

**WILL COUNTY BOARD**  
**REPUBLICAN CAUCUS MEETING**  
**MINUTES**

**October 21, 2010**

**8:35 a.m.**

**Will County Office Building**  
**Will County Board Committee Room**  
**302 N. Chicago Street**  
**Joliet, IL**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Bilotta called the meeting to order at 8:47 a.m.

**ROLL CALL**

**Present were:** Bilotta, Blackburn, Dralle, Gould, Konicki, McPhillips, Moustis, Rozak, B. Smith, L. Smith and Weigel

**Absent were:** Kusta, Maher, Singer and Wisniewski

**Also Present:** Deputy Chief of Staff M. Johannsen, Chief Highway Engineer Bruce Gould

**Present from State's Attorney's Office:** Mary Tatroe.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG**

Mr. Smith led the caucus in the pledge of allegiance.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A motion was made by Mr. Moustis, second by Mr. Weigel, to approve the minutes from the September 16, 2010 meeting. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.

**DISCUSSION OF OCTOBER 21, 2010 COUNTY BOARD AGENDA**

Mr. Bilotta advised that there will be presentations by METRA and RTA regarding their budgets for 2011-2012.

Mr. Bilotta stated that proclamations would be filed with the Clerk but no presentations were being made. Ms. McPhillips would read the lead poisoning proclamation and Ms. Seiler would read the breast cancer proclamation from their desks.

**LAND USE & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**Case No: 5932-SV2**

Mr. Weigel advised this case is regarding miniature horses in Manhattan Township. It is a special use permit request for 2 miniature horses. The committee approved it and the majority of the neighbors are in favor of it.

**Case No: 5933-S**

Mr. Weigel stated this is regarding a shelter for shelties. They have up to 20 dogs inside the house and the committee recommends approval with 17 conditions. There is a new letter out on our desks advising that some of the neighbors are objecting. They consider one of the conditions that we had in there was that they become a legal kennel but we are not requiring that. She is allowed to have these dogs in her house rather than build a kennel.

Mrs. Rozak asked if there was a legal objection filed on this case.

Mr. Bilotta replied that the towns are all fine with it. Homer Glen in error sent an opposition but they are actually fine with it.

Mrs. Rozak believed that there was a letter from an attorney stating that the neighbors were filing a legal objection.

Mr. Moustis replied he did not believe the neighbors had legal status to file a legal objection.

ASA Tatroe agreed.

Mr. Bilotta advised that he looked at the property, it is 2 ½ acres and 1 acre butts up to neighbors but since the case started, because it is all fenced off, she has been keeping the dogs off the 1 acre nearest the neighbor. The neighbor has since said they don't have any issues. One of the conditions is that they stay off that 1 acre. It is not a kennel, there are no outdoor houses for dogs. It is a lady that takes this on her own, it is a not for profit. The 3 members from the district are okay with this. There is a nice boundary for the neighbors. She is certified with the state and once she loses it or she doesn't do it anymore, then she goes back down to the 5 allowable in her zoning district and it stays with her and not the house/property.

Mr. Weigel advised that it is 10 now.

Mr. Weigel advised that they are changing the PZC quorum requirements from 5 to 4 which are the changes in state law. The second ordinance was regarding interpretative murals which was approved by the committee to be able to put them on buildings. There is a resolution designating the Brown Cemetery as a historic landmark.

Mr. Moustis stated that the historical Route 30 group has been doing murals and wanted to thank the Land Use staff because we did not have anything in the ordinance and we felt it was best to define it.

Ms. Konicki arrived at this juncture.

Mr. Bilotta inquired if Ms. Konicki had any comments regarding the Berglund case. They wanted a couple of changes, one was if they are going to build a kennel they need to get a permit and they wanted that removed. That should stay in there because if they are going to do it, then they need to come back to us.

Ms. Konicki stated that this is not an open kennel. If it goes commercial or they build something that is not on the property now, and if you leave that condition in there, it makes it sound like it is a burden over and beyond what anyone else would face with a private dog. It doesn't make any sense to have it in there as a condition.

### **FINANCE COMMITTEE**

Mr. Gould inquired about the aggregate levy which was included in our packet was \$113.6 million. The Finance Committee said let's leave it at the previous year's level which was approximately \$109 million. The issue came up at the meeting regarding adding new construction on top of last year's levy. If you took the EAV of the new construction, applied it to whatever rate and you pick from that sheet a variety of different rates, what would that translate into true dollars on top of this.

Mr. Moustis replied \$1.3 million.

Mr. Gould stated that Mr. Rafac replied \$1.4 million and if you take that, he inquired what would the impact be on the homeowner. The homeowner would save \$15.00 under last year's levy.

Mr. Rafac stated that if we increase it \$1.4 million it would drop it to \$9.00.

Mr. Moustis stated that at the Finance Committee there was a motion to do that and it failed. Mr. Wilhelmi clearly stated that it was just over a \$1 million. We can try to amend at the board meeting if that is what they want to do.

Mr. Gould stated he was not clear what that dollar would be. He was looking at the EAV and not clear on what that would translate in terms of levy dollars. He voted no because he did not know what the actual number would be.

Mrs. Dralle agreed.

Mr. Blackburn arrived at this juncture.

Mr. Moustis stated that after today, once you establish the estimated levy, we can lower it later but you cannot raise it.

Mr. Gould requested clarification of going with the \$113 million or going with the lower figure.

Mr. Moustis stated that \$109 million is what he thought the committee said to tax at the 2010 level.

Mr. Gould asked what would the decreases in each of these levy funds be then.

Mr. Rafac stated that there is an amended aggregate levy sheet which is on everyone's desk that shows 3 columns, 1 is what we actually passed last year for the aggregate levy; what we actually got which is approximately \$109.4 million and then the proposed 2010 levy at \$109.4 million. That is the aggregate dollar amount. That dollar has historically been the dollar amount we have passed in the final budget. It is my understanding that we can make adjustments to that aggregate dollar amount until the passage of the final budget and that becomes the official number that he would certify. Once he certifies an official number, the last Tuesday in December, we can't collect any more than what we levied.

Mr. Gould asked if it comes to the board at the November meeting with the levy, can you levy in excess of \$109,399 or would you have to run the black box to do that.

Mr. Rafac replied yes, we can levy up to 105% without doing the black box irrespective of what the estimate says.

Mr. Rafac stated the final aggregate levy estimate is set the first Tuesday in December. In late March or early April when all the component figures are set he will come to the Finance committee to set the final distribution.

Mr. Moustis stated that when you go to the clerk stating we will not exceed 105%, it still gives you the ability to go to 105% of the \$109 million.

Ms. Konicki stated that Mr. Moustis stated that after today, we can lower but we cannot raise.

Mr. Moustis replied of the estimated levy, when we say to the clerk we could go 105% of the \$109 million.

Ms. Konicki stated that is the law so we can set it at the maximum but we can always come down.

Mr. Moustis stated that we are saying that we would not tax above the 105%, no matter what.

Ms. Konicki stated that she hoped the Finance Committee would give some consideration to following New Lenox where they collect the tax and rebate it back to the residential property owners. Her concern is that if we simply lower the levy the top corporations will get the benefit.

There was a short discussion regarding doing a rebate.

Mr. Weigel stated New Lenox is rebating the sales tax not the property tax.

Ms. Konicki stated that the article in the paper says they were doing it. You have to come in to claim it.

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE – No Report**

**JUDICIAL COMMITTEE – No Report**

**PUBLIC HEALTH & SAFETY COMMITTEE**

Mr. Gould advised that there are some grants moving forward.

**LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE**

Ms. Goodson had no report but stated that they are working on the Federal and State legislative agendas. Smith, Dawson will be in town the first part of December so if any member has any ideas of legislation they would like to see please forward it to her.

Mrs. Dralle requested that we look at lift tax regarding the intermodals.

Mr. Goodson stated that because we are not a home rule county we can't impose something like that without legislative action. There may be another way to do something which is not a lift tax it is termed something else.

Mrs. Dralle stated that we need to look into having some type of legislation where as the cargo containers come in, are lifted off and dropped, there is a fee for that.

Mrs. Dralle stated we need to take the initiative, there has to be a mechanism. We need to be at the table as a driving force.

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS COMMITTEE**

Mr. Maher will not be present today. Mrs. Dralle advised there were two resolutions.

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Mr. Moustis advised that Resolution 10-327 would be removed. He would amend 10-354, a change in the figures, from \$41 million down to \$17 million. He will remove 10-367 because they are not ready to move forward.

**APPOINTMENTS – No Report**

**ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made by Mr. Moustis, second by Mrs. Dralle, to adjourn the meeting at 9:14 a.m. All in favor.

MOTION CARRIES.