



**CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD**  
**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE – ELUC/ County Facilities/Highway**  
*County of Champaign, Urbana, Illinois*  
*Tuesday, April 3, 2012 – 6:00 p.m.*

---

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

**Page No.**

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Roll Call**
- III. Approval of Minutes**  
A. Committee of the Whole – March 6, 2012 1-13
- IV. Approval of Agenda/Addenda**
- V. Public Participation**
- VI. Communications**
- VII. County Facilities**
- A. Physical Plant Monthly Reports – to be distributed at meeting
- B. 202 Art Bartell Construction Project
1. Monthly Report 14
2. Recommendation for Award of Contract for East Campus Storm Water Management Project 15-17
- D. Courthouse Sound System Project Update
1. Certificate of Substantial Completion 18
2. Letter from Presiding Judge re: Court Audio/Video Replacement Project 19
- E. New Bike Racks for Brookens Administrative Center – for information 20-22
- F. Chair’s Report
- G. Other Business
- H. Designation of Items to be Placed on the Consent Agenda
- VIII. Environment & Land Use**
- A. Request to Authorize CRIS Application for Public Transportation Assistance Grants for Operating and Rolling Stock Capital Under the Illinois Department of Transportation’s Authority on Consolidated Vehicle Procurements, Job Access Reverse Commute and New Freedom 23-26

- B. Recreation & Entertainment License – U of I Rodeo Club – Champaign County Fair Association, 1302 N. Coler, Urbana 27-31
- C. Request Approval from ELUC to Place the Draft LESA on the Zoning Board of Appeals Agenda for a Public Hearing 32-65
- D. Request Approval from ELUC to Place a Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment Changing the Definition of Best Prime Farmland on the Zoning Board of Appeals Agenda for a Public Hearing 66-68
- E. Monthly Report (to be distributed)
- F. Other Business
- G. Designation of Items to be Placed on Consent Agenda

**IX. Highway & Transportation**

- A. County & Township Motor Fuel Tax Claims – March, 2012 69
- B. Resolution Awarding of Contract for the Replacement of a Bridge Located in Crittenden Road District – Section #10-08968-00-BR – Project to be Let March 29<sup>th</sup>
- C. Resolution Awarding of Contract for Repair of a Culvert Wingwall Located on CH22 – Section #12-00982-00-BR – Project to be Let March 29<sup>th</sup>
- D. Resolution Awarding of Contract for Bituminous Materials for Various Township Road Districts – Section #12-000-BR - To be Let March 29<sup>th</sup>
- E. Ordinance Speed Limit – CH54 (Tin Cup Road) 70
- F. Resolution Authorizing the Chair to sign a Joint Agreement with the Illinois Department of Transportation for the Replacement of Structure #010-0117 Located on County Highway 16 (St. Mary's Road) – Section #07-00944-00-BR 71-76
- G. Chair's Report
- H. Designation of Items to be Placed on the Consent Agenda

**X. Other Business**

**XI. Adjournment**

1 **CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD**  
2 **Committee of the Whole Minutes**  
3

---

4 *Tuesday, March 6, 2012 – 6:00pm*  
5 *Lyle Shields Meeting Room*  
6 *1776 E. Washington St., Urbana, IL*  
7

8 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Alix, Ammons, Anderson, Bensyl, Berkson, Betz, Carter,  
9 Cowart, Esry, Holderfield, James, Jay, Kibler, Kurtz, Langenheim, Maxwell, Michaels,  
10 O'Connor, Petrie, Quisenberry, Richards, Rosales, Schroeder, Weibel  
11

12 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** McGinty, Mitchell, Moser  
13

14 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Deb Busey (County Administrator), Julia Reitz, Steve Ziegler  
15 and Joel Fletcher (State's Attorney), John Hall (Zoning), Sheriff Walsh, Allen Jones (Sheriff),  
16 Alan Reinhart (Facilities Director), Ranae Wolken (recording secretary), JJ Farney  
17 (videographer), Nora Stewart, Tara McCauley, Janae Wisheart, Dana Craig, Amy Foster, Kelly  
18 Dillard, Dee Ruggles, William Castro, Sarah Lazare, Patsy Howell, Chris Evans, Jerehme  
19 Bamberger, Rachel Schwartz, Rohn Koester, Aaron Ammons, many other members of the public  
20

21 **Call to Order**  
22

23 Board Chair Weibel called the meeting to order at 6:03pm.  
24

25 **Roll Call**  
26

27 A roll call was taken and the following were present: Alix, Ammons, Anderson, Bensyl,  
28 Berkson, Betz, Carter, Cowart, Esry, Holderfield, James, Jay, Kibler, Kurtz, Langenheim,  
29 Maxwell, Michaels, O'Connor, Petrie, Quisenberry, Richards, Schroeder and Weibel. The  
30 following members were absent: McGinty, Mitchell, Moser, and Rosales.  
31

32 Chair Weibel noted that McGinty and Mitchell had notified him that they would not be  
33 present at the meeting.  
34

35 Rosales arrived after roll call.  
36

37 **Approval of Minutes**  
38

39 **Motion** by Jay to approve the minutes of February 7, 2012, as presented; seconded by  
40 Esry. **Motion carried unanimously.**  
41

42 **Approval of Agenda/Addendum**  
43

44 **Motion** by Carter to approve the agenda for the meeting; seconded by James. There is  
45 no addendum.  
46

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

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

56  
57 **A vote taken on original motion to approve the agenda carried with one no vote.**  
58

59 **Public Participation**

60  
61 Nora Stewart, President of the Local 900 representing the County's AFSCME employees,  
62 spoke and asked that the negotiation team for the County show them the respect they deserve and  
63 return to the negotiation table.

64  
65 Tara McCauley wanted to draw the attention of the Board to the detailed proposals. She  
66 asked Board members to study them and hoped the Board would reconsider the proposals since  
67 both sides are not very far apart.

68  
69 Janae Wisheart, Secretary for the Local 900 said they were told there was nothing more  
70 to negotiate and asked for reconsideration in the negotiations.

71  
72 Dana Craig, State's Attorney employee said she was here to ask the Board to listen to  
73 what they have to say. She wanted to let management know they still want to negotiate and reach  
74 a deal.

75  
76 Dee Fairchild Ruggles, Professor at the University of Illinois spoke in regard to the  
77 design committee. She spoke of the criticisms of the public on the project and she said the  
78 County should look forward to different ways of incarcerating individuals who have committed  
79 crimes. She asked if a new jail facility is really needed and said that she felt \$20 million was a  
80 high price tag. She wanted the Board to consider measures to decrease crime.

81  
82 William Castro said he was dismayed with reading the reports of the NIC, more  
83 specifically with the statistics on racial makeup. He wondered how experts could make  
84 unbiased recommendations regarding alternatives to incarceration and jail expansion. He  
85 suggested depopulating the downtown jail and eliminating the downtown jail.

86  
87 Amy Foster wanted to ask one more time to grant the authority to resume the AFSCME  
88 negotiations. She felt it was difficult to talk about equality when using percentages for wage  
89 increases when there are two different scales for bargaining and non-bargaining. She said the  
90 Unit was very willing to work with the county on insurance. She said they worked hard on  
91 getting lower insurance premiums and would think those savings would allow the extra authority  
92 for salary increases in the negotiations.

93  
94 Sarah Lazare spoke and said she represented the GEO Local 6300 and wanted to talk  
95 about the proposed expansion of the jail. She talked about the issue that the IL Department of  
96 Corrections passed the County's jails without any violations, but suggested the Sheriff and others  
97 are pushing this issue of needing building issues addressed as an emergency and is problematic.  
98 She said the jail expansion effort is not just a building issue. She urged the Board not to rush  
99 through and that it should be connected to an understanding how the expansion would work.

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

108  
109 Patsy Howell said she spoke at last month's meeting about letting the public know what  
110 is happening with the \$20 million. She said that while she was incarcerated in our jail they were  
111 passing out medications and screaming out that calls were made. She felt like she was in a  
112 mental institution, not a jail. She said the Needs Assessment should deal with the trends about  
113 who will be jailed in the new jail and how to keep up maintenance. She said the Board is not  
114 capable to pick a committee that is going to discuss this issue.

115  
116 Chris Evans talked about Ordinance No. 572 passed in 1998 and of Ordinance No. 683  
117 passes in 2003.

118  
119 Jerehme Bamberger stated his concern with the influence of the project team over the  
120 Board's decisions on how to proceed with the rectifications of the jail. His concern was the  
121 team was appointed and there are no existing public records of their meetings. He spoke of  
122 portions of the RFP and the selection process.

123  
124 Rachel Schwartz, candidate for County Board District 7 spoke of the funding of the jail  
125 and the rhetoric she heard that the bonds will be paid off and there will be funds available.

126  
127 Rohn Koester said he has worked as a volunteer in the satellite jail with students in  
128 obtaining their GED. He said there are currently more inmates that request enrollment than the  
129 program allows. He continued with a description of how the GED and other programs work.

130  
131 Aaron Ammons said he had questions about the RFP. He spoke about language that  
132 referred to the County and the consultants and also about how communication with the public is  
133 structured.

134  
135 **Communications**

136  
137 Ammons asked that any written comments of those that spoke in public participation be  
138 turned in and be placed on record.

139  
140 **Environment & Land Use**

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

143  
144 **Motion** by Langenheim to direct the Zoning Administrator Regarding Proposed Zoning  
145 Ordinance Text Amendment to Amend Limits on Vehicles and Equipment in Rural Home  
146 Occupations; seconded by Weibel.

147  
148 **Motion** by Weibel to amend the main motion on Item 1E to strike the strike out when it  
149 pertains to farm vehicles; seconded by Berkson. **Motion to amend carried with one no vote.**

150 Jay stated his concerns with this case and with the proposed changes. He said some don't  
151 seem to make sense and would like to defer to the June meeting.  
152

153 **Motion** by Jay to defer to the June meeting; seconded by Holderfield. Jay said he  
154 doesn't see an immediate need, but has a lot of questions. James said he concurred with Jay.  
155 Alix said Mr. Dillard made a number of comments, one of which an issue was regarding signage.  
156 Kurtz wanted to make sure that Board members give Mr. Hall some direction. Michaels also  
157 agreed to defer. Holderfield would like more time because she wasn't sure how the strikeouts  
158 would affect any changes in the future and we need complete ordinance. She said it was  
159 imperative to do this correctly. She also said that townships have the opportunity to change  
160 limits and should have input. Anderson said she was ready to vote, but Mr. Dillard brought up  
161 some points, but it seemed there was vague wording that got it to this place. Kurtz really does  
162 not want to recognize a deferment in June and wants this to move forward. **A vote on the**  
163 **motion to defer carried with no votes.**  
164

165 Direction to Zoning Administrator Regarding Proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment to  
166 Modify Wind Farm Separation from CR District  
167

168 **Motion** by James to direct the Zoning Administrator Regarding Proposed Zoning  
169 Ordinance Text Amendment to Modify Wind Farm Separation from a CR District; seconded by  
170 Carter. James asked why this was needed. Hall said a land owner is affected by this and that  
171 this particular piece of property no longer has the natural features that a CR district is supposed to  
172 have. So this land owner was not able to participate in the wind turbine project because of that.  
173 Kibler asked where the one mile separation come from. Hall said it was originally a CR District  
174 and there were bird and bat fatalities, but now the land doesn't support that.  
175

176 Bensyl confirmed that at one time there were trees on that property, but no longer are  
177 there. A ditch on that area was also rerouted and no longer on that property and is mostly  
178 tillable acres. It was noted that a CR district allows houses just like an AG district. Petrie  
179 asked if there was nothing in the CR guidelines that gives guidelines or prohibits what happens  
180 and is there anything that precludes it becoming a CR district again. Hall said this is the only  
181 CR district like this in the entire county. Alix asked why this is a text amendment rather than a  
182 zoning or map amendment. Bensyl said the reason for doing this is the landowners around that  
183 property with the one mile setback that could have had wind towers couldn't because of the way  
184 it is written, even though the land is not put in conservation because the ground has changed over  
185 the years.  
186

187 Weibel pointed out the action tonight only sends this evening's action to ZBA for a  
188 public hearing and that should be clarified in the motion. Alix requested the landowner be sent a  
189 letter about the change. Hall said they do not ordinarily do that for text amendments, but he will  
190 check with the State's Attorney on that. Petrie felt this was not an urgent matter. Langenheim  
191 said that having read the text in the agenda, it appears to him that this piece of land should not be  
192 in a CR district and should be addressing the more appropriate zoning. If deferred, it will go to  
193 ZBA and then it will be referred back to the full County Board for approval. **Motion to forward**  
194 **on to ZBA carried with one no vote.**  
195

196 Monthly Report  
197

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

200 Other Business

201  
202 None.  
203

204 County Facilities

205 QBS Presentation & Overview – Steve Ziegler

206  
207 A five minute break was taken from approximately 7:40pm to 7:45pm.  
208

209 Steve Ziegler, with the State’s Attorney’s office, started a presentation and overview of  
210 the Qualifications-Based Section Process. He said that several Board members had already been  
211 through this procedure, but it was requested that he conduct this again for some of the newer  
212 Board members. He said it was designed to be objective and flexible for obtaining  
213 architectural, engineering and other related professional services. He said it was a very  
214 streamline procedure. He said the County is required to use this system to select architects and  
215 engineers based on competence and qualifications. The issue of fees comes up after the  
216 ranking of candidates. It sets a specific proposal. This Act requires local governments to  
217 evaluate qualifications of firms and authorized interviews or public presentations. Then those  
218 firms are ranked to a minimum of three in order of preference and being negotiations with only  
219 the top ranked firm. If a successful contract cannot be negotiated, then the next firm is  
220 approached to negotiate a contract and on down the line. Once a contract is completed, the  
221 County must work with that firm, unless there are extraordinary circumstances. The County  
222 must identify the scope of work and the general timeline. Public notice is then given. A  
223 Selection Committee is also appointed. Presentations are given, evaluations are established.  
224 A tour of the site may also be given. Interviews are conducted and then the firms are ranked.  
225 It was noted that at least three should be identified.  
226

227 Mr. Ziegler then continued with the steps in the process. Champaign County should go  
228 with a public notice system because a bidders list is not maintained by the County. He said the  
229 Selection Committee may include representatives of the department responsible for  
230 administration of the project and the project’s functions and any other stakeholders in the success  
231 of the project.  
232

233 He continued on what to ask for in the proposals: A Statement of Qualifications, Letter  
234 of Interest and a Request for Technical Proposals that are detailed plans on how a design  
235 professional firm will approach the project. Ziegler said that a number of firms to be included  
236 on the shortlist should be determined to be on the shortlist with no less than three and usually no  
237 more than five. After the Selection Committee has developed the short list, the firms are  
238 contacted and are sent complete information regarding the interview process and requirements,  
239 including evaluation criteria to be used for the interview scoring system. A tour of the site is  
240 then conducted.  
241

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

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

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

252  
253 Petrie stated she had talked with some people at the State level and they had told her the  
254 County could use vendors from their pre-qualified list. Ziegler said that list is for a variety of  
255 vendors for State buildings and those are vastly different than County building projects. Petrie  
256 said she's already been involved in this process once, and being an urban planner she sees a lot of  
257 difference is asking for qualifications and design. She found it an unsatisfactory process. She  
258 asked about extricating from the process if a firm is selected. Ziegler stated that can happen  
259 during the contract negotiation process. He said the more specific the parameters of the project,  
260 the more likely you'll get more specific information back. He also said it may not be an entirely  
261 satisfactory process, but it is the one we are required to follow.

262  
263 Ammons wanted clarification made that the Illinois statutes that set the parameters to use  
264 the system. Ziegler said it is the basics you must follow. He said it not bid system and how  
265 firms are ranked is up to this Board. Jay asked if once in the negotiation phase with a firm, the  
266 County could stop the process then. Ziegler confirmed that negotiations may stop if finances are  
267 not agreed upon. Bensyl said he had concern also about adopting someone else's list of  
268 vendors because those vendors may not be qualified to build what the County wants, for example  
269 those vendors may have qualifications for building schools, but not jail. Brief discussion  
270 continued.

271  
272 Carter asked how different this process is from the courthouse project. Ziegler said it  
273 wasn't much different. Alix talked about his experience with this system. He finds where it  
274 breaks down is on a project where you don't know what outcome you want. Zeigler said the  
275 place where that information could be sorted out is with the Needs study. He used the  
276 courthouse project as an example. The Needs Assessment and Pre-Design was conducted  
277 because they were told how many courtrooms were needed, what departments would be included  
278 in the courthouse and addition. They knew the number of employees that would be located  
279 there and they were also told that the old courthouse should remain intact and used. Maxwell  
280 said that maintaining a list of pre-qualified engineers and such and didn't think it was the best  
281 thing for the County. Zeigler agreed, because the County doesn't have on-going construction  
282 projects the way the State does. He agreed with Anderson that State prison systems are  
283 different than County jail systems.

#### 284 285 Physical Plant Monthly Reports

286  
287 **Motion** by James to receive and place on the file the monthly reports of the Physical  
288 Plant; seconded by Kibler. **Motion carried unanimously.**

#### 289 290 202 Art Bartell Construction Monthly Report

291  
292 Reinhart stated the only activity is a partial payment to BCA for the storm water  
293 management project.

294  
295 **Motion** by Jay to receive and place on file the monthly report; seconded by Bensyl.  
296 **Motion carried unanimously.**

#### 297 298 East Campus Storm Water Management Project Bid Opening Schedule

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

306  
307 Courthouse Sound System Project Update  
308

309 Reinhart said the sound system update is moving forward smoothly and that sound  
310 systems in the courthouse are upgraded and working well. They're working tonight at the Adult  
311 Detention Center for the remote video arraignment system. The courthouse arraignment system  
312 is in. They hope to have all systems up and running by the end of the week. Reinhart  
313 confirmed for James that there is a one year warranty on all labor and materials on this project.  
314

315 Jail Space Improvement Project

316 Approval of Release of RFP for Consultant Services for Needs Assessment and Pre-Design  
317 Planning  
318

319 **Motion** by Kurtz to release the RFP for Consultant Services for Needs Assessment Study  
320 for Champaign County Corrections; seconded by Langenheim. Weibel stated a more recent  
321 update copy had been placed at the members' desks.  
322

323 **Motion** by Ammons to strike "do nothing" on page 4, paragraph two and amend the time  
324 frame on page 4, assuming this was approved this evening. She suggested the release date be  
325 March 23 and adjust the schedule from there, as follows: Responses due May 25, Jail Planning  
326 Project Team Notification of Selection of Short-Listed Firms, June 18, the Short Listed Firm  
327 Interviews with the County Board on July 10; Top Ranked Firm Selection on July 11, Contract  
328 Negotiation July 12thru 19<sup>th</sup> and the County Board award of contract being July 26; seconded by  
329 Carter. Petrie asked if presentations could be made on the date normally held for the study  
330 session in June, rather than July 10 because that is a date already set aside normally. Ammons  
331 agreed with the amendment from Petrie. Betz asked Ammons if the two items in her motion  
332 could be separated.  
333

334 There was no objection to the change to separate. The committee agreed upon the  
335 change of deleting the words "do nothing" Discussion turned back to the timeline. Busey  
336 asked if the Top-Ranked Firm Selection could be moved to June 27 because that will be  
337 determined by the County Board on the 26<sup>th</sup> and then the contract negotiation could begin and not  
338 wait. Ammons agreed with that. Kibler wanted clarification that if the Committee of the  
339 whole agreed upon all changes this evening, then could it not be released in accordance with the  
340 timeline originally in the RFP. Quisenberry said he would like to get through with this  
341 discussion this evening, so that it can be released.  
342

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

350 date changes that are appropriate, they can be made later. **Motion to defer the discussion to the**  
351 **end of the discussion carried.**  
352

353 Ammons asked for clarity on methodology in selection process from Ms. Busey. Busey  
354 said it is spelled out for determining the firms that will present their options. She said on page 7  
355 there should be an amendment to change “may elect to shortlist two or three firms” to “shall  
356 short-list the firms” Alix asked if the Chair would entertain straw votes on the text changes.  
357 Betz asked how many members had changes or amendment suggestions. Five members raised  
358 their hands. He asked if they were substantive or errata. Ammons stated her respect about  
359 time, but also didn’t want to take this issue lightly. Alix asked if there was a mechanism to  
360 defer, but continue the discussion. Betz did not feel this could happen. Weibel would not like  
361 to defer again without some discussion. Holderfield agreed with Weibel so that it is known what  
362 is out there to discuss. Betz received consent to Busey’s suggestions about “the firms”.  
363

364 **Motion** by Ammons to include the phrase “including any that could contribute to racial  
365 disparities in jail population versus county demographics” after “criminal justice system,”;  
366 seconded by Alix. Weibel asked if it could just read “including any that could contribute to  
367 racial disparity” because it says the same thing. Ammons accepted that change. **A roll call**  
368 **vote carried with Alix, Ammons, Anderson, Berkson, Betz, Carter, Cowart, Holderfield,**  
369 **Kibler, Kurtz, Langenheim, Maxwell, O’Connor, Petrie, Quisenberry, Richards, Rosales**  
370 **and Weibel voting yes and with Bensyl, Esry, James, Jay and Michaels voting no.**  
371

372 **Motion** by Ammons to add “as well as community based treatment, education and  
373 prevention programs.” after agencies in #5 of the Scope of Services section and to change the  
374 phrase “incarceration or to add appropriate” to “incarceration and identify appropriate” in the  
375 same section, next sentence and to strike the entire last sentence in #7 of the same section;  
376 seconded by Cowart. Petrie stated her position in requesting that last sentence be added.  
377 She said we need to think what will happen with the downtown facility and what if it can be  
378 repurposed. Maxwell suggested leaving it in and directing the consultant to make suggestions.  
379 Brief discussion continued. Unanimous consensus on striking the sentence in #7. In #8 she  
380 asked about changing the phrase “estimate does not need to include other considerations,” to  
381 “estimate should include other considerations”. Alix spoke and said the language in the last  
382 sentence and suggestion was made to change “some operational costs” to “all operational costs,  
383 including”. Busey said she didn’t want the Board to think this consultant would be the one to  
384 determine with the budget for any project that is determined. The budget is not determined until  
385 a firm is selected for the architect and determines what will actually be done. James said the  
386 consultant should just determine what the needs actually are. Discussion continued. Betz asked  
387 for consensus to add the word “acknowledge” to Ammons’ phrase in #8. Consensus of the Board  
388 was to accept those small changes. In #9, Ammons asked about the second sentence. She felt it  
389 should be put in the methodology section and Busey agreed that should be okay. **Motion on**  
390 **Ammons motion for changes in Paragraph #2 carried with Alix, Ammons, Anderson,**  
391 **Berkson, Betz, Carter, Cowart, Holderfield, Kibler, Kurtz, Langenheim, Maxwell,**  
392 **O’Connor, Petrie, Quisenberry, Richards, Rosales and Weibel voting yes and with Bensyl,**  
393 **Esry, James, Jay and Michaels voting no.**  
394

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

400 Petrie wanted to decouple the variables of the maintenance only clause. She felt it  
401 should be considered along the timeline, rather than waiting on a plan presented by the  
402 consultants. Betz felt maintaining the jail along the line is a separate issue from this proposal.  
403

404 **Motion** by Petrie to decouple the maintenance only factor in the second paragraph and be  
405 considered separately; seconded by Ammons. Quisenberry also agreed with Betz that the  
406 building will continue to be maintained whether or not it is considered a part of a future plan.  
407 Brief discussion continued. Petrie said her major concern was with information given by  
408 Reinhart and the amount of money that would need to be put into the downtown facility and to  
409 have a clear idea how much maintenance would need to be done. **Motion failed.**  
410

411 **Motion** by Petrie that the request for costs that are in the RFP be removed from the RFP  
412 on Page 16. **Motion fails for lack of a second.**  
413

414 **Motion** by Berkson that the Committee of the Whole be the team that makes the short-  
415 list, rather than the Jail Project Planning Team; seconded by Rosales. Betz's interpretation of  
416 the Berkson motion is that all those who apply make a presentation. Berkson said no, that the  
417 whole Board should make the shortlist as to who makes presentations. She felt this is the most  
418 important step in the entire process. Bensyl asked what the project team would then do, to  
419 which Betz replied it would not exist. Alix stated his concern about a logistical problem with  
420 having all twenty-seven Board members review the proposals to make a shortlist. He mentioned  
421 it is a good idea to have Board members' input as to who makes the shortlist and said he is open  
422 to supporting the motion if it is explained how it would work in a way that doesn't deprive the  
423 input of the Sheriff and those others in the system. Berkson felt the Board should be the decision  
424 maker. She said the firm chosen could go to the Sheriff for his input. Maxwell said we might  
425 consider having someone neutral in the selection process.  
426

427 Michaels said in some ways she understands both Berkson and Alix said, but also thinks  
428 we have to have the input of those working in the facilities day in and day out because they know  
429 how it functions and doesn't want to see them eliminated from the process. Ammons said one  
430 her initial changes was to include the Justice and Social Services team in the process, but also  
431 does not disagree with Berkson. She also feels the Planning Team did a good job putting the  
432 RFP together, but feels there is a little slight that there should probably be another group  
433 reviewing those selected to interview. Petrie offered a compromise that there are three groups  
434 do the scoring: the Project Team, the Justice and Social Services Team and the County Board,  
435 and let them all score.  
436

437 Langenheim said with regard to logistics, as we did with the Nursing Home Project and  
438 many other projects in the last decade or so, we had a set of firms and saw a pre-selected group of  
439 those. He asked if it were possible to take the rejected submissions and have those available for  
440 Board member that want to look through them and then make a decision to allow one or two of  
441 them to make a presentation, if approved. Quisenberry suggested having a few or four Board  
442 members in the scoring process, part of the team in that effort. Betz pointed out there are already  
443 two Board Members on that committee. He spoke of past successful projects built. He said  
444 that nothing precludes the County Board to review anything.  
445

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

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

456

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

468

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

481

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

493

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

496

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

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

501

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

505

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

508

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

517

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

531

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

536

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

546

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

548

549 **Motion by Ammons carried with roll call vote with Alix, Ammons, Anderson,**  
550 **Berkson, Betz, Carter, Cowart, Kurtz, Petrie, Quisenberry, Richards and Weibel voting yes**  
551 **and with Bensyl, Esry, Holderfield, James, Jay, Kibler, Langenheim, Maxwell, Michaels**  
552 **and O'Connor voting no.**  
553

554 Discussion returned to the discussion of the timeline. Ammons withdrew her motion  
555 for changing the dates. Busey said she would email the revised RFP to all Board members and let  
556 them know she will still have time to make any corrections if a mistake is caught prior to March  
557 9, the release date.  
558

559 **A vote on the original motion to approve the RFP as amended carried by roll call**  
560 **vote with Alix, Ammons, Anderson, Berkson, Betz, Carter, Cowart, Esry, Holderfield,**  
561 **James, Jay, Kibler, Kurtz, Langenheim, Maxwell, Michaels, O'Connor, Petrie,**  
562 **Quisenberry, Richards and Weibel voting yes and with Bensyl voting no.**  
563

564 Other Business

565 None.  
566  
567

568 Policy, Personnel & Appointments

569 Appointments/Reappointments

570 Lincoln Legacy Committee  
571

572 **Motion by Weibel to recommend to the full Board approval of the reappointment of**  
573 **Raymond Cunningham to the Lincoln Legacy Committee for a term ending February 28, 2015;**  
574 **seconded by Esry. Motion carried.**  
575

576 C-U Mass Transit District  
577

578 **Motion by Weibel to recommend to the full Board approval of the appointment of**  
579 **Jermaine Raymer to the Champaign-Urbana Mass Transit District Board for a term ending**  
580 **December 31, 2016; seconded by Langenheim. Chair Weibel stated Mr. Raymer is a republican**  
581 **from Champaign and a daily user of the MTD. Motion carried.**  
582

583 County Administrator

584 Vacant Positions Listing

585 For information only.  
586  
587  
588

589 Other Business

590 Resolution Establishing the Champaign County Local Foods Policy Council  
591

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

599           **Motion** by Weibel to amend the motion to add a final “Whereas” to read as follows:  
600   Whereas, the Council will review available options where the Council could/should be centered  
601   or housed, and evaluate each option in terms of relationships of the local food market, financial  
602   backing, and member appointment process”; seconded by Alix.   **Motion to amend carried.**  
603

604           Discussion returned to the main motion.   **A roll call vote on the motion as amended**  
605   **carried with Alix, Ammons, Anderson, Betz, Carter, Cowart, Langenheim, Maxwell,**  
606   **Michaels, Petrie, Quisenberry, Richards and Weibel voting yes and with Bensyl, Esry,**  
607   **James, Jay, Kibler and O’Connor voting no.**  
608

609   Consideration of Position in Opposition to HB5252  
610

611           Busey explained that the state would change how the said the Rental Housing Support  
612   Fee is collected and currently retained by the County and is deposited in the County’s general  
613   revenue fund. This proposed bill would change that to the State holding the revenue. The fee is  
614   collected through the County Recorder’s office.  
615

616           **Motion** by Richards to recommend approval of a Resolution in Opposition to HB5252;  
617   seconded by Quisenberry. Richards stated he was the one who asked it be put on the agenda.  
618   **Motion carried with one no vote.**  
619

620   Chair’s Report  
621

622           None.  
623

624   Other Business  
625

626           None.  
627

628   Adjournment  
629

630           Chair Weibel declared the meeting adjourned at 11:37pm.  
631

632   Respectfully submitted,  
633

634   Ranae Wolken  
635   Recording Secretary  
636

637

638

639

640

641

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