

AS APPROVED JUNE 11, 2007

**MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING**

---

<b>Champaign County Environment &amp; Land Use Committee</b>	<b>DATE:</b>	<b>May 14, 2007</b>
<b>Champaign County Brookens Administrative Center</b>	<b>TIME:</b>	<b>7:00 p.m.</b>
<b>Urbana, IL 61802</b>	<b>PLACE:</b>	<b>Lyle Shields Meeting Room Brookens Administrative Center 1776 E. Washington Street Urbana, IL 61802</b>

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chris Doenitz, Matthew Gladney, Brad Jones, Ralph Langenheim, Carrie Melin, Jon Schroeder (VC), Barbara Wysocki (C)

**OTHER COUNTY  
BOARD MEMBERS**

**PRESENT:** C. Pius Weibel (County Board Chair)

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Jan Anderson, Steve Moser

**STAFF PRESENT:** John Hall, Leroy Holliday, J.R. Knight, Frank DiNovo (Regional Planning Commission), Susan Monte (Regional Planning Commission), Susan McGrath (Senior Assistant State's Attorney)

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Alvin Brock, Ruth Brock, Jerry Reifsteck, Barbara Reifsteck, Hal Barnhart, Tanna Fruhling

---

**1. Call to Order, Roll Call**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. The roll was called and a quorum declared present.

**2. Approval of Agenda**

**Mr. Langenheim moved, seconded by Mr. Doenitz to approve the agenda and move Agenda Item #11 to follow Agenda Item #7. The motion carried by voice vote.**

**3. Approval of Minutes (April 9, 2007 and April 19, 2007)**

**Mr. Doenitz moved, seconded by Mr. Jones to approve the April 9, 2007 and April 19, 2007, minutes as submitted. The motion carried by voice vote.**

**4. Public Participation**

None

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

**5. Correspondence**

**A. Mahomet Aquifer Consortium Member Meeting No. 52, February 9, 2007, minutes.**

**Mr. Langenheim moved, seconded by Mr. Doenitz to accept and place on file the Mahomet Aquifer Consortium Member Meeting No. 52, February 9, 2007, minutes. The motion carried by voice vote.**

**6. CDAP Loan Request – HL Precision Machining, Inc, d.b.a. Harlan & Lash (Steven Hillard)**

**Mr. Schroeder moved, seconded by Mr. Doenitz to recommend approval of CDAP Loan Request – HL Precision Machining, Inc, d.b.a. Harlan & Lash (Steven Hillard). The motion carried by voice vote.**

**7. CDAP Loan Request – Illini Contractor’s Supply (David York)**

**Mr. Schroeder moved, seconded by Mr. Doenitz to recommend approval of CDAP Loan Request – Illini Contractor’s Supply (David York). The motion carried by voice vote.**

**8. Recreation and Entertainment License: Eastern Illinois A.B.A.T.E. Inc, for live music, motorcycle show and motorcycle rodeo at the Rolling Hills Campground. Location: 3151A CR 2800E, Penfield, IL. June 1, 2007 thru June 2, 2007.**

**Mr. Langenheim moved, seconded by Mr. Doenitz to approve the Recreation and Entertainment License: Eastern Illinois A.B.A.T. E. Inc. The motion carried by voice vote.**

**9. Case 571-AM-06 Petitioner: Alvin Brock, Michael Brock and Gabe Venegas Request: Amend the Zoning Map to allow for the development of 1 single family residential lot in the AG-1, Agriculture Zoning District by adding the Rural Residential Overlay (RRO) Zoning District. Location: An 8.8 acre tract that is in the Northeast Quarter of the Northeast Quarter of Section 25 of Newcomb Township and commonly known as the field at 2507 CR 600E, Champaign.**

Mr. Hall stated that this is a zoning case that the Zoning Board of Appeals recommended for approval. He said that this is a lot one RRO to divide off the north half of the Brock farmstead. He said that this is the first instance where a property had exhausted all of their other options for selling lots therefore in order to sell off this one final lot an RRO was required. He said that the ZBA is forwarding this case to ELUC with a recommendation for approval. He said that there is no best prime farmland involved and this part of the farm was not in crop production. He said that there will be one new single family residence with all of the traffic associated with one new residence. He said that if the Committee reviews the Summary of Evidence it will find that there is no testimony included from the public hearing therefore it was not controversial.

**Mr. Schroeder moved, seconded by Mr. Jones to recommend approval of Case 571-AM-06: Alvin Brock and Gabe Venegas. The motion carried by voice vote.**

1  
2 Ms. Melin requested the definition of a “dry hydrant.”

3  
4 Mr. Hall explained that a “dry hydrant” is a fitting for a fire truck to connect to and draw water from a pond.  
5 He said that it has been designed according to Soil and Water Conservation District guidelines. He said that  
6 in a previous RRO done by the same family they installed a dry hydrant that has been tested by the  
7 Sangamon Valley Fire Protection District and they were very happy with it.

8  
9  
10 **10. *Proposal to require marking of telephone pedestals in rural areas***

11  
12 Mr. Hall stated that there is no new information on this agenda item to date. He said that it is up to the  
13 Committee whether or not they would like to have additional information on this issue. He said that the  
14 State’s Attorney’s Office has not had adequate time to work on this issue during the past month. He said  
15 that this item could be deferred to the June, ELUC meeting.

16  
17 **The consensus of the Committee was to defer Item #10 to the June, 2007, ELUC meeting.**

18  
19  
20 **11. *Proposal to prepare a Champaign County Government Land Use Plan***

21  
22 Ms. Wysocki stated that at the April, 2007, ELUC meeting this Committee talked extensively about the  
23 Land Resource Management Plan that has been proposed and researched by the Regional Planning  
24 Commission staff, particularly Susan Monte, County Planner. She said that the Committee came to the  
25 conclusion that generally this was a good idea and a good way to proceed although there were a number of  
26 Committee members who wanted to have some input from the Finance Committee. She said that this input  
27 was requested because this proposal does require a significant allocation of dollars both on the County’s part  
28 as well as the Regional Planning Commission to make all of this happen. She said that along with herself,  
29 Mr. Doenitz and Mr. Jones serve on the Finance Committee. She said that the Finance Committee met on  
30 May 10, 2007, and they talked about it extensively as well. She said that by an 8-1 vote the Finance  
31 Committee agreed that the County should move forward with this proposal but ELUC still needs to sign off  
32 on the plan. She noted that if anyone had any questions or concerns regarding the proposal then this would  
33 be the time and the place to indicate those concerns and request answers to their questions.

34  
35 Mr. Doenitz stated that he is concerned with the Steering Committee makeup.

36  
37 Ms. Wysocki stated that if the County is going to move forward with this proposal one of the things that  
38 ELUC needs to come to terms with is the creation of a Steering Committee that will basically work this plan  
39 through. She said that Ms. Monte distributed a document titled, *Champaign County Land Resources*  
40 *Management Plan Steering Committee Makeup Guidelines*, to the Committee for review. She said that this  
41 document identifies some key positions which should be represented on the Steering Committee. She said  
42 that there was previous discussion that the Steering Committee should be weighted more toward rural  
43 interests than urban interests.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

Ms. Monte stated that the distributed document is a guideline meant to be a starting point for discussion.

Mr. Doenitz stated that he is glad to see that township government will be involved and asked Ms. Monte if there could be more than one township government representative.

Ms. Monte stated that a minimum of four persons would be appointed representing township government.

Mr. Hall stated that three different townships by geography have been identified and the original idea was that, at a minimum, to get at least two representatives from each of those types. He said that after realizing that this would be a large number of representatives we went back to see where those numbers could be reduced and decided that only four carefully selected representatives would be needed to represent those types of townships. He said that this is only a preliminary guideline and if the Committee believes that two or more representatives are required to represent those types of townships then the Committee should indicate such.

Mr. Doenitz stated that there can also be too many representatives. He said that the highway commissioner is separate from the township government and he would like to see at least one, maybe two, highway commissioner representatives on the Steering Committee, one from the rural area and one from the near urban area.

Mr. Hall stated that originally that is what was going to be proposed for each of those types of townships, one supervisor and one highway commissioner. He asked Mr. Doenitz if he would like to see this considered.

Mr. Doenitz stated yes.

Ms. Monte stated that there are nine townships which have Plan Commissions and the Plan Commission Chair could also be considered for township representation on the Steering Committee.

Mr. Doenitz stated that the township and the road districts should be considered separately.

Ms. Monte stated that people could overlap in perspective and interest groups represented and the number of members could actually be less than indicated by the number of categories represented on the distributed document.

Mr. Doenitz stated that his only concern is that with only one representative you only get one perspective on several different things.

Ms. Monte stated that there is a resolution, which was originally reviewed in April, which has been updated for tonight's meeting and this would be one of the first requests for ELUC to recommend approval to the County Board. She said that ELUC's recommendation for approval would indicate support for the budget number and timeline that was discussed and to recognize that the Plan would represent a formal policy. She

1 said that there is also a Draft Resolution regarding the Steering Committee which could be adjusted to  
2 reflect tonight's discussion.

3  
4 Mr. Weibel asked Ms. Monte if ELUC is expected to recommend approval or denial of the Steering  
5 Committee Resolution at tonight's meeting.

6  
7 Ms. Monte stated that it may not be necessary to recommend approval or denial of the Steering Committee  
8 Resolution at tonight's meeting but it is necessary that the Committee discuss the resolution. She asked Ms.  
9 McGrath if she had considered a timeline for the Steering Committee Resolution.

10  
11 Ms. McGrath stated that the timeline depends on what the Committee wants to do and how fast the  
12 Committee wants to make this happen. She said that if the Committee wants the appointments to occur  
13 during the June 21, 2007, County Board Meeting then the Committee should go backwards to see how they  
14 can make that happen. She said that the appointment recommendations would need to go to the Policy  
15 Committee in June and somehow ELUC would need to figure out how to approve those members and get  
16 them selected by the County Board Chair so that a recommendation can be made to the Policy Committee.  
17 She said that the Policy Committee can actually meet at a special meeting prior to the County Board meeting  
18 in June to consider that and it is her understanding that Mr. Betz, Policy Committee Chair, would be willing  
19 to do so. She said that it really depends on how fast ELUC wants to make all of this happen and if this is  
20 what the Committee would like to do then ELUC should pass a resolution this month which talks about the  
21 composition of the Steering Committee in order to make that happen in time to be voted on at the June  
22 County Board meeting.

23  
24 Mr. Doenitz stated that personally he believes that this timeline is too quick. He said that there are a lot of  
25 people on this and he does not know how this could all be put together in less than three days.

26  
27 Mr. Weibel asked Ms. McGrath if the resolution regarding the composition of the Steering Committee  
28 should be recommended tonight or recommendations for nominations to the Steering Committee should be  
29 recommended tonight.

30  
31 Ms. McGrath stated that just the resolution itself should go to the County Board. She said that the resolution  
32 which is before the Committee tonight is to create the Steering Committee. She said that no actual  
33 nominations are required tonight.

34  
35 Ms. Wysocki reminded the Committee that the Policy Committee has indicated that they are not going to  
36 meet in July therefore if the actual appointment of names is to be moved forward to the County Board at the  
37 July meeting then the Policy Committee must have a special meeting prior to the July County Board meeting  
38 or wait until August.

39  
40 Mr. Weibel stated that if we can move on this then we should.

41  
42 Mr. Doenitz asked if there would only be one representative to serve the rural village residents and suburban  
43 village residents while there will be three representatives to serve the urban residents.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

Ms. Monte stated that these numbers are suggested because the population amount is weighted toward the greater population being in the larger urban area of Champaign, Urbana and Rantoul and relatively smaller percentage of the population being represented by the smaller villages.

Mr. Doenitz stated that he thought that this was being weighted the other way.

Ms. Monte stated that this is our recommendation.

Mr. Hall noted that the total number is 25 therefore there would be four members from those villages and municipalities and 21 other members from who knows where but it is suggested that most of those other 21 people will not be living in an urban area. He said that the resolution needs to be carefully coordinated with the appointments that are actually made.

Ms. McGrath stated that the resolution was drafted anticipating that there would be 15 members on the Steering Committee but that can be changed. She said that the resolution can also include the makeup of the Steering Committee.

Mr. Gladney stated that he does not believe that three of the 25 members to represent the Champaign, Urbana and Rantoul area are too many. He asked if the resolution recommended for approval at tonight's meeting is separate from the Steering Committee Makeup Guidelines.

Ms. McGrath stated yes.

Mr. Langenheim stated that the resolution indicates a 15 member Steering Committee and the Steering Committee Makeup Guidelines suggest 25 members.

Mr. Hall stated that this needs to be coordinated. He said that it would be easy to replace the 15 with 25 or whatever but the resolution does indicate that ten of the fifteen representatives appointed to the Steering Committee are to be residents of communities outside of Champaign, Rantoul, Savoy and Urbana. He said that at least one member of ELUC must be a formal member of the Committee and the other ELUC members will be *ex-officio members*. He said that with the 10 members of ELUC there could actually be 35 members on the Steering Committee.

Ms. Melin asked if anyone from the rural area could represent some of the other guideline categories therefore cutting the number down.

Mr. Doenitz stated that he understands the idea of trying to reduce the number of members on the Steering Committee but you will only have the perspectives of one person for two member spaces and that could hurt the plan.

Ms. Melin stated that she could see a member owning a grain elevator and living in the rural area therefore representing the rural perspective.

- 1  
2 Mr. Doenitz asked if there will only be one representative for five towns or one representative for each.  
3  
4 Mr. Hall stated that there will be one representative for all five towns.  
5  
6 Mr. Doenitz stated that he does not feel that this will be adequate representation for five towns that are  
7 drastically different. He said that those five towns have nothing in common.  
8  
9 Mr. Weibel stated that perhaps there should be two.  
10  
11 Mr. Doenitz stated that these villages should have separate representation.  
12  
13 Mr. Jones stated that the representation should be by geography and each area of the County should be  
14 equally represented.  
15  
16 Mr. Hall stated that the only way to get some of these interests in to the Steering Committee is to indicate  
17 that it is a perspective. He said that soil conservation is a universal concern in a lot of the rural area and the  
18 best way to get it represented is to have a soil conservation representative.  
19  
20 Mr. Jones stated that he is afraid that it will come down to the same thing that the Comprehensive Zoning  
21 Review faced in that the rural residents will feel that the proposal was dominated by the Champaign-Urbana  
22 interests and it will be rejected.  
23  
24 Mr. Hall stated under the perspective of agriculture there is a Commodity Crop Producer and a Livestock or  
25 Specialty Crop Producer. He asked Mr. Jones if those two perspectives should be included as one person.  
26  
27 Mr. Jones stated that he agrees with Ms. Melin in that many of the perspectives could be overlapped by one  
28 person.  
29  
30 Mr. Langenheim asked if there has been any sign of interest received from the general citizen in serving on  
31 the Steering Committee.  
32  
33 Ms. Wysocki stated that the word is not out yet therefore it is unknown what that interest will be.  
34  
35 Mr. Weibel stated that one approach could be that the selection will be by geography so that all of the areas  
36 of the County are represented.  
37  
38 Mr. Jones stated that it would be good to have people from different parts of the County.  
39  
40 Mr. Weibel stated that location could be a priority.  
41  
42 Ms. Monte stated that the geographic unit, quadrant of the county or township could be considered during  
43 the selection process.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

Mr. DiNovo asked if this could be tasked to the County Board members and allocated by County Board Districts.

Mr. Doenitz stated that he is not sure that there will be enough diversity from the geographic area.

Ms. McGrath stated that one model that might be used is utilized by the Champaign County Board of Health. She said that people have to be from a certain area and within those areas you would find people who represent the needed perspective. She said that in this model geography is looked at first and then within that geography you would choose people who would represent certain categories. She said that with this model the County could say that they would like to have “x” number of members on the Steering Committee and they need to be weighted towards rural/urban and then within this group certain representation is desired.

Mr. Doenitz asked who will pick the members of the Steering Committee.

Mr. Weibel stated that he, along with the County Board will choose the members of the Steering Committee.

Mr. Doenitz asked Mr. Weibel if he will consult with anyone during this process or will it be done arbitrarily.

Ms. Wysocki stated that anytime a County Board Chair makes a recommendation they consult with the County Board members who have an interest with that particular area. She said that she would hope that when the County Board Chair gets down to picking this Committee he would ask the ELUC Chair what they think of this combination of people.

Mr. Weibel stated that he would consult with Ms. Wysocki, Mr. Hall and Ms. Monte.

Ms. McGrath stated that the information that is incorporated into the advertisement is up to ELUC and there is no statutory restriction. She said that one of the proposals which is before the Committee tonight is that all nominations come to the County Board members although the Committee could follow the traditional model which says that the appointments will be advertised.

Ms. Wysocki asked Ms. Monte why the University of Illinois Administration is included in the makeup.

Ms. Monte stated that the University of Illinois has an interest in what is happening at the county level and they are a major player in development and the future of the County.

Mr. DiNovo stated that Champaign County has a relatively unique situation because it is unusual to find a university of this size in a community of this size. He said that the University of Illinois has a key interest in the quality of life issues in the County in terms of their overall competitiveness. He said that the University of Illinois is also a major landowner and land manager and the people that are responsible for managing those interests would be the appropriate persons to represent the University’s interest. He said that this

1 person would bring the University's concerns to the Steering Committee's table.

2  
3 Mr. Schroeder stated that from the standpoint of playing nice and playing fair he does not have a problem  
4 with having the University of Illinois included but if the University of Illinois decides that they want to do  
5 something they have the State of Illinois behind them. He said that the University of Illinois can move the  
6 South Farms and condemn as much farmland as they deem necessary and can do anything that they want to  
7 at any time and they do not need anybody else. He said that the University of Illinois is cordial and they do  
8 things through the proper channels but they do have the State of Illinois behind them. He said that he does  
9 not look at this as rural vs. urban but looks at it as though Champaign-Urbana does have their own set of  
10 governments and don't forget the one-and-one-half mile jurisdiction. He said that whatever the big  
11 developers want to do they will talk to the cities and it will be a done deal. He said that the County used to  
12 have input when a property was within the one-and-one-half mile jurisdiction of a municipality but that just  
13 does not happen anymore. He said that he agrees with his colleagues in that we are not shutting out  
14 Champaign-Urbana or the University of Illinois but from a rural perspective there isn't anything that the  
15 County can do within the one-and-one-half mile jurisdiction of a municipality. He said that his perspective  
16 is that there needs to be at least 2/3 vs. 1/3 representation between rural and urban.

17  
18 Mr. Weibel asked Mr. Schroeder if representation should be from someone who is within that one-and-one-  
19 half mile jurisdiction.

20  
21 Mr. Schroeder stated that the way the guidelines are set up there are already three members from  
22 Champaign, Urbana, Rantoul plus one from the Metropolitan area which appears to overlap. He said that he  
23 is not trying to make the point of rural vs. urban but to get down to a level or number that is workable there  
24 needs to be less overlapping of perspectives. He said that the land that is within one-and-one-half miles of a  
25 municipality he considers as rural.

26  
27 Mr. DiNovo stated that the plan would extend into the one-and-one-half mile jurisdiction to a point where  
28 the municipal plan designates an area for urban development. He said that any land within the one-and-one-  
29 half mile jurisdiction that is not designated by the municipality for urban development is covered by the  
30 County's plan. He said that the people from the metropolitan townships are those who are dealing  
31 immediately with the transition in the urbanized area. He said that these are not urban folks but people who  
32 are dealing with the issues of urbanization.

33  
34 Ms. Melin stated that she likes the model that was presented by Ms. McGrath.

35  
36 Mr. Langenheim stated that the Champaign-Urbana Urbanized Area Transportation Study (CUUATS) is  
37 trying to serve the metropolitan area which includes Champaign, Urbana, Savoy and Bondville and there is a  
38 boundary which is already designated. He said that he finds it interesting that Rantoul is listed as an urban  
39 community yet Savoy is listed as suburban.

40  
41 Mr. DiNovo stated that another way to think of it is to consider the villages that are fast growing and dealing  
42 with annexation agreements, construction of new streets, etc. He said that a better way to distinguish  
43 between urban and rural could be how fast the villages are growing.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

Mr. Hall asked Mr. Doenitz if he would prefer six members from the rural township governments which would include both township supervisors and township highway commissioners.

Mr. Doenitz stated yes. He said that his initial question was what is meant by 4 minimum of one each.

Mr. Hall stated that what is meant is that there will be one each from the so called metropolitan townships, at least one from the river townships, one from the prairie townships and at least one more.

Mr. Doenitz stated that Ms. McGrath suggested that two representatives come from the metropolitan townships, two from the rural townships, ( river corridor and rural: prairies), two highway commissioner representatives, three urban residents, five suburban village residents and one rural village representative with a total of 17. He said that if these people could be found then they could bring more than one thing to the table and prevent this plan from being a fiasco.

Ms. Wysocki asked Mr. Doenitz if he would be happy with these 17 members coming from those geographic areas regardless of their occupation.

Mr. Doenitz stated that all of the perspectives need to be considered during the selection of these 17 members.

Mr. Hall stated that the people from the first three categories were to be elected township representatives such as township supervisors. He said that Mr. Doenitz has proposed that township highway commissioners should be included.

Mr. Doenitz stated that the township highway commissioners should be one urban and one rural because they deal with different things. He said that as a rural highway commissioner he does not deal with the same issues that an urban highway commissioner does.

Mr. Weibel requested a definition of a rural village. He stated that it was his impression that Tolono is a rural village.

Ms. McGrath stated that she is taking the definition from the distributed makeup sheet and it appears that urban is Champaign, Urbana and Rantoul. She said that suburban villages are Bondville, Savoy, Mahomet, Tolono and St. Joseph and it is up to the Committee to decide how these villages are to be considered.

Mr. Doenitz stated that he would consider a rural village as a village which is not incorporated such as Seymour and Penfield.

Ms. McGrath stated that the distributed sheet indicates that a suburban village is defined as an incorporated village which lies outside of Champaign, Urbana and Rantoul and a rural village is defined as any unincorporated village.

- 1 Mr. Hall stated that the distributed sheet indicates that rural village is all the villages, incorporated and  
2 unincorporated, that are outside of the central part of the County. He said that these rural villages would  
3 include Fisher, Ogden, Royal, Homer, Sidney, Longview, Pesotum, Sadorus, Philo, Penfield, Gifford and  
4 Foosland.  
5
- 6 Mr. Weibel asked how these particular communities were categorized.  
7
- 8 Mr. DiNovo stated that there were two factors that were considered during this process. He said that towns  
9 that were contiguous to the Champaign-Urbana area or towns that were fast growing and had a very large  
10 share of their population commuting to Champaign-Urbana.  
11
- 12 Mr. Weibel asked if the population of Savoy, Mahomet, Tolono or St. Joseph was considered.  
13
- 14 Mr. Doenitz stated that Savoy, Mahomet, Tolono and St. Joseph are all fast growing communities and are  
15 probably close in population numbers.  
16
- 17 Mr. Langenheim stated that the urban area could be defined by the countenance fabric of development that  
18 as you drive from Savoy into Champaign-Urbana it is only separated by a street.  
19
- 20 Ms. Wysocki asked if the Committee is leaning towards talking about population sizes.  
21
- 22 Ms. Melin requested clarification of the list of categories.  
23
- 24 Mr. Hall stated that two representatives from each metropolitan township; two representatives for rural river  
25 corridor townships; two representatives for prairie townships; two township highway commissioners, one  
26 urban and one rural; three representatives for urban residents; four representatives for suburban residents  
27 and one rural resident.  
28
- 29 Mr. Weibel stated that the Committee needs to define the designations of suburban and rural.  
30
- 31 Mr. Hall stated that as long as the Committee agrees that suburban villages include: Savoy, Mahomet,  
32 Tolono and St. Joseph then the rest is rural.  
33
- 34 Ms. Wysocki asked if everyone is comfortable with this composition.  
35
- 36 Mr. DiNovo stated that the only representatives from the unincorporated areas are the township officials.  
37
- 38 Mr. Doenitz stated that there will be the rural village representatives.  
39
- 40 Mr. DiNovo asked if residence means postal address. He said that there are a lot of people with St. Joseph  
41 postal addresses that the Village of St. Joseph would not feel comfortable with as their representative. He  
42 said that the St. Joseph area is very large.  
43

1 Mr. Schroeder stated that regarding villages versus suburban areas the best thing to do on the suburban side  
2 is that people actually have to live within the incorporated areas of the village. He said that in the rural areas  
3 the address would be fine.

4  
5 Mr. Gladney asked if an elected official's tenure expires during their seat on the Steering Committee would  
6 they be removed from the Steering Committee.

7  
8 Ms. McGrath stated that typically, if a vacancy occurs and an elected township official is desired for the seat  
9 on the Steering Committee that person would continue to serve until someone takes their place. She said  
10 that ELUC needs to define in the resolution whether or not that person would be continuous if re-elected or  
11 could the position be filled by a former official.

12  
13 Mr. DiNovo asked if they could be appointed in their personal capacity.

14  
15 Ms. McGrath stated that ELUC must decide how they want to do this.

16  
17 Mr. Doenitz stated that this creates a problem if one person will serve more than one area on the yellow  
18 sheet. He said that if one person is removed because they were not re-elected then we've lost that faction.

19  
20 Ms. McGrath stated that if ELUC states that the seat must be filled by an elected or former elected official  
21 that would address that issue.

22  
23 Mr. Hall stated that the final tally has a total of eight positions coming from township government and nine  
24 positions coming from the urban areas and villages. He said that he would not think that this is the balance  
25 that ELUC was hoping for.

26  
27 Mr. DiNovo stated that some thought needs to be given to the fact that while clearly the rural areas are key  
28 to this, the majority of the County Board is urban and there are urban constituencies to whom this body will  
29 have to be legitimate as well. Right now, this is overweighted. There are three representatives to cover  
30 Champaign, Urbana and Rantoul out of the recommended 17. He said that right there you have 60% of the  
31 County is population. He said that this is very overweighted to the rural, considering those interests by a  
32 very, very large margin. He noted that his is not arguing one way or the other but there are constituencies  
33 that he knows that he has to go to into the Regional Planning Technical Committee and confront city  
34 planners and they have to believe that this is legitimate and credible as well.

35  
36 Mr. Schroeder stated that he understands that this has to be legitimized. He said that on the flip side to  
37 where there are a lot of things that have happened in Champaign or Urbana that people outside have had a  
38 zero say in, with zero accountability from the governments of Champaign or Urbana. He said that there is a  
39 lot of money that flows into these towns from sales taxes and a lot of money that comes in especially from  
40 the state from white collar employees, a huge massive amount of money of that is flowing in and out of here  
41 that effects a lot of people in the rural areas who have zero say in what is going on.

42  
43 Mr. Doenitz stated that he agrees with Mr. Schroeder. He said that this started out to be weighted rural and

1 he is okay with the recommended 17. He said that he would be comfortable with someone from Fisher,  
2 Foosland, Seymour or Ogden representing the rural area but he is not comfortable with someone from  
3 Champaign or Urbana representing the rural area.

4  
5 Mr. Hall stated that there had been some earlier discussion about including Savoy in the urban category and  
6 that would be a way to reduce the total number to 16.

7  
8 Ms. McGrath stated that it is not a good idea to have an even number of representatives.

9  
10 Mr. Doenitz stated that metro townships should be defined.

11  
12 Mr. Hall stated that a metro township is a township that loses area to incorporated areas as the incorporated  
13 areas grow. He said that these townships are Hensley, Somer, Urbana and Champaign.

14  
15 Mr. DiNovo stated that specifically it is where we have an urban township where the township boundary  
16 actually changes as the cities grow.

17  
18 Ms. Wysocki asked the Committee if they were copacetic with this. She said that the Resolution to Create a  
19 Steering Committee to Guide Preparation of the Champaign County Land Resource Management Plan  
20 should be revised to indicate that there will be 17 Steering Committee members and a break down of those  
21 17 representatives would be as follows: 2 metro township representatives; 2 rural river township  
22 representatives; 2 rural prairie township representatives; 2 highway commissioner representatives 1 urban  
23 and 1 rural; 3 urban residents (Champaign, Urbana and Rantoul); 4 suburban village residents (Mahomet,  
24 Savoy, St. Joseph and Tolono); and 2 rural village residents.

25  
26 Mr. DiNovo asked if the County Board Chair or the ELUC Chair would be the Chair of the Steering  
27 Committee.

28  
29 Ms. McGrath stated that it was her understanding the ELUC did not want this to be a self-electing Chair but  
30 wanted the County Board to elect who the Chair would be. She said that the Resolution states that ELUC  
31 has approved and recommended to the Champaign County Board that the Chair of the said steering  
32 committee be appointed by the County Board Chair, with the advice and consent of the County Board. She  
33 said that if the Committee chooses to specify that the Chair of the Steering Committee would be the ELUC  
34 Chair then the resolution should state such or it could say that the Steering Committee would be appointed  
35 by ELUC or the Chair would be self-elected.

36  
37 Mr. Doenitz stated that if the Chair of ELUC would be appointed as Chair of the Steering Committee then  
38 Ms. Wysocki could be Urbana's representative.

39  
40 **Ms. Melin moved, seconded by Mr. Gladney to recommend approval of a Resolution supporting**  
41 **development of a Land Resource Management Plan for a cost of \$255,000 to be distributed over the**  
42 **fiscal years of 2007 and 2009. The motion carried by voice vote.**

1 Ms. Melin moved, seconded by Mr. Doenitz to recommend approval of Resolution authorizing the  
 2 creation of a County Board appointed 17 person Steering Committee to guide the preparation of the  
 3 Land Resource Management Plan and specifying geographic categories from which Steering  
 4 Committee members are to be selected and including the Chair of ELUC as the Chair of the Steering  
 5 Committee. The motion carried by voice vote.

6  
7

8 **12. Regional Planning Commission County Planner FY 2007 Work Plan**

9

10 Ms. Wysocki stated that after the recommendation of Item #11, it appears that the RPC County Planner now  
11 has a FY 2007 Work Plan.

12

13 Mr. Hall stated that due to the action on Item #11, no action is required for Item #12.

14

15

16 **13. Landscape Recycling Center, LRC, IEPA Compost Operating Permit Renewal**

17

18 Mr. Hall stated that this information was submitted by the County Board Chair as a FYI to let the Committee  
19 know that the Landscape Recycling Center, LRC was up for renewal of its permit. He said that no action is  
20 required on this item.

21

22

23 **14. 2007 Electronic Recycling Event Update**

24

25 Ms. Monte stated that on April 21, 2007, the Computer and Electronics Recycling Event was held and was  
26 the most successful of the four such events held to date. She said that over 850 vehicles went through the  
27 line on Saturday and dropped off electronics and computer components for recycling. She said that the  
28 intent is to get more support from the outlying municipalities and villages for the next time this collection is  
29 scheduled.

30

31 Mr. Weibel asked if people who dropped off items were required to submit their address.

32

33 Ms. Monte stated no.

34

35 Ms. Melin asked if this will be an annual event.

36

37 Ms. Monte stated that this event has been held for the last three consecutive years and there appears to be a  
38 need for such an event. She said that there are two places in town that do take these components all year  
39 long but they do charge for this service. She said that she anticipates that this will be an annual event until  
40 there is another plan in place for a regional collection system.

41

42 **15. Update on Enforcement Cases**

43

1 Mr. Hall stated that there is no information to submit regarding enforcement cases other than to say that  
2 recently two properties were deeded to the County. He said that one of the properties the Mefford property  
3 in Dobbins Downs, will be on the ELUC agenda in June to seek direction regarding the sale of the property.

4 He said that the other property the Norman property on Perkins Road, needs to have a burned out structure  
5 demolished and it is anticipated that a request will be submitted to ELUC at the June 2007 meeting for that  
6 demolition. He said that the Norman property was appraised much higher than what staff expects  
7 demolition to cost and next month it will be up to ELUC if an RFP will be sent out or the Mefford property  
8 is sold.

9  
10  
11 **16. Monthly Report (April 2007)**  
12

13 Mr. Hall distributed the April 2007 Monthly Report for Committee review. He said that the zoning backlog  
14 on the docket is continuing to decline but it is still fairly high. He said that in terms of Zoning Use Permits  
15 we had a relatively active month in April. He said that in regard to Enforcement Cases there were 18 new  
16 complaints received and 9 inspections were completed. He said that if the Committee has any questions  
17 regarding the report he would be happy to address those questions at this time. He noted that attached to the  
18 Monthly Report is a Status Report on HB 3597. He said that HB 3597 is the bill which is intended to deal  
19 with the *Chatham* issues. He said that at a special ELUC meeting the Committee recommended that the  
20 County Board approve a resolution regarding that house bill and the County Board approved that resolution.  
21 He said that copies were sent out to all of the representatives but unfortunately the Bill was moved out of the  
22 House before the copies were received by the representatives. He said that HB3597 arrived at the Senate on  
23 May 3, 2007. He said that during Mr. DiNovo's discussions with the Illinois Association of County Board  
24 Members it was discovered that there is a lot of opposition of adding any more counties to that list and the  
25 opposition seemed to mainly come from the municipal league and the Illinois Association of County Board  
26 Members advised that public testimony be given in support of Champaign County being added to this list.  
27 He said that on May 10, 2007, he went to the Senate hearing and submitted written testimony but it did not  
28 change what the Senate subcommittee recommended but it was surprising how much interest there was on  
29 the committee about this issue. He said that one of the co-sponsors, Senator Burzynski, testified that he has  
30 another bill that he will try to deal with Champaign County's issues in the fall. He said that we did not get  
31 what we wanted but we did at least receive recognition and a promise that they will try to do something. He  
32 said that as an interesting note, the Illinois Municipal League has a local President which is St. Joseph  
33 Mayor B.J. Hackler.

34  
35 Mr. Doenitz stated that he is surprised by this because what they are supporting will actually hurt the  
36 municipalities.

37  
38 Mr. Hall agreed. He said that one alternative maybe that negotiations can be held where the County may ask  
39 Champaign and Urbana to send representatives because they would also like to see it changed.

40  
41 Mr. Weibel thanked Mr. Hall and Mr. DiNovo for taking time to present testimony. He said that it is his  
42 understanding that they received this information on short notice.  
43

1 Mr. Hall stated that it was short notice. He said that the change that added the specific counties occurred in  
2 late March and it was presented to ELUC in April which was just enough time to get this issue to the County  
3 Board.

4  
5 **Mr. Langenheim moved, seconded by Mr. Doenitz to place the Monthly Report for April, 2007, on**  
6 **file. The motion carried by voice vote.**

7  
8  
9 **17. Other Business**

10  
11 Mr. Hall stated that Brent Rose of the RPC has informed him that he has one and possibly two more CDAP  
12 loans that he hasn't received the applications for but they would like approvals at the May 2007 County  
13 Board meeting. He said that Mr. Rose has requested that the Committee entertain the possibility of a  
14 Special ELUC meeting prior to the County Board meeting.

15  
16 Mr. Weibel stated that there are already two meetings scheduled prior to the County Board meeting.

17  
18 Ms. Wysocki stated that if this meeting is needed then the Committee will work it out.

19  
20  
21 **18. Determination of items to be placed on the County Board Consent Agenda**

22  
23 **The consensus of the Committee was to place Agenda Items #6, #7 and #9 on the County Board**  
24 **Consent Agenda.**

25  
26  
27 **19. Adjournment**

28  
29 The meeting adjourned at 8:37 p.m.

30  
31  
32  
33

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary to the Environment and Land Use Committee

eluc\minutes\minutes.frm