

WILL COUNTY BOARD
JUDICIAL COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES

May 4, 2010

8:30 a.m.

302 North Chicago Street
County Board Committee Room
Joliet, Illinois 60432

CALL TO ORDER

Mrs. Dralle called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Present were Members: McPhillips, L. Smith and Dralle. No Quorum

Absent were Members: Deutsche, Kusta and Stewart.

Also Present: James Moustis and Bruce Friefeld

Present from State's Attorney's Office: Mary Tatroe and Phil Mock

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Staff led the committee in the pledge of allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes were approved later in the meeting after a quorum was established.

OLD BUSINESS

Update: Justice/Judicial Integration

Nick Palmer advised that he wanted to keep the committee apprized and that next month he would have a written report. He stated that they decided who would be on the committee or what we are calling workgroups, technology; development; grant writing and special projects as they arise. We are at 9 members and we are finalizing a governance document which he will bring back next month. It is basically an MOU between the partners saying that we are working with the same goal in mind. We are also working on an RFP to utilize some of that earmarked money which he will bring back to this committee. Bruce Friefeld has been attending these meetings/workshops on behalf of the County Board.

JMS Update

Mr. Piwowarski stated that the RFP was being released today, May 4, 2010. We are doing some enhancements on the existing system and we are using a similar technique as Mr. Palmer with an MOU in order to document everything that we are doing so when the new vendor comes in for the analysis we will be that much further ahead. He has met with ISP again and right now the software is pretty stable. They cannot give us any definitive answers until after the November election as to what their prospects are for moving forward. They know that they have funding until the beginning of next year. He felt that ISP will try to keep staff but will be migrating that staff to other projects which will freeze the application so they can slowly distance themselves from it. Worst case scenario is them coming back saying they can't support it, here is the source help.

Ms. Dralle requested a little background information on the Illinois State Police and how it affects the county.

Mr. Piwowarski stated that ISP is the current vendor for our jail management system. The project was supported by user fees by all the counties and police departments using the system. The biggest client they had was Cook County jail and they were paying the ISP \$275,000.00 in user support. Cook County jail has left that program. Will is the largest county that is being supported by the State Police. Their revenues have gone from \$325,000.00 down to \$50,000.00 so they are doing no expansion on staff and they have 2 existing staff members assigned to this project. He clarified that CIMIA stands for the Correctional Institution Management Information System. We have been doing testing internally and the current application will function fine on our current hardware/software and could be maintained for 2-3 years.

Mr. Piwowarski advised that we have had pre-registration of six individuals (companies) already on the RFP.

Other Old Business

NEW BUSINESS

Request to Award Sheriff's Body Armor

Action was taken later in the meeting after a quorum was established.

Request to Update Re: Past & Present JAG Award

Mr. Palmer advised information was provided in the packet and he distributed a list of recent JAG awards and funding. We will come back next with a formal recommendation on how to spend these funds. We are disparate partners with the City of Joliet so the last several years we have been split it 50-50 so that will give us just over \$51,000.00 if we continue with that process. Prior to coming to the next meeting, he will post the materials because there is a 30 day public comment period that we must do because of the application process.

Proposed Changes to: General Nuisances Ordinance; General Traffic Regulations; Abandonment of Vehicles Ordinance; and Firearms Ordinance

Ms. Dralle advised that part of the whole administrative adjudication process some of our discussion have been about clarifying the ordinances so that we are more conducive with the administrative process. Most of the fines according to state statute can go up to \$1,000.00.

ASA Tatroe replied yes and requested that ASA Mock come up because he made the changes to most of the ordinances.

General Traffic and Abandonment of Vehicles

ASA Mock stated that the only major change is that the state eliminated the definition of handicap driver, they have a different designation. We do not have anything in our ordinance regarding handicap parking or driving. We adopted a lot of the definitions out of the code. He advised the committee, regarding towing and moving vehicles, stopping when traffic is obstructed, obstructed person on highways, open and closing of vehicle doors, depositing of glass on the highway are in the code. However, you have the ability to adopt the entire vehicle code if you chose to and he did not know the why these items were selected and all the other control ordinances were not. We do deal a lot with the special vehicle moving permit for oversized loads. Our previous ordinance stated that these permits have to be approved by the County Board. I modified that so the permits are approved by County Engineer because that is what is currently going on now. The County Board would not have time to approve the number of requests coming in because in the fall during grain season every farmer will get permits.

ASA Mock stated that the language mirrors the statutes and I have also inserted specific statutory provisions as to the authority that we have to adopt these. He recommended adoption of the entire vehicle code which you have the ability to do. If that is something the County Board would like to do he would work on that.

Ms. Dralle inquired what were the advantages to adopting the entire code.

ASA Mock advised there is no advantage because the statute still says where the money goes and since we are not home rule we are stuck with that provision. It does not impact our revenue stream whatsoever.

Ms. Dralle inquired that it had nothing to do with enforcement, it is strictly revenue.

ASA Mock replied that traffic enforcement is not one of the items right now we can currently do administratively. If it was something we could do administratively it would be great to adopt the entire code and keep all the fines. We cannot do that because we are not home rule.

Ms. Dralle requested that he get on the agenda for the Legislative Committee and address this with them to see if it is something we can move forward and give us more authority.

Ms. Dralle asked regarding the towing or removal of vehicles is that statute for 24 hour period?

ASA Mock replied yes which is right in the statute.

Firearms Ordinance

ASA Mock advised that our ordinance matched the statute on firearms but that changed about 10 years ago but we did not change our ordinance. He has put in the current FOID definition which is more expansive and includes different types of firearms including pellet and bb guns. It does accept certain bb guns and pellet guns. The definitions are the same. He had to take out some of the code which included that you couldn't discharge a firearm within a railroad corridor which was 100 yards on each side of a railroad. They eliminated that in the statute and made it a felony to shoot at a train but eliminated the corridor one. It has been eliminated from the statute. He stated that the penalty is currently a \$500.00 fine and recommended that it be increased to \$1,000.00. You have that ability which is something you need to determine.

General Nuisances

ASA Mock stated that this has been updated from the statutes which have been broadened with some being abandoned and discarded. Some of the verbiage have been changed such as inoperable vehicle. The language that was added was brought directly from the statute and was added to the statute. We broadened the definition of junk to include abandoned and discarded. We cross reference the penalty section in a few sections just to make it clearer. We changed the verbiage to reflect that this is an ordinance violation versus a state violation. The penalty has been changed to \$1,000.00 and the County still has the ability to seek other remedies in the courts, such as an injunction. We did change the false alarm from 12 month to a calendar year. That was simply because of the difficulty of tracking when three violations had occurred.

Ms. Dralle inquired if all alarm systems have auto shut offs, some of the older alarms.

ASA Tatroe advised she would have to check with the Sheriff's Office.

Ms. Dralle requested that she find that information out and get back to the committee.

Ms. Dralle asked what is a direct line system?

ASA Tatroe replied when an alarm goes off the data is sent directly to the Sheriff or dispatcher.

Ms. Dralle requested that information be provided regarding the 30 minute shut off.

Ms. Dralle also stated that the fifth fine is \$50.00 and confirmed that they are all statutory so we could not go any higher.

ASA Tatroe agreed, stating these are all statutory so we cannot go any higher.

Ms. Dralle reviewed the fire penalties, \$50.00 for the 1st offense; \$150.00 for the 2nd offense and \$500.00 for the 3rd on nuisance fires. This is on last page under Penalties 93.015 to 93.213.

Ms. Dralle stated under the Public Nuisance –Sound or noise, does any of this require a decibel meter – 93.072.

ASA Tatroe replied she would check with the Sheriff's office.

ASA Mock advised that regarding the sound issue, we refer that sound shall not go past what the administrative code says and the administrative code has decibel level in it. Sheriff's department does have a working decibel meter and it has been used before.

Other New Business

Elizabeth Dunne asked if she wanted to review the RFQ and RFP drafts?

Ms. Dralle requested that Ms. Dunne distribute the information and we will have them on the next meeting agenda as we have to quorum today so no action can be taken.

Ms. Dralle advised that ASA Tatroe has provided the committee an administrative adjudication ordinance for review which will also be included on the next agenda. She asked that Ms. Dunne to please provide them to staff for dissemination later.

Mr. Moustis arrived at this juncture.

QUORUM WAS ESTABLISHED.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Ms. McPhillips, second by Ms. Smith, to approve the minutes from the April 6, 2010 meeting. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.

Sheriff's Body Armor

Ms. Meismer requested the committee to award the bid to Streicher's for body armor vests which is the only vendor who met all the criteria and requirements. It is for 100 vests per year costing \$530.00 each. This is for 3 years at that price.

Deputy Chief Romeo stated that the vests last 5 years and are on a rotation cycle. We replace about 100 each year.

A motion was made by Ms. McPhillips, second by Ms. Smith, to place a resolution on the County Board Agenda awarding the Sheriff's Body Armor bid. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIRMAN

EXECUTIVE SESSION

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Mr. Moustis, second by Ms. McPhillips, to adjourn the meeting at 9:07 a.m. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.