



## WILL COUNTY BOARD

302 N. CHICAGO ST.  
JOLIET, IL 60432

JULY 16, 2020

County Board Room

Special Meeting

11:00 AM

**IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING THE WILL COUNTY BOARD MEETING BUT NO SOONER THAN 11:00 AM**

**IN ACCORDANCE WITH EXECUTIVE ORDER 2020-18 ISSUED BY GOVERNOR PRITZKER, THIS MEETING WILL BE HELD VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE/TELEPHONICALLY THROUGH THE WEBEX EVENTS PLATFORM. WILL COUNTY BOARD MEMBERS WILL BE ATTENDING THE MEETING REMOTELY AND THE GENERAL PUBLIC IS STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO DO THE SAME.**

**THE PUBLIC IS INVITED TO COMMENT OR POSE A QUESTION BY EMAIL AT [PUBLICCOMMENT@WILLCOUNTYILLINOIS.COM](mailto:PUBLICCOMMENT@WILLCOUNTYILLINOIS.COM). AT THE PUBLIC COMMENTS PORTION OF THE MEETING, THE EMAILS WILL BE READ INTO THE RECORD. PLEASE GO TO [WWW.WILLCOUNTYBOARD.COM/MEETINGS](http://WWW.WILLCOUNTYBOARD.COM/MEETINGS) FOR A LINK TO ATTEND THE MEETING VIA WEBEX.**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Executive Winfrey called the meeting to order at 12:45 p.m.

<b>Attendee Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Arrived</b>
Sherry Newquist	District 1 (D - Steger)	Absent	
Judy Ogalla	District 1 (R - Monee)	Present	
Amanda Koch	District 2 (D - Frankfort)	Present	
Jim Moustis	District 2 (R - Frankfort)	Present	
Beth Rice	District 3 (D - Bolingbrook)	Present	
Margaret Tyson	District 3 (D - Bolingbrook)	Present	
Kenneth E. Harris	District 4 (D - Bolingbrook)	Present	
Jacqueline Traynere	District 4 (D - Bolingbrook)	Present	
Gretchen Fritz	District 5 (R - Plainfield)	Absent	
Meta Mueller	District 5 (D - Aurora)	Present	
Donald Gould	District 6 (R - Shorewood)	Present	
Joe VanDuyne	District 6 (D - Wilmington)	Present	
Steve Balich	District 7 (R - Homer Glen)	Present	
Mike Fricilone	District 7 (R - Homer Glen)	Present	
Edna Brass	District 8 (D - Joliet)	Present	
Herbert Brooks Jr.	District 8 (D - Joliet)	Present	
Annette Parker	District 9 (R - Crest Hill)	Present	
Rachel Ventura	District 9 (D - Joliet)	Present	
Gloria Dollinger	District 10 (R - Joliet)	Present	

Tyler Marcum	District 10 (D - Joliet)	Present	
Julie Berkowicz	District 11 (R - Naperville)	Present	
Mimi Cowan	District 11 (D - Naperville)	Present	
Ray Tuminello	District 12 (R - New Lenox)	Present	
Tom Weigel	District 12 (R - New Lenox)	Present	
Mark Ferry	District 13 (D - Plainfield)	Present	
Tim Kraulidis	District 13 (R - Joliet)	Present	

**II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG**

Member Cowan led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**III. ROLL CALL**

**IV. DECLARING QUORUM PRESENT**

**V. MOTION TO PLACE ON FILE CERTIFICATE OF PUBLICATION**

**VI. NEW BUSINESS**

**1. 20-264 Authorizing the County Executive to Negotiate a Contract with the RNG Facility Offtaker - Resolution Added**

Member Cowan stated we have had the interviews for the offtaker bids and we've had substantial conversation as a committee and we narrowed down the field somewhat and then had further conversation for their best and final offers to see if they moved any on what they had initially presented to us, so we had another substantial conversation about that and then the committee chose to rank in preference the three remaining offtakers in consideration and the results of that discussion/vote, U.S. Gain received the most votes, BlueSource was number two and Element Markets was number three. I will say, at this point, the companies are very closely allied with one another. There's nuts and bolts that are different, and certainly we can go into the details if County Board members want that, but it was a substantial conversation about those details that led us to rank the companies in that order. What we're asking for today is authority from the County Board to allow Executive Winfrey to negotiate a contract with one of these three offtakers. As I understand it, they will attempt to negotiate the contract with our first choice, U.S. Gain and in that process if something falls through then they move to the second and if that falls through with that then they move to the third. This is granting Executive Winfrey to partake their normal process with this kind of a contract and to fulfill their duties in negotiating that contract.

Member Ventura stated this project puts us on the cutting edge of technology by converting our waste to usable energy and I feel like we should all feel good about where we're going. As a committee member my opinion changed several times after reading through the proposals, looking at their websites, and interviewing the companies that we will be contracting with. Our committee vote was close. It was at 4:3 ranking of two companies. However, there was supposed to be a staff

member vote on there that was not taken into consideration so I'm not sure if that was just an oversight or (inaudible) question I have or I can leave that toward the end. Most of you, if you look through the packet, you're probably looking at the comparison sheet of three proposals from companies A, B and C. B was U.S. Gains and C was BlueSource, A was Element. It won't take you long to notice if the renewable energy credits remain the same where they are with company B, it looks to be the better choice. Company B is also a local company, U.S. Gains is what I'm talking about, and this is the only real advantage that I see as company B plans to sell our converted methane to C&G which stands for compressed natural gas. They can offer a better fixed price because of its vertical integration. This may not always result in the best RIN price. Company B initially offered a five year contract, and I think this is an important factor that we should consider. As you can see, the fixed rate on that spreadsheet that they provided, that we choose to sell the energy at is important. But as the world moves toward more renewable energy sources, the prices of renewable energy for producers that have potential to go down as more and more projects like this provide renewable gas to the market. Only the EPA has the ability to increase the demand limits. Over the long-term, we would be best served to lock in at good rate of 9 or ten or maybe we even negotiate higher for a longer period of time. That is why my preference is for company C BlueSource because they are offering a longer term contract that we can go up to 25 years. Another advantage between A and C, which is BlueSource and Element have is they have the capacity to sell energy to renewable markets that have the best price. The big sell to other RIN markets in states that offer the low carbon fuel credits like California and Oregon. These companies continue to follow legislation as new LCFS, the low carbon fuel standard markets open up possibly right here in the Midwest allowing us to generate even more money than we would have seen through U.S. Gains. The last piece that stood out to me during this presentation was it was clear that BlueSource clearly knew the market and were some of the front runners in the industry. They indeed have the most carbon off-sourcing today, in the United States. While U.S. Gains appears to be reactive in the market shifts and prioritizing and selling the gas to their own transportation markets. One might consider this a conflict of interest in looking at the best place to put our dollars. As political winds change and legislation opens up opportunities, we want to be with a company like BlueSource that can move quickly to get us the best (inaudible) for the taxpayers of Illinois. Because of this important decision, I would like to move to amend the resolution to authorize the Executive to enter into contract negotiations based on the ranking of this whole County Board as opposed to just the committee, and I'm happy to discuss more what these companies are offering.

Member Rice stated I would like a response from the current chair about Member Ventura's comments that a staff member was supposed to be part of the vote and wasn't. I would need a response on that.

Executive Winfrey stated staff members are not part of the vote. We very often ask their opinions because they are present but when we count the tallies we do not count staff members.

Member Cowan stated when we formulated the committee, the initial recommendation before we formed the committee was to have a certain number of Board members plus one voting member from the staff. In order to accommodate an extra Board member, and that Board member was Member Ventura, we opted to have a non-voting member of the staff available on the committee. That is why the staff does not have a vote.

Member Ventura stated that was not clear to me when the committee was formed. I remember the previous at executive when we were talking about assigning the committee and that there would be a voting member. It was an important decision for us all to discuss.

Executive Winfrey stated your motion is to change the order that the committee is recommending, is that correct?

Member Ventura stated it would be to go with the order that we all voted on today so that may not actually change. Everyone might still pick U.S. Gains first, BlueSource second, and Element as third. I am just asking that we are giving the consideration with the recommendation of the committee that we would go with the full ranking of the entire County Board.

Assistant State's Attorney Tatroe stated that's not a motion to amend. That's an entirely new motion. After there is discussion, if there is a will to reorder the choices of vendor that would be the time then to make the motion to amend to do that. That is always a possibility at the County Board. You can always amend your own motions and you can amend your resolutions to however you want to do (inaudible).

Member Ventura stated I made that motion because the resolution was not clear, (inaudible) the resolution as written and I could have gone through and written each time it said U.S. Gains and switched it to the will of the committee but it seemed like this was an easier way to make that motion. If you're saying we have the ability to discuss first and foremost what everyone on this Board likes, and then possibly change the motion, then I'm fine with that. But the way it was written it was not clear that that was the capability of this Board.

Assistant State's Attorney Tatroe stated the resolution reflects the Board's decision at the end. We have to have something drafted but if during the discussion the Board wants to change it, they can do so and in the past they have done so quite often.

Member Ventura stated I will withdraw my motion for the time being so we can have a discussion on how County Board members feel about these companies.

Executive Winfrey stated we have a motion and a second for the order the committee has recommended. Is there discussion?

Member Fricilone stated number one I appreciate having an ad hoc committee. I don't know why you would want to be on the committee if you don't want to abide by what the committee decides. The committee as far as I was concerned made a very conscious effort to do what's in the best interest of Will County. Member Ventura made some statements that just aren't true. She made some reference to renewable energy credits that were different from each. The RINs, or renewable credits, those are the same no matter what company you go with. That number is constant between the two. It's a variable number. Some days it's a \$1.62 and some days it's 50 cents, but it's the same with both companies. The big difference in this and all three companies, I believe, are equally qualified to do what we need to do. Our consultant told us on several occasions, you would not go wrong with either of these three companies as being your offtaker. What it comes down to is financially what is best for the county. If you take a look at the sheet, we were talking about company A, B & C, one company is willing to give us \$11.25 for an MMBTU which is the measure of gas coming off and we'll probably have 3,000 BTU's generated initially, probably getting to 5,000 BTU's by the end of the 10-year period. On average, 4,000 MMBTU's probably over the 10 year span. They're willing to give us \$11.25 for those energy units. The other company, which Member Ventura keeps pushing, and is going to do everything she can even though she was in the minority on that vote, is willing to give us \$9.50. When we extrapolate those numbers, we're getting 18% more on the fixed cost on U.S. Gain over BlueSource, both equally qualified. When we extrapolate those numbers out based on our annual production, we're probably going to, right now, receive \$1.3 million more, per year. If we assume that we are going to be in the \$4,000 MMBTU's over the average that would be \$1.6 million, over the 10 years period, \$16 million more by going with company B. Two companies B and C that are equally qualified to do our work but will give us \$16 million more over a 10 year period. Even on the way we do our fixed and credit breakdown percentages. We're still discussing that portion of it but what we wanted to do was make sure our costs were covered. It's going to cost us about \$3 million a year to operate this facility and our cost on debt is probably going to be in the \$3 million area. However, we can pay that off faster based on us getting some good credit, RIN money, over the first several years. No matter what else you want to talk about, the companies, you like the name better, you don't like the name, we are going to get \$16 million more by going with company B. Our consultants said it was equally qualified to any of the other two companies. As a representative of my constituents, I'm looking at the dollars saying, "We can't do this to our constituents, pick some company we just like maybe because of their name, maybe because of the people that are there when they're equally qualified and

not going to give us enough money." It's all about the money at this point, \$16 million more.

Member Traynere stated my question is for the staff member that was there but didn't vote. It doesn't seem logical to me that one company could give us \$16 million more than another because that's a huge amount of money. (Inaudible) doesn't have a printing press in the back room versus the other company, so there's got to be a reason there's that much more. I am inclined, and I was inclined to believe this when I was signing up for solar energy, that money I save on the front end of my solar project is probably going to be higher than the money I save on the back end because more and more people are going to have solar and so the cost is going to go down and I'm going to get less. I'm just wondering if it isn't the same way with the gas. I just need somebody that's just a little more technical because I wasn't there at the presentation to explain how one company could give \$16 million more than another.

Member Moustis stated if I may, I'm going to go through our process here, the committee process. When we met the first time with our consultant, we went over the initial proposals and made a determination that we want to pursue additional information from three companies, and so we did that. Instructed our consultant to go back to those three companies and get their best and final offer on the economics of it. When we selected those companies, the committee had a consensus that the determination would be the economic part of the package. Since the consultant said all three companies are more capable from a technical sense, from a market sense, they can all do the job. The determining factor was going to be the economic package. We also decided that, as a committee that we were going to stick with a 10 year term even though I believe one of the committee members made an argument why they felt the longer term would be more beneficial. The committee as a whole decided 10 years was enough. (Inaudible) after a 10 year period we're going to have an increase in production and know what the market is, and so forth. Also, the consultants on the economics recommended that we use a fixed price to cover the county's costs. In other words, the fixed price was going to be heavily weighted in my opinion. We then made the determination of what should the percentage of the fixed price be? We went back and forth but the committee decided probably 65% fixed and 35% RINs. One committee member wanted it 50/50. This hasn't been decided yet, by the way. We didn't come to a conclusion except the chair said, "We'll make it 50-65%." All committee members except one was at 65%. That would ensure that we would then cover our fixed costs, which I think we thought would be about \$7.5 million. One company, and I think there's reasons, partly because they are like the retailer of gas, also. I think it's yet to be determined when we decide to sell RINs. I think that should be part of the negotiation. The county has the ability to trigger the sale of RINs when we think the market is most advantageous to the county. That's how we came to these rankings. It was a lot on the economic package and the term was decided by the committee, as the majority. I want to

throw one other thing in about taking something from committee, and say, "Now we're just going to have the whole County Board do it." First of all, the whole County Board has not heard all the information given. We would almost have to start over. The County Board as a whole can reject it, they can amend it, but this idea now that one member doesn't like the results of the committee and now let's ask the whole County Board to get involved or not take the recommendation of the committee. The committee structure has worked very well for many years. Over the years the County Board worked very hard on an effective committee structure. Certainly what this does is it makes everything more transparent. It doesn't concentrate influence on one or two persons hands and the public is well informed...very transparent. I would recommend to the Board to be very cautious if you start getting away from that committee structure. I think it will cause chaos and I think the committee structure over time has brought order. It's much better to reject what a committee has recommended than say we're going to redo what they did. I can tell you this committee, I believe was in sync, there was discussion, and in the end the majority of the committee agreed on how to move forward and they agreed on the rankings. I know a committee member would like to undo what the committee work has been done, but I would say, move forward, take a vote. You don't like the way our process works then just reject and vote no on what the committee and the work they've done.

Member Ogalla stated thank you. What I wanted to know was what the difference was between the different companies and why this one was selected. I believe all the committee members who have answered in question so far cleared that up in my mind. Thank you and that was my comment.

Member Rice stated I just want to confirm that EcoEngineers were the consultants that were continuously referenced, is that correct?

Executive Winfrey stated that's true.

Member Ventura stated I am not trying to skirt the committee process or undo anything the committee has done, but much like when Land Use Committee brings forth a recommendation, it is for this Board to confirm. To Member Moustis' point, sure, we could just vote it down. I was trying to get the will of the committee. If that's the route you want to go then I suppose that's the route you want to go. The reason I think it's important is because it was a close vote. It was a three to four vote. Just like in Land Use if we brought forth a close vote, it would be prudent for this Board to discuss the merits of the cases at hand and come to a decision because of that. I hope no one thinks I'm trying to skirt our process or do something that's not proper, quite the opposite. I want to make sure everybody does get a voice here because it was not a consensus one way or the other. To clarify what Member Fricilone was referring to...the oftaker, that is the company that we are selecting to sell our gas. It's their decision on where we sell the gas. And this decision was basically the difference between U.S. Gains ad BlueSource. I

agree that both companies we'll be in good hands but there are benefits to one or the other. To the point of where we sell our gas changes the price of how much the gas is being sold for. U.S. Gains owns their own compressed natural gas. We use this gas for trucks, for an alternative to fuel. They can use natural gas...our busses, some of our natural gas busses use that instead. They have their own fueling places here in Will County. There's one in Joliet and one in Bolingbrook. They would be selling the natural gas essentially to themselves. That is why they are able to offer a little bit more on the fixed price because they're going to be making money in selling that gas to the trucks. (Inaudible) highest bidder. So if there's someone who wants to buy the natural gas at a higher price, they're obviously going to sell to themselves first because they make money before selling it to some other company. BlueSource and Element both do not have natural gas plants, or CNG fueling stations, so they would be able to go to the market and sell it to whatever bidder is out there at the highest price. While the environment's attribute credits would be the same, that's based on the market the EPA sets, there are other aspects here. Lastly the part with the low carbon fuel services that is an additional cost that we could be making to the taxpayers. While the perspectives they gave us looks as though because of the fixed rate, we would be bringing in more money by going with U.S. Gains, there is the potential that we could either be the same amount or (inaudible) or even more with another company. That's because some of this is projected cost and not hard cost. Because BlueSource has been a frontrunner in this and has continued to chase the legislation of different states to be the first to sell into those areas and get the (inaudible) credits, I do believe based on their presentation, what the company has done already, that they are more proactive in the market and can get us a better deal than being reactive in the market and basically selling the gas to themselves. I would just ask the committee to consider that. If it's more important to have the gas here locally, and be tied into wherever U.S. Gains is going to sell it to themselves then okay. But if we want to make sure we're getting the best deal for our taxpayers regardless whether they own CNG or not, the reality is that BlueSource could also sell it to U.S. Gains CNG plant. That might be the best place for them to sell it. What I'm saying is that it frees the offtaker company up to sell it in the best market. Lastly, I just want to say when Member Moustis said this was the best and final offer, we did ask him for the best and final offer. One of the reasons we are ranking these companies is because there is a lot of room to negotiate. When we go back to them with a percentage of RIN versus fixed, prices could change, so this is not a final, final of what the company is going to end up getting.

Member Traynere stated I never did get an answer to my question. I wanted to hear from the staff member who was present in the meeting since it was such a close vote. It was not six, it was three to four. I'm just wondering what their thoughts are. I assume it was Mr. Dean Olson but I don't know that.



Mr. Dean Olson stated I think (inaudible) had to work through a lot of this stuff. First of all, they had to decide if (inaudible) was the right way to go, so we got everyone to do the 10 year so that we could compare them equally. It is a variation of RINs on that so the fixed price is a guaranteed amount that you would get and the RIN is the stock market price, so to speak. Think of your bank account with almost zero percent interest. It's going to be there and then the stock market on the balance. They varied between 50 and 75 percent and then I think they started going in on 60 to 65 percent. I plugged in a number but we don't know yet what the right, exact number is. Mr. Brad Klima, our consultant, said it would probably be best to go around to 60 to 65 percent; 65 percent might be the right number to make sure that you pay your debts and you have a chance to play into the RIN market adequately. U.S. Gain, they have local CNG stations, one in Bolingbrook and then in Joliet. They do have their own stations heavily in the fuel market. All of these companies are really good. That's what made it so hard to make a decision here and it is a lot of money. It's what mix do you want. If you want more RINs, it appears U.S. Gain, because they are in that market, is the best one because that's their thing. They also have a very good fixed price too. They don't want to go beyond 10 years but that's what everybody set up. They said they wanted 10 years. They didn't say anything about going beyond 10 years. If you're looking at how the committee honed in on this, I think that's kind of the way it went. Again, all of these three companies are all very good, but if you're looking for that mix I was just talking about as Mr. Brad Klima, our consultant, set it out, they have the highest return that we know of the moment. Of course prices change, but U.S. Gain has definitely upped the ante here as far as their price goes throughout this several week process.

Member Traynere stated obviously this is a negotiation process and our process is the County Executive's office does the negotiating. If they don't come to terms on the first one as was mentioned earlier, they go to the next company, that's what we've done in the past. Let's see if the first company lives up to the \$16 million hype.

Member Cowan stated I did just want to let everyone know in the spirit of transparency, we had asked for a best final offer before our meeting on Tuesday and that was how we made our decisions going forward. Mr. Brad Klima, the consultant, and just to let everyone know he had intended to be here but he had let us know that he had to go at noon so we missed him because of our lengthy previous meeting. Brad let us know that oftentimes with these companies, because it's a very competitive market, that even after they give you their quote last and best final offer, that sometimes in the negotiating process when they find out they're not seated in first place, they will then have a better last and final offer and sure enough, that's what happened Tuesday after our meeting and after we had selected our rankings. Element, which was in the third position of our rankings, came back and offered a 20-year fixed price deal which they hadn't previously. I do want, in the spirit of transparency to let everyone know that was

offered. The vast majority of the committee members were not comfortable with a longer term anyway because we feel like this is a moving target so I'm not sure that would have really necessarily changed most of our considerations and Element being in the third place I'm not sure that would have been enough to bump them up to first as well, but just in the spirit of transparency. I also just want to say when we rank them, I did rank BlueSource as number one, however, as I stated at the beginning of this, I think these companies are all really solid. They've been pulled from a much larger group, the staff and the consultant have done an excellent job in leading us through this process. The amount of detail and technical detail that has gone into these conversations is really quite intense and even though I put BlueSource first, my number two was U.S Gain and I am content to go forward with the will of the committee because I think we had a fulsome and fair conversation about it. Mr. Dean Olson is there anything you want to add about your leanings on this or your recommendation, I'd be happy to have you share that with the group right now.

Mr. Dean Olson stated this is a policy decision. If you pick any of these companies you're going to be good. U.S. Gain is probably the most aggressive from what I understand on getting that extra price, so to speak, because they're in the fuel market. If Mr. Brad Klima was here he could tell you which one exactly, but all of these companies...Element Market, I wish they would have brought that offer earlier, but at the same time if we're looking at 10 years, it still makes sense to go with U.S. Gain because they have the most \$11.25 on the fixed and they are aggressive on the RINs. If you wanted to go higher it's your choice, but the choice of the committee, I believe, was 10 years, and it took a while to get to that 10 year. Originally I think we were looking at five and maybe more than 10. I think everyone settled on 10 and it took a long time but we got to 10. That needs to be respected too, but those are just my thoughts.

Member Fricilone stated I want to go back through the numbers one more time because apparently Member Ventura and I were at a different meeting. I know (inaudible) when Member Ventura says, "Well this other company can go to the market and get a better deal. It doesn't matter what any of these companies go to the market and sell the gas for. It does not matter. Theirs is what price they're guaranteeing us. U.S. Gains is guaranteeing us \$11.25, BlueSource is guaranteeing us \$9-10. That's what we get for 10 years on everything we sell. I just hope we can get to a point where everybody follows the rule instead of everybody except Member Ventura. This is the whole point in getting a fixed price. The fixed price is what we get for 10 years. So apparently Member Ventura, your whole argument is out the window because you don't understand how this works. We get \$11.25 for every unit we sell for 10 years from one company and maybe \$9.50 from the other company. They could sell it for \$1, they could sell it for \$5, they could sell it for \$50. Member Traynere I don't know why you can't understand why one company can't get us a better deal. We can make \$1.6 million more (inaudible) maybe it's because they can sell to themselves. Why do we care

where they're selling it? We're taking our money based on what they are getting us for a fixed price. They can sell it in any market they want as a renewable. That's their prerogative. But they're guaranteeing us that we're going to get that money. That additional \$1.6 million a year. The only other thing is, I know Member Ventura wants to continue to bring up the potential of what's happening in California, again, not taking the recommendations from our consultant who said, "There's no way that's going to happen out here in the next 10 years. Do not consider that in your decisions because it's not going to happen." That's our consultant, who's done an awesome job for us. Thank you.

Member Ventura stated I was just saying instead of insulting Board members, we could instead have staff confirm those details. That way we're not arguing with one another. As for what Mr. Brad Klima said about the LCFS, he also did say as well as to the company to presented it, that there is current legislation that is happening in California, even like the Midwest that will open up potential markets in the future. (Inaudible) so while that was unlikely, it was not improbable that there was legislation happening from New York all the way over to Washington state that these markets would be opening in the near future.

Member Moustis stated this would be just to enter into negotiations...I just want to clarify something. We did not determine the percentage that was going to be fixed. Correct? We leave that up to the negotiations? We put in a spread of 50 to 65 percent. Is that everyone else's recollection? We would leave that up to the negotiation?

Executive Winfrey stated yes, I believe that's true.

Member Moustis stated even though I believe that the larger consensus is between 60 and 65 percent, so that will be part of the negotiation. That's why I think we got the highest and best offer, strictly on the economic part of it as far as what they would pay for fixed. The RINs, they just take commission for selling them out into the market. I just wanted to get that clarified, that that would be part of the parameters of the negotiations (inaudible).

Executive Winfrey stated yes it will.

Member Moustis stated then you would come back before us before. I'm just wondering if you would come back to the committee, or maybe the entire County Board and let us know what you think you zeroed in on. After consultation with the consultant then you will let us know?

Executive Winfrey stated Mr. Nick Palmer and I along with Mr. Brad Klima and, of course, Mr. Dean Olson, we'll have them get the process going and as it starts to shape up we'll share that again with the committees so that you can have a chance to say you like that, you don't like that, whatever the case may be.

Member Tuminello stated I just want to make a clarifying statement that we don't typically allow staff to vote on the committees. However, in the past there have been times when we have, when Member Moustis was the Speaker, he allowed the Executive's office and Judge Schoenstedt's office in some of the committee meetings when we were picking individuals for who was going to build the courthouse, we did the same thing for the Health Department. In both of those occasions, Member Moustis was very upfront when the committee was formed that the staff members would have a vote. I would say with the premise going forward that staff members do not have a vote unless the Speaker or the committee decides that they're going to and are very vocal about it. That would be the only time staff should be allowed to be counted in vote totals.

Executive Winfrey stated that's true. Even though we do typically ask for their opinion and we share would they would have voted for they are not necessarily counted in the final number unless we have announced that on the front end.

Member Tumlnello stated like in both of those cases Member Moustis and I felt that it was important that the Health Department, the Executive's department, weigh in on the vote. Moving forward I think it should be the assumption that the staff does not have a vote that's counted unless it's stated up front.

Member Cowan stated I just wanted to say thank you to everyone for being willing to engage with this process and to listening to these details and to continue to encourage Board members who are not on the committee to come to the committee meetings if they are deeply invested in this process and really want to know all those details because especially with something like this, the amount of technical detail and discussion that's going on in the committee meeting is difficult to condense and really express in the full Board meeting without fully rehashing things which is obviously not time-effective for anyone. Please, if you are invested or interested join us for the committee meetings, we'll be happy to have you and we're looking forward to moving this forward. Thank you.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Mike Fricilone, District 7 (R - Homer Glen)
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Rachel Ventura, District 9 (D - Joliet)
<b>AYES:</b>	Ogalla, Koch, Moustis, Rice, Tyson, Harris, Traynere, Mueller, Gould, VanDuyne, Balich, Fricilone, Brass, Brooks Jr., Parker, Ventura, Dollinger, Marcum, Berkowicz, Cowan, Tuminello, Weigel, Ferry, Kraulidis
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Newquist, Fritz

- VII. OTHER NEW BUSINESS**
- VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT**
- IX. EXECUTIVE SESSION**

- X. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE COUNTY BOARD SPEAKER, MAJORITY LEADER AND MINORITY LEADER
- XI. ADJOURNMENT



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

***Authorizing the County Executive to Negotiate a Contract with the RNG Facility Offtaker***

WHEREAS, a request for bids was issued on May 12, 2020, for the RNG Facility Offtaker and six (6) proposals were received on June 3, 2020 and

WHEREAS, after careful review by the county's technical staff and consultant, four (4) firms were brought forward to interview, and subsequently three (3) RNG Offtaker bids considered; and

WHEREAS, after presentations, discussions, and evaluations of the firms, the Ad-Hoc RNG Facility Committee has ranked as its first choice U.S. Gain as the RNG Facility Offtaker; BlueSource was recommended as its second choice; and Element Markets was recommended as its third choice; and

WHEREAS, based upon recommendations and presentations at Committee, the Ad-Hoc RNG Facility Committee recommends that negotiations be entered into with U.S. Gain for the RNG Facility Offtaker.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Will County Board concurs with the recommendation of the Ad-Hoc RNG Facility Committee ranking the following firms for RNG Facility Offtaker: (1)U.S. Gain; (2) BlueSource and (3) Element Markets.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Will County Board hereby authorizes the County Executive to enter into negotiations with U.S. Gain to provide sufficient revenue to meet the County's risk profile from the RNG sold from the County owned Prairie View landfill, taking into account the estimated value, scope, complexity and professional nature of the services to be rendered. If said negotiations with the first ranked U.S. Gain prove unsuccessful then negotiations with U.S. Gain should cease and negotiations should begin with the second ranked firm, BlueSource. If negotiations with the second ranked firm of BlueSource prove unsuccessful then negotiations with BlueSource should cease and negotiations should begin with the third ranked firm of Element Markets.

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 16th day of July, 2020.

<b>AYES:</b>	Ogalla, Koch, Moustis, Rice, Tyson, Harris, Traynere, Mueller, Gould, VanDuyne, Balich, Fricilone, Brass, Brooks Jr., Parkèr, Ventura, Dollinger, Marcum, Berkowicz, Cowan, Tuminello, Weigel, Ferry, Kraulidis
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Newquist, Fritz

Result: Approved - [Unanimous]

*Lauren Staley Ferry*  
 Lauren Staley Ferry (SEAL)  
 Will County Clerk

Approved this 16 day of July, 2020.

*Denise E. Winfrey*  
 Denise E. Winfrey  
 Will County Executive