



CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE – ELUC/Highway/County Facilities
County of Champaign, Urbana, Illinois
Tuesday, October 4, 2011 – 6:00 p.m.

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

	Page No.
I. <u>Call to Order</u>	
II. <u>Roll Call</u>	
III. <u>Approval of Minutes</u>	
A. Committee of the Whole – September 6, 2011	1-14
B. Committee of the Whole – Closed Session – September 6, 2011	
IV. <u>Approval of Agenda/Addenda</u>	
V. <u>Public Participation</u>	
VI. <u>Communications</u>	
VII. <u>Environment & Land Use</u>	
A. <u>Recreation & Entertainment License: ECA Hunting & Trade Show</u> Location: Champaign County Fairgrounds, 1302 N. Coler Ave., Urbana – October 15 & 16, 2011	15-18
B. <u>Proposed FY2012 RPC Planning Contract</u>	19-33
C. <u>Final Recommendations to County Board for Zoning Ordinance</u> <u>Amendments</u>	
1. Request to Amend Champaign County Zoning Ordinance. Zoning Case 683-AT-11 Petitioner: Champaign County Zoning Administrator	34-38
2. Request to Amend Champaign County Zoning Ordinance. Zoning Case 684-AT-11 Petitioner: Champaign County Zoning Administrator	39-42
D. <u>Monthly Report</u> <i>(to be distributed)</i>	
E. <u>Other Business</u>	
F. <u>Designation of Items to be Placed on Consent Agenda</u>	

VIII. County Facilities

- A. East Campus Storm Water Management
 - 1. Approval of East Campus Storm Water Management Project Approach 43-44
- B. Facilities Director
 - 1. Monthly Reports 45-49
 - 2. Clock Tower Final Update
- C. 202 S. Art Bartell Rd. Construction Project Report 50
- D. Chair's Report
- E. Other Business
- F. Designation of Items to be Placed on Consent Agenda

IX. Semi-Annual Review of Closed Session Minutes 51-56

X. Adjournment

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

**CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MINUTES**

**Justice & Social Services/Highway & Transportation/County Facilities/Environment & Land Use
Tuesday, September 6, 2011
Lyle Shields Meeting Room, Brookens Administrative Center
1776 East Washington Street, Urbana, Illinois**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Christopher Alix, Carol Ammons, Ron Bensyl, Astrid Berkson, Tom Betz, Lorraine Cowart, Aaron Esry, Stephanie Holderfield, Stan James, John Jay, Brad Jones, Alan Kurtz, Ralph Langenheim, Gary Maxwell, Brendan McGinty, Diane Michaels, Steve Moser, Alan Nudo, Steve O'Connor, Patti Petrie, James Quisenberry, Michael Richards, Geraldo Rosales, Jon Schroeder, Pius Weibel

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Jan Anderson, Lloyd Carter

OTHERS PRESENT:

Susan Chavarria (RPC), John Hall (Director of Zoning), Deb Busey (County Administrator), Alan Reinhart (Facilities Director), Jeff Blue (County Engineer), Tom Berns & Chris Billing (Berns, Clancy & Assoc.), Ranae Wolken (recording secretary)

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

The secretary called the roll. It was noted that Anderson and Carter were not present and a quorum was established.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion by Rosales to approve the minutes of August 2, 2011 as presented; seconded by Esry. Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA/ADDENDA

Motion by Richards to approve the agenda; seconded by James. Betz requested that item 9.A.2 be conducted separately. **Motion carried unanimously.**

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

None.

COMMUNICATIONS

Board Chair Weibel introduced the new recording secretary, Ranae Wolken.

50 Moser noted for the committee's information that Wayne Busboom passed away the
51 previous week. Mr. Busboom was the husband of former County Board member Patty Busboom
52 and that he was a good farmer and public servant for many years. Ms. Busey reminded Board
53 members the deadline for paying for the County Board photos is September 13.
54

55 Holderfield talked briefly about the Daily Bread Soup Kitchen and that it does not get
56 any government funding and is currently feeding up to 200 people a day. Because they don't
57 receive funding, she stated that if anyone is interested, they do take donations.
58

59 Ammons stated a memorial service is to be held at the Courthouse Plaza on Sunday,
60 September 11 from 2-4pm. A reception for police and fire personnel will be held immediately
61 following at the Post Office in Urbana.
62

63 Kurtz stated that last week twenty-five to thirty elected officials from East Central Illinois
64 traveled to Dewitt County and attended a seminar at the Clinton landfill. He said the consensus
65 of those attending about building a PCB landfill over the drinking water that it is the wrong place
66 and time to build. He stated there is skepticism in claims that it would not leak and destroy our
67 drinking water. Steve Carter, City of Champaign, is preparing something to report and Kurtz
68 hopes to have that report to bring to the Board later.
69

70 **JUSTICE & SOCIAL SERVICES**

71 **Resolution – Champaign County Joining the National Moment of Remembrance of the 10th**
72 **Anniversary of September 11th**

73
74 Richards stated the one item is a Resolution for Champaign County to join in the
75 Commemoration on September 11. Kurtz stated his wife and son were at the World Trade
76 Center the day before the attack for a visit and that is a day that should never be forgotten.
77

78 **MOTION** by Kurtz to recommend to the full Board approval of a Resolution for
79 Champaign County Joining the National Moment of Remembrance of the 10th Anniversary of
80 September 11th; seconded by Esry. Richards stated EMA needs this approved formally for
81 sirens to be coordinated with church bells to be sounded off for the noon remembrance time.
82 This is a nationwide resolution being presented. **Motion carried unanimously.**
83

84 **HIGHWAY & TRANSPORTATION**

85 **Monthly Reports – County & Township Motor Fuel Tax Claims – August 2011**

86
87 **Motion** by Betz to receive and place on file the Monthly Reports for August, 2011 of the
88 County Engineer; seconded by Kurtz. **Motion carried unanimously.**
89

90 **County Engineer**

91 **Resolution Awarding of Contract for Stanton Road District**

92
93 Jeff Blue spoke about the letting for the Stanton Road project that was held this morning
94 in the Highway Engineer's office. He directed the committee's attention to bids received, seven
95 in all which is unusual for this type of project which is an aluminum box culvert. Appropriation
96 for this project was already made and approved back in December, 2010. They are now ready

97 for approval of the bids on the project. The engineer's estimate was \$153,747. The low bid
98 from Newell Construction came in at \$153,379 and was under the estimate.
99

100 **MOTION** by Jay to recommend to the full Board approval of a Resolution Awarding of
101 Contract for the Replacement of a Tank Car Culvert Located in Stanton Road District, Section
102 #10-28971-00-BR to Newell Construction Company, Danville, Illinois in the amount of
103 \$153,379.00; seconded by Moser. Petrie inquired about the timeline. Blue stated is should be
104 complete by December 15, 2011. Ammons inquired about the engineer. Blue stated Cummins
105 Engineering from Springfield did the design for this type of structure. The structure is delivered
106 in pieces and then assembled by the contractor on site. This is a two-week project at most.
107 **Motion carried with Ammons voting no.**
108

109 Petition Requesting and Resolution Approving Appropriation of Funds from the County Bridge
110 Fund Pursuant to 605 ILCS 5/5-501 – Philo Road District
111

112 Jeff Blue informed the committee this is a very small project along the Embarras River
113 near Philo. The bridge is washing out and is becoming exposed. Riprap needs to be redone and
114 placed by hand. This is for repair to the structure, estimated at \$8,500.
115

116 **MOTION** by Langenheim to recommend to the full Board the approval of a Petition
117 Requesting and a Resolution Approving Appropriation of Funds from the County Bridge Fund
118 Pursuant to 605 ILCA 5/5-501 – Philo Road District; seconded by James. Blue clarified they
119 project will entail re-grouting the old riprap and re-grouted and sealed on top of that. Alix
120 requested that it be noted this is for a repair and not a replacement when it is discussed at the full
121 Board meeting. **Motion carried unanimously.**
122

123 Other Business
124

125 None.
126

127 Designation of Items to be Placed on the County Board Consent Agenda
128

129 Item 8C to be placed on the Consent Agenda.
130

131 **COUNTY FACILITIES**

132 **East Campus Stormwater Management**

133 **Presentation: Berns, Clancy & Associates**
134

135 Betz stated that representatives from Bern, Clancy & Associates was here to conduct a
136 presentation on storm water management.
137

138 Chris Billing introduced himself and stated he was here to present the study and analysis.
139 The first page is basically recapping the summary of the management plan prepared in 2006 that
140 started with the Highway building then continued on with the ILEAS re-use project. That project
141 was okay'd by the City of Urbana. There are two watersheds on the site – 11.3 acres on the
142 western portion and the east watershed that wrapped from the eastern boundary lines from the
143 Humane Society, around the Juvenile Detention Center and continues on to the north side of the
144 Adult Detention Center that was about 31.8 acres. Because of the flat grades there are 3 outlets

145 to the watershed on Main Street. The idea is connect all of the outlets together. The plan is to
146 handle 72% imperviousness and looks to future conditions and improvements. At the present
147 time it is less than that. He continued with explanation of storm water maintenance currently
148 being maintained. All would follow the City of Urbana 100 year water flow. He directed the
149 committee's attention to the map with storm sewer lines, 100 year peak flow rates, and culverts
150 that direct water throughout. It is noted that new buildings the last few years have added to the
151 imperviousness.

152

153 He set up the second map which is one of the proposed approaches to storm water
154 management their firm determined was to be presented to the Board. Alix asked for
155 confirmation of existing outlets, specifically the outlets from the drainage basins and does the
156 north basin drain to the west basin and out from there. Billing confirmed they function as one
157 pond. The first plan took a storm sewer extension approach to the plan. They cut the sections
158 up into smaller acre portions and looked at flow as it was outlined in the original plan. The box
159 that is near Art Bartell Road is needed to make connections. This approach would be able to
160 utilize some of the existing lines as they are sufficient. It didn't seem reasonable to dig that up.
161 A brief explanation continued about the connections network. Weibel asked would this plan go
162 in the softball fields south of the highway building. Yes, Billing pointed out the direction of the
163 drainage in that area. At some point in the future the drainage would run to the west side of that.
164 Billing said they also looked at utilities in place and they stayed away from the sanitary sewer
165 that serves that spine along Art Bartell Rd. There is a water main further to the east which makes
166 the sewer line run along Art Bartell. The other thing to note is the storm sewer will have to
167 cross sanitary lines and have to keep them 10 feet apart vertically.

168

169 The next sheet in their proposal is a cost estimate for the first proposed approach option.
170 This approach would run just under \$400,000 in order to run the lines and extend the concrete
171 box. It would also include the cost of the repair of any lawn messed up during the project.
172 Weibel asked how long this project would take considering average weather conditions. Billing
173 said that assuming average weather conditions it would take about two months of construction.
174 He stated there is nothing tricky about the project, and that it is pretty straight forward line
175 construction and methods for this style of construction. Rosales about any existing cracks there
176 might be or with what happened with the recent heavy rains, would it be better to put in larger
177 pipes instead of due to the integrity of the pipe lines. Billing did not look at any existing
178 condition of the existing 18" lines. He hasn't heard any reports that line have had any problems
179 with the integrity of the existing sewer line. If found, billing talked about line the inside of the
180 lines if it were necessary. Billing noted the proposal takes into account the needs of the future.
181 Maxwell asked if Billing felt this proposed work would solve the storm water management
182 problem to which Billing confirmed that it would and he continued with clarification of the pipe
183 sizes in this approach.

184

185 Ammons stated she didn't understand completely the need to address the management on
186 the west side because she hadn't heard of any flooding in that area. Billing stated there are past
187 reports of some flooding periodically and that is exasperated with nearly 1 ½ acres of new
188 pavement and roof areas have been added since and add to the imperviousness. He said this
189 approach would leave the roadside ditches in place to help move water around, but run the storm
190 pipe thru the same corridor to get from Main Street to the back of the campus. Alix asked how
191 much of existing green infrastructure is staying. Billing replied that all that is staying in place
192 and it is not part of the proposed plan, which just includes the new infrastructure. All ditches

193 and culverts will stay in place and be useful in getting the water to the storm water system.
194 Alix asked if that's not the case with the second approach to which Billing said he would explain
195 with the next approach.
196

197 Billing began with a description of the other alternative approach. He said this plan uses
198 the best management practices approach in dealing with drainage conditions with this watershed.
199 Under the present conditions, the west area has most of the volume and is built in front of fleet
200 maintenance. Most of the volume is already built there. All of the problems have occurred in
201 area 2 further east. He noted one other important aspect and that is the need to use all 3 outlets
202 with connections because of the volume. The biggest impact would be during smaller storm
203 events. The larger rain events would still be taken care of. A variety of things can be done to
204 create retention, but change the imperviousness to deal with it. Basically the big hill of top soil
205 slope is changed to prairie and change the volume of water coming off of it. There some bio
206 swales noted in the dark green and run along the roadside ditches. The condition change would
207 soak up more water than just grass conditions. This approach would still use 15" culverts under
208 the road to move the water around in the watershed. There are some standard salt tolerant
209 vegetation swales near the salt dome because of some of the salt that may run off to those areas.
210 Some amount of open water is included in the wetlands, with a couple of deep pockets of water,
211 probably less than a foot deep up to a couple of feet deep. This approach also includes some
212 gardens. A brief description about the rain gardens continued.
213

214 Betz asked if the wetlands would always be wet to which Billing confirmed that yes.
215 Betz asked about possible mosquito problems. Billing stated that maintenance should be
216 ongoing, however the water would not be stagnant, but would flow. Water levels would rise and
217 fall with flow. He said there are several acres of water that would flow from. Langenheim
218 asked if there was any flooding expected on Art Bartell Road with this approach. Billings
219 answered that this approach would improve the current ditch now and has included an under
220 drain to make sure that water moves thru the swale. He said you should not see it ponded over
221 Art Bartell, but there is a low spot on Art Bartell towards the back, but that is the purpose of one
222 of the proposed swales.
223

224 Betz asked why is the second approach the best management practice as opposed to the
225 first option given. Billing stated the new name given to these alternative types of approach
226 compared to the standard line. Billing said this is a way to do something different with water
227 than drain it downstream and is a more environmentally conscious movement to hold water back
228 and not flood downstream. Betz also asked if there are greater upkeep costs to second option.
229 Billing said there is some maintenance costs involved. Underground maintenance costs less
230 than keeping wetlands and rain gardens above ground due to the exposure. He said for the first
231 years of the best management practice approaches, plants would take a while to establish and
232 weeds could take over unless maintained. It is important to get the plants established.
233

234 Nudo asked how often there would be a need to retrench or transfer sediments. Billing
235 said that as long as plants are established, there should be a very slow deposition of sediments,
236 about 10-15 years before extensive maintenance. Billing said that more sediment occurs in the
237 smaller rain events.
238

239 Jay asked how many acres the best management practice option takes away on the east
240 campus. Billing estimated approximately 12-15 acres are taken out of consideration for future

241 use. Holderfield asked how long the project is expected to take from start to finish for the
242 second option. Billing said about the same amount of time, however there would be different
243 types of crews installing the swales and pipes. He said the second option would have to start at
244 the optimum time of year due to plantings that need to be done. He assumes that plants would
245 mature in 3-5 years. He also said that some of the work can begin in the winter, but
246 landscaping on either plan could begin in the spring. Later in April to mid-June is the
247 opportune time and yes it would take heavier maintenance the first year, little bit less the second
248 year and less the third year to make sure the plant mix is established.
249

250 Richards asked about best guesses on the sanitary fees and would it reduce the amount of
251 fees paid by the County. Billing said that currently no one is charged for storm water, only
252 sanitary sewer fees. But he noted the City is looking into possibly charging storm water fees.
253 He stated the County could possibly be charged on amount of impervious area. He said the
254 second option would certainly improve the water quality. He didn't know for certain if the City
255 would credit for second above ground storm water management plan. Kurtz inquired about
256 times of drought. Billings said that watershed plants would have extensive root systems and
257 should be able to tolerate drought, but wetland plants could dry up somewhat and may become
258 dormant. But they would recover once they receive water.
259

260 Quisenberry wanted clarification if the second option reduces the tax because of the
261 reduced imperviousness. Billing said yes, as long as they give credit. He said the City does
262 plan to look at the amount of imperviousness and there is less runoff with second plan. He
263 couldn't answer for sure because the City hasn't decided yet.
264

265 Langenheim asked about the difference in the grounds maintenance costs between the
266 options. Billing said very little has been taken out of the mowing, but planting would not add
267 mowing. Routine maintenance may be 3-5 times a year with going thru the plants and weeding,
268 a little hard to say, but may take a little bit of time the first couple of years. He stated that
269 people could talk to someone if they have a similar type of plan and find out how much they
270 spend in time. Brief discussion continued.
271

272 Petrie stated that coming from the EPA every day there are new rules and regulations,
273 and most of these regulations go towards best management practices (second option). She
274 wanted to respond to some of the questions asked earlier. She said when the plantings are
275 planted properly they survive under all of the conditions asked about. She continued on to
276 describe a couple of areas in town that are already established after just one year. There are
277 many examples in the community. She then asked a question about acreage assigned for
278 wetlands. She would have preferred using the ditching as the wetlands so that acreage isn't
279 taken up and can be used for future space expansion. Petrie also felt the assumptions in the
280 proposal are based on green construction and she doesn't see that areas in the proposal that
281 include green construction, with the example that current concrete lots not porous as it should be.
282 She says the county should think about those things in the future because that is what EPA is
283 pushing for in future projects.
284

285 Maxwell said the only way he would want to spend the additional money is if it improved
286 water quality. He felt the only reason to approve the second option would be if it improved
287 water quality and there was a potential for the only reason was pollution runoff.
288

289 Esry asked how much deeper and wider would the ditches have to be, as Petrie suggested
290 earlier, if the larger areas were taken out. Billing said that if pipe size were increased by one
291 pipe size, then he could probably reduce the larger areas. Berkson stated that this is a matter of
292 sustainability and what this is about is returning the water to the aquifers. Billing responded that
293 it would help the shallow aquifers, but not the aquifer that drinking water is taken from. But it
294 would mitigate a more even flow and provide flood control.
295

296 Billing said there are other goals and approaches to address best practices that the
297 standard drainage practices do not address. Billing also noted that the EPA standards are always
298 changing and there are never less regulations, but always more to keep in mind.
299

300 Billing said there are two attachments to the end of the proposals – one addresses
301 previous questions about the existing pond on the west side and the concern about its steep bank.
302 He suggested excavating it to a gentler slope and installing a goose grid, along with planting
303 native plants along the edge. The proposed cost for this project would be approximately
304 \$42,000.
305

306 The last page explains the second alternative to correcting the steep slope in the pond
307 retaining wall edge is to remove and add concrete blocks in creating a stairway for an emergency
308 exit from the pond. This approach would cost approximately \$6,000. This approach would
309 take about a week.
310

311 Petrie asked if they had considered taking the two retention ponds and turning them into
312 wetlands. Billing replied that they hadn't because of the depth of the ponds. In the edge
313 treatment they can take the edges and plant some wetlands type plants that could go around. But
314 the ponds are too deep and would require putting fill back in. She said she understood that, but
315 her concern was taking up acreage that could be used for future space use. Billing stated that
316 wouldn't gain any storm water detention by doing that.
317

318 Ammons asked about the level of urgency and whether it fits in with existing priority
319 level of dealing with infrastructure within the County. Betz noted this is provided for the Board
320 to study for a period of time, and possibly make some decisions next month. Reinhart said it's
321 not urgent to the plan, as long as the city knows it is being considered. There is no urgency
322 unless there is some 50 year rain, but that's not expected anytime soon. Busey stated the Board
323 is looking at these proposed approached because of the new building on Art Bartell and storm
324 water management was a part of the plan from the beginning, being budgeted at \$450,000 and
325 was included in the bonding of the project. She anticipated this portion of the project to be
326 completed by the end of 2012. The City of Urbana was told this phase of the project would be
327 completed within a year of the building completion. Quisenberry asked for clarification that this
328 means we are committed to the city about following the plan that was part of the County's ability
329 to receive the permits.
330

331 Berkson asked if there was a green solution that is not as costly as the best practices plan.
332 Reinhart stated the proposals presented this evening were the opinions of the firm, but he cannot
333 say right now that the next design would cost as much. Petrie asked what the options of
334 investigating those further. Busey stated that in order for the information the Board received
335 this evening, the Board entered in contract with Berns, Clancy & Associates to do the work
336 required. The Board went through the QVS system to select the firm and after selection of the

337 firm and entered into a contract for \$36,000 to do the work that was presented tonight. QVS is
338 statutorily required to do this work. Weibel asked if we can go back and ask Berns, Clancy for
339 something in between options A & B. Busey responded that would have to be negotiated
340 because that is additional work.

341
342 Selection of Plan to be Implemented
343

344 Betz stated this item will be on the agenda next month and asked the Board members to
345 read this and be ready for it next month.

346
347 Facilities Director
348 Monthly Reports
349

350 Reinhart pointed out the monthly utilities report and states we are right on target with
351 utility expenditures.

352
353 **Motion** by Jay to receive and place on file the monthly reports of the Physical Plant;
354 seconded by James. **Motion carried unanimously.**
355

356 Clock Tower Update
357

358 Reinhart was happy to report that the finial is in Rantoul at Taylor Studios who has
359 ordered the materials to repair and is submitting the design to be reviewed by professors at the
360 University of Illinois to improve the structure and hopes to have the report tomorrow. Repair is
361 estimated to be six-eight weeks. Petrie stated that since the insurance company has released
362 some of the money she wondered if insurance would cover the remainder of the costs and if there
363 are there additional costs. At this point the insurance company has covered all costs to this
364 point.

365
366 Courthouse & Brookens Building Efficiency Summary Report
367

368 Reinhart supplied a summary report using those two buildings only due to time factor.
369 Comparing gas between the two years is difficult as the contract with the gas coop was not
370 started until summer of 2010. The electricity contract was also different in the middle of the
371 year also due to two different coop firms and rate changes. It's hard to compare last year to this
372 year. He continued on to mention lower the cost per square foot for natural gas and electricity.
373 As an indicator the Brookens building went from 7.29 therms per heating degree day in 2010 and
374 we're now at 8.02 therms heating degree day. Costs went down, but the heating degree days
375 went up, which makes it difficult to compare. Weibel mentioned the courthouse seems more
376 consistent with use, rather than Brookens. He thought there was a big improvement in
377 efficiency.

378
379 Petrie asked what does Reinhart feel contributes to the savings. He answered that there
380 are two major things, one is installing light sensors, motion sensors and time switches. Also
381 removed were the gym lights and replaced them with high efficiency lights. At the Courthouse,
382 the system that runs the building systems was replaced and that has added to the improvement of
383 the efficiency. Petrie would like to see over time what the return rate will be.
384

385 **Motion** by Quisenberry to receive and place the Building Efficiency Summary Report;
386 seconded by Ammons. **Motion carried unanimously.**

387
388 202 Art Bartell Rd. Construction Project Report

389
390 Reinhart directed the committee attention to the report. He noted the coroner's sink
391 arrived last week. Roessler has completed the electrical rough in and the sink in on schedule to
392 be complete. The maintenance shop has almost completely moved out of the Gill building and
393 plans to be completely out by the end of September. Busey stated the Gill Building lease
394 terminates on November 30.

395
396 Chair's Report

397 Report from County Team re: National Institute of Corrections Planning

398
399 Item placed on the desks. He stated that four individuals attended. There were a lot of
400 materials. Busey summarized in the report what was learned in Colorado. He noted the
401 County has exceptional and capable staff that attended the conferences and seminars. He said
402 he has sets of notebooks and those can be loaned to those interested in viewing them. These are
403 copyrighted materials and should not be copied and scanned. Betz mentioned with his history of
404 visiting many jails as a practicing attorney, he thought he knew much about jails, but learned so
405 much more about them at the conference. Now there is a background and will know what
406 questions to ask in the planning process. He said they learned how to predict future
407 incarceration rates, usage, etc. The first step in the process is recognizing there is an issue of a
408 problem. He thinks the County is at the stage of recognition and now must determine where to
409 go from here. He encouraged Board Members to contact the Sheriff's Office and take a tour of
410 that facility to understand what the problems are and aren't. He said that if you've done it
411 before do it again. He said the piece meal approach will not work. This experience opened his
412 eyes to the amount of work that needs to be done. He said that most work will be done by the
413 Sheriff and his staff in terms of knowing what work needs to be done and statistics. He expects
414 the Sheriff to say how the downtown facility will be used. Betz commended the staff that
415 attended the conference and that he is proud to be associated with the County.

416
417 Weibel will arrange multiple times with the Sheriff to organize tours and asked that
418 Board Members contact him do to so. Petrie thanked the group for the work that has been done
419 so far. She asked if a study session be scheduled to discuss more in depth what was learned.
420 Betz would like the Sheriff and the others from the conference also attend and give the
421 information because they all have different angles on the presentations. Holderfield said she
422 would like the opportunity to visit the jail before a study session is held.

423
424 Busey said the encouraging thing about the conference was to acknowledge the problem.
425 Her perspective, looking at the report she prepared, was that all those attending the conference
426 believed and concurred that the County is in the beginning stage of the needs assessment phase.
427 There is a lot of work that can be done by the County staff and Betz, the Sheriff and she are
428 committed to doing as much as they can until a professional can be working. She said the other
429 advantage that Champaign County has already identified the funding and the existing public
430 safety sales tax fund has the capability to do so or at least a majority of it. She is looking into
431 see if the fund has that ability and will report later on that.

433 Nudo said this reminds him of the time he came on the board with the Nursing Home
434 project. He said this will take an organized effort to put some timelines on this and placing a
435 timeline on each phase. He felt the jail is in the same crisis mode as the nursing home was.
436 Moser stated he had lunch with Bud Barker and Don Flessner (former County Board members)
437 and discussed with them what they had gone through before current downtown jail was built.
438 They both stressed not to wait on this issue. He said we need to get on this and get done
439 quickly and get the problem solved. He said the current jail is the result of what they were
440 capable of at the time.

441

442 Betz likes the idea of developing a timeline and it's necessary. He said the first
443 significant decision is to decide what can be done with downtown facility, whether it can be
444 remodeled, sold or what. Ammons stated she was concerned with assumption that the project as
445 already been decided and implement a timeline to build a new jail. She feels there need to be
446 more public discussion outside of the Boardroom on the social impact of jails in communities.
447 She said she was surprised to hear that rather than using the quarter-cent sales tax for
448 preventative uses, we would shift that money into a building. Betz stated he asked repeatedly at
449 the conference asked about the authority the County Board had in how the jails are used. He
450 said the Board is not the justice system. It is the County Board's responsibility to build the
451 building. He spoke briefly about the legislative system and the reality of justice system. He
452 said that we should not ignore there is a real issue of the downtown building quality. His main
453 concern is the jail safety.

454

455 Esry stated the Sheriff has said he would like to use home incarceration, but he no longer
456 has that ability. The Board cannot decide who goes in the facility, that it is the law that decides.
457 Moser said that back when building the satellite jail, time and money was wasted by having
458 County Staff transporting inmates to surrounding counties who in turn were able to build new
459 jails in their counties housing our inmates. Moser said that not doing anything is the poorest
460 excuse to use when the Department of Corrections says we can no longer use the current
461 building. Ammons said her concern is there is already a timeline in place to determine when a
462 new building will be built. Other Board members stated that is not the case just yet. Betz
463 stated that the Board must determine first what a timeline on an assessment would be to see if the
464 downtown facility can be used or remodeled, whether that is a cost effective option. He said at
465 one time he had heard the current facility could be added to on top, but that option needs to be
466 determined. Nudo pointed to the portion on the report on what needs to be identified and that
467 Busey had outlined three possible phases on the control of the decision making. James agreed
468 somewhat with Ammons, but said we have to do what the County Board is allowed to do.

469

470 Kurtz asked if there was anything imminent that we would be in trouble with the
471 Department of Corrections. Betz did not want to speculate on anything imminent. Quisenberry
472 said this discussion was turning prohibitive and asked to move forward and possibly schedule a
473 study session. Betz agreed and said a study session will be scheduled.

474

475

476

477 Other Business

478

479

No other business.

480

481 Designation of Items to be Placed on Consent Agenda

482

483 There are no items needing Board approval.

484

485 ENVIRONMENT & LAND USE

486 Approval of FY2012 RPC Planning Contract

487

488 Motion by Betz to approve the FY2012 RPC Planning Contract; seconded by
489 Quisenberry. Moser said that if some of the items were eliminated, could the amount be
490 lowered to reflect what was taken out of the contract. Chavarria replied that it is the prerogative
491 of the Board to do so. Nudo said the study session had one of the better meetings in a long time
492 in discussing the new contract. He wanted more discussion. Petrie expressed concerns about
493 continuation of the contract and would prefer that this evening's discussion be that the money be
494 moved to the county's planning office so that office is the central location of all the planning.
495 Part two of her other comment is she gets mixed comments about the role of RPC in planning
496 and she is still concerned that over time the money that goes to RPC that could have gone to a
497 county planning & zoning department.

498

499 Chavarria stated that RPC does multi-faceted planning, short and long-term. They
500 gather research to make good planning decisions and they also help with monitoring the plans.
501 She stated that with the contract that is before the members at this meeting there are three staff
502 members involved that have over thirty years of combined experience. The money in the
503 contract pays for about 2/3 of one of those positions. She stated there is a big difference in what
504 the county would get if paying a County employee versus the experience already in place in
505 RPC.

506

507 McGinty wanted to emphasize that he disagreed with Petrie's statements. James agreed
508 with McGinty and thanked Chavarria for the explanation of the breakdown of the numbers and
509 the work they have done. Busey stated, for appoint of information, that for 32 weeks of service,
510 a 52 week employee would use substantial benefits.

511

512 O'Connor wanted to say that he felt some items in the contract are questionable in need.
513 Holderfield stated she wasn't quite sure what was getting voted on. She said that members did
514 in study session question duties what RPC does and asked if this is the most prudent contract.
515 Alix would like some clarification on the contract and at what point will this be in contract form.
516 Chavarria noted there were items that were given them to include and then they have some items
517 that they would like the Board to consider adding to the package. Nudo submitted a handout
518 based on a discussion with four- to five other people based on the discussion at the study session.
519 He recommends conducting another study session about items that would fill the budget amount
520 in the contract. Chavarria said they would be willing to do whatever is necessary to move this
521 contract forward. She then reviewed items from the group's discussion on page 27 of the Board
522 packet. They're looking for a total of 335 hours to fill the gap where other items were removed
523 from the contract.

524

525 Petrie moved to enter a substitute motion to not consider the contract until after a study
526 session. Weibel stated it is more appropriate to defer the motion to a specific date. Petrie
527 agreed and moved to defer to the October 4 Committee of the Whole meeting; seconded by
528 Holderfield. Weibel stated he does not support the motion because he would like to discuss at
least some of the items they agree upon. Jay would support deferring to study session because

529 there a lot of items that he would like to be able to understand. Berkson state that those
530 opposing should be at the study session this time. Betz stated he wasn't sure what a study
531 session would accomplish. Alix said he would like something to be in contract form in order to
532 be voted on. Moser also wished to defer because it is too ambiguous. **Motion carried to**
533 **defer with roll call vote with Alix, Cowart, Esry, Jay, Maxwell, Michaels, Moser, Nudo,**
534 **O'Connor, Petrie, Quisenberry and Schroeder voting yes and Berkson, Betz, Cowart,**
535 **James, Kurtz, Langenheim, McGinty, Richards, Rosales and Weibel voting no.**
536

537 Chavarria asked how best the Board would like it presented at the next meeting. Nudo
538 said his notes from the study session had certain items that had yes's from some people.
539 Holderfield thought a menu of options could be provided and they build from that on the
540 suggestions. Petrie asked why, the way it's written, the 1310 hours are set in stone. Chavarria
541 answered that number is based on who does the work and hourly wage for that person. Alix
542 stated this needs to be in contract form to be able to be voted either up or down. There has to
543 be a clear idea of what is to be passed. Chavarria stated there are already some hours used in
544 providing this information to that point.
545

546 Preliminary Recommendation to County Board for Zoning Ordinance – Zoning Case 683-AT-11
547

548 **Motion** by Petrie to recommend approval of the preliminary recommendation to the
549 County Board for an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance – Zoning Case 683-AT-11; seconded
550 by Rosales. Petrie stated, because she is appointed to the LESA update committee, that this
551 particular action has a great deal of reference to LESA and encouraged not taking action on this
552 item until LESA works on the update on the definitions for best prime farmland. Hall stated that
553 if action is not taken, that for every day their office is open they have to go by what is in the
554 current zoning ordinance. He thought that LESA would not be affected by this.
555

556 Alix said it would be helpful if the section of the summary were in more in layman's
557 terms. Jay also agreed that this is a long standing concern about the clarity of what the LRMP
558 says. Hall stated that he thought previous meeting made it clear what was being requested of the
559 Board. Both Jay and Alix stated they would like the request to be in plain clear language.
560 Holderfield asked for clarification if the ZBA had the opportunity to change the amendment that
561 was approved by the County Board and now the ZBA is recommending the amendments to the
562 actual ordinance. Hall stated in this request the ZBA added three definitions on page 47 of the
563 attachment. Holderfield also stated there is no clarity in what is being requested. Hall said the
564 County Board has the authority to vote to make changes or not.
565

566 She asked for explanation of item 2h on page 49 with regard to emergency services. Hall
567 said the proposed to change emergency services to public services. Jay stated there is a
568 difference between emergency services and public services. He questioned the need to make
569 that change because not all emergency services are public, that there are private emergency
570 service agencies, citing both Carle and Provena ambulance services. Weibel disagreed stating
571 that not all police and fire vehicles are there on emergency calls.

572 Jay also questioned a statement about wildlife habitat that concerns him. Hall these are
573 only in relevant in agricultural rezoning and what the ZBA would consider a disturbance.
574 Langenheim requested a roll call vote. Moser stated all the CRP contracts along the ditches
575 are 10-15 year lease with the federal government and those contracts stipulate what you can and
576 cannot do during the term of the lease. When the lease terminates, the farmer has the ability to

577 plow it up and plant in crop if they wish. **Motion carried by roll call vote with Alix,**
578 **Berkson, Betz, Cowart, Kurtz, Langenheim, Petrie, Quisenberry, Richards, Rosales,**
579 **Schroeder and Weibel voting yes and with Esry, Holderfield, James, Jay, Maxwell,**
580 **McGinty, Nudo and O'Connor voting no.**

581
582 Preliminary Recommendation to County Board for Zoning Ordinance – Zoning Case 684-AT-11
583

584 **Motion** by Langenheim to recommend approval of the preliminary recommendation to
585 the County Board of the request to Amend Champaign County Zoning Ordinance, Zoning Case
586 684-AT-11; seconded by Berkson. **Motion carried.**

587
588 Upcoming Citizen Planner Workshop on September 14th
589

590 This item provided for information only.

591
592 Monthly Report
593

594 **Motion** by Betz to receive and place on file the monthly report for Zoning; seconded by
595 Richards. **Motion carried.**

596
597 Other Business
598

599 None.

600
601 Designation of Item to be Placed on County Board Consent Agenda
602

603 None.
604

605 ADDENDUM

606 ENVIRONMENT & LAND USE

607 Six-County ECIEDD Intergovernmental Agreement

608

609 **MOTION** by Weibel to recommend approval of the Six-County East Central Illinois
610 Economic Development District Agreement; seconded by Cowart. Alix noticed there was
611 language about alternate members having voting privileges. He said that he would like this
612 provision in other areas of county business. Petrie asked for clarification if this the same
613 contract that previously existed or is it a new contract. Susan Chavarria said this updates the
614 2008 contract and takes into account the full Illinois statutes. This does not come annually to the
615 Board. Jay asked if there was any cost to the county to which they said no. **Motion carried**
616 **with two no votes.**

617
618 OTHER BUSINESS
619 CLOSED SESSION

620 **Motion** by McGinty to enter into executive session at 8:25pm pursuant to 5 ILCS
621 120/2(c) (11) to consider litigation which is probable or imminent against Champaign County
622 and further moved that the following individuals remain present: County's legal counsel, County
623 Administrator and the recording secretary; seconded by Alix. **Motion carried with Alix,**
624 **Ammons, Berkson, Cowart, Esry, Holderfield, Jay, Kurtz, Langenheim, Maxwell,**

625 **McGinty, Moser, Nudo, O'Connor, Quisenberry, Richards, Schroeder and Weibel voting**
626 **yes and with James voting no.**

627

628 Meeting reopened at 8:31pm.

629

630

631 Meeting declared adjourned at 9:25pm.

632

633

634

635

**Note: The minutes of the meeting reflect the order of business on the agenda and may not necessarily reflect the order of business conducted at the meeting.*

**Closed Meeting Minutes Review – Committee of the Whole
Highway & Transportation/County Facilities/Environment & Land Use
September, 2011**

Is it necessary to protect the public interest or privacy of an individual?

Date of Minutes	Yes, Keep Confidential	No, Place in Open Files
-----------------	------------------------	-------------------------

Highway & Transportation Committee

December 20, 1989 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
January 16, 1991 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
January 22, 1992 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
November 20, 1992 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
April 5, 1994 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
September 17, 1996		
November 22, 1996 <i>Search Subcommittee for County Engineer</i>		
November 26, 1996 <i>Search Subcommittee for County Engineer</i>		
January 24, 1997 <i>Contract Negotiations Subcommittee</i>		
February 19, 1997 <i>Salary Negotiations Subcommittee</i>		
February 3, 1999 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
February 5, 1999		
May 7, 1999		
September 10, 1999		
October 15, 1999		
December 10, 1999		
January 14, 2000		
March 29, 2000		

April 7, 2000		
August 11, 2000		
September 8, 2000		
September 19, 2000		
October 24, 2000		
November 27, 2000		
December 19, 2000		
July 6, 2001 – 9:20 a.m.		
July 6, 2001 – 9:40 a.m.		
October 11, 2002		
November 7, 2003		
June 7, 2004 <i>County Engineer Selection Committee</i>		
June 14, 2004 <i>County Engineer Selection Committee</i>		
June 21, 2004 <i>County Engineer Selection Committee</i>		
June 29, 2004 <i>County Engineer Selection Committee</i>		
July 8, 2004 <i>County Engineer Selection Committee</i>		
July 8, 2004		
July 30, 2004 <i>County Engineer Search Committee</i>		
August 5, 2004		
August 23, 2005 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
August 31, 2005 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
October 7, 2005		
August 31, 2006 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		

September 14, 2006 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
October 6, 2006		
August 17, 2007 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
September 17, 2007 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
October 12, 2007		
November 9, 2007		
February 8, 2008		
March 7, 2008		
June 6, 2008		
August 26, 2008 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
September 12, 2008 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
April 17, 2009		

County Facilities Committee

April 26, 1990 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
November 12, 1992 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
July 7, 1993 <i>Search Subcommittee for Physical Plant Director</i>		
November 6, 2001 – 7:48 p.m.		
November 6, 2001 – 8:21 p.m.		
December 10, 2002		
January 6, 2004		
May 4, 2004		
June 8, 2004		
August 25, 2004 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		

September 15, 2004 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
October 5, 2004		
May 10, 2005		
August 23, 2005 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
August 31, 2005 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
October 12, 2005		
February 7, 2006		
May 2, 2006		
June 13, 2006		
August 22, 2006		
August 24, 2006 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
September 14, 2006 – #1 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
September 14, 2006 – #2 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
October 3, 2006		
November 21, 2006		
August 10, 2007 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
October 1, 2007 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
May 6, 2008		
August 26, 2008 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
September 12, 2008 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
November 12, 2008		
August 11, 2009 – 7:17 p.m.		
August 11, 2009 – 7:30 p.m.		

Environment & Land Use Committee

January 25, 2000		
December 12, 2005		
August 24, 2006 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
September 14, 2006 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
October 16, 2006		
August 17, 2007 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
September 17, 2007 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
September 20, 2007		
November 13, 2007		
August 26, 2008 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
September 12, 2008 <i>Performance Appraisal Subcommittee</i>		
October 14, 2008		

Committee of the Whole

June 8, 2010		
August 3, 2010		
October 5, 2010		
*January 18, 2011		
*February 15, 2011		
*April 12, 2011		
*August 2, 2011		

Special Committees

October 28, 2010 <i>Olympian-Lincoln Special Committee</i>		
---	--	--

***Minutes not previously approved in semi-annual review.**