Member Maher asked so when...to that point then, are you also responsible for oversight in their bidding on these processes?

Ms. Gallucci replied generally the answer would be yes, at an oversight level. We have for example audit responsibility and we do regularly go into the Service Boards to audit various policies, procedures...

Member Maher continued my question was accurate in asking about the bidding process for this?

Ms. Gallucci respond yes, correct.

Member Maher continued I will bring up the other question to them.

Ms. Gallucci responded yes.

Member Maher continued the main question is are they going out to bid for these ADA services, because I understand they are looking to freeze these.

Ms. Gallucci responded they have gone out to bid in the past. Typically, we do bid out all of our services. My understanding to that point is they are looking for an extension to the existing contract and try to negotiate some concession from the vendor to lower the overall costs. But as I said, I will let Pace answer the specifics to that.

County Executive Walsh asked are there any other questions? Thank you, very much. Thank you J.D. Mr. Ross is our representative to the RTA Board. Would you like to make any comments?

Mr. Ross stated just one. As you know we started Bus on Shoulder this Monday and it has been very, very successful already. We had a nice piece on Channel 7 that highlighted it. Pace has done a fantastic job with this. They have Wi-Fi on those buses. I used it when I took a trial run and it works. I think we are just off to a great start. So I tip my hat to the Chairman Richard Kwasneski and the people at Pace, they have done a great job. As I mentioned before we had outstanding support from the Illinois State Police and also from the Illinois Department of Transportation in working with this to make all of this happen. Then yesterday at our Board Meeting, I don't remember the exact dollar amount, but we did approve the Paratransit program that had been submitted by Mr. Nick Palmer and his staff. I think it was to the tune of about \$800,000.00 including the local match.

County Executive Walsh said thank you very much. Any questions for Mr. Ross?

Member Howard stated I would just like to compliment Pace on what they are doing. It makes a big difference in a lot of peoples' lives, especially when you get into the semi-rural areas to provide transportation and to partner with Pace to provide transportation, it's phenomenal. I just can't say enough good things about it, so thanks again.

County Executive Walsh asked are there any other questions? Thank you very much. Next with their presentation of 2012 Programs and Budgets...Pace. We have the Chairman of the Board, Mr. Richard Kwasneski and Mr. Rocky Donahue, both with us today...gentlemen.

Mr. Richard Kwasneski stated good morning. Do you need my name for the record?
Richard Kwasneski, 9 West Logan Street, Lemont.

Mr. Rocky Donahue stated good morning, Rocky Donahue, 9441 Georgetown Square, Orland Park.

Mr. Kwasneski stated thank you very much for giving us the opportunity. I think the RTA started off on a few of our things that we have been working on collectively with them and with the other Transit Boards. We are very happy here today to present to you our 2012 Suburban Service Budget, which is a balanced budget with no service reductions and no increases in fees. So we were able to do that over the past couple of years, as the RTA said, we changed and restructured some service throughout the region and also cut back on a lot of administrative fees and so forth, and structures and expenses that we have at Pace. Our budget this year is \$195 million over all for Pace Suburban Bus. For the ADA budget, the overall budget is \$115 million. We are continuing to make some efficiencies within that program and that is an on-going basis. Mr. Donahue will be able to address Member Maher's question in a minute. Our capital budget is \$100 million this year. We are going to be replacing a lot of rolling stock, doing some improvements to our facilities. We have brought in a number of hybrid vehicles to the area. We are also looking at possibly converting, at some point, to natural gas buses which have been successful throughout the country. It is a huge investment, so we are really taking our time and really looking at that closely. In 2009 we launched what we call the first "Call and Ride" ironically right here in Will County, in Joliet. Basically it is a localized service where you pick up the phone and call and say "I want to go here" and they basically come and pick you up. You basically call the driver, they actually take you where you want to go, connect you into a fixed route. It is hugely successful and quite frankly, it is a model that we are using throughout the region now with about four other counties; and it got started here in Will County. Our ridership, it continues to go

up. It is up 11.3 percent this year. We carry about 3 million riders a month. Our ADA services in the suburban area, we carry about 58,000 rider ships a month and then our "Dial-A-Ride" service which is a cooperative, that obviously we work with Townships and Municipalities, carries about 106,000 riders a month as well. We are currently working with the Municipalities along the Heritage Corridor and the County to try to figure out if there is some service that we can provide in between, in the middle of day, where people could be able to get back to their cars from downtown. One of the complaints we have seen and Metra has seen is that because of the limited service on the Heritage line it is very difficult for people to be able to plan. Quite frankly, if they get stuck downtown, they have to take another train somewhere else. We are trying to figure out if there is some opportunity to work along with Metra and the Municipalities to be able to provide some mid-day service and then some late night service as well to be able to accommodate riders. We are also working with Will County and various social service agencies on our overall "Dial-A-Ride" program. Trying to put together some, I guess, consolidation, if you will to be able to save costs. We are able to do that in a number of Townships and it has been successful. We are looking to try to do that in a wider range of Will County as well. That has been successful in some other counties and we are really looking forward to working along with all of you. Both Member Moustis and County Executive Walsh have really shown their leadership on this issue, especially with Paratransit, we really appreciate that. We appreciate Mr. Nick Palmer's efforts in working to get that grant with the RTA. I think that is going to be a huge step for Paratransit in Will County. Lastly, obviously, Mr. Ross did mention, we launched "Bus on Shoulder" on I-55 this past week. We had an event last week with Governor Quinn downtown. Member Traynere was able to ride on the bus...ride along on the way down there. It is an exciting opportunity for all of us and we are hoping to expand that. Quite frankly, on some of the other expressways if this works. This is a two year pilot program, so we are really monitoring it closely. We are also working with the Illinois Tollway on their future expansion and some opportunity for Bus Only lanes and really be more proactive in trying to do this bus rapid transit. So with that, if I could, maybe just flip it over to Mr. Donahue to be able to answer your question and then we can open it up to other questions.

Mr. Donahue began thank you Mr. Kwasneski, good morning. As it relates to bidding our ADA contract, all of our ADA service is privatized. We use private operators. The current contract doesn't expire until December 31, 2012. What we have proposed...we will put it out for bid probably in June or July or 2012 to go into affect the new contract year, January 1, 2013. What we have proposed in our 2012 budget and the current contractors have agreed, they were due for a minimal increase, an automatic step up. We have negotiated to hold their price steady at the 2011 contract rate in order to meet the budget and they recognize with the tough economic times that it was not an unreasonable request. That is what we have done. But, we will put those out for bid, but it won't come up for a year from now.

County Executive Walsh asked any other questions for...

Member Traynere stated I just wanted to say thanks. Awesome service. I rode the bus fairly regularly for a number of years, about maybe eight years ago; and really, really appreciate the enhanced service level with the Wi-Fi, that was really awesome. It is a great way to make use of time in traffic.

Member Hart stated I have a quick questions, I have always kinda wondered this, when you were saying with the Townships, I know seniors because I know going to Bolingbrook and

other areas of having it and our Township does not. How does that work? Do you work with the Townships?

Mr. Donahue asked which Township are you in.
Member Hart responded Wheatland.

Mr. Donahue stated we...I think we were talking with the Township Supervisor about trying to provide some service there and we gave them a lot of information and I am not sure if they were moving forward with it.

Member Hart asked what is the budget.

Mr. Donahue replied basically what we do is provide the vehicle and some training for their driver and they actually...there is a fee that would be paid, so it depends on how much service they really want. But I know we have been in contact with your Township Supervisor. His name is escaping me, what is it?

Member Hart responded Mr. Todd Morse.

Mr. Donahue continued Todd, yes. Ms. Beth Gonzalez is here, she is our representative for Will County, so I will make sure she follows up with him to see if there is anything outstanding. But I know, within the past year and a half we have been having on going discussions with him in regards to that, so I don't know if it is a budget issue on their end or not.

Member Hart continued that is what I was wondering of how (inaudible). I have just had going out and getting out and talking with my constituents and seniors and others have asked.

Mr. Donahue responded absolutely. I will make sure that Ms. Gonzalez gets you a packet on the "Dial-A-Ride" service and how that works as well.

Member Hart responded, perfect. Thank you.

Member Moustis stated I don't have a question, Mr. Kwasneski or Mr. Donahue, I would just like probably just make a comment. In Will County, we have been looking at this issue of mobility and specifically for folks that have special needs. You mentioned Wheatland Member Hart, what I have found is there are a lot of ways to deliver service and everyone should understand and talk to Pace and talk about the different models. Some Townships are operators, such as Frankfort Township, we operate our system. Other Townships, for example can sponsor, some may also do the operation, then help do a subsidy to the rides. I do think that...certainly working with Mr. Palmer and County Executive Walsh along with a lot of...pretty large group of folks that have an interest in transportation...public transportation specifically for those who have special needs. It is a real challenge and we have talked about, for example here at the County maybe we could bring on a mobility manager to help coordinate. By the way, I am thinking, as we look for a transportation person it would be nice if we could get somebody who can be helpful in also public transportation. I know County Executive Walsh will be looking for someone to fill those shoes during the year. I guess what I am trying to point out is there are lots of different ways to bring transportation to your area and I think it would be helpful Mr. Kwasneski and Mr. Donahue if we can get more information out to potential...either providers or people who want to

sponsor their area by giving some dollars to the provider to help service their area, which is actually the least expensive way to do it. There are lots of ways of bringing transportation, I guess what I am saying. We are working on it. We are going to get an additional grant from the RTA to allow us to further study the issue. I do think Pace is doing a pretty good job by the way, Frankfort Township is one of those Townships that has recently consolidated, who has gone to a regional call center, which means it has saved us about \$60,000.00 in operational costs. So we are looking at other efficiencies in the system that I think Mr. Kwasneski and Mr. Donahue you have been very active in trying to bring to current operators how to be more efficient. We need to continue to do that because public transportation is not inexpensive, but for many there is no alternative. That is Pace's charge is to do Paratransit really. For those folks who don't understand that Pace is the Paratransit arm of the RTA, correct?

Mr. Donahue responded correct, city and suburbs.

Member Moustis continued well you just recently go the city back, what three years ago or so?

Mr. Donahue responded yes.

Member Moustis stated that concludes my comment County Executive Walsh. Thank you.

Member Maher stated there was a second part of the question about the dollar usage for the RTA to see what the bulk of that was use for the taxes for the City of Chicago. Is that...kinda some of the points we have just been talking about are those dollars also available for a Township like Wheatland rather than them get into the bus aspect and hire drivers with the subsidy or the taxi driver.

Mr. Donahue responded that is a great question and I will try to explain this the best I can. There are really two types of service as it related to, what we will call Paratransit door to door service for the disabled. ADA, Americans with Disabilities Act is Federal Law where anywhere there is fixed route public transit; Federal law says we have to provide basically curb to curb service for those individuals with a qualifying disability. "Dial-A-Ride" service is where we have service with our local partners that necessarily fixed route service does not exist, therefore, the ADA service does not exist, but these local partners decide they would like to have mobility management for their seniors or disabled or general public even depending on how they so do it. So in the City of Chicago, that ADA service is federally required service and Wheatland Township and I apologize, I don't know the area well enough, but I will look, there may be ADA service if there is regular fixed route Pace service, but if there isn't any fixed route bus service, there would not be the corresponding ADA service. In so, in that small section, there would be the corresponding ADA service so that would be available to those residents who live within the corridor of the fixed route service, but the remainder of this service we would have to go to as Member Moustis' described some type of partnership of enhancing that transportation for those residents.

Member Maher stated just to reiterate that Chicago, because of the number of fixed routes they have they pretty much geographically have it covered just because of the size.

Mr. Donahue responded exactly. To put it in perspective, in the City of Chicago we provide 7,000 trips a day on the ADA service.

County Executive Walsh asked are there any other comments?

Member Zigrossi stated a question for you in regard to door to door, currently the qualifiers as for when an individual with disabilities has to go to get approved for the services, have there been any other discussions as far as bringing that more into a central Will County site? I know our residents with disabilities have to go to Naperville.

Mr. Donahue responded that I will actually defer to the RTA. I don't know if they are still here. The RTA does the certification. The RTA certifies... in essence how the RTA works an individual has to be certified that they cannot access the main line system. RTA determines that certification and once they are that list we then provide the service. So where RTA does that certification is really their decision.

Member Zigrossi stated (inaudible)

County Executive Walsh stated is that something you can look into Mr. Kwasneski?

Mr. Donahue responded yes, I think we can communicate with the RTA...Mr. Ross is still here so we will get with him and see exactly if there is some opportunity to do something.

Ms. Gallucci stated as Mr. Donahue stated the RTA is responsible for the certification process and at this point we have five different centers where the individuals can go to be tested. They can fill out the paperwork in a number of different places and even send it in and schedule appointments. They RTA will work with Pace to have a transportation appointment for them and then brought in. So there are five different locations throughout the six county region.

Member Zigrossi stated I understand what you are saying. But for the residents in Will County if the closest place is in Naperville.

Ms. Gallucci stated we can certainly bring that back to the ADA staff who are responsible for planning those sites.

Member Moustis stated I just want to say I agree because I help people through the process, it tends to be more difficult than it needs to be. The mere fact, for example, and of course, this is not the only one, but if you want to look at Will County, certainly Naperville is not a place you can get to easily with public transportation. So I do think the location is important. A lot is done, of course, over the telephone, but even then I have to tell you I have not had good experiences trying to get those certifications. It gets very frustrating and people will say forget it. I think it is an area that can be improved on. That is just a comment.

Ms. Gallucci replied I appreciate the feedback. To let you know, we do regularly review our services and we did conduct this past year, an evaluation of the ADA Paratransit certification process within the agency, so have looked at the processes that we go through to ensure that the certifications are accurate. So perhaps we should we should take that a step further then and maybe involve some of the folks in the communities to determine how it is working for them.

Member Maher asked are you all not working with the Department of Rehab Services in order to be able to help them out? I mean we already have an agency here within the State of Illinois that already goes through the certification process for people with disabilities. It would seem ludicrous for us not to work with that agency and those agencies are all over the State and they get into certifications as a rule of business.

Ms. Gallucci stated typically we have not worked with them and the reason, and this is my understanding of how the system works, that certification process is different than the one that is required by the Federal Transit Administration and the ADA Disabilities Act and that generally speaking they have different criteria for what would allow a person to be determined eligible for Paratransit service. So the disability criteria is different.

Member Maher said you are missing my point. My point is you have an agency that is there doing that and if you give them a criteria that says here is our criteria, can you help us in this assessment. You already have people who are doing assessments, I would imagine if somebody comes in as an amputee it is pretty easy to tell if it is an amputee. If you are talking about looking at cognitive disabilities versus physical disabilities those are all things that could be aligned to what ever criteria you are asking for. But it would sure help the citizens. They are already going to this place, they are already there looking for services for employment. If we are not using those areas then shame on us because that is where they need to start dealing with the transportation issues of how they are going to go in and improve their quality of life.

Ms. Gallucci stated that is a very good suggestion, we will take that back.

Member Dralle stated sometimes at these meetings we end up giving a lot of criticism and I hope it is constructive...I had an opportunity about a month ago, I was in one of the local municipalities and there was a gentleman in a wheelchair, he was an amputee. I ended up stopping and giving him a ride home. I took it as an opportunity to say you "we know have Pace, we do have Paratransit, we do have the availability of vehicles that will come, pick you up, will take you where you need to go and then bring you back". And, he did level some very heavy criticism toward the system in terms of, "I don't call them anymore, the driver is crabby, they want exact change when I get on the bus". Is that true, they have to have exact change?

Mr. Donahue responded, it depends on the system. Where were you referring to?

Member Dralle continued it was in the Romeoville area. Maybe we can talk later. I do feel that it was so very, very unfortunate because it was cold and he just didn't want to call any more. So if you can give me a card I would be more than happy to put some individuals together. I am sure we can rectify it.

Mr. Donahue responded I will give you my card and please have him call.

Member Dralle responded I will. Thank you.

Member Howard stated again for those of the Townships that are in here right now that are represented...I strongly encourage that they give Pace a call and talk to Pace about providing these services. Because as an operator in a Township in Eastern Will County, I have nothing but

words of praise for Pace. They have always helped out and it makes a difference in a lot of peoples' lives and especially those in need right now, they provide a great service, but communicate with them. They are more than friendly. Thank you.

County Executive Walsh asked any last comments, any last comments. Well thank you all for enlightening us on the operations.

HONORARY RESOLUTIONS/PROCLAMATIONS

County Executive Walsh announced we have one Honorary Resolution this morning. The Proclamation will be read by Member McPhillips.

Member McPhillips began I would like to recognize Zonta Chapter of Joliet and we have several members here. If they could stand and be recognized, please. I will point out that our current President is Ms. Pat Perrier, and we also have Ms. Beth May who is a previous President and Ms. Mary Baudino who is also a past President. Thank you for all you do. The Zonta Group of Joliet is a group of professional women, we have provided nearly 40 years of advocacy working with local agencies such as Lamb's Fold, Guardian Angel groundwork and Legal Aid. We raise money, awareness, advocacy and provide mentoring for women in our community and that is where this proclamation came from...so thank you very much for all you do. I am a Member also.

PROCLAMATION

RECOGNIZING 16 DAYS OF ACTIVISM ELIMINATION OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

WHEREAS, the 16 Days of Activism Against Gender Violence is an international campaign to call for the elimination of all forms of violence against women, and

WHEREAS, participants chose the dates November 25 – International Day Against Violence Against Women and December 10 – International Human Rights Day in order to symbolically link violence against women and human rights and to emphasize that such violence is a violation of human rights, and

WHEREAS, the 16 Days Campaign has been used as a strategy to raise awareness about gender-based violence as a human rights issue at the local, national, regional and international levels; strengthen local work around violence against women, provide a forum in which organizers can develop and share new and effective strategies, and

WHEREAS, over 3700 organizations in approximately 164 countries have participated in the 16 Days Campaign since 1991, and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Will County Board and the Will County Executive do hereby recognize the 16 Days of Activism Against Gender Violence.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Will County Board and the Will County Executive encourage us all to educate one another about the issues surrounding violence against women

DATED THIS 17TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2011.

LAWRENCE M. WALSH
WILL COUNTY EXECUTIVE

ATTEST:

NANCY SCHULTZ VOOTS
WILL COUNTY CLERK

Member McPhillips made a motion, seconded by Member Hart, to approve Proclamation Recognizing 16 Days of Activism-Human Rights & Stopping Violence Against Women.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Argoudelis, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-six.

No negative votes.

PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING 16 DAYS OF ACTIVISM-HUMAN RIGHTS & STOPPING VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN APPROVED.

OLD BUSINESS

**STATUS OF UNSIGNED OR RETURNED
RESOLUTIONS/ORDINANCES BY THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE**

County Executive Walsh stated that all Resolutions from the October 20, 2011 County Board Agenda have been signed by the County Executive.

NEW BUSINESS

**LAND USE PLANNING, ZONING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
Tom Weigel, Chairman**

Member Weigel stated good morning everyone. We need to have a public hearing for the Zoning Cases.

Member Weigel made a motion, seconded by Member Rozak, to open Public Hearing for all Land Use cases.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Argoudelis, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR ALL LAND USE CASES IS OPENED AT 10:27 A.M.

County Executive Walsh announced we are in Public Hearing. Please be advised that absolutely no new evidence or information will be allowed once the Land Use Public Hearing is closed. Cases to be heard this morning Case #6014-S, #5995-S3V2, #6003-S, #6009-S, #6015-V2, #6018-S and # 6021-M. We have some people that have signed up and our first one, is Ms. Joy Schwerman. Ms. Schwerman would you like to speak?

Ms. Schwerman responded no.

County Executive Walsh stated you will be available for questions at that case? Thank you. Next we have Mr. Mike McMahon. Mr. McMahon would you like to speak?

Mr. Mike McMahon stated my name is Mike McMahon, I am the Media Development Director for the Village of Channahon, 24555 S. Navajo Drive, Channahon. I don't have the case number it is Case #6015-V2. As you know the Village Board passed a Resolution two meetings ago objecting to the first variance to go five high. We do not object to the second variance. As you know, back in 2006 when this case was...this project was first brought before Will County, the Village Board did object to it. We just do not feel that storing containers, a project that just stores containers is viable for that area, especially so close to Channahon. Channahon does have an Ordinance, it is an accessory use ordinance that does allow stacking of containers, but in this case, this project would not be permitted if it came to Channahon. In Channahon you must have a secondary use...a primary use stacking could be done if there was a warehouse, distribution, manufacturing or some other primary use and then 30 percent of the property could then be used for cargo stacking. Additionally, you have to have rail access, so you have to have a primary use; only 30 percent and rail access. So the Village does object to this variance to go 5 high, and I can answer any of your questions.

Member Rozak stated I know I asked you this at the Land Use Meeting, but I wanted you tell everyone here today. Is there anywhere in Channahon where they are stacked five high?

Mr. McMahon answered presently no.

Member Weigel asked is this within your boundary as far as your boundary line agreement with Joliet.

Mr. McMahon answered no it is inside Joliet's boundary.

Member Weigel continued it is not in your jurisdiction then?

Mr. McMahon answered it is not.

Member May asked how close is this to the nearest residential area in Channahon?

Mr. McMahon answered it is about 1,000 feet.

Member May continued I think in our Land Use Meeting we had a rendering of...you could almost pull it up today and show you what it would look like five high. You will be able to see that from Route 6 as you are entering Channahon when you see the "Welcome to Channahon" sign, won't you?

Mr. McMahon answered if you went five high you sure would. Right now the three high is about the top of the tree line. At this time in the winter you can definitely see them through the trees. If you go five high it would definitely be about the tree line.

Member May asked and how close is that to our new wonderful, beautiful preserve that the people of Channahon enjoy?

Mr. McMahon answered a couple of hundred feet. I guess, very close.

Member May stated thank you.

County Executive Walsh said thank you Mr. McMahon. Next we have Ms. Helen Kapla, would you like to speak?

Ms. Helen Kapla stated my name is Helen Kapla, 25018 W. Willow Drive, Plainfield. I have some additional pictures and information that I hope the Board...

County Executive Walsh asked what case?

Ms. Kapla answered #6003-S. First of all, I hope the Board has had time to review some of the comments that were made at the last two meetings and some of the pictures that were presented at that time. I have a few more pictures that I would like to present that depict the type of vehicles that are coming in on this property and previous notes, if I may.

Two weeks ago, my family attended the second meeting on the Special Use Permit for the Mr. Carl Bryant property at 14100 S. Indian Boundary, the corner of Route 126 and Indian Boundary Road. Originally 11 of the residents that back into this property attended the first meeting that was held in the evening to express our concerns. Two of the residents that didn't attend couldn't make the meeting and the other two residents are renters who have a baby and small children that they provide daycare for. Five of us were allowed to speak and tell of our concerns. As I noted at the last meeting, many of these residents were unable to attend morning meetings since they are still working or have other obligations that prevent them from attending.

Our "good neighbor" Mr. Bryant tells how he helped us correct some of the work on our existing brick pavers. This is true. He also stated that he allowed us to stay at his home in Galena. This is also true but he practically insisted that we vacation there for a few days. Several times he mentioned it and on one occasion brought pictures of that property. Was he

a "good neighbor" or just someone trying to appease us so we won't express our complaints about the brick paver business on his property?

We have noted that before the meetings, Mr. Bryant also makes sure he greets some of the counsel members that are on the Board. Is he making an unconscious statement to the residents that he is friends with the Board Members and because of his ownership of many properties in the area has had the opportunity to appear before them on a number of occasions?

Residential properties that are along the Indian Boundary Road were brought up. These people live across the street from Mr. Bryant's property and that side of the property is blocked from view by mature pine trees. The nine properties that have documented their complaints are homes that the back yards face directly in the Fuerte Business. My home is approximately in the center of that property. The previous owner of my home planted bushes on the other side of our fence, which at the time was still within our property line. The chain link fences on the property on either side of us extend past our fencing, but the surveyor's stakes are no longer there. These bushes over time have matured and other growth has intertwined within them. I am telling you this because in the summer, these bushes bloom and somewhat hide what I consider a construction site.

Mr. Bryant planted about eleven Christmas type trees backing a few of the properties. These trees are either in the process of dying or are already dead. I have previously presented notes on the activity that goes on at this business. On a few occasions, there are trucks that arrived as early as 6:00 a.m. In fact, a dump truck was heard Wednesday morning and a pickup truck was on the property at 6:45 a.m. Last meeting it was stated that the trucks come in around 7:00 a.m. to pick up material in the morning and little activity happens during the day. I have previously documented some of their activities and turned them into the boards at the last two meetings. There are many days that there is continuous activity from trucks, bobcats, and sounds coming from where material is being dumped into the dumpster. Looking back on some of my notes, last year there was only a couple of months when there was no activity or very limited activity. Since the residents don't use their backyards or try to barbeque as much during the winter months the bothersome things is looking at the site. We all have limited the spring-summer-early fall activities on our properties to avoid the dust, noise and diesel fuel fumes from the flatbed trucks, semi's, bobcats and so on. We would once again like to be able to enjoy our yards, open our windows weather permitting and not have to hear the noise and sounds of trucks and loaders as well as viewing an unsightly work area. I have again presented previous notes to the board and a few more pictures.

It is my hope that if the Special Use Permit is granted, that all of the residents backing into this property receive a copy of the conditions that are to be met. The planting of the five foot pine trees will be a start and we can come to terms with the noise, dust and fumes as we go forward.

County Executive Walsh stated thank you very much, any questions?

Member Argoudelis stated I know you spoke before Land Use as well, just in your last comments that in this case there were eight conditions set forward from Mr. Bryant to comply with and you are stating that if he complies with those eight conditions with regard to planting

the pine trees...he had agreed to five, six foot tall evergreen type trees versus pine trees. So if he complies with those eight conditions... then you would feel that, that is a satisfactory solution?

Ms. Kapla responded I don't have a copy of what the other conditions were. I would like to have a copy of that for our records. What I am saying is that there still will be noise, there will still be the fumes that we have to put up with and the various types of trucks and vehicles that come into the properties, but hopefully we could work out something where that could be diminished some.

Member Argoudelis responded alright...so...okay. I don't know why you haven't gotten a copy of those, but I am sure we could provide those to you, but if he agrees to all eight, which he has in front of Land Use, then that is one way we could alleviate the concerns and the problems in the area.

Ms. Kapla responded speaking for myself that will be a good start.

Member Argoudelis responded okay, I appreciate that. Thank you.

Member Moustis stated I just want to get a clarification and...the complaints I get on these types of facilities in my area are really the hours of operation and all the noise they make. Not only in the summertime, but also in the winter they will run plow operations, they are banging on their plow blades to get ice off of it and so forth. So hours of operation do concern me. I just ask whatever the County Ordinance is, which I am not quite sure what it is. Is it from six in the morning until...can anyone tell me what it is? We don't have a requirement of hours of operation. This is my concern that these operations will start at 4:30, 5:00 in the morning and they make a lot of noise getting started, yes they will be gone as they leave the yard, but in the winter the same types of activities...the activities will go on in the winter and it will be quite noisy waking up everyone. So without some guidelines of hours of operation on this type of development, I am going to absolutely be a no vote. I wanted to express my concerns. Thank you.

Member Weigel stated we could add a condition in there for hours of operation, if that is what Member Moustis would like.

County Executive Walsh asked gentlemen did you have a question of this lady? Did you sign in? That is okay we will bring you up afterwards. Any other questions from Ms. Kapla?

Member May stated if the hours could be changed to be more reasonable, then would that make you a little happier?

Ms. Kapla responded I don't know if it would make me totally happy, because there is still going to be a lot of the noise and fumes from the trucks coming in during the day. That is still going to be a little bit problematic.

Member May stated I was with you at Land Use, I support you, but I don't...I mean, we can't make the company go away.

Ms. Kapla responded I understand that...

Member May continued what we have to do is make it a little...

Ms. Kapla stated easier for us live within that area and be able to use our yards in the summertime without having a lot of activity going on that is going to prevent us from using those yards.

Member Konicki stated regarding the fumes, do the trucks enter that yard and just like stay there or sit there idling...

Ms. Kapla responded they are there a very brief time I would have to admit. They are either loading or unloading materials and during that time there is some idling.

Member Konicki continued but that is the only type of idling. So in other words idling is just...it is not like they are really having the trucks sit there and continue idling.

Ms. Kapla stated they are not continuously going around the property and causing that type of ruckus.

Member Konicki continued obviously we would have the ability here this morning to impose limitations on the hours of operation. I can't think of, but I am wondering if you could think of any additional conditions we could add to address the noise or the fumes?

Ms. Kapla stated I wish that our other residents were here and giving me some ideas, but at this time I cannot.

Member Kusta stated I just have one quick question and I apologize for not know the answer to this, but what came first the residents or the business?

Ms. Kapla stated this particular business has been there for about four years, maybe five years. Prior to that, the property was leased by a wholesale nursery and that was property that we didn't have a complaint on. They did say that there were trucks and deliveries made there, but we never had a problem with the noise or activity that went on at that time. So this property has been there about four, maybe five years.

Member Argoudelis stated yes, in your packet the eight conditions are on the second page of that if Board Members want to take a look at it now. There are conditions that staff had come up with to alleviate any...alleviate any issue that would come up with regard to outdoor storage, storage has to be away from the homes, etc. But I know this property well. I grew up within a mile of it and I live within a half mile of it today. It is a landscape business that is run out of. They come in first thing in the morning in the summertime and they leave, start their trucks up, load up, go to their job sites and come in, in the evening as any landscape business would be. This particular property has been owned by the Bryant family for as long as I know. It has been zoned Industrial since the 1950's and one type of industrial use or another has operated on this property all of these years. Now this particular landscape use, they have asked for a variance and they have agreed with the eight conditions. They have agreed to put...most importantly to...there is a hedge row along the west side of the property

which is the backside of the neighborhood that the speaker lives in. That hedge row has some gaps in it and they have agreed to plant five to six foot tall evergreen trees in that area. So given that...give that this has been an industrial, zoned "I" since 1950 and there have been various industrial uses there, Mr. Bryant does own other properties in Plainfield and his history is to keep well maintained properties. I think anybody in Plainfield could testify to that. He has worked as a good neighbor. He readily agreed to the eight conditions and Land Use recommended approval of this as the speaker is saying if we can get the screen going and work on these other things and work together, but trucks starting up in the morning at a landscape business to go to work, that is part of the business. I mean, I don't know how else there are going to operate their business if they can't start their trucks up in the morning, drive out to their job sites, that's dependent on the time the sun rises. There is not a snow plowing operation, so pretty much, the property is dead from this time of the year until April. So, obviously I support this strongly in our district. It is a reasonable use, and the eight conditions will alleviate the major concerns that could occur, especially the screen.

Ms. Kapla stated I would like to make one correction to something you said. You said they come in in the morning and they load their trucks or get their material or that and they come back later in the day to do whatever they have to do. This is not totally true, they do do that, but also during the day there is a bobcat that works almost constantly on some days. If you had referred back to some of my notes that I have presented, on a daily basis for awhile you would see that is quite a bit of activity going on during the day.

Member Traynere stated I just had a point of clarification I guess. It was asked earlier which was there first the business or the homes. Member Argoudelis talked about how it had been zoned industrial since 1950. How long have the homes been there?

Ms. Kapla answered the homes were built around 1977.

Member Dralle asked is this operation seven days a week?

Ms. Kapla answered they don't work on Sundays and there is only occasional work on Saturday.

Member Dralle replied so it is basically a five day a week operation. Maybe that would be something (inaudible) but I think that might be something you want to include in the conditions.

Member Konicki stated in terms of which was there first, I want to make sure I understand this correctly. For a long time there was a wholesale nursery there and that use of the property did not cause problems for the neighbors am I correct?

Ms. Kapla answered that is correct.

Member Konicki continued this particular use started about four years ago and that is when the problems you described with the dust, the hours, the noise, the fumes, that is when that started for you. So it is this particular use that has created the problems. The use that was there...here is my...correct me if I am wrong, the use that was there when the homes

came in was a different use and it was a compatible use in the sense that it didn't cause these types of problems, is that correct?

Ms. Kapla answered okay now, there were several different uses on that property before the nursery. I was not a property owner at that time, in that area, so I don't know if there had been problems prior to that. When the nursery was there, none of my neighbors have told me of any problems that existed with the nursery. When I moved in, the nursery was there and we had no problems with them.

Member Konicki stated okay you have identified problems with fumes, noise and hours. You also mentioned dust, am I correct?

Ms. Kapla replied yes.

Member Konicki continued and the dust wasn't there with the wholesale nursery either?

Ms. Kapla replied they did say that they had trucks and that that came in, you know to pick up trees or whatever and we never had a problem with the dust from that.

Member Konicki continued I have one of these uses in my district and that is why I was not able to support it in Committee. I mean, certainly I think if this...if other Board Members are willing to support this this morning, they certainly need to impose reasonable hours. I think they ought to add another condition in absolutely banning commercial snow plowing. Because a former Board Member had one of these uses go in next to him, Mr. Hugh Stipan and he would describe the trucks coming back after spending the dark hours of the night plowing, you know supermarket parking lots and then come back, who knows 2:00 or 3:00 in the morning and then they would get on site and take a big, heavy sledge hammer and smack the blades to get the snow off before it turned to ice. Horrible, horrible, horrible noise problems. In my district with this type of use, I have seen first hand the problems with dust and it is kind of unavoidable. They may bring in piles of gravel or big stones and then they dump it there is just a poof of dust, every time they take a bobcat and shovel up a load and take it to a site there is a huge plume of dust. I am not comfortable with this, but for the Board Members who are going to vote for this, I think you ought...as a matter of courtesy to these people impose hours, absolutely ban snowplowing and find some wording in there to enable us to get a handle on the dust problem. Make sure the applicant is doing everything reasonable to keep that down, so if it starts to get out of hand, we have a handle to get back in there and help the residents, because in my district when we located one of these we didn't put such a handle on there and my residents have suffered terribly. I have seen this screens clogged with this kind of dust. So I can't support it as it is currently proposed, for a vote this morning.

Ms. Kapla stated to my knowledge there is no snowplowing going on at that facility.

Member Konicki stated if you don't ban it, they could start.

Ms. Kapla stated I understand that.

Member Goodson stated thank you County Executive Walsh. I just want to say I am fairly familiar with this case as the residents had contacted Representative Tom Cross's office

as long ago as two years ago. I just want to say that the owner has been very agreeable to addressing each complaint as they have come on a case by case basis. I mean he has tried very hard to be a good neighbor and I would expect nothing different moving forward. As complaints have occurred, he has received calls from our office and he has tried to work with the neighbors and Member Argoudelis mentioned this is a person that owns a lot of different properties in Plainfield and that has been all of my experience with him, is that he has tried very hard to work and work through any disagreements.

Member Maher stated I just have a question and maybe you can answer this, (inaudible) you stated the business has been there for 15 or 20 years (inaudible) what specifically...I am trying to go through this information...

County Executive Walsh asked who are you addressing your question to?

Member Maher stated I am actually addressing to Member Goodson. I tired to find out what specifically this property (inaudible).

Member Goodson replied yes.

Member Weigel stated the present use is he constructs playground equipment for park districts and he brings his equipment to this site and stockpiles it and when they have a project they come in and gather the equipment they need and take it out to a park and they assemble it. It is not really landscaping, but there maybe some side uses where they may bring back sod or something like that from their primary business. You could ask Mr. Bryant, he is here if he has more comments concerning that.

Member Maher stated they are asking us to allow (inaudible).

Member Goodson stated they are trying to come into compliance with the County.

Member Argoudelis stated just a little more clarification. There is just...obviously we have Committees where we get a fuller story of things, but I don't want the Board to be misinformed. For example, the issue of dust was addressed at the Land Use Committee. They have put crushed asphalt down, which has helped with the dust issue. Staff analyzed this, staff has gone out to the site, staff did a good job of identifying the issues that go along with granting this variance and that is how they came up with eight conditions. The applicant readily agreed to those eight conditions and has in fact started to implement those conditions. The resident who is speaking today, is mostly concerned that these conditions be enforced and that we comply with them...so...I don't like the misinformation of there are mushroom clouds of dust out there and stuff like that. All of those issues have been addressed. The eight conditions, the staff did a good job of identifying those concerns in those eight conditions.

Member Moustis stated now I'm getting, I don't want to say confused, but I am getting a little confused. So this is not a landscaping yard, even though we are giving them a Special Use for landscaping, their contractor's yard? But it says contractor's yard and landscaping, so are they running a landscaping operation from there or not. Because if it is not a traditional landscaping area that makes a difference.

Mr. Curt Paddock stated this particular case we initiated an enforcement action against the current use.

Member Moustis asked which was what?

Mr. Paddock responded the current use is as a landscaping and contractor's yard. That is how we would characterize the current use under the ordinance. This was a use that the owner had his tenants begin to engage in prior to receiving the proper zoning entitlements. This entitlement to engage in the use I just described would only be granted by your passing this Special Use. The prior use, the most recent prior use of the property had been what the zoning ordinance would characterize as a nursery operation. When the nursery operation was under use it was in compliance. When the current tenant began to engage in the form of use they are currently engaging in, they had come into violation because, given their particular industrial category that landscaper's contractor yard was not an authorized use. We took the enforcement action as we always do, we then informed the property owner how to come into compliance. The way to come into compliance was to apply for a Special Use to authorize the landscaping contractor's yard that is what is before you. You have it all in your packet, but I would indicate, just again for the purpose of clarity and transparency that at the initial level of staff analysis and the recommendation that was given to the Planning and Zoning Commission this staff recommended against the granting of this Special Use Permit. However, as we always do, we in our service function, pointed out to the Planning and Zoning Commission and subsequently to the Land Use Committee of the Board, that should they decide to recommend approval of the Special Use Permit, here are conditions that we would offer.

Member Moustis stated I just want to get some additional clarification. It is an industrial zoning here. Is it I-....

Ms. Eileen Frantz, Land Use Department stated it is zoned I-1.

Member Moustis stated so under I-1 is a contractor's yard permitted?

Ms. Frantz answered only with a Special Use Permit.

Member Moustis continued so I am just curious what is an I-1? What do we allow on an I-1? It seems to me the misperception is we have these industrial zonings and we go from I-1 to I-3 correct, and of course, they have various "I" right uses. People think well industrial is industrial. What typically would be allowed in I-1?

Ms. Frantz answered a contractor's shop would be allowed in I-1, various assembly and manufacturing type uses. One thing that is significant that is not allowed by right is outdoor storage or contractor's yards.

Member Moustis stated that under all the I...everyone needs special use...

Ms. Frantz answered in I-1.

Member Moustis stated for outdoor storage?

Ms. Frantz replied right.

Member Moustis stated that is not the case for I-3? I thought everyone needed...

Ms. Frantz stated it varies in some districts you can have some outdoor storage, but I think it is uncontained bulk materials, like piles of gravel and sand that you would always need it for.

Member Moustis stated so on this currently, because I'm getting the impression that there is assembly going on of park playground type of equipment or recreational equipment, and I don't quite understand on the landscaping aspect when they were operating what made you take action.

Ms. Frantz stated when they were first cited, you know, I think the case there was an argument that this was similar to the nursery stock, special use permit that was granted. We reviewed that and determined that this was just different from the nursery stock. I believe they store some trucks out there, there may be occasional equipment that is stored out there. Occasionally some of the products that they use to build the playgrounds with might be out there as well and some other miscellaneous, more landscaping type materials, more what you would typically see with a traditional landscape business may also be associated with the use and be out there as well.

Member Moustis continued I don't mean to be giving you a hard time here, I mean I am really trying to get clarification. So your determination is if there is landscaping materials there, that it is a landscaping operation? You know what I'm saying? There is a difference between...clearly outdoor storage is an issue there. I will acknowledge that. But certainly having certain landscaping materials there doesn't necessarily mean they are a landscaping operation from there. And you mentioned trucks, are they not allowed to park their trucks on their property? To store trucks on the property? I am assuming that they are there overnight or whatever. I don't quite understand what you meant there.

Ms. Frantz answered it is difficult in some of these circumstances because of the permitted uses that are allowed in I-1. You could be a landscaper and be permitted to just have your shop in I-1, but not have anything stored outside. When you are starting to park several trucks associated with the landscape business or equipment, that is what kicks in the need for outdoor storage for a contractor's yard.

Member Moustis stated but having equipment on site, things parked. Here again, I am going to get back to...I guess what I am asking is...did you observe the actual landscaping operation from that site?

Ms. Frantz responded I am not the inspector who went out there. When I went out there they had ceased most of their outdoor storage.

Mr. Paddock answered the answer is yes it was observed and this is the representation of the application that, that is the business they are engaged in. You don't have to take our word for it, it was the applicant.

Member Moustis stated I think you told them that Mr. Paddock.

Mr. Paddock answered no they told us, that is the nature of their business...they acknowledge that the nature of the business had changed from its prior use.

Member Moustis stated I'm getting more confused because I heard something different earlier. So I actually had the Chairman of the Committee say that they are basically assembling playground equipment and they really don't do landscaping, but they do outdoor storage and they may bring materials back. That is what I heard from the Chairman. But you are saying that is not correct?

Mr. Paddock stated what I am saying is that....

Member Moustis stated I don't want to argue....

Mr. Paddock continued we could best give the representation of the nature of the business from the applicant. But, what they told us is that they have various materials that are related to their landscaping business that are stored at the site. That they collect them and place them on trucks and drive to the sites of their clients to engage in their landscaping activities.

Member Adamic asked what are their hours of operation?

Mr. Paddock answered we have been, as was indicated that under the ordinance there is not presently a stipulation of allowed hours of operation. The matter has come up about possibly including this as an additional condition to the Special Use, Ms. Frantz you spoke briefly with the applicant as to what they would regard as their current hours of operation. Did they share that information with you?

Ms. Frantz answered I spoke with the owner of the property, the operator of the business is not present, we discussed possibly 6:30 a.m. as a start time and 8:00 p.m. as an end time. We did not talk about whether it was week day versus weekend. We can prohibit weekends.

Member Argoudelis stated I think to clarify some of the confusion here. The business has not changed, the company has not changed, the tenant has not changed during this period. Originally, this tenant was using this property for landscape materials, and storage in compliance with the original use. His business expanded where he builds parks, playground type of parks with pavers and other landscape materials and that is the part, as he expanded his business, he never came in to get a Special Use Permit to do that. That is where he fell out of compliance. That started this whole process. So I think we need to clarify that. Then if you look at the issue that comes up with that, as Ms. Frantz pointed out, then you get into the whole issue of the outdoor storage issue. If you look at your eight conditions, most of these conditions have to do with screening the outdoor storage. This site is located on Route 126. It is a major highway that runs through the heart of Plainfield. The conditions have outdoor storage is limited to the east portion of the property...of the interior road. Applicant must fill in the gaps in the screening, outdoor storage must be screen on all sides at all times, open burning is prohibited and landscape waste shall not be transported to the site. So all of the

items that go along with granting the special use, all of those concerns have been addressed by staff's eight conditions. The applicant has said fine. We will do all of those things.

Mr. Paddock stated let me be clear; I am not in any sense advocating. I am merely trying to provide information. On any special use permit, the decision that's before the Board is one, certainly would the conditions be appropriate, but also you are asking yourself is the underlying use that is going to be authorized by the Special Use Permit consistent with the neighborhood surroundings and the other criteria stipulated in the ordinance. So what you need to make a decision about is that now that the nature of the use is proposed to be changed, is that a use together with the conditions that would be imposed upon that use, something that you want to authorize?

Member Rozak stated I have a question on the rewrite that we are working on, because we have done so much, is this going to change? Is this going to be a buy right in it or will it stay the same? Would they still have to go through the same process?

Ms. Frantz stated I believe at this point we have not proposed any changes to outdoor storage in I-1.

Member Dralle stated I would like to apologize ahead of time, part of this is my fault for not looking at my Board packet and going to the actual aerial that was presented. I was sort of confused as to why we didn't have any additional concerns regarding this facility. But I think once you look...if you look at the aerial that was taken, this is a pie shaped entity right here with major highways on both sides. It seems to be a real appropriate use for what we have. I think this is something that certainly can be supported with the conditions that are being put forth, unless there are some other issues, but it is logical. It is a large industrial portion. It is pie shaped, there is residential in the background and I think the conditions will most certainly satisfy her. I don't know if by restricting the hours of operation here, this appears to be a very large operation and if we start restricting conditions this may have a financial impact on this business and we certainly don't need to shut down any business in Will County with our current job situation.

Member Maher stated I am actually supporting what my colleague is saying here. Taking a look at the aerial photo and the fact that we actually have a business that is trying to expand. I am not inclined to start setting any policies right now that is going to stop that...it is not going to be impacting a large number of people. I think the terms and conditions and even to this latest point a lot of this is being addressed and until we get it addressed and see where it goes from there.

Member Konicki stated obviously there is support for passing this. My comments earlier were that as currently proposed with the conditions, I would not be able to support it. The additional conditions I would be looking for at a minimum would be some wording to the affect that the...and I don't think the applicant would have a problem with any of these. The first one would be that the driving surface shall be as reasonably free from the generation of dust as possible. There was a dust problem...a bad dust problem before. Apparently the applicant has put something down to make that better. But I think we ought to lock it in with a condition so that it is always maintained as a reasonably dust free driving surface. The other thing, again would be the hours of operation. There is nothing...I mean there is nothing in these

conditions put forth right now that limits the hours. I wouldn't want to see them expand into Sunday. If he can live with 6:00 a.m. until 8:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday, and apparently he can, then I think we ought to put that in as a condition so that we are again protecting our residents. I would also like to see a condition added that the premises shall not be used in connection with a commercial snowplowing operation. I realize he doesn't do that now, but he is obviously an expanding business, let's make sure he doesn't expand into commercial snowplowing. Then the fourth one I would like to see is that the Special Use Permit shall travel with the current lessee and not with the owner of the land. So that at some point the residents can look forward to perhaps getting rid of such intensive usage adjacent to their backyards.

Member Traynere stated just a question. If you are zoned I-1 are there any hours of operation associated with that?

Mr. Paddock responded no.

Ms. Kapla stated I have a comment if I may. You are saying this is an expanding business. Well that is fine, we like to see growth too. But with that comes another problem, there is going to be more work, and more noise going on in the back of our yards and even though we may have these trees that kinda prevent us from seeing what is going on, it is still going to create quite a bit of noise and quite a bit of aggravation for the residents that live behind that. If there is some way we can resolve some of that, I would be happy to go along with what they are requesting. If you see some of the pictures that I presented today, it shows the types of trucks and vehicles that come in. It also shows a little bit of what is on the grounds. I didn't bring a whole stack of pictures like I did previously, but like I said, I am not totally agreeable to everything they are saying.

Member Moustis continued the only other thing I wanted to mention about noise. I always feel there should be as much screening for noise. Certainly the landscape barriers will help with that. We do have a noise ordinance. So, as you pointed out, if they go above the noise ordinance, they could be cited.

Ms. Kapla stated the noise that comes from the property, like I said, many, many days especially during the summer months, spring and early fall, is kinda constant on a lot of the days. If you refer to some of my notes, you will see there is a lot of activity that goes on. So the noise is pretty much constant. A lot of it is from bobcats or dump trucks coming in and moving equipment and stuff around...or materials around. Like I said, that is not going to be totally solved by the conditions, it will help but it won't totally solve it.

Member Moustis stated we have a noise ordinance. I have lived next to teenager that play their music all day long and it is sometimes annoying. As long as they are within noise ordinance...I just wanted to point out that there is a noise ordinance that the County has and if they are in violation of that they could be cited.

Ms. Kapla continued one of the other things I had mentioned previously at one of the meetings is the I-1 zoning was done sometime, I think Mr. Malone said in the 1950s and the residential homes, the properties were built in 1977, so there is a difference because there are lots of residential area backing into that property now, so that should be taken into consideration too I believe.

County Executive Walsh addressed the gentleman that evidently...you wish to speak? You could. Let's try to keep it...you know, if we are going to have a Committee meeting then lets have a Committee meeting. Come on down. State your name and address.

Mr. Carl Bryant stated my name is Carl Bryant, my address is 13360 Rivercrest Drive, Plainfield. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this issue this morning. My family has had this property since 1950 and we operated a pole building business there. My father was the third in the country to build pole barns commercially and I grew up on this site. I have a picture here. It is hard to show you, but when this property was in play, there were no homes around it at all, it was all agriculture. When Plainfield came to me many years ago and said we would like to develop residential to the west, I allowed them to have an easement to my property for Whispering Creek and Indian Oaks, which is to the southeast of me. I have endeavored to be a good neighbor. When people have complained and even the lady that was just up here, I went to her home several times and I tried to placate her concerns as I have others. I have had opportunities during the booming times to put uses there that the neighbors wouldn't really like. I have had a cell tower application, I have had sign applications, I even had a gas station that wanted to go there and I have wanted to keep the property pretty much the way it is. The current tenant is and he did grow up with me, he does these little parks, he does park districts and he does kinda, maybe to clarify the landscape aspect of it is, he will have an architectural design and he will have playground equipment on the site and it will have some landscape, it will have sod, it will have bushes and it will probably have pavers and he does these all over the Chicago area. He is a responsible individual, he recycles, he has tried to answer these concerns. He disconnected the back up bell on his equipment so there wouldn't be a dinging noise when the equipment was in reverse. We want to comply, I do and he does with the conditions that have been put forward. I have no problem with them and would do that and I would certainly answer any questions you might have.

Member Konicki stated yes, thank you for coming here this morning. I know that your lessee has installed a driving surface that is reasonably dust free. Would you have any problem if we made that a condition that your lessee shall maintain a driving surface that is as reasonably free from the generation of dust as possible?

Mr. Bryant responded that is a good point. For many years, and even when my father had the business, looking at the picture I pulled up, it had crushed rock on it which has dust and in August it would be dusty and it was that way for years, even when Bork Nursery was there, and my tenant on his own volition obtained crushed asphalt and put it down and it has substantially, probably 95 percent reduced what dust was there. What happens as it is driven on and heat hits it, it bonds together and makes a good surface. You have to maintain it and he has. One thing that puzzled me a little bit, you know the think about snowplowing I have never had a plowing operation, I have no intention of doing a plowing operation.

Member Konicki stated so it doesn't sound like you would have a problem if we attached a condition that said that the driving surface shall be maintained. The crushed asphalt driving surface shall be maintained to be as reasonably free as possible from the generation of dust.

Mr. Bryant stated we have done it, we are doing it. I have no problem with it.

Member Konicki continued it is a matter of your maintaining it...it being there five years or more, but that wouldn't be a problem, correct?

Mr. Bryant responded it is not. One question I have too is, you brought up that I am the applicant for this...

Member Konicki continued I wanted to go one by one too. For each one we wanted to know whether you would have a problem or not have a problem that is why I am doing it.

Mr. Bryant responded okay.

Member Konicki continued in terms of the hours of operation, I made the comment I wouldn't...I don't think we would want to see them expand to Sundays for example. Would you have a problem with 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday?

Mr. Bryant responded no, I don't.

Member Konicki stated would you have a problem, since it is not being used for a snowplowing business and you have no intention of using it for a snowplowing business, that we attach the condition that the premises shall not be used in connection with a commercial snowplowing business.

Mr. Bryant responded it is not part of this application.

Member Konicki replied it is not a problem then?

Mr. Bryant responded no.

Member Konicki asked do you have a problem if, since we do have residents who would prefer we don't support this, that if we go forward we at least limit this Special Use Permit to your current tenant.

Mr. Bryant responded I want to be the applicant for the Special Use that is what I am. I have applied for it and I don't want...if you are putting a time line on how long I can use the business in some form, I wouldn't do that.

Member Konicki asked is it your business or your tenants?

Mr. Bryant responded we are talking about my property. It is his business but I have...

Member Konicki continued can we at least limit it to your ownership of the property.

Mr. Bryant responded I don't want to do that, I may not be around. It might be my children. Why would I do that? My father wasn't limited when he had the property and I don't see why I should be either.

Member Konicki stated at least the first three you didn't have a problem with?

County Executive Walsh stated can I ask you a question? Did you appear at the Land Use Committee Meeting when this case was brought up for discussion?

Mr. Bryant answered yes, I did.

County Executive Walsh asked was any of these questions or ideas tossed around or talked about in the Committee meeting.

Mr. Bryant answered no.

Member Rozak responded that is not true.

Mr. Bryant responded on the dust...the dust came up, but I have talked about the dust issue before.

County Executive Walsh stated the discussion amongst County Clerk Voots and the her staff here today is if all these ideas are now going to be placed here that the idea of taking this back to Committee would probably be the most advantageous where everybody could see what they are actually doing and that this gentlemen could have actually a opportunity just as he was in debate with Member Konicki on issues that he does not want to see restricted on his property. I think we operate on a Committee structure in this County Government and it definitely and this is where almost all of this discussion should have taken place.

Member Konicki stated they did for three and half hours.

County Executive Walsh stated three and half hours you had this meeting? It took three and half hours? And we just spent an hour and a half on it here?

Member Moustis stated County Executive Walsh this is a public hearing.

County Executive Walsh responded I understand that Member Moustis.

Member Moustis stated I would also like to mention that out of a 27 Member Board, seven people sit on that Committee. I understand what you are saying about Committee Members, but certainly Non-Committee Members in a public hearing would probably ask some questions. I understand your point and I might also point out to everyone here at the public hearing that no new evidence is suppose to be presented. It does seem that we are presenting new things. I understand and either way we are two hours into our meeting and we still haven't gotten very far today. So I am getting a little frustrated myself. I am going to make a motion...

County Executive Walsh responded Member Moustis I don't think we can make a motion while we are in public hearing. We can do it after we come out...

Member Moustis stated I will make a motion to come out of public hearing.

County Executive Walsh responded we still have more speakers.

Member Moustis said oh we do, we might be here for lunch.

Member Konicki continued just very quickly these issues were all discussed in the Committee but I think the Applicant had perhaps more support there than he has in the general floor and that is why those issues are getting a greater hearing here. Certainly, if the Applicant doesn't mind it going back to Committee I certainly don't.

Member Singer stated thank you County Executive Walsh. I tend to agree with some combination of what you and Member Moustis just said. I think we should remember that Mr. Bryant, although he is standing at a podium that this is not a witness stand and I think we need to stick to the issues here and either make motions we get out of here to add amendments and move on. I think we have covered this thing to its inth degree.

County Executive Walsh responded thank you. Any other comments, any other questions? Do you have anything more to say.

Mr. Bryant responded no I don't. I would like to get a vote. I went through this with Land Use and it was covered and by your own rules as it was mentioned there is no new evidence and I think we covered everything.

County Executive Walsh said thank you for your time. Our next speaker is Mr. Daniel Stinnett. Mr. Stinnett would you like to have the opportunity to speak?

Mr. Daniel Stinnett stated good morning. Thank you for your patience and service so far this morning. My name is Daniel Stinnett I am from New Lenox at 908 Bryan Trail. I just want to take a moment to introduce myself, my family and our organization. It seems like so far this process we have actually made a lot of progress. So it won't take me long. I was born and raised in New Lenox; I went to all the New Lenox grade schools and graduated from Lincoln-Way Central High School. My family came to Joliet in 1956. My Grandparents are Peter and Helen Cinquegrani who were the ones that developed McDonald. They built the Jefferson Street McDonalds which was the 13th McDonalds in the world, that my uncle owns now. My Mom owns three McDonalds, two in Lockport and one in New Lenox and my Dad has two businesses in New Lenox as well. So we just had a good time here in New Lenox, and in Will County and Joliet. A few years ago I started an organization called Lincoln-Way Community Youth Center also known as the Hub and the goal of that is to be able to influence young people in positive things and provide them a weekend entertainment that is drug free, alcohol free and allows them to express their gifts. Hopefully propels them to good things in life. So far it has been a great run and we are looking forward to doing many things in the future. I understand that with this Special Use Permit we are working towards there are conditions which I am more than willing to agree to. It is going to be some effort working with the Building and Health Department to figure exactly how we do that. But I am sure we want to do that. I appreciate your time. In the time to come, my goal is that we then should be able to build a new facility that would serve the entire Will County region and even the Southwest Chicago Suburban region for young people. I just want you to know who I am so that in the years to come I come back up here you will have an idea kind of what we have been working on over these years.

Member Singer stated just real quickly just considering our timing this morning and your affiliation with McDonald if you might be wanting to bring us lunch.

Mr. Stinnett answered you know my Grandpa he built the Cass Street McDonalds right down the street, but we don't own that anymore.

Member Singer joked I think Member Konicki could use a Happy Meal.

County Executive Walsh asked three times if there was anybody from the general public that would like to speak on these Zoning cases.

Member Weigel made a motion, seconded by Member Smith, to close Public Hearing for all Land Use cases.

Voting Affirmative were: Adamic, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Argoudelis, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-four.

No negative votes.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR ALL LAND USE CASES IS CLOSED AT 11:27 A.M.

Member Weigel stated that this case was tabled last month at the request of the District 8.

Member Weigel made a motion, seconded by Member Argoudelis, to remove Case #6014-S from the table.

Voting Affirmative were: Adamic, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Argoudelis, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-four.

No negative votes.

CASE #6014-S IS REMOVED FROM THE TABLE.

Member Weigel presented Case #6014-S, Special Use Permit for Package Liquor Sales with 2 Conditions in Joliet Township.



ORDINANCE AMENDING THE "WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS ZONING ORDINANCE"
Adopted and Approved September 9, 1947 as amended

WHEREAS, the Planning and Zoning Commission of Will County, Illinois has recommended the reclassification of a certain area within the County as hereinafter described; and

WHEREAS, it appears that such recommendation was based upon a duly advertised hearing by said Planning and Zoning Commission of Will County affecting property located in Joliet Township where such area is situated; and

WHEREAS, it appears that due notice of the time and place of such hearing was published in a paper of general circulation in Will County, Illinois; that such hearing was duly and properly held, and that report thereof has been made to this Board within thirty days after such hearing;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the County Board of Will County, Illinois that:

Section 1. That the "Will County Zoning Ordinance", approved September 9, 1947, as amended, be and the same is hereby amended by reclassifying the area described as follows:

SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR PACKAGED LIQUOR SALES
WITH TWO (2) CONDITIONS
Legal Description

PARCEL A: THAT PRT OF THE S 320 FT OF THE W 817 FT OF THE N 60 ACRES OF THE W1/2 OF THE SW1/4 OF SEC. 13, T35N-R10E., LYG SE OF THE SE'LY RIGHT OF WAY OF (FAI RT 6) I-80 AS DEDICATED BY DOC 1015776. PARCEL B: THE S 27 ACRES OF THE N 60 ACRES OF THE W1/2 OF THE SW1/4 OF SEC 13, T35N-R10E. (EX THRFM THE S 320 FT OF THE W 817 FT THROF & EX THAT PRT CONVEYED TO THE STATE OF IL BY DOC 1001444. EX THAT PRT LYG N OF THAT PRT CONVEYED TO THE STATE OF IL BY DOC 1001444.) PARCEL C: THE E1/2 OF THE S 20 ACRES OF THE W1/2 OF THE SW1/4 OF SEC 13, T35N-R10E., LYG S OF THE I-80, (EX THRFM ONE ACRE AT THE SE COR OF SD E1/2.) (EX THE W 5 ACRES OF THE E1/2 OF THE S1/4 OF THE W1/2 OF THE SW1/4 OF SEC 13, T35N R10E.) CONSOLIDATION PER PET #2001-009 NDA: REVISED LEGAL DESCRIPTION/ACREAGE CHANGE PER NEW # ASSIGNMENT OF -037. THIS PIN STAYS THE SAME. REF# 7646. 07-23-04 LW (ACREAGE WAS 10.867)

Section 2. That the County Clerk shall alter the map of said territory described in Subsection 3.1, Section 3 of said Will County Zoning Ordinance to indicate such revised classification and shall certify such alteration by her signature and the date thereof, file the same and make available for public reference.

Section 3. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon its passage and approval as provided by law (or passage, approval and publication as provided by law).

CASE NO: 6014-S

APPELLANT: LDA Family Limited Partnership
Dwight D. Sherman, General Partner
Joy Schwerman, Lessee; Agent
Connoisseur Encounters Company, Inc.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes___ No___ Pass_____

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Weigel made a motion, seconded by Member Smith, to approve a Special Use Permit for Package Liquor Sales with 2 Conditions in Joliet Township.

Voting Affirmative were: Adamic, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Argoudelis, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-four.

No negative votes.

SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR PACKAGE LIQUOR SALES WITH 2 CONDITIONS IN JOLIET TOWNSHIP IS APPROVED

Member Weigel presented Case #5995-S3V2, Special Use Permit for a Contractor’s yard (Lot 6 and 7) with 2 Conditions; Special Use Permit for a Residence of Proprietor, Caretaker or Watchman (Lot 6) with 3 Conditions; Special Use Permit for Camper, Recreational Vehicle and Bus Repair (Lot 7) with 2 Conditions; Variance for Screening of Outdoor Storage, Section 6.1-9-6 (Lot 6 & 7) in New Lenox Township.



ORDINANCE AMENDING THE “WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS ZONING ORDINANCE”
Adopted and Approved September 9, 1947 as amended

WHEREAS, the Planning and Zoning Commission of Will County, Illinois has recommended the reclassification of a certain area within the County as hereinafter described; and

WHEREAS, it appears that such recommendation was based upon a duly advertised hearing by said Planning and Zoning Commission of Will County affecting property located in New Lenox Township where such area is situated; and

WHEREAS, it appears that due notice of the time and place of such hearing was published in a paper of general circulation in Will County, Illinois; that such hearing was duly and properly held, and that report thereof has been made to this Board within thirty days after such hearing;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the County Board of Will County, Illinois that:

Section 1. That the "Will County Zoning Ordinance", approved September 9, 1947, as amended, be and the same is hereby amended by reclassifying the area described as follows:

**SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR CONTRACTORS YARD
WITH TWO (2) CONDITIONS (Parcel 1 and 2)**

**SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR RESIDENCE OF PROPRIETOR, CARETAKER OR WATCHMAN
WITH THREE (3) CONDITIONS (Parcel 1)**

**SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A CAMPER, R.V. AND BUS REPAIR SHOP LOT 7
WITH FOUR (4) CONDITIONS (Parcel 2)**

VARIANCE FROM SCREENING REQUIREMENTS OF SECTIONS 6.1-9-6 (Parcel 1 and 2)

**PARCEL ONE (1) 08-28-402-004
PARCEL TWO (2) 08-28-402-003
LEGAL DESCRIPTION ATTACHED**

Section 2. That the County Clerk shall alter the map of said territory described in Subsection 3.1, Section 3 of said Will County Zoning Ordinance to indicate such revised classification and shall certify such alteration by her signature and the date thereof, file the same and make available for public reference.

Section 3. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon its passage and approval as provided by law (or passage, approval and publication as provided by law).

CASE NO: 5995-S3V2

**APPELLANT: First Bank of Manhattan as Trustee
Trust Agreement Dated December 12, 2007
Trust No. 547
Lloyd Bisping- 100%- Owner**

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes ___ No ___ Pass _____

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Weigel made a motion, seconded by Member Kusta, to approve a Special Use Permit for a Contractor's Yard (Lot 6 and 7) with 2 Conditions in New Lenox Township.

Voting Affirmative were: Adamic, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Argoudelis, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-four

No negative votes.

SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A CONTRACTOR'S YARD (LOT 6 AND 7) WITH 2 CONDITIONS IN NEW LENOX TOWNSHIP IS APPROVED.

Member Weigel made a motion, seconded by Member Traynere, to approve a Special Use Permit for a Residence of Proprietor, Caretaker, or Watchman (Lot 6) with 3 Conditions as amended in New Lenox Township.

Voting Affirmative were: Adamic, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Argoudelis, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-three.

Voting Negative were: Konicki. Total: One.

SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A RESIDENCE OF PROPRIETOR, CARETAKER, OR WATCHMAN (LOT 6) WITH 3 CONDITIONS AS AMENDED IN NEW LENOX TOWNSHIP IS APPROVED.

Member Weigel made a motion, seconded by Member Maher, to approve a Special Use Permit for Camper, Recreational Vehicle and Bus Repair (Lot 7) with 4 Conditions in New Lenox Township.

Voting Affirmative were: Adamic, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Argoudelis, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-four.

No negative votes.

SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR CAMPER, RECREATIONAL VEHICLE AND BUS REPAIR (LOT 7) WITH 4 CONDITIONS IN NEW LENOX TOWNSHIP IS APPROVED.

Member Weigel made a motion, seconded by Member McPhillips, to approve a Variance for Screening of Outdoor Storage, Section 6.1-9-6 (Lot 6 & 7) in New Lenox Township.

Voting Affirmative were: Adamic, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Argoudelis, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-four.

No negative votes.

VARIANCE FOR SCREENING OF OUTDOOR STORAGE, SECTION 6.1-9-6 (LOT 6 & 7) IN NEW LENOX TOWNSHIP IS APPROVED.

Member Weigel presented Case #6003-S, Special Use Permit for a Contractor’s Yard and Landscape Outdoor Storage with 8 Conditions in Plainfield Township.



ORDINANCE AMENDING THE “WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS ZONING ORDINANCE”
Adopted and Approved September 9, 1947 as amended

WHEREAS, the Planning and Zoning Commission of Will County, Illinois has recommended the reclassification of a certain area within the County as hereinafter described; and

WHEREAS, it appears that such recommendation was based upon a duly advertised hearing by said Planning and Zoning Commission of Will County affecting property located in Plainfield Township where such area is situated; and

WHEREAS, it appears that due notice of the time and place of such hearing was published in a paper of general circulation in Will County, Illinois; that such hearing was duly and properly held, and that report thereof has been made to this Board within thirty days after such hearing;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the County Board of Will County, Illinois that:

Section 1. That the “Will County Zoning Ordinance”, approved September 9, 1947, as amended, be and the same is hereby amended by reclassifying the area described as follows:

SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A CONTRACTOR’S YARD
WITH LANDSCAPE OUTDOOR STORAGE WITH EIGHT (8) CONDITIONS
Part of PIN # 03-17-200-008
LEGAL DESCRIPTION

THAT PART OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 17, NORTH OF THE INDIAN BOUNDARY LINE, IN TOWNSHIP 36 NORTH, AND IN RANGE 9 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, IN WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: BEGINNING AT THE INTERSECTION OF THE CENTERLINE OF INDIAN BOUNDARY ROAD AND THE EAST LINE OF WHISPERING CREEK SUBDIVISION UNIT ONE, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED APRIL 23, 1976 AS DOCUMENT NO. R76-11538; THENCE NORTH 0 DEGREES 51 MINUTES 59 SECONDS EAST ALONG SAID EAST LINE OF UNIT ONE 636.80 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 88 DEGREES 49 MINUTES 04 SECONDS EAST 196.00 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 0 DEGREES 51 MINUTES 59 SECONDS WEST PARALLELL WITH THE AFORESAID EAST LINE OF UNIT ONE 420.47 FEET TO THE AFORESAID CENTERLINE OF INDIANT BOUNDARY ROAD; THENCE SOUTH 43 DEGREES 11 MINUTES 09 SECONDS WEST ALONG SAID CENTERLINE 291.12 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

Section 2. That the County Clerk shall alter the map of said territory described in Subsection 3.1, Section 3 of said Will County Zoning Ordinance to indicate such revised classification and

shall certify such alteration by her signature and the date thereof, file the same and make available for public reference.

Section 3. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon its passage and approval as provided by law (or passage, approval and publication as provided by law).

CASE NO: 6003-S

**APPELLANT: Carl Bryant-Owner
Carl Buck, Attorney of Rathbun,
Cservenyak & Kozel, LLC**

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes___ No___ Pass_____

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Weigel stated there has been discussion here to add additional conditions. I would add the additional condition number 3, hours of operation 6:30 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday. Condition 4 that the driving surface be...

County Executive Walsh asked you already have eight conditions; don't you want to start with nine and ten?

Member Weigel stated right, nine...

County Executive Walsh stated nine on the first one, ten on this one?

Member Weigel continued the driving area would be kept dust free as much as possible and Condition 11 would be no commercial snowplowing on this facility. I would amend the conditions for that and I so move.

Member Weigel made a motion, seconded by Member Konicki, to amend the original requests.

Member Maher stated I don't think we should put an 8:00 time frame on this. I mean if we are going to put a time frame on this, the sun stays up during the summer until well after 9:00 and so to go in and say we are gonna just go in and put a 6:00 to 8:00 time frame...I think it is inappropriate. I think we are stepping over the boundaries. As you take a look at the lot on this, and I understand the noise, condition and things like that, but I really don't think we need to get into telling a business what their time frame is.

Member Argoudelis stated on the surface some of these conditions sound reasonable, but I agree with Member Maher. On a particular day you could be on a job and it could run really late and you could be coming in there at 9:30 in the middle of July. Hours of operation, especially on

this type of a business, we all know they start very early and they usually end very late. I think the only of the additional conditions I would suggest we support is maintaining the dust free conditions as well as possible. That seemed to be the main concern of the neighbor. They weren't talking about the hours of operation or anything else and if they...so I think that should be the only additional restriction.

Member Konicki stated I think we will probably have to vote on these one by one. Regarding the hours of operation, I mean this literally adjacent to residential. Not across the street, it is adjacent. There are school children; there are children who live in these homes who go to bed earlier than 9:00 or 9:30. You have to balance the equities between allowing him the use he wants and having at least the adjoining properties fit for people with children to occupy. He agreed to the 6:00 to 8:00. So to make arguments that he himself is not even making and leaving these people who live adjacent to it open to these such late hours. I don't think that's reasonable. Government has to balance equities. It can't be all well we don't want to impose something on this issue. You also have to protect your residents. You have to find a balance; you can't be too much in one persons' corner or too much in the other side's corner. I think when I asked him for the hours and he agreed to them, we struck a proper balance. That is still pretty late, but it is going to allow him to operate his business and it gives at least some protection to the people who live adjacent to this use. I would certainly support those hours.

Member Rozak stated as far as allowing new evidence, I never heard any evidence about school children. I don't know who lives in those houses there and I never heard anything about school children. For me the bottom line is...this is zoned I. It has been zoned I since the 1950s it has worked without these hours until now. I would be a no on that.

Member Argoudelis stated this is so arbitrary. I mean, lets put 6:00 to 8:00 on this one, we are going to put 7:00 to 5:00 on another one. We are just arbitrarily doing it. The owner of the property is here, but the owner of the actual business isn't here to say if those hours work for him. I don't think it is our job to be the "nanny state" where we tell you, you have to have your last truck in the door at 8:00 at night. Let them run their business. It is an I zoned place. It has been there forever and I think that we are trying to micromanage private industry way too much.

County Executive Walsh stated there has been a motion and a second on the amendment. The motion that Member Weigel made was he made three amendments to the original amendment. Now if you want to back up and only make one and vote on that then you have to do it that way, otherwise we are going to vote on what the motion was.

Member Weigel stated I will withdraw my Motion. If someone wants to do them one by one. Who seconded it?

County Executive Walsh stated Member Maher seconded it. Someone make a motion and whatever amendments you want.

Member Weigel made a motion, seconded by Member Konicki, to add an additional condition approve the hours of operation from 6:30 a.m. until 8:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday.

Voting Affirmative were: Konicki. Total: One.

Voting negative votes. Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Argoudelis, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

County Executive Walsh announced, having received one vote, the motion dies.

Member Weigel made a motion, seconded by Member Goodson, to add an additional condition to maintain a dust free driving surface.

Member Smith stated as it is stated it can't be a dust free, what is reasonably dust free is what I think we should say in the motion, because dust free is not going to work.

Member Weigel stated that was my intent, it should be as dust free as much as possible.

County Executive Walsh asked is that okay with you Member Weigel and Mr. Smith?

Member Smith responded it is reasonable.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Weigel, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Konicki, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey and Wilhelmi. Total: Thirteen.

Voting Negative were: Singer, Izzo, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Argoudelis, Rozak, Zigrossi, Babich and Moustis. Total: Thirteen

Since the roll call showed a tie, County Executive Walsh cast a no vote.

County Executive Walsh announced motion to add additional condition of a reasonably dust free drive way is denied.

Member Weigel made a motion, seconded by Member Konicki to prohibit commercial snowplowing.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Weigel, Traynere, Goodson, May, Konicki, Brooks, Winfrey and Wilhelmi. Total: Ten.

Voting Negative were: Howard, Singer, Izzo, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Argoudelis, Smith, Gould, Rozak, Zigrossi, Stewart, Babich and Moustis. Total: Sixteen

Motion to add additional condition to prohibit commercial snowplowing has died.

Member Weigel stated we go back to our main motion, we do not have any amendments. Committee recommends approval of a Special Use Permit for a Contractor's Yard and Landscape Outdoor Storage with 8 Conditions. Condition 2 was amended. Committee recommends approval.

Member Weigel made a Motion, seconded by Member Smith to approve a Special Use Permit for a Contractor’s Yard and Landscape Outdoor Storage with 8 Conditions in Plainfield Township.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Argoudelis, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey and Babich. Total: Twenty-three.

Voting Negative were: Konicki and Wilhelmi. Total: Two.

SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A CONTRACTOR’S YARD AND LANDSCAPE OUTDOOR STORAGE IS APPROVED.

Member Weigel presented Case #6009-S, Special Use Permit for a Youth Center with Special Events with 2 Conditions in New Lenox Township.



ORDINANCE AMENDING THE “WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS ZONING ORDINANCE”
Adopted and Approved September 9, 1947 as amended

WHEREAS, the Planning and Zoning Commission of Will County, Illinois has recommended the reclassification of a certain area within the County as hereinafter described; and

WHEREAS, it appears that such recommendation was based upon a duly advertised hearing by said Planning and Zoning Commission of Will County affecting property located in New Lenox Township where such area is situated; and

WHEREAS, it appears that due notice of the time and place of such hearing was published in a paper of general circulation in Will County, Illinois; that such hearing was duly and properly held, and that report thereof has been made to this Board within thirty days after such hearing;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the County Board of Will County, Illinois that:

Section 1. That the “Will County Zoning Ordinance”, approved September 9, 1947, as amended, be
and the same is hereby amended by reclassifying the area described as follows:

SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A YOUTH CENTER WITH SPECIAL EVENTS
WITH TWO (2) CONDITIONS

1. Upon (fourteen) 14 days of written notice to the owner of record at their last known address, Will County Land Use Department and Will County Sheriff’s Department employees are hereby granted the right of entry in and upon the premises for the purpose

of inspecting the premises and uses thereon for compliance with the terms and conditions of the special use permit.

- 2. Parking must be brought into compliance with Section 12 of the Will County Zoning Ordinance within 90 days of approval.

LEGAL USE DESCRIPTION FOR SPECIAL USE AREA

THAT PART OF THE SOUTH 624.60 FEET OF THE NORTH 1362.32 FEET OF THE EAST HALF OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 26, TOWNSHIP 35 NORTH, RANGE 11 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: COMMENCING AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF THE STORM WATER DETENTION AREA WITHIN FAIRFIELD INDUSTRIAL PARK CONDOS PHASE II, PER DOCUMENT NUMBER R2007-176402; THENCE NORTH 00 DEGREES 00 MINUTES 00 SECONDS WEST ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID STORM WATER DETENTION AREA, 95.15 FEET; THENCE NORTH 89 DEGREES 59 MINUTES 18 SECONDS EAST 96.64 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE CONTINUING NORTH 89 DEGREES 59 MINUTES 18 SECONDS EAST 60.80 FEET; THENCE NORTH 00 DEGREES 00 MINUTES 42 SECONDS WEST 89.52 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 89 DEGREES 59 MINUTES 18 SECONDS WEST 60.80 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 00 DEGREES 00 MINUTES 42 SECONDS EAST 89.52 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING, IN NEW LENOX TOWNSHIP, WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS. Containing 0.125 acres more or less.

Section 2. That the County Clerk shall alter the map of said territory described in Subsection 3.1, Section 3 of said Will County Zoning Ordinance to indicate such revised classification and shall certify such alteration by her signature and the date thereof, file the same and make available for public reference.

Section 3. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon its passage and approval as provided by law (or passage, approval and publication as provided by law).

CASE NO: 6009-S

APPELLANT: David Stinnett

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes___ No___ Pass_____

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this _____day of_____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Weigel made a Motion, seconded by Member Gould to place the Special Use Permit for a Youth Center with Special Events with 2 Conditions in New Lenox Township is on the floor.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Argoudelis, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

Voting Negative were: Konicki. Total: One.

SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A YOUTH CENTER WITH SPECIAL EVENTS WITH 2 CONDITIONS IS ON THE FLOOR.

Member Weigel made a Motion, seconded by Member Gould to add an additional condition 3, that they must comply with Health Department regulations.

Member Singer stated just a quick question. I know there has been some discussion over the last few months about what those Health Department requests and regulations are. So in general, is Mr. Stinnett okay with those conditions?

Member Weigel stated maybe to clarify my motion, rather than regulations it should be all Ordinances administered by the Health Department.

County Executive Walsh asked ordinances instead of regulations?

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Argoudelis, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

Voting Negative were: Konicki. Total: One.

SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A YOUTH CENTER WITH SPECIAL EVENTS IS AMENDED.

Member Weigel made a Motion, seconded by Member Maher to approve a Special Use Permit for a Youth Center with Special Events with 3 Conditions in New Lenox Township as Amended.

McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Argoudelis, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

Voting Negative were: Konicki. Total: One.

SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A YOUTH CENTER WITH SPECIAL EVENTS WITH 3 CONDITIONS IS APPROVED AS AMENDED.

Member Weigel presented Case #6015-V2, Variance from Section 6.3-4 (16)b to Store Cargo Containers Five Units High Outside the Twenty-Foot Side Yard Setback & Variance from Section 6.34 (16)c for End to End Grouping from Two to Six and to Eliminate the 30 Foot Paved Access Requirement for any Side Adjacent to Pipeline Easements in Channahon Township.



ORDINANCE AMENDING THE "WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS ZONING ORDINANCE"
Adopted and Approved September 9, 1947 as amended

WHEREAS, the Planning and Zoning Commission of Will County, Illinois has recommended the reclassification of a certain area within the County as hereinafter described; and

WHEREAS, it appears that such recommendation was based upon a duly advertised hearing by said Planning and Zoning Commission of Will County affecting property located in Channahon Township where such area is situated; and

WHEREAS, it appears that due notice of the time and place of such hearing was published in a paper of general circulation in Will County, Illinois; that such hearing was duly and properly held, and that report thereof has been made to this Board within thirty days after such hearing;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the County Board of Will County, Illinois that:

Section 1. That the "Will County Zoning Ordinance", approved September 9, 1947, as amended, be and the same is hereby amended by reclassifying the area described as follows:

VARIANCE FOR END TO END GROUPING FROM 2 TO 6 AND TO ELIMINATE THE 30 FEET PAVED ACCESS REQUIREMENT FOR ANY SIDE ADJACENT TO PIPELINE EASEMENTS
(6.3-4 (16) c)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION ATTACHED

Section 2. That the County Clerk shall alter the map of said territory described in Subsection 3.1, Section 3 of said Will County Zoning Ordinance to indicate such revised classification and shall certify such alteration by her signature and the date thereof, file the same and make available for public reference.

Section 3. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon its passage and approval as provided by law (or passage, approval and publication as provided by law).

CASE NO: 6015-V2

APPELLANT: MB Financial Bank, Trust #36-86
Anthony Cavalea, III
Richard Kavanagh, Attorney of
Kavanagh, Brumley&Gorbold, LLC

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes__ No__ Pass_____

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this _____day of_____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Weigel stated the Committee recommended denial; there was a split vote on that. The Petitioner came forward and said that they cannot compete with other facilities. Other facilities do allow stacking five high. The City of Joliet objected to it. They would like this to be maybe a different use a more intensive use and Channahon did talk about it. They were not in favor of it.

Member Weigel made a motion, seconded by Member Bilotta to approve a Variance from Section 6.3-4(16)b to Store Cargo Containers Five Units High Outside the Twenty-Foot Side Yard Setback.

County Executive Walsh asked is there a Legal Objection against this? No legals?

Member May stated I know that my fellow Members, the Commissioners from my District are not in favor of allowing the stacking of five high. I am sure they will speak for themselves in a few minutes. But, once again I would like to remind everyone that at Land Use the vote was 5-2 to deny. We talked about it extensively. I would also like to remind the Board Members the reason I am against this is not only for the way it will look when you drive into Channahon. As I said before, you can see a rendering they had at Land Use to show how high this is going to be. It is also my concern that reason why is that it is not just for this particular site, which by the way is the only site I was told in our jurisdiction as Board Members that we have an opportunity to vote about the stacking and why it only has to be in Channahon I don't know, why the would consider that. But I what I said in Committee is this, that I...the decision that we make today, the one that will establish a precedent, this would be allowed throughout the County that we start to stack these five high. Someone said...this gentleman said he will not make any money if he is not allowed additional money if he is not allowed to compete. I guess my point was, this is not...our decision should not be driven by what the industry calls, but what the people of Will County desire. As this intermodal comes into our area there are lots of things that we have to discuss and I think the major one is the stacking of these containers. It was my belief that when this was first talked about years ago, that these containers would come in with goods and they would leave with goods. Now all of a sudden we are faced with well the containers aren't leaving. They have to be put somewhere. To me it is kind of like garbage, it is like business is leaving their garbage behind and the people have to put up with it. I just ask that the fellow Board Members if you would support us by denying this, because I think that in the future we do need intense discussion as Board Members on what we are going to do about cargo containers. I am just asking that you support us by denying this.

Member Gould stated thank you County Executive Walsh. In the interest of time, I will be brief. I just want to make three points. Point number one, all of the representatives of District 6 are opposed to this application. Point number two, fellow Members if you ever drive out by I-55, when you go into Cook County you see these containers stacked up five high, do we want that

here? I don't think we do. This Board has been firm and resolute that we have said three, and we have held to it. I think it is important that we hold to it today. We will send the industry a message where Will County stands. Because we were very clear that we didn't want unincorporated Will County to have these higher than that. Point number three, two months ago we opened up a new Forest Preserve. A beautiful Forest Preserve right on this road. With that proximity to this, I don't think we want to do anything which is going to increase the amount of traffic and containers upon this road. We want to keep it nice, respect it, keep it as it is. So for those reasons I would urge you to vote no.

Member Rozak stated I get to go third so you get hear a repeat of what was said. I absolutely agree with my fellow Board Members. One of my main concerns on this is opening the door, that this is a slippery slope. Once we do open this door everybody is going be knocking at it, saying that they want to stack higher than three. When we originally crafted this ordinance we took a lot of time with it. As Member Gould said we don't want it to look like Cook County. I remember that phrase being repeated over and over again when we were doing this Ordinance. As far as the three high, you know right now there is a berm there, there are trees on top of it and you still can see the top third cargo container. If you add two above that, I don't even know why we are berming or why we are screening. Member Gould said the Forest Preserve is right across the street. I went out to the site and spent a lot of time there, viewing from different areas and you can see the cargo containers. You can see them from Route 6. This is going to add, according to the staff report, 1200 more containers to this site. Also, according to the staff report, there are two points here that staff looks at in every report that they give. One of them is that the purpose is for the Applicant not to make more money and their answer to that was the purpose of the variation is based upon the desire to increase storage capacity, which will result in increased profit. Another thing they look at is the difficulty or the hardship. It does say on here that the owner developed this site knowing the site limitations. Now they want to come back and change it. I am very much against it and would agree with Member May and Member Gould.

Member Maher stated I believe we are going to be starting that discussion on whether the Ordinance should be changed or not. But currently we have one that says three. I would agree with and support my colleagues and say that until that is changed, we keep it at three, because there is no...I have not heard any really good reasons to just allow stacking just to increase the business aspect. If we want to go back and revisit the Ordinance and have that debate, I think that is a good thing to do and it is really healthy. The business will be able to come back after that debate if the Ordinances change. At this point I am going to be a no vote.

Member Moustis stated I asked probably for clarification from the District Members. I understand your position on this stacking. But there is a second variance for end to end groupings from two to six and to eliminate the 30 foot paved access. I am just interested in what the position of the District Members are on the groupings. Since we will be voting on two variances.

Member Weigel stated they are a separate issue.

Member Moustis stated I know, I am just asking.

Member Gould stated that the Village of Channahon has indicated that in Channahon they have no objections. So I will not object to that portion.

Member Rozak stated I voted against it in Committee and I did ask the Village Administrator and they did not have objections (inaudible).

County Executive Walsh responded so they are only objection is to the stacking? Correct.

Member Smith stated well the question was pretty much answered, I will be for the expansion on the footprint itself, but not on the height. Just so everyone knew we are not stopping them from bringing more in, but it is just the height issues.

Member Dralle asked how far is this from Channahon boundaries.

(Inaudible)

Member Weigel stated I would like to point out that we have a couple of letters here on desk. Industry practice is five high and according to those letters and that this property is zoned industrial and the Forest Preserve property prior to being a Forest Preserve was a strip mine or a gravel pit which was an industrial use so the whole area there is industrial. Staff did recommend approval of this change.

Member Babich stated I understand that is a natural gas pipeline. How far would this be from this facility?

County Executive Walsh stated you would have to ask staff.

Member Babich continued with all the oil pipelines that we have going through the County and the breakage we have had in Romeoville and other areas around here, I would hate to see cartons flying in the air if we had an explosion out there. I would be detrimental to people living there and the whole welfare of the County.

Mr. David Dubois, Will County Land Use Department, answered the existing pipeline does currently bisect the property. It has been that way for years. It is currently developed in that manner. The original site permit was issued on the property to develop it took that into consideration. There will be no further changes to the property that would require modification to that site plan. So the easement for the pipelines is taken into account.

County Executive Walsh asked does that answer your questions Member Babich?

(Inaudible)

Mr. Dubois responded the pipeline bisects the property. That is already taken into account on the property. It is developed with that consideration. That was addressed with the Special Use Permit process.

Member Konicki stated I will be supporting my three fellow County Board Members who oppose the use. We are allowing the Applicant to expand the business to the extent we are allowing end to end, we are just not allowing them to expand as much as he wants because we are moving to deny the additional stacking. I remember so clearly this case from when it first

came through a couple of years ago, I remember Mayor Cook, a very articulate and forceful advocate for his Village. His concern was the volume of trucks, not the weight just the bulk of these things coming in, making right turns, making left turns, backing up traffic, and he just about begged this Board to extract from Applicant longer turning lanes so these trucks could get out of the flow of traffic and traffic could keep going instead of getting backed up behind these lines of trucks making turns. Twelve hundred more trucks, 1200 more containers if we stack these and I mean, maybe if you had longer turning lanes out there, I would at least give you more...I would listen to your more carefully. But I am very concerned that we never did get from the Applicant the proper turning lanes out there and I think going five high for the reasons that my fellow Commissioner stated, in terms of the Forest Preserve being there, in terms of the entrance into the Village of Channahon and standing way above the tree line – totally inappropriate.

Member May stated I just wanted to point out that Member Weigel was referring to that letter from the Container Owners Association. The gentleman begins the sentence that he is writing “as Chairman of our International Trade Organization, called Container Owners Association whose headquarters are located in England”. I don’t really care what this guy has to say from England. So once again, I just want to remind the Board Members that this is Will County and Will County should decide what height of the cargo containers should be.

Member Wilhelmi stated I want to agree with Member Maher. Again, this should not be made on a case by case basis. If we want to change our rules and go to five high we should by Ordinance and do it throughout the County. We should not be doing it as a special use.

Voting Affirmative were: Howard, Weigel and Dralle. Total: Three

Voting Negative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Singer, Izzo, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Zigrossi, Konicki, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-two.

VARIANCE FROM SECTION 6.3-4(16) B TO STORE CARGO CONTAINERS FIVE UNITS HIGH OUTSIDE THE TWENTY-FOOT SIDE YARD SETBACK IS DENIED.

Member Weigel made a motion, seconded by Member Adamic, to approve a Variance from Section 6.3-4(16)c for End to End Grouping from Two to Six and to Eliminate the 30 Foot Paved Access Requirement for any Side Adjacent to Pipeline Easements.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

VARIANCE FROM SECTION 6.3-4(16)C FOR END TO END GROUPING FROM TWO TO SIX AND TO ELIMINATE THE 30 FOOT PAVED ACCESS REQUIREMENT FOR ANY SIDE ADJACENT TO PIPELINE EASEMENTS IS APPROVED.

Member Weigel presented Case #6018-S, Special Use Permit for a Home Daycare with 2 Conditions in Jackson Township.



ORDINANCE AMENDING THE "WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS ZONING ORDINANCE"
Adopted and Approved September 9, 1947 as amended

WHEREAS, the Planning and Zoning Commission of Will County, Illinois has recommended the reclassification of a certain area within the County as hereinafter described; and

WHEREAS, it appears that such recommendation was based upon a duly advertised hearing by said Planning and Zoning Commission of Will County affecting property located in Jackson Township where such area is situated; and

WHEREAS, it appears that due notice of the time and place of such hearing was published in a paper of general circulation in Will County, Illinois; that such hearing was duly and properly held, and that report thereof has been made to this Board within thirty days after such hearing;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the County Board of Will County, Illinois that:

Section 1. That the "Will County Zoning Ordinance", approved September 9, 1947, as amended, be and the same is hereby amended by reclassifying the area described as follows:

SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A HOME DAY CARE WITH TWO (2) CONDITIONS

1. Upon (fourteen) 14 days of written notice to the owner of record at their last known address, Will County Land Use Department and Will County Sheriff's Department employees are hereby granted the right of entry in and upon the premises for the purpose of inspecting the premises and uses thereon for compliance with the terms and conditions of the special use permit.
2. The special use permit is only valid for the current owner of record. If the property is sold, the special use permit will be null and void.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

LOT 33 IN NOEL ESTATES UNIT TWO, A SUBDIVISION OF PART OF SECTION 16, IN TOWNSHIP 34 NORTH, AND IN RANGE 10 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED AUGUST 18, 1993 AS DOCUMENT NO. R93-70931, IN WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

Section 2. That the County Clerk shall alter the map of said territory described in Subsection 3.1, Section 3 of said Will County Zoning Ordinance to indicate such revised classification and shall certify such alteration by her signature and the date thereof, file the same and make available for public reference.

Section 3. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon its passage and approval as provided by law (or passage, approval and publication as provided by law).

CASE NO: 6018-S APPELLANT: Kendrick and Ann Connor

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes___ No___ Pass_____

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Weigel made a motion, seconded by Member Rozak, to approve a Special Use Permit for a Home Daycare with 2 Conditions in Jackson Township.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR HOME DAYCARE IN JACKSON TOWNSHIP, WITH 2 CONDITIONS IS APPROVED.

Member Weigel presented Case #6021-M, Zoning Map Amendment from A-2 to R-2A in Jackson Township.



ORDINANCE AMENDING THE "WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS ZONING ORDINANCE"
Adopted and Approved September 9, 1947 as amended

WHEREAS, the Planning and Zoning Commission of Will County, Illinois has recommended the reclassification of a certain area within the County as hereinafter described; and

WHEREAS, it appears that such recommendation was based upon a duly advertised hearing by said Planning and Zoning Commission of Will County affecting property located in Jackson Township where such area is situated; and

WHEREAS, it appears that due notice of the time and place of such hearing was published in a paper of general circulation in Will County, Illinois; that such hearing was duly and properly held, and that report thereof has been made to this Board within thirty days after such hearing;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the County Board of Will County, Illinois that:

Section 1. That the “Will County Zoning Ordinance”, approved September 9, 1947, as amended, be and the same is hereby amended by reclassifying the area described as follows:

MAP AMENDMENT FROM A-2 TO R-2A

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

THE EAST 160 FEET OF THE SOUTH 293.00 FEET OF LOT 12 IN SCHOOLS TRUSTEES’ SUBDIVISION IN SECTION 16, TOWNSHIP 34 NORTH, RANGE 10 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED JANUARY 6, 1892, IN PLAT BOOK 7, PAGE 78, EXCEPTING THEREFROM THAT PART DEDICATED BY DOCUMENT NUMBER R74-0153 RECORDED JANUARY 14, 1974, IN WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS.
PIN: 10-11-16-200-031 & PT 10-11-16-200-030

Section 2. That the County Clerk shall alter the map of said territory described in Subsection 3.1, Section 3 of said Will County Zoning Ordinance to indicate such revised classification and shall certify such alteration by her signature and the date thereof, file the same and make available for public reference.

Section 3. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon its passage and approval as provided by law (or passage, approval and publication as provided by law).

**CASE NO: 6021-M APPELLANT: Joyce L. Anderson
Douglas W. Schlak, Attorney**

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes___ No___ Pass_____

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Weigel made a motion, seconded by Member Stewart, to approve a Zoning Map Amendment from A-2 to R-2A in Jackson Township.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

ZONING MAP AMENDMENT FROM A-2 TO R-2A IN JACKSON TOWNSHIP IS APPROVED.

Member Weigel presented Resolution #11-419, Appealing a Decision of the Will County Planning and Zoning Commission – Patrick O’Donnell Trust 667 and Losacco Motors.



**Land Use and Development Committee
Resolution #11-419**

**RESOLUTION OF THE WILL COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**Resolution Appealing a Decision of the Will County Planning and Zoning Commission
Patrick O'Donnell Trust 667 and Losacco Motors**

WHEREAS, on February 10, 2011, the Will County Land Use Department received a complaint regarding motor vehicle sales on the subject property identified by permanent index number 15-08-27-100-018-0000 and commonly known as 1010 S. Cedar Road, New Lenox, Illinois 60451; and

WHEREAS, Section 6.1-3-2 (d) of the Will County Zoning Ordinance identifies the following as a permitted use in the I-1 zoning district: *"Internet vehicle sales, where automobiles, trucks, motorcycles, R.V.'s, boats, or trailers are stored and distributed, but not displayed for retail sales. Outdoor storage of vehicles, including automobiles, trucks, motorcycles, R.V.'s, boats, or trailers is not permitted."*; and

WHEREAS, the Will County Zoning Administrator determined a motor vehicle dealer that includes the outdoor display of vehicles for retail sales is not a permitted use or a permitted special use in the I-1 zoning district; and

WHEREAS, Patrick O'Donnell Trust 667 and Losacco Motors, in accordance with Section 6.1-3-2 (d) of the Will County Zoning Ordinance, appealed the Zoning Administrator's determination to the Will County Planning and Zoning Commission; and

WHEREAS, on October 18, 2011, the Will County Planning Zoning Commission affirmed the determination of the Will County Zoning Administrator and that the determination was not made in error; and

WHEREAS, Patrick O'Donnell Trust 667 and Losacco Motors, in accordance with Section 6.1-3-2 (d) of the Will County Zoning Ordinance, appealed the decision of the Will County Planning and Zoning Commission to the Will County Board; and

WHEREAS, the Will County Land Use and Development Committee of the Will County Board considered the appeal from the decision of the Will County Planning and Zoning Commission.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the County Board of Will County, Illinois that this appeal is approved and Losacco Motors, with authorization from the current owner of record, shall be allowed to apply for a special use permit for a motor vehicle dealer with outdoor display of vehicles for retail sales on the property identified by permanent index number 15-08-27-100-018-0000 and commonly known as 1010 S. Cedar Road, New Lenox, Illinois 60451.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Resolution shall be in full force and effect upon its passage and approval as provided by law.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes___ No___ Pass_____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Weigel made a motion, seconded by Member Brooks, to approve Resolution #11-419.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTION #11-419 IS APPROVED.

Member Weigel presented Resolution #11-420, Authorizing Temporary Use Permit 11-24-T (Frank J. Giorano & Joshua H. Cooley of Illinois Transport, on behalf of Joseph Vinachi, Temporary Use Permit to Allow Cargo Storage).



**Land Use and Development Committee
Resolution #11-420**

**RESOLUTION OF THE WILL COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS
Authorizing Temporary Use Permit 11-24-T**

**(Frank J. Giorano & Joshua H. Cooley of Illinois Transport, on behalf of Joseph Vinachi,
Temporary Use Permit to Allow Cargo Container Storage)**

WHEREAS, the County of Will adopted the Will County Zoning Ordinance in accordance with the Illinois Compiled Statutes 55 ILCS 5/5-12001 et. seq., and

WHEREAS, Section 14.12 of the Will County Zoning Ordinance establishes certain requirements for temporary use permits, and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Administrator is authorized by the Will County Zoning Ordinance to issue temporary use permits for uses specifically authorized in particular zoning districts as temporary use permits, and

WHEREAS, Frank J. Giordano & Joshua H. Cooley of Illinois Transport, on behalf of Joseph Vinachi, submitted a temporary use permit request to allow cargo container storage to be located on the property commonly known as 27711 S. Frontage Road, Channahon, Illinois and identified by permanent index numbers 10-34-100-005, 10-34-300-014, 10-34-300-015, and

WHEREAS, the subject property is zoned I-3, and the Will County Zoning Ordinance does not authorize the Zoning Administrator to issue the requested temporary use permit on the subject property, and

WHEREAS, on November 8, 2011, the Land Use and Development Committee of the Will County Board reviewed the requested temporary use permit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the County Board of Will County, Illinois, that temporary use permit application 11-24-T is hereby approved as described and conditioned in the attachment to this Resolution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Resolution shall be in full force and effect upon its passage and approval as provided by law

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes___ No___ Pass_____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Weigel made a motion, seconded by Member Rozak, to approve Resolution #11-420.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTION #11-420 IS APPROVED.

Member Weigel presented Resolution #11-421, Authorizing Temporary Use Permit 11-23-T (Centerpoint Properties to Allow Temporary Office Trailer).



**Land Use and Development Committee
Resolution #11-421**

**RESOLUTION OF THE WILL COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**Authorizing Temporary Use Permit 11-23-T
(CenterPoint Properties to Allow Temporary Office Trailer)**

WHEREAS, the County of Will adopted the Will County Zoning Ordinance in accordance with the Illinois Compiled Statutes 55 ILCS 5/5-12001 et. seq., and

WHEREAS, Section 14.12 of the Will County Zoning Ordinance establishes certain requirements for temporary use permits, and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Administrator is authorized by the Will County Zoning Ordinance to issue temporary use permits for uses specifically authorized in particular zoning districts as temporary use permits, and

WHEREAS, CenterPoint Properties submitted a temporary use permit request to allow a temporary office trailer to be located on the property commonly known as 2302 Channahon Road, Joliet, Illinois and identified by permanent index number 30-07-30-100-004-0000, and

WHEREAS, the subject property is zoned I-3, and the Will County Zoning Ordinance does not authorize the Zoning Administrator to issue the requested temporary use permit on the subject property, and

WHEREAS, on November 8, 2011, the Land Use and Development Committee of the Will County Board reviewed the requested temporary use permit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the County Board of Will County, Illinois, that temporary use permit application 11-23-T is hereby approved as described and conditioned in the attachment to this Resolution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Resolution shall be in full force and effect upon its passage and approval as provided by law.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes___ No___ Pass_____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Weigel made a motion, seconded by Member Goodson, to approve Resolution #11-421.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTION #11-421 IS APPROVED.

Member Weigel stated that concludes my Report.

County Executive Walsh stated thank you very much Member Weigel.

FINANCE COMMITTEE
Edward Kusta, Chairman

Member Kusta stated I have been the Chairman for three years of this Committee and I have never had the privilege of saying good afternoon everybody. So, good afternoon. I am not allowed to bet on whether or not we are going to finish, but if I were a betting man, Member Singer has written "tomorrow" down somewhere. With that said, I would like to place a couple of reports on file before we go into Public Hearing.

1. Report from the Illinois Department of Revenue showing sales tax remitted to Will County for the month of September 2011 to be \$1,369,153.80. The RTA Tax received is \$1,657,294.22.

$$\$1,369,153.80 + \$1,657,294.22 = \$3,026,448.02.$$

2. Will County Monthly Treasurer Report, from Will County Treasurer Steve Weber, dated September 30, 2011.

Member Kusta made a motion, seconded by Member Gould, to place the above Reports on file.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

REPORTS ARE PLACED ON FILE.

Member Kusta made a motion, seconded by Member Maher, to open Public Hearing for 2012 Will County Annual Budget.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-four.

No negative votes.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR 2012 WILL COUNTY ANNUAL BUDGET IS OPENED AT 12:06 P.M.

County Executive Walsh asked three times if anyone from the general public wishes to speak in regards to the Annual Budget that has been presented?

Member Konicki stated you addressed your comments to the public and kept looking over there, but I had my hand up, I do have some comments. I am going to be a no vote this morning on most of the parts of the budget, a couple I can support. My reason is I...first of all I know what criticisms will be leveled at me and I would like to address them. I want to make it clear...what...that my positions I am not supporting tax payers paying more taxes. I am not supporting raising taxes, but I do believe that under the County's current circumstances we should tax consistently with our ability under PTEL, which is the Property Tax Extension Limitation Law. Basically, that prevents us from taking any more money from the taxpayers this year in real dollars, basically inflation adjusted dollars. My position is that we should keep the levy the same in terms of real dollars. It is not taking more money it is simply taking the same amount in today's dollars. I do not support our taxpayers paying more taxes for the benefit of public employees. I am going to be talking about something called OPEB, which is Other Post-Employment Benefits. To the extent we can get our...basically it is a health insurance liability...we can get that down. I want to get that down. But until we get it down, I will be taking the position that I do want to see it funded. I don't want our taxpayers paying more on it. But until we get it down, we have to meet liability. I also agree that we need to lower the benefits to bring them in line with the public sector. I absolutely, enthusiastically support that position. Right now we are bound by contracts that we entered into and until we can renegotiate those contracts and lower the benefits, we have certain responsibilities to meet. I know that our taxpayers saved about \$10 million...when...we have done a few things to reduce the benefits and we have been successful in cutting down our liability by about \$10 million out of about \$85 million which means we have brought it down about 10 percent. We are moving in the right direction and I support that. But we still, even having done that, we have certain responsibilities that we need to fund under... if we don't fund them we have to show them as unfunded liabilities, which is what I don't like our County getting into the habit of unfunded liabilities. I know that there are other steps that we can take to reduce our OPEB liability. I want to see us do that. I want to see us reduce them further. But until we do that I will be maintaining my position however. I also know that the Obama Health Care Law could impact this. But I don't have a crystal ball and none of us do and we don't know now if it will, how much it will and quite frankly with the Republican push to repeal it, repeal it I mean that is a blood oath that the Republican candidates are taking across the country in their Elections. I don't even know that we can assume it will be there. So until that settles down I think it is risky to make any assumptions that that will help us with our unfunded OPEB liability. Now that being said, what I had asked during the budget process was that the Board adopt a plan and policy to identify, control and implement appropriate funding levels for OPEB liability past, current and future. We are currently, and Mr. Rafac if I...without calling you up, because you and I have had this discussion just an hour ago...if I am wrong you will correct

me. Our current...on our... right now on our books, under law, we are showing an unfunded liability of \$12 million in our OPEB account. If we go forward with the budget as proposed, that unfunded liability will grow to \$14.2. I am just not comfortable with that. It takes a great deal of discipline to put the money in there, but I think we need to have that by doing what we are doing, the owner of a \$200,000.00 house...if we don't tax for PTEL the owner of a \$200,000.00 house is saving not even \$10.00. I don't want people to think that I am arguing against something significant, but that \$10.00 to them is going to cost this County about \$3 million which could go toward a number of things; reducing the OPEB liability or capital projects which I also fully support, but I want people to understand that when they save that \$10.00 the top ten taxpayers are going to be saving about \$150,000.00 and in fact, \$100,000.00 of that will go to just the top two, Exelon and Exxon. It is kind of disproportional that way. I have also asked that the Board adopt a long range year by year financial plan and policy to fund needed improvements as identified in various studies that we have run. There are three studies and they cost up about \$1.8 million. We have done studies for our road that is the 20/30 Plan; we have done studies for capital projects, our Facilities Needs and Master Plan by Witte; and we have done an IT assessment. I think it is absolutely imperative that simply just doing these studies, we take the next step, which is establishing a financial plan and policy to implement that. I am especially, personally, my embarrassment for our County is our Courthouse. I know we want to attract business, and when you have your taxpayers, you know half a block line outside, snaking a line outside, rain, sleet, snow, freezing temperatures, with their children trying to get into our Courthouse...waiting to get into our Courthouse, they look like people in a bread line. It doesn't help us. You want to attract business, you don't give back \$10.00 you get out there and remedy something like this. It is unacceptable to me. I have heard the comment made "oh government never gives money back...if you give money to government, they never give it back". That is not true; Frankfort has given it back, New Lenox has given it back, Crestwood has given it back, but instead of doing it the way this County is proposing to do it, they have done it through a rebate of sales tax dollars. I understand that currently we don't think we can do it in an economic manner. I really don't know I have not personally investigated it, so I am not comfortable with that argument. Were we to do it, that would be more comfortable because this would then be just a one year hit. But when we do what we are doing...they way we are doing it here today, the \$3 million that we lose will be \$3 million we lose next year, next year...it just goes on every year, \$3 million this year, then it will be a total of \$6 million next year and then in three years it will be a total of \$9 million. That is how we fall behind our ability to make our County the kind of place where businesses want to come. I know we are attracting businesses, but a lot of the emphasis is on tax abatement. I think we would be a leg up in the game to focus on some of our other issues to make ourselves attractive. So I will be a no vote. I would have preferred...until we have all of our unfunded liabilities off our books, and until we have a spending plan in place to make the needed improvements, roads, capital projects, IT. If you don't fund IT, you can lose more money by the lack of efficiency, the efficiency you lose in not making these upgrades. I just can't go in that direction. I feel we if we were savings \$500.00 to the residential property owners, something signification you might tempt me, but for \$10.00 I don't think that is a wise move. I know a lot of these things can be funded by bonds, but bonds are money you borrow. You pay a lot of fees to issue the bonds, you pay interest on the bonds. I don't want to give a homeowner \$10.00 back and then turn around and borrow it in the bond market and charge them interest and fees. I just don't think...I guess I'm very, very conservative and that unfunded liability is there. Even if you want to whittle it down...when you whittle it down, then you will have my support for not... obviously you don't put so much in there, but we should be putting in there whatever we are suppose to put in there under the current accounting standards. Now the County standards don't

make us put the money in that account, but what they do is make us disclose to the public how much we should be putting in there, and if we don't put it all in there, then we have to carry it on our books, show it to the public as an unfunded liability. This budget will raise that unfunded OPEB liability to \$14.2, that is not a comfortable level for me. Again, I wish we were a little more focused on our needs on the capital projects area, the IT area. I think we are being penny wise and pound foolish here. I think it would really help raise the quality of our life for our residents and help us do an even better job of attracting business were we to address some of these needs. I am not going to let \$3 million slip through with my support, when my \$200,000.00 homeowner is going to get 10 bucks on it and Exelon and Exxon are going to get \$100,000.00 out of that. I am just not comfortable with it so I will be a no vote this morning.

Member Kusta made a motion, seconded by Member Adamic, to close Public Hearing for 2012 Will County Annual Budget.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich and Wilhelmi. Total: Twenty-three.

No negative votes.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR 2012 WILL COUNTY ANNUAL BUDGET IS CLOSED AT 12:17 P.M.

Member Kusta presented Resolution #11-422, Ordinance Re: Annual Budget and Appropriation Ordinance of the County of Will, State of Illinois, for the Fiscal Period Beginning December 1, 2011 and ending November 30, 2012.



**Finance Committee
Ordinance #11-422**

**ORDINANCE OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**ANNUAL BUDGET AND APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE OF THE COUNTY OF
WILL, STATE OF ILLINOIS, FOR THE FISCAL PERIOD BEGINNING
DECEMBER 1, 2011 AND ENDING NOVEMBER 30, 2012**

BE IT ORDAINED by the County Board of the County of Will, Illinois, at this recessed session of the September meeting of said County Board held at the Will County Office Building, 302 North Chicago Street, Joliet, Will County, Illinois, on the 17th day of November, A.D., 2011, that the County Board hereby adopts its 2012 Budget, as amended, and pursuant thereto, the attached amounts or so much thereof as may be authorized by law as may be needed, be and the same are hereby appropriated for the corporate purposes of Will County as specified in the attached "Fiscal Year 2012 Agency Departmental lump sum appropriations for wages, fringes, contractual/commodities and capital appropriations" schedule, for the following funds:

CORPORATE (101), FICA (201), IMRF (202), OPEB (OTHER POST EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS (203), TORT IMMUNITY FUND (204), WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION INSURANCE RESERVE (205), SUNNY HILL SANITARIUM (206), HEALTH DEPARTMENT (207), COUNTY HIGHWAY TAX (220), COUNTY MOTOR FUEL TAX (222), TOWNSHIP MOTOR FUEL TAX (223), COUNTY BRIDGE TAX (224), FEDERAL AID MATCHING TAX (225), VICTIM/WITNESS GRANT FUND (240), LAW LIBRARY (244), OFF-DUTY ASSIGNMENT FUND (250), JUVENILE DETENTION (261), PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION (272), COUNTY OWNED PARKING FACILITY (282), 9-1-1 (284), WASTE SERVICES DIVISION (285), MISC. SPECIAL/GRANT FUNDS (208, 212, 221, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 241, 242, 243, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 251, 252, 253, 262, 270, 271, 278, 279, 280, 281, 283, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 294, 295, 297, 298, 299, 303, 304, 305, 308, 309, 310, 311, 403, 404, 406, 407, 408, 409, 746, 760), for the period beginning December 1, 2011 and ending November 30, 2012.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes___ No___ Pass_____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this ____day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Kusta made a motion, seconded by Member Maher, to approve Resolution #11-422.

Member Adamic stated thank you County Executive Walsh. I know we have been here quite a period of time up to this point and I will try to keep this as brief as possible. First off, I would like to thank you and your staff and Member Kusta and his Committee for the work they did on this budget; and all of those who were involved various different County Board Members. I appreciate the work they did. It is not an easy task, we do this every year, we need a budget to pass so that we can fund government for the next year. We had a Committee of the Whole Meeting last Thursday and I think the time for many of these discussions were brought out at that point. In fact, I liked the Committee of the Whole Meeting with regards to the budget so we can iron out any differences or make any modifications and changes and I think an attempt was done by myself and some of the other Board Members to bring light to some of those things. Some of the very notions that Member Konicki brought forth and voted against and now is speaking for. It somewhat aggravating. Nonetheless, I am going to vote for this budget so we can have government move forward. I know it is not exactly what you want County Executive Walsh, it is not exactly what I wanted, but I think it is something we will have to live with and we can live with. I know there are lots of "ifs" in this budget and you know it is a best guess document when you come right down to it. You are trying to guess what some revenues are and some expenses are and I think Mr. Rafac does a good job in that. There is going to be a lot of things that are going to be tossed our way, we have Judges coming to this County we will need to provide for those Judgeships and also for the IT and OPEB we have started to address that so, there are other issues that I am sure will pop up, but in the end, we need a budget to function and so I am going to support it.

Member Konicki stated I am not even a Member of Finance Committee but I took the time to go to the Finance Committee Meetings. My position has been articulated consistently. I made these points last year, I made these points earlier this year in the Forest Preserve and I mention them here now. The points I am making are all in my e-mail to Member Kusta. This is not new. I don't know where Member Adamic has been, or maybe he has been tuning me out, I have been very consistent. I have been at every meeting making these points I just don't pick up support for them so maybe that is why they are not necessarily reaching his ears. That is the only reason it is not that they were not made.

Member Singer stated thank you. I just wanted to make a couple of brief comments related to the Budget and some comments made here this morning or this afternoon. I think it is important that we remember a little bit of recent history. Last year the County Executive brought forth a budget that included the property tax increase and we stopped that or removed that from the budget. That saved our taxpayers from incurring an unnecessary increase in their property taxes. This year again, the property tax increase was proposed and again we removed that increase. I am tired of hearing that small increases won't impact the property owners. Every little bit matters and enough is enough. After awhile a little bit here and a little bit there becomes a lot of it and until we start demonstrating that our budgets move us into the future; until our budgets demonstrate the capacity to meet our capital needs and until they start demonstrating something more than just getting us through the next 12 months, it is inappropriate to consider any sort of a tax increase. In this economy, when still nearly 10 percent of the people in this County are unemployed, when are costs of personnel continue to rise and in my opinion unnecessarily as the result of some pretty poor contracts we have engaged in. We cannot make the argument to our taxpayers and our property owners that they need to pay more. It is inappropriate, so enough is enough. I will leave it at that.

Member Traynere stated good afternoon everyone. I am not going to be voting in support of this budget and I don't believe it meets the financial obligation that the County has. But in particular I want to correct a statement that was just made. We received information and unless the Committee gave me information that was wrong or misleading the average priced home, approximately \$190,000.00 per homeowner, with the County Executives budget the person property tax would have been lowered by \$6.18. Not raised, not increased. Those are the numbers that I have in front of me.

Member Singer stated that is not true.

Member Traynere continued I have the floor right now. I was courteous to you Member Singer, I would request the same.

Member Howard stated I would also like to reply to that remark earlier. I asked that question this morning at our Committee Meeting...Caucus Meeting and I was told that under the County Executive's proposal for \$190,000.00 house that there would have been a reduction of \$6.18 to the homeowner. Under this budget that is being presented today that reduction would be \$14.94. So I would just like to state that on the record.

Member May stated we are talking \$6.00 or \$14.00 I wanted to thank Member Kusta for allowing us the opportunity to sit in on the Finance Committee Meetings and giving us, in most of the meetings opportunities to participate. I think it is a good practice and I wish we would start

this a lot earlier in the year. I think we can learn a lot by doing that. Member Konicki what I would like to see...what I want to see is additional cuts and I think to see cuts you have to spend time going over the budget to see if you can do things like that. With all this discussion, the difference between the draft budget presented by the County Executive and the budget that we have before us today...am I right to say it is a difference of \$600,000.00? That is really is not that big of a difference it is just...is it...\$600,000.00? But we did change some priorities and funded the OPEB like Member Konicki stated, but you know...I will say once again it is not up to the Chief Elected Officials to discuss the new Courthouse and what we are going to do about that it is up to this body. It is up to the 27 of us. So I like the idea of the Meeting of the Whole, and additional meetings or a workshop to start to look into how we can do those things and how we can possibly agree to how we will fund those. Once again, I want to say to you Member Kusta, I enjoyed the process I would like to have additional meetings so if we could do that next year and to work on moving the process along.

Member Wilhelmi stated I just wanted to end on a positive note. This is a balanced budget. We have kept control of our spending very well I think, it is a give and take between the County Executive's Office and the Board and I think it was very good in this process. I just want to give kudos to Ms. Melissa Johannsen and Mr. Paul Rafac who did most of the work in getting to this point right now. This process does take...its initiation early on in the summertime. Those of us that want to get involved in it can go and see Mr. Rafac at anytime. He starts setting up these budget notices in June. So he will have very little time after this is over to get started on the next budget. I think this County is in good financial shape and it is good to have interaction between the Board and the County Executive's Office and I think we will continue to do this.

Member Maher stated I would also like to leave this on a positive note. This is not just a budget in isolation. This budget and the reductions and things that have been going on have been a process that have been going on for three years since we started to deal with some of the financial crisis that we have in this Country and in this County. The fact that when we have our folks coming in and telling us about the bonds and the borrowing and the fact that we have a per capita debt of \$3.00 compared to someone like Cook County that is at \$600.00 something per capita. I think we are doing an excellent job here and I agree with my colleague on the other side, we have a balanced budget. We shouldn't be really...there is always going to be give and take and I think we came up with a really good way to come to some agreements and getting this thing moving forward. The fact that we took \$2 million and isolated into an area for our OPEB I think is really good because it is now locked and we can't use it. I would have support having that \$2 million sitting in another contingency fund in case something would happen that we would need that \$2 million for some reason, because we don't know what our Federal Government is going to do. We are not talking about all aspects of retirement; we are talking about one aspect. We are talking about health care, and with the way the Federal Government has written this new legislation and they don't know exactly how it is going to be done, for us to go in and isolate too much money to quick I think is an accounting principal, okay is it really something that is going to impact us? We really don't know that yet.

Member McPhillips stated I have a brief clarification about the \$600,000.00 difference I believe, a lot of that was because we reduced the property tax levy obligation, but adjusted some other non tax levy revenues and also cut, Ms. Johannsen can clarify was it \$2.6 million out of the budget and shifted some of that over to OPEB too so that was good. So that was the net balance

but a lot of that was the property tax reduction on it and the increase of other non property tax revenues.

Member Konicki stated very briefly. It is a philosophical difference that is what you can take out of the discussion taking place. I wince a little bit...I don't want to say we are in financial... financially irresponsible, but I am simply concerned...I would not be comfortable saying we have a balanced budget using that particular term when we are running an unfunded liability on our books. While we did move some money into OPEB this year, it was only half of what we needed to move in there. We have an unfunded liability on our books in our OPEB account...

County Executive Walsh stated Member Konicki you have made that point three times now. Okay.

Member Konicki continued I am just contrasting it to an unfunded versus balanced budget.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-three.

Voting Negative were: Traynere and Konicki. Total: Two.

RESOLUTION #11-422 IS APPROVED.

Member Kusta Presented Resolution #11-423(a) Corporate Fund Levy (Fund101).



**Finance Committee
Resolution #11-423(a)**

**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**RE: CORPORATE FUND LEVY
(FUND 101)**

WHEREAS, the County Board of Will County, State of Illinois, has reviewed the estimated revenue and expenditure budget for the fiscal year December 1, 2011 through November 30, 2012, and

WHEREAS, the County Board has determined in said budget the expected expenditures and revenues of the above Fund for levy year 2011, and

WHEREAS, the County Board has already reduced the amount to be levied and raised by taxation for the above Fund by reducing the levy by the expected unappropriated balance of the above Fund from levy year 2010.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, pursuant to 55 ILCS 5/5-1024 that there be and hereby is levied the sum of SIXTY-TWO MILLION EIGHT HUNDRED FORTY ONE THOUSAND NINETY TWO DOLLARS (\$62,841,092.00) for the Corporate Fund, said Fund to be entitled Fund 101. Said amount is apportioned and itemized as shown on Attachment A and is levied for the purposes as set forth opposite these amounts.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes _____ No _____ Pass _____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2011

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Kusta made a motion, seconded by Member Bilotta, to approve Resolution #11-423(a).

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-four.

Voting Negative were: Konicki. Total: One.

RESOLUTION #11-423(a) IS APPROVED.

Member Kusta Presented Resolution #11-423(b) FICA Fund Levy (Fund 201).



**Finance Committee
Resolution #11-423(b)**

**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**RE: FICA LEVY
(FUND 201)**

WHEREAS, the County Board of Will County, State of Illinois, has reviewed the estimated revenue and expenditure budget for the fiscal year December 1, 2011 through November 30, 2012, and

WHEREAS, the County Board has determined in said budget the expected expenditures and revenues of the above Fund for levy year 2011, and

WHEREAS, the County Board has already reduced the amount to be levied and raised by taxation for the above Fund by reducing the levy by the expected unappropriated balance of the above Fund from levy year 2010.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, pursuant to 40 ILCS 5/7-171, 21/110 & 110.1 that there be and hereby is levied the sum of FIVE MILLION NINE HUNDRED SIXTY SEVEN THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED TWENTY NINE DOLLARS (\$5,967,229.00) for the FICA Fund, said Fund to be entitled Fund 201.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes ____ No ____ Pass ____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this ____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Kusta made a motion, seconded by Member Maher, to approve Resolution #11-423(b).

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTION #11-423(b) IS APPROVED.

Member Kusta Presented Resolution #11-423(c) IMRF Fund Levy (Fund 202).



**Finance Committee
Resolution #11-423(c)**

**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**RE: IMRF LEVY
(FUND 202)**

WHEREAS, the County Board of Will County, State of Illinois, has reviewed the estimated revenue and expenditure budget for the fiscal year December 1, 2011 through November 30, 2012, and

WHEREAS, the County Board has determined in said budget the expected expenditures and revenues of the above Fund for levy year 2011, and

WHEREAS, the County Board has already reduced the amount to be levied and raised by taxation for the above Fund by reducing the levy by the expected unappropriated balance of the above Fund from levy year 2010.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, pursuant to 40 ILCS 5/7-171 that there be and hereby is levied the sum of THIRTEEN MILLION FIVE HUNDRED THIRTY NINE THOUSAND FOUR HUNDRED THIRTY SIX DOLLARS (\$13,539,436.00) for the IMRF Fund, said Fund to be entitled Fund 202.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes ____ No ____ Pass ____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this ____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Kusta made a motion, seconded by Member Smith, to approve Resolution #11-423(c).

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTION #11-423(c) IS APPROVED.

Member Kusta Presented Resolution #11-423(d) Tort Immunity Fund (Fund 204).



**Finance Committee
Resolution #11-423(d)**

**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**RE: TAX LEVY FOR THE TORT IMMUNITY FUND
(FUND 204)**

WHEREAS, the County Board of Will County, State of Illinois, has reviewed the estimated revenue and expenditure budget for the fiscal year December 1, 2011 through November 30, 2012, and

WHEREAS, the County Board has determined in said budget the expected expenditures and revenues of the above Fund for levy year 2011, and

WHEREAS, the County Board has already reduced the amount to be levied and raised by taxation for the above Fund by reducing the levy by the expected unappropriated balance of the above Fund from levy year 2010.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, pursuant to 745 ILCS 10/9-107 that there be and hereby is levied the sum of THREE MILLION SIX HUNDRED SIXTY TWO THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED FORTY FOUR DOLLARS (\$3,662,644.00) for the Tort Immunity Fund, said Fund to be entitled Fund 204. Said amount is apportioned and itemized as shown on Attachment X and is levied for the purposes as set forth opposite these amounts.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes _____ No _____ Pass _____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Kusta made a motion, seconded by Member Weigel, to approve Resolution #11-423(d).

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-four.

Voting Negative were: Konicki. Total: One.

RESOLUTION #11-423(d) IS APPROVED.

Member Kusta Presented Resolution #11-423(e) Workers' Compensation Fund (Fund 205).

**Finance Committee
Resolution #11-423(e)**



**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**RE: TAX LEVY FOR THE WORKMEN'S COMP. RESERVE FUND
(FUND 205)**

WHEREAS, the County Board of Will County, State of Illinois, has reviewed the estimated revenue and expenditure budget for the fiscal year December 1, 2011 through November 30, 2012, and

WHEREAS, the County Board has determined in said budget the expected expenditures and revenues of the above Fund for levy year 2011, and

WHEREAS, the County Board has already reduced the amount to be levied and raised by taxation for the above Fund by reducing the levy by the expected unappropriated balance of the above Fund from levy year 2010.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, pursuant to 745 ILCS 10/9-107 that there be and hereby is levied the sum of FOUR MILLION THREE HUNDRED EIGHTY TWO THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED TWENTY SEVEN DOLLARS (\$4,382,827.00) for the Workmen's Compensation Reserve Fund, said Fund to be entitled Fund 205. Said amount is apportioned and itemized as shown on Attachment J and is levied for the purposes as set forth opposite these amounts.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes ____ No ____ Pass ____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this ____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Kusta made a motion, seconded by Member Izzo, to approve Resolution #11-423(e).

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-four.

Voting Negative were: Konicki. Total: One.

RESOLUTION #11-423(e) IS APPROVED.

Member Kusta Presented Resolution #11-423(f) TB Sanitarium Fund (Fund 206).



**Finance Committee
Resolution #11-423(f)**

**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**RE: TAX LEVY FOR THE TB SANITARIUM FUND
(FUND 206)**

WHEREAS, the County Board of Will County, State of Illinois, has reviewed the estimated revenue and expenditure budget for the fiscal year December 1, 2011 through November 30, 2012, and

WHEREAS, the County Board has determined in said budget the expected expenditures and revenues of the above Fund for levy year 2011, and

WHEREAS, the County Board has already reduced the amount to be levied and raised by taxation for the above Fund by reducing the levy by the expected unappropriated balance of the above Fund from levy year 2010.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, pursuant to 55 ILCS 5/5-23001 and 40 ILCS 5/7-171 that there be and hereby is levied the sum of SIX HUNDRED SEVENTEEN THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED NINETY NINE DOLLARS (\$617,299.00) for the TB Sanitarium Fund, said Fund to be entitled Fund 206. Said amount is apportioned and itemized as shown on Attachment A and is levied for the purposes as set forth opposite these amounts.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes _____ No _____ Pass _____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Kusta made a motion, seconded by Member Goodson, to approve Resolution #11-423(f).

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-four.

Voting Negative were: Konicki. Total: One.

RESOLUTION #11-423(f) IS APPROVED.

Member Kusta Presented Resolution #11-423(g) Health Department Fund Levy (Fund 207).



**Finance Committee
Resolution #11-423(g)**

**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

RE: TAX LEVY FOR THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT FUND (FUND 207)

WHEREAS, the County Board of Will County, State of Illinois, has reviewed the estimated revenue and expenditure budget for the fiscal year December 1, 2011 through November 30, 2012, and

WHEREAS, the County Board has determined in said budget the expected expenditures and revenues of the above Fund for levy year 2011, and

WHEREAS, the County Board has already reduced the amount to be levied and raised by taxation for the above Fund by reducing the levy by the expected unappropriated balance of the above Fund from levy year 2010.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, pursuant to 55 ILCS 5/5-25010 and 40 ILCS 5/7-171 that there be and hereby is levied the sum of NINE MILLION FOUR HUNDRED THREE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED THIRTY DOLLARS (\$9,403,530.00) for the Health Department Fund, said Fund to be entitled Fund 207. Said amount is apportioned and itemized as shown on Attachment A and is levied for the purposes as set forth opposite these amounts.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes _____ No _____ Pass _____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Kusta made a motion, seconded by Member Gould, to approve Resolution #11-423(g).

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-four.

Voting Negative were: Konicki. Total: One.

RESOLUTION #11-423(g) IS APPROVED.

Member Kusta Presented Resolution #11-423(h) Highway Fund (Fund 220).

**Finance Committee
Resolution #11-423(h)**



**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**RE: TAX LEVY FOR THE COUNTY HIGHWAY FUND
(FUND 220)**

WHEREAS, the County Board of Will County, State of Illinois, has reviewed the estimated revenue and expenditure budget for the fiscal year December 1, 2011 through November 30, 2012, and

WHEREAS, the County Board has determined in said budget the expected expenditures and revenues of the above Fund for levy year 2011, and

WHEREAS, the County Board has already reduced the amount to be levied and raised by taxation for the above Fund by reducing the levy by the expected unappropriated balance of the above Fund from levy year 2010.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, pursuant to 605 ILCS 5/5-601 and 40 ILCS 5/7-171 that there be and hereby is levied the sum of SIX MILLION NINE HUNDRED THIRTEEN THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED FIFTY FIVE DOLLARS (\$6,913,755.00) for the County Highway Fund, said Fund to be entitled Fund 220. Said amount is apportioned and itemized as shown on Attachment D and is levied for the purposes as set forth opposite these amounts.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes _____ No _____ Pass _____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Kusta made a motion, seconded by Member Moustis, to approve Resolution #11-423(h).

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-four.

Voting Negative were: Konicki. Total: One.

RESOLUTION #11-423(h) IS APPROVED.

Member Kusta Presented Resolution #11-423(i) County Bridge Fund (Fund 224).



**Finance Committee
Resolution #11-423(i)**

**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**RE: TAX LEVY FOR THE COUNTY BRIDGE FUND
(FUND 224)**

WHEREAS, the County Board of Will County, State of Illinois, has reviewed the estimated revenue and expenditure budget for the fiscal year December 1, 2011 through November 30, 2012, and

WHEREAS, the County Board has determined in said budget the expected expenditures and revenues of the above Fund for levy year 2011, and

WHEREAS, the County Board has already reduced the amount to be levied and raised by taxation for the above Fund by reducing the levy by the expected unappropriated balance of the above Fund from levy year 2010.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, pursuant to 605 ILCS 5/5-602 that there be and hereby is levied the sum of TWO HUNDRED SIXTY SEVEN THOUSAND FOUR HUNDRED NINETY SIX DOLLARS (\$267,496.00) for the County Bridge Fund, said Fund to be entitled Fund 224. Said amount is apportioned and itemized as shown on Attachment G and is levied for the purposes as set forth opposite these amounts.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes _____ No _____ Pass _____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this ____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Kusta made a motion, seconded by Member Bilotta, to approve Resolution #11-423(i).

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-four.

Voting Negative were: Konicki. Total: One.

RESOLUTION #11-423(i) IS APPROVED.

Member Kusta Presented Resolution #11-423(j) FICA Fund Levy (Fund 225).



**Finance Committee
Resolution #11-423(j)**

**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**RE: TAX LEVY FOR THE FEDERAL AID MATCHING
(FUND 225)**

WHEREAS, the County Board of Will County, State of Illinois, has reviewed the estimated revenue and expenditure budget for the fiscal year December 1, 2011 through November 30, 2012, and

WHEREAS, the County Board has determined in said budget the expected expenditures and revenues of the above Fund for levy year 2011, and

WHEREAS, the County Board has already reduced the amount to be levied and raised by taxation for the above Fund by reducing t

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, pursuant to 605 ILCS 5/5-603 that there be and hereby is levied the sum of TWENTY THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED SEVENTY SEVEN DOLLARS (\$20,577.00) for the Federal Aid Matching Fund, said Fund to be entitled Fund 225. Said amount is apportioned and itemized as shown on Attachment H and is levied for the purposes as set forth opposite these amounts.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes ____ No ____ Pass ____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this ____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Kusta made a motion, seconded by Member Weigel, to approve Resolution #11-423(j).

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-four.

Voting Negative were: Konicki. Total: One.

RESOLUTION #11-423(j) IS APPROVED.

Member Kusta Presented Resolution #11-423(k) Public Building Commission (Fund 272).



**Finance Committee
Resolution #11-423(k)**

**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**RE: TAX LEVY FOR THE WILL COUNTY
PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION
(FUND 272)**

WHEREAS, the County Board of Will County, State of Illinois, has reviewed the estimated revenue and expenditure budget for the fiscal year December 1, 2011 through November 30, 2012, and

WHEREAS, the County Board has determined in said budget the expected expenditures and revenues of the above Fund for levy year 2011, and

WHEREAS, the County Board has already reduced the amount to be levied and raised by taxation for the above Fund by reducing the levy by the expected unappropriated balance of the above Fund from levy year 2010.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, pursuant to 50 ILCS 20/18 that there be and hereby is levied the sum of FOUR MILLION TWELVE THOUSAND FOUR HUNDRED FORTY SEVEN DOLLARS (\$4,012,447.00) for the Public Building Commission Fund for the County lease with the Public Building Commission other than the lease concerning the Juvenile Detention Center, said Fund to be entitled Fund 272. Said total amount is apportioned and itemized as shown on Attachment A and is levied for the purposes as set forth opposite these amounts.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes ____ No ____ Pass ____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this ____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Kusta made a motion, seconded by Member Smith, to approve Resolution #11-423(k).

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-four.

Voting Negative were: Konicki. Total: One.

RESOLUTION #11-423(k) IS APPROVED.

Member Kusta stated I would quickly like to thank Ms. Johannsen for your hard work with this budget. You are a godsend to the County Board. Thank you so much. Mr. Bruce Friefeld, Ms. Karen Burke and Ms. Beth Adams the same thing, thank you for your efforts. Mr. Paul Rafac and Ms. Karen Hennessy you guys did a great job. We actually moved this budget through a lot earlier than the last year and maybe previous years so I want to thank the County Board Members that participated for the County Board Members that showed up and gave comments. I do appreciate it. I am learning as a Chairman it is not always the easiest thing to run a meeting where you have to come up with a budget. There is a two headed monster in the room that we are trying to appease and come to a resolution and I applaud you in this room for doing that and coming together and giving the residents of Will County a properly responsibly balanced budget. So thank you, hats off to you guys.

Member Kusta Presented Resolution #11-424, Authorizing the County Executive to Execute Necessary Documents for Delinquent Tax Program.



**Finance Committee
Resolution #11-424**

**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**AUTHORIZING COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS
FOR DELINQUENT TAX PROGRAM**

WHEREAS, the County of Will has undertaken a program to collect delinquent taxes and to perfect titles to real estate in cases where the taxes on the same have not been paid pursuant to 35 ILCS 200/21-90; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to this program the County of Will, as trustee for the taxing districts involved, has acquired an interest in the real estate in question; and

WHEREAS, it appears to the Will County Board that it would be to the best interest of the taxing districts of Will County to dispose of this interest in said property.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Will County Board hereby authorizes the Will County Executive to execute a deed of conveyance of the County's interest or authorize the cancellation of the appropriate certificate of purchase, as the case may be, on the real estate in question for the sums shown on the attachment and to be disbursed as shown and according to law.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Preamble of this Resolution is hereby adopted as if fully set forth herein. This Resolution shall be in full force and effect upon its passage and approval as provided by law.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes___ No___ Pass_____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this ____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Kusta made a motion, seconded by Member Gould, to approve Resolution #11-424.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTION #11-424 IS APPROVED.

Member Kusta Presented Resolution #11-425, Intent to Abate Certain Property Taxes for Illinois Transport, Inc.



**Finance Committee
Resolution #11-425**

**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

Intent to Abate Certain Property Taxes

WHEREAS, **ILLINOIS TRANSPORT, INC.** recently selected a Will County site in Wilmington for their refrigeration storage container and repair facility; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to 35 ILCS 200/18-165 Will County is authorized to abate any portion of its taxes on property that is commercial or industrial; and

WHEREAS, Will County has made a determination of the assessed value of its property in conformance with 35 ILCS 200/18-165; and

WHEREAS, this development would include 30 transferred jobs and create 95 jobs with an average compensation per employee of around \$60,000 per year; and

WHEREAS, the Will County yearly abatement portion of the tax bill is \$3,381.00, as estimated by the CED; and

WHEREAS, this type of job creation is needed in the Will County area; and

WHEREAS, it is in the best interest of the citizens of Will County that this expansion occur and the abatement of ad valorem property taxes be granted.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Will County Board that if **ILLINOIS TRANSPORT, INC.** relocates to a site in Wilmington, the Will County Clerk is directed to abate 50% percent of Will County’s ad valorem property taxes for a period of five (5) years subject to and in conformance with a contractual agreement in substantially the form attached hereto being entered into between Will County and **ILLINOIS TRANSPORT, INC.**

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Will County Board hereby authorizes the Will County Executive to negotiate and execute an Agreement of Intent to Abate Taxes with **ILLINOIS TRANSPORT, INC.**, in substantially the form attached hereto, subject to the review and approval of the Will County State’s Attorney.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Preamble of this Resolution is hereby adopted as if fully set forth herein. This Resolution shall be in full force and effect upon its passage and approval as provided by law.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes:___ No: _____Pass:_____(SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this ___ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Kusta made a motion, seconded by Member Rozak, to approve Resolution #11-425.

Member Konicki stated I am going to continue the practice I have been operating under for quite some time now of being a no vote for the abatement of property taxes. At the last County Board Meeting I asked for an audit...an outside audit. What we received instead was a review Mr. John Greuling, I personally feel that he is too close to the process to be...I don’t think he should be the one doing the audit. I don’t even think what he did is an audit. There are two things I was looking for, whether or not the abatements we have given to date have generated the jobs we were promised. All Mr. Greuling did was take a survey and it is just self reported jobs from the businesses that received the abatements. I don’t think that is adequate. An Auditor comes in and he spot checks...he checks himself to make sure that the recipient is actually being accurate...fully accurate. Self reporting doesn’t cut the mustard with me. The other thing is he gave us absolutely no data on whether or not when we give the tax abatements we have gotten

the degree of EAV, that would be basically the property improvements that we were promised. I still call for an outside audit on this. Absent that, I will continue to be a no vote on these abatements. If an audit were done, I believe we need...I just believe we need procedures in place...we don't even know how to track these things right now. There was some discussion in Committee or requiring them to submit a certified payroll records, whatever. Until that procedure is in place and we are doing this, we have a handle on how effective, not effective but whether or not we have gotten the benefit of our bargain on prior tax abatements I will continue to be a no as a matter of driving my point that we need to be making sure that what we are promised is what we are receiving for our taxpayers.

Member Gould stated County Executive Walsh this particular Resolution is the abatement portion for Will County is \$3,381.00. But it is 65 new jobs in Wilmington and the City of Wilmington is in favor of this so I would urge that we approve it.

County Executive Walsh stated my question to you Member Konicki who will you propose pay for this gigantic audit of all these businesses that we have given a tax abatement to?

Member Konicki responded I would put it out for a request for proposal. (Inaudible).

County Executive Walsh asked who is going to pay for it? Do you want the County to pay for it...going into these businesses and finding out exactly...

Member Konicki responded they will not do every business, they will spot check. They will decide how many they need to spot check. I think, County Executive Walsh I think we need to look into it. Otherwise we come on the floor this morning and we are promised 65 new jobs. That is wonderful. How do you think I feel voting against 65 new jobs, but I have had these abatement requests in front of me before, but I never know if we get the 65 new jobs. I am not against 65 new jobs, good heavens I would like 65 new jobs. I would like them to be good paying jobs with good benefits and full time jobs. I just don't know that we have been...when this leaves our County Board floor, I never hear about this and I don't know.

County Executive Walsh stated let me make a suggestion to you, make an appointment to sit down with Mr. John Greuling and Ms. Janet Scott at the CED's Office after the meeting and you sit there and ask all the questions and meet them to get their perspective. The County Board, have basically instructed Mr. Greuling to do what we set up as criteria to justify, justify, whether a company coming in here is going to create jobs, what it is going to bring and the total participation, just as Member Gould has said, that whether they justify having some property tax relieve for three maybe five years. Everything that he has done, he puts together and brings to us as a report, that shows where he justified authorizing what he did. So my suggestion to you is to do that.

Member Moustis stated I was just going to say these discussions have taken place County Executive Walsh. We have talked to Mr. Greuling at the CED. We have talked about other methods of doing follow up, do some annual reporting. We are working on that currently. It is something that the Board has discussed and it is taking up, as I know you are in your office so we will do some of the efforts of seeing the results of the abatements.

Member Konicki continued and depending on the success...how we go about this, I may be able to support future abatements. I am trying to make a point and drive a policy.

County Executive Walsh stated you have raised your point very well.

Member Konicki continued to your comments what I would say is, I understand you have the criteria in place to guide Mr. Greuling when he grants these...

County Executive Walsh stated it was criteria drafted by you, the County Board.

Member Konicki stated can I have the floor please...

County Executive Walsh said you have had it all morning.

Member Konicki continued I know you haven't liked my comments on any of the issues, but I will make them any how. You have the criteria in which to grant them, you made that point and you are correct, but you don't have criteria under which to evaluate whether or not promises were made under those criteria are promises that have been delivered upon. That is my concern. I would be happy to sit down with Mr. Greuling did he have the information I am seeking. He does not. He knows that the businesses that we have given 65 jobs turn around and tell me oh yeah we did it. I don't want that, I want something more objective.

County Executive Walsh stated you meet with him and you tell him what you want.

Member Konicki stated he doesn't have the information sir. I am not an Auditor.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-four.

Voting Negative were: Konicki. Total: One.

RESOLUTION #11-425 IS APPROVED.

Member Kusta Presented Resolution #11-426, Designating Providence Bank as County Depository.



**Finance Committee
Resolution #11-426**

**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

Designating Providence Bank as County Depository

WHEREAS, the Will County Treasurer has requested that Providence Bank be designated as an additional depository in which the funds and monies received by him in his official capacity may be deposited and invested, and

WHEREAS, this bank has furnished the required reports of condition, and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Illinois Compiled Statute 55 ILCS 5/3-11002, the County Board, when requested by the County Treasurer, shall designate institutions in which the funds of the County Treasurer may be kept.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Will County Board designates Providence Bank as an additional depository in which the funds and monies received by the Will County Treasurer may be deposited and invested.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Preamble of this Resolution is hereby adopted as if fully set herein. This Resolution shall be in full force and effect upon its passage and approval as provided by law.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes ____ No ____ Pass _____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Kusta made a motion, seconded by Member Traynere, to approve Resolution #11-426.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTION #11-426 IS APPROVED.

Member Kusta Presented Resolution #11-427, Designating UBS as County Depository.



**Finance Committee
Resolution #11-427**

**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

Designating UBS as County Depository

WHEREAS, the Will County Treasurer has requested that UBS be designated as an additional depository in which the funds and monies received by him in his official capacity may be deposited and invested, and

WHEREAS, this financial services company has furnished the required reports of condition, and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Illinois Compiled Statute 55 ILCS 5/3-11002, the County Board, when requested by the County Treasurer, shall designate institutions in which the funds of the County Treasurer may be kept.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Will County Board designates UBS as an additional depository in which the funds and monies received by the Will County Treasurer may be deposited and invested.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Preamble of this Resolution is hereby adopted as if fully set herein. This Resolution shall be in full force and effect upon its passage and approval as provided by law.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes ____ No ____ Pass _____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Kusta made a motion, seconded by Member Maher, to approve Resolution #11-425.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTION #11-425 IS APPROVED.

Member Kusta Presented Resolution #11-428, Designating New Century Federal Credit Union as County Depository.



**Finance Committee
Resolution #11-428**

**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

Designating New Century Federal Credit Union as County Depository

WHEREAS, the Will County Treasurer has requested that New Century Federal Credit Union be designated as an additional depository in which the funds and monies received by him in his official capacity may be deposited and invested, and

WHEREAS, this credit union has furnished the required reports of condition, and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Illinois Compiled Statute 55 ILCS 5/3-11002, the County Board, when requested by the County Treasurer, shall designate institutions in which the funds of the County Treasurer may be kept.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Will County Board designates New Century Credit Union as an additional depository in which the funds and monies received by the Will County Treasurer may be deposited and invested.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Preamble of this Resolution is hereby adopted as if fully set herein. This Resolution shall be in full force and effect upon its passage and approval as provided by law.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes ____ No ____ Pass _____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Kusta made a motion, seconded by Member McPhillips, to approve Resolution #11-428.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTION #11-428 IS APPROVED.

Member Kusta Presented Resolution #11-429, Amending Resolution 11-250 Adopting the Will County 2011 Action Plan for the Community Development Block Grant and Home Investment Partnership Grant Programs.



**Finance Committee
Resolution #11-429**

**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**Amending Resolution 11-250 Adopting the Will County 2011 Action Plan
For the Community Development Block Grant and Home Investment
Partnership Grant Programs**

WHEREAS, the Will County Board enacted prior resolutions agreeing to participate in and administer the Will County CDBG and HOME programs, in accordance with Federal regulatory requirements, and

WHEREAS, the Will County Executive has appointed a CDBG/HOME Advisory Board to recommend program policies and the funding of projects based on the HUD approved five-year Consolidated Plan, and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the County's HUD approved Citizen Participation Plan, and HUD Regulations at CFR Section 91.505, the CDBG/HOME Advisory Board, was consulted to evaluate the proposed reallocation of funds in the amount of \$100,000, and

WHEREAS, the Advisory Board did evaluate the nature and contents of the above referenced amendments, and does hereby recommend the adoption of the attached amendment to the Year 2011 Action Plan by the Will County Board, and

WHEREAS, the Will County Executive Committee has reviewed these recommendations, and places this resolution before the Will County Board for its approval.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Will County Board:

SECTION 1: That the amendments to the Year 2011 Action Plan as attached hereto and made a part hereof, be approved.

SECTION 2: That a special Statement of Conditions, which will be administratively developed prior to final award of any subgrant project, shall become a provision of the local grant award to which each relates, consistent with the requirements of HUD and the County's Policy Manual.

SECTION 3: This Resolution and every provision thereof, shall be separable and the invalidity of any portion shall not affect the validity of the remainder.

SECTION 4: That the Will County Executive is authorized to execute all HUD Grant Agreements, and all Cooperation Agreements with all sub-recipients subject to compliance with the general and special Statements of Condition and upon the review and approval of the Will County State's Attorney if applicable.

SECTION 5: All Resolutions or parts thereof, in conflict herewith, are hereby repealed.

SECTION 6: This Resolution shall take effect following its passage, approval, adoption, recording, inspection and publication, as may be required by law.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

VOTE: YES: _____ NO: _____ PASS: _____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Kusta made a motion, seconded by Member Gould, to approve Resolution #11-429.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTION #11-429 IS APPROVED.

Member Kusta Presented Resolution #11-430, Authorizing the Amendment of Budgets to Reflect Correct Allocation of Salaries to CDBG, Home and NSP Grant Programs.

**Finance Committee
Resolution #11-430**



**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**Authorizing the Amendment of Budgets to Reflect Correct Allocation of Salaries
To CDBG, Home and NSP Grant Programs**

WHEREAS, the Community Development Division (CD Division) of the Will County Land Use Department is responsible for administration of certain Federal and State grant programs allocated to the County under the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Entitlement program and under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA); and

WHEREAS, the CD Division staff salaries are allocated across grant programs in accordance with the assignment of responsibilities within each grant program and as authorized under each program’s administrative allowance; and

WHEREAS, the County Budget adopted for Fiscal-Year 2011 did not reflect the correct allocation of salaries across grant programs; and

WHEREAS, the proposed amendments to the CDBG, HOME, LEAD and NSP grant fund program budgets do not represent salary increases but rather adjustments to correct the proper allocation of salaries within each grant program; and

WHEREAS, the County Budget adopted for Fiscal-Year 2011 did not reflect an unexpected revenue influx/expense outlay to/from the HOME grant fund for previously Board Approved Homebuyer Assistance activities through the NSP grant program; and

WHEREAS, the CD Division requests that said funds be transferred within the various Funds under its charge, to recognize correct allocation and amount of salaries for existing staff allocated to each grant program.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Will County Board:

SECTION 1: That adjustments will be made to the following accounts as follows:

Fund 290 Community Development Block Grants			
Increase	290-41-275-1010	Full Time Salaries	\$ 4,500.00
Decrease	290-41-275-3150	Sub Grant Awards	(4,500.00)
Fund 291 Home Investment Partnership Grant Program			
Increase	291-41-276-1010	Full Time Salaries	\$ 500.00
Increase	291-41-276-1565	Health Benefits	1,000.00
Decrease	291-41-276-3150	Sub Grant Awards	(1,500.00)
Increase	291-00-000-33164	CDBG HOME Invest Partner	\$320,000.00
Increase	291-41-276-3150	Sub Grant Awards	\$320,000.00
Fund 298 LEAD			
Increase	298-41-277-1010	Full-Time Salaries	\$ 1,000.00
Increase	298-41-277-1530	FICA	100.00
Increase	298-41-277-1550	IMRF/Pension	200.00
Increase	298-41-277-1565	Health Benefits	500.00
Decrease	298-41-277-3150	Sub Grant Awards	\$ (1,800.00)
Increase	298-00-000-33201	HUD LEAD Grant Revenue	\$ 250,000.00
Increase	298-41-277-3150	Sub Grant Awards	\$ 250,000.00
Fund 299 NSP			
Increase	299-41-269-1010	Full-Time Salaries	\$ 2,000.00
Increase	299-41-269-1565	Health Benefits	\$ 2,500.00

WHEREAS, the Will County Executive and Finance Director reviewed the new terminology and recommended to the Finance Committee, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee concurs with the following recommendations of the Will County Executive and Finance Director, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that property taxes, intergovernmental revenues, and charges for services not otherwise restricted for the Sunny Hill TB Sanitarium Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that property taxes, licenses and permits, intergovernmental revenues, and charges for services not otherwise restricted for the Health Department Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that charges for services not otherwise restricted for the Animal Control Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that charges for services not otherwise restricted for the Geographical Information System (GIS) Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that property taxes, licenses and permits, intergovernmental revenues, and charges for services not otherwise restricted for the Highway Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that intergovernmental revenues and charges for services not otherwise restricted for the County Motor Fuel Tax Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that intergovernmental revenues not otherwise restricted for the Township Motor Fuel Tax Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that property taxes, intergovernmental revenues, and charges for services not otherwise restricted for the Bridge Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that property taxes and intergovernmental revenues not otherwise restricted for the Federal Matching Tax Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that charges for services not otherwise restricted for the Circuit Court Automation Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that intergovernmental revenues and charges for services not otherwise restricted for the Circuit Court Alimony and Child Support Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that charges for services not otherwise restricted for the Court Document Storage Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that charges for services not otherwise restricted for the Circuit Clerk Operations and Administration Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that charges for services not otherwise restricted for the Circuit Clerk Electronic Citation Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that intergovernmental revenues and fines and forfeitures not otherwise restricted for the State's Attorney Drug Forfeiture/Money Laundering Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that charges for services not otherwise restricted for the State's Attorney Drug Prosecution Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that charges for services not otherwise restricted for the Law Library Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that charges for services not otherwise restricted for the Probation Services Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that intergovernmental revenues and charges for services not otherwise restricted for the Children's Advocacy Center Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that charges for services not otherwise restricted for the Child Exchange Center Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that charges for services not otherwise restricted for the Off Duty Assignment Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that fines and forfeitures not otherwise restricted for the Sheriff's Weight Scale Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that intergovernmental revenues and charges for services not otherwise restricted for the Sheriff's Restricted Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that fines and forfeitures not otherwise restricted for the Arrestee's Medical Cost Special Revenue be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that charges for services not otherwise restricted for the Foreclosure Mediation Special Revenue be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS the Finance Committee recommends that intergovernmental revenues not otherwise restricted for the Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS the Finance Committee recommends that intergovernmental revenues not otherwise restricted for the EMA Warning and Training Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS the Finance Committee recommends that charges for services not otherwise restricted for the County Clerk Assignment Automation Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses.

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that charges for services not otherwise restricted for the County Clerk Document Storage Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS the Finance Committee recommends that charges for services not otherwise restricted for the Treasurer's Automation Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that charges for services not otherwise restricted for the Recorder's Automation Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that charges for services not otherwise restricted for the County Owned Parking Facility Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that charges for services not otherwise restricted for the 911 Emergency Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS the Finance Committee recommends that licenses and permits, intergovernmental revenues, charges for services, and fines and forfeitures not otherwise restricted for the Solid Waste Management Special Revenue Fund be committed for wages, fringes, capital, and other operating expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that intergovernmental revenues, interest, and miscellaneous revenues not otherwise restricted for the Community Health Center Capital Projects Fund be committed for capital expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that intergovernmental revenues, interest, and miscellaneous revenues not otherwise restricted for the Capital Improvement/Repair Capital Projects Fund be committed for capital expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that intergovernmental revenues, interest, and miscellaneous revenues not otherwise restricted for the ADF Expansion Capital Projects Funds be committed for capital expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that intergovernmental revenues, interest, and miscellaneous revenues not otherwise restricted for the Road Improvement Capital Projects Funds be committed for capital expenses, and

WHEREAS, the Finance Committee recommends that the Will County Board delegate authority to the Finance Director to designate fund balances for CAFR reporting as assigned for other resources in the budget that are not identified as reserved or committed as needed.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Will County Board hereby agrees with the recommendations of the Will County Executive and the Will County Finance Committee and hereby approves the above.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Will County Executive's Office be authorized to take such action necessary to implement the intent of this Resolution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Preambles of this Resolution are incorporated herein as if fully set forth.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes: ____ No: ____ Pass: ____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this ____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Kusta made a motion, seconded by Member Maher, to approve Resolution #11-431.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTION #11-431 IS APPROVED.

Member Kusta Presented Resolution #11-432, Authorizing Contribution to Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) Fund.

**Finance Committee
Resolution #11-432**



**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**AUTHORIZING CONTRIBUTION TO
OTHER POST EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS (OPEB) FUND**

WHEREAS, effective for fiscal years beginning on and after January 1, 2007, the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (“GASB”) provides standards for state and local governments and their political subdivisions to calculate and report their liability for non-pension benefits for current and future retirees, and also provides standards for adoption and maintenance of a retiree health and welfare benefits trust (an “OPEB Trust”) for the exclusive purpose of pre-funding and providing for other post-employment benefits under a health and welfare benefit plan as provided in GASB 43/45; and

WHEREAS, on October 26, 2011, the Finance Committee recommended that a \$2 Million Contribution be made to the Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) Fund to offset the County’s growing liability.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Will County Board hereby concurs with the recommendations made by the Finance Committee and hereby authorizes a \$2 Million Contribution be made to the Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) Fund from the funding set aside in the County Board 2011 Budget.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Will County Finance Department is directed to make the necessary line item and fund adjustments to effectuate the intent of this Resolution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Preamble of this Resolution is hereby adopted as if fully set herein. This Resolution shall be in full force and effect upon its passage and approval as provided by law.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes ___ No ___ Pass _____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Kusta made a motion, seconded by Member Traynere, to approve Resolution #11-432.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTION #11-432 IS APPROVED.

PUBLIC WORKS & TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
Jim Bilotta, Chairperson

Member Bilotta presented Resolution #11-433, Salary of County Engineer for the Period Beginning December 1, 2011 and Ending November 30, 2012.



Public Works & Transportation Committee
Resolution #11-433

RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS

SALARY OF COUNTY ENGINEER
Section 12-00000-00-CS
12-CS197-00-AC

WHEREAS, the County has sufficient Surface Transportation Program funds available and desires to use a portion of said funds to pay a portion of the County Engineer's salary; and

WHEREAS, the County desires the expenditure of funds for the purpose of payment of the County Engineer's salary for the period beginning December 1, 2011 and ending November 30, 2012.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the sum of \$159,731.00 be hereby expended for payment of the County Engineer's salary and \$46,060.00 County's share of fringes from the Motor Fuel Tax funds. Said expenditure includes Motor Fuel Tax funds and \$79,865.50 from the Surface Transportation Program.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the County hereby authorizes the sum of \$79,865.50 of their Surface Transportation Program funds to be made available to the Illinois Department of Transportation for the State’s use in exchange for an equal amount of State Funds.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the County Executive and the County Clerk of Will County are hereby authorized and directed to execute this Resolution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Clerk is hereby directed to transmit four (4) certified copies of this resolution to the regional office of the Illinois Department of Transportation through the office of the County Engineer.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes___ No___ Pass_____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Bilotta made a motion, seconded by Member Adamic, to approve Resolution #11-433.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTION #11-433 IS APPROVED.

Member Bilotta presented Resolution #11-434, Confirming Award of Contract to P.T. Ferro Construction Co. (\$2,359,547.91) let on October 19, 2011 – DeSelm Road (CH 8) from IL Route 102 to about 300 feet east of Old Chicago Road, County Board District #6.



**Public Works & Transportation Committee
Resolution #11-434**

**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

RESOLUTION CONFIRMING AWARD OF CONTRACT

WHEREAS, on October 19, 2011 bids were received and opened for public highway improvements under the jurisdiction of the County of Will; and

WHEREAS, the improvement shall be constructed using County's allotment of County Series A, B, or C Road Bond funds; AND

WHEREAS, on November 1, 2011 the Public Works Committee of the County Board of Will County met to consider the bids; and

WHEREAS, the said committee determined that the following qualified bidder submitted the low bid as listed below for the work consisting of removal and replacement of existing pavement with full depth asphalt pavement, including earthwork, ditch grading, miscellaneous drainage structures and pavement markings, and other items and did award the bid subject to the confirmation of this County Board.

<u>BIDDER</u>	<u>JOB</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
P.T. Ferro Construction Co. PO Box 156 Joliet, IL 60434-0156	CH 8 (DeSelm Road) From IL Route 102 to East of Old Chicago Road Section 06-00177-04-FP County Board District #6	\$2,359,547.91

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the County Board of Will County confirms the award of the foregoing contract heretofore awarded by the Public Works Committee subject to the confirmation hereby enacted.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes___ No___ Pass_____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Bilotta made a motion, seconded by Member Rozak, to approve Resolution #11-434.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTION #11-434 IS APPROVED.

Member Bilotta presented Resolution #11-435, Authorizing Approval of Professional Services Supplemental Agreement for Engineering Services with Hutchison Engineering, Inc., for Roadway and Appurtenant Work Thereto on DeSelm Road (CH 8) between IL Route 102 and Will-Kankakee County Line, County Board District #6, using County Series A, B, or C Road Bond Funds (\$10,000.00)



**Public Works & Transportation Committee
Resolution #11-435**

**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**Authorizing Approval of Professional Services
Supplemental Agreement for Engineering Services**

WHEREAS, the Public Works & Transportation Committee requested proposals for design engineering services for roadway and appurtenant work thereto on County Highway 8 (DeSelm Road) between Illinois Route 102 and Will-Kankakee County Line, Section 06-00177-04-EG, County Board District #6; and

WHEREAS, said additional roadway design engineering services are budgeted for in the current Highway Department budget.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the County of Will enter into a supplemental with Hutchison Engineering, Inc., 605 Rollingwood Drive, Shorewood, Illinois, for roadway improvement study and appurtenant work thereto on County Highway 8 (DeSelm Road), Section 06-00177-04-EG.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the compensation for the additional design engineering services (Phase II – contract plans and right of way documents) be according to the schedule of cost as listed in the supplemental agreement.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the County Executive and the County Clerk of Will County are hereby authorized to execute the supplemental agreement subject to review and approval by the Will County State’s Attorney.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that there is approved the additional \$10,000.00 from the County’s allotment of County Series A, B, or C Road Bond funds.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes___ No___ Pass___ (SEAL)

Approved this___ day of_____, 2011.

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Bilotta made a motion, seconded by Member Stewart, to approve Resolution #11-435.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTION #11-435 IS APPROVED.

Member Bilotta presented Resolution #11-436, Authorizing Approval of Agreement between the County of Will and Towpath Joint Venture for the Purchase of Wetland Banking Site Credits on 95th Street (CH 89) between Plainfield-Naperville Road and Boughton Road, County Board District #3 and #4, using County Series A, B, or C Road Bond Funds (\$358,500.00).



**Public Works & Transportation Committee
Resolution #11-436**

**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**Authorizing Approval of Agreement between
the County of Will and Towpath Joint Venture
for the Purchase of Wetland Banking Site Credits**

WHEREAS, the County of Will desires to reconstruct and extend County Highway 89 (95th Street) between Plainfield-Naperville Road and Boughton Road, County Board Districts #3 & 4, County Section 01-00181-00-FP in Will County; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary as part of the improvement in order to obtain a Section 404 Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to purchase wetland banking credits to compensate for wetland impacts from the project; and

WHEREAS, Towpath Joint Venture, is willing to sell the needed wetland credits from its Des Plaines - Towpath Wetland Mitigation Bank site and is desirous to enter into an agreement with the COUNTY OF WILL, a copy of which is attached hereto and which specifically sets forth the obligations of the parties; and

WHEREAS, it is in the best interest of the residents of the COUNTY OF WILL that the foresaid improvements to the roadway along County Highway 89 (95th Street) between Plainfield-Naperville Road and Boughton Road be made and the wetland banking be purchased from Towpath Joint Venture.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that there is approved the sum of \$358,500.00 from the County's allotment of County Series A, B, or C Road Bond funds for the purchase of the wetland banking site credit.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the County Executive and the County Clerk of Will County are hereby authorized to execute the said agreement subject to review and approval by the Will County State's Attorney.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes___ No___ Pass_____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Bilotta made a motion, seconded by Member May, to approve Resolution #11-436.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTION #11-436 IS APPROVED.

Member Bilotta presented Resolution #11-437, Authorizing Approval of Additional Professional Services for Design Engineering Services (Phase I) with STV Incorporated for Intersection and Appurtenant Work Thereto at the Intersection of Cedar Road (CH 4) and Laraway Road (CH 74) County Board Districts #2 and #6, using County Series A, B, or C Road Bond Funds (\$67,733.63).

**Public Works & Transportation Committee
Resolution #11-437**



**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**Authorizing Approval of Additional Professional Services
Agreement for Design Engineering**

WHEREAS, the Public Works and Transportation Committee requested proposals for additional design engineering services (Phase I) for intersection and appurtenant work thereto at

the intersection of County Highway 4 (Cedar Road) and County Highway 74 (Laraway Road), Section 08-00138-28-TL, County Board Districts #2 & 6; and

WHEREAS, said intersections design services (Phase I) are budgeted for in the current Highway Department budget.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the County of Will enter into an agreement for Phase I design engineering services with STV Incorporated, 200 West Monroe Street, Chicago, IL , for intersection and appurtenant work thereto at the intersection of County Highway 4 (Cedar Road) and County Highway 74 (Laraway Road), Section 08-00138-28-TL.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the compensation for the additional design engineering services be according to the schedule listed in the supplemental agreement, increasing the upper limit of compensation by \$67,733.63 from \$281,629.08 to \$349,362.71 paid for out of the County's allotment of County Series A, B, or C Road Bond funds.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the County Executive and the County Clerk of Will County are hereby authorized and directed to execute said agreement, subject to the review and approval by the Will County State's Attorney.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes____ No____ Pass____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this ____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Bilotta made a motion, seconded by Member Gould, to approve Resolution #11-437.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTION #11-437 IS APPROVED.

Member Bilotta presented Resolution #11-438, Authorizing Approval of Additional Professional Services Design Engineering (Phase I) with AECOM for Roadway and Appurtenant Work Thereto on Bell Road (CH 16) between 159th Street (IL Route 7) and 131st Street, County Board District #7, using County Series A, B, or C Road Bond Funds (\$165,504.05).



**Public Works & Transportation Committee
Resolution #11-438**

**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**Authorizing Approval of Additional Professional Services
Agreement for Design Engineering**

WHEREAS, the Public Works and Transportation Committee requested proposals for additional design engineering services (Phase I) for roadway and appurtenant work thereto on County Highway 16 (Bell Road) between IL Route 7 (159th Street) and 131st Street, Section 99-00147-07-FP, County Board District #7; and

WHEREAS, said design engineering services are budgeted for in the current Highway Department budget.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the County of Will enter into a supplemental agreement for design engineering services (Phase I) with AECOM, 303 East Wacker Drive, Suite 600, Chicago, IL, for the Bell Road improvement, Section 99-00147-07-FP.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the compensation for the additional engineering services be according to the schedule listed in the supplemental agreement, increasing the upper limit of compensation by \$165,504.05 from \$1,000,938.16 to \$1,166,442.21 paid for out of the County's allotment of County Series A, B, or C Road Bond funds.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the County Executive and the County Clerk of Will County are hereby authorized and directed to execute said agreement, subject to the review and approval by the Will County State's Attorney.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes ___ No ___ Pass ___ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Bilotta made a motion, seconded by Member Winfrey, to approve Resolution #11-438.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTION #11-438 IS APPROVED.

Member Bilotta presented Resolution #11-439, Authorizing the Will County State's Attorney's Office to Proceed with Condemnation Cases Regarding the County's Weber Road (CH 88) and Renwick Road (CH 36) Intersection Project, County board Districts #7 and #9.



**Public Works & Transportation Committee
Resolution #11-439**

**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**Authorizing the Will County's State's Attorney's Office to Proceed with
Condemnation Cases Regarding the County's County Highway 88 (Weber Road) and
County Highway 36 (Renwick Road) Intersection Project**

WHEREAS, the Will County Board has adopted a plan for the improvement of certain county highway to wit: Section 01-00170-26-FP Intersection of County Highway 88 (Weber Road) and County Highway 36 (Renwick Road) , County Board Districts #7 & #9; and

WHEREAS, additional right of way is necessary for the construction of said improvement; and

WHEREAS, the hereinafter legally described properties lie within said necessary additional right of way; and

WHEREAS, the takings of said properties is for the public purpose of improving certain county highway; and

WHEREAS, the properties sought to be acquired is necessary for the improvement of said certain highway; and

WHEREAS, that the County of Will shall acquire by dedication and possession, as the case may be, the following described real properties which are necessary, required and needed for the improvement to the highway lying wholly within the limits of the County of Will, to wit:

See attached list of Parcels, owners, Townships, permanent index tax numbers and legal descriptions.

WHEREAS, a title search indicates the present owners listed; and

WHEREAS, the present owners listed and unknown owners, have not been able to reach an agreement on compensation during negotiations with Swanson & Brown, Ltd., on behalf of the County, therefore, no Quit Claim Deed or any other agreement has been executed; and

WHEREAS, in order for the County to proceed with a condemnation pursuant to 735 ILCS 30/1 et seq, the Will County State's Attorney's Office requires permission from the Board to go forward with condemnation suits against the attached list of owners and unknown owners; and

WHEREAS, the Eminent Domain Act was amended by Public Act 097-0458 to allow Will County the use of Quick-take powers for the aforementioned project.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the Will County Board hereby passes, approves, and directs the Will County State’s Attorney’s Office to commence with any and all required procedures, including the use of quick-take powers, to condemn the real property described on the attached list for the purpose of public use.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes___ No___ Pass___ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this___ day of_____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Bilotta made a motion, seconded by Member Adamic, to approve Resolution #11-439.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTION #11-439 IS APPROVED.

Member Bilotta presented Resolution #11-440, Authorizing Approval of Professional Services Supplemental Agreement for Engineering Services (Phase II) with Willett, Hofmann & Associates, Inc., for Roadway/Bridge and Appurtenant Work Thereto on Pauling-Goodenow Road (CH 23) over Plum Creek, County Board District #1, using County Series A, B, or C Road Bond Funds (\$23,296.80).



**Public Works & Transportation Committee
Resolution #11-440**

**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**Authorizing Approval of Professional Services
Supplemental Agreement for Engineering Services**

WHEREAS, the Public Works & Transportation Committee requested proposals for design engineering services for roadway/bridge and appurtenant work thereto on County Highway 23

(Pauling-Goodenow Road) over Plum Creek, Section 01-00112-01-EG, County Board District #1; and

WHEREAS, said additional roadway/bridge design engineering services are budgeted for in the current Highway Department budget.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the County of Will enter into a supplemental agreement with Willett, Hofmann & Associates, Inc., 1000 Essington Road, Joliet, Illinois for County Highway 23 (Pauling-Goodenow Road) over Plum Creek, Section 01-00112-01-EG.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the compensation for the additional design engineering services (Phase II – contract plans and right of way documents) be according to the schedule of cost as listed in the supplemental agreement.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the County Executive and the County Clerk of Will County are hereby authorized to execute the supplemental agreement subject to review and approval by the Will County State’s Attorney.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that there is approved the additional \$23,296.80 from the County’s allotment of County Series A, B, or C Road Bond funds.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes___ No___ Pass___ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this___ day of_____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Bilotta made a motion, seconded by Member May, to approve Resolution #11-440.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTION #11-440 IS APPROVED.

JUDICIAL COMMITTEE
Anne Dralle, Chairperson

Member Dralle began good afternoon everyone. I have only one item for business and I would like to place on file the recent inspection report from the Illinois Department of Corrections Annual Inspection for Will County ADF. The Illinois Compiled Statutes require the Department of Corrections inspect our counties on an annual basis and make the results available to the public.

The Will County ADF was in total compliance with Illinois Jail Standards and there are no recommended improvements. I believe that both, Sheriff Paul Kaupas and our Warden, Michael O'Leary as well as the ADF staff are to be commended for their outstanding remarks that were received from the Illinois DOC.

Member Dralle made a motion, seconded by Member Hart, to place to place the above mentioned correspondence on file.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

CORRESPONDENCE IS PLACED ON FILE.

Member Dralle continued sometimes as Committee Chair you do get to do some things out of the ordinary. Member Goodson and I have two items that we would like to show you and to pass around. Member Goodson has termed what you see the glistening material as "Will County Diamonds". In reality it is really calcimite and Member Goodson has one and I have one. I think this is a really interesting side point as being County Board Members. This Monday, Member Goodson and I had what I consider a really unique opportunity with all of the discussion that has gone on about the construction demolition debris and contaminated soil and the eleven quarries we have in Will County the nine active, we arranged for a tour of a local facility that had closed landfill, a composting facility, a quarry that was taking construction demolition debris and also a undergrounding mining operation. We both felt we had the nerve to go 450 feet below and we did. The instructions that we received were quite amazing. We were given, obviously safety instructions, we were given an air unit we had to breath into should something go wrong underground, we had yellow vests, safety goggles and we also had a round copper tag that we had to stick in our pocket. What was interesting is that the tag number correlated to our names on a clipboard that was above ground, as we went under. I think it was for identification later. The important thing about the tour, when we went 450 feet below ground was that they did tell us they would keep the lights on. I can't tell you how unbelievably dark it is. Did I have trepidations about going underground? Sure Member Goodson and I held hands all the way. We sat in the backseat...no we didn't but you know we were concerned. Member Goodson said she was hyperventilating and I pretended to be very brave. I guess the point in telling all of this, is we have so many issues that come before us as County Board Members and when somebody talks about a construction demolition bill or they talk about quarries or they talk mining operations and we are looking at issues that affect us and affect the votes that we are going to be taking, I think it is imperative and important to be educated. I can't explain really what it is like to go 450 feet underground and to see 50 foot wide stone pillars that are supporting the ceiling. Some of the pillars were 90 feet high; to look at where they store the dynamite; to look at the ventilation systems, the escape routes coming out of the quarry; to look at how they remove stormwater out of an inactive quarry through the mechanics of pumping. If you have the opportunity, please try to arrange a tour of any of the mining operations that we have in the County. I know that Member Goodson and I would be more than willing to help you make phone calls. I think we can both promise it is a really exceptional trip. You maybe scared, but you certainly won't be disappointed. So this is a great rock.

Member Goodson added I would encourage all of you to set up appointments and do the same tour. Because it was fascinating, it was interesting to see that when we were 450 below the surface it was dry, there was not water. I thought that was an important point for me. I thought there would be a pool down there, it was very dry. They do de-water, but they are located right next to the river and it was very dry. Anybody that is looking for a new career they said it is a great work environment, the weather is always even. That was really the point, we wanted to encourage anybody that has an interest to do this to go ahead and set up an appointment because these guys certainly did enjoy taking us around.

**PUBLIC HEALTH & SAFETY COMMITTEE
Don Gould, Chairman**

Member Gould began good afternoon. I have two Resolutions for your consideration.

Member Gould presented Resolution #11-441, Renewing Contracts for Medical Products at Sunny Hill Nursing Home.

**Public Health & Safety Committee
Resolution #11-441**



**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**RENEWING CONTRACTS FOR MEDICAL PRODUCTS
AT SUNNY HILL NURSING HOME**

WHEREAS, the current contracts for medical products for Sunny Hill Nursing Home will expire on November 30, 2011, and

WHEREAS, the current contracts allow for the extension of said contracts at one year intervals, if the County so chooses, and

WHEREAS, the Purchasing Director and Nursing Home Administrator have recommended, and the Public Health & Safety Committee has concurred, that the contracts for medical products for Sunny Hill Nursing Home be renewed for one year from December 1, 2011, through and including November 30, 2012, with the following vendors: Professional Medical, New Lenox, IL with a 2% increase; Moore Medical, Farmington, CT with a 3% increase; Medline, Mundelein, IL with no percentage increase; and Gulf South Medical Supply, Jacksonville, FL with a 4% increase. The actual contract amounts will vary depending upon actual amount used and facility census, and

WHEREAS, sufficient appropriations have been budgeted for this purpose.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Will County Board hereby authorizes the County Executive to renew the contracts for medical products for Sunny Hill Nursing Home for one year, December 1, 2011, through and including November 30, 2012, with the following

vendors: Professional Medical, New Lenox, IL with a 2% increase; Moore Medical, Farmington, CT with a 3% increase; Medline, Mundelein, IL with no percentage increase; and Gulf South Medical Supply, Jacksonville, FL with a 4% increase. The actual contract amounts will vary depending upon actual amount used and facility census.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that such purchases shall be funded through the Sunny Hill Nursing Home Budget.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Preamble of this Resolution is hereby adopted as if fully set forth herein. This Resolution shall be in full force and effect upon its passage and approval as provided by law.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes___ No___ Pass_____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this ____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Gould made a motion, seconded by Member Rozak, to approve Resolution #11-441.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTION #11-441 IS APPROVED.

Gould presented Resolution #11-442, Renewing Contracts for Miscellaneous Paper Products at Sunny Hill Nursing Home.



**Public Health & Safety Committee
Resolution #11-442**

**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**RENEWING CONTRACTS FOR MISCELLANEOUS PAPER PRODUCTS
AT SUNNY HILL NURSING HOME**

WHEREAS, the current contracts for miscellaneous paper products for Sunny Hill Nursing Home will expire on November 30, 2011, and

WHEREAS, the current contracts allow for the extension of said contracts at one year intervals, if the County so chooses, and

WHEREAS, the Purchasing Director and Nursing Home Administrator have recommended that the contracts for miscellaneous paper products for Sunny Hill Nursing Home be renewed for one year, December 1, 2011, through and including November 30, 2012, with the following vendors: Edward Don of North Riverside, IL with no percentage increase; Gordon Food Service of Grand Rapids, MI, with no percentage increase; Laport, Inc. of Skokie, IL with a 7% increase; and Tri-K Supplies, Inc., of Minooka, IL, with a 7% increase. The actual contract amounts will vary depending upon actual amount used and facility census, and

WHEREAS, the Public Health & Safety Committee concurs with this request.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Will County Board hereby authorizes the County Executive to renew the contracts for miscellaneous paper products for Sunny Hill Nursing Home for one year, December 1, 2011, through and including November 30, 2012, with the following vendors: Edward Don of North Riverside, IL with no percentage increase; Gordon Food Service of Grand Rapids, MI, with no percentage increase; Laport, Inc. of Skokie, IL with a 7% increase; and Tri-K Supplies, Inc., of Minooka, IL, with a 7% increase. The actual contract amounts will vary depending upon actual amount used and facility census.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that such purchases shall be funded through the Sunny Hill Nursing Home Budget.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Preamble of this Resolution is hereby adopted as if fully set herein. This Resolution shall be in full force and effect upon its passage and approval as provided by law.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes___ No___ Pass_____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this ___ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Gould made a motion, seconded by Member May, to approve Resolution #11-442.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTION #11-442 IS APPROVED.

LEGISLATIVE & POLICY COMMITTEE
Lee Goodson, Chairperson

Member Goodson stated thank you. I can be brief because the Legislature just wrapped up the Veto Session and they got very little work accomplished so there is not much to report on. The one thing that they did do was pass the Senate Bill 2147 which involved the Regional Superintendents of Schools salaries. They did support a one year diversion from the local personal property tax replacement tax to pay for the salaries, but they also amended this Legislation to include the creation of a task force to look at the office and make recommendations to streamline it; possibly a merger with another office and also to possibly do away with it, to close the office. They are to report back to the Legislature in one year and I guess we will wait and see how that all comes out. They will be called back briefly on November 29th to take up some work that was not completed during Veto Session. This Special Session is just to look at the tax decrease for the Chicago Mercantile Exchange and the Chicago Board of Trade and it is possible that they could take up some other work during this Special Session. It is suppose to go only one day. I guess we will have to wait and see if that in fact happens. That concludes my report.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS COMMITTEE
Charles Maher, Chairman

Member Maher stated thank you County Executive Walsh. I have nothing official to report. We provided all of that time to Member Kusta and the Finance Committee and I really do appreciate all the hard work that everybody has been doing here. I do want to say that after being on this Board for over eight years, a lot of you have lost a lot of close members, family members, friends and stuff. I have lost a very close friend of mine this week. We have had some really good debate here today, but without our family close and friends none of this really matters. So I think we really need to keep in perspective what it is that we are trying to accomplish here. The whole goal, I think, of everybody on this Board is to make sure that we provide the best environment for the citizens of our County. I think we do that. We many not come at it the same way, but there are a lot of roads leading in and out of Will County. With all those different roads comes a lot of different opinions. I just want to say that I hope that everybody has a really great Thanksgiving. To remind folks that this is Veteran's Appreciation Month, that I don't think there is any other County around here that I am aware of, the Government body has put a Resolution out there recognizing November as the month of the Veteran. We did that a couple of years ago and I want to make sure that we remember these Resolutions that we pass as well. Thank you.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
James Moustis, Chairman

Member Moustis stated good afternoon County Executive Walsh and County Board Members.

Member Moustis made a motion, seconded by Member Konicki, to remove Resolutions #11-443, 11-444 and 11-445 from the Agenda.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTIONS #11-443, 11-444 AND 11-445 ARE REMOVED FROM THE AGENDA.

Moustis presented Resolution #11-446, Replacement Hires for Sunny Hill Nursing Home.



**Executive Committee
Resolution #11-446**

**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**REPLACEMENT HIRES FOR
SUNNY HILL NURSING HOME**

WHEREAS, in accordance with 55 ILCS 5/2-5009, the County Executive shall "appoint, with the advice and consent of the Board, such subordinate deputies, employees, and appointees for the general administration of county affairs as considered necessary, except those deputies, employees and appointees in the office of an elected county officer", and

WHEREAS, the Will County Executive has presented the attached personnel list for the Sunny Hill replacement hires to the Executive Committee of the County Board, and

WHEREAS, that list has been approved by the Executive Committee in the appropriate manner and now the committee recommends the list to the full Will County Board for approval.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Will County Board, in accordance with 55 ILCS 5/2-5009, does hereby concur with the action of its Executive Committee and the County Executive and gives its consent to the list of names attached to this Resolution for the Sunny Hill Nursing Home.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Preamble of this Resolution is hereby adopted as if fully set forth herein. This Resolution shall be in full force and effect upon its passage and approval as provided by law.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes___ No___ Pass_____ (SEAL)

Approved this ___day of _____, 2011.

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Moustis made a motion, seconded by Member Rozak, to approve Resolution #11-446.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTION #11-446 IS APPROVED.

Moustis presented Resolution #11-447, Re: Extension of Term of Board of Review.



**Executive Committee
Resolution #11-447**

**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

Extension of Term of Board of Review

WHEREAS, in compliance with the Illinois Compiled Statutes (35 ILCS 200/16-35), the term for the Board for completion of their work on the 2010 Assessment Books for Will County will expire on December 31, 2011, and

WHEREAS, the Executive Committee, after reviewing the time cycle for preparation of the tax bills, recommends that the term of the Board of Review, for completion of their work in this cycle, be extended to January 31, 2012.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Will County Board authorizes the extension of the term of the Board of Review until January 31, 2012.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Preamble of this Resolution is hereby adopted as if fully set herein. This Resolution shall be in full force and effect upon its passage and approval as provided by law.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes___ No___ Pass_____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this ___ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Moustis made a motion, seconded by Member Smith, to approve Resolution #11-447.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTION #11-447 IS APPROVED.

Moustis presented Resolution #11-448, Authorizing the County Executive to Execute Standard Software Maintenance Agreement with New World Systems Corporation.

**Executive Committee
Resolution #11-448**



**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**IZING COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO EXECUTE STANDARD SOFTWARE
MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT WITH NEW WORLD SYSTEMS**

WHEREAS, the current Software Maintenance Agreement with New World Systems expires on November 30, 2011, and

WHEREAS, the Director of the ICT Department has requested approval of the attached New World Systems Corporation Standard Software Maintenance Agreement, and

WHEREAS, the ICT Director has recommended, and the Executive Committee has concurred, that the County Executive be authorized to execute a Software Maintenance Agreement with New World Systems, in the form substantially attached hereto, subject to the review and approval of the Will County State’s Attorney’s Office.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Will County Board hereby authorizes the County Executive to execute a Software Maintenance Agreement with New World Systems, in the form substantially attached hereto, subject to the review and approval of the Will County State’s Attorney’s Office.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Preamble of this Resolution is hereby adopted as if fully set herein. This Resolution shall be in full force and effect upon its passage and approval as provided by law.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes___ No___ Pass_____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this ____day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Moustis made a motion, seconded by Member May, to approve Resolution #11-448.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTION #11-448 IS APPROVED.

Moustis presented Resolution #11-449, Declaring Various Equipment Surplus and Authorizing Recycle/Disposal.

**Executive Committee
Resolution #11-449**



**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**DECLARING VARIOUS EQUIPMENT SURPLUS
AND AUTHORIZING RECYCLE/DISPOSAL**

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Will County Purchasing Ordinance, “the Director of Purchasing shall promulgate regulations governing the sale, lease or disposal of surplus equipment/supplies by public auction, competitive sealed bidding, or other appropriate method designated by regulation”, and

WHEREAS, the Director of Purchasing has submitted the attached list of equipment to be declared surplus and disposed of, and

WHEREAS, the Executive Committee concurs with the Director of Purchasing, and recommends that the attached list of various county equipment be declared surplus and disposed of pursuant to the Will County Purchasing Ordinance and in accordance with State Statutes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Will County Board hereby declares the attached list of various county equipment surplus and authorizes the Director of Purchasing to

dispose of such, pursuant to the Will County Purchasing Ordinance and in accordance with State Statutes.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Preamble of this Resolution is hereby adopted as if fully set forth herein. This Resolution shall be in full force and effect upon its passage and approval as provided by law.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes___ No___ Pass_____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Moustis made a motion, seconded by Member Adamic, to approve Resolution #11-449.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTION #11-449 IS APPROVED.

Moustis presented Resolution #11-450, Renewing Contracts for Refuse & Recycling Collection for Various County Buildings.



**Executive Committee
Resolution #11-450**

**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**Renewing Contracts for Refuse & Recycling
Collection for Various County Buildings**

WHEREAS, the current contracts for refuse and recycling services for various county buildings expire on November 30, 2011, and

WHEREAS, Waste Services Department has recommended, and the Executive Committee has concurred, that the contract for refuse and recycling collection services be renewed with Joliet Disposal, Joliet, IL, for all County locations except for three (3). The other three (3) County sites refuse and recycling collection services contract, specifically stated in the original bid history,

should be renewed with Allied Waste Services, Joliet, IL, commencing December 1, 2011, through and including November 30, 2012, and

WHEREAS, sufficient appropriations were budgeted in the respective Budgets.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Will County Board hereby authorizes the County Executive to renew the contracts for refuse and recycling collection service for the County buildings with Joliet Disposal, Joliet, IL and for all locations except three (3). The other three (3) sites should be renewed with Allied Waste Services, Joliet, IL commencing December 1, 2011, through and including November 30, 2012, pursuant to the terms and conditions contained in the original bid history, attached.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Will County Board hereby authorizes the Will County Executive to take such action as necessary to implement the bid award set forth herein.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Preamble of this Resolution is hereby adopted as if fully set herein. This Resolution shall be in full force and effect upon its passage and approval as provided by law.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes___ No___ Pass_____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this ____day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Moustis made a motion, seconded by Member Goodson, to approve Resolution #11-450.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

RESOLUTION #11-450 IS APPROVED.

Moustis presented Resolution #11-451, Re: Aggregation of Residential and Small Commercial Retail Electrical Loads.



**Executive Committee
Ordinance #11-451**

**ORDINANCE OF THE COUNTY BOARD
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**AGGREGATION OF RESIDENTIAL AND SMALL COMMERCIAL
RETAIL ELECTRICAL LOADS**

WHEREAS, some electrical customers, especially residential and small commercial customers, have failed to benefit from lower electricity costs from retail and wholesale competition; and

WHEREAS, the County Board of the County of Will finds that the residential and small commercial customers in unincorporated Will County will benefit from an electrical load aggregation program; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to 20 ILCS 3855/1-92 the County Board may adopt an ordinance to:

- aggregate residential and small commercial retail electrical loads located in the unincorporated areas of the county; and
- solicit bids; and
- enter into service agreements to facilitate for those loads the sale and purchase of electricity and related services and equipment, and

WHEREAS, Section 3855/1-92 allows the County to seek to operate the aggregation program as an opt-out program for residential and small commercial retail customers, and

WHEREAS, the County Board finds that residential and small commercial customers in unincorporated Will County will benefit from an opt-out aggregation program.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED, that the Preamble of this Ordinance is hereby adopted as if fully set forth herein.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED, that the County Board of the County of Will that the County of Will desires to establish an aggregation program for residential and small commercial retail electrical loads within the unincorporated areas of Will County,

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED, that pursuant to and in conformance with 20 ILCS 3855/1-92 and Article 28 of the Election Code, the County of Will does hereby certify to the Will County Clerk the following referendum question to be submitted to the electors residing in unincorporated Will County on the ballot for the next general election:

Shall the County of Will have the authority to arrange for the supply of electricity for its residential and small commercial retail customers who have not opted out of such program?	YES
	NO

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED, that the Will County Clerk is directed to certify and submit said referendum question to the proper election authorities to be placed upon the ballot for the next regular election.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED, that the Will County Clerk is directed to provide notice of the purpose of the referendum in conformance with 20 ILCS 3855/1-92 and the General Election Code, which notice may state as follows:

The County Board of Will County desires to adopt an ordinance under which it may aggregate residential and small commercial retail electrical loads for customers located within the unincorporated areas of the county, and for that purpose, may solicit bids and enter into service agreements to facilitate for those loads the sale and purchase of electricity and related services and equipment. The purpose of the referendum is to determine whether residential and small retail electrical customers who do not wish to receive their electrical service through the aggregation program may opt out of it.

Adopted by the Will County Board this 17th day of November, 2011.

Vote: Yes___ No___ Pass_____ (SEAL)

Nancy Schultz Voots
Will County Clerk

Approved this ____ day of _____, 2011.

Lawrence M. Walsh
Will County Executive

Member Moustis made a motion, seconded by Member Stewart, to approve Resolution #11-451.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-four.

No negative votes.

Voting Abstain: Winfrey. Total: One.

RESOLUTION #11-451 IS APPROVED.

APPOINTMENTS BY COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Member Moustis presented the Appointments by the County Executive.



LAWRENCE M. WALSH
WILL COUNTY EXECUTIVE

WILL COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING • 302 N. CHICAGO STREET • JOLIET, ILLINOIS 60432

Phone (815) 774-7480
Fax: (815) 740-4600

APPOINTMENTS BY THE WILL COUNTY EXECUTIVE

November 2011

Florence-Wesley Union Drainage District #1
70 ILCS 605

William Phelan

31536 S. Martin Long Road, Wilmington, IL 60481
Re-Appointment - Term expires November 1, 2014

Purpose (70 ILCS 605/3-1) (from Ch. 42, par. 3-1)

Sec. 3-1. Drainage districts.

Drainage districts may be formed to construct, maintain or repair drains or levees or to engage in other drainage or levee work for agricultural, sanitary or mining purposes. (Source: Laws 1955, p. 512.)

Board information: (70 ILCS 605/4-1) (from Ch. 42, par. 4-1)

Sec. 4-1. Appointment of Commissioners.

Upon the organization of the district, the temporary commissioners shall continue as permanent commissioners and shall hold office until the first Tuesday in September following the organization of the district and until their successors are selected and have qualified. On the first Tuesday in September after the organization of any district, or as soon thereafter as may be feasible, and in the manner provided in Section 3-9 of this Act, the appropriate appointing authority shall appoint 3 commissioners for such district, one of whom shall hold office for a term expiring on the first Tuesday of September next, one of whom shall hold office for a term expiring on the first Tuesday of the second succeeding September, and the other of whom shall hold office for a term expiring on the first Tuesday of the third succeeding September, and until their respective successors are selected and have qualified. On the first Tuesday of September of each succeeding year, or as soon thereafter as may be feasible, the appointing authority shall appoint one commissioner, who shall hold his office for a term expiring on the first Tuesday of the third succeeding September and until his successor is selected and has qualified.

(Source: P. A. 77-701.)

Qualifications: (70 ILCS 605/4-3) (from Ch. 42, par. 4-3)

Sec. 4-3. Qualifications of Commissioners. No person shall be appointed or elected commissioner of a district who is not an adult resident of Illinois. Neither shall any person be appointed or elected commissioner of a district who does not own land in the district unless (a) the court in election districts or the appointing authority in other districts finds it to be in the best interests of the district that the requirement of ownership of land in the district be waived or (b) the selection of commissioners is by appointment and a majority of the adult landowners owning a majority of the area embraced in the district have duly petitioned the appropriate appointing authority to allow the appointment as commissioner of an individual who does not own land in the district. (Source: P.A. 86-297.)

Submitted to the Will County Board October 18, 2011



LAWRENCE M. WALSH
WILL COUNTY EXECUTIVE

WILL COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING • 302 N. CHICAGO STREET • JOLIET, ILLINOIS 60432

Phone (815) 774-7480
Fax: (815) 740-4600

APPOINTMENTS BY THE WILL COUNTY EXECUTIVE

November 2011

Washington Drainage District
70 ILCS 605

Dale Mueller

P.O. Box 224, Beecher, IL 60401

Re-appointment - Term expires September 1, 2014

Purpose (70 ILCS 605/3-1) (from Ch. 42, par. 3-1)

Sec. 3-1. Drainage districts.

Drainage districts may be formed to construct, maintain or repair drains or levees or to engage in other drainage or levee work for agricultural, sanitary or mining purposes. (Source: Laws 1955, p. 512.)

Board information: (70 ILCS 605/4-1) (from Ch. 42, par. 4-1)

Sec. 4-1. Appointment of Commissioners.

Upon the organization of the district, the temporary commissioners shall continue as permanent commissioners and shall hold office until the first Tuesday in September following the organization of the district and until their successors are selected and have qualified. On the first Tuesday in September after the organization of any district, or as soon thereafter as may be feasible, and in the manner provided in Section 3-9 of this Act, the appropriate appointing authority shall appoint 3 commissioners for such district, one of whom shall hold office for a term expiring on the first Tuesday of September next, one of whom shall hold office for a term expiring on the first Tuesday of the second succeeding September, and the other of whom shall hold office for a term expiring on the first Tuesday of the third succeeding September, and until their respective successors are selected and have qualified. On the first Tuesday of September of each succeeding year, or as soon thereafter as may be feasible, the appointing authority shall appoint one commissioner, who shall hold his office for a term expiring on the first Tuesday of the third succeeding September and until his successor is selected and has qualified.

(Source: P. A. 77-701.)

Qualifications: (70 ILCS 605/4-3) (from Ch. 42, par. 4-3)

Sec. 4-3. Qualifications of Commissioners. No person shall be appointed or elected commissioner of a district who is not an adult resident of Illinois. Neither shall any person be appointed or elected commissioner of a district who does not own land in the district unless (a) the court in election districts or the appointing authority in other districts finds it to be in the best interests of the district that the requirement of ownership of land in the district be waived or (b) the selection of commissioners is by appointment and a majority of the adult landowners owning a majority of the area embraced in the district have duly petitioned the appropriate appointing authority to allow the appointment as commissioner of an individual who does not own land in the district. (Source: P.A. 86-297.)

Submitted to County Board October 18, 2011

Member Moustis made a motion, seconded by Member Adamic, to approve the County Executive's Appointments.

Voting Affirmative were: Bilotta, Adamic, Howard, Singer, Izzo, Weigel, Dralle, Hart, McPhillips, Kusta, Maher, Traynere, Goodson, Smith, Gould, May, Rozak, Konicki, Zigrossi, Brooks, Stewart, Winfrey, Babich, Wilhelmi and Moustis. Total: Twenty-five.

No negative votes.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE ARE APPROVED.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS BY COUNTY BOARD CHAIRMAN
James Moustis**

Member Moustis stated I will make a couple of comments. First let me make comments about the budget and the budget process. For those of you who may have not been through this a number of times, we did pretty good this year. I thought it was a pretty good process. We brought it along in a timely fashion. One of the things I believe that makes it easier for us is there is no real extreme position, which makes it easier, I think to come to that middle and come to consensus. A consensus is just that, it is a consensus, no body is every happy. I am sure there are people here that would like to have cut the budget even more and I am sure there are people out there that would like to increase services or fund services more. But, in the end, I believe we do what is best for the citizens of this County both from a tax perspective and from a service and budgeting perspective. It was a little nostalgic for me here today. I will tell you why. The first ten years I was on the budget, the Land Use report probably always took an hour, because we had a lot of zoning cases going on back then, so that report could go on for an hour, hour and a half, then the Finance Chairman felt compelled to take up at least an hour. So we wouldn't get out of their reports until noon time, so this is a little nostalgic. Then we get into Member Dralle's report. It reminds me of grammar school, "How I Spent My Summer Vacation". So it is a little nostalgic today. There is one other thing I am going to bring up, I think of a more serious nature. I can see frustration on how sometimes the meetings go on, how long comments may be made, we do have rules. I am going to ask Leadership to go over those rules. County Executive Walsh I will be talking with you also, and we will give everybody the County Board rules on how the meetings are suppose to be run. We will ask the County Executive to make sure he adheres to those rules so you will understand it is the Board asking the County Executive to adhere to those rules. There are limitations on comments, how long you can comment, how many times you can comment on an issues and I think we probably need to remind everybody what those rules are and make it a little easier on our County Executive to make sure those rules are being adhered to. We will be doing that going forward. We are coming up to my favorite holiday, Thanksgiving. Because the only expectation is that we all sit down and have a good meal. I want to remind everyone on this Board, as everyone here knows, I am the Supervisor of Frankfort Township, a Township that is considered probably somewhat affluent. But, we also have a food pantry and when you sit in that food pantry you will find that people that once were doing very well aren't doing so well today. In Frankfort Township, are supplying 150 turkeys with all the trimmings so people can have a nice Thanksgiving...sit down and have a regular Thanksgiving meal. I would like to ask the Board to think about all those folks. If you have a few extra bucks, go down to your local pantry, donate a turkey, donate the whole meal, but think about those folks. At least we can try to make things a

little better for them on the holidays because they do struggle everyday of the week. We are really talking more about the kids, I mean it is not the people, people in my area it takes them a long time to stick their pride pocket and show up and say can you help me. So there are folks you know that may need a little help. There is nothing wrong with dropping a turkey off on the doorstep for them or just give them a call and invite them over and say why don't you join our family tonight for this great Holiday. So think about those folks because there is more of a need than we have seen, at least what I have seen in a long time. Another thing about those areas that are not as fortunate as Frankfort Township where they are having an even tougher time. You can also help others outside of your area. Everyone have a great Thanksgiving. I appreciate all the hard work you do. County Board staff, I noticed you were all tense the last month of so, thanks for all your great work. Thank you, Mr. Bruce Friefeld. I usually skip Bruce...I will thank Bruce he doesn't need thanks, he knows he's doing a good job. Melissa Johannsen you are super, we couldn't do without you. Everyone have a great Thanksgiving. Thank you Mr. Executive.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY LEGISLATIVE MAJORITY LEADER
Jim Bilotta

Member Goodson, Majority Whip stated I will just take the opportunity to wish everybody a Happy Thanksgiving and the beginning of this Holiday season, I hope that we all have the opportunity to help those that aren't able to enjoy these holidays as much as we are.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY LEGISLATIVE MINORITY LEADER
Walter Adamic

Member Adamic stated thank you Mr. Executive and fellow Board Members, good afternoon. First off, congratulations to Mr. David Izzo from County Board District #2, I look forward to working with you and all the Members, of course on this Board, as I have in the past and will continue to do. With regards to the budget, I think like Member Moustis said, not everybody is happy but I think I stated my comments earlier, so I will leave it at that since it is such a long day. Happy Thanksgiving to all. Without family, friends, neighbors our lives would be so boring and without your family, friends, neighbors and your health...we have much to be grateful for, so I wish all here a Happy Thanksgiving. Thank you very much.

County Executive Walsh stated I wish to offer my best wishes for a Happy Thanksgiving and a great Holiday season coming up. This Board will stand at recess until Thursday, December 15, 2011 at 9:30 a.m.