

CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD
Committee of the Whole Minutes

Tuesday, March 6, 2012 – 6:00pm
Lyle Shields Meeting Room
1776 E. Washington St., Urbana, IL

MEMBERS PRESENT: Alix, Ammons, Anderson, Bensyl, Berkson, Betz, Carter, Cowart, Esry, Holderfield, James, Jay, Kibler, Kurtz, Langenheim, Maxwell, Michaels, O'Connor, Petrie, Quisenberry, Richards, Rosales, Schroeder, Weibel

MEMBERS ABSENT: McGinty, Mitchell, Moser

OTHERS PRESENT: Deb Busey (County Administrator), Julia Reitz, Steve Ziegler and Joel Fletcher (State's Attorney), John Hall (Zoning), Sheriff Walsh, Allen Jones (Sheriff), Alan Reinhart (Facilities Director), Ranae Wolken (recording secretary), JJ Farney (videographer), Nora Stewart, Tara McCauley, Janae Wisehart, Dana Craig, Amy Foster, Kelly Dillard, Dee Ruggles, William Castro, Sarah Lazare, Patsy Howell, Chris Evans, Jerehme Bamberger, Rachel Schwartz, Rohn Koester, Aaron Ammons, many other members of the public

Call to Order

Board Chair Weibel called the meeting to order at 6:03pm.

Roll Call

A roll call was taken and the following were present: Alix, Ammons, Anderson, Bensyl, Berkson, Betz, Carter, Cowart, Esry, Holderfield, James, Jay, Kibler, Kurtz, Langenheim, Maxwell, Michaels, O'Connor, Petrie, Quisenberry, Richards, Schroeder and Weibel. The following members were absent: McGinty, Mitchell, Moser, and Rosales.

Chair Weibel noted that McGinty and Mitchell had notified him that they would not be present at the meeting.

Rosales arrived after roll call.

Approval of Minutes

Motion by Jay to approve the minutes of February 7, 2012, as presented; seconded by Esry. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Approval of Agenda/Addendum

Motion by Carter to approve the agenda for the meeting; seconded by James. There is no addendum.

Motion by Ammons to amend the motion and requested to strike the words pre-design plan from Item F1; seconded by Cowart. She stated the reason was because the RFP was written in a specific way and gets to the heart of the needs assessment. She said didn't feel we are in the timeframe for a pre-design plan. Alix said he was frustrated because the RFP has been in the works for five weeks, and was in support for deferring to get feedback, but not sure that changing

the description on the agenda, but changing the wording on the agenda is the appropriate thing to do. Langenheim concur with Alix's statement. Ammons felt the wording gives the assumption and implication we are building a jail. Alix said the thing to do is change the title is when the discussion comes up on the agenda. **Motion to amend failed.**

A vote taken on original motion to approve the agenda carried with one no vote.

Public Participation

Nora Stewart, President of the Local 900 representing the County's AFSCME employees, spoke and asked that the negotiation team for the County show them the respect they deserve and return to the negotiation table.

Tara McCauley wanted to draw the attention of the Board to the detailed proposals. She asked Board members to study them and hoped the Board would reconsider the proposals since both sides are not very far apart.

Janae Wisehart, Secretary for the Local 900 said they were told there was nothing more to negotiate and asked for reconsideration in the negotiations.

Dana Craig, State's Attorney employee said she was here to ask the Board to listen to what they have to say. She wanted to let management know they still want to negotiate and reach a deal.

Dee Fairchild Ruggles, Professor at the University of Illinois spoke in regard to the design committee. She spoke of the criticisms of the public on the project and she said the County should look forward to different ways of incarcerating individuals who have committed crimes. She asked if a new jail facility is really needed and said that she felt \$20 million was a high price tag. She wanted the Board to consider measures to decrease crime.

William Castro said he was dismayed with reading the reports of the NIC, more specifically with the statistics on racial makeup. He wondered how experts could make unbiased recommendations regarding alternatives to incarceration and jail expansion. He suggested depopulating the downtown jail and eliminating the downtown jail.

Amy Foster wanted to ask one more time to grant the authority to resume the AFSCME negotiations. She felt it was difficult to talk about equality when using percentages for wage increases when there are two different scales for bargaining and non-bargaining. She said the Unit was very willing to work with the county on insurance. She said they worked hard on getting lower insurance premiums and would think those savings would allow the extra authority for salary increases in the negotiations.

Sarah Lazare spoke and said she represented the GEO Local 6300 and wanted to talk about the proposed expansion of the jail. She talked about the issue that the IL Department of Corrections passed the County's jails without any violations, but suggested the Sheriff and others are pushing this issue of needing building issues addressed as an emergency and is problematic. She said the jail expansion effort is not just a building issue. She urged the Board not to rush through and that it should be connected to an understanding how the expansion would work.

Kelly Dillard spoke regarding the amendment to the zoning ordinance that is listed on the agenda and that it affects small business in the county. He said it is far reaching and crippling to small business at a time when we need to increase business. He criticized Mr. Hall regarding the proposed changes. He then mentioned each of the items in the proposed amendment. He asked three things of the Board: to instruct the Zoning office to enforce the Ordinance as written, to not grant Mr. Hall's proposed amendments and to conduct an investigation to the misuse of the zoning codes.

Patsy Howell said she spoke at last month's meeting about letting the public know what is happening with the \$20 million. She said that while she was incarcerated in our jail they were passing out medications and screaming out that calls were made. She felt like she was in a mental institution, not a jail. She said the Needs Assessment should deal with the trends about who will be jailed in the new jail and how to keep up maintenance. She said the Board is not capable to pick a committee that is going to discuss this issue.

Chris Evans talked about Ordinance No. 572 passed in 1998 and of Ordinance No. 683 passes in 2003.

Jerehme Bamberger stated his concern with the influence of the project team over the Board's decisions on how to proceed with the rectifications of the jail. His concern was the team was appointed and there are no existing public records of their meetings. He spoke of portions of the RFP and the selection process.

Rachel Schwartz, candidate for County Board District 7 spoke of the funding of the jail and the rhetoric she heard that the bonds will be paid off and there will be funds available.

Rohn Koester said he has worked as a volunteer in the satellite jail with students in obtaining their GED. He said there are currently more inmates that request enrollment than the program allows. He continued with a description of how the GED and other programs work.

Aaron Ammons said he had questions about the RFP. He spoke about language that referred to the County and the consultants and also about how communication with the public is structured.

Communications

Ammons asked that any written comments of those that spoke in public participation be turned in and be placed on record.

Environment & Land Use

Direction to Zoning Administrator Regarding Proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment to Amend Limits on Vehicles and Equipment in Rural Home Occupations

Motion by Langenheim to direct the Zoning Administrator Regarding Proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment to Amend Limits on Vehicles and Equipment in Rural Home Occupations; seconded by Weibel.

Motion by Weibel to amend the main motion on Item 1E to strike the strike out when it pertains to farm vehicles; seconded by Berkson. **Motion to amend carried with one no vote.**

Jay stated his concerns with this case and with the proposed changes. He said some don't seem to make sense and would like to defer to the June meeting.

Motion by Jay to defer to the June meeting; seconded by Holderfield. Jay said he doesn't see an immediate need, but has a lot of questions. James said he concurred with Jay. Alix said Mr. Dillard made a number of comments, one of which an issue was regarding signage. Kurtz wanted to make sure that Board members give Mr. Hall some direction. Michaels also agreed to defer. Holderfield would like more time because she wasn't sure how the strikeouts would affect any changes in the future and we need complete ordinance. She said it was imperative to do this correctly. She also said that townships have the opportunity to change limits and should have input. Anderson said she was ready to vote, but Mr. Dillard brought up some points, but it seemed there was vague wording that got it to this place. Kurtz really does not want to recognize a deferment in June and wants this to move forward. **A vote on the motion to defer carried with no votes.**

Direction to Zoning Administrator Regarding Proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment to Modify Wind Farm Separation from CR District

Motion by James to direct the Zoning Administrator Regarding Proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment to Modify Wind Farm Separation from a CR District; seconded by Carter. James asked why this was needed. Hall said a land owner is affected by this and that this particular piece of property no longer has the natural features that a CR district is supposed to have. So this land owner was not able to participate in the wind turbine project because of that. Kibler asked where the one mile separation come from. Hall said it was originally a CR District and there were bird and bat fatalities, but now the land doesn't support that.

Bensyl confirmed that at one time there were trees on that property, but no longer are there. A ditch on that area was also rerouted and no longer on that property and is mostly tillable acres. It was noted that a CR district allows houses just like an AG district. Petrie asked if there was nothing in the CR guidelines that gives guidelines or prohibits what happens and is there anything that precludes it becoming a CR district again. Hall said this is the only CR district like this in the entire county. Alix asked why this is a text amendment rather than a zoning or map amendment. Bensyl said the reason for doing this is the landowners around that property with the one mile setback that could have had wind towers couldn't because of the way it is written, even though the land is not put in conservation because the ground has changed over the years.

Weibel pointed out the action tonight only sends this evening's action to ZBA for a public hearing and that should be clarified in the motion. Alix requested the landowner be sent a letter about the change. Hall said they do not ordinarily do that for text amendments, but he will check with the State's Attorney on that. Petrie felt this was not an urgent matter. Langenheim said that having read the text in the agenda, it appears to him that this piece of land should not be in a CR district and should be addressing the more appropriate zoning. If deferred, it will go to ZBA and then it will be referred back to the full County Board for approval. **Motion to forward on to ZBA carried with one no vote.**

Monthly Report

Motion by Betz to receive and place on file the monthly report of the Zoning Director; seconded by Quisenberry. **Motion carried.**

Other Business

None.

County Facilities

QBS Presentation & Overview – Steve Ziegler

A five minute break was taken from approximately 7:40pm to 7:45pm.

Steve Ziegler, with the State's Attorney's office, started a presentation and overview of the Qualifications-Based Section Process. He said that several Board members had already been through this procedure, but it was requested that he conduct this again for some of the newer Board members. He said it was designed to be objective and flexible for obtaining architectural, engineering and other related professional services. He said it was a very streamline procedure. He said the County is required to use this system to select architects and engineers based on competence and qualifications. The issue of fees comes up after the ranking of candidates. It sets a specific proposal. This Act requires local governments to evaluate qualifications of firms and authorized interviews or public presentations. Then those firms are ranked to a minimum of three in order of preference and being negotiations with only the top ranked firm. If a successful contract cannot be negotiated, then the next firm is approached to negotiate a contract and on down the line. Once a contract is completed, the County must work with that firm, unless there are extraordinary circumstances. The County must identify the scope of work and the general timeline. Public notice is then given. A Selection Committee is also appointed. Presentations are given, evaluations are established. A tour of the site may also be given. Interviews are conducted and then the firms are ranked. It was noted that at least three should be identified.

Mr. Ziegler then continued with the steps in the process. Champaign County should go with a public notice system because a bidders list is not maintained by the County. He said the Selection Committee may include representatives of the department responsible for administration of the project and the project's functions and any other stakeholders in the success of the project.

He continued on what to ask for in the proposals: A Statement of Qualifications, Letter of Interest and a Request for Technical Proposals that are detailed plans on how a design professional firm will approach the project. Ziegler said that a number of firms to be included on the shortlist should be determined to be on the shortlist with no less than three and usually no more than five. After the Selection Committee has developed the short list, the firms are contacted and are sent complete information regarding the interview process and requirements, including evaluation criteria to be used for the interview scoring system. A tour of the site is then conducted.

Ziegler described the interview process that includes the scheduling, which is generally thirty minutes for presentation and a Q & A session followed by fifteen minutes of private discussion by the committee. He directed the Board's attention to a sample of an evaluation form and explained the scoring system.

James asked about the process about different projects that may come up. Busey said that painters don't fall under this process. The QBS is for engineers and architects. Maxwell asked a question about the weighing factors in the selection process for the RFP that is on the agenda, which included a statement that costs are 15% of the selected criteria. Busey pointed

out that Mr. Ziegler's presentation on QBS is not the same process as the other agenda item which is the RFP.

Petrie stated she had talked with some people at the State level and they had told her the County could use vendors from their pre-qualified list. Ziegler said that list is for a variety of vendors for State buildings and those are vastly different than County building projects. Petrie said she's already been involved in this process once, and being an urban planner she sees a lot of difference is asking for qualifications and design. She found it an unsatisfactory process. She asked about extricating from the process if a firm is selected. Ziegler stated that can happen during the contract negotiation process. He said the more specific the parameters of the project, the more likely you'll get more specific information back. He also said it may not be an entirely satisfactory process, but it is the one we are required to follow.

Ammons wanted clarification made that the Illinois statutes that set the parameters to use the system. Ziegler said it is the basics you must follow. He said it not bid system and how firms are ranked is up to this Board. Jay asked if once in the negotiation phase with a firm, the County could stop the process then. Ziegler confirmed that negotiations may stop if finances are not agreed upon. Bensyl said he had concern also about adopting someone else's list of vendors because those vendors may not be qualified to build what the County wants, for example those vendors may have qualifications for building schools, but not jail. Brief discussion continued.

Carter asked how different this process is from the courthouse project. Ziegler said it wasn't much different. Alix talked about his experience with this system. He finds where it breaks down is on a project where you don't know what outcome you want. Ziegler said the place where that information could be sorted out is with the Needs study. He used the courthouse project as an example. The Needs Assessment and Pre-Design was conducted because they were told how many courtrooms were needed, what departments would be included in the courthouse and addition. They knew the number of employees that would be located there and they were also told that the old courthouse should remain intact and used. Maxwell said that maintaining a list of pre-qualified engineers and such and didn't think it was the best thing for the County. Ziegler agreed, because the County doesn't have on-going construction projects the way the State does. He agreed with Anderson that State prison systems are different than County jail systems.

Physical Plant Monthly Reports

Motion by James to receive and place on the file the monthly reports of the Physical Plant; seconded by Kibler. **Motion carried unanimously.**

202 Art Bartell Construction Monthly Report

Reinhart stated the only activity is a partial payment to BCA for the storm water management project.

Motion by Jay to receive and place on file the monthly report; seconded by Bensyl. **Motion carried unanimously.**

East Campus Storm Water Management Project Bid Opening Schedule

Reinhart stated the project is on schedule. Drawings have been reviewed and dates have now been set for the bidding on the construction of the project as listed in the agenda. He said that Board members are welcome to join the Pre-bid Meeting that is to be held at the ILEAS building on March 20. The Bid opening is scheduled for March 27 at the Brookens building. A recommendation for the full Board should occur in April. Brief discussion about bid bonds continued.

Courthouse Sound System Project Update

Reinhart said the sound system update is moving forward smoothly and that sound systems in the courthouse are upgraded and working well. They're working tonight at the Adult Detention Center for the remote video arraignment system. The courthouse arraignment system is in. They hope to have all systems up and running by the end of the week. Reinhart confirmed for James that there is a one year warranty on all labor and materials on this project.

Jail Space Improvement Project

Approval of Release of RFP for Consultant Services for Needs Assessment and Pre-Design Planning

Motion by Kurtz to release the RFP for Consultant Services for Needs Assessment Study for Champaign County Corrections; seconded by Langenheim. Weibel stated a more recent update copy had been placed at the members' desks.

Motion by Ammons to strike "do nothing" on page 4, paragraph two and amend the time frame on page 4, assuming this was approved this evening. She suggested the release date be March 23 and adjust the schedule from there, as follows: Responses due May 25, Jail Planning Project Team Notification of Selection of Short-Listed Firms, June 18, the Short Listed Firm Interviews with the County Board on July 10; Top Ranked Firm Selection on July 11, Contract Negotiation July 12thru 19th and the County Board award of contract being July 26; seconded by Carter. Petrie asked if presentations could be made on the date normally held for the study session in June, rather than July 10 because that is a date already set aside normally. Ammons agreed with the amendment from Petrie. Betz asked Ammons if the two items in her motion could be separated.

There was no objection to the change to separate. The committee agreed upon the change of deleting the words "do nothing" Discussion turned back to the timeline. Busey asked if the Top-Ranked Firm Selection could be moved to June 27 because that will be determined by the County Board on the 26th and then the contract negotiation could begin and not wait. Ammons agreed with that. Kibler wanted clarification that if the Committee of the whole agreed upon all changes this evening, then could it not be released in accordance with the timeline originally in the RFP. Quisenberry said he would like to get through with this discussion this evening, so that it can be released.

Motion by Weibel to defer discussion of the timeline to the end of the discussion of the RFP; seconded by Kurtz. Alix said that Kibler had made a good point about the dates because procedurally nothing goes to the full Board for vote, that Committee makes the approval for a release of an RFP. Ammons said she was not comfortable with getting the new edited copy this evening and does not disagree with a majority of the framework of the RFP. Weibel said not much was edited in the version on the tables, only with the dates and two other phrases in the RFP. Holderfield said it is more advantageous to go through the rest of the RFP and if there are

date changes that are appropriate, they can be made later. **Motion to defer the discussion to the end of the discussion carried.**

Ammons asked for clarity on methodology in selection process from Ms. Busey. Busey said it is spelled out for determining the firms that will present their options. She said on page 7 there should be an amendment to change “may elect to shortlist two or three firms” to “shall short-list the firms” Alix asked if the Chair would entertain straw votes on the text changes. Betz asked how many members had changes or amendment suggestions. Five members raised their hands. He asked if they were substantive or errata. Ammons stated her respect about time, but also didn’t want to take this issue lightly. Alix asked if there was a mechanism to defer, but continue the discussion. Betz did not feel this could happen. Weibel would not like to defer again without some discussion. Holderfield agreed with Weibel so that it is known what is out there to discuss. Betz received consent to Busey’s suggestions about “the firms”.

Motion by Ammons to include the phrase “including any that could contribute to racial disparities in jail population versus county demographics” after “criminal justice system,”; seconded by Alix. Weibel asked if it could just read “including any that could contribute to racial disparity” because it says the same thing. Ammons accepted that change. **A roll call vote carried with Alix, Ammons, Anderson, Berkson, Betz, Carter, Cowart, Holderfield, Kibler, Kurtz, Langenheim, Maxwell, O’Connor, Petrie, Quisenberry, Richards, Rosales and Weibel voting yes and with Bensyl, Esry, James, Jay and Michaels voting no.**

Motion by Ammons to add “as well as community based treatment, education and prevention programs.” after agencies in #5 of the Scope of Services section and to change the phrase “incarceration or to add appropriate” to “incarceration and identify appropriate” in the same section, next sentence and to strike the entire last sentence in #7 of the same section; seconded by Cowart. Petrie stated her position in requesting that last sentence be added. She said we need to think what will happen with the downtown facility and what if it can be repurposed. Maxwell suggested leaving it in and directing the consultant to make suggestions. Brief discussion continued. Unanimous consensus on striking the sentence in #7. In #8 she asked about changing the phrase “estimate does not need to include other considerations,” to “estimate should include other considerations”. Alix spoke and said the language in the last sentence and suggestion was made to change “some operational costs” to “all operational costs, including”. Busey said she didn’t want the Board to think this consultant would be the one to determine with the budget for any project that is determined. The budget is not determined until a firm is selected for the architect and determines what will actually be done. James said the consultant should just determine what the needs actually are. Discussion continued. Betz asked for consensus to add the word “acknowledge” to Ammons’ phrase in #8. Consensus of the Board was to accept those small changes. In #9, Ammons asked about the second sentence. She felt it should be put in the methodology section and Busey agreed that should be okay. **Motion on Ammons motion for changes in Paragraph #2 carried with Alix, Ammons, Anderson, Berkson, Betz, Carter, Cowart, Holderfield, Kibler, Kurtz, Langenheim, Maxwell, O’Connor, Petrie, Quisenberry, Richards, Rosales and Weibel voting yes and with Bensyl, Esry, James, Jay and Michaels voting no.**

Petrie asked Busey to explain when thinking about the category of criteria when giving percentages to methodology. Busey said there are four different areas such as the firms’ unique approach and how they may do the work. Petrie asked if a copy could be sent to the Board members on that. Petrie also asked about how the first round of selections happened. The split would be 60/40 split between methodology and qualifications.

Petrie wanted to decouple the variables of the maintenance only clause. She felt it should be considered along the timeline, rather than waiting on a plan presented by the consultants. Betz felt maintaining the jail along the line is a separate issue from this proposal.

Motion by Petrie to decouple the maintenance only factor in the second paragraph and be considered separately; seconded by Ammons. Quisenberry also agreed with Betz that the building will continue to be maintained whether or not it is considered a part of a future plan. Brief discussion continued. Petrie said her major concern was with information given by Reinhart and the amount of money that would need to be put into the downtown facility and to have a clear idea how much maintenance would need to be done. **Motion failed.**

Motion by Petrie that the request for costs that are in the RFP be removed from the RFP on Page 16. **Motion fails for lack of a second.**

Motion by Berkson that the Committee of the Whole be the team that makes the shortlist, rather than the Jail Project Planning Team; seconded by Rosales. Betz's interpretation of the Berkson motion is that all those who apply make a presentation. Berkson said no, that the whole Board should make the shortlist as to who makes presentations. She felt this is the most important step in the entire process. Bensyl asked what the project team would then do, to which Betz replied it would not exist. Alix stated his concern about a logistical problem with having all twenty-seven Board members review the proposals to make a shortlist. He mentioned it is a good idea to have Board members' input as to who makes the shortlist and said he is open to supporting the motion if it is explained how it would work in a way that doesn't deprive the input of the Sheriff and those others in the system. Berkson felt the Board should be the decision maker. She said the firm chosen could go to the Sheriff for his input. Maxwell said we might consider having someone neutral in the selection process.

Michaels said in some ways she understands both Berkson and Alix said, but also thinks we have to have the input of those working in the facilities day in and day out because they know how it functions and doesn't want to see them eliminated from the process. Ammons said one her initial changes was to include the Justice and Social Services team in the process, but also does not disagree with Berkson. She also feels the Planning Team did a good job putting the RFP together, but feels there is a little slight that there should probably be another group reviewing those selected to interview. Petrie offered a compromise that there are three groups do the scoring: the Project Team, the Justice and Social Services Team and the County Board, and let them all score.

Langenheim said with regard to logistics, as we did with the Nursing Home Project and many other projects in the last decade or so, we had a set of firms and saw a pre-selected group of those. He asked if it were possible to take the rejected submissions and have those available for Board member that want to look through them and then make a decision to allow one or two of them to make a presentation, if approved. Quisenberry suggested having a few or four Board members in the scoring process, part of the team in that effort. Betz pointed out there are already two Board Members on that committee. He spoke of past successful projects built. He said that nothing precludes the County Board to review anything.

Kibler asked if the proposals received could be put on the County's website and allow anyone on the Board to review them and put in their input. James said he trust the Project Team and wondered logistically how the entire Board would meet with these proposers. He said the process has its merits. Jay concurred with James, but also wanted everyone to keep in mind

there is confidentiality involved. He said the Project Team is the best group to begin the project with. Cowart said she supported Berkson's motion. Anderson said she could see adding two more Board members to the evaluation team. She thought there is a good possibility that a number of the proposers may not even have the qualifications and could be weeded out right away in the initial screening. Berkson said she did not feel that a small team would know what the County Board would want.

Holderfield said she understands the concerns, but we're not experts in the field and said it is the most important thing is that the RFP is written with what is requested. She said we will never know what those on the Team know working in that field every day. The Sheriff said he couldn't say how important it is to have the layout, no matter what the decision is, is a critical factor in the way he and his staff and his successors will work. He said this is a huge undertaking of this Team and didn't see a decision coming quickly, because they have to do research and background checks. Reitz stated her willingness to put in the time and has no personal stake as an elected official. She said those on the Team are accountable to the citizens of the County and there is no benefit to them other than to be sure it is done properly. Bensyl feels exactly the same way, and said he's smart enough to know when not to make those decisions. He said he is a firm believer in smaller groups.

Rosales said he appreciates what Reitz said, but they have defined roles as elected officials and the County Board has fiduciary roles. He felt all three groups should have equal input, but it is the Board's decision to make. Kurtz said there are numerous aspects of this process, but we need to get the RFP out tonight and was satisfied with most of the concerns of this Board. He felt we need the best people on the Team who understand from all the system from all perspectives. He didn't see the Board being able to spend the time reviewing all of the proposals that will be received. Richards stated his concern for having all twenty-seven Board members reviewing the RFP. He is open to having the Project Team and the Advisory Team review the proposals. Esry agreed, but asked if the Project Team could provide a summary of comments of those rejected proposal provided as to why they felt those proposals were satisfactory. Betz felt it was very possible that a large number of proposals will be received in this economy.

Motion by Ammons to substitute Berkson's motion to incorporate what Esry suggested with regard to providing comments to the County Board about the rejected proposals; seconded by Carter. Alix asked at what point the submissions become public information. Busey said procedurally, when all the responses are received the list of those respondents can be made available to the Board members. Then the selection process begins with tours and evaluations. They can share that information with the Board. This is the typical process. She said it takes at least two hours per response to do due diligence and research. In terms of publishing the RFP's, the proposers will not want their proposals published because that would expose their strategy. Alix if it was appropriate to allow County Board Members to inspect the submissions prior to the decision. Busey said all Board Members would have access to those. **Ammons withdrew her motion.**

Motion by Petrie to offer a compromise to Berkson's motion to add several Board Members and add some from the Task Force; seconded by Ammons. **Motion carried.**

Motion to change the words "Jail Project Planning Team" to "County Board Members" in the Selection Process Section failed by roll call vote with Ammons, Berkson, Carter, Cowart, O'Connor, Rosales and Weibel voting yes and with Alix, Anderson, Bensyl,

Betz, Esry, Holderfield, James, Jay, Kibler, Kurtz, Langenheim, Maxwell, Michaels, Petrie, Quisenberry and Richards voting no.

Motion by Alix to add the following to Section VIII, last sentence “The final report and supporting documents shall be made in electronic form to be placed on the County’s website”; seconded by Ammons. **Motion carried.**

Kibler pointed out a punctuation error in the introduction section, second paragraph that a colon should replace the period in the first sentence, which received consensus of the Board.

Motion by Ammons to add members from the members of the Justice and Social Services task force to the Project Planning Team for the selection process; seconded by Petrie. She said this project will deal with larger issues than the facility itself. James disagreed with that because that is an advisory team and that it is the Board that makes the decision. Richards asked how many members Ammons thought should be put on the Team. Ammons suggested that he and that group get together and select a couple among themselves as to who will be on the selection team. Alix like that idea, but didn’t see how it could be done legally due to the confidentiality issues.

Motion by Richards to amend Ammon’s motion as follows: Two members from the Task Force be appointed to the Selection Team and that the County Board Chair makes those appointments and that they sign a confidentiality agreement; seconded by Quisenberry. Brief discussion followed. Michaels said the Task Force hasn’t even been appointed yet and that could delay this even further. Carter said that the County Board shouldn’t allow others that are not on the County Board to be on the selection team, because that is when problems occur. Betz said we have had successful projects in the past with the system that is already outlined. He also said that just because we don’t get the result we want, does not mean the process is bad. Weibel said one problem that may come up is that the posting for the task force did not include the task of serving on a selection team for the RFP. **Motion to amend failed with a roll vote with Alix, Ammons, Anderson, Berkson, Cowart, Kurtz, Petrie, Quisenberry and Richards voting yes and with Bensyl, Betz, Carter, Esry, Holderfield, James, Jay, Kibler, Langenheim, Maxwell, Michaels, O’Connor and Weibel voting no.**

Main Motion by Ammons failed by roll call vote with Ammons, Berkson, Carter, Cowart, Petrie and Richards voting yes and with Alix, Anderson, Bensyl, Betz, Esry, Holderfield, James, Jay, Kibler, Kurtz, Langenheim, Maxwell, Michaels, O’Connor, Quisenberry and Weibel voting no.

Motion by Ammons to add one additional County Board member from one of the minority districts of color to the selection committee; seconded by Petrie. James said he finds that offensive because he represents many minorities in his district. Berkson said all those on the committee now are the keepers of the jail and also felt there should be someone of color on the committee. Kurtz asked if Ammons if she was volunteering for this position, to which she affirmed that. Richards asked if there was a way to get someone of color from the other side, but not necessarily a Board Member. Reitz agreed with James and said she is an elected official and represents the County as a whole and was willing to hear from anyone who had comments in the process.

Motion by Jay to call the question; seconded by James. **Motion carried.**

Motion by Ammons carried with roll call vote with Alix, Ammons, Anderson, Berkson, Betz, Carter, Cowart, Kurtz, Petrie, Quisenberry, Richards and Weibel voting yes and with Bensyl, Esry, Holderfield, James, Jay, Kibler, Langenheim, Maxwell, Michaels and O'Connor voting no.

Discussion returned to the discussion of the timeline. Ammons withdrew her motion for changing the dates. Busey said she would email the revised RFP to all Board members and let them know she will still have time to make any corrections if a mistake is caught prior to March 9, the release date.

A vote on the original motion to approve the RFP as amended carried by roll call vote with Alix, Ammons, Anderson, Berkson, Betz, Carter, Cowart, Esry, Holderfield, James, Jay, Kibler, Kurtz, Langenheim, Maxwell, Michaels, O'Connor, Petrie, Quisenberry, Richards and Weibel voting yes and with Bensyl voting no.

Other Business

None.

Policy, Personnel & Appointments

Appointments/Reappointments

Lincoln Legacy Committee

Motion by Weibel to recommend to the full Board approval of the reappointment of Raymond Cunningham to the Lincoln Legacy Committee for a term ending February 28, 2015; seconded by Esry. **Motion carried.**

C-U Mass Transit District

Motion by Weibel to recommend to the full Board approval of the appointment of Jermaine Raymer to the Champaign-Urbana Mass Transit District Board for a term ending December 31, 2016; seconded by Langenheim. Chair Weibel stated Mr. Raymer is a republican from Champaign and a daily user of the MTD. **Motion carried.**

County Administrator

Vacant Positions Listing

For information only.

Other Business

Resolution Establishing the Champaign County Local Foods Policy Council

Motion by Petrie to recommend to the full Board approval of a Resolution Establishing the Champaign County Local Foods Policy Council; seconded by Richards. Quisenberry said he had the understanding that there would be some feedback from the Extension to see if there was duplicate work on that. Petrie pointed the members' attention to a memo placed on the tables. She said the Extension was in full support of a council being established and don't see this as their role, which is education. Quisenberry said he feels there is more demand in the County for local food than what is available.

Motion by Weibel to amend the motion to add a final “Whereas” to read as follows: Whereas, the Council will review available options where the Council could/should be centered or housed, and evaluate each option in terms of relationships of the local food market, financial backing, and member appointment process”; seconded by Alix. **Motion to amend carried.**

Discussion returned to the main motion. **A roll call vote on the motion as amended carried with Alix, Ammons, Anderson, Betz, Carter, Cowart, Langenheim, Maxwell, Michaels, Petrie, Quisenberry, Richards and Weibel voting yes and with Bensyl, Esry, James, Jay, Kibler and O’Connor voting no.**

Consideration of Position in Opposition to HB5252

Busey explained that the state would change how the said the Rental Housing Support Fee is collected and currently retained by the County and is deposited in the County’s general revenue fund. This proposed bill would change that to the State holding the revenue. The fee is collected through the County Recorder’s office.

Motion by Richards to recommend approval of a Resolution in Opposition to HB5252; seconded by Quisenberry. Richards stated he was the one who asked it be put on the agenda. **Motion carried with one no vote.**

Chair’s Report

None.

Other Business

None.

Adjournment

Chair Weibel declared the meeting adjourned at 11:37pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Ranae Wolken
Recording Secretary

Secretary’s note – The minutes reflect the order of the agenda and may not necessarily reflect the order of business conducted at the meeting.