

Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting

The Executive Committee of the McLean County Board met on Wednesday, February 14, 2007, at 2:00 p.m. in Room 400, Government Center, 115 E. Washington Street, Bloomington, Illinois.

Members Present: Chairman Sweeney, Members Sorensen, Segobiano, Renner, Hoselton and Bostic

Members Absent: Members Gordon, Bass, Nuckolls

Staff Present: Mr. John Zeunik, County Administrator, Mr. Terry Lindberg, Assistant County Administrator, Ms. Jude LaCasse, Assistant to the County Administrator

Other Members Present: None

Department Heads/
Elected Officials Present: Mr. Curt Hawk, Director, EMA

Others Present: None

Chairman Sweeney called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

Chairman Sweeney presented the minutes from the January 9, 2007 Executive Committee Meeting and the December 19, 2006 Stand-up Committee Meeting for approval.

Motion by Bostic/Sorensen to approve and place on file the minutes of the January 9, 2007 Committee Meeting and the December 19, 2006 Stand-up Committee Meeting.
Motion carried.

Chairman Sweeney presented three Reappointments to the Committee for approval.

Motion by Hoselton/Renner to Recommend Approval of the three Reappointments as recommended by the Chairman.
Motion carried.

Chairman Sweeney presented a request for approval of a Resolution of the McLean County Board adopting the 2007 Legislative Program for McLean County. Chairman Sweeney asked Mr. Lindberg to review each item.

Mr. Lindberg reviewed the five items included in this year's Legislative Program. The first is to amend the Enterprise Zone Act to allow more than one Enterprise Zone in a County or to have more area devoted to an Enterprise Zone (20 ILCS 655). He explained that the legislation known as the Enterprise Zone Act shows that there are ways for a County to have more than one Enterprise zone (Cook County currently has approximately 15 Enterprise Zones). However, it is very difficult to have more than one Enterprise Zone.

Mr. Lindberg stated that there are two basic thrusts to the County's interest in amending the Enterprise Zone Act. The first is to make it easier for a County to have more than one Enterprise Zone to avoid the "gerrymandering" and spider-webbing of one Enterprise Zone district. The second point is that all County Enterprise Zones are limited to 13 square miles, regardless of the size of the County. Mr. Lindberg noted that, when you have a County that is 160 square miles and another one is 1,186 square miles, this rule is inequitable. He indicated that the square mile standard should be made more flexible and should relate more to the overall size of the County. Mr. Lindberg clarified that making it easier to establish more than one Enterprise Zone and changing the size limit so that it is more relevant to the overall size of the County are the two things being proposed as amendments to the Enterprise Zone Act.

Mr. Lindberg stated that the amendment might say that the maximum size of an Enterprise Zone within a County would be equal to 2.5% percent of the total square miles within a County or 13 square miles, whichever is greater. This would not penalize the smaller County, while being advantageous to a larger County.

Chairman Sweeney suggested that questions be addressed on each topic before moving on to the next topic.

Mr. Segobiano asked if this will be a fair amount for all potential projects. Mr. Lindberg replied that if the standard were changed from a flat 13 square miles to 2.5%, the County could designate as much as 29.6 square miles in the County for Enterprise Zone purposes. At 2%, the County would receive 23 square miles and, at the 1.5% level, it would be 17.76 square miles. Mr. Lindberg advised that this would be very adequate for future projects.

Ms. Bostic asked if the Mitsubishi Enterprise Zone will always be an Enterprise Zone. Mr. Zeunik stated that this designation will eventually expire, noting that it is on its last extension permitted by law. When that time runs out, the Enterprise Zone will run out and the County will, in effect, not have an Enterprise Zone. If the County wishes to create another Enterprise Zone for another purpose, it would be necessary to go back to the State, file a new application, justify to the State the basis for creating an Enterprise Zone and the State would then have to designate a new Enterprise Zone.

Mr. Sorensen asked if the extensions are for ten years. Mr. Zeunik replied that they are ten year extensions and the County is in its second extension. He stated that the Enterprise Zone was created in 1984. He indicated that the history of the Enterprise Zone was in the memorandum supporting the request received from Normal last month.

Mr. Segobiano asked if the land between College, Maple Hill Road and Wiley Drive is part of the Enterprise Zone. Mr. Zeunik responded that most of that land is part of the Enterprise Zone and is available for development. He advised that the EDC is encouraging people to develop property within the Enterprise Zone. There is property available in both Bloomington and Normal within the Enterprise Zone that can be developed and would qualify for the State benefits.

Mr. Lindberg presented the second item, namely a bill that would authorize County Boards to pass a cigarette tax of up to \$2.00 per pack. He stated that there is strong support among the Collar Counties for this bill, including Lake, McHenry, DuPage and Will Counties. He noted that this is an enabling bill that will allow individual County Boards to make the decision whether to enact the tax. It is not a mandatory bill. Each County will decide whether or not to enact a cigarette tax and each County will decide at what level to enact the tax, up to \$2.00 per pack. The bill also provides that the funds generated from the County-wide cigarette tax can only be used to fund public health and public safety programs.

Mr. Lindberg advised that he suspects that the State may have adopted this bill as something they might want to pursue. If the State decides to enact a Statewide increase in the cigarette tax, the State would likely get the largest share of proceeds and may share a small percentage with Counties.

Mr. Sorensen expressed his opinion that \$2.00 per pack is excessive. Chairman Sweeney replied that, more than likely, the figure would be approximately \$.50.

Mr. Segobiano suggested that, considering the obesity in children, perhaps, we should talk about putting a tax on sweets, chips and sodas.

Chairman Sweeney asked if the tax in Cook County is \$2.00 per pack. Mr. Lindberg replied that he is correct.

Chairman Sweeney referred to the Legislative Update from Metro Counties that was distributed. He indicated that this information is to inform the Committee on the legislative issues that are discussed at Metro Counties.

Mr. Lindberg presented the third item, which is to pass Legislation to authorize County Boards to assess a \$5.00 fee on Civil Court cases to support Child Advocacy Centers. He stated that, some years ago, the County passed a referendum to authorize a special property tax levy for the Children's Advocacy Center. Mr. Lindberg advised that we are at the levy maximum and it raises half of the cost of operating the Children's Advocacy Center (CAC). He indicated that the County has been fortunate and very aggressive in seeking grant funded support, but those monies are becoming difficult to sustain. Mr. Lindberg stated that this fee is a good alternative and has received broad support from other County Children's Advocacy Centers. He noted that it has also received a positive reception from the members of the General Assembly. Mr. Lindberg added that there are other State-wide lobbying bodies that have an interest in supporting this fee. He stated that this could raise as much as \$20,000.00 per year for the Children's Advocacy Center.

Mr. Lindberg reviewed the next item, namely to pass Legislation to restore the Election Levy, which is a topic that the County Board has dealt with over the last 15 years. He noted that there was interest on the part of Metro Counties and on the part of the Illinois Association of County Administrators to address the funding differences between how a County funds their part of the elections and how an independent election commission is funded. He stated that there was a heated discussion regarding this in a southern County, as well as great interest in Peoria County.

Mr. Lindberg informed the Committee that the Election Commission issue goes back to pre-1980 when there was a separate levy dedicated for election expenses. The County Board could levy a property tax for the purpose of funding the County's election expense and the expense of the Bloomington Election Commission. Since SB 512 already was drafted and since some people are familiar with the bill, it seemed appropriate to bring this issue forward again to renew the discussion. He noted that there are only eight City Election Commissions in the State at this time, including McLean and Peoria Counties.

Mr. Lindberg advised that if 100% of the election costs can be paid out of the Election Levy, that amount would not have to be paid out of the County's General Fund. He further explained that this levy is restoring an authority that was in place up until the mid-1980's.

Mr. Lindberg stated that funding the City Election Commission comes out of the County's General Tax Levy. This Election Levy restores the County's ability to raise a separate levy amount for elections.

Ms. Bostic asked if the Bloomington Election Commission and the County Clerk Election function are a duplication of effort. Mr. Lindberg replied that both would say that they are, but their approach to eliminating that duplication is quite different. He stated that there is another bill going before the General Assembly that proposes to create a County-wide Election Authority, which would consolidate both the City and the County authority.

Mr. Segobiano asked if there has been any recent discussion with the City of Bloomington regarding doing away with the Bloomington Election Commission. Mr. Lindberg replied that there has not been any discussion.

Ms. Bostic asked if the City of Bloomington funds their Election Commission in any way. Mr. Lindberg responded that the \$400,000.00 that the County pays from its budget funds the stipends for the three Election Commissioners, pays the Director's salary, pays the Assistant Director's salary, and provides a substantial amount of money for the General Election expense. In addition to that, the City budget funds one staff person and one part-time person.

Mr. Sorensen advised that the Finance Committee has dealt with this issue repeatedly. In order to eliminate the Bloomington Election Commission, it requires a Referendum in the City of Bloomington. He reported that, over the last couple of years, the Bloomington Election Commission intentionally selected different technology for their electronic voting machines than the County and intentionally selected different vendors for a variety of things. Mr. Sorensen stated that, whether it was intentional or not, they created substantial differences between the two offices. As a result, there would be a significant cost to merge the two offices.

Ms. Bostic stated that no one has control over the Bloomington Election Commission budget. Mr. Sorensen replied that the Election Commissioners do have control of that budget. Mr. Lindberg added that there is a supervising judge who has some budgetary oversight, but it is not stringently exercised.

Mr. Segobiano asked what is the salary of the Commissioners. Mr. Lindberg replied that they receive \$2,100.00 per year.

Mr. Sorensen indicated that some progress has been made over the last couple of years. Two years ago Mr. Esaw Peterson and Ms. Char Stanford attended the

Finance Committee to review their budget, and last year Ms. Stanford came again.

Mr. Segobiano asked if the City reimburses the County for part of this cost. Mr. Zeunik replied that the County is supposed to get \$100,000.00 back from the Election Commission each year. However, after the 2000 Presidential Election, the Help America Vote Act was passed and, because of all of the changes and expenses that were anticipated, the Election Commission decreased the amount of money going back to the County. Mr. Zeunik informed the Committee that one year the County only received \$25,000.00 back. He stated that, with all of the changes in place, the reimbursement has increased. Mr. Zeunik indicated that in 2006 the County received \$75,000.00 back and we expect \$80,000.00 this year.

Mr. Lindberg stated that the Legislative Committee chose to support legislation to restore the Election Levy in an attempt to deal with the Election Commission versus the County Clerk's Elections debate. He advised that he met with a number of other large Counties several years ago, including some that have an Election Commission, to discuss ways to address this issue, where we are not choosing sides. One of the ways to do that is to have this source of funding restored and to give every County Board Finance Committee the ability to review the budget and the election tax levy in the same manner as all other budgets are reviewed.

Mr. Lindberg reviewed the next proposal is to support legislation to enact a Statewide Smoking Ban. He explained that the reason this is included in the Legislative Program is that, when you watch what happened in Bloomington, Normal, McLean County, Sangamon County and Springfield, you see that every Smoking Ban is different.

Mr. Lindberg gave a brief update on where the State-wide Ban is at this time. He noted that Senator Cullerton was planning on introducing a State-wide Smoking Ban, which is tentatively identified as Senate Bill 500. This has not been read on the floor yet, so there is no SB 500 that can be seen. Mr. Lindberg stated that House Bill 246 was the companion piece on the House side and he expects Senate Bill 500 should be identical to HB 246.

Mr. Lindberg indicated that this legislation will eliminate the inter-County issues of smoking bans. He added that, having a consistent smoking ban across the State, will clear up a lot of confusion in the minds of citizens.

Mr. Lindberg informed the Committee that there is one additional issue that is not in the Packet. He stated that Representative Mautino has introduced House Bill 380, which proposes to change the basis by which wind towers are valued for

taxation purposes. Mr. Lindberg advised that it is a complex issue emanating from Grundy County where years ago, when they received one of the early nuclear plants, they classified over 90% of the value as real property. As such, they had very little personal property involved, so they scored big on the property tax side of the issue and scored poorly on the Personal Property Replacement Tax. He stated that it is good for Grundy County in the case of the nuclear plant, but it is bad for them if a wind farm operator is considering more than one County and the ratio of real property and personal property is different between County A, County B and County C. The wind farm operator could be proposing the same number of wind towers in each of those three Counties and see a radically different valuation placed on them.

Mr. Lindberg indicated that this legislation proposes to cure that disparity by going to an income approach to value wind towers. This is very impractical and the utility industry is concerned about having to disclose a lot of proprietary information. He noted that McLean County doesn't need this legislation as it has a highly proficient Assessor. Mr. Lindberg stated that this legislation will not be beneficial to McLean County or most other Counties, and it may be a detriment to taxing bodies like school districts who want to rely on a steady, stable Property Tax from these kinds of developments.

Mr. Lindberg advised that we have registered our opposition to this bill for those reasons. He added that the wind farms are not in favor of this legislation because they are not interested in disclosing to their competition their income and pricing schedules. Mr. Lindberg indicated that a third option may be introduced, which is to rate every tower in terms of its total production capacity and set a value per kilowatt hours. He informed the Committee that Senator Rutherford has embraced House Bill 380 and is co-sponsoring the companion bill in the Senate.

Chairman Sweeney stated that Senator Brady called him regarding this legislation. He indicated that Senator Brady told him that he received feedback that Senator Rutherford is not supporting the bill. Chairman Sweeney noted that Senator Rutherford introduced a shell bill, with nothing in it, so you don't know if he is pro or con.

Ms. Bostic recommended that if anyone needs better background on this bill, they should visit with Mr. Bob Kahman, Supervisor of Assessments, who can explain it very clearly. Mr. Lindberg added that the Statewide Assessors Association unanimously supports this bill.

Motion by Sorensen/Renner to Recommend Approval of a Resolution of the McLean County Board Adopting the 2007 Legislative Program for McLean County – Legislative Subcommittee.
Motion carried.

Mr. Sorensen presented a request for approval of a Resolution Adopting the Rules of the County Board of McLean County as amended – Rules Subcommittee. He stated that the Rules Subcommittee has recommended a couple updates to the rules.

Mr. Sorensen indicated that the first update is an amendment to the Ethics section of the Preamble of the Rules of the County Board of McLean County to consider Ex parte Communications. This language would be added as Number 7 under the Preamble, stating: “refrain from considering ex parte communications involving matters where a public hearing is required according to law and when such consideration would interfere with the due process of law.”

Mr. Sorensen stated that the second update is to amend the Rules of the County Board of McLean County to consider Absence and/or Incapacity of the Chairman of the County Board. This Amendment would add a new sentence authorizing the Vice Chairman to act in the capacity of the Chairman, as detailed in the Resolution.

Chairman Sorensen stated that, under the current rules, the State did not recognize that the County’s current Rules authorize the Vice Chairman of the Board, in the absence of the Chairman, the authority to sign requests for pay vouchers to the State for reimbursement to the County. He pointed out that it was necessary to Federal Express items to Chairman Sweeney for his signature because they would not allow the Vice Chairman to sign the documents.

Motion by Sorensen/Hoselton to Recommend Approval of a Resolution Adopting the Rules of the County Board of McLean County as Amended – Rules Subcommittee.
Motion carried.

Mr. Sorensen presented a proposed solution on how to deal with ex parte communications received by Board members. He indicated that the Rules Subcommittee recommended that the Administrator’s Office institute a courtesy mail service for Board members to drop off their letters and clerical staff could send back a form letter explaining why the member is not communicating directly and to thank them for their interest. Mr. Sorensen stated that this procedure is

not an action item. He indicated that the Administrator's Office has drafted a model letter and will set up a return mail service.

Mr. Zeunik stated that one logistical issue that needs to be worked out in the Administrator's Office is determining how to respond when all 20 Board members receive the same letter from the same individual.

Mr. Sorensen reiterated that the Rules Subcommittee did not feel like any action was required on the part of the Executive Committee, rather it was an effort to inform the Committee of this new service being offered by the Administrator's Office.

Chairman Sweeney presented a request for approval of a Resolution of the McLean County Board approving and authorizing an Appropriation of \$10,000.00 in support of the 150th Anniversary of the Founding of Illinois State University.

Motion by Hoselton/Renner to Recommend Approval of a Resolution of the McLean County Board Approving and Authorizing an Appropriation of \$10,000.00 in Support of the 150th Anniversary of the Founding of Illinois Sate University.
Motion carried, Member Segobiano voting "present."

Chairman Sweeney asked if there were any further questions or comments. There were none.

Chairman Sweeney introduced, for discussion, the issue on remote meeting attendance pursuant to Public Act 94-0508. Mr. Sorensen explained that this was one of the topics proposed during the Rules Subcommittee meeting on February 6th. He indicated that there was a lengthy discussion during the meeting and the Subcommittee recommended that the topic be forwarded to the Executive Committee for their input and potential interest.

Mr. Sorensen noted that the State law allows remote attendance via telephone, internet, or video-conference. However, the law mandates that a quorum be present to vote approval of a remote attendee. Mr. Sorensen stressed that the County Board is not required to approve remote attendance.

Mr. Sorensen summed up the three issues that he believes need to be resolved should the Committee want to consider this as a new Rule:

- Remote attendance can only be done via telephone;
- Need to determine the number of times a member can exercise his right to use remote attendance;

- Chairman of a Committee, Subcommittee or Board cannot conduct a meeting via conference call, but must be physically present.

Mr. Sorensen advised that the Rules Subcommittee was split in terms of how they feel about remote attendance. Therefore, it was forwarded to the Executive Committee as an information item to determine if there is any interest in pursuing this issue. He reminded the Committee that they are under no obligation to do anything.

After a brief discussion, the Executive Committee concurred that they were not interested in pursuing the possibility of remote attendance.

Chairman Sweeney recommended that the Committee review the distributed list of projects that Metro Counties supports. He noted that Metro Counties is presently monitoring 236 bills. Chairman Sweeney indicated that our lobbyists are doing their job and this is what we were looking for when we joined Metro Counties.

Mr. Matt Sorensen, Chairman, Finance Committee, reported that the Finance Committee brings several items for action to the Executive Committee. The first item is a request for approval of Amendment to an Intergovernmental Agreement to Provide for Public Transportation in Ford, Iroquois, Livingston and McLean Counties (SHOWBUS) – Building and Zoning Department.

Motion by Renner/Sorensen to Recommend Approval of Amendment to an Intergovernmental Agreement to Provide for Public Transportation in Ford, Iroquois, Livingston and McLean Counties (SHOWBUS) – Building and Zoning Department.
Motion carried.

Mr. Sorensen presented the next three items as a group. The three items provide authorization for interfund borrowing in anticipation of Property Tax revenue later in the year. The first is a request for approval of an Ordinance Transferring Monies from the County General Fund 0001 to the F.I.C.A./Social Security Fund 0130 and the Tort Judgment Fund 0135, Fiscal Year 2007 – County Administrator's Office. The second is a request for approval of an Ordinance transferring Monies from the TB Care and Treatment Fund 0111 and the Health Department Fund 0112 to the Persons with Developmental Disabilities Fund 0110, Fiscal Year 2007. The final item is a request for approval of a Resolution transferring Monies from the Working Cash Fund 0002 to the I.M.R.F. Fund 0131, Fiscal Year 2007 – County Administrator's Office.

Motion by Sorensen/Renner to Recommend Approval of an Ordinance transferring monies from the County General Fund 0001 to the F.I.C.A./Social Security Fund 0130 and the Tort Judgment Fund 0135, Fiscal Year 2007; an Ordinance Transferring Monies from the TB Care and Treatment Fund 0111 and the Health Department Fund 0112 to the Persons with Developmental Disabilities Fund 0110, Fiscal Year 2007; and a Resolution Transferring Monies from the Working Cash Fund 0002 to the I.M.R.F. Fund 0131, Fiscal Year 2007 – County Administrator's Office.
Motion carried.

Mr. Sorensen presented a request for approval of an Ordinance of the McLean County Board amending the 2007 Ordinance to Reappropriate the Unliquidated Encumbrances of the prior Fiscal Year 2006 Budget – County Auditor's Office.

Motion by Sorensen/Bostic to Recommend Approval of an Ordinance of the McLean County Board Amending the 2007 Ordinance to Reappropriate the Unliquidated Encumbrances of the prior Fiscal Year 2006 Budget – County Auditor's Office.
Motion carried.

Mr. Sorensen presented a request for approval of a Resolution of the McLean County Board amending the Resolution Establishing the Budget Policy for Fiscal Year 2007 – County Clerk's Office.

Mr. Sorensen explained that the County Clerk's Office found an inconsistency between the Budget Policy and the Personnel Policy regarding using exempt County employees to help out at election time. It was discovered that the Budget Policy has language that contradicts the Personnel Policy, which states that exempt employees cannot be paid to assist in the County Clerk's Office. Mr. Sorensen stated that the County Clerk's Office requested that the language be altered to allow exempt employees to be paid for work they perform in the County Clerk's Office during election time.

Motion by Sorensen/Renner to Recommend Approval of a Resolution of the McLean County Board Amending the Resolution Establishing the Budget Policy for Fiscal Year 2007 – County Clerk's Office.
Motion carried.

Chairman Sweeney asked if there were any questions or comments. Hearing none, he thanked Mr. Sorensen.

Mr. Tari Renner, Chairman, Justice Committee, reported that the Justice Committee brings one item for action to the Executive Committee, namely reconsideration of a request for Approval of an Emergency Appropriation Ordinance Amending the FY'2007 Combined Annual Appropriation and Budget Ordinance for the Purchase of a vehicle – EMA. Mr. Renner introduced Mr. Curt Hawk, Director, EMA, to explain the need for the vehicle and to answer any questions the Committee may have.

Mr. Hawk advised that the Rescue Squad was discontinued as a separate operation in 2005 and combined into the Emergency Management Budget in 2006. Further, he noted that EMA has eliminated four areas of emergency response, namely extrication, hazardous materials, technical rescue and air-cascade. Mr. Hawk indicated that the County is out of the emergency rescue business and into the emergency management business, namely emergency response planning and executing the logistics of a response.

Mr. Hawk informed the Committee that the vehicle he is requesting will eliminate two obsolete rescue vehicles and will provide complementary services that are still needed in the community, but not services currently being provided by the local and rural fire departments. He noted that he had originally explored purchasing a new vehicle, but the cost was prohibitive. Mr. Hawk indicated that, during the budget cycle, he considered repairing the current vehicles, but, again, it was too expensive. When this truck became available in mid-November, 2006, it fit the needs of EMA at an affordable price.

Mr. Hawk explained that the current older vehicles are designed as quick response, heavy rescue and are loaded down with generators, air cascade systems, etc. The new vehicle has cabinet space available that will house logistics and planning materials.

Motion by Renner/Sorensen to Recommend Approval
of an Emergency Appropriation Ordinance Amending
the McLean County Fiscal Year 2007 Combined
Annual Appropriation and Budget Ordinance for the
Purchase of a Vehicle – EMA.

Mr. Hoselton asked what is the frequency of use of this vehicle. Mr. Hawk responded that there were 35 call-outs last year and they responded to 25 of those calls, including teams that went out to support the police at a crime scene. EMA did the management work for the police while the police focused on the crime.

Mr. Hoselton asked what jurisdictions does EMA support. Mr. Hawk replied that they support McLean County, as well as Livingston County. He informed the Committee that the McLean County EMA has been held up as an example by the State of Illinois as the role model for other EMA teams around the State.

Mr. Hoselton asked if EMA is used by Bloomington and Normal. Mr. Hawk stated that it is used by both. He added that it is also used by Pontiac P.D. and several other cities and towns. Mr. Hoselton asked if Bloomington-Normal get the bulk of EMA calls. Mr. Hawk responded that quite a few of the calls are from the Sheriff's Department and other areas as well as Bloomington and Normal.

Ms. Bostic asked what will need to be done to the vehicle once it is purchased to make it a viable vehicle for EMA. Mr. Hawk replied that virtually the only thing they will need to do is remove the other city's name. He indicated that the back end of the truck is a command center and includes a GIS system.

Mr. Hoselton asked if there is a charge-back to the department that requires the presence of EMA. Mr. Hawk responded that they do charge-back to the community for the use of supplies and fuel.

Mr. Segobiano expressed confusion over Emergency Management and how this truck's function will be different from the existing EMA vehicles. Mr. Hawk explained what Emergency Management entails and how it differs from Emergency Rescue. Mr. Hawk explained that Emergency Management is the management of an overall incident. For example, if there is an incident in McLean County that involves fire departments, police departments, hazmat squads, EMA would manage the coordination of all of the emergency agencies. The fire department would manage the fire department, the hazmat team manages the hazmat team, etc. and EMA would coordinate the entire operation in terms of communication and resources.

Mr. Segobiano asked for a printout of the calls to which EMA responded last year. Mr. Hawk supplied a printout, which will be placed in the Board packet.

Mr. Segobiano recommended that, if the new vehicle is purchased, the old equipment be sold. Mr. Hawk responded that he intends to sell the old vehicles and equipment that is not needed.

Mr. Zeunik explained that the County's Purchasing and Contracting Ordinance specifies how equipment must be disposed. First, it must be declared surplus equipment, then it must go out for bid. Bid forms can be sent to other agencies or departments. The bids can be handled two different ways, as follows:

1. Receive sealed bids and take the highest bid; or
2. Receive sealed bids and then allow bidders who are present to increase their bid if they choose.

Mr. Segobiano suggested that disposing of the old vehicles and equipment should have been a companion motion to purchasing the truck. Mr. Zeunik responded that this is already part of the Emergency Appropriation Ordinance currently under consideration.

Mr. Hawk informed the Committee that he would also like to dispose of a 1967 military Jeep Truck through E-Bay or a military collector's magazine. He noted that it is a fine piece of equipment. Mr. Hawk indicated that he believes he can get more money for the vehicle through this method.

The Committee asked what will this new vehicle do that the Mobile Command Center vehicle will not do. Mr. Hawk stated that the new truck will house operational materials, including pens and paper, electronic equipment etc. and will also have a GIS system of mapping. The Mobile Command Center vehicle is a command and communication center.

Ms. Bostic informed the Committee that there was an incident at the Health Department where an Ameren IP transformer blew out, which required EMA's involvement. She complimented Mr. Hawk on the assistance they provided during that time.

After further discussion, Chairman Sweeney called for a vote on the motion to the Emergency Appropriation Ordinance.

Motion carried.

Mr. Paul Segobiano, Vice Chairman, Land Use and Development Committee reported that the Land Use and Development Committee brings no items for action to the Executive Committee.

Chairman Sweeney asked if there were any questions or comments. There were none.

Ms. Diane Bostic, Chairman, Property Committee, reported that the Property Committee brings no items for action to the Executive Committee.

Chairman Sweeney asked if there were any further questions. Hearing none, he thanked Ms. Bostic.

Mr. Stan Hoselton, Vice Chairman, Transportation Committee, reported that the Transportation Committee brings no items for action to the Executive Committee.

Mr. John Zeunik, County Administrator stated that he had two informational items to present to the Committee. He announced that the County Board members will receive, in their County Board Agenda Packet, a DVD from Information Services, which is a complete recording of all of the Hearings that occurred on the White Oak Wind Farm. Mr. Zeunik advised that there will be instruction as to how you can listen to the DVD. He also noted that additional information, including written information, exhibits and the application submitted by Invenergy are available in the Building and Zoning Office. Mr. Zeunik indicated that this recommendation is scheduled to go to the County Board in March.

Mr. Lindberg announced that the STARCOM21 System is up and running and doing very well. He stated that two weeks ago, McLean County was contacted, via telephone, by the Chicago Fire Department and asked if we would stand by on a shared channel, which was done. Mr. Lindberg indicated that Deputy Sheriff Jeff Thompson, Technical Services, had a radio conversation with the Chief of the Chicago Fire Department to test the suitability of the STARCOM21 for use by the Chicago Fire Department. It earned an A++.

Mr. Sorensen asked if the Sheriff's Deputies are maintaining problem logs for dead spots in the County. Mr. Lindberg replied that they do maintain a log. Mr. Sorensen stated that he spoke with a Sheriff's Deputy who indicated that there are some issues in the Heyworth area. Mr. Lindberg stated that he will look into that problem.

Chairman Sweeney asked if there was any further discussion. Hearing none, Chairman Sweeney presented the final December 31, 2006 bills as recommended and transmitted by the County Auditor for payment. The fund total for the month is \$38,464.27 with the prepaid total the same.

Minutes of the Executive Committee
February 14, 2007
Page Sixteen

Motion by Hoselton/Bostic to approve the Executive Committee bills for December 31, 2006 as presented to the Committee by the County Auditor.
Motion carried.

Chairman Sweeney presented the January 31, 2007 bills as recommended and transmitted by the County Auditor for payment. The Pending Total is \$250.00 and the Prepaid Total is \$290,922.23 for a fund total of \$291,172.23.

Motion by Bostic/Hoselton to recommend approval of the Executive Committee bills for January 31, 2007 as presented to the Committee by the County Auditor.
Motion carried.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Judith A. LaCasse
Recording Secretary