

CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MINUTES

Highway & Transportation/County Facilities/Environment & Land Use
Thursday, February 10, 2011
Lyle Shields Meeting Room, Brookens Administrative Center
1776 E. Washington St., Urbana, Illinois

MEMBERS PRESENT: Christopher Alix, Jan Anderson, Astrid Berkson, Thomas Betz, Lloyd Carter, Lorraine Cowart, Stephanie Holderfield, Stan James, John Jay, Brad Jones, Alan Kurtz, Ralph Langenheim, Brendan McGinty, Diane Michaels, Alan Nudo, Steve O'Connor, Pattsie Petrie, Michael Richards, Jonathan Schroeder, C. Pius Weibel

MEMBERS ABSENT: Carol Ammons, Ron Bensyl, Greg Knott, Steve Moser, James Quisenberry, Giraldo Rosales, Larry Sapp

OTHERS PRESENT: Jeff Blue (County Engineer), Kat Bork (Administrative Assistant), Deb Busey (County Administrator), John Hall (Planning & Zoning Director), Susan Monte (RPC County Planner), Alan Reinhart (Facilities Director), Tom Berns (Berns Clancy & Associates)

CALL TO ORDER

Weibel called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Busey called the roll. Alix, Anderson, Berkson, Betz, Holderfield, James, Jay, Jones, Kurtz, Langenheim, McGinty, Michaels, Nudo, O'Connor, Petrie, Richards, Schroeder, and Weibel were present at the time of roll call, establishing the presence of a quorum.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by James to approve the Committee of the Whole minutes of January 11, 2011; seconded by Anderson. **Motion carried with unanimous support.**

MOTION by Langenheim to approve the Olympian-Lincoln Special Committee minutes of November 10, 2010; seconded by Holderfield. **Motion carried with unanimous support.**

APPROVAL OF AGENDA/ADDENDA

MOTION by Jay to approve only the agenda; seconded by Nudo.

MOTION by Nudo to amend the motion to remove agenda items 9.B.1-3 from the agenda; seconded by Holderfield.

Nudo explained he spoke to Hall and Monte after Tuesday's study session about incorporating ideas from that session into the direction to the Zoning Administrator. He would also like the eight Board members who did not attend the study session to have the opportunity to see the ideas raised. He also had a conversation yesterday with Kurtz and Weibel about pulling these items off the agenda and both individuals concurred. Kurtz said he had changed his mind and requested pulling only 9.B.1 from tonight's agenda. He felt 9.B.2-3 were well discussed at the study session and the Board could move forward on those issues tonight. Weibel clarified the motion was to pull the items from tonight's agenda, not to defer them and Nudo concurred.

Motion carried to amend the original motion with unanimous support.

Carter and Cowart entered meeting at 6:09 p.m.

Motion carried to approve the agenda as amended with unanimous support.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Weibel stated public participation would be limited to one hour and each individual could speak for five minutes.

Joel Barickman from the Atkins Group spoke in support of the Olympian Drive project and encouraged the Board to work towards getting the project completed.

William Cope spoke on behalf of 26 landowners about the Olympian Drive/Lincoln Avenue project. He stated the group of landowners had met with Blue and were willing to support the option shown as a yellow line on the map. His group would like the road to be built as far west as possible. They assume Project B will never happen and support a compromise based on this assumption.

William Bates read a letter on behalf of Shirley Squire and Christine Squire Pierson about the Squire Farms land and the Olympian Drive/Lincoln Avenue project. The letter included information about the farm's operations and how it is owned by three heir groups, which are represented by a three-person management committee. It identified Janet Scharlau as the farm agent, not the farm manager. The letter expressed Squire's and Pierson's support of the Olympian Drive/Lincoln Avenue project and the S-curve alignment for Lincoln Avenue. They are willing to sell land, but did not want Squire Farms to carry the sole burden of sacrificing land to appease other landowners who object to the project. The letter questioned whether Nudo had a conflict of interest as a County Board member because it claimed he was related to Billy and Virginia Ziegler, who are opposed to the project.

Robert Lakey, an Olympian Drive resident, spoke in support of the Olympian Drive/Lincoln Avenue project based on traffic needs.

John Dimit, representing the Economic Development Commission, voiced the EDC's support of the AXC options for the Olympian Drive project. A major employer, with facilities on both sides of the railroad tracks, has a critical need for the road to be completed. The company's local management is having difficulty convincing corporate management that they should continue to invest in the Champaign-Urbana community. He felt this was an issue concerning current jobs, not just the potential for future jobs.

Joe Lamb, from Open Road Paving & Champaign Asphalt, described how the Cities of Champaign and Urbana worked to relocate much of the industries formerly scattered about the north side. The industries moved with the design by city planners that they would have trucking and road access. He stressed the need to follow through on building the access.

Tara McCauley, AFSCME representative, explained the union and County were in the process of negotiating a wage reopener. She spoke about the wage freeze instituted in 2008 and the County's goals about maintaining quality workforce from the FY2011 budget. She stated Champaign County employees' wages are not keeping up with other county employees in the region, based on AFSCME's survey. She objected to the idea of eliminating some of the step increases for union employees. McCauley said it was not fair that some administrative and managerial employees have received upgrades and raises since 2008. Regarding the attorney hired to represent the County Board during negotiations, McCauley stated this attorney has offended union members when discussing wage increases. She objected to the fee the attorney was being paid and said shame on the County Board for sending this person to represent them. McCauley remarked the union employees deserve more than what is being offered by the County Board. If the Board can afford to pay for projects, then it can afford to put more money into the employees.

Patty Walls, a union employee in the Supervisor of Assessments' Office, did not like some of the comments made by the County's negotiating team during negotiations. She spoke about the learning process as an employee and the value of longevity.

Nora Stewart, AFSCME Local 900 President, said she was hurt and appalled by comments made by Lorna Geiler, a private attorney hired by the County Board as its representative in negotiations. She objected to the fee Geiler was being paid and the County's offer of a wage increase.

John Farney, AFSCME Local 900 Vice-President, said it was important that the union employees' step increases from previous contracts continue so Champaign County does not fall behind other counties in regard to wages. Noting the health insurance changes, layoffs, and furloughs helped balanced the County budget, he said the \$80,000 difference between the management and union proposals should not be insurmountable. The \$80,000 could be taken out of the General Corporate Fund's balance or by the Nursing Home repaying the loan from the GCF. Farney spoke against the County Board's decisions to extend the University Avenue TIF district and authorize position upgrades for seventeen elected officials and non-bargaining employees. He also objected to comments made by the County Board's legal counsel at the bargaining table and the same attorney's hourly rate.

Weibel closed public participation after verifying that no one else which to speak.

COMMUNICATIONS

Petrie informed the Board that she, Kurtz, and Eric Thorsland attended a wind energy seminar at Normal. Kurtz added that the County is looking good on future wind farms.

HIGHWAY & TRANSPORTATION

Monthly Reports

County & Township Motor Fuel Tax Claims – January 2011

MOTION by Langenheim to receive and place on file the County & Township Motor Fuel Tax Claims for January 2011; seconded by Carter. **Motion carried with unanimous support.**

County Engineer

Intergovernmental Agreement for the Jurisdictional Transfer of County Highway 32 in Gifford

Blue described the \$4 million project, completely funded by federal and state dollars, on County Road 11 and County Highway 32. It will not cost the Champaign Count taxpayers any money from the Highway Fund to complete the project. This road travels through Gifford's main street and Blue provided a map at the Board's desks. He explained that receipt of federal aid money carries a number of requirements, including the caveat that there is no angular parking when the road passing through a smaller community, such as Gifford. Gifford would have to change to parallel parking in its downtown and sacrifice 50% of the available spaces to use the federal money. Blue has negotiated an intergovernmental agreement with Gifford that would enable the Highway Department to complete the project while meeting the village's needs at the same time. Gifford will take jurisdictional transfer of the main street while the federal aid project is being completed and then the road will be transferred back to the County. This gets around the federal regulations. The agreement was signed at Village's board meeting. At some point in the future, Gifford will have to decide how to proceed. The road inside the village could be milled and overlaid using County tax dollars. Gifford's downtown area has serious drainage problems and the motor fuel tax dollars have constraints when being used for drainage improvements. The positive side of using federal funds on the road project is that this money will pay to replace street parking lost by Gifford with a parking lot in downtown. The federal money would also pay for the drainage work. Gifford has been given the option to choose one of these two approaches. The request for the Board tonight is for the jurisdictional transfer and deletion of the road from the County Highway System.

MOTION by Langenheim to approve the Intergovernmental Agreement for the Jurisdictional Transfer of County Highway 32 in Gifford and deletion of County Highway 32 from the County Highway System; seconded by Weibel.

The Board discussed the road project details. Schroeder asked about coordinating with Gifford to finish the drainage work. Blue could not speak on behalf of the village engineer, but he was willing to work with the engineer on developing a plan. Petrie asked about any

anticipated problems for Gifford. Blue explained the village would possess the road for a year and he did not foresee any major maintenance problems. The project will be done this summer, with the exception of the portion inside Gifford.

Motion carried with unanimous support.

Weibel exited the meeting at 7:04 p.m.

Lincoln Avenue/Olympian Drive

Blue explained the Olympian-Lincoln Special Committee last met on November 10th and agreed that the project's purpose and need was valid and that they would like to see a compromise with the affected property owners. The motion approved by the committee was "to ask Blue to interact with the various parties and come back to the County Board, perhaps by February 1st, to report his progress to see if there can be breakthroughs on some of the details."

Weibel returned to the meeting at 7:05 p.m.

Blue described the efforts he made in meeting with Jason Barickman (who represented landowners group at the November 10th meeting) and Shirley Squire to fill the committee's direction. Shirley Squire is a major property owner in the area and 1/3 owner of Squire Farms. Her niece, Christine Squire Pierson, is another 1/3 owner of the Squire Farms property and sent the letter with Squire that was read during public participation. Barickman represents Janet Scharlau, the other 1/3 owners of Squire Farms. Blue contacted Shirley Squire following the November meeting, who asked him wait and contact her after holidays. He contacted her on January 6, 2011 and met with Squire and Barickman at Squire's house for four hours. They discussed everything from 1997 to the present about the project. At the beginning of the meeting, Shirley Squire was adamantly opposed to any alignment of Lincoln Avenue that differed from the proposed alignment (shown as green on the map). By the end of the meeting, Squire indicated she would be open to discussion of an alignment west of her homestead if they people represented by Barickman would be open to discussion about continuing Olympian Drive to U.S. Route 45. Squire wanted Barickman's group make concessions regarding Olympian Drive if Squire Farms was being asked to make concessions regarding the Lincoln Avenue project. She asked Barickman to return with a response from his clients. Barickman said he was going to take this information back to his clients. Squire also wanted to see where the different alignment would be on a map. It became apparent other option is possible, hence why the map shows three separate alignments in green, yellow, and red.

Blue contacted Barickman later about his clients' response and, on January 17, 2011, received an email from Barickman. In this email, Barickman stated it was his belief that the Olympian-Lincoln Special Committee's direction to Blue was to develop a westerly alignment. The minutes from the November 10, 2010 Olympian-Lincoln Special Committee reveal that the direction to Blue was to open communications about a compromise and not what Barickman described. Barickman advised his clients to not take any further action on Shirley Squire's offer. More email communication followed and on January 28, 2011 Barickman informed Blue he was no longer representing his clients in this matter and they preferred Blue correspond with them

directly as individuals instead of corresponding to a representative of the group. On February 3rd, Blue, Bill Gray, and Mike Munson went and talked to Shirley Squire with the three route map to apprise her of the different alternatives. Shirley Squire prefers the green alignment, as indicated by her letter, because it was the alignment chosen by the people who lived in that area. Shirley Squire put a lot of time of effort into the development of the green alignment when the process was done. She does not like the red alignment and open to discussing the yellow alignment if the other group of landowners is open to extending Olympian Drive to the east.

Blue met with the group of landowner who have opposed the project last night and presented the three route map. As indicated by William Cope during public participation, the group is not in favor of the red or green alignments and would prefer the yellow alignment be stopped at the Olympian Drive intersection with no continuation of the curve to Lincoln Avenue. Blue felt he has fulfilled the committee's direction and the committee has been dissolved.

Regarding the current situation, Blue reviewed the three alignments on the map. The green alignment is the approved alignment from 1999 study. The total of new right-of-way that would need to be purchased is roughly 12.6 acres, affecting six landowners. The red alignment came out of the original engineering study as the preferred alignment but was adjusted to the green alignment thru input at public meetings. Four property owners are impacted by the red alignment for a total of 13.6 new acres of right-of-way that will have to be purchased. The yellow alignment brought to the Olympian-Lincoln Special Committee by BKB Engineers hired by the group of objecting landowners. This alignment travels west of Shirley Squire's homestead. The yellow alignment crosses the property of four owners for a total of 18.6 acres of newly acquired right-of-way. Squire Farms owns 14.4 acres of the right-of-way that would have to be acquired for the yellow alignment.

The green alignment requires no additional location work and has been approved. The Board could move ahead with this alignment. The red alignment would have to be re-evaluated as an amendment to the Phase 1 study. Blue estimated that work would cost an additional \$120,000. The yellow alignment or any other alignment would require starting anew with a location study or Phase 1 study. The price tag to complete new Phase 1 study was about \$170,000. Blue explained that the Board cannot direct that the study to evaluate one particular alignment, it has to start over with multiple alignments and go through the public participation process. The impacts on the land, homes, and environment all have to be considered. A design phase cannot be performed just on the yellow alignment and Blue could not predict what alignment would come out of this process as the preferred alignment.

Blue outlined the County Board's options as: 1. use the approved green alignment, 2. re-evaluate the alternatives from the previous location study (the red alignment), or 3. start a new study and look at all the different alternatives which may come out of that study.

Blue distributed a timeline and spreadsheet on costs for north Lincoln Avenue. The Olympian Drive project is in the plan with the Illinois Commerce Commission for FY2013. This project needs to be bid before July 1, 2011. He described impact of performing a new location study. The good news is that Project A is 100% funded without any local dollars being spent. ICC, Illinois Jobs Now, and STU (CUUATS) money will pay for it. Project C (the westerly

hookup to Duncan Road) does not require any local dollars to be spent. Project X is funded by STU in the amount of \$1.4 million and a local match that will cost a slightly higher amount. The reason is federal dollars could be used for Phase 2 or right of way acquisition. The bottom line is the project will cost a total of \$20 million with about \$2 million of this amount coming from local match. Some money came from FHWA to IDOT this year that could be allocated to this project and this is how the STU money was allocated. This is real money programmed through different agencies. Weibel informed Blue there would be no vote on the Olympian-Lincoln project tonight. Blue asked the County Board to reaffirm at next opportunity that the purpose and need of projects AXC are valid. He also asked the Board to make a motion of support for the existing report and alignment of Project A. If the Board decides to choose the second or third options, then those options are funded with CUUATS money to a 50% match. This would have to be approved by the CUUATS Board. The County Board would be funding approximately \$60,000-\$85,000 from some funding source. Blue offered to answer any questions from the County Board.

Jay asked if the estimated cost of Project A would build the road over to the green or yellow alignments. Blue confirmed the estimated cost builds the road to the green alignment.

Nudo spoke about development versus impediments to development. He preferred the yellow alignment because it better divided the residential areas from the industrial or commercial areas. He would comment on Shirley Squire's letter under other business. He inquired about the logic in keeping the sweeping S alignment because it would affect eleven properties and the yellow alignment would affect one property. He encouraged working for the best solutions to not interfere with the existing residences, regardless of whether they were built after Shirley Squire's home was constructed.

Michaels asked if the match portion for Project X was based on the road being constructed north of Olympian Drive. Blue explained that all of the different funding was based on the approved (green) alignment. Michaels inquired if the amount would be the same if the alignment was moved further west and stopped at Olympian Drive. Blue answered that it would be a coin flip in regards to construction costs. The \$1.1 million estimate is close if the road stops at Olympian Drive.

Alix appreciated Blue's contributions in clarifying the available options. He asked Blue about the funding. Blue confirmed the funding for Section A is contingent to there being a solution to Section X. The County's contribution would come from the Motor Fuel Tax money. There would be monies available in 2013-2014 to fund a project per the with fringe road agreement. Alix asked if north Lincoln Avenue would be City of Urbana street (not a County road) and if it was true the city does not have the right to condemn land outside the corporate limits. Blue confirmed it would be a street in the City of Urbana. The city has the right to purchase property from a willing seller, but cannot condemn property. The County would have to be the instrument for condemning land, not the City of Urbana. Alix concluded the County did not have a role in this project except for the financial contribution if the Squire Farms owners were willing sellers. The letter from Shirley Squire and Christine Squire Pierson indicated the majority of the farm shareholders are not willing sellers. Blue understood that the Squire Farms agreement required the unanimous consent of all three owners to sell the property. Based on the

letter, it is assumed two of the three parties are not willing sellers. Alix asked if any assurances could be made to anyone regarding whether Olympian Drive will extend east of Lincoln Avenue to U.S. Route 45. Blue understood Shirley Squire's intent as being to get a letter of understanding or an agreement with the landowners along the Olympian Drive corridor that says they would willingly allow the project to proceed. Alix understood one of the City of Urbana's reasons for preferring the green alignment was that it would maximize the size and flexibility of the unbroken parcel west of the new Lincoln Avenue and south of the new Olympian Drive. Blue confirmed that was one of Urbana's stated reasons.

Holderfield inquired whether the engineering costs would vary with the different alignments considering the floodplain. Blue explained that the red alignment would require some floodplain mitigation. The green alignment likely needs more mitigation. Regardless of the alignment some mitigation will be needed.

McGinty thanked Blue for the gathering this information and getting the various parties together. He felt the other landowners found the yellow alignment acceptable as a compromise and it felt that the matter was close to resolution if a full court press is applied to make it happen. He asked if Shirley Squire was averse to the yellow alignment. Blue reiterated that Squire wanted to see Olympian Drive be built to Route 45. He did not know whether her opinion of the yellow line would be favorable if only the A&X portions are constructed. He could not speak on her behalf. McGinty suggested taking the approach quickly move forward to see if it was possible to make the yellow alignment happen. He had no objections to reaffirming the purpose and need of the AXC portions. He encouraged the Board to make the final push to decide on the project. Blue wanted the Board to understand that if the study is reopened, then there was no guarantee that the yellow line is exactly where the alignment will fall.

James exited the meeting at 7:57 p.m. and Weibel exited the meeting at 7:58 p.m.

Discussion continued over the Lincoln Avenue and Olympian Drive projects.

James and Weibel returned to meeting at 8:01 p.m.

Betz was concerned about new lines being drawn after the money has been invested in a study that arrived at a different route. He did not think arbitrary lines should be drawn after a study has been finished or the Board be asked to spend more money on another study. The yellow route may not be the result of a new study and people will be angry with this project no matter what route is selected. Betz wanted to take a vote on whether or not the County Board actually wants to do this project. He requested next month's agenda include items for a direct vote on the AXC project and to either support or reject each of three options.

Langenheim argued the green alignment was far superior to yellow line from the perspective of convenience, safety, and the engineering standpoint. The Board has not discussed the problems of traffic, safety, and construction for the project. Blue concurred that was the result of the 1999 design study

Betz asked for Blue's opinion based on his expertise as the County Engineer. Blue stated that if County Board sees fit to expend the money to restudy the project, then whatever alignment comes out of the study will be what they need to meet today's transportation needs, if the study is done appropriately. He was not a proponent of spending more money or time, but he was a proponent of doing the right thing.

Petrie asked if there were any archeological findings in the area. Blue explained the only known cultural resource is south of Squire Farms. There has not been any investigation west of the Squire homestead. Any artifacts that might be discovered can be removed from the site.

Nudo and Betz exited the meeting at 8:13 p.m.

Petrie asked if the acreage figure given was the amount necessary for the road to be constructed. Blue answered the acreage was the amount needed to build the four lane section in the future. One of the issues that came out of the public participation during the study was that it was appropriate to purchase the right-of-way for a four lane section even if only a two lane section is constructed at this time. Petrie questioned why the yellow alignment was not one of routes originally studied. Kurtz said the westerly route was one of ten routes studied, but not one of final three options. Blue said the yellow alignment was brought by the landowners who are objecting to the approved alignment.

Nudo returned to the meeting at 8:17 p.m.

Alix understood yellow alignment was proposed because it was a road that could be built which only affects one or two landowners, who were willing sellers. The support for having Blue look at the Yellow alignment was based on that idea. There is considerable evidence that the Squire Farms owners are not willing sellers and they would be the most affected owners under the yellow alignment. The green and yellow alignments propose purchasing about the same amount of land. He did not think engineering decisions should be based on taking land from one owner versus taking it from another owner when neither owner is a willing seller.

Betz returned to the meeting at 8:18 p.m.

In response to an earlier question from Petrie, Blue described how the three final options that were a result of the original study all realigned with the existing Lincoln Avenue. This alignment was done to lessen the impact of the land takings along the roadway. The Board also has to consider what will happen to the old Lincoln Avenue if it is not reused as an alignment of the new roadway. He questioned who would accept the burden of maintaining old Lincoln Avenue into the future. In the short term it would probably fall to Somer Township and later to the City of Urbana if the area is annexed into the city. If the new road is not realigned with the existing Lincoln Avenue then there would be parallel routes that would have to be maintained forever. Blue thought this was a large decision-making factor in the original study. The Board members continued to voice their opinions regarding the Olympian Drive and Lincoln Avenue project.

Blue explained IDOT was clear that Olympian Drive could not be built without building Lincoln Avenue. IDOT would not allow the County to simply stop Olympian Drive at a dead end in the middle of nowhere. The Board needs to make a commitment on whether the purpose and need of the projects are viable. If the money is spent to perform a design study then they should follow the recommendations that are a result of the study.

Nudo did not want a study to determine what the best route is. He wanted a study devised to determine if the yellow alignment would work and then let the Board decide. Blue explained a study cannot be performed to look only at the yellow alignment. A consequence of not following the appropriate study process is that nothing is built because the \$20 million is funding is taken away. If the County does not follow the federal aid guidelines when a study is performed then there will be no federal funding for the project.

Betz reiterated his request to have the County Board vote on whether they want this project, not the route, just the project itself next month. If a study is performed, then the Board needs to follow the results of the study. The study should be objective and follow the federal guidelines. He was not convinced the Board would support the alignment that comes out of the study, but he was willing to try it.

Blue asked if Bill Gray, the City of Urbana Public Works Director, could address the Board as someone who has worked on the project since the beginning. Cowart allowed Gray to speak. Gray said he was involved in the location study process for both Olympian Drive and Lincoln Avenue. He wanted the Board to be aware of a few things about the yellow alignment from the Urbana perspective. With the yellow alignment, the area north of Olympian Drive would have to be completed to connect to Lincoln Avenue. There has to be a way to go north and south. The yellow alignment has presented tonight carries about a \$1.2 million additional cost to the green alignment. This money would be spent to obtain the additional right-of-way. The City of Urbana does not want to maintain two parallel roads when the area is annexed in the future. The old Lincoln Avenue is a geometric disaster for truck travel and would someday have to be rebuilt. Gray asked if the County Board would partner with the City of Urbana to build old Lincoln Avenue is its existing alignment. The green alignment was selected because it essentially farms out the existing Lincoln Avenue. It also provides east and west access for future development. If Olympian Drive is eventually built to Route 45, then there will be not second or additional intersection with the existing Lincoln Avenue. Gray wants to have intersections that are at least a half mile apart and the large parcel size intact for development purposed. The green alignment allows this to occur and the yellow alignment does not.

MOTION by James to suspend the rules; seconded by Holderfield. **Motion carried with unanimous support.**

Nudo asked if Gray was saying that he did not care about the eleven affected families who were paying taxes to have their roads improved. Gray said green alignment would affect six families and the yellow alignment would affect four families. He cared about the families, but in any scenario the government would have to purchase right-of-way from a property owner who is either willing or unwilling. This is also true for the Olympian Drive project.

McGinty understood the half mile intersections were preferred from an engineering perspective, but asked Gray if it was possible even if it cost \$1 million extra. This could be considered Phase 2 and been constructed when there is a need to construct a road north of Olympian Drive. Gray explained that IDOT is a major player in this project and discussion were held with that entity. The roads are being built for access and there needs to be access to travel north. McGinty and Gray discussed about the traffic on the roads.

O'Connor asked about the costs. Blue verified the estimates were current and put together by Hanson Engineers. The vast majority (approximately 90%) of the cost will be used to build the bridge. The roadway portion of the Olympian Drive project is minor compared to the cost of the bridge.

Jay stated the County would not be in this position if the City of Urbana had not cut and run on the project years ago.

Alix stated that moving a project from the land of an unwilling seller to a willing seller is a valid reason to reopen an engineering study or look at ways to minimize the impact on unwilling sellers and move the project to land of willing sellers. But simply moving the project from affecting one owner to affecting a different owner is very hard to justify as a reason to reopen a study.

Jones exited the meeting at 8:41 p.m.

Libby Tyler, the City of Urbana Community Development Director, asked to speak to the Board and Cowart gave her permission. Tyler stated the green alignment is in City of Urbana's comprehensive plan adopted in 2005 and the CUUATS long-range transportation plan. She talked about planning jurisdiction and changes that the County Board would be asking the City of Urbana and CUUATS to make if a different alignment is chosen.

Kurtz exited the meeting at 8:43 p.m.

Blue said there has to be a decision made by the County Board about this issue. Weibel concurred.

Other Business

Nudo spoke in response to part of Shirley Squire's letter accusing him of having a conflict of interest. He asked the State's Attorney to determine if he has a conflict of interest concerning the Zieglers. He thinks his wife and Mrs. Ziegler might be second cousins. He does not believe he has a conflict of interest. The Zieglers do not benefit from the sweeping S alignment.

Alix exited the meeting at 8:45 p.m. and returned at 8:46 p.m.

Chair's Report

There was no Chair's Report.

Designation of Items to be Placed on County Board Consent Agenda

Agenda item 7.B.1 was designated for the consent agenda.

Petrie asked for a break because it was almost 9:00 p.m. Betz called for a five-minute break before the Board continued with the other agenda items.

Kurtz returned to the meeting at 8:54 p.m.

COUNTY FACILITIES

Facilities Director

Physical Plant Monthly Reports

MOTION by Cowart to receive and place on file the Final FY2010 Year End Report and Physical Plant December 2010 monthly reports; seconded by Jay. **Motion carried with unanimous support.**

County Facilities Construction History and Potential Long-Term Plan

Reinhart reviewed the Construction History and Potential Long Term Plan he was asked to provide. Betz wanted members to keep this document because they would need to refer back to it over the next few years. Betz asked Reinhart to prioritize the top two-three significant projects in terms of need. Reinhart said it would need to start with the oldest facilities, namely the Brookens Administrative Center, that have the largest deficiencies. Betz asked Reinhart to identify what equipment would need replacing and the time span of projects. Reinhart said all that information is in the study supplied by GHR Engineers during their last assessment program. Betz asked for Busey's opinion. Busey expressed the importance of assessing and upgrading the Brookens Center. The Board needs to start budgeting for the upgrades. There are daily issues with the building's operations. The energy plan adopted by Board is impossible to implement in the Brookens Center because the heating and cooling system were ineffective in certain areas. The Board will also need to look at downtown correctional center in the next year. That building would require a lot of structural work to maintain. The Board needs to make the decision of whether to maintain that building or move the operation out to an expanded Satellite Jail. The Satellite was designed to be expanded and there are operational efficiencies that can be gained with that change. Betz when it should be placed on an agenda to begin the process. Busey recommended no longer than the third quarter of this year.

James wanted to see a plan that lists each building and maintenance needs per buildings with estimated costs. He wanted to budget for these costs to avoid sudden expenditures like the correctional center's chiller repair. Busey stated that Page 37 is beginning of such a plan. They are looking each system instead of each building. The goal is to get a better documented plan to budget for capital replacements. Board continued to discuss long-range planning and budgeting.

Petrie wanted to see a ten-fifteen year plan on building needs, not just replacement and repair. She wanted to know how much of the energy plan has been implemented and how much money the implementation has saved. She talked to people at SEDAC who did this report for the County. Petrie considered the County's monthly energy expenses awe-inspiring and there are ways to save these costs.

Capital Improvement Plan Preliminary Draft

The capital improvement plan preliminary draft was presented to the Board.

202 Art Bartell Construction Project

Report Re: Storm Water Management Planning & Requirements for East Campus

A handout was distributed on the storm water management. Reinhart and Busey met with Tom Berns, the City of Urbana, and Brad Bennett as requested. The City of Urbana storm water management requirements had not changed since 2006. The minimum amount of work necessary has been identified. Other options for future expansion can be designed in the plan.

Betz asked for the rough estimate of the minimum necessary work. Berns said they have not generated an estimate because he does not know what the County Board wants to do yet. James asked if Berns could supply some estimates to the Board in the future at no cost. Berns said yes.

Berkson asked why the public parking was removed from the main public entry. Berns explained she was looking at a concept prepared six years ago regarding what might happen in the renovation of the old Nursing Home facility. Those things have changed and that is not the same plan.

Petrie said she would be happy to have conversations with Berns to discuss alternate ways of designing the storm water management throughout the County campus. She was interested in the work Jim Pagac does. Berns said absolutely.

Betz said the Board would likely take action next month on these issues.

Project Update

Reinhart said the workers are putting half of the concrete floor inside the building tomorrow. The cold weather has delayed the construction. He expects to have an updated schedule supplied by Roessler Construction at next month's meeting.

Chair's Report

Discussion Regarding Possible Re-Design and Upgrade of Shields Meeting Room to Reflect Change in Board Size – Target Date 2012

Betz noted the redesign of this meeting room has been discussed over the years. When the County Board is reduced to 22 members, there will be the opportunity to make the room

more accessible. He would like to authorize Busey to create a budget line item for this project so the Board can look at the issue in 2012. He wants Busey to estimate how much money is needed and bring it to the Board at some time in the future.

MOTION by Langenheim to direct Busey to create a budget line item for the purposes of updating and reconfiguring Shields Meeting Room for new Board size; seconded by Petrie.

Petrie asked if moving the walls was an option. Busey felt the motion was fairly general and they would try to look at the issues that are significant. Moving the walls could be considered. She would probably bring the best overall solution to the Board. The Board members could then pick and choose what issues they do or do not want to do in the solution. Petrie would rather see three different scenarios presented to the Board. Busey replied that was a possibility.

Motion carried with unanimous support.

Other Business

There was no other business.

Designation of Items to be Placed on County Board Consent Agenda

No items were designated for the consent agenda.

ENVIRONMENT & LAND USE

Kurtz wanted to move the study session forward to March 3rd. Busey recommended checking the calendar first. Kurtz said the Board would be contacted if the study session date was changed.

Direction to CCRPC Planner Regarding Proposed Update of the Site Assessment Portion of the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) System Pursuant to LRMP Priority Items 4.5a and 4.5b

MOTION by Schroeder to approve the direction to the CCRPC Planner Regarding Proposed Update of the Site Assessment Portion of the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) System Pursuant to LRMP Priority Items 4.5a and 4.5b; seconded by Richards.

Kurtz wanted to make a revision on Site Assessment Update Committee's membership to change the Planning & Zoning Director to an advisory, not voting, member. This would change the committee to eight members.

James suggested the committee have seven members to avoid a tie vote. Kurtz did not see this committee being controversial or politically partisan. James thought there could still be a tie vote. He thought the Board agreed at the study session that some of the people who had served on the last Update Committee might not be selected again. Kurtz said some investigation

was done and five-six members of the last committee were still living and active in the community. James asked if the spot for the past member would be eliminated if none of the 5-6 previous members wished to serve again and Kurtz agreed.

MOTION by Alix to amend the motion to have the Planning & Zoning Director be an advisory member; seconded by McGinty.

Petrie wanted to amend the motion to add a Soil Scientist from the University of Illinois to the committee as a voting member.

The Board discussed the committee membership.

Motion carried for the Planning & Zoning Director to be an advisory committee member.

MOTION by Petrie to amend the motion by adding a Soil Science Researcher from the University of Illinois as a voting committee member; seconded by Anderson.

Kurtz asked if she had someone in mind and if that person has accepted. Weibel called a point of order because the County Board Chair decides who sits on this committee. He also felt that it should not matter where the Soil Scientist comes from and asked the University of Illinois be dropped. **Petrie and Anderson agreed to drop the University of Illinois as a friendly amendment.**

Schroeder was opposed to this amendment and explained that Terry Savco is the preeminent expert with the Illinois Department of Agriculture. Brad Uken of the Farm Bureau has spoken to Savco and she is happy to help the committee. Monte said Savco would help as consultant, not a voting member who would attend all the meetings. Holderfield concurred that Savco is best person to provide the necessary expertise.

Motion failed to amend the motion to add a Soil Science Researcher to the committee.

MOTION by Jay to amend the motion to change the number of committee member to seven by removing the original 1983 Site Assessment Committee member; seconded by James.

The Board discussed the number of committee members and their qualifications.

Motion carried to amend the motion to a seven member committee by removing the original 1983 Site Assessment Committee member carried with a vote of 10 to 9. Alix, Holderfield, James, Jay, McGinty, Michaels, Nudo, Richards, Schroeder, and Weibel voted in favor of the motion. Anderson, Berkson, Betz, Carter, Cowart, Kurtz, Langenheim, O'Connor, Petrie voted against the motion.

Motion carried to approve the direction to CCRPC Planner and to establish the seven-member Site Assessment Update Committee as amended with the removal of the original 1983

Site Assessment Committee member and the Planning & Zoning Director serving as an advisory member.

Weibel would likely bring the appointment of the committee to the County Board in March.

Direction to Zoning Administrator Regarding Proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments

Request to Amend the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance to Implement Land Resource Management Plan Policies 4.1.5, 4.1.7, and 4.1.9

This item was removed from the agenda.

Request to Amend the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance to Implement Land Resource Management Plan Policies 4.1.6 and 4.3.1-4.3.4

This item was removed from the agenda.

Request to Amend the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance to Implement Land Resource Management Plan Objective 4.4

This item was removed from the agenda.

2011 Countywide Residential Electronics Collections

This item was provided for information only.

Zoning Ordinance Amendments

Request to Amend Champaign County Zoning Ordinance. Zoning Case 665-AT-10 Petitioner: Champaign County Zoning Administrator

MOTION by Alix for preliminary approval of the Zoning Ordinance text amendment, Case 665-AT-10; seconded by Langenheim.

Hall explained the text amendment process. The Board discussed the fence height and the concerns expressed by the Sheriff which caused the addition of the transparency requirement for the front yard.

Motion carried.

Request to Amend Champaign County Zoning Ordinance. Zoning Case 666-AT-10 Petitioner: Champaign County Zoning Administrator

MOTION by Anderson for preliminary approval of the Zoning Ordinance text amendment, Case 666-AT-10; seconded by Langenheim.

Hall explained this amendment made it as clear as possible that the standard conditions for special uses can be waived.

Motion carried with unanimous support.

Monthly Report

No monthly report was distributed.

Other Business

There was no other business.

Chair's Report

Kurtz commended the Board for their cooperation at the study session.

Designation of Items to be Placed on County Board Consent Agenda

No agenda items were designated for the consent agenda.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 9:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kat Bork
Administrative Assistant

Secy's note: The minutes reflect the order of the agenda and may not necessarily reflect the order of business conducted at the meeting.