



CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE – Highway/Facilities/ELUC Agenda
County of Champaign, Urbana, Illinois
Thursday, February 10, 2011 – 6:00 p.m.

Lyle Shields Meeting Room, Brookens Administrative Center
1776 East Washington Street, Urbana, Illinois

	<u>Page Number</u>
I. <u>Call To Order</u>	
II. <u>Roll Call</u>	
III. <u>Approval of Minutes</u>	
A. Committee of the Whole – January 11, 2011	*1-12
B. Olympian-Lincoln Special Committee – November 10, 2010	*13-24
IV. <u>Approval of Agenda/Addenda</u>	
V. <u>Public Participation</u>	
VI. <u>Communications</u>	
VII. <u>Highway & Transportation:</u>	
A. <u>Monthly Reports</u>	
1. County & Township Motor Fuel Tax Claims – January 2011	*25
B. <u>County Engineer</u>	
1. Intergovernmental Agreement for the Jurisdictional Transfer of County Highway 32 in Gifford	*26-32
2. Lincoln Avenue/Olympian Drive	
C. <u>Other Business</u>	
D. <u>Chair’s Report</u>	
E. <u>Designation of Items to be Placed on County Board Consent Agenda</u>	
VIII. <u>County Facilities</u>	
A. <u>Facilities Director</u>	
1. Physical Plant Reports	
a. Final FY2010 Year End Report	*33
b. Monthly Reports – December 2010	*34-35
2. County Facilities Construction History and Potential Long Term Plan	*36
3. Capital Improvement Plan Preliminary Draft	*37

B. 202 Art Bartell Construction Project

1. Report Re: Storm Water Management Planning & Requirements for East Campus
(*Separate Attachment*)
2. Project Update

C. Chair's Report

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

D. Other Business

E. Designation of Items to be Placed on County Board Consent Agenda

IX. Environment & Land Use

A. 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 (See Study Session Agenda Packet)

B. Direction to Zoning Administrator Regarding Proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments (See Study Session Agenda Packet)

1. 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
2. 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
3. Request to Amend the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance to Implement Land Resource Management Plan Objective 4.4

C. 2011 Countywide Residential Electronics Collections *38-41
(*Provided for Information Only*)

D. Zoning Ordinance Amendments

1. Request to Amend Champaign County Zoning Ordinance. Zoning Case 665-AT-10 Petitioner: Champaign County Zoning Administrator *42-67
2. Request to Amend Champaign County Zoning Ordinance. Zoning Case 666-AT-10 Petitioner: Champaign County Zoning Administrator *68-82

E. Monthly Report (To Be Distributed)

F. Other Business

G. Chair's Report

H. Designation of Items to be Placed on County Board Consent Agenda

X. Adjourn

1 **CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD**
2 **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MINUTES**
3

4
5 **Highway & Transportation/County Facilities/Environment & Land Use**
6 **Tuesday, January 11, 2011**
7 **Lyle Shields Meeting Room, Brookens Administrative Center**
8 **1776 E. Washington St., Urbana, Illinois**
9

10 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Christopher Alix, Carol Ammons, Jan Anderson, Astrid Berkson,
11 Thomas Betz, Stephanie Holderfield, Stan James, John Jay, Alan
12 Kurtz, Ralph Langenheim, Brendan McGinty, Alan Nudo, Steve
13 O'Connor, Patti Petrie, James Quisenberry, Michael Richards,
14 Giraldo Rosales, Jonathan Schroeder, C. Pius Weibel
15

16 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Ron Bensyl, Lloyd Carter, Lorraine Cowart, Brad Jones, Greg
17 Knott, Diane Michaels, Steve Moser, Larry Sapp
18

19 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Jeff Blue (County Engineer), Kat Bork (Administrative Assistant),
20 Deb Busey (County Administrator), John Farney (County Clerk's
21 Office), John Hall (Planning & Zoning Director), Susan Monte
22 (RPC County Planner), Alan Reinhart (Facilities Director)
23

24 **CALL TO ORDER**

25
26 Weibel called the meeting to order at 6:08 p.m.
27

28 **ROLL CALL**

29
30 Busey called the roll. Alix, Ammons, Anderson, Berkson Betz, Holderfield, James, Jay,
31 Kurtz, Langenheim, McGinty, Nudo, O'Connor, Petrie, Quisenberry, Richards, Rosales,
32 Schroeder, and Weibel were present at the time of roll call, establishing the presence of a
33 quorum.
34

35 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

36
37 **MOTION** by Betz to approve the Committee of the Whole minutes of December 7,
38 2010; seconded by Rosales. **Motion carried with unanimous support.**
39

40 **APPROVAL OF AGENDA/ADDENDA**

41
42 **MOTION** by Betz to approve only the agenda; seconded by Langenheim.
43

44 Ammons wanted to be sure the motion did not include approving the addendum. Weibel
45 confirmed that was correct.
46

47 **Motion carried with unanimous support.**

48 **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

49
50 Bruce Stickers, who works with the Champaign County Soil & Water Conservation
51 District, wanted to address the proposed update of the site assessment portion of land evaluation,
52 pursuant to the Land Resource Management Plan (LRMP). He stated the Soil & Water
53 Conservation District produces a resource report for the County's Planning & Zoning
54 Department when anyone wants to construct a project or subdivision in the county or cities. The
55 County performs the site assessment to rate a construction project. He noted the system has
56 never been reviewed since it was put into place in February 1984. The Soil & Water
57 Conservation District Board has included improving the system in their work plan every year and
58 every year it has not been done. Stickers wanted the County Board to direct the RPC to do this
59 and that he participate on the panel.

60
61 O'Connor entered the meeting at 6:13 p.m.

62
63 Stickers said the their Soil & Water Conservation District Board was willing to name a
64 person from their board to also serve on the panel when they know the review will actually go
65 forward. The Soil & Water Conservation District Board was willing to cooperate in any way
66 requested by the County Board.

67
68 **COMMUNICATIONS**

69
70 Weibel reminded the Board that this Friday is the County-Wide MLK Celebration taking
71 place at the Hilton Garden Inn in Champaign at 4:00 p.m. The event is free to everyone.

72
73 Anderson commented the Nursing Home Board of Directors meet yesterday and learned
74 the Nursing Home's is \$233,000 positive for closing out the year. The average census was 196.5
75 for the year.

76
77 James said a meeting was held at the Champaign-Urbana Public Health District
78 (CUPHD) about the Cherry Orchard Apartments situation near Thomasboro. Board members
79 can contact CUPHD Administrator, Julie Pryde, if they want more information.

80
81 Ammons exited the meeting at 6:17 p.m.

82
83 **HIGHWAY & TRANSPORTATION**

84 **Monthly Reports**

85 **County & Township Motor Fuel Tax Claims – December 2010**

86
87 **MOTION** by Langenheim to receive and place on file the County & Township Motor
88 Fuel Tax Claims for December 2010; seconded by James. **Motion carried with unanimous**
89 **support.**

94 **County Engineer**

95 **Resolution for the Improvement of County Highways 11 & 32 Section #10-00429-00-RS**

96

97 Blue explained the resolution concerns the road that runs from Thomasboro straight east,
98 then turns north and goes to Gifford, up to Route 136, and then continues north up to County
99 Road 9. The plan is to mill and overlay 15.5 miles of the road. This is a federal aid project and
100 the Highway Department has also applied for funding through the Truck Access Route Program,
101 via the TARP, to upgrade the road to support 80 pound trucks. It will be bid in June 2011 and
102 likely constructed in July/August. Blue has a meeting tomorrow morning with the Gifford
103 Mayor about also performing some road improvements through Gifford during this project.

104

105 Blue asked that the resolution be amended to read \$800,000 instead of \$600,000 from the
106 County's allotment of Motor Fuel Tax funds. The total project cost is estimated at \$4 million,
107 with \$3.2 million coming from the federal government. The TARP funding will cover the
108 \$800,000 if the application is successful.

109

110 Ammons returned at 6:20 p.m.

111

112 **MOTION** by Kurtz to approve the Resolution for the Improvement of County Highways
113 11 & 32 Section #10-00429-00-RS as amended; seconded by James.

114

115 Petrie asked what the Highway Department would do if the TARP money is not granted.
116 Blue confirmed the department has the \$800,000 in its budget to cover the project.

117

118 **Motion carried with unanimous support.**

119

120 **Resolution for the Improvement of County Highway 18 (Monticello Road) Section #10-00430-**
121 **00-RS**

122

123 Blue explained this resolution would authorize the County Board Chair to sign a joint
124 agreement with IDOT for the improvement of Monticello Road. The majority of the Monticello
125 Road work was done last year. This agreement is for the intersection of Route 45 and Monticello
126 Road. IDOT is working on Route 45 this year and Blue delayed the intersection work to
127 coincide with IDOT's construction. IDOT will do the loops that control the stoplight under their
128 contract. The resolution will also appropriate \$61,000 for the County's share of the project.

129

130 **MOTION** by Langenheim to approve the Resolution for the Improvement of County
131 Highway 18 (Monticello Road) Section #10-00430-00-RS; seconded by Holderfield.

132

133 Ammons asked what the County is paying for if IDOT is doing the project. Blue
134 explained the \$61,000 will do the work on Monticello Road while IDOT is doing its Route 45
135 project. O'Connor commended Blue for approaching the project in this manner to avoid any
136 Monticello Road work from having to be redone after IDOT's Route 45 project is complete.

137

138 **Motion carried with unanimous support.**

139

140 **Other Business**

141

142 Blue was aware there has been some conversation about Olympian Drive and Lincoln
143 Avenue. He informed the Board that he has been working with the Squire family and Jason
144 Barickman, who represents some land owners, as he was directed by the Olympian-Lincoln
145 Special Committee in November. These conversations with landowners have been in an effort to
146 reach a compromise in finding a westerly route for Lincoln Avenue. Blue does not have
147 anything to report to the County Board because he has been in negotiations with the landowners
148 to reach a solution. He feels that he has a good working relationship with the Squire family and
149 Mr. Barickman.

150

151 Betz asked if there was a finite time the state funds dedicated to this project would be
152 held. Blue said no state funds were appropriated for the Lincoln Avenue project, all the state
153 funds are appropriated to the Olympian Drive project. These funds are not finite in terms of
154 time. The majority are Illinois Commerce Commission funds to build the bridge over the
155 railroad tracks. These funds are slated for use in 2013. The impetus is to find a terminus for the
156 Olympian Drive project and determine where Lincoln Avenue will be built. Betz asked if it was
157 true the Lincoln Avenue terminus does not have fixed funding at this point in time. Blue
158 answered no. Betz requested a cost estimate. Blue said building Lincoln Avenue will cost about
159 \$4 million. Betz asked where that money will likely come from. Blue answered it would likely
160 be federal aid urban allotments and/or some kind of prospective federal money that the City of
161 Urbana would request.

162

163 Nudo was under the impression that the City of Urbana has money they could allocate to
164 Lincoln Avenue and the City could request a change if the state representatives and state senators
165 agreed with it. Blue said that could happen. Nudo noted most of the County Board received a
166 letter from the people affected by the sweeping S alignment that indicated they were willing to
167 compromise if the design is changed. Barickman indicated his clients were amenable to this
168 subject in the negotiations with the Squire family. Blue said they are trying to take it in steps.
169 He is working with Barickman, including a four-hour negotiation session held with two-thirds of
170 the Squire family last week. They agreed in the sessions to make sure everyone is open and
171 willing to make some concessions before they start trying to determine how far the road can be
172 built from Ms. Squire's house. They are diligently working on Step 1 in order to get to Step 2,
173 but Blue does not want to overstep his bounds and push someone the wrong way who may be
174 open to discussions. The February 1st deadline may not happen, but Blue confirmed they are
175 working diligently to get an open discussion going about the possibilities.

176

177 Alix was sympathetic to the affected landowners, but reminded the Board to take into
178 account that there are not too many parcels in Champaign-Urbana suitable for a rail-served
179 development. He would hope they are attempting to maintain parcels on the west side of any
180 Lincoln Avenue extension that will be large enough for rail-served development in the spirit of
181 compromise. Blue confirmed it takes half a mile away from the railroad bridge to be returned to
182 a level roadway.

183

184 Jay asked how much the County is obligated to financially support Lincoln Avenue.
185 Blue said it would be half of the local share. This amount could be anywhere from \$0 to \$2
186 million.
187

188 **Chair's Report**

189
190 Jay advised Board members to drive carefully on the slick roads due to the weather.
191

192 **Designation of Items to be Placed on County Board Consent Agenda**

193
194 Agenda items 7.B.1&2 were designated for the consent agenda.
195

196 **COUNTY FACILITIES**

197 **Facilities Director**

198 **Physical Plant Monthly Reports**

199
200 Reinhart reminded the Board that this monthly report does not contain the final figures
201 for 2010. The final numbers will be provided next month.
202

203 **MOTION** by Jay to receive and place on file the Physical Plant November 2010 monthly
204 reports; seconded by Kurtz. **Motion carried with unanimous support.**
205

206 **202 Art Bartell Rd. Project Update**

207
208 Reinhart stated the super structure is complete. Installation of the roof was scheduled to
209 start today, but was delayed due to the snow. The steel structure was delivered on schedule, but
210 they are a little behind on the concrete flatwork because of the cold snap. They plan to make up
211 the work and the project is on schedule.
212

213 Nudo asked if the construction crew would use blankets to protect the structure while
214 construction is underway. Reinhart confirmed they are using blankets on the installed footing
215 work and will heat what will be the office areas to begin construction.
216

217 **History of Champaign County Energy Audits and Projects**

218
219 **MOTION** by Ammons to receive and place on file the History of Champaign County
220 Energy Audits and Projects; seconded by Petrie.
221

222 Petrie appreciated having the history and asked why proposals were rejected in 2004 and
223 2006. Reinhart believed the simple answer was that those recommendations were very cost
224 prohibitive and the County does not have the support staff to maintain its own power lines.
225

226 **Motion carried with unanimous support.**
227
228
229

230 East Campus Storm Water Update

231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275

Reinhart had a meeting with Tom Berns and Bill Clancy from Berns Clancy & Associates. They have identified the minimum amount of work they think will be necessary to satisfy the City of Urbana. They also looked at storm water planning for the next five to ten years. There will be a meeting this week with the City of Urbana Planners to make sure they are in agreement on the minimum requirements before designing a package to put out for bids.

Betz asked if Reinhart would request three different levels of proposals for the minimum work, the five-year outlook, and the ten-year outlook so the Board could select which type of plan they prefer. Reinhart thought he could put that together with some estimates in current dollars. Figures on future planning can change because future prices are unknowable. Betz asked if the Board wanted to receive the three levels of proposals to evaluate long-range planning versus financial possibilities.

Petrie remarked that she sent information about work Jim Pagac has done to Betz and asked Reinhart to comment. Reinhart confirmed Betz had forwarded him the information and explained he has not had a chance to review it yet. Petrie wanted him to look at it because Pagac has been brought into the community by the City of Urbana and could offer an alternative approach to storm water management that may reduce costs. She would be happy to work with Reinhart on getting information about this and bringing Pagac back into the community.

Richards wanted to receive the multiple level proposals as described by Betz to give the Board different options with the East Campus storm water construction.

Busey explained she was participating in the City of Urbana's storm water site management project and has seen the presentations Petrie was referring to. When the County meets with the City of Urbana, the City could provide their ideas on storm water management options that the County may want to consider. The County does not have the budget for another outside consultant at this time. They are working with Berns Clancy because that firm is the most familiar with the campus and brings their expertise on storm water management. She anticipates that she and Reinhart would bring a range of options to the Board.

Betz wondered if they wanted to anticipate building an addition to the County Jail or other potential buildings in the storm water management project. Nudo agreed this type of project could be phased. Since the project was bonded, he asked Busey how much was in the budget for this portion of the project. Busey said there was about \$400,000-\$450,000 in the budget for the storm water management part of the project. Langenheim liked the idea of anticipating future needs because the County's history with Physical Plant projects has been penny-wise and pound-foolish. Petrie understood the County is employing Berns Clancy & Associates, but she wanted to bring in another consultant to look at another design that could be done for less money. Richards suggested having a study session at some point to review the proposals for this project before a decision has to be made. Betz was getting a sense of the body that people wanted to look at alternatives and consider long-range planning when Reinhart returned with options.

276 Notice to Proceed – Illinois Dept of Commerce & Economic Opportunity – Installation of High
277 Efficiency Lighting at Brookens

278
279 This item was provided for information only. Reinhart stated they applied for this grant
280 in addition to the block grant from RPC to improve the lighting at the Brookens Administrative
281 Center.

282
283 **Chair's Report**

284
285 Betz said he was enjoying working with Reinhart. He recommended new members set
286 up a time with Reinhart for a tour of County facilities.

287
288 **Other Business**

289
290 There was no other business.

291
292 **Designation of Items to be Placed on County Board Consent Agenda**

293
294 No items were designated for the consent agenda.

295
296 **ENVIRONMENT & LAND USE**
297 **Direction to Zoning Administrator Regarding Proposed Increase of Zoning Ordinance,**
298 **Subdivision Regulations, and Selected Other Related Fees Pursuant to LRMP Priority Item**
299 **3.1B**

300
301 **MOTION** by Anderson to proceed with the direction to the Zoning Administrator
302 regarding proposed increase of Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision Regulations, and selected other
303 related fees pursuant to LRMP Priority Item 3.1B; seconded by Rosales.

304
305 Monte said this was a proposed 8% increase to the Zoning Ordinance fees associated with
306 planning. The increases are consistent with the Consumer Price Index increases and it has been
307 about nine years since the last significant zoning fee increase. Hall added they are also
308 proposing a specific change for the maximum fee. The current maximum fee for any single
309 structure is \$1,500 because they believe this covers the costs on most one or two-family
310 residences. However, the County absorbs much more unfunded costs on commercial buildings.
311 The change would double the maximum fee up to \$3,240 per structure. A builder would only
312 pay this amount if the review requires that amount of work. Commercial buildings require more
313 review on complicated issues and coordination with the cities due to annexations agreements.
314 The County absorbs a lot of costs for commercial buildings and would continue to do so; the fee
315 increase would only lessen the unfunded amount. Hall did not think the fee increases were
316 unreasonable as people are not being asked to pay more than it costs to perform the review.
317 Champaign County's fees were compared with other counties' fees. The County no longer
318 permits in the subdivisions and the department is incurring a lot of costs in the rural areas. This
319 increase would simply reduce the amount the County is losing and would not be a big revenue
320 generator.

322 Richards inquired if the fee increases would cover the department's cost of providing the
323 service. Hall answered that the increases proposed would still not recapture all of the County's
324 costs. These are the costs to ensure compliance with the regulations. Monte supplied an
325 example based on the September 2010 revenue of \$3,499. The rate increase would only have
326 generated \$230 more revenue. Richards asked how much of the cost is left unfunded even after
327 the fee increases. Hall acknowledged that was difficult to estimate. On a zoning case, the
328 County is paying for the legal advertisement of about \$100. The fee is probably not even
329 covering the cost to prepare the first memorandum to the Zoning Board of Appeals. Richards
330 asked if this was a one-time fee increase and Hall confirmed that was correct.

331

332 James did not think the length of time that has passed since the last increase justified
333 raising the fees and felt this increase could deter people from building. He would rather see the
334 County be friendlier to those coming in and not worry about what we are taking in until a later
335 date. Nudo opposed increasing the fees until the economy recovers and argued that fees are
336 raised when a government desires to slow down a certain type of business. The commercial
337 builders will increase the County's property tax base, thereby bringing in additional revenue. He
338 felt this action was being suggested at the wrong time because the County's permitting is
339 substantially down.

340

341 **MOTION** by Nudo to defer this item until next year; seconded by Jay.

342

343 Holderfield thought this increase would discourage construction and builders would
344 simply pass the costs onto consumers. She did not think it was the current consumers' problem
345 that the fee has not been raised fees in nine years.

346

347 Weibel called for a point of order that discussion should be only about the motion to
348 defer. The Board discussed deferring the item and fees keeping pace with the cost of providing
349 services. Langenheim called the question. Nudo requested at roll call vote.

350

351 **Motion to defer failed with a vote of 7 to 12.** Holderfield, James, Jay, McGinty, Nudo,
352 O'Connor, and Schroeder voted in favor of the motion. Alix, Ammons, Anderson, Berkson,
353 Betz, Kurtz, Langenheim, Petrie, Quisenberry, Richards, Rosales, and Weibel voted against the
354 motion.

355

356 **MOTION** by Weibel to amend the original motion to enact half the recommended fee
357 increase (4%) this year and the other half (4%) next year; seconded by James.

358

359 The Board discussed taxpayers subsidizing the building industry versus the property tax
360 revenue generated by commercial buildings and whether an increase in fees would deter builders.

361

362 Langenheim called the question, stating the comments from Board members had become
363 repetitive. Schroeder objected to closing discussion over the issue because one of the purposes
364 of the Committee of the Whole meetings was to allow members the opportunity to speak about
365 the issues. Discussion continued over the increase the fees to recover the cost of staff time spent
366 on the permitting.

367

368 McGinty exited the meeting at 7:22 p.m. and returned at 7:23 p.m.

369

370 Langenheim requested a roll call vote.

371

372 **Motion carried to amend to original motion with a vote of 10 to 9.** Alix, Ammons,
373 Anderson, Berkson, Betz, Kurtz, Langenheim, Quisenberry, Schroeder, and Weibel voted in
374 favor of the motion. Holderfield, James, Jay, McGinty, Nudo, O'Connor, Petrie, Richards, and
375 Rosales voted against the motion.

376

377 Hall said if the amended motion is approved, then he would proceed to the ZBA and this
378 would come back to the County Board as a text amendment. Nudo asked Hall to provide
379 information on the actual costs and Kurtz concurred with the request. Alix noted it would be
380 helpful to see information about what it costs to have staff provide a service when the Board is
381 asked to raise fees.

382

383 Langenheim requested a roll call vote.

384

385 **Motion carried to approve the motion as amended with a vote of 13 to 6.** Alix,
386 Ammons, Anderson, Berkson, Betz, James, Kurtz, Langenheim, Quisenberry, Richards, Rosales,
387 Schroeder, and Weibel voted in favor of the motion. Holderfield, Jay, McGinty, Nudo,
388 O'Connor, and Petrie voted against the motion.

389

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

393

394 **MOTION** by Anderson to direct the RPC Planner regarding the proposed update of the
395 site assessment portion of the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) System pursuant to
396 LRMP Priority Items 4.5a and 4.5b; seconded by Richards.

397

398 Langenheim and Betz exited the meeting at 7:32 p.m.

399

400 In answer to James's question, Monte confirmed this update was not related to the soils
401 component of the LESA score. Holderfield requested a study session over this item because so
402 much information was involved. Monte explained that a February 25th study session was already
403 built into the process when the committee being proposed is formed.

404

405 Langenheim returned at 7:35 p.m.

406

407 Nudo asked how much of the Planning Contract's budget would be spent on this item.
408 Monte answered that it appears in the 2010 work plan and 2011 work plan. The amount in the
409 2011 work plan was 220 hours or \$11,000 in staff time.

410

411 Betz returned at 7:36 p.m.

412

413 Nudo asked whether this will have any effect on taxation. Monte said there was no
414 taxation effect that she was aware of. This is a site specific tool to rate the agricultural value of a
415 parcel during the discretionary review process by the ZBA. Nudo was trying to determine what
416 the County was trying to achieve with this process. Monte said it is a tool that needs to be fine-
417 tuned and updated on a regular basis, but it has been 26 years since they have looked at this part.
418 Nudo and Monte debated the date of the study session with Nudo wanting the item on the
419 County Board's February 1st study session agenda. He asked if the Farm Bureau had any input.
420 Kurtz, who sits on the Farm Bureau's Land Use Committee, did not recall any objections to this
421 proposal. The Board discussed the committee and ten month process covered by the motion to
422 give the Planner direction for this item, in addition to the benefits of a study session.

423
424 **MOTION** by James to have a study session before moving forward with this item.

425
426 Weibel called for a point of order because the motion as stated by James has no priority
427 over the motion on the floor. He suggested James make a motion to defer or amend the motion.
428 Discussion was held over what type of motion would be appropriate.

429
430 **MOTION** by James to defer this item to the February 8th Committee of the Whole
431 meeting and place the topic on the February 1st study session agenda for discussion; seconded by
432 Rosales.

433
434 Kurtz noted there are already three items on the February 1st study session and asked if
435 the Board wanted to move this item to the next County Board study session on March 29th.
436 Nudo said it was not his intention to interfere with Monte's timeline for this issue. The Board
437 discussed the items on the February 1st study session and whether there would be sufficient time
438 to cover them all. Monte suggested including this item with the three others on the February 1st
439 study session agenda and anything the Board could not get through would be moved to March.

440
441 **Motion carried to defer with unanimous support.**

442
443 **Direction to CCRPC Planner Regarding Proposed Champaign County Building Code**
444 **Feasibility Study Consistent with County Board Resolution No. 7482 and the Approved**
445 **Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant**

446
447 **MOTION** by Langenheim to direct the RPC Planner to proceed with Champaign County
448 Building Code Feasibility Study consistent with County Board Resolution No. 7482 and the
449 approved Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant; seconded by Richards.

450
451 The Board discussed what the end product of the feasibility study would be. Monte
452 pointed out the end products of the report and recommendations for the County Board are listed
453 in the agenda packet on Page 73. It is a feasibility study, which is a first step to begin
454 consideration of energy efficiency in a building code. Monte answered Schroeder's questions
455 about the specifics of the study focusing on whatever a building code would cover in the County.
456 This is an information gathering process.

457

458 Ammons and Rosales exited the meeting at 7:59 p.m. Weibel exited the meeting at 8:00
459 p.m. Rosales returned at 8:01 p.m.

460
461 Schroeder asked if there would be both county and state energy efficiency standards.
462 Monte said she would have to do research to answer his question. She assumed there were some
463 state standards out there because grant money was awarded to look into ways of incorporating
464 those standards.

465
466 Weibel returned at 8:02 p.m.

467
468 Nudo inquired about the County's obligations. Hall stated that on July 1st the County has
469 to have certification that construction meets the international building code. This is a state
470 statute. Hall added the County is only authorized to approve broad codes. He does not know
471 how the international code compares to the state's energy efficiency standards. Nudo said the
472 County needs to know what other entities require of builders and developers. He was worried
473 about adding another level of cost for builders.

474
475 Ammons returned at 8:06 p.m.

476
477 The Board continued to discuss the feasibility study and the future impact it may have.
478 Betz requested a roll call vote.

479
480 **Motion carried with a vote of 16 to 3.** Alix, Ammons, Anderson, Berkson, Betz, James,
481 Kurtz, Langenheim, McGinty, Nudo, Petrie, Quisenberry, Richards, Rosales, Schroeder, and
482 Weibel voted in favor of the motion. Holderfield, Jay, and O'Connor voted against the motion.

483
484 **Monthly Report**

485
486 The December 2010 monthly report was distributed at the Board's desks. Hall
487 announced the Planning & Zoning Department is short one Associate Planner. He hopes to hire
488 a new Planner at the end of the three-month period required by the hiring freeze who could help
489 with both planning and enforcement.

490
491 **MOTION** by McGinty to receive and place on file the December 2010 monthly report;
492 seconded by Ammons. **Motion carried with unanimous support.**

493
494 **Other Business**

495
496 A Redistricting Commission meeting is scheduled for tomorrow at 7:00 p.m.

497
498 **Chair's Report**

499
500 There was no Chair's report.

501
502
503

504 **Designation of Items to be Placed on County Board Consent Agenda**

505

506 No agenda items were designated for the consent agenda.

507

508 **ADDENDUM**

509 **Recommendation for Amendment to the FY11 County Planning Contract Work Plan**

510

511 The addendum (which contained this item) was not approved at the beginning of the
512 meeting.

513

514 **APPROVAL OF CLOSED SESSION MINUTES**

515

516 **MOTION** by Betz to approve the Committee of the Whole closed session minutes of
517 October 5, 2010; seconded by McGinty. **Motion carried with unanimous support.**

518

519 **ADJOURN**

520

521 The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

522

523 Respectfully submitted,

524

525 Kat Bork

526 Administrative Assistant

527

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

1 CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD
2 COMMITTEE MINUTES
3

4
5 **OLYMPIAN-LINCOLN SPECIAL COMMITTEE**

6 **Wednesday, November 10, 2010**

7 **Brookens Administrative Center, Lyle Shields Meeting Room**

8 **1776 East Washington Street, Urbana**
9

10 11:30 a.m.

11
12 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Lorraine Cowart, Greg Knott, Ralph Langenheim, Alan Nudo
13 C. Pius Weibel (Chair)

14
15 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

16
17 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Astrid Berkson (County Board Member), Jeff Blue (County Engineer),
18 Kat Bork (Administrative Assistant), Deb Busey (County
19 Administrator), Brendan McGinty (County Board Member), Mike
20 Munson (Urbana Mayor Chief of Staff), Dave Speicher (IDOT), Libby
21 Tyler (City of Urbana)
22

23 **CALL TO ORDER**

24
25 Weibel called the meeting to order at 11:33 a.m.
26

27 **ROLL CALL**

28
29 Bork called the roll. Cowart, Knott, Langenheim, Nudo, and Weibel were present at the time
30 of roll call, establishing the presence of a quorum.
31

32 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

33
34 **MOTION** by Knott to approve the October 19, 2010 and October 28, 2010 minutes; seconded
35 by Langenheim. **Motion carried with unanimous support.**
36

37 **APPROVAL OF AGENDA/ADDENDUM**

38
39 **MOTION** by Cowart to approve the agenda; seconded by Knott. **Motion carried with**
40 **unanimous support.**
41

42 **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

43
44 Weibel reminded the public to keep their speeches within the five-minute limit.
45

46 Jason Barickman spoke on behalf of some landowners involved in the Olympian Drive
47 discussion to uphold their private property interests before governments of the Cities of Champaign
48 and Urbana and Champaign County. He was retained on their behalf as an attorney, but assured the

49 committee he was not here as a threat. His purpose was to represent the best interest of his clients who
50 have concerns about a very public proposal that appears to try to balance the needs of the public versus
51 the individuals' private property rights. He would do his best to ensure his clients are well counseled
52 through this process. He was aware emotions have been high during this process and he trusted the
53 committee members understood the burdens placed on his clients as this development proceeds. He
54 has counseled his clients to present reasonable alternatives to the committee. It is thought by some that
55 decisions have been made and he wanted the committee to give the landowners the comfort that their
56 minds are open, which is difficult when County resources appear to be moving full speed ahead in a
57 fashion that has not been authorized by the County Board. He wanted to be sure the County Board's
58 resources are being spent at their direction and that staff is not just moving forward without the
59 Board's guidance and direction. Barickman has encouraged a number of the landowners to present to
60 the committee the tremendous burden that will be placed upon them by some of the proposed
61 directions of the project. The landowners have retained an engineering professional who could talk
62 through some of the alternatives. He emphasized that we are all part of the community and understood
63 the needs of the community. His clients did not want to be viewed as obstructionists.
64

65 Mary Atkinson stated that the State took land from her husband's business to widen Neil Street
66 several years ago. The State informed her husband it would take the land and later inform him the
67 amount of the payment. In early 2000 or so, the University of Illinois took her house and built a
68 welcome center on the site. If the Atkinson's land is taken for this road project, it will be the third time
69 in their lifetimes that eminent domain has been used against them. She thought this would be a fact of
70 interest to the committee.
71

72 Joe Behrends described how he built a new home at 3609 North Lincoln Avenue seven or eight
73 years ago when the university took his home. When he came to the Champaign County Planning &
74 Zoning Office to obtain a permit, he was shown a map with several proposed routes for the extension
75 of Lincoln Avenue. He claimed he was told it was highly unlikely this would ever happen because the
76 City of Urbana had rejected a proposed road project at one time and it was unlikely they would ever be
77 able to raise the money to build the road. He has new neighbors, Pat and Cindy Gayer, who have
78 indicated they did not want to sell, although they were described at the last meeting as willing sellers.
79 Pat Geyer told Behrends that he would want to be given at least two acres for any one acre taken from
80 him. Cindy Geyer said her name is on the property too and she would not sell.
81

82 Bill Cope said twenty-three landowners affected by the project have joined together in a well
83 organized fashion to oppose the project. They have put their own money and resources into this
84 opposition and now have an attorney and an engineer representing them. He spoke about the
85 community support for their group. He emphasized the group was not opposed to road development or
86 some of the objectives behind the development, but they wanted a compromise. He viewed the current
87 plan as old and noted the group has invested in one alternative design. Their engineer is thinking
88 through other alternatives. They would be quite happy if the road was not built, but if it is built then he
89 felt there has to be a compromise. He thanked the committee for this process because Board members
90 have listened to the group.
91

92 Janet Scharlau talked about the Jeff Blue's description at the last meeting regarding the impact
93 of the proposed alignment on individual landowners. Scharlau argued about what really constituted
94 impact. Her house would not be taken in the proposed alignment, but the road would be located feet

95 from her home. She said this would intrude on her privacy during family gatherings and decrease the
96 land's and home's value. Scharlau wondered where the \$30 million would come from at a time when
97 federal, state, county and city governments are in financial trouble and what other needy projects will
98 be left behind. She claimed the option presented by the landowners will impact no one and will meet
99 the travel needs on the road. The alternative route bisects Squire Farms from the north and south, but
100 the impact is less to the surrounding homeowners. She felt the issue for this committee is whether the
101 project is approved since the issue of where the road will go is for the engineers. If the project is
102 approved it must be realigned to not impact 26 people.

103
104 Harold Scharlau said the landowners wanted to participate in the committee discussions later in
105 the meeting beyond public participation. He referred to a handout from the landowners opposed to the
106 project, which described the impact of three different designs to a business located in the area. He felt
107 the underlying assumption was that the road project would encourage industrial development in the
108 area. He introduced Brian Bradshaw, a licensed engineer and land surveyor from BKB Engineering
109 who has been employed by a group of landowners opposing the project.

110
111 Brian Bradshaw explained that he had been hired as an engineer by a group of landowners to
112 perform a review of the Olympian Drive and North Lincoln Avenue location studies. He has identified
113 a possible compromise route for North Lincoln Avenue shown in orange or red on the handout. He
114 described the proposed route and its impact on the residential properties.

115
116 Ken Mathis, the Somer Township Supervisor, was present to represent the Somer Township
117 Trustees and its Road Commissioner. He spoke in support of the Olympian Drive and Lincoln Avenue
118 project. The township wants a bridge over the railroad tracks to help with emergency vehicles and the
119 switching delays caused by the railroad. The township feels the industrial areas of Lincoln Avenue
120 and Mercury Drive needs to be serviced with new infrastructure. This road project would relieve the
121 township roads of some truck traffic. He did not want to stall the project and risk losing available
122 funds.

123
124 John Dimit, CEO of the Economic Development Corporation, voiced the EDC's strong
125 continued support for the Olympian Drive project, with the understanding that the AX option is the
126 appropriate first phase of construction. He has received a great deal of input from EDC members on
127 the North Lincoln and North Market business roundtables, some of whom are relying on this project
128 being completed.

129
130 After determining no one else wanted to speak, Weibel closed public participation.

131
132 **COMMUNICATIONS**

133
134 Weibel announced Alan Kurtz could not make the meeting due to family commitments.

135
136 **REVIEW OF PAST LINCOLN AVENUE STUDIES**

137
138 Blue introduced Jim Moll and Matt Heyen from Hanson Engineers. Moll was largely involved
139 in the original Olympian Drive and Lincoln Avenue location studies and Heyen has been involved with
140 the current project. Moll explained he worked on the Olympian Drive location study in the mid-1990's

141 and the Lincoln Avenue location study in the late 1990's. The Regional Planning Commission
142 anticipates that the Lincoln Avenue area will grow and have additional industrial development. The
143 purpose of Lincoln Avenue was to improve access to the land projected for development north of
144 Urbana. Some of that development has occurred since the study began in the late 1990's. The purpose
145 was also to improve the north Lincoln Avenue alignment to better accommodate increased traffic.
146 There are a lot of bad curves and narrowness on north Lincoln Avenue that need to be improved to
147 accommodate the anticipated industrial development in the area. They also wanted to improve traffic
148 circulation in conjunction with the new Olympian Drive and US-45 to provide for the anticipated
149 industrial growth. A number of studies have identified the importance of Lincoln Avenue to
150 accommodate the industries, reduce traffic impacts, and to eliminate the roadway deficiencies. Moll
151 reviewed how roadways and development are interrelated. He showed a series of slides revealing what
152 has happened in Champaign as development has occurred and the roadways that have been constructed
153 since 1940. Moll stated the most important things that drive development are roadway and utility
154 connections. Ideally, a roadway network is in place prior to the occurrence of development because it
155 is so difficult to build a roadway network after development had happened.

156
157 Moll brought up the Champaign County Land Use Management Plan (LRMP) developed by
158 the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) through a long and arduous process to determine where and
159 what types of development should occur in Champaign County, specifically around the Champaign-
160 Urbana urbanized area. The LRMP shows the west of the proposed Lincoln Avenue is primarily
161 intended to be an industrial area. The area east of Lincoln Avenue is primarily intended to have
162 industrial/light commercial/residential use. Development has occurred along existing Lincoln Avenue.
163 The original study anticipated the road would be built in stages. The Lincoln Avenue and Olympian
164 Drive projects are specifically designed to support the type of industrial development that the RPC has
165 determined is appropriate for that specific location.

166
167 Some alternatives were considered when the Lincoln Ave study was begun in 1996-1997 by
168 working with the city. The choices were narrowed down to three specific alternatives, which were
169 then shown to the public at a public informational meeting held in January 1997. The southern
170 alternative was eliminated after that meeting, primarily because its design contains a large number of
171 curves. It is more complicated and dangerous to locate intersections on curves. The middle
172 alternative was eliminated because a large portion of it would run adjacent to a creek's flood plan.
173 This alternative also ran close to houses along Lincoln Avenue and would have affected the most
174 parcels of the three options. The final, northern option was supported by most of the public who made
175 comments at the public informational meeting. This road is the furthest from the houses and provides
176 good access to the areas west and between the creek, as well as the railroad tracks. Some further
177 modifications were made based on the engineers' discussions with the public and subsequent meetings
178 with the city. The third alternative route was shifted a little to the south to eliminate banking two very
179 tight curves or constructing an intersection along the curve in those locations. The shift also better
180 utilized the existing Lincoln Avenue right-of-way and minimized the amount of property that would be
181 taken for the project. This is how they ended up with the Lincoln Avenue alignment as it exists today.
182 This alignment was displayed at a public informational meeting held in September 2007. An
183 environmental assessment was prepared and submitted to the Illinois Department of Transportation
184 (IDOT) for review along with the Olympian Drive location study. These documents were also sent to
185 the Federal Highway Administration. Both agencies reviewed the reports and provided comments.
186 The engineers finalized the report and held a public hearing in June 2008 to receive comments. The

187 final report was compiled and submitted to IDOT and the Federal Highway Administration, who then
188 approved this as the alternative for Lincoln Avenue. This approved alternative allows the city and the
189 County to apply for funding to actually begin land acquisition and construction. The project has
190 proceeded in stages as anticipated. The south segments of the project have already been built and the
191 project is moving along, maybe a little slower than was planned. Moll reiterated that the project was
192 intended to provide for the anticipated industrial development. Moll showed a slide of the various
193 property owners who are affected by the project and how much right of way would need to be
194 acquired. Moll offered to answer any questions about the Lincoln Avenue study process.

195
196 Weibel asked Moll to share more about the reasons why the curves would be a problem on
197 Alternative #1, the northern most alternative. Moll said the curves have a sufficiently tight radius that
198 requires they would have to be super-elevated or banked. The speed limit of 45 mph and banked
199 curves complicates the intersection construction and produces some safety concerns. It was felt the
200 preferred alternative was a better alignment because it has slightly flatter radiuses and does not require
201 the curves to be super-elevated. This would also produce less of the roadway on a curve, allows more
202 straightaway, and allows better locations for intersections. The proposed alternative also reduced the
203 area of floodplain impacted by the project. Weibel inquired if costs were considered. Moll answered
204 that costs were a factor in the comparison. He thought there was a slight difference in the costs of the
205 alternatives primarily because this alternative was a little shorter and used a little more existing right-
206 of-way. There was not a dramatic difference in costs amongst the three alternatives. Weibel asked
207 about the cost difference of the original eleven options. Moll said some of those alternatives were
208 more expensive, specifically the alternative that was on a completely new alignment because it would
209 involve building a lot more new road and buying more land.

210
211 Knott questioned if Moll had any comments on Brian Bradshaw's statement of the grade. Moll
212 had not had the chance to study that Bradshaw's alternative, but he would recommend staying with a
213 flatter slope and avoid a 6% slope. A 6% slope is a steep slope for a truck and there are safety
214 concerns about icing at that slope. Moll said they would be better off to stay with 4% or 5% slopes.
215 Regarding Bradshaw's comment about the location of the intersection, it could be moved to intersect
216 with Olympian Drive west of the current intersection. Even with the slopes designed on the Olympian
217 Drive project, there would still be enough room to drive down the slope and get a truck stopped on a
218 flat spot before reaching the intersection. He cautioned they would not want to have two intersections.
219 A major criterion to consider in road design is widely spaced intersections. Knott did not think the
220 current proposal had enough votes to pass the current County Board. He wondered how far west the
221 road would have to go to miss all the landowners outlined on an earlier slide. He does not see a great
222 groundswell of support for this project. He wanted to figure out if there was a way to engineer the
223 road to move the intersection to the west.

224
225 Nudo inquired about the plans for north Lincoln Avenue above Olympian Drive. Moll replied
226 their location study only went to Olympian Drive and did not extend north of the intersection. He was
227 not sure what the City of Urbana's or the County's long-term plans were for Olympian Drive. Libby
228 Tyler from the City of Urbana said the area north of Olympian Drive was being viewed as a place for
229 future agricultural growth. The city is concentrating on future development south of Olympian Drive.
230 The next comprehensive plan from the city will likely have to look further north. Nudo wanted to
231 know why there is a necessity to connect Lincoln Avenue above and below Olympian Drive when it
232 impedes on the lifestyles of some homeowners. He did not understand why Lincoln Avenue

233 businesses would want to go east to get to I-57 or what the impetus was to connect to a road when the
234 future is unknown. Moll explained there are two fundamental problems associated with bringing
235 Lincoln Avenue up to Olympian Drive, staggering the road, and then taking Olympian Drive further to
236 the north. The first problem is the introduction of two intersections. Intersections are always places
237 where traffic slows down and where accidents happen. Reviewing any accident map along a roadway
238 will show accidents clustered at intersections. Intersections with left turns are especially dangerous.
239 One of the tenets of the Olympian Drive project was that it would be a roadway to move traffic and
240 one of the necessities of achieving that was to make the intersections spaced about a half a mile apart.
241 Staggering the road would introduce an additional, closely spaced intersection. The other problem
242 with having the roadway staggered is that all the traffic going north and south on Lincoln Avenue also
243 has to drive on and combine with the traffic on Olympian Drive. This increases congestion on
244 Olympian Drive.
245

246 Knott asked why drivers would continue traveling north on Lincoln Avenue when there is
247 nothing up there except farmland. Moll indicated he is trying to take into account how the area will
248 look in 25, 50, or 75 years. Nudo said the City of Urbana has no future plans for that area at this time
249 and the logic about the increased number of accidents due to intersections applies to every street in
250 Champaign and Urbana. His point is that if they are trying to avoid interfering with people's lifestyles,
251 plus they want to cut costs for commercial properties that want to travel west to I-57. Nudo did not
252 understand the logic of the alignment and asked why they could not make a concession to make the
253 project work. He wanted Olympian Drive to attach to Lincoln Avenue, but he thought they were
254 coming up with reasons why they have to go with the 1997 project. Moll thought there were
255 concessions that could possibly be made on the location of Lincoln Avenue, but a staggered
256 intersection is probably not a concession they want to make because it would saddle the future Urbana
257 and Champaign County with a problem. All the cars that just want to travel straight north or south on
258 Lincoln Avenue for any reason would have to go through an intersection, turn onto Olympian Drive,
259 and make another turn to continue north or south. Everyone traveling on Olympian Drive would then
260 have to travel through two intersections. Knott asked about abandoning the current Lincoln Avenue
261 right-of-way south of the two houses on the map. Moll said that approach would be similar to the
262 alternative they were just talking about where Lincoln Avenue would continue up to the north and tie
263 in north of those houses. This would eliminate that intersection and would be a more viable
264 compromise from an engineering standpoint than introducing two intersections on Olympian Drive.
265

266 Knott understood Moll's point about the two intersections and that is why he wanted to explore
267 moving the road to the west. There would be some inconvenience on drivers coming from the north
268 because it would not be a straight shot because there would be a curve slightly west abandoning some
269 of the right-of-way. This is the only way he could see to make it work. Moll explained the problem
270 associated with shifting to the west involves acquiring more right-of-way at a greater cost and the
271 property owners who are impacted will simply be shifted from the current landowners to others. The
272 other question was about coming one way on Lincoln Avenue and returning to I-75. Moll stated when
273 they looked at the area fully developed and did traffic projections, the traffic was heavier on Olympian
274 Drive west of Lincoln Avenue but there was still significant traffic east of Lincoln Avenue. He
275 anticipated there would still be a lot of vehicles coming into the area from the east or coming out of
276 this area and going off to the east to access Route 45 or whatever may develop in the east part of the
277 county. Once Olympian Drive extends further to the east, connects to Route 45, and the area develops,
278 he thinks having the curve going the recommended way is not a disadvantage.

279 Langenheim asked how one would drive to Route 45 from the intersection at the projected
280 Lincoln Avenue. Moll said that once Olympian Drive is constructed and Lincoln Avenue is
281 completed, one would go north on Lincoln Avenue, turn right on Olympian Drive, and drive right over
282 to Route 45. Langenheim said that would only happen if Olympian Drive is extended and Moll
283 concurred. Their assumption when the Lincoln Avenue location study was done was that Olympian
284 Drive would eventually be extended over to Route 45. Langenheim agreed with the logic of the maps
285 and that assumption is shown by the commercial zoning for the area south of Olympian Drive.
286

287 Knott wondered what the process is to select a new alignment. Moll said the County Board
288 would have to go back through the location study and environmental document process. This is called
289 a Phase I Study by IDOT. Weibel asked about time factors. Moll estimated it would take 18 months
290 to get the study done, assuming it is not a controversial project. They would have to start at the
291 beginning and redo data collection, an environmental inventory, check the environmental
292 consequences, study the various alternatives, hold a series of public informational meetings, do cost
293 estimates for the alternatives, and develop mitigation plans for any environmental impacts. This
294 information would then be submitted to IDOT and the Federal Highway Administration for review and
295 comment. Knott asked for a ballpark cost. Moll could not ballpark a cost without reviewing the
296 matter. Knott asked if it would be plus or minus \$1 million or \$2 million. Moll said it would be less than
297 \$1 million.
298

299 Langenheim asked if the current funding for the overpass could be preserved during this delay
300 or if it would be lost. Moll said they would possibly lose that money because the Illinois Commerce
301 Commission programs money in specific years. If the County Board was unwilling to proceed with
302 Olympian Drive until this issue was resolved and missed the years in which the bridge is programmed
303 with ICC funding, then the ICC would throw the money back into their pool. The County would have
304 to go back through the application process in an attempt to secure the funding again. Weibel asked
305 Blue to comment on the possibility of losing the funding. Blue asked Dave Speicher from IDOT to
306 comment. Speicher was not able to answer if the ICC money would remain available while the County
307 goes through a potential 18-month Phase 1 Study. That would be an issue for the ICC, but anything is
308 possible. The ICC money is specifically for Olympian Drive, not Lincoln Avenue. IDOT's biggest
309 issue from a department standpoint will probably depend on whether they are willing to go ahead with
310 the extension of Olympian Drive without a definitive decision to move forward very quickly with
311 Lincoln Avenue afterwards. IDOT would be very concerned about an agency moving forward with the
312 Olympian Drive construction and stopping it at the existing Lincoln Avenue without connecting it to
313 something.
314

315 Knott said a key point was whether the ICC would preserve the funding and IDOT could
316 maybe connect Lincoln Avenue. Speicher said the extension of Olympian Drive from Apollo to
317 Lincoln and the extension of Lincoln up to Olympian could be a viable improvement for the time
318 being. Weibel asked if the County Board should talk to the ICC first about possible changes to the
319 alignment. Speicher concurred they could talk to the ICC about whether or not they would be willing
320 to move their funding. Agencies that have tried that approach have been told to reapply for funding
321 when their projects are ready to move forward. Those projects have been significantly delayed.
322

323 Blue added some background on the ICC money. This money was originally applied to be
324 used for Olympian Drive. When it became a community decision to make Curtis Road a higher

325 priority than Olympian Drive, they asked and were given the approval to move that money to build the
326 overpass east of First Street on Curtis Road. There was another shift and Olympian Drive became the
327 priority project in Champaign-Urbana. They again asked the ICC to move the money back to
328 Olympian Drive. Blue believed another such inquiry would be met with resistance. The ICC receives
329 \$27 million per year and one-third of that amount (\$9.6 million) was being taken for this project. A
330 request to move the money would mean the ICC would have to find other projects to fund with the
331 \$9.6 million during the same year, move projects ahead, and then put the Olympian Drive project in
332 two years down the road. That is a lot of money to move around.

333
334 Nudo recalled at the public meeting held at the Urbana Civic Center that this could be done if
335 all the municipalities agreed with the changes and the political entities of Frerichs and Jakobsson
336 agreed with the changes. Blue asked if Nudo was talking about the Illinois Jobs Now money because
337 that was totally different from the Illinois Commerce Commission money. He believed there was
338 some flexibility with the Illinois Jobs Now money that the City of Urbana received. The ICC money is
339 taken off the top of the Motor Fuel Tax Funds and set aside specifically for safety improvements at
340 rail/highway crossing. It is controlled by the ICC and there is no legislative authority per say in that
341 money. Nudo asked what the ICC would feel if all the governmental bodies involved agreed to take
342 the extra 18 months to see if there was an alternative to the alignment. Blue said they would have to
343 ask the ICC. Weibel questioned if asking the ICC would hurt them. Blue did not think it hurt to ask,
344 but he did not know what the ICC's reaction would be.

345
346 McGinty did not think there had been an issue with the need to continue to move Olympian
347 Drive to the east. He felt the issue was just how to do it. He believed the concept of doing Olympian
348 Drive in phases and keeping it in long-range plans makes sense. But for now, he wondered how to
349 make Lincoln Avenue happen. He urged everyone to take the landowners' concerns into
350 consideration. He has heard the sweeping S is the only way to go because it has been in the plans for a
351 long time and there is no other way to do it. A lot of people are questioning whether that is truly the
352 case. There are other potential routes to consider, even though they involve jumping through some
353 hoops. McGinty would prefer the Lincoln Avenue project and loop done with the extension to Route
354 45 stay in the long-range plans. He recommended focusing on the logistics and realizing the
355 engineering perspective is only one of the elements. Traffic north of Olympian Drive is irrelevant for
356 this lifetime. He suggested having a stop sign and one intersection west of the alignment to avoid the
357 objecting landowners. He would like to get past the notion that there is only one way to do the project
358 and work creatively without blowing the money that is already there.

359
360 Knott asked if Barickman or Bradshaw might have a question or input at this point. Weibel
361 said he had another question for the engineers present. He asked if Phase A of the project could be
362 completed and then have Phase X completed. Speicher explained that once the project is let, where the
363 project moves to construction, IDOT will want to see Phase A connect to something before moving
364 forward. This usually involves having a comfort level with the local agencies that the next project is
365 going to move forward soon after. An agency restarting Phase I is not going to give IDOT comfort
366 that Phase X is going to move forward anytime soon.

367
368 Blue wanted to ask the committee a question because they are trying to build the project
369 incrementally and it seems to him that some headway has been made through the committee process.
370 He wanted to determine if he was on the right page in understanding that the committee as a whole

371 sees a purpose and need for Olympian Drive to go over the railroad tracks and sees a purpose and need
372 for Lincoln Avenue to get up to Olympian Drive. He believed the committee wants to look at the
373 project that Olympian Drive will sometime in the future extend to Route 45. It better helps focus their
374 efforts if those are three things the committee has moved past and they are now talking about where
375 Lincoln Avenue will come up and meet Olympian Drive. Blue thought this was a good direction in
376 which to head, but he wanted to understand where the committee was in this process. Nudo thought
377 everyone on the committee wanted to connect Lincoln Avenue and get the bridge built. He felt that,
378 beyond the committee, they did not have the political willpower to take and displace a number of
379 people. If they could compromise to that degree and get a road attaching Lincoln to Olympian with
380 that in mind, then the votes would be on the County Board to support it. He wanted to connect the
381 road without taking pieces of property from so many owners. Nudo advised looking at the political
382 reality and getting this done with some concessions. So far what they have been shown is from 1997
383 or 1998 and he wants to get beyond that to make compromises.
384

385 Blue stated the shifting of the alignment as shown in Bradshaw's engineering design basically
386 puts the entire project on Squire Farms. He asked if shifting the alignment in this way would be
387 desirable for the owners of Squire Farms, since there was a Squire Farms representative present who
388 was one of those asking to shift the project. He was concerned about the County putting in months of
389 work trying to shift the alignment to accommodate the landowners' request only to hit another
390 roadblock in acquiring the property. Weibel asked Barickman if he represented Squire Farms.
391 Barickman stated there are multiple parties involved in Squire Farms and he represented some of those
392 parties. It was safe to say at least some of those parties would be open to that discussion and would
393 start with a positive foot forward. He noted the devil was in the details of anything they would come
394 up with, but those people he has spoken to would keep an open mind towards an alternative alignment.
395 Nudo said it was a two-way street in making concessions because the County has certain timelines to
396 consider. He would expect the other side to make concessions if the County is making concessions to
397 get things done. There needs to be a timeline to logically do this, otherwise he would not put his
398 political capital into something that would not be met with a positive reaction from the other side.
399 Barickman wanted to respond without speaking for his clients. Weibel asked what he meant by that
400 statement. Barickman said that, when he first had conversations with some of the Squire Farms
401 parties, their views were that they did not want the extension of Olympian Drive to occur. Barickman
402 thought the tone heard from those who spoke in public participation today was that they recognize the
403 community benefit and they would like to be a part of it. They would not like to be a part of a public
404 benefit driven through their front and back yards.
405

406 Nudo asked what would be a logical timeline for the Squire family to meet and for the County
407 to get some answers. Janet Scharlau said she is a one-third owner of Squire Farms with her brother.
408 There were three siblings and each sibling got a third of the interest in the farm. No single family
409 member owns any designated acreage within Squire Farms. Scharlau wants some sort of compromise.
410 She has one aunt who died a week ago, who had five siblings. Scharlau is the Squire Farm manager
411 and she has not yet called a meeting of the owners. Her other aunt has been in favor of the entire
412 project going across since the beginning and Scharlau has not had any conversation with this aunt
413 because they are at discourse. Scharlau has been the holdout person who did not want to sell the
414 property. If an alternate alignment does not go next to her house and is behind her house so it not
415 something she visually has to deal with, then she is open to at least discussing the matter, but the devil
416 is in the details. Scharlau wanted to see the exact alignment that Bradshaw drew used for the project.

417 She felt the project did not need the next stoplight over on Lincoln Avenue or the road from where it
418 stops to Lincoln Avenue because Lincoln Avenue is a useless road right now. She also wanted the
419 road to stop and then for the governmental entities to wait and see what develops. Scharlau's short
420 answer was that she would do her best and she though the Squire Farms owners could come to a
421 consensus. Nudo wanted to know how quickly a consensus could be reached. Scharlau asked how
422 quickly the committee would like to see it. Nudo said the committee has given Blue the directive to
423 work with the parties, so a reasonable timeline needs to be developed. Scharlau said she would get
424 back to the County as quickly as possible.

425
426 Knott said there have been some major breakthroughs via conversations today and now comes
427 the details which are beyond this committee's scope and ability.

428
429 **MOTION** by Knott to ask Blue to interact with the various parties and come back to the
430 County Board, perhaps by February 1st, to report his progress to see if there can be breakthroughs on
431 some of the details.

432
433 Weibel asked Knott to define the various parties. Knott said Blue should interact with the
434 landowners or their appointed representatives on the legal or engineering side, IDOT, ICC, and his
435 colleagues with the Cities of Urbana and Champaign.

436
437 The motion was seconded by Nudo.

438
439 Langenheim, in response to Janet Scharlau's comments that north Lincoln Avenue was a
440 useless road, commented that there had been no discussion today concerning the goat farm. This farm
441 is a destination on north Lincoln Avenue that could grow into something like Curtis Orchards.

442
443 Blue noted Scharlau indicated she would hold a Squire Farm meeting to discuss openness to
444 this project. Something else that could really stretch out the length of this project is condemnation.
445 Blue hoped that Squire Farms understood there is a fair process to come up with a value for that
446 property and hopefully condemnation is not something the County would have to enter into to stretch
447 out the length of the project.

448
449 McGinty asked if there should be an agreement with Squire Farms in place before too long so
450 the Board would know if they need to re-enter into a Phase I. He encouraged the committee to ask the
451 owner of the goat farm, who was present to comment on Langenheim's question directly. Leslie
452 Cooperband stated she and her husband owned Prairie Fruits Farm and Creamery. She does not see
453 this project as having a negative impact on her farm's accessibility if the project proceeds in the
454 direction it seems to be moving. She pointed out people are currently able to reach her farm just fine.

455
456 Nudo said his purpose for establishing a timeline was to allow the Board to come up with a
457 political solution and it does not serve them any further to go into any more public negotiations. He
458 concurred that February 1st is a good deadline. He thought there was the political will on the County
459 Board to get something done to connect Lincoln Avenue and Olympian Drive and the clock is ticking,
460 so they want to get it done. The Board wants to be fair and on the other hand he does not want a delay
461 be used as a tactic. He thought the negotiations with Blue and the landowners should be private.

462

463 Moll, at Blue's request, said he realized it complicates the discussion, but he thought it was
464 only fair to let everyone know that the Olympian Drive project, as it is currently approved, includes the
465 grades, slopes of the road, and intersection spacing along Olympian Drive. Any restudy of Lincoln
466 Avenue would have to be based on those conditions along Olympian Drive; otherwise the Olympian
467 Drive study would also have to be reopened. Weibel lives in an area of Champaign with offset
468 intersections and stated they did not want offset intersections in Lincoln Avenue because these cause a
469 lot of accidents and traffic problems.

470
471 Weibel asked Bork to read the motion, which she did, before calling for a vote.

472
473 **Motion carried with unanimous support.**

474
475 Weibel announced he would allow a second public participation session to be held at the end of
476 the other agenda items.

477
478 **OTHER BUSINESS**

479 **Discussion of Independent Needs Study**

480
481 Weibel stated an independent needs study was proposed by Laura Huth, who was not present.
482 He asked if the committee wanted to discuss this issue or where the money would come from for such
483 a study. An independent needs study would likely be expensive and the County certainly does not
484 have the money for such a study. Blue hoped the points he made earlier are true and that they have
485 moved to the point where the purpose and needs of the project are understood. The purpose and needs
486 are based on the 1999 Lincoln Avenue and the 1997 Olympian Drive studies and those purpose and
487 needs still hold up today. Blue did not think anything had changed enough to devalue those purpose
488 and needs and they are now looking for a solution in order to meet those purpose and needs. Weibel
489 stated he did not disagree with Blue. McGinty suggested somehow formalizing the fact that those
490 purpose and needs have been analyzed and those factors still apply. He said that would remove the
491 sting from the accusation that the purpose and needs are old. He has never been a proponent of
492 redoing all the work; it is a matter of tweaking for today's times and situation. He wanted to reaffirm
493 that the purpose and needs still apply and have it be called the 2010 version.

494
495 Blue said if they move in the direction discussed today and there is a realignment of Lincoln
496 Avenue, then a totally new study will be conducted, which will have a new purpose and need. He
497 asked for the IDOT representative's confirmation on that statement. Speicher would not say they
498 would have an entirely new study, but they would have to obtain another approval from IDOT and
499 FHWA that the purpose and needs that is included in the study is valid for the date of that signature.
500 Blue confirmed that was what he was trying to say. Weibel said there would surely be a partial study.

501
502 Langenheim wanted verification that the 1997 plans had been periodically reviewed by
503 CUUATS on a five-year basis. Blue said he was absolutely correct. Langenheim noted the plans were
504 not a fossilized, unchanged object since 1997. Blue said it had been updated and reviewed through the
505 long-range transportation plan every time it is reviewed. The last review was in 2009. Langenheim
506 stated they are viewing the 2009 plan, not the 1997 plan.

507
508 Weibel offered to entertain brief comments from the public.

509 Harold Scharlau said the Lincoln Avenue study had a projection that there would be 13,600
510 cars a day by 2018. He hoped the committee did not accept that projection.

511
512 John Dimit asked the committee to keep in mind that this project is also for businesses already
513 in the community, not simply for businesses they hope might come. He thought this will become more
514 apparent as things unfold in the next few months. He stressed this road is very important for a major
515 employer in Champaign County. This employer has facilities on both sides of the railroads tracks and
516 it is not about getting to I-57 or I-74, but it is about their business need and making sure they remain in
517 Champaign County at their current employment levels. This is a major issue to the employer and the
518 delays have been of significant importance to its corporate strategies.

519
520 Leslie Cooperband endorsed the need for independent needs assessment study. She did not
521 concur with McGinty that the assumptions that went into the 1997 study were still valid. The fact that
522 CUUATS approved the five-year plan in 2009 also does not mean the assumptions used to develop the
523 scenarios for the road's development were updated in 2009. She said the landowners still wanted to
524 have an independent body without a vested interest in the outcome of the project to undertake a needs
525 assessment study.

526
527 **APPROVAL OF CLOSED SESSION MINUTES**

528
529 **MOTION** by Knott to approve the October 28, 2010 closed session minutes; seconded by
530 Cowart. **Motion carried with unanimous support.**

531
532 **ADJOURNMENT**

533
534 Weibel saw no reason to schedule another meeting and declared the work of the committee to
535 be over.

536
537 Weibel adjourned the meeting at 1:14 p.m.

538
539 Respectfully submitted,

540
541 Kat Bork

542 Administrative Assistant