

County Board Documents Distributed at Meeting
April 21, 2011

- 1. Resolution No. 7683 Appointing Patsi Petrie & Steve Moser to the Site Assessment Update Committee**
Agenda Item XV.B.3 Under Policy, Personnel, & Appointments
Page 1
- 2. Resolution No. 7686 Payment of Claims**
Agenda Item XV.C.3 Under Finance
Page 2
- 3. Resolution No. 7729 Authorizing the County Board Chair to Sign an Intergovernmental Agreement with the City of Champaign & the City of Urbana for the Improvement of Olympian Drive**
Agenda Item XV.D.1 Under Highway & Transportation
Pages 3-11
- 4. Champaign County Redistricting Commission Report in Support of Map 1E**
Agenda Item X
Pages 12-18

RESOLUTION NO. 7683

RESOLUTION APPOINTING PATTSI PETRIE & STEVE MOSER
TO THE SITE ASSESSMENT UPDATE COMMITTEE

WHEREAS, C. Pius Weibel has submitted to the County Board his appointment of County Board members Patti Petrie and Steve Moser to the Site Assessment Update Committee; and

WHEREAS, Such appointment requires the advice and consent of the County Board under 35 ILCS 200/6-5;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED By the Champaign County Board that the County Board does hereby advise and consent to the appointment of County Board members Patti Petrie and Steve Moser to the Site Assessment Update Committee for terms commencing April 22, 2011 and ending November 1, 2011.

PRESENTED, ADOPTED, APPROVED, AND RECORDED this 21st day of April, A.D. 2011.

C. Pius Weibel, Chair
Champaign County Board

ATTEST: _____
Gordy Hulten, County Clerk
and ex-officio Clerk of the
Champaign County Board

RESOLUTION NO. 7686

PAYMENT OF CLAIMS AUTHORIZATION

April, 2011

FY 2011

WHEREAS, The County Auditor has examined the Expenditure Approval List of Claims against the County of Champaign totaling \$6,767,558.06 including warrants 449565 through 451314; and

WHEREAS, The claims included on the list were paid in accordance with Resolution No. 1743; and

WHEREAS, Claims against the Mental Health Fund do not require County Board approval and are presented for information only; and

WHEREAS, The County Auditor has recommended the payment of all claims on the Expenditure Approval List; and

WHEREAS, The County Board finds all claims on the Expenditure Approval List to be due and payable;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Champaign County Board that payment of the claims totaling \$6,767,558.06 including warrants 449565 through 451314 is approved.

PRESENTED, ADOPTED, APPROVED, AND RECORDED this 21st day of April, A.D. 2011.

C. Pius Weibel, Chair
Champaign County Board

ATTEST: _____
Gordy Hulten, County Clerk
and ex-officio Clerk of the
Champaign County Board

RESOLUTION NO. 7729

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY BOARD CHAIR
TO SIGN AN INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT
WITH THE CITY OF CHAMPAIGN AND THE CITY OF URBANA
FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF OLYMPIAN DRIVE

WHEREAS, Champaign County, the City of Champaign and the City of Urbana are desirous to enter into an Intergovernmental Agreement for the design, construction and maintenance of Olympian Drive;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the County Board of Champaign County authorizes the County Board Chair to enter into an intergovernmental agreement with the City of Champaign and the City of Urbana for improvement of Olympian Drive.

PRESENTED, ADOPTED, APPROVED AND RECORDED This 21st day of April A.D. 2011.

C. Pius Weibel, Chair
Champaign County Board

ATTEST: _____
Gordy Hulten, County Clerk and
ex-Officio Clerk of the County Board

Prepared by: Jeff Blue
County Engineer

AMENDED INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT
FOR THE DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION, AND MAINTENANCE
OF OLYMPIAN DRIVE BETWEEN
THE CITY OF CHAMPAIGN, THE CITY OF URBANA, AND
THE COUNTY OF CHAMPAIGN

THIS INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT is entered into by and between the City of Champaign, a municipal corporation (“Champaign”); the City of Urbana, a municipal corporation (“Urbana”); and the County of Champaign, Illinois (“County”)(“Parties”).

WHEREAS, Article VII, Section 10 of the 1970 Constitution of the State of Illinois authorizes Champaign, Urbana, and the County to contract to perform and share services in any manner not prohibited by law; and

WHEREAS, 65 ILCS 5/11-91.2-1 and 605 ILCS 5/5-102, 5-105, 5-408, 5-410, 5-410.1, 7-101 and 9-101 all provide statutory authority for Champaign, Urbana, and the County to enter into this cooperative agreement with respect to the jurisdiction and maintenance of roads and streets; and

WHEREAS, the responsibility to provide for a highway system rests with Champaign, Urbana, the County, and the State; and

WHEREAS, Champaign, Urbana, and the County desire to perform this function as efficiently and effectively as possible thereby reducing costs to local taxpayers; and

WHEREAS, Champaign, Urbana, and the County find it to be in the best interest of the public to design and construct the section of Olympian Drive from Apollo Drive to Lincoln Avenue according to the location study and project design report that was completed for this road and approved by the Illinois Department of Transportation in 1997; and

WHEREAS, Champaign, Urbana, and the County find it to be in the best interest of the public to design and construct the section of Olympian Drive from Champion Avenue to Duncan Road; and

WHEREAS, Champaign, Urbana, and the County have received \$5,000,000 from the State of Illinois Capital Bill specifically for the Olympian Drive Improvements which requires no local match and is to be used for engineering design fees, land acquisition, construction, and expenses.

NOW, THEREFORE, Champaign, Urbana, and the County, in consideration of the mutual promises and covenants herein, agree as follows:

Paragraph 1. Definitions.

- (a) “Highway” means any public way for vehicular travel, which has been laid out in pursuance of any law of this State. The term “highway” includes rights-of-way, curbs, sidewalks, bikeways, sidepaths, bridges, drainage structures, channels and detention basins, signs, traffic signals, guards rails, protective structures and all other structures and appurtenances necessary or convenient for vehicular, bicycle, or pedestrian traffic.
- (b) “Direct expenses” include costs for appraisers, ROW agents, attorneys, and other direct expenses necessary for the completion of the project.
- (c) “Engineer” is a Professional Engineer appointed by the lead agency for a project. The duties of the Engineer are described in the IDOT Design Manual.
- (d) “Maintenance” means the performance of all activities necessary to keep a highway in serviceable condition for vehicular traffic.

Paragraph 2. Projects. “Project A” is defined as all work required to complete Olympian Drive from Apollo Drive to Lincoln Avenue. “Project C” is defined as all work required to complete Olympian Drive from 1400’ west of Champion Avenue to Duncan Road.

Paragraph 3. Project Description.

- (a) Project A will include design engineering, acquisition of all rights-of-way, construction engineering, excavation, embankment work, utility relocations, bridges, sidepaths, drainage structures and facilities, installation of signs, traffic signals, and paving for two lanes of Olympian Drive.
- (b) Project C, will include a project development report, design engineering, acquisition of all rights-of-way, construction engineering, excavation, embankment work, utility relocation, sidepaths, installation of signs, drainage structures and facilities and paving for two lanes of Olympian Drive.

Paragraph 4. Lead Agency. Urbana shall be the lead agency for Projects A and C.

Paragraph 5. Engineering and Other Services.

- (a) Consulting Engineer. A Qualifications Based Selection process was used to select the consulting engineer, Hanson Professional Services Inc. (“Engineer”), has been selected to complete the location study update, project design report, plans, specifications, and estimates (PS&E) for Projects A and C. If any change orders are required with the Engineer for Projects A and C, the lead agency shall receive prior written approval from the Champaign City Engineer and the County Engineer before approving any change order. The lead agency shall also obtain written authorization from the Champaign City Engineer and the County Engineer should the lead agency determine that it is necessary for any reason to increase the cost of the contracts, provided the increases do not exceed the total approved project budget.
- (b) Other Professional Services. The lead agency shall select and negotiate with other professionals or for other professional services as necessary for the completion of the projects, including, but not limited to, title companies, real estate appraisals, right-of-way

agents, soils and material testing services and other professional services associated with administering, managing, applying for grants, engineering and acquiring rights-of-way for the projects. Prior to entering into any contract for necessary professional services, the lead agency shall provide a good faith estimate of the cost and a description of such services to the Champaign City Engineer and the County Engineer and obtain their written approval before contracting with any of said professionals. The lead agency shall also obtain written authorization from the Champaign City Engineer and the County Engineer should the lead agency determine that it is necessary for any reason to increase the cost of the contracts for any of said professionals, provided the increases do not exceed the total approved project budget.

Paragraph 6: Right of Way Acquisition

The City of Urbana shall be the lead agency for any necessary right of way acquisition and shall use the powers given in Paragraph 5(b) to hire professionals to perform legal work in reference to such right of way acquisition. The County Engineer shall be the lead negotiator during right of way acquisition. Since the relevant property to be acquired lies outside the corporate boundaries of Champaign and Urbana the County shall pass legally sufficient resolutions for acquisition of property needed for right of way by eminent domain if needed.

Paragraph 7. Implementation.

- (a) Timing. Champaign, Urbana, and the County agree to take all necessary steps to implement the projects and perform those activities set forth in this Agreement. It is the intent of the parties to complete the engineering design work for Projects A and C in 2012. Land acquisition will commence as soon as practical with the preparation of right-of-way plat documents performed during the design phase. Project A and C construction

timing will be determined on the acquisition of right-of-way and easements and on the availability of Illinois Commerce Commission funding.

- (b) Champaign Budgeting; Urbana Budgeting; County Appropriations. For this Agreement there is no financial commitment or share by Champaign, Urbana, or the County.

Paragraph 8 . Maps. Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a map of which the Parties agree is the section of highway subject to the provisions of this Agreement. The limits of Projects A and C are also identified.

Paragraph 9. Funding. The Parties have received \$5,000,000 in funding from the Illinois Jobs Now, Capital Bill that requires no local match. The Parties further agree that these funds shall be used for engineering services, right-of-way acquisition, and construction for Projects A and C. Furthermore, the Illinois Commerce Commission has programmed funding in the amount of \$9,000,000 to be used toward the construction of a bridge over the Canadian National railroad tracks. The balance of funding for the approximately \$16,500,000 Projects A and C cost will come from the federal Surface Transportation Program – Urban (STP-U) funding in the amount of \$2,500,000. If the \$16,500,000 in funding from the Illinois Jobs Now, Capital Bill, the Illinois Commerce Commission, and the STP-U is not sufficient to complete the design, land acquisition, and construction for Projects A and C then the Parties shall first consider using additional STP-U funding. Projected local funding expenditures are currently set at zero for Urbana, Champaign, and the County individually. Any need for additional funding from Urbana, Champaign, and the County will require an amendment to this Agreement.

Paragraph 10. Invoices. A local agency agreement with the lead agency and IDOT is required for Projects A and C for the use of Illinois Jobs Now funds. The lead agency shall make direct payment to the Engineer. The lead agency shall seek immediate reimbursement from IDOT.

Urbana, Champaign, and the County will enter into necessary agreements for Illinois Commerce Commission and STP-U funding.

Paragraph 11. Effective Date of Agreement. The Agreement shall be effective, as between Champaign, Urbana, and the County, on the date approved by the last of the Parties to approve it.

Paragraph 12. Maintenance. Once Project A and C are completed the following understanding for maintenance of these projects is as follows:

- (a) Project A between Apollo Drive and the centerline of the Canadian National railroad bridge shall be the responsibility of Champaign.
- (b) Project A between Lincoln Avenue and the centerline of the Canadian National railroad bridge shall be the responsibility of Urbana.
- (c) Project C shall be the responsibility of Champaign.

Paragraph 13. Amendment. No amendment to this Agreement shall be effective unless it is in writing and signed by the Parties hereto.

Paragraph 14. Notices. Notice with respect to any matter contained herein shall be sent first class and mailed to:

CHAMPAIGN:
City Manager
City of Champaign
102 N. Neil St.
Champaign, IL 61820

URBANA:
Mayor
City of Urbana
400 S. Vine St.
Urbana, IL 61801

COUNTY:
County Board Chair
County of Champaign
1776 E. Washington St.
Urbana, IL 61802

City Engineer
City of Champaign
702 Edgebrook Dr.
Champaign, IL 61820

City Engineer
City of Urbana
706 S. Glover Ave.
Urbana, IL 61802

County Engineer
County of Champaign
1605 E. Main St.
Urbana, IL 61802

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Agreement.

CITY OF CHAMPAIGN

CITY OF URBANA

COUNTY OF CHAMPAIGN

By: _____
City Manager

By: _____
Mayor

By: _____
Chair

Date: _____

Date: _____

Date: _____

Attest: _____
City Clerk

Attest: _____
City Clerk

Attest: _____
County Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

By: _____
City Attorney

By: _____
City Attorney

By: _____
Its Attorney

City Council Approval Date

City Council Approval Date

County Board Approval Date

Report in Support of Map 1E Revision 1

Adopted: April 13, 2011

Delivered: April 14, 2011

To: Champaign County Board
From: Champaign County Redistricting Commission
Date: April 20, 2011

Champaign County Redistricting Commission

On November 11, 2010, the Champaign County Board appointed membership to a Redistricting Commission with the charge of completing apportionment planning based on the 2010 Census.¹ Champaign County Board Resolution No. 7307² and No. 7596³ provide guidance regarding composition of the Commission, standards, procedures, public input, the number of representatives per district and the number of districts.

The Redistricting Commission is believed to be the first of its kind in the country.⁴ The Champaign County Board based the language of Resolution No. 7307 on an Iowan statute that had created an independent redistricting commission for redistricting state legislative districts. The Iowa model was chosen because it had objective statistical tests for every map under consideration and the process was open to the public.⁵

Resolution No. 7307 provides objective statistical tests for map plans, including population and non-population criteria.⁶

Population Criteria

Paragraph 12 of Resolution 7307 describes in detail the population criteria, including ideal equal district, population, deviation, mean deviation, overall range, and smallest majority measurement.⁷

Regarding population criteria, Paragraph 12 provides (emphasis added):⁸

While the most important legal criteria for redistricting is population, strict mathematical equality is not required. If the difference in population for election districts can be demonstrated on the basis of legitimate governmental interests whose objective is related to the variance between districts and the ideal population for such districts, the Redistricting Commission may recommend a particular reapportionment plan map to the Champaign County Board and express the non-population criteria that may support consideration and adoption of that particular plan.

¹ http://www.champaigncountyclerk.com/county_board/resolutions/r07001_08000/r07544.pdf

² http://www.champaigncountyclerk.com/county_board/resolutions/r07001_08000/r07307.pdf

³ <http://www.ccrpc.org/planning/pdfs/r07596.pdf>

⁴ <http://www.news-gazette.com/news/politics-and-government/2011-04-13/county-redistricting-panel-votes-7-4-new-map.html>

⁵ <http://www.co.champaign.il.us/COUNTYBD/redistricting%20commission%20agendas/110216minutes.pdf>

⁶ http://www.champaigncountyclerk.com/county_board/resolutions/r07001_08000/r07307.pdf

⁷ http://www.champaigncountyclerk.com/county_board/resolutions/r07001_08000/r07307.pdf

⁸ http://www.champaigncountyclerk.com/county_board/resolutions/r07001_08000/r07307.pdf

Regarding the principle of one-person, one-vote, an American Civil Liberties Union Foundation pamphlet published in 2010 entitled, *Everything You Always Wanted to Know about Redistricting, But Were Afraid to Ask*, explained:

Q: As far as state and local offices are concerned, how does one person, one vote work?

For state and local offices one person, one vote requires the jurisdiction to make “an honest and good faith effort” to construct districts with as near to equal population as is practicable. Population equality is determined by calculating a district’s deviation from ideal district size. Ideal district size is determined by dividing the total population by the number of seats involved. Deviation is determined by calculating the extent to which an actual district is larger (has a “+” deviation) or smaller (has a “-” deviation) than the ideal district size. **Plans with a total population deviation (the sum of the largest plus and minus deviations) under 10% are presumptively regarded as complying with one person, one vote.** Plans with deviations between 10% and 16.4% are acceptable *only* if they can be justified “based on legitimate considerations incident to the effectuation of a rational state policy.” Plans with deviations greater than 16.4% are regarded as unconstitutional and are probably never justifiable. (Citations omitted and emphasis added at pages 8-9.)⁹

Non-Population Criteria

Paragraph 12 of Resolution 7307 describes in detail the non-population criteria:

- Voting Rights Act and the Constitution prohibiting discrimination
- Maintaining communities of interest (groups having shared interests or identity),
- Compactness (district shapes)
- Contiguity (districts connected)
- Preservation of municipal, township and precinct boundary lines

A key feature of Resolution No. 7307 is Paragraph 12 c., which provides:

Voting Patterns; Political Affiliation. The Redistricting Commission shall not consider voting patterns, voting records, past election results, party affiliation, incumbency or other such political factors in reviewing, analyzing or adopting a Reapportionment Plan Map.

Thus, the resolution expressly prohibited the Commission from consideration of voting patterns, political affiliation, and incumbency.

Transparency: Open to the Public

The Commission unanimously approved transparency principles¹⁰ and complied with them.¹¹

1. All redistricting plans have included sufficient information such that the public can verify, reproduce, and evaluate a plan. The Commission directed CCRPC to use automated processes, for

⁹ http://www.aclu.org/files/assets/2010_REDISTRICTING_GUIDE_web_0.pdf

¹⁰ Scholars from the Brookings Institution and the American Enterprise Institute developed the transparency principles.

¹¹ <http://www.ccrpc.org/planning/pdfs/TransparencyPrinciples.pdf>

- which CCRPC used the open source software BARD. Documentation regarding this software and the process were provided.
2. Proposed redistricting plans were publicly available in non-proprietary formats. Spatial files for plans were available for import into BARD, an open source redistricting software.
 3. The Commission has clearly documented criteria used as a basis for creating plans and individual districts. The criteria used for creating map plans were documented in County Board Resolution Nos. 7307 and 7596.
 4. All demographic, electoral and geographic data necessary to create legal redistricting plans and define community boundaries are publicly available, under a license allowing reuse of these data for non-commercial purposes. All demographic and geographic data used in redistricting in Champaign County is available from the United States Census Bureau. The Redistricting Commission did not use electoral data.
 5. Software used to automatically create or improve redistricting plans was open-source. CCRPC used automated processes and BARD was the open source software. Documentation regarding this software and the process were provided.
 6. Software was used to generate reports that analyzed redistricting plans that were accompanied by documentation of data, methods, and procedures that were sufficient for the reports to be verified by the public. Raw measurements were reported and calculations were accompanied by equations. Software was limited to ArcGIS and Microsoft Excel.
 7. Software necessary to replicate the creation or analysis of redistricting plans and community boundaries produced by the service were publicly available. ArcGIS and the free ESRI Districting extension were available in the Brookens Administrative Center at a public terminal.
 8. Public redistricting services provided the public with all published redistricting plans and community boundaries in nonproprietary formats. All published redistricting plans and boundaries were available in .kml formats.
 9. Champaign County Government was the only entity that contributed funds to the Redistricting Commission for public redistricting services.

All software used in the redistricting process was made available to the public by using open source software that is freely available for download and through a computer terminal open to the public at the Brookens Administrative Center. The use of open source software provides for transparency by having open access to the source code used to complete calculations and analysis. Other proprietary software generally does not provide source code, which may be interpreted as secrecy or the use of unknown methods. While proprietary software was used, calculations that were done are verifiable or code is accessible. The proprietary software was used specifically to revise the automated maps to meet the standards required by the County Board. The proprietary software and instructions about its use were available at a public computer terminal. All data that was used is available in its original format from the U.S. Census Bureau or the CCRPC website. These measures enabled anyone to generate a map using the same methodology used by CCRPC. Spreadsheets and basic geography maps were also provided so that paper maps could be printed and used to generate plans.

Maps generated for the Commission were made available on the CCRPC website at the same time they were made available to the Commission. The files were also made available on the public terminal for viewing at that location through the proprietary software.

The Redistricting Commission has met nine (9) times¹² and held four (4) public hearings.¹³ Local radio and newspaper media have covered its proceedings.¹⁴ Minutes, map plans and data (including Ideal Equal District Population, Deviation, Mean Deviation, Overall Range and Smallest Majority Measurement) and other materials generated during the work of the Redistricting Commission are available to the public on the following web sites:

- County Board: <http://www.co.champaign.il.us/COUNTYBD/redistrictcommission.htm>
- CCRPC: http://www.ccrpc.org/planning/ChampaignCounty_Redistricting.php

The Process

The Redistricting Commission adhered to the process set forth in County Board Resolution No. 7307 and No. 7596. The crux of the process adhered to by the Redistricting Commission was that professional non-partisan staff were employed, pursuant to the directions and instructions of the Commission, to use the automated processes of a computer model to generate initial reapportionment maps based on (1) objective statistical tests for every map under consideration and (2) the process was open to the public.

The Redistricting Commission requested¹⁵ that the local census liaison (housed at the Champaign County Regional Planning Commission), prepare a scope of work for technical assistance.¹⁶ The Champaign County Board approved this on January 27, 2011.¹⁷

Prior to receiving Census data from the United States government¹⁸ on February 15, 2011, the Commission reviewed the standards adopted by the County Board, general approaches to redistricting and some additional factors for consideration in the redistricting process. CCRPC prepared a document providing additional detail regarding the statistical standards established by the County Board and outlined specific methods for measuring compactness and racial diversity.¹⁹ CCRPC identified the use of Communities of Interest as qualitative information that often informs decision-making in redistricting.²⁰

In addition to the Commission roles established by the County Board, CCRPC identified goals, objectives²¹, and transparency principles²² to provide benchmarks and further guide the process. The Commission unanimously adopted the following guides.²³

¹² December 15, 2010, January 12, 2011, February 16, 2011, March 2, 2011, March 16, 2011, March 30, 2011, April 6, 2011, April 13, 2011, and April 20, 2011.

¹³ January 12, 2011, March 16, 2011, March 30, 2011, and April 6, 2011.

¹⁴ For example, News-Gazette: [County redistricting panel will have first new maps soon](#); [Nominees for redistricting panel getting mostly positive reviews](#); [Appropriation OK'd for county redistricting panel](#); [Champaign County panel to start reviewing map options](#); [Extra meeting set for county redistricting commission](#); [Champaign County Board backs redistricting commission](#); [Redistricting occupies meeting on size of county board](#); [County redistricting panel votes 7-4 for new map](#)

¹⁵ <http://www.co.champaign.il.us/COUNTYBD/redistricting%20commission%20agendas/101215MINUTES.pdf>

¹⁶ <http://www.co.champaign.il.us/COUNTYBD/CB/110127agendafull.pdf>

¹⁷ <http://www.co.champaign.il.us/COUNTYBD/CB/110127action.pdf>

¹⁸ <http://www.ccrpc.org/planning/pdfs/CensusRedistrictingDataSummary.xls>

¹⁹ <http://www.ccrpc.org/planning/pdfs/StatisticalStandards.pdf>

²⁰ <http://www.co.champaign.il.us/COUNTYBD/redistricting%20commission%20agendas/110112agendafull.pdf>

²¹ <http://www.ccrpc.org/planning/pdfs/Goals%20and%20Objectives.pdf>

²² <http://www.ccrpc.org/planning/pdfs/TransparencyPrinciples.pdf>

²³ <http://www.co.champaign.il.us/COUNTYBD/redistricting%20commission%20agendas/110216minutes.pdf>

Goal 1: The Redistricting Commission will produce a map that is not gerrymandered.

Objective 1.1 – The RC will not use voting records or political affiliation.

Objective 1.2 – The RC will use the measures identified in Resolution No. 7307.

Objective 1.3 – The RC members will document reasons for approving or disapproving maps.

Goal 2: The Redistricting Commission will maintain a transparent process.

Objective 2.1 – The RC will adopt and adhere to transparency principles.

Objective 2.2 – The RC members will provide updates to the County Board as often as possible.

Goal 3: The Redistricting Commission will provide a map or maps to the Champaign County Board, no later than April 15, 2011.

Objective 3.1 – The RC will adhere to the process identified in Resolution No. 7307.

The Commission discussed the process for receiving public input in the form of maps specifically as it concerned their charge to “not consider voting patterns, voting records, past election results, party affiliation, incumbency or other such political factors”. The Commission concluded that limitations on public input would be inappropriate. In addition, the Commission endorsed the guideline that expressly prohibited the Commission from consideration of voting patterns, political affiliation, and incumbency as factors in redistricting.²⁴

CCRPC identified methods for generating initial plans including computer generated seed maps and manually adjusting existing boundaries. The Commission selected the option of generating seed maps using an automated computer process. The Commission decided the use the open source software BARD (Better Automated Redistricting) to maintain transparency in generating the districts as the computer algorithm and the program code itself is freely available to the public.

The process set forth by the Champaign County Board in Resolution 7307 established a rigorous set of criteria used to develop plans as well as a series of non-population criteria (mapping constraints), which affected how strictly the Commission could adhere to the population criteria.²⁵

CCRPC and the Champaign County GIS Consortium (CCGISC) generated 22 plans based on the results of the automated computer process. During the March 16, 2011 Redistricting Commission meeting, CCRPC provided the Commission with 21 printed maps fitting the criteria of the Resolution.²⁶ None of the maps generated automatically fit within standards set by the County Board, which resulted in manual adjustment of each plan.²⁷

CCRPC also provided summary statistics for each map, based on the County Board standards, to help Commission members compare the alternatives. Commission members requested that CCRPC provide additional detail on the maps including additional roads, precincts, and Census Blocks. CCRPC designed

²⁴ <http://www.co.champaign.il.us/COUNTYBD/redistricting%20commission%20agendas/110216minutes.pdf>

²⁵ <http://www.ccrpc.org/planning/pdfs/Constraints.pdf>

²⁶ While CCRPC described 22 maps, it was discovered during the meeting that only 21 were printed. CCRPC did not print copy of Map Plan 5A map because, contrary to the criteria used for drawing maps, it divided a precinct into 4 parts, which problem was deemed avoided by Map Plan 5B.

<http://www.co.champaign.il.us/countybd/redistricting%20commission%20agendas/110316audio.mp3>

²⁷ <http://www.co.champaign.il.us/COUNTYBD/redistricting%20commission%20agendas/110316Minutes.pdf>

the map portion of the materials specifically so that the statistical information would be used to weigh the alternatives rather than where specific lines fall. Additional detail and reviewing the location of specific lines were incorporated in later phases of the project.

The Commission reviewed all map plan alternatives. All plans fell within reasonable standards and commonly held legal requirements including the 10% rule for overall range percent variance. However, one map did not stand out as a best option. The Commission weighed each map based on the statistical information and district boundaries shown on the maps. Commission members identified maps that they would like to see in additional detail including Map Plans 1E, 3B, 3C, 3D, 4D, and 5B.²⁸ None of the 22 initial map plans were rejected.

Since the Commission did not allow voting patterns for consideration (Resolution 7307, paragraph 12 c), the Voting Age Population (VAP) of minority races was identified instead as the method of approximating compliance with the Voting Rights Act.²⁹ Except for Map Plan 5B, all six of the plans pursued by the Commission contained a district where the minority made up at least 50% plus 1 of the VAP or, in other words, a Majority Minority District (MMD). VAP was added to the list of statistics that CCRPC provided to the Commission.

On March 30, 2011, the Commission requested revisions to three plans identified as Map Plans 1E, 4D and 5B.³⁰ On April 6, 2011, the Commission reviewed and discussed the revisions made to Map Plans 1E, 4D and 5B.³¹ In addition, three (3) new map plans (Richards, Hallmon, and Thorsland, all of which CCRPC posted on its website) were submitted to the Commission, which directed CCRPC staff to analyze and report to the Commission on April 13, 2011.

In Resolution 7307, paragraph 6, the County Board stated the responsibility of the Commission on how to adopt a map:

It shall be the responsibility of the Redistricting Commission to adopt by majority vote a Champaign County Reapportionment Map with election districts in accordance with the standards and procedures set forth in this Resolution.

On April 13, 2011, the Redistricting Commission voted to reject the Richards, Thorsland, Hallmon, 4D, and 5B map plans. The Commission adopted by a majority vote (7-4-0) Map Plan 1E Revision 1, which is a Champaign County Reapportionment Map with election districts in accordance with the standards and procedures set forth in Champaign County Board Resolution No. 7307 and No. 7596.³²

Analysis for Map Plan 1E Revision 1

The Commission considered and published population and non-population criteria within the printout of Map Plan 1E Revision 1, including:

²⁸ <http://www.co.champaign.il.us/COUNTYBD/redistricting%20commission%20agendas/110316Minutes.pdf>

²⁹ http://www.aclu.org/files/assets/2010_REDISTRICTING_GUIDE_web_0.pdf

³⁰ <http://www.co.champaign.il.us/COUNTYBD/redistricting%20commission%20agendas/110330minutes.pdf>

³¹ <http://www.co.champaign.il.us/countybd/redistricting%20commission%20agendas/110406audio.mp3>;

<http://www.news-gazette.com/print/511786>

³² <http://www.co.champaign.il.us/countybd/redistricting%20commission%20agendas/110413audio.mp3>;

<http://www.news-gazette.com/print/516846>

- Population Characteristics
- Racial Diversity Index
- Population Summary for 11 Districts
- Measures of Compactness; and Absolute Deviation by Race.

The data analysis shows that Map Plan 1E Revision 1 meets or exceeds the criteria required by the County Board in Resolution Nos. 7307 and 7596.

Map Plan 1E Revision 1 maintains “communities of interest,” including rural, urban, racial and ethnic communities. District 6 would be a Majority Minority District (MMD) that would have an estimated Voting Age Population (VAP) of nearly 56.6 percent minority.³³

The map also balances the number of urban and rural interests by creating Districts 1, 2, 3, and 4 that appear to be primarily rural districts.

A concern addressed by the Commission involved the boundary between District 6 and District 7 near University Avenue and Hill Street in Champaign.

- This area was seen as a Community of Interest that was being split. On March 30, 2011, the Commission instructed CCRPC to revise Map Plan 1E so that the area in question was held within a single district. Revisions were made along the boundary between District 6 and District 7.
- On April 6, 2011, the Commission incorporated this change into Map Plan 1E Revision 1, and after that, the Commission made no request for any other changes.

Map Plan 1E Revision 1 splits 16 existing precincts, 4 townships and 3 municipalities and it complies with state law requirements.³⁴

- The map plan was comprised on contiguous territory, as nearly compact as practicable, including the City of Urbana and proposed District 5.
- Townships or municipalities were divided only when necessary to conform to the equal population requirement.
- Precincts were retained in such a manner so that no precinct was divided between 2 or more districts insofar as practicable.

First Reapportionment Plan Map

On April 14, 2011, a copy of adopted Map Plan 1E Revision 1 was hand-delivered and the Chairperson of the Champaign County Board acknowledged receipt of the map. Pursuant to Resolution 7307, paragraph 13 b., this was the First Reapportionment Plan Map.

³³ See Map Plan 1E Revision 1 for analysis of date entitled, Absolute Deviation by Race, which shows District 6 is an MMD (56.6 %).

³⁴ Paragraph 12 of Resolution 7307, which cites 55 ILCS 512-3003(1) (a)-(d).