

Minutes of the Transportation Committee

The Transportation Committee of the McLean County Board met Tuesday, June 5, 2001 at 7:30 a.m. in Room 700, Law and Justice Center, 104 West Front Street, Room 701 Bloomington, Illinois.

Members Present: Chairman Bass, Vice Chairman Hoselton, Members Emmett, Johnson, Owens

Members Absent: Member Selzer

Staff Members Present: Mr. John M. Zeunik, County Administrator;
Mr. Terry Lindberg, Assistant County Administrator;
Ms. Martha B. Ross, County Administrator's Assistant,
County Administrator's Office

Department Heads/
Elected Officials Present: Mr. Jack Mitchell, County Engineer, County Highway Department

Others Present: Ms. Lydia Reynolds, Transportation Planner, McLean County Regional Planning Commission

Chairman Bass called the meeting to order at 7:32 a.m. Chairman Bass presented the Minutes of the May 1, 2001 and the May 15, 2001 meetings for approval.

Motion By Hoselton/Owens to approve the minutes of the May 1, 2001 and May 15, 2001 meetings of the Transportation Committee. Motion carried.

Chairman Bass presented the bills as prepared by the Auditor's Office. Mr. Hoselton asked why overtime pay is being utilized at a high rate at this time of the year. Mr. Mitchell responded that seal coat is now being applied to many County roads at this time of the year and it is often more expedient for workers to remain on the job until it is complete, rather than return to the same project the following day for merely a short period of time.

Mr. Owens asked what is the life span for much of the office equipment utilized at the Highway Department office. Mr. Mitchell stated that the office usually tries to retain equipment for a full three (3) years before attempting to replace it, and whenever possible, five (5) years of use is the objective. He noted that copiers receive especially hard use and often last only 3 years before replacement is necessary.

Mr. Hoselton asked where Right Of Way was purchased during this bill cycle. Mr. Mitchell responded that the Right Of Way was purchased on the Lexington-LeRoy Road.

Mr. Owens asked whether employees received a clothing allowance or whether clothing is supplied solely by the County as the employer. Mr. Mitchell responded that the Highway Department's union contract has furnished uniforms for the employees covered by the collective bargaining agreement. The uniforms consist of jeans, work shirts, steel-toed work boots.

Mr. Hoselton noted that there is between \$7,000 and \$8,000 charged as overtime in this month's bills. He noted that such an amount seems to be an unusual amount of overtime charges for the season. Mr. Mitchell explained that much of the work being done at this time, including seal coat on the roads and maintenance work, requires the discretionary incurring of overtime charges in order to properly finish a job in the most expedient manner.

Mr. Hoselton remarked that the Highway Department employees who are subject to a union contract are guaranteed 2,040 work hours, which in turn, guarantees their annual salary up to payment for that amount of work time. He stated that the current incurring of overtime seems too excessive at this time of the year. Mr. Hoselton noted that the workers at the Highway Department are good workers, he only objected to the amount of overtime that is being expended.

Motion by Emmett/Johnson to Approve the Bills as presented and recommended by the Auditor's Office. Motion carried.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the issue underlying the appeal requested by Mr. and Mrs. Clay of the City of LeRoy, has been resolved. Therefore, the appeal process will not need to be invoked. The mailbox built by the Clays, 3 feet 6 inches off the edge of the road, was determined by the Highway Department to be too close to the edge of the road, and was

therefore, subject to damage by passing equipment. The Clays have agreed to move the existing mailbox, and will replace it with a standard mailbox with an 8 feet turnout. The box will then be 9 feet off the road and will not be a hazard to those who need to access it, as well as those who need to specifically avoid it.

Mr. Emmett stated that he has seen the mailbox in passing, and questions whether the Clays will be able to effectively remove it. Mr. Mitchell noted that the Clays felt that they would be able to replace the box.

Chairman Bass asked whether there is a blacktop portion of the road that is provided to accommodate rural mailboxes. Mr. Mitchell responded that, over the years, there have been several different mailbox standards implemented. The current standard calls for an 8 feet turn out. He noted that it is safer for the mailman when there is an accommodation, so that the mailman may get off the road to perform his service. Chairman Bass stated that it is nice to be able to accommodate the rural residents in this manner.

Ms. Johnson asked how far the existing box is located from the road. Mr. Mitchell responded that the existing mailbox is 3 feet 6 inches off the road at present. The Clays will be asked to move their mailbox location 9 feet from the road so that an 8 feet turnaround can be added and the box is sufficiently off the road.

Mr. Owens asked what is the timeframe for completion of the job. Mr. Mitchell responded that it is hoped that the job will be completed as soon as possible, but that weather will be a consideration. He further noted that since the appeal process will not be utilized, there will be no action required by either the Transportation Committee or the County Board.

Chairman Bass presented the results of the bids submitted for consideration to purchase a new copier for the Highway Department.

Motion by Hoselton/Johnson to accept the recommended low bid that has been submitted for the purchase of a copier for the Highway Department office.

Mr. Mitchell noted that bids were advertised for either purchase or lease of a unit. He stated that 3 companies brought in machines for examination by the office staff. Mr. Mitchell explained that a lease was initially most attractive in terms of economics. However, the sales representative notified him that there had been a mistake in the lease term quoted, in that the price quoted was for the five (5) year lease price, rather than the three (3) year lease price.

In view of this discrepancy, Mr. Mitchell explained that the bids were reevaluated and it was determined that purchase was now the more attractive option in terms of cost. Chairman Bass stated that there were quite a few potential bidders who subsequently declined to bid on this purchase opportunity. Xerox, Paxton, and Danka were the companies returning bids.

Mr. Emmett remarked that there is an interesting comparison in price between Paxton and Danka for the same machine.

Motion carried.

Mr. Mitchell presented the bicycle permits for the Dog Days 5-K Run and Ride for Relief. He noted that in the past, the Committee alone has acted on all such permit applications, without the action of the full Board. In May, similar permits were presented to the full Board for approval.

Mr. Mitchell asked Mr. Zeunik how he would suggest permits be handled from this point forward. Mr. Zeunik responded that the Committee approves the permits.

Mr. Owens stated that it was favorable to the Committee to have the information available, but is it necessary to have the Committee act upon each individual application. Mr. Owens asked if it would be more efficient for the Committee to grant Mr. Mitchell the discretion to approve such applications routinely, and only involve the Committee when there are conditions that are outside the usual request parameters. He noted that authority has already been granted to Mr. Jack Moody, Director, Facilities Management, to approve applications for the use of County grounds, under certain conditions.

Mr. Zeunik stated that there is a fundamental difference between the requests to use County grounds and the bicycle permits. The bicycle permit requests are actually applications that involve the issuance of a permit, which is viewed as a license. That permit allows the use of County property for a specific event, generally for fundraising. Conversely, the events conducted on the County's plaza are generally not fundraising events and are usually not issued a formal permit in order to assemble and utilize County facilities.

Mr. Zeunik remarked that since a permit, which may potentially be viewed as a license, can be a legal document, the Civil Assistant State's Attorney should be consulted to determine whether the Committee can delegate authority to the County Engineer to approve and issue such permits, without the consent of the Transportation Committee.

Mr. Hoselton asked whether Mr. Mitchell objected to operating in this fashion. He noted that the permit applications are generally very simple, and can be reviewed in a short period of time. He noted that to ask the Committee to approve all such permits is excessive.

Motion by Hoselton/Johnson to approve the bicycle permit applications for Dog Days 5-K Run and Ride for Relief with the Committee.

Ms. Johnson stated that she is comfortable with having Mr. Mitchell review and approve the routine bicycle permit applications. Mr. Mitchell stated that there is a member of his staff who routinely works with applicants to be certain that all items requested by the application are submitted correctly and that the application is in compliance with requirements.

Chairman Bass asked who is responsible for informing the County Sheriff of the granting of a permit for use of County roads. Mr. Zeunik responded that the applicants are required to inform the Sheriff as well as any of the emergency services that may be needed for the event. The applicant is also responsible for the appropriate signage for the event. Chairman Bass noted that there is also a time limit whereby the event can utilize County roads for a given function.

Mr. Mitchell stated that he will be happy to check each application with the State's Attorney's office, if the Committee desires.

Motion carried.

Mr. Mitchell presented the request for repair of the Livingston County Line Bridge. He explained that the bridge is located on the County Line between Livingston and McLean Counties, 4.5 miles South of Route 24. An automobile or other vehicle has hit the concrete rail and broken it. The bridge, built in 1962, is constructed with concrete curb, rail and post.

Mr. Mitchell explained that the reason that Livingston County contacted McLean County was that the original structure was constructed by the two (2) Counties. He noted that a meandering creek located in the area was straightened directly along the County line, and the bridge was constructed to serve both Counties. As a result, the repair is to be a joint project.

Mr. Emmett asked why McLean County is contributing \$4,100.00 and Livingston County is only contributing \$900.00 toward the repair. Mr. Mitchell responded that on County Line structures, the law requires that the split in cost be allocated based on the

County's equalized assessed valuation. McLean County's percentage of that value is slightly in excess of 81%.

Mr. Emmett asked whether the entity who collided with the bridge has been identified. Mr. Mitchell responded that the County Engineer for Livingston County, Mr. Dave Winters, did get a repair estimate of approximately \$4,000.00. He noted that the Counties could potentially recoup the expense of repair if that entity could be identified.

Mr. Owens asked which County clears the bridge during adverse weather conditions. Mr. Mitchell responded that the Township is responsible for clearing the bridge, since it is located on a Township road. However, Mr. Mitchell added that State regulations indicate that structures located on County lines are to be constructed and maintained by both Counties if the structure is over 25 feet in waterway opening.

Mr. Owens asked how the split in construction costs was made in 1962 at the initial construction of the bridge. Mr. Mitchell noted that the assessed valuation was utilized at that time, as well, in determining the amount of costs expended by each County.

Chairman Bass asked who initiated this project. Mr. Mitchell explained that he received a call from the Livingston County Engineer stating that the bridge had been damaged. Mr. Winters had a firm inspect the damage and provide an estimate to repair the damage. Mr. Mitchell then inspected the bridge himself. He subsequently provided photographs to the Committee for their inspection of the damage.

Mr. Hoselton commented that the accident causing the damage to the bridge must have happened fairly recently, since the rebar exposed by the breakage of the concrete is not rusted by virtue of its exposure to moisture.

Motion by Emmett/Hoselton to approve the repair to the Livingston-McLean County Line Bridge to be completed in conjunction with Livingston County.
Motion carried.

Mr. Mitchell presented the Illinois Tomorrow Corridor Planning Grant Program Application. He introduced Ms. Lydia Reynolds, Transportation Planner, McLean County Regional Planning Commission, who is in attendance to assist in explaining the grant.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the Illinois Tomorrow Grants are planning grants that are administered in Springfield. There is currently \$3,000,000.00 available statewide. In the

Regional Planning Commission meetings, it has been discussed with representatives from

Minutes of the Transportation Committee Meeting

June 5, 2001

Page Seven

Bloomington and Normal how best to use such grants. He noted that both the City of Bloomington and the Town of Normal have proposed traffic studies of their downtown areas. This grant affects all three (3) localities in that it is to study the access to highways.

Ms. Reynolds stated that the program application is an access management plan. It is listed in the Regional Comprehensive Plan as a priority to develop an access management plan that could be utilized by the City of Bloomington, the Town of Normal, and the rest of the County concurrently. It is hoped that obtaining the funding from the grant would enable the County to accomplish this goal.

Chairman Bass asked whether the City of Bloomington and the Town of Normal would be included in the grant application. Ms. Reynolds responded that they would be included, but that there is only one sponsor needed, and so the County would function in that capacity.

Mr. Hoselton stated that McLean County would be the grant recipient and the lead agency. He asked why the County should be involved in the specific needs of the City of Bloomington and the Town of Normal. Ms. Reynolds noted that as the area grows, the opportunity for access management will become more restricted within Bloomington and Normal as it becomes hemmed in by additional growth. She noted that the goal is to develop a model that will be agreeable to all entities for the future.

Mr. Hoselton asked what the percentage of funds would be for the County to participate in the grant. Ms. Reynolds responded that the amount of the grant to the recipient is \$40,000.00. The \$4,000.00 amount refers to a local match through Regional Planning's In-Kind Services. The grant will either be administered in-house with local planners or contracted out with the \$4,000.00 being the local match that Regional Planning would provide.

Mr. Emmett asked whether there is an actual out-of-pocket amount for the County. Ms. Reynolds responded that there is an indirect outlay through the Regional Planning Commission.

Mr. Emmett asked who would do the coordination of the spending. Ms. Reynolds responded that the Regional Planning Commission would do the coordination of the distribution of the \$4,000.00 it contributes. It would also involve coordination with the County's Highway Department and the Regional Planning Technical Committee to distribute the \$40,000.00. Mr. Mitchell noted that the Technical Committee meets on an

as-needed basis, but many of the participants have frequent contact with each other on a regular basis.

Minutes of the Transportation Committee Meeting

June 5, 2001

Page Eight

Motion by Emmett/Johnson to approve the Illinois Tomorrow Corridor Planning Grant Program Application. Motion carried.

Mr. Mitchell presented the draft of the Intergovernmental Agreement Between the Village of Towanda and McLean County regarding railroad improvements. Mr. Mitchell remarked that there are three (3) crossings affected by this Agreement. The first is Jefferson Street, which is also County Highway 2. The Village has two (2) crossings, one of which they will close. The other crossing will be kept open and road improvements will provide better access to it.

Mr. Mitchell explained that the Stipulated Agreement that was approved at the May 2001 County Board meeting didn't specify some of the aspects of the situation that the County would have liked to see addressed. From now on, the County will handle the income and outgo of funds and will keep the ongoing financial records, as well as administer the grant. That way the Village won't have to try to handle these tasks with limited staff.

Motion by Hoselton/Owens to approve the Intergovernmental Agreement Between the Village of Towanda and McLean County regarding railroad improvements.

Chairman Bass asked for a timeframe for this project. Mr. Mitchell responded that the Illinois Commerce Commission (the "ICC") is quite anxious to complete this project. It is part of the first contract that the ICC has for the implementation of the high-speed rail facility. It involves a line beginning at Airport Road in Bloomington and proceeding to the City of Chenoa. There are 12 other crossings along this route, where quad gates will be installed and total closure of the crossing will be achieved. Also to be installed will be detection devices under the concrete crossings so a vehicle that might be trapped on the tracks within the gates could be detected. Concrete crossings will also be installed, which will provide a smoother crossing. Part of the Agreement includes the paving of Jefferson Street, which will upgrade that crossing.

Chairman Bass asked when the project is expected to be finished. Mr. Mitchell stated that Fall of 2001 is projected, but it may not be finished until the end of the winter of 2002.

Mr. Hoselton stated that there was a completion date in the Agreement, but it is doubtful that the date will be accurate. Mr. Mitchell noted that much of the work must be done in sequence.

Motion carried.

Minutes of the Transportation Committee Meeting

June 5, 2001

Page Nine

Mr. Mitchell presented the Local Agency Agreement for Federal Participation for the Hoffman Bridge in Funk's Grove Township. This is a Federal project, utilizing the Federal Bridge Rehabilitation and Replacement Program Funds for 80% of the job. State of Illinois PVP Funds will pay for 80% of the engineering costs. Therefore, the County and the Township will need to pay for 10% each of the remaining costs. Mr. Mitchell explained that the Road Improvement Statement further details how the funding is being spent.

Mr. Hoselton asked whether the local agency referred to is only the County. Mr. Mitchell responded that it includes both the County and Funk's Grove Township. On the Road Improvement Statement, it is shown that the Federal funds are paying \$360,000.00, with the County and the Township paying \$45,000.00 each. Under engineering, the County and the Township are paying \$3,500.00 each, with TBP paying \$28,000.00. Therefore, each County and Township are putting in \$48,500.00.

Mr. Mitchell remarked that hopefully, this item will be included on the August letting, so that the structure could be built in the Fall of 2001. However, it will depend on which contractor is selected, and its existing job load at the time of the letting, as to how quickly the job will actually progress.

Mr. Owens asked how long the job would take to complete. Mr. Mitchell noted that construction could begin as early as September 2001, but that is unlikely. The structure could ideally be finished in the winter of 2002, but it is unlikely that such a fast-moving schedule will commence.

Mr. Owens asked whether the bridge project is a total rip out of the existing structure. Mr. Mitchell responded that the entire bridge must be removed, as no part of it is salvageable.

Mr. Emmett asked what is TBP. It is located on the application under the Statement of Proposed Road Improvement under the heading of Engineering. He noted that the itemization is \$3,500.00 for County Bridge Fund and Township Bridge Fund is also \$3,500.00. However, the section classified as Other indicates an item at TBP in the amount of \$28,000.00. Mr. Mitchell explained that TBP is the State Township Bridge Program Fund. He stated that each year the State of Illinois appropriates \$15,000,000.00 statewide for the construction of bridges on township roads. McLean County receives approximately \$325,000.00 or 2% of the total amount. In turn, McLean County builds a little over \$400,000.00 worth of projects per year, utilizing an 80/20 ratio. With regard to

Federal projects, the County has been funding engineering costs out of the TBP Program funds so that for any one township, it does not matter whether the project is a Federal or State-funded project. The same amount is paid out in either case.

Minutes of the Transportation Committee Meeting

June 5, 2001

Page Ten

Mr. Emmett asked whether the amount indicated as Local Share is truly considered the amount expended for the locality. Mr. Mitchell responded that the itemization on the form is somewhat ambiguous in that the Federal entity considers funds at the State level to be local funds. He noted that the Road Improvement Statement further details the itemization of funds and provides improved clarification.

Motion by Johnson/Hoselton to approve the Local Agency Agreement for Federal Participation for the Hoffman Bridge in the Funk's Grove Township. Motion carried.

Mr. Mitchell noted that the elevator personnel in Danvers had written to the Highway Department requesting notification of when road work will occur in their area. Mr. Mitchell stated that his response included notification of upcoming projects on the Danvers-Uton Road in 2002 and the Carlock-Danvers Road in 2003. He remarked that the dates are proposed, but may be subject to weather conditions and funding availability.

Mr. Mitchell commented that he recently received a book on the history of Counties in Illinois. He stated that a reverse chronology went back to the year 1790, the date when the first Counties were formed in the state.

Mr. Owens asked whether the volume progresses in time forward past the year 1843. Mr. Mitchell responded that it does detail events following 1843, but that McLean County specifically is not affected beyond that date. To his recollection, the last County formed in Illinois was Ford County in 1853.

Mr. Hoselton remarked that the area now known as Ford County was, at one time, a swamp area, not suitable for land use development at that time. He noted that there were two (2) men who installed drainage tiles and developed the land to the point where it could then be appropriately utilized. That tract of land subsequently became what is now known as Ford County.

Chairman Bass asked which County in Illinois is the largest. Mr. Hoselton responded that McLean County is the largest County in terms of area, followed by Livingston County and LaSalle County. Mr. Mitchell noted that Iroquois County and Champaign County are also roughly commensurate in area to McLean.

Chairman Bass asked what is the smallest County in Illinois. Mr. Hoselton responded that Hardin County is quite small. Chairman Bass noted that Marshall County is small, as is Putnam County.

Minutes of the Transportation Committee Meeting
June 5, 2001
Page Eleven

Mr. Emmett remarked that McLean County was initially surveyed in 1824 by Barcroff, whose survey maps are still available for study in Springfield. He noted that the margins of some sections of the maps include Barcroff's notes and comments regarding the Kickapoo Indian Village that at one time thrived in the area now known as McLean County.

Mr. Mitchell presented the letter that he sent, per the direction of the Committee, to Central Illinois Contractors. He noted that he selected all of the firms that are located within a 75 mile radius of the Bloomington-Normal area for the mailing. Some of the areas included in the mailing were: Kankakee, Galesburg, Champaign, Springfield, and Mattoon.

Mr. Mitchell remarked that a Stand-Up Meeting will be needed prior to the June 19th County Board meeting to approve bids for a letting for a bridge. The Committee elected to hold their July meeting on the same date as they would normally, with no change in schedule due to the annual NACo Conference, that is scheduled to be held July 13-17, 2001. Therefore, the July meeting of the Transportation Committee will be Tuesday, July 3, 2001 at 7:30 a.m. in Room 700, 104 West Front Street, Bloomington, Illinois.

Motion by Owens/Johnson to move into Executive Session to discuss Real Estate matters. The members of the Committee are requested to remain, as are Mr. Zeunik, Mr. Lindberg, and Ms. Ross.
Motion carried.

The Committee went into Executive Session at 8:36 a.m.

The Committee came out of Executive Session and returned to Regular Session at 9:02 a.m.

Motion by Hoselton/Owens to proceed to negotiations with the Deneen Trust for the purchase of 5 acres of land adjacent to the present County Highway facility. The negotiations should commence, whether or not the City of Bloomington elects to pursue negotiation for the purchase of a 5 acre tract for their future needs.

Chairman Bass asked whether the County should issue a statement to the City of Bloomington ("City") regarding the intention of the County to pursue negotiations for the purchase of land. Mr. Emmett stated that the County has made it known to the City that its intent is to negotiate to purchase 5 acres of land and the City is to purchase 5 acres of land.

Minutes of the Transportation Committee Meeting
June 5, 2001
Page Twelve

Mr. Hoselton stated that the Transportation Committee should inform the Property Committee that the City is not amenable to a lease agreement with the County. The City would, instead, prefer to pursue ownership of its own tract of 5 acres so that it has the flexibility to utilize the land at its discretion.

Mr. Zeunik noted that it may not be in either party's best interest to share common facilities that may be placed on the expanded tract of land.

Motion carried.

Mr. Zeunik asked the Committee to consider the possibility of financial benefits that may come as a result of having both City and County facilities located side by side. Materials bids could be done jointly and delivery would be potentially be more efficient as the sites would be in close proximity.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the primary material that might benefit from the City and County having adjacent locations would be salt for use on the roads during the winter season. He stated that the City has been utilizing the State's joint purchasing method. While the County has opted in recent years for a different purchase option, the State bid process will likely be utilized this upcoming year. This is due to the fact that the best price will most likely be available through the State bid.

Motion by Hoselton/Owens to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried.

There being nothing further to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 9:08 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Martha B. Ross
Recording Secretary

Minutes of the Executive Session of the Transportation Committee
Tuesday, June 5, 2001

The Transportation Committee of the McLean County Board went into Executive Session at 8:37 a.m. on Tuesday, June 5, 2001 to discuss the acquisition of real estate.

Mr. Jack Mitchell, County Engineer, Highway Department, noted at the May 2000 meeting the Committee recommended that the County negotiate with representatives from the Deneen Trust to purchase 10 acres of real estate. Mr. Mitchell would then propose that the City of Bloomington ("City") lease five (5) acres of land from the County for their future use.

Mr. Mitchell explained that the County currently owns approximately 8.5 acres, which is currently occupied by the County Highway facility. He stated that the County anticipates that an additional five (5) acres is needed for future expansion. The City also anticipates that it will need to acquire five acres for future expansion as well. However, while the City is amenable to maintaining adjoining properties, it prefers to purchase its own property rather than lease property from the County.

Mr. Zeunik stated that he had spoken with Mr. Tom Hamilton, City Manager of Bloomington, who stated that the City is not interested in leasing property from the County for two reasons: 1) the City wants to be able to utilize the land at their discretion; and, 2) in the near future, the City may be able to sell the property for a profit because of the prospect of future development to the east of the current City limits. Mr. Zeunik noted that the City is interested in pursuing a joint negotiation with the County for the purchase of land from the Deneen Trust. The City and County would then independently assume the responsibility for the use of their respective acreage.

Chairman Bass asked how much conversation had taken place with the City regarding the proposed land purchase. Mr. Zeunik responded that the initial contact was between County Engineer, Jack Mitchell, and Mr. George Drye, Mr. Mitchell's counterpart with the City of Bloomington. Mr. Mitchell then reported to Mr. Zeunik, who subsequently met with Mr. Hamilton to determine the level of commitment that the City had to the idea of land acquisition. Mr. Hamilton indicated that the City was indeed very interested in purchasing five acres adjacent to the five acres proposed for the County's acquisition.

Ms. Johnson asked what was the intended use for the City's proposed acreage. Mr. Zeunik responded that the City is considering utilizing the acreage for a remote public works facility, including salt and vehicle storage. This facility would allow the City to service the east side of the community more readily and efficiently. The widening of the Towanda-Barnes Road and the opening of new school facilities for Unit 5 school district will likely stimulate a large amount of growth in the area in a relatively short period of time, for which the City must plan. Mr. Zeunik noted that future growth on the east side of Bloomington will also be driven by the opening of the new terminal at the Central Illinois Regional Airport ("Airport").

Chairman Bass stated that he viewed the proposal regarding the acquisition of five acres each for the City and the County, through a joint negotiation process, as a sound arrangement. He asked whether there are any questions or comments from the other members of the Committee.

Mr. Hoselton commented that, at the present time, the City has more possible sites for a remote public works facility than does the County. In the event that the City acquires the proposed site, and later chooses to vacate it in favor of another site, the County might then acquire the City's acreage. He noted, however, that there should be some type of physical barrier, such as a fence, that separates the County property from the City property.

Mr. Emmett remarked that acquisition of the additional acreage might also be advantageous to the County, in the event that the County may vacate its Highway facility at some unknown future date. In that regard, assuming that projected growth in the area does in fact occur, the County may be able to sell its existing facility at a good price. The County would then be free to place its Highway facility in a location that will best service residents at that point in time. Mr. Emmett noted that such planning and foresight constitutes sound management.

Ms. Johnson asked whether the County should negotiate a first right of refusal provision with the City, with regard to its contract for purchase of the proposed real estate. Mr. Mitchell responded that it is exceedingly difficult to project needs 20 years in the future. He stated that a five-acre acquisition would suffice for some time.

Mr. Owens asked what type of salt storage facility the County currently maintains. Mr. Mitchell explained that the current facility is a 4-bay salt storage building. In the short-term foreseeable future, another bay may need to be added to that existing facility. There is also a need for a shelter to store chloride for use in the winter.

Mr. Mitchell stated that a joint-usage salt facility with the City is not recommended at this time. Monitoring of salt supply and its usage might be a difficult task. Additionally, the joint purchase and usage of salt-related equipment would also be difficult to monitor.

Mr. Hoselton remarked that another issue that was previously discussed is that of placing satellite locations around the County. He asked whether the proposed five-acre acquisition would eliminate satellite locations from further consideration. Mr. Mitchell responded that the issue of satellite locations is a separate issue. The proposed five-acre acquisition is meant primarily for storage.

Mr. Hoselton asked whether the triangular shaped portion on the map that was provided by Mr. Mitchell, is currently owned by the County. Mr. Mitchell responded that it is owned by the County. Mr. Hoselton asked what is the current use of that portion of land. Mr. Mitchell responded that snow plows and culverts are stored there. He stated that one of the boundary lines bordering the rest of the property is at an angle because it also borders one of the runway lines at the Airport.

Mr. Mitchell remarked that until a new access road is built for the City to access its proposed new property, the County would allow the City to drive through its property so that the City may access its property. Mr. Hoselton stated that immediate access for both parties should be a point of negotiation with the Deneen Trust.

Mr. Hoselton asked what is the cost estimate for the property purchase. Mr. Mitchell responded that \$45,000.00 to \$50,000.00 is currently budgeted for the purchase, and it is assumed that this amount will be insufficient.

Chairman Bass stated that if the County pursued negotiations jointly with the City to purchase land from the Deneen Trust, it would not be a finalized agreement for awhile. In the meantime, an ongoing examination of the options, including costs, can be pursued.

Mr. Hoselton commented that the County should move forward in negotiations for the acquisition of its proposed five acres. If the City would like to negotiate jointly for its five acres as well, that would be acceptable, but the County should not wait to accommodate the City's timetable.

Chairman Bass noted that it is in the best interest of both the City and the County to jointly pursue the purchase of the proposed acreage, so as to insure the best possible price for both parties. Mr. Hoselton remarked that he is in agreement, but that the County should continue to pursue its proposed acquisition, regardless of the City's timetable.

Mr. Emmett stated that the County and City should approach the Deneen Trust collectively to negotiate for the purchase of acreage.

Motion by Emmett/Owens to return to Open Session. Motion carried.

Minutes of the Executive Session of the Transportation Committee
June 19, 2001
Page Four

The Transportation Committee of the McLean County Board returned to Open Session at
9:02 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Martha B. Ross". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name and title.

Martha B. Ross
Recording Secretary