



**CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE – Highway/Facilities/ELUC Agenda**
County of Champaign, Urbana, Illinois
Tuesday, March 1, 2011 – 6:00 p.m.

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

	<u>Page Number</u>
I. <u>Call To Order</u>	
II. <u>Roll Call</u>	
III. <u>Approval of Minutes</u>	
A. Committee of the Whole – February 10, 2011	*1-17
IV. <u>Approval of Agenda/Addenda</u>	
V. <u>Public Participation</u>	
VI. <u>Communications</u>	
VII. <u>Highway & Transportation:</u>	
A. <u>Monthly Reports</u>	
1. County & Township Motor Fuel Tax Claims – February 2011	*18
B. <u>County Engineer</u>	
1. Resolution Appropriating County Bridge Funds & Authorizing the County Board Chair to Sign the Joint Agreement for Section #09-00956-00-BR	*19-25
2. Resolution Authorizing the County Board Chair to Sign the Joint Agreement for Section #10-00429-00-RS	*26
3. Petition – Raymond Township	*27-28
4. Resolution of Support for Project A – Olympian Drive, from Apollo Drive to Lincoln Avenue Extension <i>(To Be Distributed)</i>	
5. Resolution of Support for the Extension of Lincoln Avenue to Olympian Drive <i>(To Be Distributed)</i>	
C. <u>Other Business</u>	
D. <u>Chair's Report</u>	
E. <u>Designation of Items to be Placed on County Board Consent Agenda</u>	

VIII. County Facilities

A. Facilities Director

1. Physical Plant Monthly Reports (*To Be Distributed*)
2. Brookens Energy Lighting Retrofit Project Update

B. 202 Art Bartell Construction Project

1. Project Update
2. Monthly Project Budget Report *29
3. Presentation - Overview of the Qualified Based Selection (QBS) Process in Illinois
4. Recommendation for Engineering Firm for Storm Water Portion of Project *30-35

C. Chair’s Report

D. Other Business

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

IX. Environment & Land Use

A. Preliminary Recommendation to County Board for Zoning Ordinance Amendment

1. Request to Amend Champaign County Zoning Ordinance. Zoning Case 675-AT-10 Petitioner: Champaign County Zoning Administrator *36-80

B. Direction to Zoning Administrator Regarding Proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments

1. Request to Amend the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance to Implement Land Resource Management Plan Policies 4.1.5, 4.1.7, and 4.1.9 *81-85
2. Request to Amend the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance to Implement Land Resource Management Plan Policies 4.1.6 and 4.3.1-4.3.4 *86-89
- 3a. Request to Amend the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance to Implement Land Resource Management Plan Objective 4.4 by adding a Special Use Permit for the RRO *90-97
- 3b. Request to Amend the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance to Implement Land Resource Management Plan Objective 4.4 by Adding Standard Conditions for the Special Use Permit for the RRO *90-97

C. Final Recommendation to County Board for Zoning Ordinance Amendments

1. Request to Amend Champaign County Zoning Ordinance. Zoning Case 665-AT-10 Petitioner: Champaign County Zoning Administrator *98-100

2. Request to Amend Champaign County Zoning Ordinance. Zoning Case *101-102
666-AT-10 Petitioner: Champaign County Zoning Administrator

D. Monthly Report *(To Be Distributed)*

E. Other Business

1. Request for Letter of Support for Senate Bill 2195 *103-130

F. Chair's Report

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

X. Semi-Annual Review of Closed Session Minutes *131-135

XI. Adjourn

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MINUTES

10 **Highway & Transportation/County Facilities/Environment & Land Use**
11 **Thursday, February 10, 2011**
12 **Lyle Shields Meeting Room, Brookens Administrative Center**
13 **1776 E. Washington St., Urbana, Illinois**

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

MEMBERS PRESENT: Christopher Alix, Jan Anderson, Astrid Berkson, Thomas Betz, Lloyd Carter, Lorraine Cowart, Stephanie Holderfield, Stan James, John Jay, Brad Jones, Alan Kurtz, Ralph Langenheim, Brendan McGinty, Diane Michaels, Alan Nudo, Steve O'Connor, Pattsy Petrie, Michael Richards, Jonathan Schroeder, C. Pius Weibel

MEMBERS ABSENT: Carol Ammons, Ron Bensyl, Greg Knott, Steve Moser, James Quisenberry, Giraldo Rosales, Larry Sapp

OTHERS PRESENT: Jeff Blue (County Engineer), Kat Bork (Administrative Assistant), Deb Busey (County Administrator), John Hall (Planning & Zoning Director), Susan Monte (RPC County Planner), Alan Reinhart (Facilities Director), Tom Berns (Berns Clancy & Associates)

24
25

CALL TO ORDER

26 Weibel called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

27
28
29

ROLL CALL

30 Busey called the roll. Alix, Anderson, Berkson, Betz, Holderfield, James, Jay, Jones, Kurtz, Langenheim, McGinty, Michaels, Nudo, O'Connor, Petrie, Richards, Schroeder, and Weibel were present at the time of roll call, establishing the presence of a quorum.

31
32
33
34
35

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

36 **MOTION** by James to approve the Committee of the Whole minutes of January 11, 2011; seconded by Anderson. **Motion carried with unanimous support.**

37
38
39
40
41

MOTION by Langenheim to approve the Olympian-Lincoln Special Committee minutes of November 10, 2010; seconded by Holderfield. **Motion carried with unanimous support.**

42
43

APPROVAL OF AGENDA/ADDENDA

44 **MOTION** by Jay to approve only the agenda; seconded by Nudo.

47 **MOTION** by Nudo to amend the motion to remove agenda items 9.B.1-3 from the
48 agenda; seconded by Holderfield.

49
50 Nudo explained he spoke to Hall and Monte after Tuesday’s study session about
51 incorporating ideas from that session into the direction to the Zoning Administrator. He would
52 also like the eight Board members who did not attend the study session to have the opportunity
53 to see the ideas raised. He also had a conversation yesterday with Kurtz and Weibel about
54 pulling these items off the agenda and both individuals concurred. Kurtz said he had changed his
55 mind and requested pulling only 9.B.1 from tonight’s agenda. He felt 9.B.2-3 were well
56 discussed at the study session and the Board could move forward on those issues tonight.
57 Weibel clarified the motion was to pull the items from tonight’s agenda, not to defer them and
58 Nudo concurred.

59
60 **Motion carried to amend the original motion with unanimous support.**

61
62 Carter and Cowart entered meeting at 6:09 p.m.

63
64 **Motion carried to approve the agenda as amended with unanimous support.**

65
66 **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

67
68 Weibel stated public participation would be limited to one hour and each individual could
69 speak for five minutes.

70
71 Joel Barickman from the Atkins Group spoke in support of the Olympian Drive project
72 and encouraged the Board to work towards getting the project completed.

73
74 William Cope spoke on behalf of 26 landowners about the Olympian Drive/Lincoln
75 Avenue project. He stated the group of landowners had met with Blue and were willing to
76 support the option shown as a yellow line on the map. His group would like the road to be built
77 as far west as possible. They assume Project B will never happen and support a compromise
78 based on this assumption.

79
80 William Bates read a letter on behalf of Shirley Squire and Christine Squire Pierson about
81 the Squire Farms land and the Olympian Drive/Lincoln Avenue project. The letter included
82 information about the farm’s operations and how it is owned by three heir groups, which are
83 represented by a three-person management committee. It identified Janet Scharlau as the farm
84 agent, not the farm manager. The letter expressed Squire’s and Pierson’s support of the
85 Olympian Drive/Lincoln Avenue project and the S-curve alignment for Lincoln Avenue. They
86 are willing to sell land, but did not want Squire Farms to carry the sole burden of sacrificing land
87 to appease other landowners who object to the project. The letter questioned whether Nudo had
88 a conflict of interest as a County Board member because it claimed he was related to Billy and
89 Virginia Ziegler, who are opposed to the project.

90
91 Robert Lakey, an Olympian Drive resident, spoke in support of the Olympian
92 Drive/Lincoln Avenue project based on traffic needs.

93 John Dimit, representing the Economic Development Commission, voiced the EDC's
94 support of the AXC options for the Olympian Drive project. A major employer, with facilities
95 on both sides of the railroad tracks, has a critical need for the road to be completed. The
96 company's local management is having difficulty convincing corporate management that they
97 should continue to invest in the Champaign-Urbana community. He felt this was an issue
98 concerning current jobs, not just the potential for future jobs.
99

100 Joe Lamb, from Open Road Paving & Champaign Asphalt, described how the Cities of
101 Champaign and Urbana worked to relocate much of the industries formerly scattered about the
102 north side. The industries moved with the design by city planners that they would have trucking
103 and road access. He stressed the need to follow through on building the access.
104

105 Tara McCauley, AFSCME representative, explained the union and County were in the
106 process of negotiating a wage reopener. She spoke about the wage freeze instituted in 2008 and
107 the County's goals about maintaining quality workforce from the FY2011 budget. She stated
108 Champaign County employees' wages are not keeping up with other county employees in the
109 region, based on AFSCME's survey. She objected to the idea of eliminating some of the step
110 increases for union employees. McCauley said it was not fair that some administrative and
111 managerial employees have received upgrades and raises since 2008. Regarding the attorney
112 hired to represent the County Board during negotiations, McCauley stated this attorney has
113 offended union members when discussing wage increases. She objected to the fee the attorney
114 was being paid and said shame on the County Board for sending this person to represent them.
115 McCauley remarked the union employees deserve more than what is being offered by the County
116 Board. If the Board can afford to pay for projects, then it can afford to put more money into the
117 employees.
118

119 Patty Walls, a union employee in the Supervisor of Assessments' Office, did not like
120 some of the comments made by the County's negotiating team during negotiations. She spoke
121 about the learning process as an employee and the value of longevity.
122

123 Nora Stewart, AFSCME Local 900 President, said she was hurt and appalled by
124 comments made by Lorna Geiler, a private attorney hired by the County Board as its
125 representative in negotiations. She objected to the fee Geiler was being paid and the County's
126 offer of a wage increase.
127

128 John Farney, AFSCME Local 900 Vice-President, said it was important that the union
129 employees' step increases from previous contracts continue so Champaign County does not fall
130 behind other counties in regard to wages. Noting the health insurance changes, layoffs, and
131 furloughs helped balanced the County budget, he said the \$80,000 difference between the
132 management and union proposals should not be insurmountable. The \$80,000 could be taken out
133 of the General Corporate Fund's balance or by the Nursing Home repaying the loan from the
134 GCF. Farney spoke against the County Board's decisions to extend the University Avenue TIF
135 district and authorize position upgrades for seventeen elected officials and non-bargaining
136 employees. He also objected to comments made by the County Board's legal counsel at the
137 bargaining table and the same attorney's hourly rate.
138

139 Weibel closed public participation after verifying that no one else which to speak.

140
141 **COMMUNICATIONS**

142
143 Petrie informed the Board that she, Kurtz, and Eric Thorsland attended a wind energy
144 seminar at Normal. Kurtz added that the County is looking good on future wind farms.

145
146 **HIGHWAY & TRANSPORTATION**

147 **Monthly Reports**

148 **County & Township Motor Fuel Tax Claims – January 2011**

149
150 **MOTION** by Langenheim to receive and place on file the County & Township Motor
151 Fuel Tax Claims for January 2011; seconded by Carter. **Motion carried with unanimous**
152 **support.**

153
154 **County Engineer**

155 **Intergovernmental Agreement for the Jurisdictional Transfer of County Highway 32 in Gifford**

156
157 Blue described the \$4 million project, completely funded by federal and state dollars, on
158 County Road 11 and County Highway 32. It will not cost the Champaign Count taxpayers any
159 money from the Highway Fund to complete the project. This road travels through Gifford’s
160 main street and Blue provided a map at the Board’s desks. He explained that receipt of federal
161 aid money carries a number of requirements, including the caveat that there is no angular parking
162 when the road passing through a smaller community, such as Gifford. Gifford would have to
163 change to parallel parking in its downtown and sacrifice 50% of the available spaces to use the
164 federal money. Blue has negotiated an intergovernmental agreement with Gifford that would
165 enable the Highway Department to complete the project while meeting the village’s needs at the
166 same time. Gifford will take jurisdictional transfer of the main street while the federal aid
167 project is being completed and then the road will be transferred back to the County. This gets
168 around the federal regulations. The agreement was signed at Village’s board meeting. At some
169 point in the future, Gifford will have to decide how to proceed. The road inside the village could
170 be milled and overlaid using County tax dollars. Gifford’s downtown area has serious drainage
171 problems and the motor fuel tax dollars have constraints when being used for drainage
172 improvements. The positive side of using federal funds on the road project is that this money
173 will pay to replace street parking lost by Gifford with a parking lot in downtown. The federal
174 money would also pay for the drainage work. Gifford has been given the option to choose one of
175 these two approaches. The request for the Board tonight is for the jurisdictional transfer and
176 deletion of the road from the County Highway System.

177
178 **MOTION** by Langenheim to approve the Intergovernmental Agreement for the
179 Jurisdictional Transfer of County Highway 32 in Gifford and deletion of County Highway 32
180 from the County Highway System; seconded by Weibel.

181
182 The Board discussed the road project details. Schroeder asked about coordinating with
183 Gifford to finish the drainage work. Blue could not speak on behalf of the village engineer, but
184 he was willing to work with the engineer on developing a plan. Petrie asked about any

185 anticipated problems for Gifford. Blue explained the village would possess the road for a year
186 and he did not foresee any major maintenance problems. The project will be done this summer,
187 with the exception of the portion inside Gifford.
188

189 **Motion carried with unanimous support.**

190
191 Weibel exited the meeting at 7:04 p.m.
192

193 Lincoln Avenue/Olympian Drive
194

195 Blue explained the Olympian-Lincoln Special Committee last met on November 10th and
196 agreed that the project's purpose and need was valid and that they would like to see a
197 compromise with the affected property owners. The motion approved by the committee was "to
198 ask Blue to interact with the various parties and come back to the County Board, perhaps by
199 February 1st, to report his progress to see if there can be breakthroughs on some of the details."
200

201 Weibel returned to the meeting at 7:05 p.m.
202

203 Blue described the efforts he made in meeting with Jason Barickman (who represented
204 landowners group at the November 10th meeting) and Shirley Squire to fill the committee's
205 direction. Shirley Squire is a major property owner in the area and 1/3 owner of Squire Farms.
206 Her niece, Christine Squire Pierson, is another 1/3 owner of the Squire Farms property and sent
207 the letter with Squire that was read during public participation. Barickman represents Janet
208 Scharlau, the other 1/3 owners of Squire Farms. Blue contacted Shirley Squire following the
209 November meeting, who asked him wait and contact her after holidays. He contacted her on
210 January 6, 2011 and met with Squire and Barickman at Squire's house for four hours. They
211 discussed everything from 1997 to the present about the project. At the beginning of the
212 meeting, Shirley Squire was adamantly opposed to any alignment of Lincoln Avenue that
213 differed from the proposed alignment (shown as green on the map). By the end of the meeting,
214 Squire indicated she would be open to discussion of an alignment west of her homestead if they
215 people represented by Barickman would be open to discussion about continuing Olympian Drive
216 to U.S. Route 45. Squire wanted Barickman's group make concessions regarding Olympian
217 Drive if Squire Farms was being asked to make concessions regarding the Lincoln Avenue
218 project. She asked Barickman to return with a response from his clients. Barickman said he was
219 going to take this information back to his clients. Squire also wanted to see where the different
220 alignment would be on a map. It became apparent other option is possible, hence why the map
221 shows three separate alignments in green, yellow, and red.
222

223 Blue contacted Barickman later about his clients' response and, on January 17, 2011,
224 received an email from Barickman. In this email, Barickman stated it was his belief that the
225 Olympian-Lincoln Special Committee's direction to Blue was to develop a westerly alignment.
226 The minutes from the November 10, 2010 Olympian-Lincoln Special Committee reveal that the
227 direction to Blue was to open communications about a compromise and not what Barickman
228 described. Barickman advised his clients to not take any further action on Shirley Squire's offer.
229 More email communication followed and on January 28, 2011 Barickman informed Blue he was
230 no longer representing his clients in this matter and they preferred Blue correspond with them

231 directly as individuals instead of corresponding to a representative of the group. On February
232 3rd, Blue, Bill Gray, and Mike Munson went and talked to Shirley Squire with the three route
233 map to apprise her of the different alternatives. Shirley Squire prefers the green alignment, as
234 indicated by her letter, because it was the alignment chosen by the people who lived in that area.
235 Shirley Squire put a lot of time of effort into the development of the green alignment when the
236 process was done. She does not like the red alignment and open to discussing the yellow
237 alignment if the other group of landowners is open to extending Olympian Drive to the east.
238

239 Blue met with the group of landowner who have opposed the project last night and
240 presented the three route map. As indicated by William Cope during public participation, the
241 group is not in favor of the red or green alignments and would prefer the yellow alignment be
242 stopped at the Olympian Drive intersection with no continuation of the curve to Lincoln Avenue.
243 Blue felt he has fulfilled the committee's direction and the committee has been dissolved.
244

245 Regarding the current situation, Blue reviewed the three alignments on the map. The
246 green alignment is the approved alignment from 1999 study. The total of new right-of-way that
247 would need to be purchased is roughly 12.6 acres, affecting six landowners. The red alignment
248 came out of the original engineering study as the preferred alignment but was adjusted to the
249 green alignment thru input at public meetings. Four property owners are impacted by the red
250 alignment for a total of 13.6 new acres of right-of-way that will have to be purchased. The
251 yellow alignment brought to the Olympian-Lincoln Special Committee by BKB Engineers hired
252 by the group of objecting landowners. This alignment travels west of Shirley Squire's
253 homestead. The yellow alignment crosses the property of four owners for a total of 18.6 acres of
254 newly acquired right-of-way. Squire Farms owns 14.4 acres of the right-of-way that would have
255 to be acquired for the yellow alignment.
256

257 The green alignment requires no additional location work and has been approved. The
258 Board could move ahead with this alignment. The red alignment would have to be re-evaluated
259 as an amendment to the Phase 1 study. Blue estimated that work would cost an additional
260 \$120,000. The yellow alignment or any other alignment would require starting anew with a
261 location study or Phase 1 study. The price tag to complete new Phase 1 study was about
262 \$170,000. Blue explained that the Board cannot direct that the study to evaluate one particular
263 alignment, it has to start over with multiple alignments and go through the public participation
264 process. The impacts on the land, homes, and environment all have to be considered. A design
265 phase cannot be performed just on the yellow alignment and Blue could not predict what
266 alignment would come out of this process as the preferred alignment.
267

268 Blue outlined the County Board's options as: 1. use the approved green alignment, 2. re-
269 evaluate the alternatives from the previous location study (the red alignment), or 3. start a new
270 study and look at all the different alternatives which may come out of that study.
271

272 Blue distributed a timeline and spreadsheet on costs for north Lincoln Avenue. The
273 Olympian Drive project is in the plan with the Illinois Commerce Commission for FY2013. This
274 project needs to be bid before July 1, 2011. He described impact of performing a new location
275 study. The good news is that Project A is 100% funded without any local dollars being spent.
276 ICC, Illinois Jobs Now, and STU (CUUATS) money will pay for it. Project C (the westerly

277 hookup to Duncan Road) does not requires any local dollars to be spent. Project X is funded by
278 STU in the amount of \$1.4 million and a local match that will cost a slightly higher amount.
279 reason is federal dollars could be used for Phase 2 or right of way acquisition. The bottom line is
280 the project will cost a total of \$20 million with about \$2 million of this amount coming from
281 local match. Some money came from FHWA to IDOT this year that could be allocated to this
282 project and this is how the STU money was allocated. This is real money programmed thru
283 different agencies. Weibel informed Blue there would be no vote on the Olympian-Lincoln
284 project tonight. Blue asked the County Board to reaffirm at next opportunity that the purpose
285 and need of projects AXC are valid. He also asked the Board to make a motion of support for the
286 existing report and alignment of Project A. If the Board decides to choose the second or third
287 options, then those options are funded with CUUATS money to a 50% match. This would have
288 to be approved by the CUUATS Board. The County Board would be funding approximately
289 \$60,000-\$85,000 from some funding source. Blue offered to answer any questions from the
290 County Board.

291
292 Jay asked if the estimated cost of Project A would build the road over to the green or
293 yellow alignments. Blue confirmed the estimated cost builds the road to the green alignment.

294
295 Nudo spoke about development versus impediments to development. He preferred the
296 yellow alignment because it better divided the residential areas from the industrial or commercial
297 areas. He would comment on Shirley Squire's letter under other business. He inquired about the
298 logic in keeping the sweeping S alignment because it would affect eleven properties and the
299 yellow alignment would affect one property. He encouraged working for the best solutions to
300 not interfere with the existing residences, regardless of whether they were built after Shirley
301 Squire's home was constructed.

302
303 Michaels asked if the match portion for Project X was based on the road being
304 constructed north of Olympian Drive. Blue explained that all of the different funding was based
305 on the approved (green) alignment. Michaels inquired if the amount would be the same if the
306 alignment was moved further west and stopped at Olympian Drive. Blue answered that it would
307 be a coin flip in regards to construction costs. The \$1.1 million estimate is close if the road stops
308 at Olympian Drive.

309
310 Alix appreciated Blue's contributions in clarifying the available options. He asked Blue
311 about the funding. Blue confirmed the funding for Section A is contingent to there being a
312 solution to Section X. The County's contribution would come from the Motor Fuel Tax money.
313 There would be monies available in 2013-2014 to fund a project per the with fringe road
314 agreement. Alix asked if north Lincoln Avenue would be City of Urbana street (not a County
315 road) and if it was true the city does not have the right to condemn land outside the corporate
316 limits. Blue confirmed it would be a street in the City of Urbana. The city has the right to
317 purchase property from a willing seller, but cannot condemn property. The County would have
318 to be the instrument for condemning land, not the City of Urbana. Alix concluded the County
319 did not have a role in this project except for the financial contribution if the Squire Farms owners
320 were willing sellers. The letter from Shirley Squire and Christine Squire Pierson indicated the
321 majority of the farm shareholder are not willing sellers. Blue understood that the Squire Farms
322 agreement required the unanimous consent of all three owners to sell the property. Based on the

323 letter, it is assumed two of the three parties are not willing sellers. Alix asked if any assurances
324 could be made to anyone regarding whether Olympian Drive will extend east of Lincoln Avenue
325 to U.S. Route 45. Blue understood Shirley Squire's intent as being to get a letter of
326 understanding or an agreement with the landowners along the Olympian Drive corridor that says
327 they would willingly allow the project to proceed. Alix understood one of the City of Urbana's
328 reasons for preferring the green alignment was that it would maximize the size and flexibility of
329 the unbroken parcel west of the new Lincoln Avenue and south of the new Olympian Drive.
330 Blue confirmed that was one of Urbana's stated reasons.

331
332 Holderfield inquired whether the engineering costs would vary with the different
333 alignments considering the floodplain. Blue explained that the red alignment would require
334 some floodplain mitigation. The green alignment likely needs more mitigation. Regardless of
335 the alignment some mitigation will be needed.

336
337 McGinty thanked Blue for the gathering this information and getting the various parties
338 together. He felt the other landowners found the yellow alignment acceptable as a compromise
339 and it felt that the matter was close to resolution if a full court press is applied to make it happen.
340 He asked if Shirley Squire was averse to the yellow alignment. Blue reiterated that Squire
341 wanted to see Olympian Drive be built to Route 45. He did not know whether her opinion of the
342 yellow line would be favorable if only the A&X portions are constructed. He could not speak on
343 her behalf. McGinty suggested taking the approach quickly move forward to see if it was
344 possible to make the yellow alignment happen. He had no objections to reaffirming the purpose
345 and need of the AXC portions. He encouraged the Board to make the final push to decide on the
346 project. Blue wanted the Board to understand that if the study is reopened, then there was no
347 guarantee that the yellow line is exactly where the alignment will fall.

348
349 James exited the meeting at 7:57 p.m. and Weibel exited the meeting at 7:58 p.m.

350
351 Discussion continued over the Lincoln Avenue and Olympian Drive projects.

352
353 James and Weibel returned to meeting at 8:01 p.m.

354
355 Betz was concerned about new lines being drawn after the money has been invested in a
356 study that arrived at a different route. He did not think arbitrary lines should be drawn after a
357 study has been finished or the Board be asked to spend more money on another study. The
358 yellow route may not be the result of a new study and people will be angry with this project no
359 matter what route is selected. Betz wanted to take a vote on whether or not the County Board
360 actually wants to do this project. He requested next month's agenda include items for a direct
361 vote on the AXC project and to either support or reject each of three options.

362
363 Langenheim argued the green alignment was far superior to yellow line from the
364 perspective of convenience, safety, and the engineering standpoint. The Board has not discussed
365 the problems of traffic, safety, and construction for the project. Blue concurred that was the
366 result of the 1999 design study

367

368 Betz asked for Blue's opinion based on his expertise as the County Engineer. Blue stated
369 that if County Board sees fit to expend the money to restudy the project, then whatever
370 alignment comes out of the study will be what they need to meet today's transportation needs, if
371 the study is done appropriately. He was not a proponent of spending more money or time, but he
372 was a proponent of doing the right thing.

373
374 Petrie asked if there were any archeological findings in the area. Blue explained the only
375 known cultural resource is south of Squire Farms. There has not been any investigation west of
376 the Squire homestead. Any artifacts that might be discovered can be removed from the site.

377
378 Nudo and Betz exited the meeting at 8:13 p.m.

379
380 Petrie asked if the acreage figure given was the amount necessary for the road to be
381 constructed. Blue answered the acreage was the amount needed to build the four lane section in
382 the future. One of the issues that came out of the public participation during the study was that it
383 was appropriate to purchase the right-of-way for a four lane section even if only a two lane
384 section is constructed at this time. Petrie questioned why the yellow alignment was not one of
385 routes originally studied. Kurtz said the westerly route was one of ten routes studied, but not one
386 of final three options. Blue said the yellow alignment was brought by the landowners who are
387 objecting to the approved alignment.

388
389 Nudo returned to the meeting at 8:17 p.m.

390
391 Alix understood yellow alignment was proposed because it was a road that could be built
392 which only affects one or two landowners, who were willing sellers. The support for having Blue
393 look at the Yellow alignment was based on that idea. There is considerable evidence that the
394 Squire Farms owners are not willing sellers and they would be the most affected owners under
395 the yellow alignment. The green and yellow alignments propose purchasing about the same
396 amount of land. He did not think engineering decisions should be based on taking land from one
397 owner versus taking it from another owner when neither owner is a willing seller.

398
399 Betz returned to the meeting at 8:18 p.m.

400
401 In response to an earlier question from Petrie, Blue described how the three final options
402 that were a result of the original study all realigned with the existing Lincoln Avenue. This
403 alignment was done to lessen the impact of the land takings along the roadway. The Board also
404 has to consider what will happen to the old Lincoln Avenue if it is not reused as an alignment of
405 the new roadway. He questioned who would accept the burden of maintaining old Lincoln
406 Avenue into the future. In the short term it would probably fall to Somer Township and later to
407 the City of Urbana if the area is annexed into the city. If the new road is not realigned with the
408 existing Lincoln Avenue then there would be parallel routes that would have to be maintained
409 forever. Blue thought this was a large decision-making factor in the original study. The Board
410 members continued to voice their opinions regarding the Olympian Drive and Lincoln Avenue
411 project.

412
413

414 Blue explained IDOT was clear that Olympian Drive could not be built without building
415 Lincoln Avenue. IDOT would not allow the County to simply stop Olympian Drive at a dead
416 end in the middle of nowhere. The Board needs to make a commitment on whether the purpose
417 and need of the projects are viable. If the money is spent to perform a design study then they
418 should follow the recommendations that are a result of the study.

419
420 Nudo did not want a study to determine what the best route is. He wanted a study
421 devised to determine if the yellow alignment would work and then let the Board decide. Blue
422 explained a study cannot be performed to look only at the yellow alignment. A consequence of
423 not following the appropriate study process is that nothing is built because the \$20 million is
424 funding is taken away. If the County does not follow the federal aid guidelines when a study is
425 performed then there will be no federal funding for the project.

426
427 Betz reiterated his request to have the County Board vote on whether they want this
428 project, not the route, just the project itself next month. If a study is performed, then the Board
429 needs to follow the results of the study. The study should be objective and follow the federal
430 guidelines. He was not convinced the Board would support the alignment that comes out of the
431 study, but he was willing to try it.

432
433 Blue asked if Bill Gray, the City of Urbana Public Works Director, could address the
434 Board as someone who has worked on the project since the beginning. Cowart allowed Gray to
435 speak. Gray said he was involved in the location study process for both Olympian Drive and
436 Lincoln Avenue. He wanted the Board to be aware of a few things about the yellow alignment
437 from the Urbana perspective. With the yellow alignment, the area north of Olympian Drive
438 would have to be completed to connect to Lincoln Avenue. There has to be a way to go north
439 and south. The yellow alignment has presented tonight carries about a \$1.2 million additional
440 cost to the green alignment. This money would be spent to obtain the additional right-of-way.
441 The City of Urbana does not want to maintain two parallel roads when the area is annexed in the
442 future. The old Lincoln Avenue is a geometric disaster for truck travel and would someday have
443 to be rebuilt. Gray asked if the County Board would partner with the City of Urbana to build old
444 Lincoln Avenue is its existing alignment. The green alignment was selected because it
445 essentially farms out the existing Lincoln Avenue. It also provides east and west access for
446 future development. If Olympian Drive is eventually built to Route 45, then there will be not
447 second or additional intersection with the existing Lincoln Avenue. Gray wants to have
448 intersections that are at least a half mile apart and the large parcel size intact for development
449 purposed. The green alignment allows this to occur and the yellow alignment does not.

450
451 **MOTION** by James to suspend the rules; seconded by Holderfield. **Motion carried**
452 **with unanimous support.**

453
454 Nudo asked if Gray was saying that he did not care about the eleven affected families
455 who were paying taxes to have their roads improved. Gray said green alignment would affect six
456 families and the yellow alignment would affect four families. He cared about the families, but in
457 any scenario the government would have to purchase right-of-way from a property owner who is
458 either willing or unwilling. This is also true for the Olympian Drive project.

459

460 McGinty understood the half mile intersections were preferred from an engineering
461 perspective, but asked Gray if it was possible even if it cost \$1 million extra. This could be
462 considered Phase 2 and been constructed when there is a need to construct a road north of
463 Olympian Drive. Gray explained that IDOT is a major player in this project and discussion were
464 held with that entity. The roads are being built for access and there needs to be access to travel
465 north. McGinty and Gray discussed about the traffic on the roads.
466

467 O'Connor asked about the costs. Blue verified the estimates were current and put
468 together by Hanson Engineers. The vast majority (approximately 90%) of the cost will be used
469 to build the bridge. The roadway portion of the Olympian Drive project is minor compared to
470 the cost of the bridge.
471

472 Jay stated the County would not be in this position if the City of Urbana had not cut and
473 run on the project years ago.
474

475 Alix stated that moving a project from the land of an unwilling seller to a willing seller is
476 a valid reason to reopen an engineering study or look at ways to minimize the impact on
477 unwilling sellers and move the project to land of willing sellers. But simply moving the project
478 from affecting one owner to affecting a different owner is very hard to justify as a reason to
479 reopen a study.
480

481 Jones exited the meeting at 8:41 p.m.
482

483 Libby Tyler, the City of Urbana Community Development Director, asked to speak to the
484 Board and Cowart gave her permission. Tyler stated the green alignment is in City of Urbana's
485 comprehensive plan adopted in 2005 and the CUUATS long-range transportation plan. She
486 talked about planning jurisdiction and changes that the County Board would be asking the City
487 of Urbana and CUUATS to make if a different alignment is chosen.
488

489 Kurtz exited the meeting at 8:43 p.m.
490

491 Blue said there has to be a decision made by the County Board about this issue. Weibel
492 concurred.
493

494 **Other Business**

495
496 Nudo spoke in response to part of Shirley Squire's letter accusing him of having a
497 conflict of interest. He asked the State's Attorney to determine if he has a conflict of interest
498 concerning the Zieglers. He thinks his wife and Mrs. Ziegler might be second cousins. He does
499 not believe he has a conflict of interest. The Zieglers do not benefit from the sweeping S
500 alignment.
501

502 Alix exited the meeting at 8:45 p.m. and returned at 8:46 p.m.
503
504
505

506 **Chair's Report**

507
508 There was no Chair's Report.

509
510 **Designation of Items to be Placed on County Board Consent Agenda**

511
512 Agenda item 7.B.1 was designated for the consent agenda.

513
514 Petrie asked for a break because it was almost 9:00 p.m. Betz called for a five-minute
515 break before the Board continued with the other agenda items.

516
517 Kurtz returned to the meeting at 8:54 p.m.

518
519 **COUNTY FACILITIES**

520 **Facilities Director**

521 **Physical Plant Monthly Reports**

522
523 **MOTION** by Cowart to receive and place on file the Final FY2010 Year End Report and
524 Physical Plant December 2010 monthly reports; seconded by Jay. **Motion carried with**
525 **unanimous support.**

526
527 **County Facilities Construction History and Potential Long-Term Plan**

528
529 Reinhart reviewed the Construction History and Potential Long Term Plan he was asked
530 to provide. Betz wanted members to keep this document because they would need to refer back
531 to it over the next few years. Betz asked Reinhart to prioritize the top two-three significant
532 projects in terms of need. Reinhart said it would need to start with the oldest facilities, namely
533 the Brookens Administrative Center, that have the largest deficiencies. Betz asked Reinhart to
534 identify what equipment would need replacing and the time span of projects. Reinhart said all
535 that information is in the study supplied by GHR Engineers during their last assessment program.
536 Betz asked for Busey's opinion. Busey expressed the importance of assessing and upgrading the
537 Brookens Center. The Board needs to start budgeting for the upgrades. There are daily issues
538 with the building's operations. The energy plan adopted by Board is impossible to implement in
539 the Brookens Center because the heating and cooling system were ineffective in certain areas.
540 The Board will also need to look at downtown correctional center in the next year. That building
541 would require a lot of structural work to maintain. The Board needs to make the decision of
542 whether to maintain that building or move the operation out to an expanded Satellite Jail. The
543 Satellite was designed to be expanded and there are operational efficiencies that can be gained
544 with that change. Betz when it should be placed on an agenda to begin the process. Busey
545 recommended no longer than the third quarter of this year.

546
547 James wanted to see a plan that lists each building and maintenance needs per buildings
548 with estimated costs. He wanted to budget for these costs to avoid sudden expenditures like the
549 correctional center's chiller repair. Busey stated that Page 37 is beginning of such a plan. They
550 are looking each system instead of each building. The goal is to get a better documented plan to
551 budget for capital replacements. Board continued to discuss long-range planning and budgeting.

552 Petrie wanted to see a ten-fifteen year plan on building needs, not just replacement and
553 repair. She wanted to know how much of the energy plan has been implemented and how much
554 money the implementation has saved. She talked to people at SEDAC who did this report for the
555 County. Petrie considered the County's monthly energy expenses awe-inspiring and there are
556 ways to save these costs.

557

558 Capital Improvement Plan Preliminary Draft

559

560 The capital improvement plan preliminary draft was presented to the Board.

561

562 **202 Art Bartell Construction Project**

563 Report Re: Storm Water Management Planning & Requirements for East Campus

564

565 A handout was distributed on the storm water management. Reinhart and Busey met
566 with Tom Berns, the City of Urbana, and Brad Bennett as requested. The City of Urbana storm
567 water management requirements had not changed since 2006. The minimum amount of work
568 necessary has been identified. Other options for future expansion can be designed in the plan.

569

570 Betz asked for the rough estimate of the minimum necessary work. Berns said they have
571 not generated an estimate because he does not know what the County Board wants to do yet.
572 James asked if Berns could supply some estimates to the Board in the future at no cost. Berns
573 said yes.

574

575 Berkson asked why the public parking was removed from the main public entry. Berns
576 explained she was looking at a concept prepared six years ago regarding what might happen in
577 the renovation of the old Nursing Home facility. Those things have changed and that is not the
578 same plan.

579

580 Petrie said she would be happy to have conversations with Berns to discuss alternate
581 ways of designing the storm water management throughout the County campus. She was
582 interested in the work Jim Pagac does. Berns said absolutely.

583

584 Betz said the Board would likely take action next month on these issues.

585

586 Project Update

587

588 Reinhart said the workers are pouring half of the concrete floor inside the building
589 tomorrow. The cold weather has delayed the construction. He expects to have an updated
590 schedule supplied by Roessler Construction at next month's meeting.

591

592 **Chair's Report**

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

595

596 Betz noted the redesign of this meeting room has been discussed over the years. When
597 the County Board is reduced to 22 members, there will be the opportunity to make the room

598 more accessible. He would like to authorize Busey to create a budget line item for this project so
599 the Board can look at the issue in 2012. He wants Busey to estimate how much money is needed
600 and bring it to the Board at some time in the future.

601
602 **MOTION** by Langenheim to direct Busey to create a budget line item for the purposes of
603 updating and reconfiguring Shields Meeting Room for new Board size; seconded by Petrie.

604
605 Petrie asked if moving the walls was an option. Busey felt the motion was fairly general
606 and they would try to look at the issues that are significant. Moving the walls could be
607 considered. She would probably bring the best overall solution to the Board. The Board
608 members could then pick and choose what issues they do or do not want to do in the solution.
609 Petrie would rather see three different scenarios presented to the Board. Busey replied that was a
610 possibility.

611
612 **Motion carried with unanimous support.**

613
614 **Other Business**

615
616 There was no other business.

617
618 **Designation of Items to be Placed on County Board Consent Agenda**

619
620 No items were designated for the consent agenda.

621
622 **ENVIRONMENT & LAND USE**

623
624 Kurtz wanted to move the study session forward to March 3rd. Busey recommended
625 checking the calendar first. Kurtz said the Board would be contacted if the study session date
626 was changed.

627
628 **Direction to CCRPC Planner Regarding Proposed Update of the Site Assessment Portion**
629 **of the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) System Pursuant to LRMP Priority**
630 **Items 4.5a and 4.5b**

631
632 **MOTION** by Schroeder to approve the direction to the CCRPC Planner Regarding
633 Proposed Update of the Site Assessment Portion of the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment
634 (LESA) System Pursuant to LRMP Priority Items 4.5a and 4.5b; seconded by Richards.

635
636 Kurtz wanted to make a revision on Site Assessment Update Committee's membership to
637 change the Planning & Zoning Director to an advisory, not voting, member. This would change
638 the committee to eight members.

639
640 James suggested the committee have seven members to avoid a tie vote. Kurtz did not
641 see this committee being controversial or politically partisan. James thought there could still be
642 a tie vote. He thought the Board agreed at the study session that some of the people who had
643 served on the last Update Committee might not be selected again. Kurtz said some investigation

644 was done and five-six members of the last committee were still living and active in the
645 community. James asked if the spot for the past member would be eliminated if none of the 5-6
646 previous members wished to serve again and Kurtz agreed.

647
648 **MOTION** by Alix to amend the motion to have the Planning & Zoning Director be an
649 advisory member; seconded by McGinty.

650
651 Petrie wanted to amend the motion to add a Soil Scientist from the University of Illinois
652 to the committee as a voting member.

653
654 The Board discussed the committee membership.

655
656 **Motion carried for the Planning & Zoning Director to be an advisory committee**
657 **member.**

658
659 **MOTION** by Petrie to amend the motion by adding a Soil Science Researcher from the
660 University of Illinois as a voting committee member; seconded by Anderson.

661
662 Kurtz asked if she had someone in mind and if that person has accepted. Weibel called a
663 point of order because the County Board Chair decides who sits on this committee. He also felt
664 that it should not matter where the Soil Scientist comes from and asked the University of Illinois
665 be dropped. **Petrie and Anderson agreed to drop the University of Illinois as a friendly**
666 **amendment.**

667
668 Schroeder was opposed to this amendment and explained that Terry Savco is the
669 preeminent expert with the Illinois Department of Agriculture. Brad Uken of the Farm Bureau
670 has spoken to Savco and she is happy to help the committee. Monte said Savco would help as
671 consultant, not a voting member who would attend all the meetings. Holderfield concurred that
672 Savco is best person to provide the necessary expertise.

673
674 **Motion failed to amend the motion to add a Soil Science Researcher to the**
675 **committee.**

676
677 **MOTION** by Jay to amend the motion to change the number of committee member to
678 seven by removing the original 1983 Site Assessment Committee member; seconded by James.

679
680 The Board discussed the number of committee members and their qualifications.

681
682 **Motion carried to amend the motion to a seven member committee by removing the**
683 **original 1983 Site Assessment Committee member carried with a vote of 10 to 9.** Alix,
684 Holderfield, James, Jay, McGinty, Michaels, Nudo, Richards, Schroeder, and Weibel voted in
685 favor of the motion. Anderson, Berkson, Betz, Carter, Cowart, Kurtz, Langenheim, O'Connor,
686 Petrie voted against the motion.

687
688 Motion carried to approve the direction to CCRPC Planner and to establish the seven-
689 member Site Assessment Update Committee as amended with the removal of the original 1983

690 Site Assessment Committee member and the Planning & Zoning Director serving as an advisory
691 member.

692
693 Weibel would likely bring the appointment of the committee to the County Board in
694 March.

695
696 **Direction to Zoning Administrator Regarding Proposed Zoning Ordinance Text**
697 **Amendments**

698 Request to Amend the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance to Implement Land Resource
699 Management Plan Policies 4.1.5, 4.1.7, and 4.1.9

700
701 This item was removed from the agenda.

702
703 Request to Amend the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance to Implement Land Resource
704 Management Plan Policies 4.1.6 and 4.3.1-4.3.4

705
706 This item was removed from the agenda.

707
708 Request to Amend the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance to Implement Land Resource
709 Management Plan Objective 4.4

710
711 This item was removed from the agenda.

712
713 **2011 Countywide Residential Electronics Collections**

714
715 This item was provided for information only.

716
717 **Zoning Ordinance Amendments**

718 Request to Amend Champaign County Zoning Ordinance. Zoning Case 665-AT-10 Petitioner:
719 Champaign County Zoning Administrator

720
721 **MOTION** by Alix for preliminary approval of the Zoning Ordinance text amendment,
722 Case 665-AT-10; seconded by Langenheim.

723
724 Hall explained the text amendment process. The Board discussed the fence height and
725 the concerns expressed by the Sheriff which caused the addition of the transparency requirement
726 for the front yard.

727
728 **Motion carried.**

729
730 Request to Amend Champaign County Zoning Ordinance. Zoning Case 666-AT-10 Petitioner:
731 Champaign County Zoning Administrator

732
733 **MOTION** by Anderson for preliminary approval of the Zoning Ordinance text
734 amendment, Case 666-AT-10; seconded by Langenheim.

735

736 Hall explained this amendment made it as clear as possible that the standard conditions
737 for special uses can be waived.

738

739 **Motion carried with unanimous support.**

740

741 **Monthly Report**

742

743 No monthly report was distributed.

744

745 **Other Business**

746

747 There was no other business.

748

749 **Chair's Report**

750

751 Kurtz commended the Board for their cooperation at the study session.

752

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

754

755 No agenda items were designated for the consent agenda.

756

757 **ADJOURN**

758

759 The meeting was adjourned at 9:56 p.m.

760

761 Respectfully submitted,

762

763 Kat Bork

764 Administrative Assistant

765

766 *Secy's note: The minutes reflect the order of 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
March 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		

Special Committees

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

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