

Committee of the Whole  
Tuesday, October 2, 2012  
Handouts

1. Written comments made during Public Participation
  - a. Dennis Kimme
  - b. Norman Stenzel
2. Physical Plant Monthly Reports
3. Department of Zoning Monthly Reports
4. Corrected Final Bridge Reports

## **STATEMENT OF DENNIS KIMME – October 2, 2012**

351-7036 office.

### **OPENING**

I come before you as a person who simply responded to a county RFP for a jail needs assessment study.

In return I had my integrity, credibility, and even my morality publicly attacked. As reluctant as I am to appear before you tonight, I cannot let these attacks stand without a response.

### **SERIOUS CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

The attacks started at your June 12 meeting, when Board member Carol Ammons charged my firm with a "serious conflict-of-interest" because we were "already being consulted" on the jail. She used that accusation to cast doubt on the integrity of Planning Committee Members for ranking our written proposal first by a wide margin.

Mrs. Ammons used her accusation as a segue into advocating that ILPP of Berkeley California join the Top 3 interview group even though they ranked poorly, finishing seventh of eight.

I have to assume the conflict charge perhaps stems from a couple of e-mails I sent the sheriff in an attempt to simply help my own county.

In an e-mail sent one year ago, for example, I offered some opinions about how to mitigate some of the problems at the downtown jail that caused two NIC consultants to recommend its immediate closure, a conclusion I found extreme.

There are two crucial facts about these e-mails. First, my e-mails were unsolicited , and not part of any on-going relationship with the sheriff.

Second, they went without response or acknowledgment. To me they just disappeared into the ether.

To go so far as to label this a disqualifying "serious conflict-of-interest" is absurd and unfair.

With the way things have transpired, I actually believe you should label this, "no-good-deed-goes-unpunished".

## **BOILERPLATE**

Also at the June 12 meeting Mrs. Petrie insultingly dismissed our proposal and all others, except ILPP's, as non-responsive, "cranked-out boilerplate". This too was done for the purpose of getting ILPP an interview and diminishing our standing.

Well, we don't show our potential clients, especially our own county, such disrespect. We spent hours writing originally and responsively about all aspects of your requirements.

This included specially written case studies, an example being where our recommendations to Pinellas County Florida

resulted in a reduction of 440 felony pretrial inmates in one year, and \$95 million of avoided construction.

## **GENERAL CONFLICT CHARGE & ILPP**

Mrs. Ammons also accused us and all other proposers, except ILPP, with "classic conflicts-of-interest" because we were "Builders" and architects even though 7 of 9 requested services required architectural skills. Her argument was essentially that none of us could be trusted to give honest answers about building needs because we were all "angling" for the next phase of work, design.

By contrast ILPP stood out because they "simply did analysis".

I was quite surprised then when during ILPP's interview Mr. Kalminoff touted the award-winning designs he worked on, and how his San Francisco architect built award-winning jails.

The key to explaining this contradiction is on Page 22 of ILPP's proposal. There they make the exceedingly fine distinction that it is only a conflict-of-interest to work on a design when you hold the prime contract, not if you are a sub-contractor to the prime contract.

Well, since we never hold the prime contract during design either, can I now assume that the "classic conflict-of-interest" charge against us is hereby withdrawn?

Or is ILPP now as conflicted as us?



## **THE ARTICLE**

Insulting as all of this was, I was going to let it all go.

Then I learned that even after the process ended with ILPP's selection, a newspaper article was circulated among County Board members that was meant to further attack our credibility.

The contents of this article were then trumpeted on Sept. 20 during public participation by "peace and justice" member James Kilgore, a self-described "Research Scholar" at the University.

In their eagerness to further attack my reputation, the Board Member and the Research Scholar relied upon the flimsiest of evidence: one article from a fringe newspaper which never contacted us for our side of the story.

The article alleges that one of our clients overbuilt because during our 2005 study we made "Jail Population Predictions" that were "all wrong".

Mr. Kilgore suggested immoral conduct as I "laughed all the way to the bank" for designing and unduly profiting from the allegedly overbuilt jail I wantonly recommended.

Let me tell you **six** things that were wrong or left out in this far too convenient story.

**First**, the article was factually wrong about the population we projected for 2010. It was not for "over 1000" but for 926, much closer to the actual average.

**Second**, the article says that when the county finally decided to build in 2008, our projections were already way off. They reported an average daily population of 857 to make the point, but didn't report our projection of 872, which is hardly way off.

**Third**, we made significant recommendations regarding alternatives to incarceration, including the very expansion of pretrial release services that the article credited with holding the population down. Though the article gave us no credit for this achievement, we consider the lowered jail population a success, not a failure.

**Fourth**, the article criticized us for saying that alternatives alone would not be enough, and that the "only real option" was building a new jail. But they missed a key reason behind our statement which was that peak counts were nearing 1000 inmates in dangerous jails that only had 400 compliant beds per current jail standards.

**Fifth**, it was ridiculous to declare a two-week old jail planned for the year 2025 in a fast-growing community "overbuilt". This is particularly true since existing jails were overcrowded by 30% against existing capacity -- and 110% against standards-compliant capacity -- and system practitioners were holding back the population in response.

**Last**, we did not design the jail.

In fact, we've had absolutely nothing to do with the project for the last seven years.

## **KILGORE**

Mr. Kilgore's personal attack on me after our team had already been rejected was a gratuitous twisting of the knife.

It was highly inappropriate conduct from an official representative of the County's Jail Task Force.

And as someone with such a shocking personal history, he should be the last person to pass moral judgment on me.

## **CLOSE**

In closing, I accept your right to pick whomever you want to do your study and, as a citizen, hope for its success.

What I cannot accept, and will not tolerate, are attempts at trashing my integrity and credibility as a means of attaining a desired political result.

That this occurred in my own community of all places, makes it worse.

As I taught my children, the ends do not justify the means. I think some people on this Board, and in this community, need to re-learn this basic lesson of moral conduct.

**NECESSARY CONSIDERATIONS  
FOR THE COUNTY LAND USE COMMITTEE  
FOR THE LESA UPDATE  
Submitted by Norman Stenzel**

**I have attended nearly all of the county sponsored meetings relative to LESA. (By my count I have only missed two meetings.) Part of my background has been a professional career that included the development of instruments similar to the LESA and providing technical assistance to a number of state governments. Based on this background, I suggest that it would be prudent for the County Board to return the LESA to ZBA for further developmental effort. Following are a number of issues that require attention.**

**1. Procedural Issues.** In common matters brought to ZBA and forwarded for County Board there is separation between a petitioner and the reviewer identifying the "findings of fact". This is not the case in considering the LESA materials. The Zoning Administrator is both the petitioner and the reviewer. *This is a blatant conflict of interest.* In fact, the Zoning Administrator was one of the major authors of the document and its documentation. That conjunction has led to claims in the document that have not been validated by either the LESA Committee or the ZBA consideration. For example, one statement of rationale claims that an item in the instrumentation is supportive of Zoning Office practices. While that may in some respects be desirable, no consideration of that condition was made by the LESA Committee or the ZBA. It is an assertion by the petitioner/Zoning Administrator/ZBA staff person and not a finding of fact by either body in review.

**2. Instrument Development.** You may be aware of the extended schedule for the instrument development committee. That expanded time is offered as a claim of diligent consideration for a sound outcome. I offer a different view: It was more generally a superficial consideration of materials largely generated by staff and consultants.

**Development issues include:**

**Failure to Include Local Foods.** Although the matter of Local Foods was raised in ZBA, the Zoning Administrator resisted revision of the instrument suggesting that it is a matter of point allocation. I have suggested that a "branching" approach could be used (as branching is used to include CUGA.) A Local Foods branch could replace some items allowing the total points to remain the same through reallocation.

**Failure to include Local Foods considerations in LESA would complicate ZBA deliberations if a different/additional instrument had to be developed for use.**

**Test Sites as Justification.** The sites suggested as "tests" in the development of the new LESA were to have been selected "randomly" and then touted for including features such as moraines, livestock facilities, or CUGA locations. Those conditions were supposedly random occurrences, and if they were should not be singled out to support the representativeness of the sites compared to county conditions. If it was

**felt that such features needed to be represented, a different sampling strategy should have been used so as to assure that the sites randomly represented a specified set of conditions.**

**The sites used to “test” the instrument also do not replicate the sites that come before the ZBA to be considered for conversion. The test sites were entire parcels, while sites for conversion are often portions of larger parcels. The results of trials using entire parcels can be quite different when a deliberate selection of “lesser” soils is more often the case brought to ZBA. The Zoning Administrator told the LESA Committee that he help petitioners to do this to “game” the system. We do not know what the test results tells us about the new instrument unless the “game” has been played.**

**Technical Features of the New LESA. Validity and reliability are important for instruments in service of public purposes. Validity is a match of the instrument with the purposes and intentions for its use. Reliability represents the consistency of the instrument in practice. Neither of these technical characteristics have been explored although claims have been included in supporting materials.**

**Consequently, I charge that one cannot know if the new LESA can accomplish the goals of the Federal legislation on one hand or the relevant County goals on the other hand. *The LESA is of unknown validity.* There are several types of reliability. Intra-rater reliability indicates how consistent the same person is in the application of the instrument, and inter-rater reliability indicates how consistent different raters are in using the instrument. There is no evidence this has been adequately considered. And if the Zoning Administrator “games the system” in applications the consistence with an independent second rater is not likely. *There is little chance that reliability can be achieved under such conditions.* With such practice there is jeopardy to the county when an application is challenged.**

**I have suggested in previous submissions that a field test using previously decided cases might be useful as proof for the new LESA.**

**Physical Plant Monthly Expenditure Report**

**August, 2012**

**FY2012**

<b>EXPENDITURE ITEM</b>	<b>FY10/11 YTD 8/31/2011</b>	<b>FY10/11 ACTUAL</b>	<b>FY10/11 as % of Actual</b>	<b>FY11/12 ORIGINAL BUDGET</b>	<b>FY11/12 BUDGET 8/31/2012</b>	<b>FY11/12 YTD 8/31/2012</b>	<b>FY11/12 as % of Budget</b>	<b>FY11/12 Remaining Balance</b>
Gas Service	\$273,933	\$355,604	77.03%	\$400,000	\$396,500	\$222,320	56.07%	\$174,180
Electric Service	\$546,203	\$863,826	63.23%	\$900,000	\$896,500	\$564,519	62.97%	\$331,981
Water Service	\$49,225	\$77,033	63.90%	\$71,415	\$71,415	\$47,287	66.21%	\$24,128
Sewer Service	\$29,120	\$48,249	60.35%	\$44,312	\$44,312	\$34,102	76.96%	\$10,210
All Other Services	\$99,331	\$257,902	38.51%	\$129,888	\$147,629	\$98,758	66.90%	\$48,871
Cths R & M	\$50,459	\$75,518	66.82%	\$35,477	\$35,477	\$34,523	97.31%	\$954
Downtown Jail R & M	\$10,535	\$17,045	61.81%	\$26,698	\$26,698	\$25,118	94.08%	\$1,580
Satellite Jail R & M	\$30,589	\$48,762	62.73%	\$27,342	\$37,342	\$30,133	80.70%	\$7,209
1905 R & M	\$7,007	\$11,426	61.33%	\$10,169	\$10,169	\$5,652	55.58%	\$4,517
Brookens R & M	\$28,540	\$34,285	83.24%	\$31,114	\$44,062	\$25,355	57.54%	\$18,707
JDC R & M	\$8,367	\$8,375	99.90%	\$11,366	\$11,366	\$10,387	91.39%	\$979
1701 E Main R & M	\$13,616	\$18,337	74.26%	\$45,200	\$27,320	\$17,119	62.66%	\$10,201
Other Buildings R & M	\$2,575	\$4,954	51.97%	\$8,188	\$8,196	\$2,983	36.40%	\$5,213
Commodities	\$56,019	\$67,820	82.60%	\$68,637	\$67,757	\$56,811	83.85%	\$10,946
Gas & Oil	\$7,518	\$9,957	75.50%	\$10,810	\$9,521	\$5,668	59.53%	\$3,853
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$1,213,036</b>	<b>\$1,899,093</b>		<b>\$1,820,616</b>	<b>\$1,834,264</b>	<b>\$1,180,736</b>		<b>\$653,528</b>

Other buildings R & M includes storage outbuildings, Animal Control and 202 Art Bartell  
 This report does not include information on personnel, intergovernmental loans and capital projects.

Prepared by:  
 Ranae Wolken  
 10/2/2012

Gas Utilities - FY2012

Period	Courthouse	204 E Main	502 S Lierman	JDC	1905 E Main	1701 E Main Rear EMA/METCAD	Brookens	ITC	1705 E Main North Garage	1705 E Main South Garage	202 Art Bartell	Monthly Totals
December - Ameren	\$3,687.33	\$566.19	\$1,958.76	\$455.15	\$252.42	\$90.64	\$1,598.24	\$3,261.76	\$118.60	\$210.96	\$806.98	\$13,007.03
December - Integrys	\$10,302.50	\$1,966.86	\$5,133.06	\$1,531.62	\$737.13	\$103.00	\$4,054.90	\$9,029.81	\$212.69	\$574.63		\$33,646.20
January - Ameren	\$3,853.33	\$615.54	\$2,243.97	\$507.20	\$268.29	\$116.18	\$1,774.05	\$3,577.38	\$143.49	\$241.97	\$902.70	\$14,244.10
January - Integrys	\$9,974.41	\$2,032.61	\$5,514.24	\$1,629.24	\$739.70	\$173.39	\$4,211.88	\$9,209.58	\$275.01	\$641.76		\$34,401.82
February - Ameren	\$3,676.72	\$610.07	\$1,976.15	\$407.64	\$264.48	\$121.92	\$1,529.23	\$3,368.21	\$137.67	\$228.48	\$773.29	\$13,093.86
February - Integrys	\$8,223.85	\$1,781.29	\$4,114.84	\$1,103.61	\$624.40	\$147.13	\$3,034.93	\$7,478.44	\$199.93	\$503.91		\$27,212.33
March - Ameren	\$3,090.24	\$368.06	\$1,812.90	\$204.77	\$239.05	\$92.11	\$1,036.90	\$1,593.05	\$97.33	\$124.46	\$523.49	\$9,182.36
March - Integrys	\$7,495.03	\$1,066.89	\$4,096.54	\$466.46	\$592.43	\$52.02	\$2,031.94	\$3,511.63	\$71.33	\$171.00		\$19,555.27
April - Ameren	\$3,016.89	\$396.97	\$1,597.04	\$177.74	\$229.90	\$85.05	\$991.17	\$289.73	\$85.21	\$86.89	\$297.31	\$7,253.90
April - Integrys	\$5,519.02	\$878.22	\$2,662.93	\$274.71	\$418.28	\$19.59	\$1,444.28	\$33.29	\$19.99	\$24.56		\$11,294.87
May - Ameren	\$2,351.45	\$160.92	\$1,275.22	\$125.44	\$185.94	\$82.47	\$639.69	\$408.24	\$80.18	\$89.88	\$148.21	\$5,547.64
May - Integrys	\$4,839.52	\$204.49	\$2,299.62	\$102.24	\$360.40	\$6.82	\$809.42	\$38.33	\$0.00	\$11.50		\$8,672.34
June - Ameren	\$1,879.64	\$135.52	\$1,091.83	\$107.71	\$167.26	\$81.98	\$535.18	\$410.56	\$80.18	\$89.97	\$80.10	\$4,659.93
June - Integrys	\$4,394.12	\$144.27	\$2,207.12	\$48.09	\$378.63	\$6.57	\$660.23	\$52.47	\$0.00	\$15.32		\$7,906.82
July - Ameren	\$2,238.85	\$145.33	\$1,339.30	\$102.95	\$224.73	\$82.61	\$364.52	\$422.29	\$80.18	\$90.10	\$77.82	\$5,168.68
July - Integrys	\$4,323.64	\$133.33	\$2,327.10	\$17.79	\$455.49	\$6.67	\$128.88	\$68.89	\$0.00	\$11.12		\$7,472.91
August - Ameren	\$2,186.77	\$138.75	\$1,487.57	\$112.13	\$196.00	\$82.28	\$465.10	\$417.20	\$80.18	\$89.45	\$77.82	\$5,333.25
August - Integrys	\$4,654.24	\$130.75	\$2,957.74	\$56.67	\$422.26	\$6.55	\$400.95	\$63.17	\$0.00	\$10.44		\$8,702.77
September - Ameren												\$0.00
September - Integrys												\$0.00
October - Ameren												\$0.00
October - Integrys												\$0.00
November - Ameren												\$0.00
November - Integrys												\$0.00
Total to date	\$85,707.55	\$11,476.06	\$46,095.93	\$7,431.16	\$6,756.79	\$1,356.98	\$25,711.49	\$43,234.03	\$1,681.97	\$3,216.40	\$383.95	\$236,356.08

Ameren - gas delivery and tax charges  
Integrys - gas usage

Prepared by Ranae Wolken  
10/2/2012

Electric Utilities - FY2012

Period	Courthouse	204 E Main	502 S Llerman	JDC	1905 E Main	1701 E Main Rear EMA/METCAD	Nite Lite	Brookens	ITC	1705 E Main North Garage	1705 E Main South Garage	202 Art Barteli	Monthly Totals
December - Integrys December - Champion	\$17,021.68	\$6,330.01	\$7,998.26	\$3,426.93	\$4,254.50	\$116.88	\$199.62	\$8,500.83	\$6,148.01	\$64.68	\$81.90	\$639.04	\$54,782.34
January - Integrys January - Champion	\$17,374.28	\$5,693.04	\$9,485.39	\$3,938.93	\$3,563.60	\$136.66	\$203.20	\$9,508.39	\$6,811.20	\$70.99	\$68.82	\$216.56 \$20.53	\$57,071.06 \$20.53
February - Integrys February - Champion	\$15,871.77	\$5,927.77	\$7,786.87	\$3,427.11	\$3,427.11	\$127.32	\$186.49	\$8,245.61	\$5,841.99	\$70.90	\$75.82	\$197.12 \$355.62	\$51,185.88 \$355.62
March - Integrys March - Champion	\$21,903.00	\$6,485.77	\$11,197.06	\$3,548.06	\$3,923.56	\$131.61	\$179.22	\$10,355.79	\$5,659.80	\$67.40	\$106.75	\$205.14 \$374.34	\$63,763.16 \$374.34
April - Integrys April - Champion	\$25,014.66	\$7,591.45	\$12,192.87	\$3,802.19	\$4,534.32	\$136.17	\$174.88	\$11,723.75	\$5,521.61	\$62.36	\$56.59	\$183.47 \$333.81	\$70,994.32 \$333.81
May - Integrys May - Champion	\$26,344.07	\$7,035.82	\$13,069.98	\$3,747.00	\$4,255.89	\$123.94	\$170.26	\$12,917.96	\$6,765.27	\$94.31	\$86.50	\$178.90 \$318.19	\$74,789.90
June - Integrys June - Champion	\$29,415.76	\$8,480.75	\$15,546.11	\$4,516.54	\$5,993.71	\$154.85	\$138.65	\$14,324.68	\$7,348.42	\$68.20	\$88.55	\$285.66 \$360.30	\$86,361.88
July - Integrys July - Champion	\$34,327.03	\$9,476.59	\$18,625.25	\$6,595.87	\$7,689.16	\$128.47	\$157.05	\$16,581.67	\$8,500.76	\$75.85	\$149.43	\$525.57 \$594.98	\$102,832.70
August - Integrys August - Champion	\$30,090.06	\$7,944.75	\$17,110.26	\$5,462.94	\$6,891.63	\$121.79	\$164.63	\$14,239.72	\$8,296.90	\$73.13	\$83.22	\$463.50 \$510.03	\$90,942.53
September - Integrys September - Champion													\$0.00
October - Integrys October - Champion													\$0.00
November - Integrys November - Champion													\$0.00
Total to Date	\$217,362.31	\$64,965.95	\$113,012.05	\$38,465.57	\$44,533.48	\$1,177.69	\$1,574.00	\$106,398.40	\$60,893.96	\$647.82	\$797.58	\$3,237.13	\$653,808.07

Prepared by Ranae Wolken  
10/2/2012

Nite Lites are billed by Ameren - all other electric is provided by Integrys Energy



Building/Grounds Maintenance work hour comparison

FY2012

Weekly Period	Repair & Maintenance	Scheduled Maintenance	Nursing Home	Special Project	Grounds Maintenance	Other Tenants	TOTAL
11/27/2011-12/3/11	193.00	0.00	76.50	32.50	5.00	0.00	307.00
12/4/11-12/10/11	238.00	0.00	55.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	323.00
12/11/11-12/17/11	249.50	9.00	63.75	7.50	2.00	0.00	331.75
12/18/11-12/24/11*	239.00	8.50	33.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	281.00
12/25/11-12/31/11*	133.00	6.50	51.00	0.00	7.50	0.00	198.00
1/1/12-1/7/12*	243.25	8.00	18.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	269.25
1/8/12-1/14/12	242.25	10.00	49.50	0.00	0.00	12.00	313.75
1/15/12-1/21/12*	247.00	0.00	71.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	333.00
1/22/12-1/28/12	298.00	7.50	45.50	0.00	2.50	15.00	368.50
1/29/12-2/4/12	277.25	15.00	47.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	349.25
2/5/12-2/11/12	297.00	7.00	25.50	0.00	7.00	31.00	367.50
2/12/12-2/18/12	293.00	6.00	30.00	0.00	15.50	37.50	382.00
2/19/12-2/25/12*	230.50	0.00	45.75	0.00	16.50	4.00	296.75
2/26-3/3/12	328.25	7.50	24.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	360.00
3/4/12-3/10/12	254.50	0.00	27.50	0.00	27.50	6.00	315.50
3/11/12-3/17/12	251.00	10.50	10.00	0.00	30.00	25.00	326.50
3/18/12-3/24/12	233.50	9.00	8.50	0.00	45.00	0.00	296.00
3/25/12-3/31/12	227.00	7.50	23.00	8.00	36.50	0.00	302.00
4/1/12-4/7/12*	197.00	4.50	38.50	6.00	60.00	0.00	306.00
4/8/12-4/14/12	244.50	8.00	11.25	0.00	60.00	0.00	323.75
4/15-12-4/21/12	233.00	36.00	55.25	0.00	69.50	0.00	393.75
4/22/12-4/28/12	189.00	82.00	17.00	0.00	70.50	0.00	358.50
4/29/12-5/5/12	198.25	94.50	18.50	0.00	58.00	0.00	369.25
5/6/12-5/12/12	153.50	84.00	8.00	0.00	63.00	0.00	308.50
5/13/12-5/19/12	201.50	51.50	3.00	0.00	70.00	0.00	326.00
5/20/12-5/26/12	167.75	112.50	1.50	0.00	65.50	0.00	347.25
5/27/12-6/2/12*	217.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	59.00	0.00	276.00
6/3/12-6/9/12	260.00	0.00	2.50	0.00	62.75	0.00	325.25
6/10/12-6/16/12	237.75	9.50	11.25	0.00	57.00	0.00	315.50
6/17/12-6/23/12	241.00	20.00	2.50	0.00	58.25	0.00	321.75
6/24/12-6/30/12	200.50	7.50	4.50	0.00	50.00	0.00	262.50
7/1/12-7/7/12*	160.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	22.50	0.00	182.50
7/8/12-7/14/12	216.00	7.50	12.50	0.00	44.50	0.00	280.50
7/15/12-7/21/12	273.50	7.50	6.25	0.00	57.25	0.00	344.50
7/22/12-7/28/12	173.50	61.00	4.25	0.00	47.75	0.00	286.50
7/29/12-8/4/12	184.50	40.50	5.00	0.00	54.50	0.00	284.50
8/5/12-8/11/12	277.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	55.50	0.00	336.50
8/12/12-8/18/12	225.25	6.00	0.00	0.00	61.50	0.00	292.75

Building/Grounds Maintenance work hour comparison

FY2012

8/19/12-8/25/12	198.25	4.50	2.00	0.00	41.50	0.00	246.25
8/26/12-9/1/12	247.25	4.50	4.25	1.50	49.25	0.00	306.75

\*week includes a holiday

One regular work week = 435.00 hours with full staff

There are currently 166.59 comp time hours available to the maintenance staff

Total comp time hours earned in FY12 to date- 496.46

Total spent to date on overtime in FY12 - \$94.86 (Original Budgeted Amount - \$0)

Prepared by: Ranae Wolken

10/2/2012

# MONTHLY REPORT for SEPTEMBER 2012<sup>1</sup>

## Zoning Cases

Champaign  
County  
Department of

PLANNING &  
ZONING

Brookens  
Administrative Center  
1776 E. Washington Street  
Urbana, Illinois 61802

(217) 384-3708

The distribution of cases filed, completed, and pending is detailed in Table 1. No zoning cases were filed in September and one was filed in September 2011. The average number of cases filed in September in the preceding five years is 3.2.

Two ZBA meetings were held in September and four cases were finalized. Four ZBA meetings were held in September 2011 for the wind farm but no case was completed. The average number of cases finalized in September in the preceding five years is 2.4.

By the end of September there were 15 cases pending. By the end of September 2011 there were 14 cases pending.

**Table 1. Zoning Case Activity in September 2012 & September 2011**

Type of Case	September 2012 2 ZBA meetings		September 2011 4 ZBA meetings‡	
	Cases Filed	Cases Completed	Cases Filed	Cases Completed
Variance	0	2	1	0
SFHA Variance	0	0	0	0
Special Use	0	0	0	0
Map Amendment	0	0	0	0
Text Amendment	0	2	0	0
Change of Non-conforming Use	0	0	0	0
Administrative Variance	0	0	0	0
Interpretation / Appeal	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
Total cases filed (fiscal year to date)	27 cases		17 cases	
Total cases completed (fiscal year to date)	21 cases		12 cases	
Case pending*	15 cases		14 cases	
* Cases pending includes all cases continued and new cases filed <u>but not decided</u>				
‡ The four meetings in September 2011 were only for the wind farm case				

<sup>1</sup> Note that approved absences and sick days resulted in an average staffing level of 86% or the equivalent of 4.3 staff members (of the 5 authorized) present for each of the 19 work days in September.

### **Subdivisions**

There was no County subdivision application, review, or recording in September.

One municipal subdivision was reviewed for compliance with County zoning.

### **Zoning Use Permits**

A detailed breakdown of permitting activity appears in Table 2. A list of all Zoning Use Permits issued for the month is at Appendix A. Permitting activity in September can be summarized as follows:

- 25 permits for 17 structures were received in September compared to 17 permits for 14 structures in September 2011. The five-year average for permits in September in the preceding five years is 19.2.
- 9 months in the last 24 months (including September 2012, May 2012, April 2012, January 2012, December 2011, August 2011, February 2011, January 2011, September 2010) have met or exceeded the five-year average for number of permits.
- 7.0 days was the average turnaround (review) time for complete initial residential permit applications in September.
- \$1,566,100 was the reported value for the permits in September compared to a total of \$1,054,300 in September 2011. The five-year average reported value for authorized construction in September is \$1,273,131.
- 12 months in the last 44 months (including September 2012, August 2012, May 2012, April 2012, February 2012, January 2012, December 2011, November 2011, August 2011, June 2011, February 2011, August and May 2010 and March 2009) have equaled or exceeded the five-year average for reported value of construction.
- \$7,133 in fees were collected in September compared to a total of \$2,718 in September 2011. The five-year average for fees collected in September is \$4,645.
- 10 months in the last 40 months (including September 2012, May 2012, April 2012, February 2012, January 2012, December 2011, June 2011, August 2010, and December and March 2009) have equaled or exceeded the five-year average for collected permit fees.
- There were also 5 lot split inquiries and more than 231 other zoning inquiries in September.
- Minutes were completed for 2 ZBA meetings.

### **Zoning Compliance Inspections**

- 2 compliance inspections were made in September for a total of 127 compliance inspections so far in FY2012.
- 2 compliance certificates were issued in September. So far in FY2012 there have been 108 compliance certificates or about 2.6 per week. The FY2012 budget anticipates a total of 512 compliance inspections for an average of 9.8 inspections per week.

**TABLE 2. PERMIT ACTIVITY SEPTEMBER, 2012**

PERMITS	CURRENT MONTH			FISCAL YEAR TO DATE		
	#	Total Fee	\$ Value	#	Total Fee	\$ Value
AGRICULTURAL:						
Residential		N.A.		4	N.A.	691,258
Other		N.A.		14	N.A.	2,035,100
SINGLE FAMILY Residential:						
New - Site Built	2	1,254	380,000	22	14,870	5,376,900
Manufactured				2	714	205,000
Additions	7	1,799	420,500	28	4,281	1,234,615
Accessory to Residential	5	655	76,100	33	6,117	900,621
TWO-FAMILY Residential						
Average turn-around time for permit approval			7 days			
MULTI - FAMILY Residential						
HOME OCCUPATION:						
Rural				5	165	0
Neighborhood	6	N.A.	0	14	N.A.	0
COMMERCIAL:						
New	3	3,229	687,000	4	4,078	737,000
Other				2	624	1,172,500
INDUSTRIAL:						
New						
Other						
OTHER USES:						
New				1	1,124	752,000
Other						
SIGNS				1	141	1,200
TOWERS (Includes Acc. Bldg.)				32	10,041	6,994,416
OTHER PERMITS	2	196	2,500	13	1,078	16,100
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>25/17</b>	<b>\$7,133</b>	<b>\$1,566,100</b>	<b>175/143</b>	<b>\$43,233</b>	<b>\$20,116,710</b>

\* 25 permits were issued for 17 structures during September, 2012

◇175 permits have been issued for 143 structures since December, 2011 (FY 12/2011 - 11/2012)

NOTE: Home occupations and other permits (change of use, temporary use) total 32 since December, 2011, (this number is not included in the total # of structures).

### **Zoning and Nuisance Enforcement**

Table 3 contains the detailed breakdown of enforcement activity for September 2012 and can be summarized as follows:

- 8 new complaints were received in September compared to 8 complaints in September 2011. One complaint was referred to another agency in each September.
- 56 enforcement inspections were conducted in September compared to 29 in September 2011. 6 of the inspections were for 8 of the new complaints received in September.
- One contact was made prior to written notification in September and 2 contacts were made in September 2011.
- 57 initial investigation inquiries were made in September for an average of 14.3 per week in September and 10.9 per week for the fiscal year. The FY2012 budget had anticipated an average of 7.7 initial investigation inquiries per week.
- 2 First Notices and no Final Notices were issued in September compared to no First Notice and 2 Final Notices in September 2011. The FY2012 budget anticipates a total of 45 First Notices and there have been 13 First Notices by the end of September.
- No case was referred to the State's Attorney in September and none were referred in September 2011.
- 3 cases were resolved in September and 109 cases were resolved in September 2011.
- 447 cases remain open at the end of September compared to 435 open cases at the end of September 2011.

### **APPENDICES**

**A Zoning Use Permits Authorized**

**B Zoning Compliance Certificates Issued**

TABLE 3. ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITY FOR SEPTEMBER, 2012

	FY 2011 Enforcement	December, 2011	January, 2012	February, 2012	March, 2012	April, 2012	May, 2012	June, 2012	July, 2012	August, 2012	September, 2012	TOTALS FOR FY 12
Complaints Received	100	2	5	7	16	4	13	6	6	9	8	76
Initial Complaints Referred to Other Agencies	16	0	0	2	2	0	2	1	2	0	1	10
<b>TOTAL CASES INCLUDING PREVIOUS YEARS</b>												
Inspections	331	43	47	37	71	19	59	29	40	42	56 <sup>3</sup>	443 <sup>4</sup>
Phone or On-Site Contact Prior to Written Notification	22	0	1	3	3	1	1	2	0	1	1	13
1st Notices Issued	27	1	1	3	4	0	2	2	4	0	2	19
Final Notices Issued	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Referrals to State's Attorney's Office	3	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	5
Cases Resolved <sup>1</sup>	224	3	10	5	15	3	9	1	7	2	3 <sup>5</sup>	58 <sup>6</sup>
Open Cases <sup>2</sup>	429	428	423	425	426	427	431	436	435	442	447	447 <sup>*/**</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Resolved cases are cases that have been inspected, notice given, and violation is gone, or inspection has occurred and no violation has been found to occur on the property.

<sup>2</sup>Open Cases are unresolved cases, and include any cases referred to the State's Attorney's Office or new complaints not yet investigated.

<sup>3</sup>6 inspections of the 56 performed were done for the 8 complaints received in September, 2012.

<sup>4</sup>122 of the 443 inspections performed in 2012 were for complaints received in 2012.

<sup>5</sup>None of the resolved cases for September, 2012, were received in September, 2012.

<sup>6</sup>12 of the 58 cases resolved in FY 2012 were complaints that were also received in FY 2012.

\*Open Cases include the previous number of open cases plus the number of new complaints received in the current month less the number of cases resolved in that same month.

\*\*The 447 open cases include 29 cases that have been referred to the State's Attorney's Office, some of which were referred as early as 2001, which brings the total of open cases to 418.

**APPENDIX A. ZONING USE PERMITS AUTHORIZED DURING SEPTEMBER, 2012**

<b><u>NUMBER</u></b>	<b><u>LOCATION</u></b>	<b><u>NAME</u></b>	<b><u>DATE IN/ DATE OUT</u></b>	<b><u>PROJECT</u></b>
111-05-01		Pending Special Use Permit		
221-05-01		Pending resolution of violation		
RHO				
345-05-01		Under review		
26-06-02		Under review		
88-06-01		More information needed		
RHO				
118-06-02		Under review		
277-06-02		More information needed		
FP				
82-07-01		Need IDNR response		
FP				
192-07-02		More information needed		
FP				
219-07-01		More information needed		
219-07-02		More information needed		
RHO				
250-07-02		More information needed		
320-07-01		More information needed		
FP				
18-08-01		Under review		
137-08-01		Under review		
187-08-02		Under review		
235-08-01		More information needed, possible Variance		
235-08-02		More information needed, possible Variance		
266-08-01		Variance needed		
12-09-01		Under review		
147-09-01		Under review		
357-09-01		Under review		
RHO				
41-10-01		Pending Special Use Permit		



**APPENDIX A. ZONING USE PERMITS AUTHORIZED DURING SEPTEMBER, 2012**

54-10-01	Under review			
251-10-01	Variance needed			
03-11-01	Zoning Case required			
26-11-01	Under review			
66-11-01	More information required			
77-11-02	More information required, possible variance			
168-11-01 FP	Under review			
196-11-01	Under review			
13-12-01	More information needed			
65-12-01	Variance needed			
74-12-03	Variance needed			
101-12-01	More information needed			
157-12-02	More information needed			
180-12-01 AG-1	A 2 acre tract of land located immediately north of Henry Behrends 1 <sup>st</sup> Addition to the Original Town of Dewey and Lots 6, 7, 8 &9 and a vacated right-of-way in Henry Behren's 1 <sup>st</sup> Addition to the Original Town of Dewey, Section 34, East Bend Township; 16 Third Street, Dewey, Illinois PIN: 10-02-34-177-010 & 011	Dewey Evangelical Mennonite Church	06/28/12 09/05/12	construct a multi-purpose church building
220-12-02	variance required			
226-12-01 AG-2	Lot 2, Booe's Subdivision, Section 28, Somer Township; 1506 E. Olympian Road, Urbana, Illinois PIN: 25-15-28-451-008	DeWayne and Shaennon Clark	08/13/12 09/12/12	construct an addition to an existing single family home

**APPENDIX A. ZONING USE PERMITS AUTHORIZED DURING SEPTEMBER, 2012**

230-12-01 R-1	Lots 3, 4 & 5 of Block 1 of Irwin's Addition to the Town of Prairieview, now Longview, Section 34, Raymond Township, Champaign County, Illinois; 202. E. Hancock, Longview, IL PIN: 21-34-34-301-004, 005, 006	Steve and Stacey Barkley	08/17/12 09/06/12	construct an addition to an existing single family home and construct a detached garage
236-12-01 I-1	Lot 7, IIDC Subdivision No. 2, Section 9, Champaign Township; 3200 W. Springfield Avenue, Champaign, IL PIN: 03-20-09-400-018/019	Prairie Central VCNA	08/23/12 09/11/12	construct a detention pond
240-12-01 AG-1	Tract 3 of Trautman's Section 34 Subdivision No. 2, which includes a Replat of Trautman's Section 34 Subdivision, Section 34, Mahomet Township; 399 CR 2425N, Mahomet, IL PIN: 16-07-34-400-023 & 024	Jeremy Allen	08/27/12 09/07/12	construct a detached garage
240-12-02 B-4	A tract of land located in the SE Corner of the SE 1/4 of Section 3, St. Joseph Township; 1707 CR 2200E, St. Joseph, Illinois PIN: 28-22-03-400-018	Jim Clingan	08/27/12 09/11/12	construct a building for an office and auction house
240-12-03 B-4	A 1.5 acre tract of land in part of the NE 1/4 of the SE 1/4 of the NE 1/4 of Section 33, Somer Township; 3515 N. Cunningham Avenue, Urbana, Illinois PIN: 25-15-33-276-007	Ken Judy, Glen Judy II, Glen Judy III (Lessees)	08/27/12 09/12/12	Change the Use to establish a Retail Sales Business, <i>July's Liquidation</i>

**APPENDIX A. ZONING USE PERMITS AUTHORIZED DURING SEPTEMBER, 2012**

240-12-04	A 13 acre tract of land located in the NE 1/4 of the NE 1/4 of Section 29, Tolono Township; 785 CR 800E, Tolono, IL PIN: 29-26-29-200-019	Ken McPheeters	08/27/12 09/12/12	construct a detached green house for personal use only and authorize construction of a previously constructed detached garage
AG-1				
243-12-01	Lot 60, Regency West Subdivision, Section 35, Hensley Township; 1512 Kings Way, Champaign, Illinois PIN: 12-14-35-328-022	Palestine Manley	08/30/12 09/20/12	construct an addition to an existing single family home
R-3				
243-12-02	A tract of land located in the SW Corner of the SW 1/4 of Section 30, Newcomb Township; 2506 CR 0E, Mansfield, Illinois PIN: 16-07-30-300-005	Gregg and Cynthia Giertz	08/30/12 09/13/12	construct a detached garage
AG-1				
243-12-03	A tract of land located in the SE Corner of the SE 1/4 of Section 15, Brown Township; 388 CR 3300N, Fisher, Illinois PIN: 02-01-15-400-011	David Cender	08/30/12 09/17/12	construct an addition to an existing single family home
AG-1				
244-12-01	Under review			
249-12-01	Lot 1, Lakeview 6 <sup>th</sup> Subdivision, Section 13, Mahomet Township; 2012 E. Tin Cup Road, Suite D, Mahomet, IL PIN: 15-13-13-101-017	Joella Koss	09/05/12 09/19/12	Change the Use to establish a Veterinary Clinic, <i>All About the Animals Pet Clinic</i>
B-4				
250-12-01	Lot 3 of Walter Sandwell's 2 <sup>nd</sup> Subdivision; Section 33, Philo Township; 1480 CR 600N, Tolono, IL PIN: 19-27-33-400-016	Stanley Kaiser	09/06/12 09/19/12	construct a single family home with attached garage
AG-1				

**APPENDIX A. ZONING USE PERMITS AUTHORIZED DURING SEPTEMBER, 2012**

251-12-01	Lot 1, Sullivan Subdivision No. 1, AG-2 Section 1, Mahomet Township; 529 CR 2400N, Dewey, Illinois PIN: 15-13-01-300-023	Kennedy Builders	09/07/12 09/19/12	construct a single family home with attached garage
251-12-02	Lot 10, Woodfield Estates Subdivision, R-1 Section 22, Mahomet Township; 1404 Buckthorn Lane, Mahomet, Illinois PIN: 15-13-22-251-003	Bob Born	09/07/12 09/26/12	construct a garage addition to an existing single family home
254-12-01	Lot 132, Dobbins Downs 2 <sup>nd</sup> , Section 2, R-1 Champaign Township; 1408 Dobbins Drive, Champaign, Illinois PIN: 03-20-02-126-010	Stephanie Terhune	09/10/12 09/20/12	an addition to an existing single family home
257-12-01	More information needed			
261-12-01	Lot 15, Woodcreek Subdivision, 3 <sup>rd</sup> Plat, AG-2 Section 17, Mahomet Township; 106 Wood Creek Court, Mahomet, Illinois PIN: 15-13-17-225-020	Gary Flannell	09/17/12 09/20/12	a detached garage
262-12-01	Lot 6 of the Original Town of Foosland, B-5 Section 17, Brown Township; 203 Main Street, Foosland, IL PIN: 02-01-17-404-006	Dave Adamson	09/18/12 09/26/12	an addition to an existing warehouse building for personal storage
263-12-01	Lot 248 Parkhill's Lakeview Sub. 2, R-1 Section 11, Mahomet Township; 602 Dennis Drive, Mahomet, Illinois PIN: 15-13-11-477-007	William and Bonnie Smith	09/19/12 09/26/12	a detached garage
265-12-01	Under review			
269-12-01	Under review			

**APPENDIX A. ZONING USE PERMITS AUTHORIZED DURING SEPTEMBER, 2012**

270-12-01 Under review

271-12-01 Under review

272-12-01 Under review

**APPENDIX B: ZONING COMPLIANCE CERTIFICATES ISSUED DURING OCTOBER, 2012**

<b><u>DATE</u></b>	<b><u>LOCATION</u></b>	<b><u>PROJECT</u></b>
09/25/12	A tract of land located in the West ½ of the SE 1/4 of Section 10,	a detached storage shed
156-12-02	Philo Township; 1574 CR 1000N, Philo, Illinois PIN: 19-27-10-400-005	
09/25/12	A tract of land located in the NE Corner of the NE 1/4 of the NW	a single family home with attached garage
76-12-01	1/4 of Section 3, Crittenden Township; 1535 CR 600N, Tolono, Illinois PIN: 08-33-03-100-009	

# CHAMPAIGN COUNTY HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT

August 2012

## FINAL BRIDGE REPORT – COUNTY HIGHWAY 22 #05-00907-00-BR

Awarded Price: \$1,110,888.87  
Contractor: O'Neil Bros.  
Completed Price: \$1,121,181.48

### CONSTRUCTION:

County Bridge	\$ 181,088.63
State	<u>940,092.85</u>
	\$ 1,121,181.48

### ENGINEERING:

County	\$104,818.00 (Design)
	\$ 12,500.00 (Staking)

## FINAL BRIDGE REPORT – CH. 22 #06-00923-00-BR

Awarded Price: \$416,477.00  
Contractor: O'Neil Bros.  
Completed Price: \$403,116.90

### CONSTRUCTION:

County Bridge	\$403,116.90
---------------	--------------

### ENGINEERING (DESIGN):

County	\$28,445.80
--------	-------------

## FINAL BRIDGE REPORT – COUNTY HIGHWAY 22 #06-00924-00-BR

Awarded Price: \$695,843.00  
Contractor: O'Neil Bros.  
Completed Price: \$696,038.80

### CONSTRUCTION:

County Bridge	\$696,038.80
---------------	--------------

### ENGINEERING (DESIGN):

County	\$42,906.55
--------	-------------

## FINAL BRIDGE REPORT – COUNTY HIGHWAY 6 #10-00965-00-BR

Awarded Price: \$50,147.00  
Contractor: Otto Baum Company  
Completed Price: \$51,812.28

### CONSTRUCTION:

County Bridge	\$51,812.28
---------------	-------------

### ENGINEERING (DESIGN):

County	\$19.612.00
--------	-------------

# CHAMPAIGN COUNTY HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT

August 2012

Page 2

## **FINAL BRIDGE REPORT – CHAMPAIGN –VERMILION #08-01949-00-BR**

Awarded Price: \$209,527.50  
Contractor: Newell Construction  
Completed Price: \$205,487.67

### CONSTRUCTION:

County Bridge	\$ 86,099.33
Township Bridge	82,195.07
Vermilion County	<u>37,193.27</u>
	\$205,487.67

## **FINAL BRIDGE REPORT – COUNTY HIGHWAY 22 #12-00982-00-BR**

Awarded Price: \$17,527.00  
Contractor: Big O Services  
Completed Price: \$18,407.10

### CONSTRUCTION:

County Bridge	\$18,407.10
---------------	-------------

### ENGINEERING (DESIGN):

County	\$2,382.50
--------	------------

## **FINAL BRIDGE REPORT – CONDIT #10-07969-00-BR**

Awarded Price: \$160,344.50  
Contractor: Newell Construction  
Completed Price: \$160,247.72

### CONSTRUCTION:

County Bridge	\$ 48,074.32
Township Bridge	96,148.63
Condit	<u>16,024.77</u>
	\$160,247.72

### ENGINEERING (DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION):

County	\$10,283.00
Condit	<u>14,289.19</u>
	\$24,572.19



# CHAMPAIGN COUNTY HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT

August 2012  
Page 3

## FINAL BRIDGE REPORT – CONDIT #10-07970-00-BR

Awarded Price: \$93,126.00  
Contractor: Stark Excavating  
Completed Price: \$91,232.66

### CONSTRUCTION:

County Bridge	\$27,369.80
Township Bridge	54,739.59
Condit	<u>9,123.27</u>
	\$91,232.66

### ENGINEERING (DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION):

County	\$ 6,999.00
Condit	<u>9,279.82</u>
	\$16,278.82

## FINAL BRIDGE REPORT – HENSLEY #10-12967-00-BR

Awarded Price: \$119,126.50  
Contractor: Stark Excavating  
Completed Price: \$118,942.40

### CONSTRUCTION:

County Bridge	\$ 35,682.72
Township Bridge	71,365.44
Hensley	<u>11,894.24</u>
	\$118,942.40

### ENGINEERING (DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION):

County	\$14,722.25
Hensley	<u>17,295.81</u>
	\$32,418.06

## FINAL BRIDGE REPORT – HENSLEY #10-12973-00-BR

Awarded Price: \$121,826.00  
Contractor: Stark Excavating  
Completed Price: \$124,220.37

### CONSTRUCTION:

County Bridge	\$ 38,011.43
Township Bridge	73,786.90
Hensley	<u>12,422.04</u>
	\$124,220.37

### ENGINEERING (DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION):

County	\$ 7,618.80
Hensley	<u>10,724.31</u>
	\$18,343.11

# CHAMPAIGN COUNTY HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT

August 2012

Page 4

## FINAL BRIDGE REPORT – STANTON #10-28971-00-BR

Awarded Price: \$153,379.00  
Contractor: Newell Construction  
Completed Price: \$159,305.80

### CONSTRUCTION:

County Bridge	\$ 51,347.82
Township Bridge	92,027.40
Stanton	<u>15,930.58</u>
	\$159,305.80

### ENGINEERING (DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION):

County	\$11,485.59
Hensley	<u>15,467.88</u>
	\$26,953.47

## FINAL REPORT – VARIOUS CULVERT REPAIRS/REPLACEMENTS (CONSTRUCTION ONLY)

### COMPROMISE #10-06972-00-BR

County Bridge	\$13,622.20
Compromise Township	<u>13,622.20</u>
	\$27,244.40

### COMPROMISE #12-06987-00-BR

County Bridge	\$14,725.00
Compromise Township	<u>14,725.00</u>
	\$29,550.00

### COMPROMISE-OGDEN #09-06964-00-BR

County Bridge	\$4,320.80
Compromise Township	2,544.81
Ogden Township	<u>1,775.99</u>
	\$8,641.60

### HENSLEY #12-12983-00-BR

County Bridge	\$ 9,198.00
Hensley Township	<u>9,198.00</u>
	\$18,396.00

# CHAMPAIGN COUNTY HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT

August 2012

Page 5

## KERR #11-13979-00-BR

County Bridge	\$14,368.60
Kerr Township	<u>14,843.61</u>
	\$29,212.21

## NEWCOMB #09-16958-00-BR

County Bridge	\$13,250.00
Newcomb Township	<u>13,250.00</u>
	\$26,500.00

## NEWCOMB #10-16974-00-BR

County Bridge	\$16,243.39
Newcomb Township	<u>16,243.39</u>
	\$32,486.78

## PHILO #11-19975-00-BR

County Bridge	\$4,300.00
Philo Township	<u>4,300.00</u>
	\$8,600.00

## PHILO #11-19980-00-BR

County Bridge	\$18,522.00
Philo Township	<u>18,522.00</u>
	\$37,044.00

## RAYMOND #11-21976-00-BR

County Bridge	\$3,712.80
Raymond Township	<u>3,712.80</u>
	\$7,425.60

## SADORUS #12-22986-00-BR

County Bridge	\$10,017.00
Sadorus Township	<u>10,017.00</u>
	\$20,034.00

## TOLONO #12-29984-00-BR

County Bridge	\$ 8,058.00
Tolono Township	<u>8,058.00</u>
	\$16,116.00