

**WILL COUNTY BOARD**  
**PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION**  
**COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

**July 7, 2009**

Will County Office Building  
County Board Room  
302 North Chicago Street  
Joliet, IL 60432  
**8:30 a.m.**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Bilotta called the meeting to order at 8:36 a.m.

**ROLL CALL**

**Present were Members:** Singer, Babich, Goodson, Weigel, Winfrey, Wisniewski and Bilotta.

**Absent were Members:** None.

**Also Present:** Moustis and Friefeld.

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

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Ms. Winfrey led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A motion was made by Mr. Wisniewski second by Ms. Winfrey to approve the minutes from the June 2, 2009 meeting. On a roll call vote, Singer, Babich, Goodson, Weigel, Winfrey, Wisniewski and Bilotta voting yes. MOTION CARRIES.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**Request by TCB Development on behalf of Cross Point Church for Temporary Access onto North Briggs Street (CH 62) north of Oak Avenue within the Fox Hollow Subdivision Development**

Mr. Bilotta stated the developer would need to minimally come up with a bond to guarantee that the road improvements will be done; typically we would require a letter of credit.

Mr. Gould indicated there is some internal work that we are requiring them to do for the temporary access on Division Street and the bond will cover this work; this temporary access would be up to a 2-year period.

Mr. Bilotta commented the development is dead due to the economy – the roads, sewer and water are all in and the church wants to continue building their new facility.

Mr. Coleman with TCB stated this is a 200 acre residential unit. We are asking for a temporary permit for access off of Bruce Road. We started the development in 2006 but nothing is selling out there. In a normal economy we would have funds to build these road improvements. We want to get the minimum amount needed to satisfy the county and get the church operational. We are asking for your approval for this 2-year temporary access permit.

Mr. Singer arrived at this juncture.

Mr. Bilotta clarified they are requesting 2 things – a temporary access permit and allowing bond instead of letter of credit.

Mr. Weigel questioned the difference between the two.

Mr. Bilotta replied a letter of credit is more secure. It is easier to foreclose on; it is easier for the county to call that note. It is banked by a bank. A bond is backed by the insurance company. It is secure but not quite as secure as a letter of credit. On letters of credit the banks are requiring 50% of that cash in bank.

Mr. Ronaldson indicated since this is for improvements that may or may not happen at the end of 2 years, it might not be as crucial to get the money to finish the project.

A motion was made by Mr. Wisniewski, second by Ms. Winfrey, to approve the temporary access permit for up to 2 years. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.

A motion was made by Ms. Winfrey, second by Mr. Wisniewski, to approve the request to allow using a bond instead of letter of credit. All in favor, with Singer voting no.

MOTION CARRIES.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

#### **Request by Frankfort Fire Protection District for Access to a County Freeway (Center Road – CH 19) and for Various Variances to the WCDH Permit Regulations**

Mr. Gould stated Frankfort Fire Protection District is building a station at Stuenkel Road and Center Road and they are requesting access off of Center Road, 450 feet south of Stuenkel Road. As part of this request a few variances are needed. We have reviewed this and feel access should come off of Stuenkel Road – that is the controlled stop. For safety reasons we are not in agreement.

Mr. Brunke with Tech 3 Consulting Group addressed the committee regarding this request. The reason that Frankfort Fire Protection District would prefer to have this access on Center Road is that for most calls they would be using Center Road. They would like to sell a 1.4 acre lot for commercial use.

Mr. Weigel asked where the stop sign is at this intersection.

Mr. Brunke answered there is a two-way stop on Stuenkel Road.

Mr. Singer questioned the estimated anticipated additional costs to run access to Stuenkel versus Center Road.

Mr. Brunke replied it would eliminate them from selling that lot as commercial since it would use more of the property.

Mr. Singer commented we have a number of residents who live along Center Road with drive ways that access Center Road as well as many neighborhoods. We have businesses and residents who access state highways or county highways all over Will County. He does not understand how all of those things can function and work and then this is something different especially when this is an emergency vehicle pulling out. To ask them to increase their cost is just not consistent with how we have operated in the past.

Mr. Bilotta indicated we have 5 points to be addressed. We need to make sure that the left turn lanes are done if they are warranted. As development happens; that intersection will eventually be signalized. We need some reassurance the Fire Protection District would get that marked.

Mr. Brunke clarified the left turn lanes will be at Stuenkel Road and Center Road; the fire protection district would be happy to do their share.

Mr. Singer stated we have had this situation many times where we have a developer on one corner of the intersection and because state law does not give us authority to require a developer to all of the intersection improvements that would typically be required we ask them to contribute towards future improvements.

Mr. Wisniewski asked what the down side is.

Mr. Gould answered our concern is the traffic on Center Road going past this facility at a high rate of speed.

Mr. Bilotta indicated the fire protection district is in agreement to install warning signs.

A motion was made by Ms. Goodson, second by Mr. Weigel, to approve a variance from Article 2.1.3-2 of the WCDH Permit Regulations. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.

A motion was made by Ms. Goodson, second by Mr. Weigel, to approve a variance from Article 2.1.6-2(e) of the WCDH Permit Regulations. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.

A motion was made by Mr. Weigel, second by Mr. Babich, to approve a variance from Article 2.1.6-4(a) of the WCDH Permit Regulations. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.

A motion was made by Ms. Winfrey, second by Mr. Babich, to approve a variance from Article 2.1.7-4 of the WCDH Permit Regulations. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.

A motion was made by Mr. Weigel, second by Ms. Goodson, to approve a variance from Article 2.1.6-2(e) of the WCDH Permit Regulations. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.

**Request for Resolution in Support of the Preferred Corridor Alignment for Caton Farm/Bruce Corridor, County Board Districts #7, #8 & #9**

Mr. Gould stated we have undertaken the Phase I study over the last 10 years across the DesPlaines River Valley. There have been discussions with Crest Hill, Homer Glen, Homer Township, Lockport Township, City of Joliet, Joliet Township Will County and Plainfield Township – this is a regional project. We are ready to go forward with the preferred alignment. We started with 25 or 30 different alignments that were looked at and narrowed it down to 6. The preferred alignment is from Route 30 and Caton Farm Road continuing to the east, cross to the south across the river and hook up with Oak; then cut north to Bruce Road and continue to the east up to the middle alignment and end at the intersection of 159<sup>th</sup> and Cedar. It was unanimously approved; it is the corridor we are bringing to the committee.

Mr. Babich questioned the dollar amount.

Mr. Moustis arrived at this juncture.

Mr. Gould replied the total is \$250 million for the entire corridor to be completed.

Mr. Bilotta indicated it is \$150 million for the bridge alone; this is a huge project. We have to submit this to the federal government. It will be done in phases and the bridge is to be first part of it. We just need to pick a corridor so the federal government could decide if it is environmentally proper; over the years, I am sure the route will change. This is the next step to move forward with it and give it to the hands of the federal government who ultimately will be funding 80% of it.

Mr. Friefeld arrived at this juncture.

Mr. Gould commented once we get definite approval then we can put plans together for the bridge crossing the corridor. The transportation bill runs out September 30; if we can get some funding for the crossing we can start putting plans together.

Ms. Winfrey asked if there was any idea as to the number of homeowners who would be displaced.

Mr. Gould answered he does not have those numbers; there would be some displacement on Oak and Bruce Road.

Mr. Singer commented he will support this today; if he could have his way he would scrap the whole thing and refuse to participate in the process unless the federal government made a commitment that they were going to build it and within a specific timeframe. There are not a lot of better options when building a project of this size.

A motion was made by Mr. Babich, second by Ms. Winfrey to place a resolution on the County Board Agenda supporting the preferred corridor alignment for Caton Farm/Bruce Corridor. All in favor.

MOTION CARRIES.

Mr. Babich left at this juncture.

**Road Name Change – CH 17**

Mr. Gould stated he had received a letter regarding the name of Manhattan Road between Route 52 and Route 53 stating he was told by the Post Office that the name was actually West Elwood Manhattan Road. There was a situation with a 9-1-1 response and they went to a different address. The only entity that has authority to change the name of a road is the County Board. The letter is requesting to change it back to Manhattan Road but County Board did not change it to begin with.

Mr. Bilotta suggested a resolution clarifying the name as Manhattan Road.

A motion was made by Ms. Winfrey, second by Ms. Goodson, to place a resolution on the County Board Agenda reaffirming the name as Manhattan Road. All in favor.

MOTION CARRIES.

**Discussion Re: Letters of Credit and Performance Bonds**

Mr. Bilotta stated he had received a call from a developer regarding that banks now require 50% of the cash in the bank for letters of credit. Prior to 2004 the county did allow performance bonds. We as a board and committee stated we prefer letters of credit. He suggested looking at this on a case by case basis and leaving it as letter of credit. We need some security that improvements will get done. We are not changing our policy but would look at each case and if someone has valid reasons for a bond we would look at that. The last thing he would want to do is to hinder development.

Ms. Winfrey commented she would be willing to support a case by case basis.

Mr. Singer questioned what the variable would be to allow it on a case by case basis.

Mr. Bilotta replied they could meet a certain minimum requirement before we would address it; if someone has the ability to do a letter of credit, we want them to do it, not just that it is too expensive.

Mr. Moustis stated we are considering it because of the economics of the letter of credit. He agrees with Mr. Singer that we have to have some type of criteria for who qualifies; that could be as simply that we will allow bonds over a period of time because of the economics of letters of credit being pretty expensive. He recommends that we allow bonds versus letter of credit based on the current economic situation for the next 6 months. We can continue to review it; the banks are making it so unreasonable, the economics are not there especially for small businesses. He asked Mr. Gould if he sees any problems with bonds. Obviously you have to have good bonding companies to make sure they are legitimate.

Mr. Gould answered the main reason we went to a letter of credit is because it is much easier to call up; it is like having a check. With a bond the procedure is more lengthy – it is with

an insurance company. Another issue is that everything at the Land Use Department was letter of credit so we wanted to be consistent.

Mr. Moustis commented Land Use may have to look at their ordinance as well.

Mr. Singer indicated this is a very real world issue and something we have to deal with.

Mr. Bilotta suggested Mr. Gould and the State's Attorney's office look at this and figure out what we need to do. We will bring this back next month.

Mr. Moustis stated the Highway Department has done a good job; they have a good estimate of what the improvement would cost. With Land Use, those letters of credit that are foreclosed on is because the improvement far exceeds the letter of credit. We need to make sure it is sufficient enough whether a bond or letter of credit.

### **RESOLUTIONS TO BE RECOMMENDED TO COUNTY BOARD**

1. Resolution Authorizing Approval of an Agreement between the County of Will and Northern Illinois Gas Company DBA NICOR Gas Company for Relocation of Facilities along Plainfield-Naperville Road for the Installation of Noise Walls  
Motion by Mr. Wisniewski, second by Ms. Goodson. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.
2. Resolution Confirming Award of Contract to "D" Construction, Inc. (126,007.74) – Let on June 24, 2009 – CH 52 (Gougar Road) gaps from south of Haven Avenue to north of Laraway Road, Section 09-00154-14-GM, County Board District #6  
Motion by Mr. Weigel, second by Ms. Winfrey. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.
3. Resolution for Improvements by County under the IL Highway Code, CH 52 (Gougar Road) gaps from south of Haven Avenue to north of Laraway Road, Section 09-00154-14-GM, County Board District #6, Using County's allotment of MFT funds (\$150,000.00)  
Motion by Ms. Goodson, second by Mr. Weigel. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.
4. Resolution Confirming Award of Contract to Iroquois Paving Corporation (296,365.27) – Let on June 24, 2009 – CH 53 (Western Avenue) from Crete-Monee Road to south of Exchange Street, Section 09-00092-10-GM, County Board District #1  
Motion by Mr. Weigel, second by Mr. Singer. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.
5. Resolution for Improvements by County under the IL Highway Code, CH 53 (Western Avenue) from Crete-Monee Road to south of Exchange Street, Section 09-00092-10-GM, County Board District #1, Using County's allotment of MFT funds (\$325,000.00)  
Motion by Mr. Singer, second by Mr. Weigel. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.
6. Resolution Authorizing Approval of Professional Services Agreement for Right of Way Acquisition Services with Civiltech Engineering, Inc., for property along CH 24 (Indiana Avenue) over Trim Creek in unincorporated Will County, Illinois, Section 04-00042-07-LA, County Board District #1, Using RTA Tax funds (\$4,000.00)  
Mr. Singer asked if this is part of the Build Will Program.  
Mr. Gould answered yes; any resolution using RTA funds is part of the program.  
Motion by Mr. Weigel, second by Mr. Singer. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.

7. Resolution Authorizing Approval of Professional Services Agreement for Right of Way Acquisition Services with "T" Engineering Services, Ltd., for property along CH 24 (Indiana Avenue) over Trim Creek in unincorporated Will County, Illinois, Section 04-00042-07-LA, County Board District #1, Using RTA Tax funds (\$6,000.00)

Motion by Mr. Weigel, second by Ms. Goodson. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.

8. Resolution Authorizing Approval of Additional Professional Services Agreement for Design Engineering Services (Phase I) with SEC Group, Inc. for the improvement of CH 52 (Gougar Road) at U.S. Route 30, Section 07-00154-11-EG, County Board District #2

Mr. Bilotta indicated SEC is our program manager. One of the agreements is they will not do any further projects. They had two projects and this is one of the two. We also have had discussions that whoever gets Phase I will get Phase II. The question is once they are done, would the committee want someone else to do the design?

Mr. Moustis stated they should not do it – they are our program consultants. Even if there is a slight increase in cost, someone else should do it. It was made clear to SEC once they are done with what they are currently working on for these two projects; then they were done.

Motion by Mr. Singer, second by Mr. Wisniewski. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.

9. Resolution for Additional Design Engineering Services (Phase I) by County under the IL Highway Code with SEC Group, Inc., for the improvement of CH 52 (Gougar Road) at U.S. Route 30, Section 07-00154-11-EG, County Board District #2, Using County's allotment of MFT & Matching Tax funds (\$8,059.76 & 8,059.76)

Motion by Mr. Weigel, second by Ms. Winfrey. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.

10. Resolution Authorizing Approval of Additional Professional Services Agreement for Design Engineering Services (Phase II) with Willett, Hofmann & Associates, Inc., for roadway and appurtenant work thereto on CH 4 (Cedar Road), Section 01-00051-04-BR, County Board District #7, Using County's allotment of County Bridge Tax funds (\$57,147.57)

Motion by Ms. Winfrey, second by Mr. Weigel. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.

11. Resolution Authorizing Approval of an IDOT – County Joint Agreement (Supplemental) for improvements to CH 4 (Cedar Road) over Spring Creek, Job No. D-91-144-01, County Section 01-00051-04-BR, County Board District #7

Motion by Mr. Weigel, second by Mr. Wisniewski. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.

12. Resolution Authorizing the Will County's State's Attorney's Office to Proceed with a Condemnation Case regarding the County's CH 23 (Pauling-Goodenow Road) at Kedzie Avenue project (Parcel 0001), Section 03-00054-05-LA, County Board District #1

This item was discussed in executive session.

13. Resolution Authorizing Approval of Professional Services Agreement for Right of Way Acquisition Services with Swanson and Brown, Ltd., for property along CH 24 (Indiana Avenue) over Trim Creek in unincorporated Will County, Illinois, Section 04-00042-07-LA, County Board District #1, Using RTA Tax funds (\$4,000.00)

Motion by Mr. Weigel, second by Mr. Singer. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.

Mr. Moustis left at this juncture.

#### **Other Business**

#### **COUNTY ENGINEER DISCUSSION**

#### **STATE'S ATTORNEY DISCUSSION**

**MONTHLY WORK REPORTS – Attached**

**AUDIENCE COMMENTS**

**REPORTS BY COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

Ms. Goodson stated there were a number of projects submitted in the state emergency repair program; those projects were supposed to have been selected on a priority basis by the state in June but they have not prioritized all projects they received. Gougar Road was one of our top priority projects and is in our Build Will Program.

Mr. Gould indicated the contract for the north piece has already been awarded; the contractor was ready to begin work. He questioned if we were to start and then this was selected as one of the emergency projects would that jeopardize funding. Ms. Goodson contacted IDOT yesterday and they told her yes it would jeopardize funding. Right now that project is on hold and we are waiting to see what IDOT is doing with this program.

Ms. Goodson commented they had no clear date they could give us.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIRMAN**

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Mr. Bilotta stated an executive session was necessary to discuss right of way acquisition.

A motion was made by Mr. Weigel, second by Ms. Winfrey, to go into executive session at 10:15 a.m. to discuss right of way acquisition. On a roll call vote, Singer, Goodson, Weigel, Winfrey, Wisniewski and Bilotta voting yes. MOTION CARRIES.

Mr. Bilotta announced they were now in executive session.

Mr. Singer left during executive session.

A motion was made by Mr. Wisniewski, second by Ms. Goodson, to come out of executive session at 10:44 a.m. On a roll call vote, Goodson, Weigel, Winfrey, Wisniewski and Bilotta voting yes. MOTION CARRIES.

12. Resolution Authorizing the Will County's State's Attorney's Office to Proceed with a Condemnation Case regarding the County's CH 23 (Pauling-Goodenow Road) at Kedzie Avenue project (Parcel 0001), Section 03-00054-05-LA, County Board District #1 Motion by Mr. Weigel, second by Mr. Wisniewski. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.

**ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made by Mr. Weigel, second by Ms. Goodson, to adjourn the meeting at 10:44 a.m. All in favor. MOTION CARRIES.