CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL: Amy Cesich, Lynn Cullick, Scott Gryder (Chair), Judy Gilmour (Vice-Chair) and Jeff Wehrli

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Approval of minutes from the September 9, 2013 meeting.

EXPENDITURE REPORT- (handed out at meeting)

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

PETITIONS
None

OLD BUSINESS
Plumbing Inspector replacement
Building Code Discussion
Fields of Farm Colony Change Order

NEW BUSINESS
Review of IL APA Conference Planner Zubko attended
Bed & Breakfast question- 1542 Plainfield Road- possible weddings on site
Request from NaAuSay Township to pay ½ building permit fee in the amount of $218.20 (Total was $436.40)

PUBLIC COMMENT

UPDATE ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

UPDATE ON CMAP LAND USE COMMITTEE MEETING

PROJECT STATUS REPORT
PERMIT REPORT
REVENUE REPORT
CORRESPONDENCE
EXECUTIVE SESSION

ADJOURNMENT- Next meeting on November 12, 2013(TUESDAY)
CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order by Chairman Scott Gryder at 6:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL
Present: Chairman Scott Gryder, Amy Cesich, Lynn Cullick, Vice-Chair Judy Gilmour and Jeff Wehrli
Absent: None
Also present: Senior Planner Angela Zubko, Interim PBZ Director Jeff Wilkins, Code Official Brian Holdiman and County Board Member Matt Prochaska

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Lynn Cullick made a motion to approve the agenda as written, Amy Cesich seconded the motion. All agreed and the motion was approved.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Jeff Wehrli made a motion to approve the minutes from August 12, 2013. Judy Gilmour seconded the motion. All agreed and the minutes were approved.

EXPENDITURE REPORT (handed out at meeting)
Amy Cesich made a motion to approve the expenditure report in the amount of $14,249.08 and forward it onto the Finance Committee, Lynn Cullick seconded the motion. All agreed and the motion was approved.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD
There were no citizens to be heard at this time

NEW BUSINESS
Plumbing Inspector Replacement- Mr. Holdiman stated we've had the same plumbing inspector for 29 years, John Schneider, a retired plumber and come December 1 he will be retiring at the age of 93. Therefore we need to start looking for a replacement, a contractual inspector. Mr. Holdiman has contacted 11 contractors, with serious interest from 2 that can meet the County's requirements of insurance and a contract. Currently Mr. Schneider does not have a contract with the County and also does not have insurance. We currently pay Mr. Schneider $37 for residential and $47 for commercial inspections. We charge the rate of $50 per residential inspection and $75 per commercial inspection. Mr. Holdiman stated when we update our codes to the 2012 IBC coming up in the next 3-6 months we would also do a fee study for what we charge for inspections as the two interested charge between $100 and $125 an inspection. They would have to have their own company to have the type of insurance the County is requesting.

Mr. Gryder asked why we would not like to have a retired plumbing do our inspections. Mr. Holdiman explained it is not economically feasible as insurance would cost about $8,000 and last year the inspector made about $4,000.
Ms. Cesich asked about posting an ad and if we need to legally? Mr. Wilkins stated Statutes state anything over $30,000 needs to be bid out but this would fall below that amount. Ms. Gilmour asked if Mr. Holdiman asked the Union for any names. Mr. Holdiman stated he could if the committee would like him to but would like to hire someone from the area.

The Committee wished Mr. Holdiman good luck and will wait to hear more information.

OLD BUSINESS–
Response to Insurance Services Office (ISO) survey and reclassification- We were to respond by August 22nd, we did respond via email and now we have till October 22nd to give them a list of the changes we intend to make. Mr. Holdiman suggestions updating to the 2012 code and discuss the sprinkler system requirements. Once we get that list to them we have another year to adopt those changes.

PETITIONS-
#13-16 Poultry processing plant and slaughtering
Planner Zubko stated this is a text amendment to allow a small poultry and small animal processing plant as a special use in the A-1 district. Planner Zubko went through the memo and stated we are looking to add a definition of a small poultry and small animal processing plant and rendering. Planner Zubko went through all 14 conditions proposed. Mr. Wehrli asked about the 21,000 units a week and if we want to define a unit in case someone wants to process 21,000 turkeys. The suggestion was maybe geese and turkeys count as 3 units. She stated there is a detailed description on how to process chickens at the end of the memo. She also stated she visited the Central IL Poultry Processing plant in Arthur, IL and thought it was quite efficient, they had about 25 employees and processed about 2,500 chickens a day. Also the smell was minimal and only at the unloading area which is why condition b is worded the way it is worded. Condition g was modified to basically say that to have retail from the plant it must be specified in the special use. The concerns that were brought up during the Plan Commission and Special sue Hearing officer meeting was more related to the specific special use but staff feels the concerns are met with relation to the text amendment. The concerns brought up were the notification process, which I was discussed a little earlier to the public, traffic, noise, the property values in the area, lighting, possible protests, landscaping, driveway construction, commercial retail on the site, possible water contamination, appearance, signage and waste.

Mr. Gryder stated most of the concerns seemed to have been addressed. Mr. Wehrli asked if everyone is comfortable with the option to allow retail sales? Mr. Gryder likes it in the special use so we’d have more authority. Ms. Gilmour stated she knows there’s a concern about traffic so how would that affect traffic. Mr. Wehrli stated it might need to be on a major highway or have good access due to the possibility of more traffic. Planner Zubko was instructed to research the units and update the committee at County Board.

With no further suggestions or changes Jeff Wehrli made a motion, seconded by Amy Cesich to approve and forward the petition onto the next County Board meeting. All were in favor

#13-17 Maly Poultry Processing Plant
Planner Zubko stated this will be continued after it has another public hearing. During the Plan Commission and special use hearing officer meeting there was discussion on notification. Planner Zubko has received the opinion of the State’s Attorney’s office and would like to take the petition back to another public hearing notifying resident’s within 500’ of the overall 130 acre property. Most of the residents that have attended the meetings are more than 500’ from the overall parcel so they still will not receive notice. Also there was a change of ownership of a parcel so staff is of the opinion it is just the right thing to do.
OLD BUSINESS—

Billboards- Planner Zubko stated this was discussed last month and the Committee wanted to continue it till this month. There was discussion on the amortization clause, where the current billboards are located and what the consensus of the group is. Mr. Wehrli stated he is of the opinion not having billboards makes Kendall County unique. Mr. Wilkins stated this could end up in the courts. There was a consensus to get some direction from the SAO on what the choices are. They would like the SAO to come to a PBZ meeting to discuss this.

Mr. Wilkins stated the Pay as you Grow Plan went very well at Mayors and Mangers meeting.

Mr. Wilkins stated the ordinance changes we talked about last month the junk and nuisance, Mr. Weis is assigning the new employee to working on this so we will bring this back when they are prepared, the plan is end of October.

Mr. Wehrli asked how the Fields of Farm Colony work is coming along. Planner Zubko stated it is about 75% complete and moving along quickly.

PUBLIC COMMENT — None

UPDATE ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION— The meeting will be September 18th, at the last meeting we elected a new Chair, Michael Garrigan and Whitney French will be the Vice-Chairman.

PROJECT STATUS REPORT— Reviewed
PERMIT REPORT— Reviewed
REVENUE REPORT— Reviewed
CORRESPONDENCE — Planner Zubko wanted to bring an amendment to the fees for EcoCat’s/Endangered Species report. It was part of the General Assembly’s “IDNR Sustainability Bill” passed this spring, the same law that enacted an additional $2 park fee for automobile registration. The Administrative Rule, Part 1075.90, was amended effective July 5, 2013, but they don’t have the mechanics of collection in place yet. The fee was free and now each EcoCat is going to cost $500. The petitioner will be paying it but Planner Zubko wanted to make everyone aware of this change as they will probably be receiving complaints. It was requested Planner Zubko email out the code to the County Board members and discuss this at the Committee of the Whole meeting on Thursday.

EXECUTIVE SESSION— None

ADJOURNMENT- Next meeting will be on October 7, 2013

Judy Gilmour made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Lynn Cullick seconded the motion. All agreed. Chairman Gryder adjourned the meeting at 7:29 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Angela L. Zubko
Senior Planner

9.9.13 PBZ Meeting Minutes
Fields of Farm Colony

CHANGE ORDER

PROJECT: Pond Outlet and Trail Reconstruction

CONTRACTOR: Wilkinson Excavating, Inc.

CONTRACT FOR: Pond Outlet and Trail Reconstruction

You are directed to make the following changes in the Contract Documents:

DESCRIPTION: Various scope changes (see attached detail)

PURPOSE OF CHANGE: See attached Detail

ATTACHMENTS: Exhibit #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHANGE IN CONTRACT PRICE</th>
<th>CHANGE IN CONTRACT TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original Contract price:</td>
<td>Original Contract time:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 63,005.00</td>
<td>9/1/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Change Orders:</td>
<td>Previous Change Orders:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Price prior to this Change Order:</td>
<td>Contract Time prior to this Change Order:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 63,005.00</td>
<td>11/1/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Increase (Decrease) of this Change Order</td>
<td>Net Increase (Decrease) of this Change Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 1,800.00</td>
<td>61 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract price with all approved Change Order:</td>
<td>Contract time with all approved Change Order:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 64,805.00</td>
<td>11/1/2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDED:  

Engineer Date

APPROVED:  

Owner Date

Contractor Date
Field of Farm Colony Pond Outlet and Trail Reconstruction

It is noted that the project was bid Lump Sum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CHANGE IN VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SILT FENCE - Reduction based on field conditions and timing of construction (estimated quantity 500 LF)</td>
<td>$(1,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LIMESTONE SCREENINGS - Reduction based on condition of existing trail section from erosion (STA 0+25) to the south approximately 200 feet</td>
<td>$(1,200.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>EARTHWORK - Reduction along same trail section noted in item 2</td>
<td>$(200.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ALTERNATE B - Reduce this alternate based on work performed by HOA</td>
<td>$(3,500.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CA-6 - Utilize CA-6 base in lieu of limestone screenings to match existing trail section desired by HOA</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>STORM MANHOLE - Adjustment in steel grate value based on contractor bid error</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>EARTHWORK - Filled gully/rill on south side of major erosion area. This area was in high vegetation and not identified on the plans</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>RIP RAP - Added rip rap at culvert for trail crossing Fields Drive roadside ditch (south side). Based on the length of the culvert additional protection needed even though it did not exist prior to the project. This matches what the HOA has done at other locations</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>24'' RCP STORM SEWER - Addition of storm sewer to replace existing 16 inch DIP to improve function of stormwater base and minimize overtopping. This expands the bid scope from a simple replacement to an improvement. Includes pipe, FES, grate and labor to install</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Change  $ 1,800.00
ORDINANCE - 95
GRANTING A SPECIAL USE

WHEREAS Candice Hadley did petition the Kendall County Board in the manner required by law and the ordinances of Kendall County, Illinois for a Special Use for a Bed and Breakfast Establishment pursuant to Section 8.01.B.2. of the Kendall County Zoning Ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the Kendall County Zoning Board did hold a public hearing regarding the proposed Special Use,

THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED by the County Board of Kendall County, Illinois that the following described property located at 1542 Plainfield Road-Oswego, be granted the Special Use as requested:

Lot 107 of County Clerk's Subdivision of a Part of the North half of Section 2 and part of the Northwest Quarter of Section 1 in Township 36 North, Range 8 East of the Third Principal Meridian and a part of the South half of Section 35, in Township 37 North, Range 8, East of the Third Principal Meridian, according to the plat thereof recorded July 9, 1971, in Book 13 of Plats, Page 59, as Document 71-2373, in the Townships of Oswego and Na-Au-Say, Kendall County, Illinois.

ADDITIONALLY, the following stipulations must be adhered to with the granting of the Special Use:

1. Compliance with applicable state and county ordinances.

2. Inspection by health, fire & building inspectors.
3. Use of only off-street or building mounted signs.

4. Residence of owner or owner's agent on property.

5. Establishment of sufficient off-street parking.

6. Protection of architectural or historical significant structures.

7. Each guest's stay be limited to 14 consecutive days and no more than six weeks per year.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the Zoning Map of Kendall County will be changed to show this Special Use.

PASSED this 18th day of April, 1995.

Chairman, County Board of Kendall County, Illinois

ATTEST:

County Clerk
CMAP Land Use Working Committee
Annotated Agenda
Wednesday, September 18, 2013
9:00 a.m.
DuPage County Conference Room
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 800
Chicago, Illinois

1.0 Call to Order 9:00 a.m.

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

3.0 Approval of Notes—August 20, 2013
ACTION REQUESTED: Approval

4.0 GO TO 2040 Update, Drew Williams-Clark
Federal regulations mandate the update of GO TO 2040 by October of 2014. CMAP staff have begun work updating the financial plan, major capital projects, indicators, and implementation actions to inform the plan update. These components are expected to be complete in the early spring so that the plan can be drafted for public comment release at the June, 2014 meetings of the CMAP Board and MPO Policy Committee.

a. Major Capital Projects Overview, Todd Schmidt
   Major capital projects are large, regionally significant projects that add capacity to the transportation system. Staff will present an overview of the process CMAP will employ to update the fiscally constrained and unconstrained menu of major capital projects in the GO TO 2040 plan update.
   ACTION REQUESTED: Information

b. Implementation Actions Overview, Alex Beata
   As part of the GO TO 2040 plan update, the FY 2014 work plan calls for a review of the implementation action tables at the end of each of the twelve chapters in GO TO 2040. Specifically, the work plan calls for these actions to be updated to reflect their implementation status. Staff will present an overview of the process CMAP will employ to update the implementation actions. This will involve substantial discussion at October and/or November working committee meetings.
   ACTION REQUESTED: Discussion

5.0 Criteria for selecting projects for Transportation Alternatives funding
CMAP received 11 applications from its call for projects this summer and had an additional 28 potential projects previously solicited. Jesse Elam (CMAP) will present proposed evaluation criteria for the projects for committee feedback. Link to memo: Criteria for selecting projects for Transportation Alternatives funding
6.0 Proposed Amendment to GO TO 2040 – Illiana Corridor

CMAP received a formal request from IDOT to consider inclusion of the proposed Illiana Expressway as a fiscally constrained major capital project in GO TO 2040. Under federal regulation, this proposed new highway facility must be included in GO TO 2040 in order to complete the upcoming Tier 2 Environmental Impact Statement. A special August meeting of the Land Use Committee was scheduled to review the CMAP staff analysis of the proposal.

Staff have prepared a memo summarizing public comments for the CMAP Board, which will meet at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, September 11. The memo includes links to all 965 public comments, 169 supporting the proposed amendment and 796 opposing it. Those numbers do not include two petitions submitted in opposition, with more than 3,700 total signatures. Erin Aleman (CMAP) will provide an overview of the memo.

The committee will discuss its position and how it would like to be represented when the Regional Coordinating Committee gives a recommendation on the proposal to the CMAP Board in October. The proposal is scheduled to be voted on by the CMAP Board and MPO Policy Committee at their joint meeting on Wednesday, October 9. The CMAP staff recommendation on this proposed amendment will be available on September 27 at the Transportation Committee agendas page (www.cmap.illinois.gov/transportation/minutes).

ACTION REQUESTED: Reach consensus on position for Regional Coordinating Committee

7.0 Other Business

8.0 Public Comment

This is an opportunity for comments from members of the audience. The amount of time available to speak will be at the chair’s discretion.

9.0 Next Meeting

The committee is tentatively scheduled to visit Orland Park’s NinetyFifty on the Park development in lieu of our regular committee meeting on October 18, 2013.

10.0 Adjournment

CMAP Land Use Committee Members:

- Judy Beck, U.S. EPA - Great Lakes National Program Office
- Robert Cole, Oak Park
- Kristi DeLaurentis, Village of Lansing
- Lisa DiChiera, Landmarks Illinois
- Kimberly Flom, Village of Orland Park
- Sheena Frére, Metropolis Strategies
- David Galowich, Urban Land Institute
- Ed Paesel, South Suburban Mayors & Managers
- Curt Paddock, Will County
- Arnold Randall, Cook County Forest Preserve District
- Elaine Romas, Cook County Bureau of Economic Development
- Dennis Sandquist, McHenry County
- Heather Smith, Field Foundation
- Heather Tabbert, RTA
- Todd Vanadilok, APA-Chicago Metro Section/Illinois Chapter
- Mark VanKerkhoff, Kane County
- Eric Waggoner, Lake County
- Nathaniel Werner, City of Elmhurst
- Norm West, U.S. EPA
- Nancy Williamson, IDNR
- Ruth Wuorenma, Neighborhood Capital Institute
- Angela Zubko, Kendall County
On Friday, August 2, 2013, the CMAP Transportation Committee released the CMAP staff analysis of the proposed Illiana Expressway plan amendment for a 32-day public comment period. During this time CMAP posted information about the public comment period on the agency website and in the Weekly Update email. The public comment period closed on Tuesday, September 3, 2013. This memo provides a summary of the public comments received to date. A complete PDF of every public comment made to CMAP can be downloaded here.

In total, CMAP received 965 public comments on the proposed amendment. Comments were submitted by email, fax, mail, and phone. The majority of comments came from Illinois residents, businesses, organizations, and governments, however, CMAP also received public comments from Indiana units of government and residents. Of the 965 comments, 169 were supportive of the proposed amendment, and 796 comments expressed opposition to it. These numbers do not include two petitions that were also submitted as public comment in opposition to the proposed amendment. The first petition was received from the State Taxpayers Opposing the Proposed Illiana Toll Road (STOPIT Committee), which included 898 signatures from both Illinois and Indiana residents opposed to the Illiana. The second petition was submitted by No Illiana 4 US and includes over 2,900 signatures against the Illiana.

The remainder of this memo describes the nearly 1,000 public comments received by CMAP. To highlight common themes, the comments are divided into the two general categories of support and opposition. The comments are further subdivided into the following categories:

- Businesses, which includes individual businesses and chambers of commerce.
- Civic organizations, which includes membership-based organizations, educational institutions, and not-for-profits.
- Government, which includes municipal, county, councils of governments, councils of mayors, state, and federal.
- Individuals or residents.
- Labor unions.
Business, civic, government, and labor union comments are summarized below to highlight key issues, whereas the individual comments are described more generally. Each category of comments is available in PDF format by clicking the linked headings for each section.

**Support**
Comments in support of the Illiana project cited multiple benefits, chief among them transportation improvements and economic development. Respondents stated that the new expressway would reduce congestion on existing routes, particularly I-80 and local roads in Will County, and accommodate future traffic growth in the corridor. Some respondents also noted that the Illiana would provide east-west connectivity that is currently lacking in the corridor. In terms of economic development, respondents stated that the project would create near-term construction jobs and also long-term benefits, namely by providing better market access and supporting the growth of intermodal and logistics activity in the area.

Respondents also noted a variety of other benefits. Some stated that the potential for a public-private partnership would be beneficial, leveraging additional private investments for the facility. Less-frequently cited benefits included safety improvements, increased tax revenue, and environmental benefits. Environmental benefits included reduced emissions (as a result of less congestion), as well as minimal disruption to existing communities.

**Business**

**Aldridge Electric, Inc.**
Aldridge Electric states the Illiana will provide a "much needed east-west alternative" and will result in decreased travel time, enhanced safety, and increased reliability. They also believe the Illiana will provide economic development opportunities in the Southland.

**Chicago Southland Chamber of Commerce**
As an advocate for important infrastructure, the Chicago Southland Chamber states that the Illiana should be included in the GO TO 2040 plan. If not, the chamber says, a $40 million investment in the planning for the project will be lost, and the process for soliciting potential concessionaire teams for a public-private partnership (PPP, also referred to as P3) will be halted.

**Economic Alliance of Kankakee County**
The Economic Alliance of Kankakee County submitted resolutions passed in support of the Illiana Expressway. Resolutions were from 2010 and state that I-80 and I-94 are experiencing growing congestion, and Kankakee County has a concentration of intermodal centers that are creating congestion and threatening quality of life and safety of local citizens. The resolutions also state that freight movement is critical to the national, regional, and local economy, resolving that there is local support for a new circumferential east-west expressway – the Illiana Expressway.

**Fidelity National Title of Illinois**
"As a business manager that employs 25 in the Will/Grundy area I support the B3 Corridor plan."

September 9, 2013
Gallagher Asphalt
Gallagher Asphalt states that the Illiana is long overdue, and major capital projects require a "leap of faith" at their outset. As local resident, knows need for relief on I-80. As business owner, knows economic benefit.

Great Lakes Basin, LLC
"I plan to be part of the P3 bid and will offer a second concession check (after tolls) that, in my estimation, can fund the entire corridor, without any public monies needed to build and operate both a toll highway component and a freight rail component."

Grundy County Economic Development
Grundy County Economic Development states that industrial and residential growth in the area has created a need for the Illiana.

Illinois Association of Aggregate Producers (IAAP)
The IAAP believes the Illiana will produce economic and environmental benefits, and that the PPP structure will reduce costs.

Illinois Road and Transportation Builders Association (IRTBA)
IRTBA states that the Illiana is of national, regional, and local significance. "CMAP has downplayed the economic benefits this project would provide...CMAP should apply a consistent standard of evaluation with respect to financing construction and operating costs. CMAP has also not recognized the positive impact on truck freight traffic...that the Illiana would create."

J.S. Alberico Construction Co., Inc.
J.S. Alberico is a local construction firm that sees growth in traffic on I-80 as detrimental to business, and states that the "vast majority" of vehicles on I-80 are passing through.

Joliet Region Chamber of Commerce and Industry
The Board of Directors of the Joliet Region Chamber of Commerce and Industry supports the Illiana and are requesting its inclusion in GO TO 2040 because of safety concerns for citizens and drivers, for improved congestion, reduced travel times, and to support the local economy.

Lake Tandem Lodge
Lake Tandem Lodge states that the Chicago region is in dire need of the Illiana. It will help alleviate pressure on local roads and support intermodal development in the Southland region.

Lane Construction Company
Lane Construction Company states that the project can be built using PPP. Near-term benefits include job creation and healthier infrastructure.

Managing Packaging Systems
Managing Packaging Systems states that the Illiana will reduce traffic on I-80, support Peotone Airport, and "revitalize business parks all over the south suburbs."
James McHugh Construction Co. (McHugh)
McHugh supports the Illiana because it will provide improved access, supports population growth and employment, improve safety, supports the use of PPPs, and has a number of environmental benefits.

Jones Lang LaSalle Americas
As a former resident of Will County, Mr. Ostrowski supports the Illiana because Jones Lang LaSalle is marketing the connections the expressway will have to logistics companies. It is critical to the growth of the RidgePort Logistics Center in Wilmington, IL. The expressway will ease congestion and provide for efficient movement of goods.

Moore Glass, Inc.
Moore Glass supports the Illiana because the expressway is needed to reduce truck congestion on local roads, thereby improving traffic and safety and increasing jobs and tax revenue.

Ozinga Bros., Inc.
Ozinga Bros., states that the Illiana corridor is a necessary step toward creating short-term and long-term jobs in both Indiana and Illinois. By connecting two major roadways, the Illiana can relieve traffic congestion on local roads. Vehicle idling is a major issue, Ozinga says, and emissions caused by trucks stopped on the road could be prevented with the Illiana.

Prairie Material
Prairie Material supports the Illiana because it will provide a bypass for cars and trucks around Chicago, stimulate the economy by creating jobs, and become the first public-private partnership in Illinois.

Presence Saint Joseph Medical Center
Presence states that the Illiana will provide a much needed bypass for trucks on congested local roads. They also are supportive of the economic benefits of the Illiana and applaud the efforts of the Illiana to be more sustainable by reducing number of hours traveled, emissions, and wasted fuel due to traffic congestion.

The Scollar Company
The Scollar Company has two grain-handling operations in Will County (in Andres and Joliet), both of which are highly dependent on trucks to move containers. The Illiana would reduce regional traffic congestion and provide a high-speed freight corridor between Indiana and Illinois.

Valley Fire Protection Systems
Valley Fire Protection Systems supports the Illiana because it will create jobs for both Indiana and Illinois and provide a much needed diversion for today's congestion. It will also improve safety in the region.
Will County Center for Economic Development (CED)
The Will County CED supports the Illiana and recognizes that there are areas of disagreement between the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) and CMAP that need to be resolved. However, it asserts that there are similarities between the IDOT and CMAP analyses, including impact on urbanization, support for freight, and PPPs. The CED also raises a concern that CMAP’s review process for adding major capital projects has changed.

Other Businesses

Civic

Chicago Southland Convention and Visitors Bureau
The Chicago Southland Convention and Visitors Bureau supports the Illiana Expressway because it will ease increasing traffic and improve quality of life for local commuters. The Illiana will also provide opportunities for economic development in the hospitality sector, providing jobs and tax revenue for Will County and the Chicago Southland.

Illinois Economic Policy Institute (IEPI)
The IEPI states that the Illiana will produce economic and environmental benefits, will not divert funds from other major capital projects, will generate substantial tax revenues, and will accommodate the South Suburban Airport. IEPI believes the benefits outweigh the upfront costs. IEPI also included a detailed policy briefing book.

Lewis University
Lewis University supports the Illiana Expressway because it will provide for reduced congestion, safe efficient movement of freight and people, economic development, and environmental benefits including reduced emissions.

University of St. Francis
The University of St. Francis supports the Illiana and states it will reduce congestion, is designed for environmental and quality-of-life considerations, and provides an important link in the transportation network. The University does not see the Illiana as inconsistent with transportation projects in the core of the region.

Government – Municipalities in South Cook County

Homewood
The Village of Homewood supports the Illiana as an alternative route to I-80, reducing congestion and maintaining an efficient freight network. The Illiana is also an opportunity to support innovative financing.
Richton Park
The Village of Richton Park sent a letter in support of the Illiana to improve regional mobility, support economic development, and enable innovative financing. The Village states that the Illiana will not promote sprawl.

South Chicago Heights
The Village of South Chicago Heights sent a letter supporting the Illiana, stating it will provide "significant congestion relief, support the economy in the south suburbs and improve quality of life in eastern Will County." The Village also supports the use of innovative financing for the Illiana.

Government – Municipalities in Kankakee County

A number of Kankakee municipalities submitted resolutions passed in support of the Illiana Expressway. Resolutions were from 2010 and state that I-80 and I-94 are experiencing growing congestion, Kankakee County has a concentration of intermodal centers that are creating congestion, threatening quality of life, and safety of local citizens. The resolutions also state that freight movement is critical to the national, regional, and local economy, resolving that there is local support for a new circumferential east-west expressway – the Illiana Expressway.

1. Aroma Park (February 9, 2010)
2. Bourbonnais (February 17, 2010)
3. Bradley (February 8, 2010)
4. Chebanse (undated)
5. Grant Park (February 16, 2010)
6. St. Anne (March 8, 2010)
7. Manteno (February 16, 2010)
8. Momence (March 1, 2010)

Hopkins Park
The Village of Hopkins Park sent a letter that states their support for the Illiana Expressway and for the opportunity it can offer its residents.

Government – Municipalities in Will County

Beecher
The Village of Beecher is supportive of the Illiana Expressway and has passed a number of resolutions in support of the project; most recently the Village Board passed a resolution on August 13, 2012. In their cover letter, the Village expressed that a number of local communities, including Beecher, have been actively participating in discussions on the Illiana for some time. The Village states that the Illiana must be looked at from a Midwest or National perspective to achieve freight efficiencies. Beecher is also supportive of this project because of the economic development it may bring and states the PPP concept will ultimately determine if it is cost-effective to build this roadway.
Braidwood
The Braidwood City Council passed a resolution in support of including the Illiana on August 27, 2013. The resolution states that there has been a significant increase in heavy truck traffic damaging local roads. The Illiana is necessary to handle existing and future east-west truck traffic.

Channahon
The Village of Channahon sent a letter in support of the Illiana, stating it will reduce congestion, remove trucks from local roads, support intermodal development, promote broader economic development, and support innovative finance.

Crest Hill
The Village of Crest Hill sent a letter in support of the Illiana, stating it will reduce congestion, remove trucks from local roads, support intermodal development, promote broader economic development, and support innovative finance.

Diamond
The Village of Diamond passed a resolution in support of the Illiana on August 13, 2013. The resolution states that the Illiana will support economic development, support innovative financing, reduce congestion, improve safety, and remove trucks from local roads.

Frankfort
The Village of Frankfort supports the Illiana because it would improve regional mobility, increase the efficiency of freight movement, and use innovative financing. Frankfort also states that the project has momentum due to the current significant support of elected officials in Illinois and Indiana.

Joliet
The City of Joliet states that the Illiana is needed to support the major intermodal facilities in Joliet and to support Will County as a grain exporter. The City’s letter also notes that I-80 and its interchanges in Joliet are presently insufficient to meet demand.

Manhattan
The Village of Manhattan supports the Illiana to reduce local truck traffic, serve intermodal developments, provide network connectivity, and improve mobility.

Orland Park
The Village of Orland Park sent a letter in support of the Illiana, stating that it will reduce congestion, remove trucks from local roads, support intermodal development, promote broader economic development, and support innovative finance.

Peotone
The Village of Peotone sent a letter in support of the Illiana, stating it will reduce congestion, remove trucks from local roads, support intermodal development, promote broader economic development, and support innovative finance.
Plainfield
The Village of Plainfield sent a letter in support of the Illiana, stating it will reduce congestion, remove trucks from local roads, support intermodal development, promote broader economic development, and support innovative finance.

Tinley Park
The Village of Tinley Park sent a letter in support of the Illiana, noting the following advantages: cost-effective PPP, environmental improvements by reducing congestion, expanded access to markets and intermodals, and industrial development opportunities.

Wilmington
The City of Wilmington sent a letter in support of the Illiana, citing economic benefits, GO TO 2040’s support of PPPs and freight investment, and the CMAP nexus report’s support of freight. The Village of Wilmington sent seven copies of the letter signed by various city officials, including the Mayor, five Aldermen, and the City Clerk.

Government – County and Councils

Grundy County
Grundy County sent a letter in support of the Illiana, stating it will reduce congestion, remove trucks from local roads, support intermodal development, promote broader economic development, and support innovative finance.

Kankakee County
The Kankakee County Board passed a resolution in support of the Illiana B3 alternative on March 13, 2012. The Board also sent a letter citing the need for safe efficient transportation, efficient movement of freight and people, minimal environmental impacts, the greatest financial viability, and the most compatible with community plans. This resolution is supported by all of the county’s subcommittees.

South Suburban Mayors and Managers Association (SSMMA)
On behalf of its communities, SSMMA strongly supports the proposed amendment. SSMMA states that the Illiana has the potential to provide significant congestion relief and will support the economy of the south suburbs and improve quality of life in eastern Will County. An efficient freight network is critical to the economic well-being and livability of the Chicago region. South Cook and eastern Will counties are the most underdeveloped portions of the region and have long commute times.

Will County
Will County sent a letter expressing strong support for the Illiana. The county is a fast-growing population and freight center. The facility will improve regional mobility, support freight and mitigate the negative impacts of heavy truck traffic, and provide economic benefits. IDOT has managed an extensive outreach process, made considerable progress toward completing the EIS, and has met the requirements outlined by CMAP for GO TO 2040 amendments.
Will County Government League (WCGL)
The WCGL sent a letter in support of the inclusion of the Illiana now and not during the next long-range plan cycle. The Illiana accomplishes stated regional goals to reduce congestion, improve safety, reduce emissions and make deliveries to local suppliers more efficient. Given the region’s limited capital resources, adding unnecessary expense to the Illiana through delays limits the region’s ability to implement the goals of GO TO 2040.

Government – State and Federal

Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT)
IDOT sent a response to CMAP staff analysis regarding the proposed Illiana Expressway’s planning process, forecast assumptions, costs and financing, and local planning. A PDF of IDOT’s analysis can be viewed here.

Joliet Arsenal Development Authority (JADA)
JADA supports the development of the Illiana Expressway using the B3 central corridor alignment as that alternative will have the highest positive economic impact for the region. JADA states that the JADA/CenterPoint developments will continue to expand and improve economic development with jobs and investments related to the Illiana.

State Representative Anthony DeLuca
Representative DeLuca supports the Illiana Expressway because the existing expressway system is reaching capacity, and if we cannot solve our congestion problems, freight companies will start moving away. This would be a detriment to our economy.

U.S. Representative Robin L. Kelly
Representative Kelly strongly supports the Illiana because it will relieve road congestion, reduce drive times, and reduce air and noise pollution. The Illiana is also about transportation equity, regional fairness and quality of life. The project will contribute to the future success of the Southland.

Individuals

In total, CMAP received 80 comments from individuals in support of the Illiana Expressway. Generally speaking, comments reflected similar benefits noted across the business, civic, education, government, and labor organizations. A number of the comments listed an identical list of benefits. Comments in support came from residents in the following municipalities: Aurora, Bolingbrook, Channahon, Chicago, Frankfort, Glenwood, Homewood, Joliet, Lemont, Lowell (IN), Markham, McHenry, Morris, Oak Brook, Orland Park, Romeoville, Schaumburg, South Holland, Thornton, Tinley Park, Warrenville, Wilmington, and Yorkville. However, it should be noted that, while CMAP documented where comments came from, not everyone included their place of residence in their submission.
Labor Unions

AFL-CIO
The AFL-CIO states that the Illiana is a much-needed project that will help relieve traffic in northeastern Illinois by providing an east-west link between Illinois and Indiana. The Illiana will also provide a much-needed boost to the economy by creating construction and long-term jobs for the region.

Chicago Area Laborers-Employers Cooperation and Education Trust (LECET)
The Chicago Area LECET supports the Illiana, which will produce substantial economic benefits and jobs, increase tax revenues, and use the PPP model to allow projects like the Illiana to be built with fewer tax dollars.

Construction and General Laborers' District Council of Chicago and Vicinity
The Construction and General Laborers' District Council states that the Illiana should be included because of job creation, economic opportunity, safety, efficiency, environmental benefits, and fiscal constraint.

Indiana-Illinois-Iowa Foundation for Fair Contracting (II FFC)
The III FFC strongly supports the Illiana for a number of reasons. The III FFC states that the Illiana will produce substantial economic benefits and jobs, increase tax revenues, and use the PPP model to allow projects like the Illiana to be built with fewer tax dollars.

Labor-Management Cooperation Committee (LMCC)
The LMCC supports the proposed amendment because it will provide a way for cars and trucks to navigate around Chicago, stimulate the economy, and be the first PPP in Illinois. The Illiana will allow the state to construct a great project with fewer tax dollars, allowing taxpayers to foot less of the bill. In addition to economic benefits, LMCC is also supportive of this project for safety, efficiency, and environmental reasons.

Other Union Support
Fourteen additional Unions sent letters of support for the Illiana. Their letters of support state the importance of the project's economic benefits and the need to create construction jobs in the region. Additionally, the Illiana will reduce congestion, provide access to intermodal centers, and support innovative finance in Illinois.

Each of the following unions sent an identical letter of support:

1. Carpenters Union Local 1185
2. International Association of Bridge, Structural, Ornamental and Reinforcing Iron Workers Local Union 444
3. International Association of Sheet Metal, Air, Rail, and Transportation Workers Local Union No. 265
4. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IEEW) Local No. 176
5. International Union of Bricklayers and Allied Craftworkers
6. International Union of Operating Engineers - Local 150  
7. Kankakee Building and Construction Trades Council  
8. Laborers' Local 75  
9. Sprinkler Fitters and Apprentices Union Local 281  
10. Teamsters Local Union No. 179  
11. United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America Local Union No. 174  
12. United Union of Roofers, Waterproofers, and Allied Workers Local No. 11  
13. Will & Grundy County Building Trades Council  
14. Pipefitters' Association Local Union 597

**Opposition**

Opponents of the Illiana project were primarily concerned with the project's financial feasibility, projected economic benefits, inconsistency with GO TO 2040 principles, and environmental harm. In regard to the project's financial feasibility and economic benefits, many of those opposed state that IDOT has not demonstrated how toll revenues would cover the costs of the facility and suggest that instead, the burden of these costs would fall on taxpayers. Many opponents also challenged the nature of the data used to support the project, expressing concern that the projected economic benefits are inflated, especially relative to potential long-term negative regional impacts.

In terms of environmental harm, opponents asserted that this project would destroy native wildlife habitats, including the Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie, fertile farmland, rural communities and residents' way of life in the path of the chosen B3 alternative. Many opponents also discussed how the proposed Illiana alignment would affect Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie. Additionally, opponents noted how the Illiana would be further detrimental to people's access and use of the Abraham Lincoln National Cemetery. Still other opponents expressed that – while they acknowledge the need for transportation facilities to better accommodate freight truck traffic and alleviate congestion and safety issues – the Illiana is not the best solution, and the region should instead invest in its existing transportation network and emphasize rail-based freight as a better alternative.

**Business**

FitzGerald Associates Architects  
FitzGerald Associates Architects does not support the Illiana. Stating that the project is driven by an “entrenched road-building lobby,” FitzGerald asserts that it would be a misuse of public funds.

**U.S. WAY Corp.**  
They are a private electronics-design company that works in energy-efficient products and proposes a MagLev Train as a high-speed rail solution to the freight needs that are addressed by the Illiana.
Civic

Active Transportation Alliance (ATA)
The ATA is opposed to the Illiana primarily because there is an unacceptably high risk that, if constructed, the Illiana will require significant public funds to supplement its private financing. ATA expressed concern that the project was inconsistent with GO TO 2040 and also cited environmental concerns.

Calumet Ecological Park Association
The Calumet Ecological Park Association opposes the Illiana due to its cost and potential to diminish the habitat along the border of the Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie and the Des Plaines Conservation Area.

Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT)
CNT opposes the Illiana for numerous reasons that fit in three broad categories. The first is that the justification for the Illiana relies on outdated assumptions about development patterns and will do little to increase regional prosperity. The second is that the Illiana is not a cost-effective investment given other transportation needs. The third is that the ancillary impacts of the Illiana have not been fully considered.

Chicago Streetcar Renaissance
The Chicago Streetcar Renaissance is opposed to the Illiana because of the cost to build, operate, and maintain the Illiana. The Renaissance recommends that the city and state invest in alternatives to driving, particularly the streetcar.

Chicago Wilderness
Chicago Wilderness is opposed to the Illiana due to concerns about the project’s potential negative impact on the region’s natural assets and the areas designated as part of the GIV. The group also notes that the Illiana does not support GO TO 2040.

Congress for the New Urbanism (CNU)
CNU is opposed because Illinois in financial crisis and funding for project has not been fully identified. The Congress encourages "smaller scale network-based highway solutions to address the population forecast and freight needs."

Congress for the New Urbanism (CNU) Illinois, Board of Directors
On behalf of CNU Illinois membership, CNU Illinois strongly opposes this amendment. CNU Illinois opposes the project because it goes against the principles of GO TO 2040 and because it has the potential to take away funding from other regional priority projects like the CTA Red Line extension.

Dunelands Group of the Hoosier Chapter of the Sierra Club
The Dunelands Group opposes the Illiana because the project will degrade habitat, pollute the Kankakee River, and put pressure on clean water resources. Additionally, the group opposes the facility because it conflicts with GO TO 2040.
Friends of the Kankakee
The Friends of the Kankakee’s Board is comprised of equal number of members from Illinois and from Indiana. The group voted against Illiana at their August 2013 meeting.

Illinois Ornithological Society
The Illinois Ornithological Society is opposed due to the low cost estimate and inconsistency with GO TO 2040. The society also cites negative impacts on Midewin, a globally important grassland habitat. Finally, they are concerned about continued sprawl.

Illinois PIRG Education Fund
Illinois PIRG Education Fund opposes the Illiana because the road is unnecessary, will deplete scarce dollars away from other road projects, and will contribute to sprawling development rather than investment in existing communities. The project doesn’t make financial sense and leaves Illinois taxpayers at risk. In addition, given the magnitude of the changing trends and the implications for the future, the Illiana Tollway doesn’t make sense for the region’s residents.

Metropolitan Planning Council (MPC)
MPC states that “the Illiana would yield few benefits in exchange for high – and uncertain – costs.” Among MPC’s concerns: It is not evident that private funds will cover all capital and long-term maintenance costs, future toll revenues are uncertain, and cost estimates are low. MPC questions IDOT’s cost projections and cites recently built similar toll roads that did not achieve expected revenues, including several bankruptcies. The Council states that the Illiana’s high cost requires harmful tradeoffs that would impede other GO TO 2040 major capital projects. The Illiana fails to address the region’s transportation needs, MPC says, carrying fewer vehicles per day than many arterial roads and doing little to reduce congestion. The Council states: “The Illiana would do little to improve the region’s economic health and would not help the region grow sustainably.”

Midewin Heritage Association
The Midewin Heritage Association states that the Illiana does not advance GO TO 2040 goals and will not improve quality of life. The project will have detrimental impacts on historic sites, communities, agricultural lands, and natural areas. The facility was analyzed as a freeway, but will now be a toll road well south of the region that does not improve regional mobility. Finally, the project’s approaches to potential environmental and traffic impacts appear to be mitigation rather than resolution.

Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie
The Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie opposes the Illiana primarily because of the environmental concerns. Acknowledges that transportation facilities are needed to address the core purpose of the Illiana proposal, but states the B3 corridor is not the solution. Additionally, Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie questions the lack of coordination across major capital projects in that area.

Midewin Tallgrass Prairie Alliance
The Midewin Tallgrass Prairie Alliance opposes the Illiana, stating that the expressway will make congestion worse, severely impacting the the Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie,
Abraham Lincoln National Cemetery, Historic Route 66, and local communities. The Alliance is also concerned with the local communities’ capacity for land use planning, the lack of identified funding for the expansion of I-55 and I-80, and the costs of the road. They look forward to finding a regional solution to managing truck traffic that is not the B3 alternative for Illiana.

No Illiana 4 US
A grassroots bi-state group, No Illiana 4 US, strongly opposes the Illiana. They question the projected costs to build the Illiana, removal of productive agricultural land, destruction of local heritage, under-reporting by IDOT/INDOT of impacted homeowners, and environmental issues. Included in the No Illiana 4 US public comments are approximately 2,900 notarized petition signatures of local Indiana and Illinois residents who oppose the Illiana Expressway.

Openlands Joint Coalition Letter
A coalition of 19 organizations signed a joint letter opposing the Illiana. They state that the Illiana is inconsistent with GO TO 2040, would be “financially imprudent, offers minimal transportation value and disproportionately low economic benefits, and would unnecessarily damage vital natural resources.” For those reasons and more, the following organizations signed on to oppose the Illiana:

1. Audubon Society, Chicago Region
2. Bird Conservation Network
3. Center for Neighborhood Technology
4. Chicago Audubon Society
5. Citizens Against Ruining the Environment
6. Environmental Law and Policy Center
7. Fuller Park Community Development
8. Illinois Audubon Society
9. Illinois Division of the Izaak Walton League of America
10. Illinois Paddling Council
11. Indiana Chapter of Izaak Walton League of America
12. Midewin Heritage Association
13. Midewin Tallgrass Prairie Alliance
14. Openlands
15. Prairie Parklands Ecosystem Partnership
16. Prairie Rivers Network
17. Sierra Club, Illinois Chapter
18. The Nature Conservancy
19. The Wetlands Initiative

Shut This Airport Nightmare Down (STAND)
STAND is opposed, citing its mistrust of IDOT in light of prior projects in that area of the region. In addition to questioning the project’s economic benefits, STAND states that the Illiana would support sprawl, destroy farmland, disrupt the environment, and displace families.
State Taxpayers Opposing the Proposed Illiana Toll Road (STOPIT) Committee
The STOPIT Committee strongly opposes the Illiana and supports a “No Build” future for Indiana. The STOPIT Committee believes that a “bypass does NOT promote economic growth.” Included in this public comment is a petition signed by 518 Indiana residents and 380 Illinois residents.

The Nature Conservancy in Illinois
The Nature Conservancy in Illinois is opposed to the Illiana because of cost, inconsistency with sound land use and transportation planning, and concern for wildlife habitats.

The Wetlands Initiative
The Wetlands Initiative is opposed to the Illiana, stating that the cost estimates are unrealistic, the PPP is vague, and is based on unsupported growth forecasts. The Wetlands Initiative is also opposed because of the environmental harm that would come to the Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie and the Des Plaines Conservation Area.

Township Wildlife Society
The Township Wildlife Society opposes the Illiana and states that CMAP has not taken into consideration the proper procedures or MAP-21 requirements.

Government

Cook County
Cook County opposes the Illiana due to concerns about the low projected cost of the facility as compared to other projects as well as the additional subsidy required to add 33 lane miles to nearby expressways. The County also extended concerns about the Illiana’s consistency with the GO TO 2040 plan and whether it promotes optimal and sustainable growth, citing the discrepancy between IDOT and CMAP forecasts. The County expressed significant concerns with the economic projections, which indicate that the region as a whole, and particularly Cook County, will lose jobs. Finally, Cook County noted that it is a locus of the region’s freight rail and trucking facilities, and that Illiana may drain freight facilities out of Cook County. It also notes that the Illiana will address only a small part of the region’s freight congestion.

Dundee Township Supervisor (Kane County)
The Dundee Township Supervisor is opposed to the Illiana because of the potential environmental impacts the expressway will have. Recommends building more transit on existing tollways.

Judy Ogalla, Will County Board Member, District 1
Writing on behalf of her constituents in Washington, Will, and Peotone Townships, the Will County District 1 elected Board member opposes the Illiana. She is opposed for a number of reasons: Local townships will experience a future loss of tax dollars as IDOT buys property and takes it off the tax rolls; quality of life "will be changed forever" for local residents; and other negative impacts include future flooding issues and disrupted police and fire services because of road closures.
McHenry County
McHenry County questions the prioritization and fast-tracking of the Illiana project by IDOT and supports the process used for developing GO TO 2040. They state that many other projects that are in the TIP should be prioritized before moving forward with the Illiana, especially in light of the lack of information to demonstrate the benefits of the project. As long as the state continues to arbitrarily limit highway funding in the Chicago region based on a formula that caps funding at 45 percent of the state total, additional funding for this project will mean less funding for projects that have been in the TIP for many years.

Village of Elwood (Will County)
The Village of Elwood strongly opposes the Illiana, stating that the negative impacts on Elwood have not been considered thoroughly. The Village questions IDOT's project study process (including use of consultants, software, stakeholder engagement, and data) and expresses major concerns with safety.

West Creek Township (Lake County, IN)
West Creek Township opposes the Illiana because IDOT has presented "false and inflated numbers to create a P3 that the taxpayers of the states of Illinois and Indiana will be responsible for." They are also concerned for vital agriculture industry and wildlife habitats, and suggest that expanding rail capabilities makes more sense.

Individuals

Sierra Club Illinois Chapter members
A majority of opposition letters, 627 total, came from members of the Sierra Club of Illinois. These letters stated opposition to the proposed amendment based on concerns of financial feasibility, environmental harm, loss of agriculture, conflicts with the Abraham Lincoln National Cemetery, and inconsistency with GO TO 2040.

Other individual comments
The remaining 126 comments from individuals who oppose the Illiana Expressway generally reflected similar concerns as the business, civic, and government letters. However, a number of letters from local residents showed concern for the loss of their way of life if the Illiana were to be built. Comments came from residents in the following municipalities: Arlington Heights, Aurora, Berwyn, Chicago, Deerfield, Frankfort, Gary (IN), Glen Ellyn, Glenview, Grant Park, Hickory Hills, Hinsdale, Joliet, Lake Bluff, LaPorte (IN), Lockport, Lowell (IN), Manhattan, Naperville, Oak Park, Park Ridge, Peotone, Plainfield, Riverside, Sandwich, St. Charles, Tinley Park, Union Mills (IN) Valparaiso (IN), West Creek Township (IN), Western Springs, Wilmington, and Winfield. Again, not everyone included their place of residence.

ACTION REQUESTED: Informational

###
PBZ Projects and Activities-10.1.13

Active Zoning Petitions (not including petitions on hold)
12-19 LRMP Update- Trails
13-17 Maly Processing Plant (A-1 Special Use)
13-25 Kevin & Wendy Bernard (Administrative Variance)

Active Site Development Permits- 24 active

Subdivisions
Subdivisions that are under construction:
Fields of Farm Colony- Almost complete, will work on doing ‘extra’ work
Subdivisions still open:
Highpoint Meadows- Might vacate otherwise will need a new LOC or bond
Schaefer Glen- For Sale
Light Road Industrial park- Bought through foreclosure, nothing going on
High Grove- Sold some property to the Park District
Tanglewood Trails-Potential investor interested in buying

Projects outside the office
NWPA Planning Committee
Drainage District meetings through the Farm Bureau
Kane/Kendall Bike & Pedestrian Plan
County Director Meetings
Village of Montgomery’s Comp Plan meeting
Land Use Committee Meeting (CMAP)

Other Projects in the office
Investigate floodplain/zoning issues (3 pretty large water issues currently)
Stormwater mapping in the field- completed 53 subdivisions so far (Finished Little Rock Township)
Working on the windshield Survey for Historic Preservation- going through Oswego pictures
Continue improving the GIS website with regards to information on zoning, permits, etc.
Work with mapping to convert hard copy allocation maps into an Ag Allocation layer in GIS
Convert information from pre 1993 permit cards into an excel database to create searchable system of old permit records by PIN or permit number.
Mobile Home Permits- 5 active
Cleaning up office with regards to getting old files scanned- All petitions are scanned, working on 2007 in building permits; have some more site development permits to scan
FOIA’s
Keep track of escrow accounts
Update website- minutes, applications and ordinances
Normal day-to-day things- phone calls, people with questions, organizing, scheduling, posting, etc.

A weekly log sheet showing what I've done for that week is available upon request and submitted to Mr. Wilkins weekly

Night meeting hours attended in 2013 so far: 97.50 Hours (58 Meetings)
Night meeting hours attended in 2012 so far: 111.00 Hours (67 Meetings)
Night meeting hours attended in 2011: 98.5 Hours (56 Meetings)
Night meeting hours attended in 2010: 77.50 Hours (37 Meetings)
Night meeting hours attended in 2009: 51.75 Hours (36 Meetings)
Night meeting hours attended in 2008: 53.5 Hours (27 Meetings)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Buildings</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remodeling</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - M Zone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - B Zone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barns/Farm Buildings</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pools</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolitions</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Upgrades</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towers (Comm.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Occupancy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Restoration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Total                   | 167   | 9   | 10  | 11  | 18  | 25  | 21  | 27  | 21  | 24  | 1   | 0   | 0   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Permit Fees</th>
<th>Land Cash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$19,700</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Buildings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,344,146</td>
<td>$286</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$572</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remodeling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>$278</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - M Zone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barns/Farm Buildings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$227,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$249</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$35,675</td>
<td>$790</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pools</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolitions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,864,321</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,625</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Date</td>
<td>Permit ID</td>
<td>Permit Category</td>
<td>Parcel Number</td>
<td>Owner Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2013</td>
<td>022013170</td>
<td>02 Garage</td>
<td>0228452015</td>
<td>PERROTTA FRANK &amp; PATRICIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10/2013</td>
<td>032013157</td>
<td>03 Accessory Buildings</td>
<td>0905100014</td>
<td>SEABORG THOMAS &amp; ELIZABETH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/27/2013</td>
<td>042013175</td>
<td>04 Additions</td>
<td>0332134001</td>
<td>KILPATRICK MICHAEL &amp; MARLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/4/2013</td>
<td>052013156</td>
<td>05 Remodeling</td>
<td>0305432005</td>
<td>SCHEIWEKE DALLAS &amp; GERD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/27/2013</td>
<td>052013173</td>
<td>05 Remodeling</td>
<td>0211127011</td>
<td>BOCKEWITZ LUKE &amp; ANDREA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2013</td>
<td>082013164</td>
<td>08 Barns/Farm Buildings</td>
<td>0426400001</td>
<td>DEVICK BRUCE &amp; LAURA J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11/2013</td>
<td>082013158</td>
<td>08 Barns/Farm Buildings</td>
<td>0323100003</td>
<td>RGIA PROPERTIES LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2013</td>
<td>082013166</td>
<td>08 Barns/Farm Buildings</td>
<td>0708100007</td>
<td>BERNARD KEVIN E &amp; WENDY K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/27/2013</td>
<td>092013174</td>
<td>09 Signs</td>
<td>0318403012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/27/2013</td>
<td>102013172</td>
<td>10 Other</td>
<td>0214429003</td>
<td>WEEKS STEVEN A &amp; BEVERLY S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2013</td>
<td>102013171</td>
<td>10 Other</td>
<td>0603250005</td>
<td>LARSEN GREGORY L &amp; KRISTINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Date</td>
<td>Permit ID</td>
<td>Permit Category</td>
<td>Parcel Number</td>
<td>Owner Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2013</td>
<td>102013168</td>
<td>10 Other</td>
<td>0518203005</td>
<td>DUMPELMANN WM H &amp; MARILYN D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11/2013</td>
<td>102013161</td>
<td>10 Other</td>
<td>0236106004</td>
<td>KARNIK ROBERT &amp; CAROL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2013</td>
<td>122013165</td>
<td>12 Swimming Pools</td>
<td>0416377012</td>
<td>LUDWIG ADAM E &amp; MEGHAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11/2013</td>
<td>122013159</td>
<td>12 Swimming Pools</td>
<td>0224179004</td>
<td>WRIGHT RICHARD J &amp; TIFFANY D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2013</td>
<td>142013167</td>
<td>14 Demolitions</td>
<td>0418100002</td>
<td>ELLIOTT KENDALL FARM LLC %CHARLES H ELLIOTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11/2013</td>
<td>142013163</td>
<td>14 Demolitions</td>
<td>0434300001</td>
<td>FRIESEND LAURIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11/2013</td>
<td>142013162</td>
<td>14 Demolitions</td>
<td>0914300001</td>
<td>CRYDER LEWIS SHERILL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>BUILDING FEES</td>
<td>ZONING APPLICATION</td>
<td>LAND-CASH</td>
<td>OFFSITE ROADWAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>$1,602.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>$1,063.20</td>
<td>$1,805.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>$2,735.52</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>$2,896.24</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$3,162.98</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>$2,854.72</td>
<td>$1,240.00</td>
<td>$9,676.05</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>$3,378.81</td>
<td>$1,850.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>$5,233.20</td>
<td>$230.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>$6,641.68</td>
<td>$850.00</td>
<td>$4,615.30</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>$3,848.40</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$7,410.86</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>$2,953.88</td>
<td>$652.50</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$33,207.65</td>
<td>$6,877.50</td>
<td>$24,865.19</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>