

WILL COUNTY BOARD
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES

December 1, 2011

9:30 a.m.

Will County Office Building
County Board Committee Room
302 North Chicago Street
Joliet, IL 60432

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Moustis called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Present were Members: Bilotta, Adamic, Dralle, Gould, May, Weigel, Zigrossi and Moustis.

Absent were Members: Kusta, Maher, Singer and Wilhelmi.

Present from State's Attorney's Office: M. Tatroe and M. Manning.

Also Present: B. Friefeld, M. Johannsen, N. Palmer

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

Mr. Weigel led the committee in the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Mr. Weigel, second by Mrs. Zigrossi, to approve the minutes from the October 13, 2011 meeting. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.

A motion was made by Mr. Gould, second by Mrs. Dralle, to approve the Executive Session minutes from October 13, 2011 meeting. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.

A motion was made by Mr. Adamic, second by Ms. Goodson, to approve the minutes from the November 3, 2011 meeting. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.

OLD BUSINESS

Presentation by Goodwill Industries

Mr. Palmer advised that the Executive's Office was approached by Goodwill Industries. They have a number of locations in Will County, including Bolingbrook, Joliet, New Lenox and

Tinley Park. They use their resources to pay their employees and also use that for a Workforce component in their Joliet location. We felt this was information we should share because this is a resource beyond our Workforce. Renee Barman is here from Goodwill to make a short presentation.

Ms. Barman thanked the committee for allowing her to speak. She distributed a handout which bullet points their mission and presence as well as a flyer about the workforce connection center that opened about 7 months ago in the Joliet store. People think of Goodwill as a second hand retail store or a place to drop off used good donations. They are a non-profit organization and the proceeds from our stores go toward serving our mission. Their mission is to provide training, employment and support services in a number of ways so people with disabilities or disadvantages can find a job or be productive during the day. The most local presence is the workforce connection center in Joliet where people can come in and for no fee have access to a computer to search for job opportunities or prepare a resume. They offer seminars and sessions for people to learn about interviewing. They have had employers coming to them to post their job opportunities. This is a free of charge service to local residents and this is their 6th one; 3 in Wisconsin and 3 in the Chicago area. In 2010 they served more than 10,000 people through those facilities. In addition they provide workshop settings for people with greater disabilities that provides them with piece work through manufacturing or other companies that need repetitive type work done. They also have a relationship with Great Lakes with statistics which is on the back of the flyer that was distributed. They have 720 employees with disabilities at Great Lakes Naval Center. Last year they served 9.3 million meals, issued 9.2 million uniform items and processed over 3.6 million pieces of mail for the Navy.

Ms. Barman stated regarding the retail portion, they have stores in Joliet, Bolingbrook, a store opening in New Lenox next year. They are planning to grow within their region 5 stores a year. Their region includes southeastern Wisconsin and metropolitan Chicago. There are 13 counties in Wisconsin, 10 counties in Illinois and of all of the Goodwills, this is the largest region. The revenue from the stores enables them to serve all of these people and provide all of these mission services. She thanked all of those who have shopped or donated and urged them to continue. They try to operate as clean and modern of a facility for a second hand store as they can. They try to provide great service when you are donating and take great care of your goods as you are donating. If anyone has any complaints please call her so she can take of the issue.

Ms. Barman advised that they have more than 130 employees in Will County. The Joliet store and Bolingbrook store generated more than \$300,000.00 in sales tax in 2010.

Ms. May stated that she attended one of their afterhours, the parking was great, and you can see the Workforce Center which is very professionally done. It is great opportunity for those that if you lose your internet service at home you might want to go there to look for jobs. Plus after using their center, you can go out and get interview clothes. This is a great service to our area.

Ms. Barman advised that they provide vouchers to people who use their Workforce Connection Centers for clothes appropriate for an interview, if needed, so they can shop in one of their stores. They also have partners in every community where they have stores with other non for profits to provide needy families that are part of their church, schools or group to provide them the dignity of choice to allow them to go shopping.

Mr. Moustis stated that Goodwill has been a mainstay in our community for many years, do good work and wish them success.

Presentation by Smith Dawson & Andrews

Jim Smith and Brett Garson from Smith Dawson & Andrews were present to provide a brief update.

Mr. Smith stated that they have a written report which will be provided to the board members following the meeting. The report does include a summary of their activities of the past year and some of their accomplishments that they have experienced as well as a copy of their most recent monthly legislative report that they provide on a monthly basis. They have also included a summary of federal grants. As you know, this year with the continued moratorium in Congress on earmarking where they have been successful in years past in directing dollars right into the County's coffers, we are unable to do that now so we have put more emphasis on federal grant opportunities. Internally, they have put in systems that monitor and track these grant announcements across all of the federal agencies and they have provided throughout the year 45 different grant notices to the County. We have also included some issues that will be in Congress next year that the County will want to weigh in on.

Mr. Smith advised that Congress is still in session and will be in session for approximately another 3 weeks. They continue to work on budget appropriations. The super committee that was formed last summer as part of the deficit reduction agreement between the Congress and the President failed to meet its mandatory deadline of November 23rd and to come to terms on a budget and spending package that would have resulted in \$1.2 trillion in spending cuts. As a result of that, there was a mechanism should the super committee fail to meet their responsibility, then these automatic cuts would take effect. That is where we are now and will result in a \$1.2 trillion reduction in federal spending spent equally, 50% between the

defense department and 50% on domestic discretionary programs. These cuts don't take effect until January 2013. Congress continues to work on appropriation bills. To date, keep in mind that the federal fiscal year began on October 1st, they have only enacted 3 regular appropriation bills. Those were the Department of Transportation, the Department of Agriculture and the Departments of Commerce, State and Justice. They passed a continuing resolution that allows the government to operate on a short term basis for the remaining agencies of the federal government. That resolution is in effect until December 16th so they will have to do something again, either pass regular appropriation bills; pass another longer term continuing resolution or do one big omnibus spending bill. The moratorium remains in effect.

Mr. Smith stated there are a number of big federal programs that the County is very dependent upon that remain in play and are up for reauthorization that have not been completed. The first one is the transportation bill; the SAFETEA-LU which is the Federal Surface Transportation Program that authorizes all federal spending for highways and public transportation. The program expired 2 years ago and has been operating on a series of short-term extensions. The latest extension was passed in September and is funded through March 2012. Meanwhile, Congress is trying to move a reauthorization bill forward. On November 9th, the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee reported out a 2 year reauthorization bill funding programs under its jurisdiction which is highways. There were 2 significant components to this new bill. One, it authorized for the first time a federal freight rail program which is designed for intermodal opportunities where major trade traffic is moving intersecting with highways causing all the congestion and environmental problems that come with it. That program is funded at \$2 billion per year and is out of the highway trust fund. They would ask the U.S. Department of Transportation to do a study and analysis and designate national freight corridors. This is a big deal for Will County and we feel this will provide real opportunities for us to address a number of congestion and environmental issues in the County. The other program is for projects for national and regional significance. This is a program designed to address major corridors that have national and regional impact and significance which plays right into the Illiana. We think this is a project the Illiana would benefit from and we have advocated for that program in Washington and are now seeing some progress. Over in the House, Chairman Mica is proposing to do a 5 year bill and is proposing to authorize new gas and oil drilling and to take the royalties off of the new wells and designate it to transportation. Mr. Smith stated he expects to have a transportation bill in 2012. This presents an opportunity for the county to showcase the county as a national center for freight and logistics. With these 2 new programs,

he believed that Will County can be a leader in providing transportation and freight movement solutions to the country.

Mr. Smith advised there are other programs that are discussed in the report. One of the programs is the Workforce Investment. They lobbied hard in retaining funding for those programs which were threatened early in the budget process. We were successful in retaining significant funding. This is another issue that will be addressed in the coming weeks as Congress does the appropriations bill for the Department of Labor. We have done a letter just this past week signed by the County Board Chairman and the County Executive on those programs. There is a full agenda ahead of us.

Mr. Moustis stated that when the earmark moratorium started, we received good advice in shifting to the agencies and focusing the people that have discretion on how grants go and give us the guidelines.

Mr. Smith advised that there were 2 significant results of that with funding for the Sheriff's Department and for the Veteran's Highway Trail.

Mr. Moustis stated that getting to the right people within the agencies is extremely important because this is not about the Congressional people. We took another path based on their advice which he believed was the correct path.

Ms. Goodson agreed that it was good to develop a relationship with the staff of the various agencies and believed that they had a very successful trip earlier this year. She inquired if Mr. Smith felt the moratorium would be changing.

Mr. Smith replied that he expected the moratorium to continue through 2012. He believed when the new Congress is sworn in 2013 that a new process would be instituted.

There was a short discussion regarding the process on the freight corridors designation and the release of any funds.

Memberships, Consulting/Services Contracts

- a. Smith, Dawson & Andrews
- b. CED
- c. NACo
- d. Illinois Association of County Officials
- e. Others

Mr. Moustis stated there are various memberships and consulting services that we were going to discuss after passing the budget of whether we would continue with them. He would like to assign some for every meeting or just do it during one meeting. He was looking for their input. He added that initially we probably would not get into the costs. It would be a discussion

of whether it is an association or service we want to continue with or not. The cost for NACo is worth it but reminded everyone there are additional costs related with NACo if you are participating with it and if not, why be a part of it. There are some costs with a number of these associations. We will review these all and determine if the committee feels the service is a benefit to the County. Presentations would probably be included when having this discussion.

Mr. Bilotta stated we would need a list of who we are discussing.

There was a short discussion regarding whether each committee should determine the need and then bring it back to the Executive Committee or just have the discussion at the Executive Committee.

Ms. Goodson stated that some of these are time sensitive and should be addressed immediately. The Congress will be back in session in January.

Mr. Moustis stated that the contracts are still in place, we will continue with them until we decide. There are some that are time sensitive because they are currently due, such as NACo and CED.

Ms. Goodson stated with the Legislative Committee, they have legislative agendas that need to be formulated. Smith Dawson has already put some time in on that.

Mr. Moustis replied that she should continue.

Mr. Palmer advised that while Smith Dawson is here today, they are having some meetings and will have additional meetings by phone because they are putting an agenda together with the hope that will move forward. He knows that we need to keep moving as Ms. Goodson stated to get the agenda ready for the January/February board meeting.

Mr. Moustis clarified that we will continue with the current consultants while we review.

Mr. Bilotta agreed stating that certain agreements will continue and possibly change the scope. Washington has changed from 2 years ago and if we address these on a case by case basis, there is a value to the county for these people to be here. Maybe we want to do an RFQ on certain consultants.

Ms. Goodson stated that there are a lot of things going on in the state that we have to be very proactively engaged and we need above and beyond the service we currently receive. It is imperative that we get something in place prior to the state reconvening.

Mr. Moustis advised that if we want to change the scope, then we should change the scope. It depends on what we, collectively, decide we want them doing and include in the scope.

Mrs. Dralle advised that she would like to see a list of everyone's salaries even though

we are not going to discuss salaries, a recommendation from staff if they feel this is someone we should continue with or not; recommendations from board members or committee chairs who have dealt with them. She does not have all of that because she does not deal directly with them and would rely on their input and information if we should move forward or not rather than coming to a meeting and rehashing all of this, she would like to see a spreadsheet with recommendations and also do them all at once.

Mr. Moustis replied that we could list them all but the discussion would still be necessary.

There was a discussion on whether an evaluation tool should be provided and how to provide that information.

Mr. Adamic agreed that it would be good to know the entire cost regarding association fees and what the value is from those on the committees providing the information or report. We should have some cost benefit.

Mr. Moustis explained that in some cases there are benefits and effects that will be subjective.

Ms. May inquired what the method should be for the review and what is the amount of money we are discussing, is it \$2 million that was set aside in the contingency for these consultants.

Mr. Friefeld replied currently we are spending, not counting travel expenses for associations, but including association membership and consultant fees close to \$500,000.00 per year.

Ms. May stated that she would like to see what the dollar amount that came back for what we paid. For example, if I spent \$50,000.00, did I get \$50,000.00 back or did I get \$2 million back.

Mr. Moustis replied that in some cases we can do that, such as Smith Dawson we can measure what money came back. However, in other cases it would be hard to measure, to quantify it and would be more subjective.

Ms. May inquired regarding the associations, is the fee based upon the population of the County.

The response was yes.

Mr. Moustis stated the most expensive would be Metro Counties. When we discuss these, we will discuss how they are structured and what benefits we get from our membership. We can talk about public information person and should the County Board have a public

information person. He felt the entire county should have just one public information person but instead every office has their own. That is not a hard dollar amount that you will see.

Mr. Friefeld stated that this will take some time as policy makers to decide what to do about some of these consultants. However, his recommendation was to deal with the associations since their fees are fixed. Regarding everyone else concerned, we can go month to month up to \$20,000.00. At that point you will have to come to the County Board to spend anything over the \$20,000.00 for any one of these consultants so you can use that time to work through the discussion you are having today. There is one consultant on our list that he recommends we move forward and that is Mr. McKibbin. He is our consultant on health insurance which is an ongoing issue and he brings a lot of expertise to the table.

Mr. Moustis stated that we can bring McKibbin at the next Executive Committee meeting. He will be here for a short period of time. He inquired if everyone wanted to go over all of the temporary ones, such as Wight. They are finishing up something and when they are finished, then that will be done. It is not an ongoing relationship. Scott McKibbin will help us negotiate with the health care benefit coordinators from the union. When that is done, then he will be done.

It was agreed that the temporary ones were not the ones they want to include in the discussion. A discussion was held regarding having a yearly review being done.

Ms. Zigrossi stated that if we are planning on doing some type of an evaluation before we are going to renew their contract, we also have to have some type of scoring mechanism in place. What is the expectation that we have of them and what constitutes satisfactory performance. She believed that whatever consultant we bring in that criteria are set up.

Mr. Moustis stated, using Smith Dawson, that our expectation is that they bring dollars back from Washington that are available, identifying those dollars that are available and trying to get those back. As well as building relationships which does not happen in the same year but makes progress and it shows in the following year.

Mr. Weigel suggested setting up special meetings over the next few months to review these.

Mr. Moustis replied when you eliminate the short term relationships, we don't have that many.

ASA Tatroe inquired, for clarification purposes, were they going to move forward a resolution that these contracts go forward on a month to month basis. There needs to be some parameter of what services are being provided and some guidance. You have to authorize it

going forward on a month to month basis rather than it being out there with no parameters whatsoever.

Staff advised a lot of these have terms and have expired.

ASA Tatroe stated that she would have to review them but there probably is a provision that they would go month to month upon approval. She did not think that would be an automatic mechanism.

Mr. Moustis suggested that the committee do this next Thursday at the Executive Committee meeting. If we can't agree on some agreements, then we will do a month to month or renew the contracts. We will have a week to renegotiate them covering the dollar amount and if we want to put forward a scope of work.

Mr. Friefeld advised that the Capital Improvements Committee did move their meeting to start after the Executive Committee. We were going to start that meeting at 11:30 a.m. so he was inquiring if we should change it to 12:30 p.m. or 1:00 p.m.

Mr. Moustis replied that he did not think this would take that long.

The committee was advised that Mr. Maher cancelled the Capital Improvements Committee meeting for Tuesday, December 6th and moved it to Thursday, December 8th for a tour of the Pioneer Building.

Other Old Business

NEW BUSINESS

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENT REQUESTS

1. Request for Designation of Historic Landmark Nomination for North Providence Ridge Cemetery in Elwood – Amy Munro- Attached – Land Use & Development Committee
2. Request to Abate Bonds – Paul Rafac - Attached – Finance Committee
3. Request for Temporary Loan from the MFT Fund to Highway Fund – Bruce Gould - Attached - Finance Committee
4. Request to Present Auditor's Quarterly Report at December County Board Meeting - Finance Committee
5. Request for Resolution Authorizing the County Executive to Execute Necessary Documents for Delinquent Tax Program – Attached - Finance Committee
6. Request to Discuss the Administrative Adjudication Program – Nick Palmer – Attached – ??? Judicial or Executive Committee

7. Request for Award of Contract to Accept Credit Card, Debit Card, and ACH Payments for Real Estate Property Taxes by the Treasurer's Office – Brian McDaniel– Attached – Executive Committee
8. Request for Presentation Re: RTA Grant at County Board Meeting – Nick Palmer – Attached – Executive Committee
9. Request for Approval to Conduct Maximus Fee Studies – Paul Rafac - Attached – Executive Committee
10. Request to Renew PBC Lease – Paul Rafac – Attached - Executive Committee
11. Request to Award Bid for Sale of Surplus Seized Vehicles – Rita Weiss – Attached – Executive Committee
12. Request for Approval of Resolutions Re: Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity Grant – Derek O'Sullivan – Attached - Executive Committee
13. Request to Discuss Prairie View Gas to Energy Plant Project – Dean Olson – Attached – Executive Committee
14. Request for Support for County Seat University of St. Francis Art Gallery – President Michael Vinciguerra, Ph.D. – Attached - Executive Committee
15. Request for Funding for University of Illinois Extension – Beth LaPlante, Director – Attached – Executive Committee
16. Placement of Items for Public Works & Transportation – List Attached – Public Works & Transportation Committee

Staff advised that #6 needed a clarification.

Mrs. Dralle stated she did not believe there was a need to have it addressed at either Executive or Judicial; contract resolutions.

Mr. Palmer advised that the 2 adjudication hearing officers were approved by resolution. One of them signed all the paperwork and returned it to him. The other was unresponsive for a long, long period of time.

Mr. Friefeld stated that he did sign the first contract.

Mr. Palmer stated yesterday he was just provided with a letter revoking it from Jamy Lyne who was the staff person who worked with this person because she contacted him a number of times. Therefore that letter was sent and subsequent to that he did return a signed contract. At this point the Executive's prerogative is the guy was unresponsive for an extended

period time, how good of an administrative person is he going to be. He doesn't want to move forward.

Mr. Palmer stated his understanding was that if we are going to take that action, then we would have to rescind the previous resolution. He was asking to have that discussion now because he is not sure as it was a County Board resolution that was signed by the Executive with the intent to hire both of those individuals. If we are going to go forward with the number three person, which would be the Executive's prerogative, we need a new resolution. Otherwise we have one administrative adjudication officer signed up and ready to go. We will have to bring back the clerk position also to the County Board which we will do later.

Mr. Moustis clarified that the County Executive is not going to execute a contract with one.

Mr. Palmer replied that would be his intent but legally we have a resolution that instructs him but it is basically like when we hire an employee we sign a contract and someone is not adequately responsive.

Mr. Moustis stated there were only 2 names in the resolution.

Mr. Palmer agreed, stating there were 2 separate resolutions. One for each individual.

Mr. Moustis verified that there was no resolution for alternates.

Mr. Palmer replied no, he did not believe so. Only one resolution has been fully processed. The other one, the resolution was processed and executed but when the contract was sent out we did not receive a reply.

Mr. Friefeld stated there was more to the story.

Mr. Moustis replied that he understood that but inquired of ASA Tatroe if the County Executive have the authority to hire someone else or talk to someone.

ASA Tatroe replied he doesn't and believed that is why Mr. Palmer is here.

Mr. Palmer replied no, he doesn't have the authority to hire someone else. One option ASA Tatroe and he discussed was that the County Executive could sign it and then terminate it because he has a resolution that authorizes him to sign it.

Mr. Moustis inquired if the County Executive has the authority not to execute the resolution.

ASA Tatroe and Mr. Palmer replied that he executed the resolution.

Mr. Moustis replied that you are not executing it if you don't do what it says.

ASA Tatroe replied right, but he is coming back looking for further guidance based on this information.

Mr. Palmer stated it would be like if we passed a resolution to hire a vendor to do some other work and the resolution signed to negotiate the contract and then you find out the vendor isn't, in the Executive opinion, responsive.

Mr. Moustis inquired when the resolution was passed.

Mr. Friefeld replied June or July.

Mrs. Dralle stated that we passed the software and everything together in order to have parallel services. She advised that Mr. Palmer and her have had discussions, she has had discussions with the County Executive, discussions with our Chief of Staff and at this point in time she does feel, with the process that we have looked at, with all of the initiatives that we have taken on, with the education process, with the scrutiny by which I really put a lot into the hearing officers, at this point I believe the hearing officers are vital to the success of the administration adjudication program. I am personally and professionally as a Board member not willing to move forward with someone who does not have any experience. Yes, we had an issue with one of the hearing officers. The potential hearing officer, the individual was non-responsive and we come to find out that the reason for the non-responsiveness was due to an illness. That being said I feel that we will move on and she is not interested in rescinding, passing new resolutions. This individual needs to be given the opportunity that we initially afforded him. If it doesn't work out, we will review but at this point and time it has come out of Judicial as well as the Executive and the County Board. She would like to see this move forward with a contract.

Mr. Friefeld stated he thought Mrs. Dralle said it all. He felt the County Board has acted and he worked with Jamy on this. Jamy did not have all the information when she prepared that revocation. He did sign the first contract that you received in July. The contract changed and it was the second contract he didn't sign because he became ill. That was information found out after the fact. Clearly he was one of the most experienced hearing officers that we observed. He is confident and is qualified. If he doesn't perform then there is an opportunity to replace him.

Mrs. Dralle stated that it would be extremely detrimental to this type of program without experience.

Mr. Moustis inquired of ASA Tatroe if we need to do anything more then?

ASA Tatroe replied no.

A motion was made by Mrs. Dralle, second by Ms. Goodson, to remove Item #6 from the Committee Assignment Requests. All in favor.

MOTION CARRIES.

A motion was made by Mr. Bilotta, second by Mrs. Dralle, to place the committee assignment requests, as amended. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.

ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENT REQUESTS - None

Other Business

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE COUNTY BOARD CHAIRMAN

EXECUTIVE SESSION

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Mr. Adamic, second by Mr. Bilotta, to adjourn the meeting at 10:50 a.m. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.