

Members Present

Mr. Tripp, Mr. James, Mr. LaGesse, Mr. Liehr, Mr. Olthoff, Mr. Washington, Mr. Einfeldt, Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Vickery, Ms. Polk, Mr. Whitis, and Mr. Tholen

Members Absent

Mr. Howard

In Attendance

- **Board Members**

Mr. Bossert, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Enz, and Mr. Hess

- **Department Heads**

Jamie Boyd and Mark Rogers

- **Media**

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

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

2. Public Comment

3. Approval of Minutes – October 28, 2014

**A motion to approve the minutes was made by Mr. James and seconded by Mr. Vickery.
Motion carried with a voice vote.**

4. Planning

- **Ordinance to Establish the Kankakee County Enterprise Zone**
- **Resolution to Enter into Intergovernmental Agreement for the Kankakee County Enterprise Zone**
- **Ordinance to Establish the Kankakee River Valley Enterprise Zone**
- **Resolution to Enter into Intergovernmental Agreement for the Kankakee River Valley Enterprise Zone**

Mr. Van Mill stated that he will talk about all four of the above items together. In today's packet are draft documents that they have been working on for several months in conjunction with the municipalities and Kankakee County. They have a deadline of December 31, 2014, to make application to the state for the recertification of our enterprise zones.

Mr. Van Mill stated that Kankakee County has two enterprise zones. They were both established in the mid-1980's and they provide a number of local incentives and state incentives. There is sales tax abatement on building materials that goes into the construction of an industrial manufacturing site. There is a property tax abatement on new construction which is a 5-year abatement that starts at 100% the first year, goes to 80% the second year, 60% the third year, 40% the fourth year, 20% the fifth year, and then year six the improvement is on the full tax roll.

Mr. Van Mill stated that one of the enterprise zones is the Kankakee County Enterprise Zones which is made up currently of Kankakee County, the Village of Manteno, the City of Momence, and the Village of Hopkins Park. The new application that they are proposing adds the Village of Grant Park to that mix.

Mr. Van Mill stated that the other enterprise zone is the Kankakee River Valley Enterprise Zone which is comprised of most of the urbanized area of the county. The current zone is made up of the partners of

Kankakee County, the City of Kankakee, the Village of Bradley, the village of Bourbonnais, and Aroma Park. In the new application they are proposing including portions of the Village of Herscher.

Mr. Van Mill stated that these two enterprise zones are set to expire July 1, 2016. So far in the Kankakee County Enterprise Zone they have seen over \$133 million of capital investment and 2372 jobs retained or created during the life of that zone. In the Kankakee River Valley from 2005 to 2014 they have seen over \$276 million of investment creating or retaining over 4000 jobs.

Mr. Van Mills stated that with many of the enterprise zones in Illinois set to expire about the same time new legislation was passed in 2012 to extend the enterprise program for another 25 years. With the new certification program every enterprise zone is going to expire so competition for zones across the State of Illinois is going to be very competitive. Statutorily, there are only 98 zones in the State of Illinois and everyone will be fighting for those as every community can apply. There are new reporting requirements which they are already doing. The Department of Revenue is very involved in that. The new application process is going to require them to demonstrate that Kankakee County can meet 10 criteria that the state puts forth. They have to demonstrate a need for the enterprise zone which has to be done by December 31. Once that is done, the state has until September of 2015 to grade the applications. There will be a zone board that is going to be appointed by the Governor that will actually take the recommendations. That board can do whatever they want to certify zones across the state. They do not have to take a recommendation or the highest score. It is a process that has a lot of definitive points up to a certain level and then it kind of gets into the state's process.

Mr. LaGessee asked if the City of Kankakee is doing something with building permits that is different than what the other entities are doing.

Mr. Van Mill stated that early this spring the City of Kankakee and Kankakee County were certified to charge 50% instead of waiving the entire building permit fee. The intergovernmental agreement allows every community to structure the incentive programs the way that they want them to be. Bradley changed theirs to state that they will waive building permit fees but they will not waive inspection fees.

Mr. Washington asked what sources the state is drawing from to create the 10 criteria points.

Mr. Van Mill stated that they probably used other state's criteria for enterprise zones. Enterprise zones exist across the country. He doesn't know the exact sources.

Mr. Wheeler asked if one of our enterprise zones does not get approved, are the businesses that may be enjoying the benefits of the enterprise zone now grandfathered in.

Mr. Van Mill stated that they are not. As of July 1, 2016, it ceases to exist so if there is a company that is getting property tax abatements that start right now and they have 5-year abatement, it stops on July 1, 2016. They have a contingency plan in place for that kind of situation to occur. It is quite labor intensive but they could on a case-by-case basis, if the projects are large enough, use the Revenue Act and provide them some sort of property tax rebate, if it is necessary.

Mr. McConnell asked if the building material tax abatement is strictly for new construction or is it for the life of the 5 years. If they build a building and have \$100,000 in material and then in five years they want to build another building and there is \$200,000 in material, are we giving them a rebate again?

Mr. Van Mill stated that it is not an ongoing thing. Every property tax abatement form has to be accompanied by a building permit. Once the material is bought, it ends.

Mr. McConnell stated that he has seen it happen where someone will use that material tax abatement and buy and buy and buy and not pay taxes.

Mr. Van Mill stated that can no longer be done because the Department of Revenue (DOR) now issues the sales tax abatement form with a very specific number on it and a very specific start date and end date, as well as, an estimate of the amount of materials that is going to be bought. They cannot be used for multiple projects. A contractor also has to file with the DOR what they actually paid.

Mr. McConnell asked if he has any idea how much it costs for them to go out and do inspections.

Mr. Van Mill stated that they are now collecting 50% of the building permit fees. When they issued the building permit for the seven story CSL facility they got a check for \$44,000. They just got two checks from them for \$13,000. That is enough to cover the cost of their plan reviews, processing the building permits, doing multiple inspections, etc. Before they changed the intergovernmental agreement, they received nothing.

Mr. Enz asked if there is any encouragement for them to buy materials locally.

Mr. Van Mill stated that in the early 80's there was provision in most enterprise zones that you had to buy in the zone but the state will not allow them to do that anymore.

Mr. Enz stated that he is assuming that the whole sales tax is abated, not just the county's.

Mr. Van Mill stated that all of the state sales tax is abated.

Mr. James asked if their inspectors have to be engineers.

Mr. Van Mill stated that his staff works with a third party engineer to approve the plans and when the plans are done they are certified by our third party reviewer. Also, the architect for the company has to certify them too.

Mr. McConnell stated that it takes 30 to 45 days before the plans are approved.

Mr. Vickery asked Mr. Van Mill to tell the committee what this does to give the county more marketing tools to attract and retain business.

Mr. Van Mill stated that during the Phase #1 application process there are going to be 48 zones certified. There will be over 100 applications for these 48 zones. There is going to be 98 across the State of Illinois. Even if someone does not philosophically agree with these programs, if we don't have one we are not on the same level playing field because there are going to be 98 of them throughout the state so we need to be aggressive and be a part of that.

Mr. Vickery stated that it has been very important in his district in Momence and Grant Park. It made them friendlier to business.

Mr. Van Mill stated that they have to meet a minimum of three of the ten criteria. They had to have an economic impact analysis done and they partnered with Western Illinois University to help them with that. They will meet to some level all of the ten criteria.

Mr. Whitis asked what the size limitations were on the enterprise zones.

Mr. Van Mill stated that statutorily it has to be a minimum of a half square mile and can be no more than fifteen square miles, if there are more than four units of government involved. We have five units of government in one zone and six in the other so we can go to the maximum 15 square miles. The zones also have to be contiguous so they have to have three foot connector strips amongst the municipalities to connect the zones. They held public hearings on October 23 for the enterprise zones.

Mr. Bossert asked how many square miles are the two applications.

Mr. Van Mill stated that the Kankakee River Valley Enterprise Zone is 14.5 square miles and the Kankakee County is almost 12.97 square miles.

Mr. Van Mill stated that every unit of government involved in this has to pass a designating ordinance that basically establishes the zone and then there is a resolution and an intergovernmental agreement. The resolution is passed by the county board authorizing the chief elected officials to sign the intergovernmental agreement. They have gotten broad support for this already. They have already sent out to industry asking them for support letters with a deadline of December 12 and so far they have had a good response.

Mr. Bossert stated that at this time there are no other taxing bodies mentioned in our documents. In the future, is it possible? At that point, do we have to amend all of our documents to bring in a school district, a fire district, etc?

Mr. Van Mill stated that we do. The property tax abatement is pretty much driven by the school districts. If we want to make the property tax abatement meaningful, we have to have the local units of government on board with that. We don't get positive points or negative points if we don't have resolutions by our taxing districts that are participating in the abatement portion of this. They felt their attention should be spent more on getting the community and industries supportive of this and get the application done. It is going to be over a year once the application is in place before we are going to have any idea if we get certified. From that perspective, let's make sure we get it and then we can go back and see if we can get support from the taxing districts.

Mr. LaGesse asked if having two enterprise zones hurts our chances getting certified.

Mr. Van Mill stated that he does not think that it hurts our chances but it is highly unusual for a county to have two. He realizes that issue but he thinks it makes sense with the needs in the Hopkins Park and Momence and with the proposed Illiana coming.

Mr. Van Mill stated that at the December county board meeting they would like the board to take action on both zones. The first is the designating ordinance that establishes the zone and establishes its boundary and sets the parameters for the intergovernmental agreement. The second part is a resolution that authorizes the chief elected official in the municipalities and in the county to sign the intergovernmental agreement that sets the administrative entity, establishes how the zone administrator gets appointed and

what his duties are, and it sets the incentives offer. They are working closely with the State's Attorney's Office to make sure that these things are ready for the December 12 board meeting.

Mr. LaGesse made a motion to approve the ordinance and intergovernmental agreement to establish the Kankakee County Enterprise Zone and Mr. Tripp seconded it. Motion carried with a roll call vote of 13 ayes and 0 nays. Voting aye were Mr. Bossert, Mr. Tripp, Mr. James, Mr. LaGesse, Mr. Liehr, Mr. Olthoff, Mr. Washington, Mr. Einfeldt, Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Vickery, Ms. Polk, Mr. Whitis, and Mr. Tholen.

Mr. Washington made a motion to approve the ordinance and intergovernmental agreement to establish the Kankakee River Valley Enterprise Zone and Mr. James seconded it. Motion carried with a roll call vote of 13 ayes and 0 nays. Voting aye were Mr. Bossert, Mr. Tripp, Mr. James, Mr. LaGesse, Mr. Liehr, Mr. Olthoff, Mr. Washington, Mr. Einfeldt, Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Vickery, Ms. Polk, Mr. Whitis, and Mr. Tholen.

Mr. Vickery asked Mr. Van Mill to explain the work that went into this.

Mr. Van Mill stated that their goal was to try and get this to the committee in November but a combination of negotiations amongst municipalities in terms of where some of the zones would be involved a lot of discussion and negotiating. They had to be a facilitator amongst the municipalities.

Mr. Vickery thanked him for the hard work that his department has done on this.

Mr. McConnell thanked Mr. Van Mill for educating him on this and for the work well done on it.

Mr. Washington stated that looking back historically this is a milestone in cooperation and it is steadily moving forward to a unified form of cooperation throughout the county. He congratulates Mr. Van Mill and Mr. Skimerhorn.

5. Transportation

• URS Contract for Traffic Safety Audit

Mr. Lammey stated that this is the third year that they have done a contract with a consultant for a traffic safety audit. It is for things that they do not have the in-house expertise to do.

Mr. Wheeler asked if the grant can be used for different things.

Mr. Lammey stated that State Metro is for transportation planning inside the urbanized area with state money rather than federal money so they have a lot more leeway on what they can do with it. This is how they have chosen to use it for the last three years.

Mr. LaGesse stated that on page 9 #4 it says the study areas are assistance in developing a program to measure traffic delay on corridors in the Kankakee urbanized area. Does that include Armour & Rt. 50 and Rt. 102 & Rt. 45-52?

Mr. Lammey stated that it does. They have discovered that it is possible to hit five red lights in a row. They have been told by the State of Illinois that those signals are coordinated but they now have proof that they are not. Now they have evidence to show them that we would like for them to do a study on coordinating those signals.

Mr. Liehr stated that this contract is for \$18,741. Will our cost exceed that?

Mr. Lammey stated that it will not.

Mr. Vickery made a motion to approve and Mr. James seconded it. Motion carried with a roll call vote of 13 ayes and 0 nays. Voting aye were Mr. Bossert, Mr. Tripp, Mr. James, Mr. LaGesse, Mr. Liehr, Mr. Olthoff, Mr. Washington, Mr. Einfeldt, Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Vickery, Ms. Polk, Mr. Whitis, and Mr. Tholen.

Mr. Hess asked Mr. Lammey to give an explanation as to why the state denied CSL Bering access onto Route 50 to alleviate the problem on North Street.

Mr. Lammey stated that it was asked but they turned it down. It really needs a self-actuated signal but they don't have it yet.

Mr. Van Mill stated that they are looking at an alternative that may help alleviate the traffic there.

Mr. Hess stated that the problem is when CSL employees are getting out and they have a semi that wants to turn to go into their delivery area that semi sits in that lane and it backs everything up.

Mr. Van Mill stated that internally they have talked about having different entrances.

Mr. LaGesse stated that another huge problem is if you are headed east and you stop at the stop sign on Armour Road there is only one turn lane to go north so people in both lanes have to get over and it gets congested. The state needs to buy some property and make another right hand turn lane to the right.

- **Intergovernmental Agreement with Will County for Illiana Expressway Planning Grant**

Mr. Lammey stated that they have a joint study with Will County on the effect of land use planning, transportation planning, and economic development planning in the area that will impacted by the Illiana.

Mr. Lammey gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Planning Grant with Will County. It is two-year study from the date of the contract signing and they think the contract is close to being signed. Will County will hire the consultant for the study and Kankakee County will be represented in the Steering Committee for the study. Kankakee County will be the lead in this county. Will County has agreed to be the lead agency for the study. Kankakee County will receive reimbursement from grant funds for Kankakee County staff time spent on the project not to exceed \$25,000. There is no local money from Kankakee County involved in the study. They plan on using state funds for rural transportation planning that they receive. Will County is going to fund \$25,000. They are asking the committee to authorize Chairman Bossert and the County Clerk to sign the agreement.

Mr. Washington made a motion to approve and Mr. Tripp seconded it.

Discussion

Mr. Liehr stated that public comment on the Illiana continues to be very skeptical because of perceived cost of the toll way. Is there any way that we can respond to the public when they say that trucks and other vehicles won't pay the toll and will continue to use Route 17 to go through Kankakee County?

Mr. Van Mill stated that they have the traffic studies done which they need done to go out and solicit investors. Apparently, at this point, it shows that it is feasible because both Illinois and Indiana are moving forward. Mr. Rauner was quoted as saying that he is in favor of public private partnerships and that was the first time that he heard him say anything on this project. There is a lot of pressure from Chicago and the Chicago media to dump this project but the process is moving forward.

Mr. Vickery stated that he tells people to take a ride up the toll road and count the trucks. There are convoys of trucks and he is hoping that they get those convoys out of Momence.

Mr. Wheeler stated that it reimburses cost up to \$25,000. If it goes over, is the county responsible for it?

Mr. Lammey stated that it will not go over \$25,000.

Mr. Washington stated that the state police normally watch traffic patterns and they use their movable scales to catch people going on routes other than the main routes so ultimately they end up forcing them to travel the new route.

Mr. Wheeler stated that he thought the \$25,000 was to reimburse for office personnel.

Mr. Lammey stated that there are two \$25,000. One is the local share which is made out of state money that the state gives us and the other is \$25,000 for staff time.

Mr. James asked what Chicago's opposition is.

Mr. Van Mill stated that they see this as investing money way outside the urbanized area and it is going to create sprawl. They are concerned that the state is going to spend a lot of money on this project which would limit the amount of funds that would be available for public improvements in the urban area. They also fear that the state is going to set up to have to be a backstop if the tolls do not reach the revenues that are necessary. The state is going to have to guarantee certain amounts of money to whoever the private developer is in case it doesn't generate the revenue necessary. Also, is the funding for the Illiana going to jeopardize funding for the other communities to the north?

Original motion carried with a roll call vote of 13 ayes and 0 nays. Voting aye were Mr. Bossert, Mr. Tripp, Mr. James, Mr. LaGessee, Mr. Liehr, Mr. Olthoff, Mr. Washington, Mr. Einfeldt, Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Vickery, Ms. Polk, Mr. Whitis, and Mr. Tholen.

6. Other

- **Solid Waste Consultant Status/Update**

Mr. Bossert stated that at the last county board meeting a request was made to place on this agenda an update for the committee on the solid waste consultant activity. Our outside attorney, Chuck Helsten, has been contacted by a potential developer and he is asking that he have a chance to explore that discussion and wants us to know that our consultants have been involved in that activity and are needed. Mr. Helsten suggested that they could continue to have updates at future committees and he can share additional information as he can but right now the nature of these types of discussions are extremely confidential and Mr. Helsten is asking for our indulgence in that matter to explore this discussion. They are asking the committee to agree that we can continue with our current arrangement but he has mentioned to Mr. Helsten that our consultant contract probably needs to be reviewed and perhaps in some fashion limited and come to an understanding on what balance may be due to our consultants for their activities to-date.

Obviously, it has gone way past the timeline that was originally discussed and whether we are still liable for the amount of money that has accrued needs to be discussed and Mr. Helsten is the one that can help us with that.

Mr. James stated that his interest would be in what type of time frame or time table are we going to extend this, if we do. What would be needed? He thinks that one of the problems is that we have not had any concrete answers on direction on when it going to happen or if it is going to happen. Is there a timetable that Mr. Helsten is talking about?

Mr. Boyd stated that if the committee is going to continue forward his recommendation to the committee is that do so a week at a time and keep this matter fresh. Based on Mr. Helsten's conversation with Mr. Bossert, it sounds like there is something in the wind and this matter touches on each and every committee in some fashion so his recommendation would be every two weeks at the most get a status of where we are with whatever Mr. Helsten has. They may not be lengthy updates and details but at least the board members know and they can make a determination. Mr. Helsten has a desire to address board members so if the committee can give this a week a determination can be made as to when he is available to come address the committee.

Mr. Liehr asked Mr. Boyd if he is recommending that this be on the agenda of each committee.

Mr. Boyd stated that he is not going to make that specific of a recommendation. The committee can make a decision as to how they want to handle this. His advice is that whatever is done, keep it in the forefront.

Mr. Wheeler stated that he appreciates the sensitivity of all of this but why do we need to extend the payment and the agreement with the consultants if there is someone already talking to the lawyers. At this point, he imagines it is the lawyers talking to each other and he doesn't understand why we need to keep the agreement going with the consultants. He thinks that we are around \$300,000 into this and having a hard stop is not necessarily a bad thing at this point.

Mr. Bossert stated that Mr. Helsten's comment is that they are needed and are a part of whatever discussion is going on. He thinks that Mr. Helsten can help us with working through their role and it may be a matter of breaking off whatever agreement we have now and reenter into a new one if things move forward. He will caution everybody that this is a big "if" and Mr. Helsten says that this may come to nothing. At this point it is just a contact. We can let him take the lead on discussions with our consultants.

Mr. Olthoff asked if this should be a brief update at this committee's meeting every month or at the county board meeting.

Mr. Bossert asked for direction on how the committee wants to handle it.

Mr. Einfeldt stated that he thinks there should be an update every two weeks, one at the board meeting and one at this committee meeting.

Mr. Enz stated that he thinks that this has gone on long enough and that it is time to cut this off. Right now we are in a dire situation for money and the money that we spent on this in the last year could keep three deputies on their job. He believes that this is a long shot, at best. He figures it would be at least seven years before this would come true and he does not think that it is worth it. He would like to know exactly

what it has cost us between consultants, attorneys, and lobbyists. He would ask someone to make a motion to push this onto the county board for discussion by all the board members.

Mr. James stated that it is easy to want to shoot this thing down and he can understand why but we got beat on the 1% sales tax and right now the only shadow out there that might pull us away from bankruptcy would be this issue. If somebody has a better plan, we can always stop this thing down the road. Everybody that was against this in the first place was not supporting the 1% sales tax increase that would have alleviated this problem.

Mr. Washington stated that in 1984 or 1985 the federal government decided that they would stop giving us a replacement tax which totaled around \$800,000 a year for this county. At that point and time, we were not under tax caps so it involved us going to the state and asking the state legislature if we could impose a quarter percent sales tax. The legislature agreed and the counties involved were able to impose that quarter percent sales tax to replace the monies that were taken away by the federal government. The next major incident that occurred was a proposition by this board to place on the ballot the proposition to have a tax cap. He was one of the very few that opposed the tax cap simply because he knew that we would be hurting ourselves over time. Then comes along the closing of the landfill which the county was receiving \$4 million a year from. Now we lose the tax sharing agreements with the City which hurt us even more. We are not a body that can go out and raise taxes like the state can so we are searching for every avenue that we can have in order to become a self-sustaining body. This is not a certain thing and it is not going to be a certain thing for some time but to just cut off the possibility of having a new source of revenue does not make any sense to him. We have to look at every possibility that we have before us in order to try and sustain this government and we are not doing a very good job of it if we don't.

Mr. Tripp stated that he thinks that we are shortsighted in not at least listening to Mr. Helsten. We don't know the whole story.

Mr. Whitis stated he agrees with both side on this. We are talking about the consultants, not about closing the Solid Waste Plan or limiting options. We are talking about ending the relationship with the consultants that we agreed to a year ago June. None of us anticipated it going on this long. He agrees that we need to look at every available option that is out there but this option is costing us money every month that it goes on. That is the issue he has – How long are we going to let this keep going forward? He understands what Mr. Bossert is saying in that somebody has reached out and the lawyers are talking but he thinks what needs to happen is that we need to have a real defined role of what these consultants are going to do for us moving forward and is that necessary. Are they out there still trying to find us other partners or is this the only partner that is there after 18 months? If it is a PR type of campaign looking for partners shouldn't we look to end that type of agreement because we have given them 18 months to find us options? If this is the only option necessary, can't we end that relationship and determine if there needs to be a relationship going forward? He is not saying that we need to shut the door totally but he does think that there needs to be some limitations placed on this agreement because it has gone on long enough.

Mr. LaGesse stated that he understood Mr. Bossert to say that what Mr. Whitis just said would be part of a discussion with Mr. Helsten. He thinks that we need to leave everything on the table and our options open just to see where we are.

Mr. Wheeler asked if they could be a limitation on that discussion and limit it to one more month. It is not just a discussion, it is a \$20,000 discussion each month.

Mr. Bossert stated that the reality is that we stopped paying the consultants some time ago. Payments were suspended after seven months. The issue is whether we owe the amount accrued or can we come to an agreement on that and then what do we do going forward. He thinks a month is fair but maybe this could be repeated for full board in December.

Mr. Boyd stated that because this is the committee from which this item was generated, when Mr. Helsten is available to come and speak Mr. Bossert is going to need some direction as to whether this committee cares who it comes in front of. Is this committee going to want to have a special meeting when Mr. Helsten is available?

Mr. Olthoff stated that they can let Mr. Bossert contact Mr. Helsten and see what time is possible.

Mr. Bossert stated that if it is agreeable he will make a special meeting of this committee for whenever Mr. Helsten is available.

Mr. Olthoff stated that Mr. Bossert can set that up.

Mr. LaGesse asked if a conference call would be sufficient and less costly to the county.

Mr. Bossert stated that if that is what the committee desires.

Mr. Enz stated that he feels it should be brought before the full board and Mr. Helsten should explain it to the full board. This is a very important issue in this county and it is not a very popular issue. Fourteen of the seventeen townships have taken a vote by the people that live there and they do not want this. Two more townships are going to be voting on this, also. He thinks it is a full board issue and should be brought to the full board.

Mr. Olthoff stated that Mr. Bossert said we have been charged for only seven months.

Mr. Enz stated that that is not what our contract says and if they want to hold us to our contract it will be a lot more than that and that is not including what Mr. Helsten had been paid or what our lobbyist has been paid.

Mr. Bossert asked what lobbyist.

Mr. Enz stated that it was Chris Brown.

Mr. Bossert asked why he was connected to this discussion.

Mr. Enz stated that he just assumed that if he has a lobbyist he is certainly going to be working for something that Mr. Bossert is pushing for.

Mr. Bossert stated that Mr. Brown has not been involved in the landfill in terms of any of this activity. Furthermore, Mr. Brown's last day here will be next week. It is a budgetary issue and he had to make a change. He knows that Mr. Bruck and others out there have said that Mr. Brown is part of the landfill discussion but he is not. Mr. Bruck has also made charges that Chuck Helsten is somehow tied into the Chicago garbage consortium. Mr. Helsten has represented this county faithfully on both sides of this issue for a number of years. He is one of the top respected attorneys in the state on environmental issues. He

has also donated some of his time. For instance, last time he came down here he did not charge us for it. His cost has been minimal in terms of what has been accomplished. He charged us for the solid waste amendment and the siting ordinance. The critics out there have all kinds of things to say about how this ought to work and yet nobody has a solution for us to handle our financial situation. He is waiting for some positive recommendations for the county moving forward.

Mr. Wheeler stated that he thinks that Mr. Helsten should come to talk to the full board. The landfill consultants were introduced to our county by Chris Brown so he is involved in some level. This was admitted by the consultants and Mr. Brown in a meeting.

Mr. Bossert stated that Mr. Brown knew them.

Mr. Vickery stated that he had a conversation with the Chairman earlier and he had made a suggestion to the Chairman that they keep this on the agenda every month on this committee and that we provide for an executive session if we need so that we could talk to Mr. Helsten in executive session. He does not know how the rest of the committee feels about that. He thinks that we could call a special meeting if it was needed and get Mr. Helsten either on the phone or in person so that they could ask him some questions. He understands that Mr. Helsten is in negotiations with the consultants on the fee so he thinks that at this point we need Mr. Helsten. He would remind everyone that when everyone said that we would not win at the Supreme Court Mr. Helsten said that we would and we did.

Mr. Washington stated that at this point and time there is not enough definitive information to take this whole matter to the full board. Let the committee have a special meeting once Mr. Helsten is contacted and get more information.

Mr. Enz asked if Mr. Brown is going to be employed by the county in any way after he is let go as a lobbyist.

Mr. Bossert stated he is aware of that right now. They have discussed possibly if there is a role as a lobbyist to assist the county in Springfield in some fashion but nothing has been worked out in that regard. He hesitates to do that because the finances are so tight. He never has been employed by the county; he has been a contract position all this time. He has never gotten benefits.

Mr. Enz asked if he in any way is going to continue to be an employee of the county when he is no longer a lobbyist.

Mr. Bossert stated that he cannot say never but at this point there are no arrangements.

7. Old Business

8. New Business

9. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:30 a.m. was made by Mr. LaGesse and seconded by Mr. Einfeldt. Motion carried.

Bill Olthoff, Chairman Joanne Langlois, Executive Coordinator