

**Members Present**

Mr. Dodge, Mr. Whitis, Mr. LaGesse, Ms. Polk, Mr. Skutt, Mr. Byrne, Mr. Tripp, Mr. Hess, Mr. Liehr, Mr. Wheeler, and Mr. McConnell

**Members Absent**

Mr. Snipes

**In Attendance**

- **Board Members**

Mr. Bossert, Mr. Arseneau, Mr. Miller, Mr. Mulcahy, Mr. Howard, Mr. Hildebrand, and Mr. James

- **Department Heads**

Brian Gadbois, Lori Gadbois, Sheriff Bukowski, Bruce Clark, and Jamie Boyd

- **Media**

Dimitrios Kalantzis  
The Herald

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Mr. Whitis, at 9:00 a.m. Quorum present.

**2. Public Comment**

Leo Whitten commented on the courthouse.

**3. Continue Discussion of Courthouse Commission Findings**

Mr. Whitis stated that at their last meeting two weeks ago they started to discuss the findings of the Blue Ribbon Commission and from that they decided to extend it in order to have more discussion and to review the findings and propose what our actions should be. Mr. Bohlmann is here today to walk us through some of the conceptual programming that they have come up with. They want this to be a discussion so at any time if the committee has questions they should feel free to bring them up.

Mr. Bohlmann gave a PowerPoint presentation titled "Conceptual Program & Implementation". He stated that the courthouse has been here for over 100 years and it has a physical presence in Kankakee County. It has been the center of the County's judicial system and it has historic character to it as it is on the National Register. It is certainly a focal point of downtown Kankakee. The courthouse has been remodeled, worked on, and facilities have been added near it for the last 50 years, as recent as 6 years ago a space needs analysis study was done. The catalysis that is bringing this group, the County and the public, together was the letter from the Attorney General's Office relative to ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) accessibility.

Mr. Bohlmann stated that he is documenting information that has been presented and has been available over the last couple of months and is trying to bring it all together to help the committee and the public understand the basic issues. The resource he is using is the letter from the OAG (Office of Attorney General State of Illinois) dated May 2, 2012, which is the catalysis; it listed 159 ADA non-compliance issues. After discussion, a response letter was put together October 25, 2012. Some of the responses were simple and will be made but others were that a 1909 building structurally just cannot accommodate certain ADA issues. In general, most of the issues can be taken care of. Back in December 25, 2005, Dennis Kimme of Kimme Associates, a planning architect from Champaign, Illinois who practices in judicial and correctional architecture and space planning, did a space needs

analysis of the courthouse. On December 17, 2012, the Blue Ribbon Commission, after several meetings and reviewing the challenges of the courthouse and all the possible options, gave a recommendation of what could be done. He wants to share today the conclusion of that group with the input of other resources. (The resources referenced in the above paragraph are posted on the County's websites.)

Mr. Bohlmann stated that the four basic issues at the courthouse are:

- ADA/IAC (American Disabilities Act) / (Illinois Accessibility Code) non-compliance items – that is the catalysis and is what has brought this all to the front burner. There was a complaint filed by an individual who could not gain access to the courthouse and that complaint brought in the Attorney General's Office who represents the federal government in cases such as this. When they come in they do not look at just the one specific location of the complaint; they look at the whole facility which is how 1 or 2 items became 159. This is the catalysis that started this back in May.
- Illinois Supreme Court Courtrooms Standards – the courthouse does not meet the current standards of the Supreme Court.
- Space Needs – there is probably double the people that should be in the courthouse. If there was a fire or some emergency situation there are a lot of people to get out of a lot of cubbyholes.
- Age of Facility (systems, life safety) – it was a very well-built, solid, beautiful, historic facility. The outside structure is in good shape but the infrastructure, such as, the heating and cooling systems, the electrical systems, the plumbing, and the technology cannot meet the needs. Who 100 years ago conceived computers and laptops?

These are the four issues and based on the physical and financial impact he has weighted them accordingly: 12.5% of the whole project is ADA/IAC issues; 12.5% is relative to the facility age/needs; 37.5% is related to Illinois Supreme Court Courtroom Standards; and 37.5% is related to space needs.

Mr. Bohlmann stated that the impetus with response to and compliance with ADA is that it is a \$250/a day fine per item – 159 items at \$250 each per day.

Mr. Bohlmann stated that most of Issue #1, the 159+ items of ADA non-compliance, can be corrected but not all of them. Some of them are just financially or physically impossible to address. The courtroom accessibility is the major challenge and that ties in with the Illinois Supreme Court Standards. There are maybe two courtrooms that could possibly be upgraded to be ADA compliant but it would be somewhat of a challenge to bring them up to Supreme Court standards. The County is currently in the process of a DCEO Grant of \$375,000 and have been told that they would receive the grant subsequent to the continuation of paperwork responses and input. That grant could cover in the courthouse the following items:

- Additional Judge's Chambers – the County was given an additional judge.
- East Side ACCU (air cool condensing unit) Replacement – the unit was 35 years old and has been replaced.
- Elevator ADA/IAC Upgrade – the elevator is within a few inches of being ADA compliant but the controls and door safety controls are not compliant.
- Restrooms (1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor) – need to be completely remodeled.
- Water Fountains – they do not comply.

- Parking & Parking Lot Improvements

Mr. Bohlmann stated that the intent is that this remodeling be permanent and not impacted by future remodeling.

Mr. Bohlmann stated that Issue #2, Supreme Court Standards, were updated January, 2011. There were no major changes to the original. The major item under this issue is the segregation of the public, judicial, and defendant traffic. At the moment, judges' chambers are used as prisoner holding cells. As a judge goes into their office they are walking by three, four, five prisoners. As the public go to use the elevator, many times they have to wait because prisoners are being brought in. There is also no sally port. Prisoners are dropped off right at the south door which is also the door the staff uses and the public uses to exit the building. It is not safe and does not meet code. Within a courthouse there is supposed to be three hallways to a courtroom - one for the public to access the courtroom, one for the prisoner, and another for the judge. Our courthouse does not come near meeting any of those requirements. Courtroom sizes and amenities do not comply and neither does support rooms and spaces. They have jury courtrooms that do not have an adjacent jury deliberation room. Their jury deliberation rooms are about one-fourth to one-half of what they should be. They are to have men's and women's restrooms somewhat privately located within a jury deliberation room but only half of our jury deliberation rooms have a restroom and it is unisex. Lawyers, defendants or plaintiffs are to have a private room for consultation before, during, and after a proceeding. We do not have any such spaces for private communication. Supreme Court Standards also address ADA/IAC requirements.

Mr. Bohlmann stated that Issue #3 is space needs. Dennis Kimme did a space needs study back in December of 2005 which is on the County website. Additional courtrooms and support spaces are needed. The Circuit Clerk's Office is very overcrowded. It needs twice the space that they have now. Jury assembly quarters are needed. Right now it is in the basement and twice the number of people is congregated there that are allowed to be in there. The State's Attorney space needs to be consolidated and some of their offices are no bigger than some closets. The State's Attorney's function is split up; the criminal division is in the courthouse but traffic and civil are down in the Annex Building.

Mr. Bohlmann stated that Issue #4 is the building age. The HVAC system was upgraded back in the 60's, touched upon in the 80's, and just recently a piece of equipment up on the east side roof had to be replaced. It needs to have more work done on it. If anything needs to be addressed it is the electricity system; it is 100 years old. Electricity was barely an invented item when that courthouse was being built. The facility needs an emergency generator. If people get in and out via the elevator, how do they get out in a power outage? What happens to proceedings in court when it was in session? What about the employees? The plumbing system is in fair shape. Codes were basically nonexistent in 1909. There was good practice and common sense but there were not code books of minimum standards that were followed. There are life safety issues – no fire egress stairways within the building, no fire sprinkler system, and no fire alarm system. There is an entry burglar system and the various judges' benches do have a duress button but is the building as safe as it could or should be. It is not.

Mr. Bohlmann stated that the conceptual site plan is an idea, a thought, something that could happen, or may happen. It is not cast in stone or the only solution. It is just to plant the seed. There cannot be good discussion if there is nothing in front of you to compare notes on. This conceptual

site plan comes from the Kimme Plan of 2005. He thinks it is a good plan but they had shown the addition to the courthouse right up against the south face of the courthouse. Personally, he would like to take that expansion and suggest that it be 35' away south of the courthouse so that it is a separate building. They would complement each other but to connect it to the courthouse is a challenge and it would have to be very, very carefully done, in his opinion. The plan is showing that Merchant Street is not closed but would have a dog leg in it. The main idea is that Merchant Street between Indiana and Harrison is a drop-off and pick-up that would now be the south security ADA accessible entrance to the whole facility. The first floor of the addition could have the courtrooms and the Circuit Clerk area. Our existing courthouse cannot accommodate per Supreme Court Standards courtrooms so the solution would be to get all the courtrooms out of the courthouse which is what the conceptual plan shows. The idea is to get the high-volume traffic in and out of the first floor - in and out of a well-planned established secure area with proper queuing lines. Most people don't want to be in the courthouse any longer than they have to be. Security doesn't want to have any more challenges than what is necessary. Merchant Street is about six feet to eight feet lower than the floor of the current courthouse basement so that means that the first floor which is right at grade and ADA accessible could interconnect via a very nice lobby/tunnel arrangement to the courthouse basement and then have stairs going to the first floor and elevators going to all four floors. The two facilities have been connected below ground and what is now the current driveway drop-off would become a nice terrace – something that would blend 1909 and 2013. There would also be a sally port to bring prisoners in and then through a private elevator/stairs down to holding cells in the lower level. The prisoners' exist and entry into the building is now segregated as is their traffic within the building. There would also be a private hallway for the judges and a corridor for the public. The second floor would be very similar; they would like it 35' away and instead of a sally port they have jury deliberation rooms that would be compliant with the standards. In the master plan there is shelled space that would be ready to finish when the time came that more room was needed because of growth within the County. Expansion in place should be allowed for. In other words, the Circuit Clerk is going to grow so let's allow for some empty room next to the Circuit Clerk. Kendall County did a very good job at that. On their new courthouse construction, their whole second floor is empty and on the first floor one-fourth of it is empty so that various departments can just take out a door and a wall and grow right into a remodeled space.

Mr. Bohlmann stated that part of the concern that people have is the historic nature. He showed a slide of a proposed addition. Kimmee's intent back in 2005 was that the ground level would be a stone or pre-cast stone to compliment the present courthouse design and then monumental glass above. He asked if a third floor should be considered – a shelled out space for future growth. It would have to be studied. DeKalb County just constructed a recent addition that looks much like the original courthouse. They used precast concrete that looks just like stone. The new Student Life and Recreation Center at Olivet University also used it in the entrance. It looks just like Indiana Limestone. The same thing could be done with our courthouse addition. It lasts as long as and wears as well as stone. With modern technology in construction, we could architecturally very well complement the existing courthouse.

Mr. Bohlmann stated that the intent is not to abandon the current courthouse. Other than some good upgrade and rehab, it is an excellent building; it is historic. We are not tearing it down. The first floor could house the county board offices, county clerk, etc. Should county government be brought back into a two-block complex? The discussion and conclusion from the Blue Ribbon Commission was that historic courtroom 200 and its chambers could and should remain. They may not be used

on a daily basis but could be used for special ceremonies, weddings, a special court situation, etc. Minor ADA/IAC compliance could be done to it. Probation, Public Defender, and the County Recorder could also be on the second floor. On the historic register it basically reads that the exterior façade of the courthouse is to be maintained as is and the rotunda and the open public areas of the courthouse are to be maintained and retained but the backside of the rotunda walls can be remodeled for offices. In fact, it all has been remodeled.

Mr. Bohlmann stated that on the third floor Courtroom 300 would just be upgraded and maintained as is and the State's Attorney Offices, criminal; civil; and traffic, could all be on the third floor which would open up space at the Annex that could also be used for other departments.

Mr. Bohlmann stated that in rough numbers at this time the expansion or addition to the courthouse is estimated to be about \$35 million, the upgrading to the existing courthouse would cost about \$10 million, 50,000 sq. ft. of shelled space would cost around \$5 million, and two floors added to the Annex Building would be about \$5 million. The total project would be around \$55,000,000. Some of the buildings used now could be vacated and put back on the tax rolls.

Mr. Bohlmann stated that for the new addition there is site work, construction, furniture & equipment, design fees & miscellaneous expenses, contingency for design and construction which totals \$35 million. Contingency is "what didn't we know about when we started this?" Until you do it, it is a best guess.

Mr. Bohlmann stated that for the existing courthouse upgrade there is remodeling and upgrade allowance, furniture and equipment, design fees and miscellaneous expenses, contingency on design and construction which totals \$10 million.

Mr. Bohlmann stated that the short-term intent was to address the Office of the Attorney General's 159 issues. How many of those can and should be taken care of in a permanent fashion? We would need to comply with the law and we would like to stay on the friendly side of the Office of the Attorney General State of Illinois. In 2012 and early 2013, they would take care of their ADA/IAC issues that they are able to do within the existing facility. At the same time in 2013 leading up to 2014 through 2017 the County is looking at and addressing the major issues which are space needs and the Illinois Supreme Court Standards. There is the short-term and the long term – What can we take care of now with monies that we have and what is our long-range plan? The Attorney General will also be looking at our long-range plans.

Mr. Bohlmann stated that this presentation shows one option of how the County might address the four major issues.

Mr. Whitis stated that we can see that a lot of time has been put into this. Now we are at the crossroads of what are we going to do which is what we are here to talk about.

Mr. Wheeler stated that he and a few other board members took a trip over to the courthouse and the magnitude of what the Clerk is doing over there as far as stashing files in every corner of the building is understated here. It really is remarkable how scattered that office is around the building. Every little cubby hole is being used. When they walked into the basement the Circuit Clerk immediately started wheezing because of the mold in the basement. There are no sprinklers down

there and that is where all the paper is stored and also there are people working in closets. The mess over there is understated here. People are working on top of each other; it is like a submarine.

Mr. Whitis stated that after they brought everything to the table and started looking at it all they just kind of had to take a step back and look at how fixing the 159 items is not really fixing the main problems. The biggest thing that he found surprising is the amount of space that is required for certain activities, such as a courtroom, compared to what we have. Months ago Mr. Boyd brought an RFP to them to rent space for some of his office to move out of the courthouse but it was really not fixing any of the major issues.

Mr. Liehr stated that there are major components of this that involve space needs and Supreme Court Standards. We live in a different world in 2013 compared to when the courthouse was built. There was one complaint that was brought to the Attorney General that sparked them coming in and looking at the courthouse. That is something that we need to impress upon the public. Individuals have the right to challenge us if we are not meeting the requirements of the law and we could be in serious difficulty if additional challenges take place. These are all things that we need to emphasize to our constituents.

Mr. Whitis stated that it is not just ADA. There are other regulatory things that we are out of compliance with that we need to address.

Mr. Bossert stated that perhaps the lack of questions here is because of the fact that they have already rehashed this information but he asked Mr. Bohlmann to revisit and walk through the issues to reinforce it and also because we have a number of new board members who need to get informed about the issues. Also, part of what they wanted to do today is re-examine and discuss the cost numbers that were used. They had some conceptual discussions early on about how much this might cost and we need to revisit and recheck those numbers. If they start thinking outside of strictly addressing the courthouse building and look to the future and to do some consolidation, they are coming up with a larger number than they initially talked about. Perhaps discussion for this committee is "Is this enough?" If we are going to ask the public for funding once, let's make it enough to take care of any other contingencies that may arise. Are we ready to move ahead with a motion to place a question on the ballot, if that is what the board wants to do? Have we settled on a number yet? We need to open up that discussion. If we are not ready, we may need to rethink this and come back in a week or so.

Mr. Tripp stated that he would like to know where the numbers came from. He does have a lot of confidence in Mr. Bohlmann guiding us through this and also with Mr. Kimme. He thinks that they are a class act and that we can put a lot of confidence in what they do. He thinks that he has heard all that he needs to hear. Especially, when we put a Blue Ribbon Committee on this and they come up with a recommendation. Let's figure out how to pay for it. We have all the detail that we need. He had someone this morning ask him, "What if we don't do it? We have enough taxes." He told him that we will have to do it. The Supreme Court will tell us to do it and how to do it, if we don't. He is ready to move on and discuss how we are going to do it.

Mr. Whitis stated that there is no doubt that there is a need. The question is where the funds are going to come from. He thinks that the charge of the board is to say what we do, how we do it, and where the money comes from. Our constituents say that we don't need it at this time and we have to

listen to that and yet at the same time we have been mandated by the Attorney General to address this issue.

Mr. James stated that right now we probably have 200 well-informed people, not counting the employees, as to what the problems are so we have a big sell ahead of us. With the conceptual design showing the addition to the courthouse, there is a lot of expense in trying to duplicate the appearance of the existing courthouse. We talked about going south where the old jail is. He thinks that we are going to have to have two concepts – one on what we can do as inexpensively as possible and still meet the criteria that we are required to meet at another site, which would be south of this proposed site, as well as, this conceptual plan presented today. Right now with the financial cliff advertising we are uphill. We need it and we know that we need it but it is not going to be a soft sell and we better come up with all the facts that we need to convince the people. He would like to see another concept south of Merchant Street, economically constructed. If we went to the people with two plans, they are going to select one.

Mr. LaGesse stated that in Champaign County they had a similar situation with an older courthouse. Someone threw a Molotov cocktail into the courthouse and there were some serious injuries and the Chief Judge shut the courthouse down and they had to put court services all over Champaign in different buildings. Our courthouse is also an accident waiting to happen. We need to be proactive enough that we don't lose a life here and then decide something has to be done. A life is worth that. The cost of something like that happening and having to move all the services all over town would be astronomical and then we would still not have a courthouse. He is amazed at the people that do not want this and say that we don't need it but have never ever stepped in the courthouse. We need to be realistic about this. He thinks it would cost the average taxpayer a minimal amount for what they are going to get. This is necessary before something tragically happens. We have to act.

Mr. Whitis stated that one of the key things that the Blue Ribbon Commission said to them at the Committee of the Whole Meeting was to do it right the first time and don't come back again. Part of the master plan is what the totality of everything is which is what they are trying to do. We don't want to do it twice. We need to discuss whether this is the right thing to do and at what level. There are still options. This is not the only option but this is the option that the Blue Ribbon Commission asked them to come forward with and he thinks that it is a good plan and has everything addressed so we don't have to come back down the road.

Mr. Skutt asked if there are any reports on the cost savings of a new facility as far as maintenance and consolidation of some of the departments. Are there any reports on the additional cost of maintaining a new facility because it is so much larger? How much more manpower would the Sheriff need? Is it a large increase to the total budget?

Mr. Bohlmann stated that no study has been done yet. Until there is a determination that this is a viable concept worth further study, it is just a thought. Looking at the existing facility, the cost for housekeeping would probably remain the same. When they upgrade the electrical system they would be upgrading lighting and going from the old T12 lamps to T5 or even LED's which use a lot less energy. Upgrades to the HVAC would use much less energy, as well. The new addition should be designed to be very energy efficient and material usage efficient, such as, carpet made out of recycled product. The walls need to be well insulated and the windows need to have reflective, insulated glass. The roof needs a minimum of 4" of insulation so the energy that is used is limited.

They would like to have a carbon neutral facility meaning that we are not using any outside electricity or gas. Do we consider geo-thermal? These things would all save money.

Mr. Bohlmann stated that when the courthouse is upgraded and remodeled there are floor finishes and wall finishes that could be used as a natural part of the remodeling process that cuts the maintenance in half. Housekeeping staff may have to be increased but part of it would be to use material that have longevity to them and wear well and don't need maintenance. Can enough money be saved in energy costs to more than offset staff? That should be the challenge.

Mr. Whitis stated that the operational expenses are obviously going to go up but through consolidation and having one point of egress, etc. there will also be some cost savings.

Mr. Bossert stated that the question came up about the cost analysis and what this may mean to taxpayers. Based on the best numbers that they have right now, the average home in the county, in terms of fair market value, is about \$126,000. The tax bill for an average home would increase between \$60 and \$90 a year, if the referendum passes. The numbers are not extreme and yet they realize that any number is a large number to our voters. They are looking at a debt service between \$3 million and \$5 million a year, depending on how far they go with a debt obligation. There is no room in the general fund budget to accommodate that unless they fire half of the staff out here or the entire Sheriff's Department.

Mr. Whitis stated that if we are mandated to do it then we will have to cut the budget.

Mr. Bossert stated that the nuclear option is thrown out there but what does it mean. It means that they would have a court order to take care of the problem and to do it with the money that is available.

Mr. Liehr stated that he thinks that it would be important for them to start talking numbers and cost with the public and call to their attention the success of the recent aggregation. If that is going to save the average person several hundred dollars a year, they are actually going to be ahead because of the actions of this board and other municipal boards that have moved ahead with the electrical aggregation. If public safety is a major part of the responsibility of local government, certainly the savings that they have had may be reduced a little bit but we now achieve that public safety which he thinks the public really wants. He is not sure how we inform the public that they are still coming out ahead because of the actions of this body and other local bodies but he thinks that we should think of ways to do that.

Mr. Whitis stated that because we are not a home rule we do not have the ability to continually go back and stage this in by doing this more times than one. He thinks that this committee needs to come up with what level we are going to move forward with. He thinks that is the first question that needs to be answered. Do we move forward with the concept that we currently have or do we take a step back and go to the minimalist approach? If we do want to go to referendum on the timeline that we are currently on, we have to move forward. From conversations that they have had in the past, they have wanted to keep the courthouse in downtown, they wanted to add to the existing structure, and they wanted it to have the same kind of look. That is the direction they have gotten in the past so that is why they are progressing down that road. If that needs to change, then we need to stop and shift gears.

Mr. McConnell stated that he would concur with Mr. Tripp's evaluation of the job that has been done. There has been a lot of work done on this and a lot of time and effort put into this. If we wait, how much more is this all going to increase? Now is the prime time because interest rates are low. He agrees with building out extra space now so we have it instead of going back again and again which we can't do anyway because we are not home rule. He thinks that the concept is excellent and all the people who have been involved have done a great job. They have looked at the options of going south and other options also. They have looked at everything and this is the best option that they see. He would be more inclined to move ahead with their recommendation. How much more will it cost to build if we wait?

Mr. Whitis stated that the building that Olivet just built could not have been built three years from now. The only reason that they were able to build that building was because of the timing. He has been asked why the County does not go out and expand into space in other buildings. His experience is that when a facility spreads out the operational cost skyrockets. Instead of one facility that has to be cleaned, maintained, secured, etc., now there are five or six so the operational cost goes up extraordinarily. They have looked at that option. They have tried to put together a plan that addresses all of that. If you bring everything to one campus, look at all the other facilities that are being freed up. Everything would be consolidated so that operations would become more efficient, not only with personnel but even for the public. The Blue Ribbon Commission saw that. It doesn't make sense to fracture our whole operation. If there is the ability to bring it back together, bring it back.

Mr. Dodge stated that he thinks that we have asked several members of our community, separate from us, to look at the alternatives. He thinks that we need to ask the public - Based upon these numbers, will they support us? They may say no. On the other hand, once we tell them what the situation is, they may say yes, and then we can start to proceed ahead. If we are going to scramble, let's scramble after we have asked the public if they will support us. Let's not scramble now and study it again and ask for another committee to come back to end up telling us that they gave us the best alternative the first time. He thinks it is time to get the voters to give us a yea or nay.

Mr. Arseneau stated that the question has been asked – How do we get the message out? He thinks that one of the biggest ways is for the papers to make sure that they have their facts straight and put the correct numbers in the paper. This is probably going to be one of the biggest things that come out in the next century. We have to make sure that we come at it positively and make sure that we talk to everyone about it.

### **3. Recommendation to Place Referendum Question or Questions on the April 2013 Consolidated Election Ballot**

Mr. Tripp stated that he talked to several people this morning about what they were meeting about today and a prominent business man in our area overheard their conversation and came by and said, "We elected you guys to make those decisions, do it."

Mr. Bossert stated that he knows that the committee is anxious to move ahead with the vote; however, he thinks that they are still toying with the exact language to place on the ballot. We may need to come back so Mr. Boyd can fine tune the ballot question, if that is where they want to go. He is getting the sense from the committee that they want to move ahead. They are going to have

to pick a number and go with it. His sense is to make it big enough that we can make sure that we do what needs to be done. It doesn't all have to be spent.

Mr. Whitis stated that he thinks that it is supposed to be worded "not to exceed" the number.

Mr. Bossert stated that that is correct.

Mr. Whitis stated that we can say \$60 million but if they go through the whole process and find out that they only need \$30 million then that is all that they would spend. Our constituents put trust in them that they are going to be fiscally responsible. Just because we ask for \$60 million doesn't mean that we are going to spend \$60 million just because we have it. We need a consensus coming out of this committee that we are ok with the plan that has been put in front of us so that we can move forward.

Mr. Bossert stated that they were thinking of moving the next Buildings & Grounds Meeting, normally scheduled for Wednesday, January 16, to Monday, January 14 and then have a special full county board meeting on Wednesday, January 16 in the evening. He believes the deadline to place a question on the ballot would be January 21 or 22.

Mr. Whitis stated that this is going to be one of the biggest decisions that this board and the public have to make. As a board, we need to do everything possible to get the information to our constituents and the public. He thinks that a key component to that is for them to appear to be as accessible as possible by moving as many meetings as we can to the evening when this issue is discussed. He thinks that until the referendum comes out every county board meeting should meet at night. We need to be accessible to the people.

Mr. Hess stated that he thinks that we need to move this forward and do whatever we can do to get this ready for April. People out there know that we have been working on this for months and months. We need to tell them what we want and then let them make the decision. He thinks we should make the Building and Grounds Committee Meeting in the evening, also.

Mr. McConnell stated that he agrees that the evening meeting shows that we want the people to understand what is going on and give them the opportunity to give feedback. He would be in favor of any evening meetings that are necessary.

Mr. Whitis asked if any action needed to be taken.

Mr. Bossert stated that for a Special County Board Meeting they would either have to petition or vote at next week's full county board meeting. The Buildings and Grounds Meeting will be on January 14 at 6:00 p.m. in this room.

Mr. LaGesse stated that he didn't think both meetings had to be at night. Monday night there will a conflict with other municipalities that cannot come to that meeting that may like to.

Mr. Skutt stated that Monday night would give people who work during the day a chance to come to a meeting. A big part of our constituent base does work during the day.

Special Buildings & Grounds  
Committee Meeting  
January 3, 2013

Mr. Whitis stated that the Buildings and Grounds Meeting will be on January 14, 2013 at 6:00 in this room.

**5. Old Business**

**6. New Business**

**7. Adjournment**

**A motion was made by Mr. LaGessee and seconded by Mr. Dodge to adjourn the meeting at 10:40 a.m. Motion carried with a voice vote.**

Matt Whitis, Chairman  
Joanne Langlois, Executive Coordinator