

Members Present

Mr. Tripp, Mr. Mulcahy, Mr. Einfeldt, Mr. Washington, Mr. Liehr, Ms. Polk, Ms. Evans, and Mr. Tholen

Members Absent

Mr. Olthoff, Mr. James, Mr. Vickery, and Mr. Reid

In Attendance

- **Board Members**

Mr. Bossert, Mr. Whitis, Mr. Wheeler, Mr. LaGesse, and Mr. McConnell

- **Department Heads**

Lori Gadbois, Jamie Boyd, and Mike Van Mill

- **Media**

Present

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

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

2. Public Comment

- **Warren Piper commented on the solid waste issue.**

3. Approval of Minutes – February 19, 2015

Ms. Polk made a motion to approve the minutes and Mr. Tholen seconded it. Motion carried with a voice vote.

4. Building

- **Building Report – February 2015**
- **Building Code Update 2015**

Mr. Van Mill stated that he would discuss these two topics at the same time. Typically, February is a light month with regards to activity. They had 13 permits and a little over \$3000 in fees collected. Because it is a light month, they decided during the month to also take the opportunity to review their building codes and bring them up to today's standards.

Mr. Van Mill stated that they have been using the 2003 edition of the building code up to this point. They did their own internal audit and found that they needed to bring the code up-to-date so they held a public hearing this month with their Board of Examiners and Appeals. In today's packet is the updated version of their building code regulations adopting the 2015 codes. Most of the municipalities are going to be doing this also. The Board of Examiners and Appeals at the public hearing recommended approval of this update.

Mr. Philips gave a quick overview of what the updates are. On a typical home the updates would raise the cost about \$1200 to \$1600.

Mr. Bossert stated that all the municipalities will now be on a consistent set of codes.

Mr. Phillips stated that most of them today are on the 2012 code and many of them are in the process of going to the 2015 code, like the county is.

Mr. Van Mill stated that they were in the process of going to the 2012 code but heard that municipalities were going to the 2015 code so they went to the 2015 code, as well.

Mr. Phillips stated that there have been four code changes since 2006 which is when the county adopted the 2003 code.

Mr. Tripp asked if the updated code is a bit overkill. He understands some of the updates but are all them necessary?

Mr. Phillips stated that the technology is there now.

Mr. McConnell stated that he does inspections for Bradley and Bourbonnais and he knows that the contractors are very excited that everyone will be using the same codes.

Ms. Evans asked if any municipality or county can choose to amend any portion of the code if they would choose to.

Mr. Phillips stated that that is correct. The code can be amended. They did amend the code for the residential sprinklers.

Mr. Einfeldt stated it is a great thing that everyone is now on the same playing field but it is another step in continually adding expense to dwellings that have been serving people for hundreds of years. Pretty soon the sprinklers will be mandatory and pretty soon the radon detection will be mandatory for crawl spaces and basements. We need to keep an eye on cost versus the good that we get out of it.

Mr. Einfeldt made a motion to approve the Building Report for February and Mr. Tholen seconded it. Motion carried with a voice vote.

Ms. Polk made a motion to approve the Building Code Update 2015 and Mr. Liehr seconded it. Motion carried with a voice vote.

5. Transportation

• 2016 Rural Transit Service

Mr. Lammey stated that two months ago they came to this committee with some letters that they were sending out to people asking if they were interested in providing rural transit service for us. A month ago they came to the committee with the one response in favor of doing it and that was from SHOW BUS.

Mr. Lammey stated that there are four sources of funding for rural transit in our county. There are federal grants, state grants, revenue from service contracts that SHOW BUS has with not-for-profit agencies, and then there is local share. In their current contract with SHOW BUS, SHOW BUS is responsible for the local share and not the county.

Mr. Lammey stated that they provide two services for rural transit. One is called a demand response service which is a service where a person calls the week day before they need the trip and they schedule their trip. The charge for that service is \$4.00 round trip. Once they get into the urbanized area it will take them around to all the trips that they need to make in town, provided that they have the time. They schedule all areas of the county but the overwhelming majority of their service is for the eastern part of the county, based on the demand for service that they get for that part of the county. This service is used mainly for medical, shopping, and personal business trips. It is almost impossible to use that service for a work trip because it is hard to guarantee a seat every day. The second service they run is the service that they started three to four years ago which runs every day Monday through Friday between downtown

Kankakee and downtown Momence. It was planned as a work trip service but it has grown to more than that. There are certain places that are scheduled trips and will pick up people in downtown Kankakee and downtown Momence and then people who are not at those specified points can be picked up on the way to and from each of the trips. Service starts at 4.00 a.m. in downtown Kankakee and the last trip is at 5:00 p.m. They will deviate off of the route to pick people up and they do that whenever they have time. The charge for this service is \$2.00. Once the people get into town with that service SHOW BUS will not take them around town. They would need to use METRO to go around town.

Mr. Bossert asked how frequent the trips are.

Mr. Lammey stated that every hour there is a bus that leaves downtown Kankakee and there is a bus that leaves downtown Momence at the same time.

Mr. Liehr asked what the level of usage is on this service.

Mr. Lammey stated that at certain times of the day when they have work trips they have full buses.

Mr. Lammey stated that there is also a third service that they provide which is special medical trips. If a person cannot ride the regular bus service they do have a way to pick them up. They don't do it very often; it is a very expensive service.

Mr. Lammey stated that the Governor's initial budget showed less money for them next year than they have this year and if that actually happens then they are going to have to figure out some way to cut service to match the amount of money they get. It requires legislation to change the amount of money.

Ms. Evans asked if the money that pays for the services comes from the fees that he gets from their customers and from the state.

Mr. Lammey stated that federal and state grants are the majority of what they use for that. The federal grants will stay the same. The state grant is the one that could change.

Ms. Evans asked how many buses they have.

Mr. Lammey stated that there are nine buses that provide service to this county. It is a little confusing because some of the buses that provide service to this county we do not own. They are owned by SHOW BUS. The blue buses are owned by SHOW BUS and the green buses are owned by the county.

Mr. Tripp asked how it could be made to be less confusing.

Mr. Lammey stated that he does not think that it is confusing to the people who ride the bus. He thinks that when he tries to explain how they fund some of these things it gets a little bit complicated.

Mr. Wheeler asked if there is a reason why our buses say SHOW BUS instead of something regarding the county so the citizens know that we are part of this equation.

Mr. Lammey stated that if they had their own fleet they would probably put Kankakee County on the side of it but since a lot of the services are provided by buses that SHOW BUS owns it makes it very complicated

to brand them with the county that they are in. The rest of the buses that SHOW BUS provides is for five or six different counties so they could be in any one of six different counties that afternoon.

Mr. Wheeler asked how many buses they own.

Mr. Lammey stated that they own eight or nine. They have a couple buses that do not run that they will replace when the buses are old enough.

Mr. Bossert asked Mr. Lammey to explain what the county's exposure might be if they were to step up and provide local match in cash. Right now the county provides in-kind support.

Mr. Lammey stated that for the last few years they have not paid any local share at all. Before that, they had paid as much as \$20,000 a year for local match.

Mr. Bossert stated that he just wanted to help the committee understand that there is potentially local funding to put up but between the cooperation of SHOW BUS and other measures they have managed to get by without having to put up any cash which was helpful through our budget crunch.

Mr. Lammey stated that there are not-for-profit agencies out there that are providing transportation themselves right now but would like for someone else to provide that transportation for them. If we could find one of those agencies that has enough riders that would solve the local match problem because that counts as local match. They think that there is one out there but they just have not been able to figure out a way to make our resources match their need.

Mr. Bossert stated that the lack of branding or public knowledge that this is a county program adds to the confusion. There is some discussion occurring elsewhere in the state about creating a rural transit district as opposed to the county being the provider.

Mr. Lammey stated that in the southern part of Illinois there is a number of huge mass transit districts that do only rural transit service. If that would come here he would recommend that the county join the district and not have the county be the grantee for these.

6. Planning

- **Review/Revision of County Solid Waste Plan**

Mr. Bossert stated that as a result of their action at the last full county board meeting the request was made to bring back to the committee and perhaps to the full board discussion of the amendment to the solid waste plan that was adopted two years ago on June 13. He handed out to the committee a copy of the resolution and the amendment to the solid waste plan that was adopted at that time. The thought process that went into that amendment was very considered as far as the rationale for why the amendment was adopted at that time. It laid out in quite a bit of detail the requirements that would be considered if at any point a host agreement for a solid waste facility is brought forth. He also reminded the committee that there was quite a bit of discussion about the fact that alternative disposal facilities would be encouraged as part of a consideration in the future and that is part of this discussion. The vote two years ago was decidedly in favor of amending the plan. It is up to the committee's discussion and their consideration whether they want to revert to old language or leave the plan as amended stand as is. It mentions in the plan amendment the fact that the plan itself will be up for review in two years which is when a review of the plan would be required anyway.

Mr. Van Mill stated that back when they made the comprehensive amendment to the solid waste plan the idea was threefold. One was to have a total moratorium on landfills that would accept outside waste which was what the situation was with our landfill in the past. They only allowed waste from Kankakee County in that landfill. The second one was allowing what the language is today which is consideration of a solid waste facility accepting waste from outside and the third option was some sort of condition that was somewhere in the middle of allowing all waste or no waste at all but under certain conditions we would consider one. Those were the three conversations at the time of the comprehensive update to the Solid Waste Plan that were under consideration. It is a public policy decision and it is up to the board to decide what direction that they want to go with this language.

Mr. Liehr stated that he was off of the board for two years and he thinks that may have been when this action was taken. He has heard talk about a facility that would have three parts to it, one would be to take garbage, one would be to take recyclable material, and the third part would be to take care of metal. This is a concept that he thinks that the board needs to look at closely, recognizing that they have had a lot of public comment in opposition to a landfill. He thinks that we need to compliment those who have come before us making us conscious of what some of the downsides. At the same time, he is concerned that some of the comments that have been brought before us are as a result of images of garbage dumps that existed in the 1970's and 1980's. We need the elected officials to educate the public on the difference between what happens at solid waste facilities in 2015 compared to the 1970's and 1980's. From the information that he has they are not the same. The idea that there are going to be a lot of rats running around is outdated. The idea that there is going to be huge odors permeating the entire county is outdated. One of the questions that comes up is questions about aquifers. Certainly, this is something that the county must be very sensitive to. Because language is important in a resolution, he wonders if the word "landfill" should be stricken and replaced by "eco-campus" simply because it does suggest what he would be wanting for the county.

Mr. Wheeler stated that he appreciates Mr. Liehr's comments and he understands the need for good information is important in this whole discussion. The word "eco-campus" in this application is not good information in his opinion. The vast majority of the waste that would go into it a landfill here would come from outside the area and the vast majority of that waste is going to be in bags that will not be gone through for recyclables, which is what the consultants said. Unless it has been separated at transfer stations outside of this area it will go into the landfill. If we want to actually change the language of this it would be appropriate to require the garbage to be separated before it comes here. He understands the economics of the situation and he would much rather see this closed for two years while we decide what we want to be. Do we want to be open for business for hybrid solutions that do not involve landfilling? Do we want to be a transfer station area if the economics work out? Right now he thinks that there is too much gray area to be able to say that he would be willing to accept a landfill here and call it an eco-campus when it really isn't. He would like to see the full board be able to stand up and say what they stand for.

Mr. Bossert stated that he thinks that the point of the Solid Waste Plan is to lay out criteria to be examined in a potential host agreement. If there are particular things that this county wants, such as, mandatory recycling, which type of waste are handled, and limitations on volume those things can be laid out at that point. That would be the point to have negotiations on a host agreement and that would be our opportunity to incorporate limitations and desired handling methods. If the committee wants to take a stand, a motion to amend it may be needed and then vote negatively if that is the committee's position and then take that to the full board. His thought was to leave that option open to see what is available out there in the industry.

Mr. Einfeldt stated that his view of an eco-campus or whatever it is called is that we need to proceed with the ability to look at an offer if there is one. If it is taken off for two years, it will not be talked about. If we get an opportunity to look at somebody's offer we can scrutinize their offer. We don't have to take anything. Any host can come here and we can turn them down because we do not owe them anything but we owe everyone the opportunity to have another avenue to manage our waste and be able to benefit from the finances of it, whether it takes seven years or ten years. We need to allow these offers to come now rather than just wait.

Mr. Washington stated that he has been here for the closing of the last landfill, the negotiations and communications concerning the construction of a new land fill. Mr. Liehr is correct when he said that the difference between the landfills that existed in the past and the landfills that would be constructed today is like night and day. The landfills that were constructed in the past used clay as their base to prevent any leakage. Today they use liners and double liners in addition to the clay. When the garbage is brought to a landfill it is backfilled and covered on a regular basis throughout the day so there is not an opportunity for any vermin to get in. The landfills are scientifically designed now to prevent leakage for hundreds of years. He has traveled around to visit other landfills and there has always been the statement that it diminishes property values but that has been disproved. What we are looking at is a vehicle not only for the disposal of county garbage but for reducing the cost of the citizens of the county to dispose of their garbage. We are also looking at a significant amount of income that would come into the county that they lost when they closed the last landfill. Many negative things have happened to the income of the county and we are looking for something that the county can do to re-establish its financial base. We have not got a very stable base at this point and there are many reasons for that.

Mr. Tripp stated that he likes what Mr. Liehr said and he understands the comments the Mr. Wheeler made but he has talked to a lot of people in the community and they do not know as much as they should know about an eco-campus, like Mr. Liehr is talking about. It is not a "dump" anymore. He understands the people in Rockford love the Rockford operation. Not enough is known about an eco-campus by them or the public. All the public knows is that they do not want bags of garbage dumped here from Chicago and he does not want that either.

Mr. Whitis stated that he thinks that this committee needs to take some formal action to show that we either want to continue down this path or we don't. He understands keeping this open to look at options and he understands the validity of that and the positives of that. He doesn't think that we want to limit potential options because it is up to this board to make that determination if an option is feasible or not but he thinks that the majority of the people do not want to go back to the way we did it in the 70's, 80's, and 90's. He thinks everybody wants to see a recycling component and new technology used; therefore, he doesn't see an issue with amending the plan to take out any of the archaic past practices and put in what we want and say that we won't consider anything less than what we want. He is not on this committee and cannot make a motion but he would like somebody to make the motion to at least amend the plan and if it passes it passes and if it doesn't it doesn't. He thinks it is such a big issue and we have not done anything with in almost two years so it should go to the full board. He would ask that the committee send it on to the full board so the full board can discuss it and either ratify the direction we are going or amend it to a new direction. We have had a lot of public comment at our meetings and he thinks that we owe it to the community to take a stand so they know where we stand.

Mr. Boyd stated that he would echo what Mr. Whitis has said. He thinks based on the discussion here it is appropriate for this committee to make a motion in some fashion to amend the Solid Waste Plan and then forward it on the full county board for a full discussion. It is inappropriate to make a motion to ratify or

reaffirm a position on an ordinance or a plan that is already in place. However, a motion to amend the plan with or without specificity is appropriate and if it is voted down the committee can still agree to forward it to the county board for review of the actions of the committee. Between now and the county board meeting his office will start taking a look at the plan and meet with Mr. Van Mill and others from his office in regard to what areas might or might not be appropriate for amendment. If nothing else, maybe there would be a more vivid and detailed statement of what is expected if a waste facility comes to Kankakee County. Keep in mind that the guidelines from the State of Illinois which require the plan are minimal and there is truly no limitation to the level of detail that the county board can put into any plan. It is the county's plan and is subject to amendment at any time. He would encourage that if the committee is going to take this to the county board that they make a motion to amend in whatever level they want and see what the full board thinks.

Ms. Evans made a motion to amend the current Solid Waste Plan and Mr. Tripp seconded it. Motion carried with a voice vote. Mr. Bossert and Mr. Washington voted nay.

7. Old Business

8. New Business

Mr. Liehr stated that at the Community Services Committee a discussion came up regarding an alleged puppy mill out in the St. Anne area. At this time the State's Attorney, the Director of Animal Control, and some interested parties have been meeting to discuss what action might be appropriate to take. There may be something that needs to eventually come before this committee so he wanted to alert members of this committee that they may want to be alert to any information that they hear in regard to this issue because at some point it may come before this committee.

Mr. Bossert stated that last month there was some discussion about the issue of occupancy permits being granted. Did any further discussion take place with regards to that issue? A few board members were assigned to take up that issue.

Mr. Tholen stated that yesterday he, along with Mr. Einfeldt and Mr. McConnell, met with Mr. Van Mill and some other representatives from the Planning & Building Department to discuss that issue. The outcome of that discussion was to comprise a list of contractors that have expressed interest in being involved in this issue and then meet with them to discuss ideas as to how they should proceed. They are continuing to work on it.

9. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:00 a.m. was made by Mr. Tholen and seconded by Mr. Liehr. Motion carried.

George Washington, Vice-Chairman
Joanne Langlois, Executive Coordinator