

CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MINUTES

Tuesday, April 6, 2010

**Lyle Shields Meeting Room, Brookens Administrative Center
1776 E. Washington St., Urbana, Illinois**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jan Anderson, Steve Beckett, Thomas Betz, Lloyd Carter, Lorraine Cowart, Chris Doenitz, Matthew Gladney, Stan James, John Jay, Brad Jones, Greg Knott, Alan Kurtz, Ralph Langenheim, Brendan McGinty, Diane Michaels, Steve Moser, Alan Nudo, Steve O'Connor, Michael Richards, Giraldo Rosales, Larry Sapp, Jonathan Schroeder, Samuel Smucker, C. Pius Weibel, Barbara Wysocki

MEMBERS ABSENT: Carol Ammons, Ron Bensyl

OTHERS PRESENT: Jeff Blue (County Engineer), Kat Bork (Administrative Secretary), Deb Busey (County Administrator), Nicole George (RPC Transportation Planner), John Hall (Planning & Zoning Director), Rita Morocoima-Black (RPC Transportation Planning Manager), Alan Reinhart (Facilities Director), T.J. Blakeman (City of Champaign Planner), Kathy Cooksey (CRIS Rural Transit), Bruce Knight (City of Champaign Planning Director), Amy Marchant (CRIS Rural Transit), Bill Vavrik (Applied Research Associates)

CALL TO ORDER

Wysocki called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Bork called the roll. Anderson, Beckett, Betz, Carter, Doenitz, Gladney, James, Jay, Jones, Knott, Kurtz, Langenheim, McGinty, Michaels, Moser, Nudo, Richards, Rosales, Sapp, Schroeder, Smucker, Weibel, and Wysocki were present at the time of roll call, establishing the presence of a quorum.

APPROVAL OF COUNTY BOARD RESOLUTION TO MEET AS COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MOTION by Beckett to approve the County Board Resolution to meet as a Committee of the Whole; seconded by Carter. **Motion carried with all ayes.**

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Rosales to approve the Committee of the Whole minutes of March 2, 2010; seconded by James.

Tuesday, April 6, 2010

Page 2

Langenheim requested the minutes be amended to include the word “not” on line 406. Smucker asked that line 593 reflect that he changed his vote.

Motion carried as amended with all ayes.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA/ADDENDA

MOTION by Rosales to approve the agenda; seconded by Langenheim. **Motion carried with all ayes.**

Cowart entered the meeting at 6:06 p.m.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Morgan Johnston, University of Illinois Transportation Demand Management Coordinator, spoke in support of developing a rural public transportation system that offers demand response and curb to curb rides. Many university students, faculty, staff, and retirees live in the areas that would be served by the system.

Hal Barnhart, spoke about the Land Resource Management Plan (LRMP) and the historical by right development limitation of one per forty acres in Champaign County to preserve best prime farmland. The protection of agriculture and preservation of farmland are prevalent in LRMP. He distributed an exercise to the Board members to consider before voting on the proposed LRMP and suggested amendments.

Eric Thorsland spoke in support of the LRMP’s one per forty guideline. Various discussions on priorities for Champaign County during public meetings have demonstrated the public’s desire to preserve best prime farmland. He urged the County Board to stick with the original policy proposed in the LRMP.

Norman Stenzel spoke about rural residential overlay and the past proposed zoning ordinance amendments. He suggested that moving forward with the rural residential overlay will create problems in ultimate zoning activities.

After confirming no one else wished to address the Board, Wysocki declared public participation closed.

COMMUNICATIONS

There were no communications.

HIGHWAY & TRANSPORTATION

Monthly Reports

MOTION by Beckett to receive and place on file the County & Township Motor Fuel Tax Claims Monthly Reports for March 2010; seconded by Carter. **Motion carried with all ayes.**

Final Bridge Reports

MOTION by Beckett to receive and place on file the Final Bridge Reports for April 2010; seconded by James.

Weibel questioned why the some completed bridge project costs were higher than the awarded price. Blue explained those projects included change orders and adjustments made during the course of the projects, which were approved by Blue and IDOT.

Motion carried with all ayes.

County Engineer

Pavement Management System Update – Presentation by Applied Research Associates

Blue introduced Bill Vavrik from Applied Research Associates and described how the Highway Department began working with the firm in 2006 on the County's pavement management system. Vavrik gave a PowerPoint presentation on the pavement management system, including its background, development, and capital maintenance plans. Vavrik offered to answer any questions and said he would leave a copy of the presentation materials with Blue.

Rosales asked if alternatives to road salt were used to help preserve the roads. Vavrik explained the County road system mostly consists of asphalt pavements and salt is less damaging to asphalt than concrete. A telling factor for a road network is the amount of rain in November. Champaign County's roads have faired very well this year. Rosales asked if there was a plan to replace the oil and chip roads. Blue explained almost all the chip and seal roads are township roads and not part of the County's system. James asked if the townships have expressed interest in using a pavement management system. Blue explained the townships do not have the level of funding for roads the County does. Townships try to keep the chip roads together, but a pavement management system is not as great a necessity for township roads as it is for the County road system.

Blue spoke about how the pavement management system has been used extensively on the Monticello Road project to determine the different road conditions and needs for repair. Monticello Road is not on a single repair timeline because it was built in different sections at different times. His goal is to get the entire road on the same timeline. The pavement management system selects the right application on the right roads at right times. The Highway Department looks at other factors to select projects, but the system has been very beneficial.

Resolution Appropriating \$125,000.00 from County Bridge Funds for the Repair of Structure #010-4271 Located on County Highway 6 – Section #10-00965-00-BR

Blue stated this project is for the bridge five miles south of Seymour on County Road 6. The bridge was designed with an expansion joint that has not done its job and has allowed deicing materials and salt to corrode the steel and rocker bearings on the bridge. One of Highway's trucks caught the expansion joint with a plowing blade this winter and bent its frame. The expansion joint and rocker bearing will be replaced and the bridge will be reinforced with steel beams. Blue felt this type of repair is the best bang for the County's buck. The work needs to be done this summer.

Tuesday, April 6, 2010

Page 4

MOTION by Jay to approve Resolution Appropriating \$125,000.00 from County Bridge Funds for the Repair of Structure #010-4271 Located on County Highway 6 – Section #10-00965-00-BR; seconded by Kurtz. **Motion carried with all ayes.**

Resolution Appropriating \$100,000.00 from County Bridge Funds and \$125,000.00 from County Motor Fuel Tax Funds for the Replacement of Structure #010-3336 located on County Highway 23 – Section #10-00963-00-BR

Blue described the project located four miles north of Dewey on County Highway 23. It is a severely deteriorated old concrete slab bridge. The money will pay for engineering fees and construction of the bridge.

MOTION by Jay to approve Resolution Appropriating \$100,000.00 from County Bridge Funds and \$125,000.00 from County Motor Fuel Tax Funds for the Replacement of Structure #010-3336 located on County Highway 23 – Section #10-00963-00-BR; seconded by James. **Motion carried with all ayes.**

Rosales asked for a timeframe on both bridge repairs. Blue stated the projects are slated for this summer to fall and are included in this year's budget.

Other Business

Blue announced a fire occurred in the Highway Fleet Maintenance Facility on Sunday night. An electrical fire started in front of a dump truck. The engine and cab were burnt to a crisp. Minor damage occurred to the truck immediately adjacent to the dump truck. The sprinklers and fire suppression kicked on and contained the fire until the fire department arrived. There is a lot of smoke damage and soot in the building, but no major structural damage. The County is self-insured and will have repair the truck at a cost between \$80,000-\$90,000. The insurance adjuster estimated it will cost between \$200,000-\$250,000 to repair the equipment and building damage. Everything in the building functioned according to design. All the smoke smell was contained in the large shop area. The Highway Department has a similar truck and have parked it outside as a precaution. The insurance company will look into the origin of the fire to determine why it happened. Blue is looking into adding a switch to the trucks that will cut all electricity after the truck is turned off. The truck had not been on the road since the Monday before the Sunday fire. Blue remarked it was great to have a state of the art building to minimize damage and losses.

Chair's Report

There was no Chair's report.

Designation of Items to be Placed on County Board Consent Agenda

Agenda items 8.B.2-3 were designated for the consent agenda.

Tuesday, April 6, 2010

Page 5

COUNTY FACILITIES

Courthouse Exterior/Clock & Bell Tower Renovation Project

Project Update

MOTION by James to receive and place on file the project update; seconded by Rosales. **Motion carried with all ayes.**

County Administrator

Supplemental Lease Agreement – U.S. Army Corp of Engineers

A revised supplemental lease agreement was distributed. Beckett stated the lease with the United States government and the County for the East Main Street property. The rental is \$40,600 compared to the previous lease of \$1.

MOTION by Kurtz to approve the supplemental lease agreement with the United States, subject to review by the County's legal counsel; seconded by Rosales. **Motion carried with all ayes.**

Facility Director

Courthouse Exterior Restoration and Landscaping Tentative Schedule

Reinhart stated the stone has been quarried and is being shaped to continue the exterior renovation. It will take five weeks to finish replacing the remaining stone, tuck-pointing, and banding on the south side, plus a couple weeks of clean-up. He plans to landscape the Courthouse's north side with six ornamental trees and sod in the front from Broadway to the existing grass. There are no plans to sod the other sides of the building, though there may be some seeding.

Downtown Correctional Center Replacement Chiller Update

Reinhart announced delivery of the new chiller is expected within the next couple of weeks. The old chiller has been cut loose and the back-up unit is running. The downtown Correctional Center does have functional air-conditioning.

Chiller Waste Water Contract Information

Reinhart explained the County always independently contracts for hazardous waste removal and is contracting with an environmental company for the contaminated chiller water disposal. The disposal cost will depend on the bleach level in the water. The price can range from \$125 per barrel to \$1,200 per barrel. Weibel asked how many barrels are involved. Reinhart estimated the amount of contaminated water at 550 gallons or 10 barrels.

Reinhart stated the new pay station for the Courthouse parking lot has been installed and will be operational tomorrow morning. This means parking enforcement will commence tomorrow morning. Rosales asked if a sign would be posted informing Courthouse employees and visitors that the pay station is working. Beckett noted all Courthouse employees has been directed not to park in the Courthouse lot in order to leave it open to the public.

Tuesday, April 6, 2010

Page 6

Energy Efficiency Update

Reinhart remarked the motion and occupancy sensor equipment arrived this week for the Courthouse. He hopes to start the installation and de-lamping process next week.

Physical Plant Monthly Report – February 2010

MOTION by Jones to receive and place on file the Physical Plant February 2010 monthly report; seconded by Smucker. **Motion carried with all ayes.**

Other Business

There was no other business.

Chair's Report

There was no Chair's report.

Designation of Items to be Placed on County Board Consent Agenda

Agenda item 9.B.1 was designated for the consent agenda.

ENVIRONMENT & LAND USE

Approval of Main Transportation Provider for Countywide Transportation

MOTION by Beckett to designate CRIS Rural Transit as the main transportation provider for countywide transportation services; seconded by Rosales.

James agreed having a rural transportation system would serve a need, but he wanted to know the federal and local match funding will be used to provide actual services, not administrative jobs, and that the program will not become a burden on the property tax base. Morocoima-Black confirmed the funding was from federal and local match sources. The program would provide transportation services. She noted the CRIS Rural Transit people were present.

Nudo asked how this program works in Vermilion County. Amy Marchant from CRIS explained they have been providing transportation services in Vermilion County for almost 25 years. CRIS obtains matching funds through the development of service contracts with organizations needing transportation. The service is primarily used by people with disabilities or significant issues who can no longer operate a vehicle. There are also opportunities to raise money by contracting with local nursing homes. Any money raised through service contracts can be used towards the local match requirement. Marchant anticipates acquiring additional money through the downstate operating assistance fund.

Weibel asked how soon the service would begin following County Board approval. Marchant said they are at the mercy of the Illinois Department of Transportation. She hopes to be operating by fall.

Tuesday, April 6, 2010

Page 7

Langenheim requested a roll call vote.

Schroeder questioned what percentage of the program is state funding. Marchant said it is flow through money from the federal government. Once this is in place, they can move towards obtaining state funding to expand the project. Schroeder asked how the state generates that funding. Kathy Cooksey from CRIS believed 3/32 of the sales tax raised in every Illinois county is placed in a downstate operating assistance fund. She thought money from Champaign County is going into the fund regardless of whether they provide services. It is a dedicated funding source, not general revenue funds.

Nudo asked what fare is charged to the general public in Vermilion County. Marchant stated the fare was \$5 per trip. Cooksey added the hours of operation are 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday thru Friday.

O'Connor entered the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

Motion carried with a vote of 21 to 4. Anderson, Beckett, Betz, Carter, Cowart, Gladney, James, Knott, Kurtz, Langenheim, McGinty, Michaels, Nudo, O'Connor, Richards, Rosales, Sapp, Schroeder, Smucker, Weibel, and Wysocki voted in favor of the motion. Doenitz, Jay, Jones, and Moser voted against the motion.

Letter of Support for Term Extension of the East University Avenue Tax Increment Finance District

MOTION by Beckett to approve leaving the County Board Chair's letter of support for the East University Avenue Tax Increment Finance District on file with legislators; seconded by McGinty.

Weibel explained he received a telephone call on March 19th from Mayor Schweighart and Fred Stavins of the City of Champaign requesting a letter of support for the East University Avenue Tax Increment Finance District. Weibel decided to write the letter as requested with the understanding that it can be withdrawn if the County Board does not approve.

Bruce Knight, the City of Champaign Planning Director, stated the request was for a letter to allow action at the state legislature that does not itself extend the TIF district. Tax Increment Finance (TIF) districts are a key tool in the City of Champaign's efforts to promote infield development rather than fringe growth. The new development of land in the City's core area is more expensive and difficult than building on the fringe. TIF districts provide a tool to try to overcome those challenges, promote a higher level of investment, and build a larger tax base.

TJ Blakeman, the City of Champaign Planner and project leader, conducted a PowerPoint presentation describing the three TIF districts in Champaign: Downtown, East University Avenue, and North Campustown (Burnham). Blakeman described the East University plan and current status of the TIF district. The City is proposing a different strategy for East University Avenue District than Downtown. The plan is to shrink the TIF and release 50% of property value back to the taxing districts. The City would retain \$376,000/year to go towards the projects' operating

Tuesday, April 6, 2010

Page 8

budgets. A smaller area allows a more targeted approach. Around \$40,000 would be returned to the County's tax rolls with the TIF reduction. The legislature has to authorize Champaign City Council's ability to extend TIF district and the letter from the County Board Chair is in support of this authorization.

Sapp and McGinty exited the meeting at 7:28 p.m.

Knott asked why the City of Champaign waited until last minute to request the letter of support and put Weibel on the spot to submit a letter without the County Board's authority when the City has known the TIF district would expire for twenty-three years. Obtaining the County Board's support seemed to be an afterthought. Knight confirmed there was no intent to put anyone on the spot and explained the City has been working with legislators on the process to extend the district. All district extensions are placed in a single bill.

McGinty and Sapp returned to the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

Rosales received an email from a Champaign City Council member indicating that the Champaign 150th Celebration would be using \$50,000 from the Downtown TIF District and \$10,000 from the East University Avenue TIF District. He wanted to know how such activities would stimulate economic development and growth. Knight said the Downtown TIF District revenue is used to promote downtown Champaign with the downtown festivals and the park district. Blakeman said the historical museum will receive a \$7,000 redevelopment incentive grant for the 150th exhibition and to promote the area. Another \$50,000 will be used towards the downtown fountain infrastructure.

Kurtz agreed with Knott on the issue of timing. He received a 44-page email attachment over the weekend about the TIF district that will affect the next ten years. He did not like being rushed into a vote without time to research the issue.

Beckett applauded Knight and City of Champaign for what they have accomplished with TIF districts. Downtown Champaign and campustown look wonderful. He trusts the City in the spirit of intergovernmental cooperation.

James felt the general public would like to see tax money spent in rightful ways and not on fountains and fluff. As a representative of County residents, he could not support beautification issues when the money could be used elsewhere.

Carter supported the efforts made to improve the downtown and increase business activity.

Anderson applauded efforts by the City to develop vacant lots within city limits and asked about the amount of money lost by taxing districts with a TIF district. Blakeman said the City agreed in a 2005 intergovernmental agreement to incrementally pay the County an annual surplus payment. The County will receive the amount they would have received if the TIF district did not exist every year from now until the end of the Downtown TIF District. The City of Champaign was trying to find a winning solution for all parties while keeping successful programs alive. Knight

Tuesday, April 6, 2010

Page 9

stated the released increment money comes on the tax rolls as new growth, which is important for a tax cap government. It is not impacted by the tax caps.

Richards spoke about the blighted University Avenue corridor twenty-three years after the TIF district was implemented. He did not support extending the TIF district and referred to it as a city slush fund to improve the area and increase tax revenue for all taxing districts. He had not heard any reasons why the TIF District would be successful if extended and, in the meantime, the County is missing out on \$100,000 in revenue and \$400,000 is being taken away from the schools. This is not something the County Board can afford unless shown this will get the results it was supposed to accomplish twenty-three years ago. Blakeman stated that TIF districts are evaluated be determining what the district would have been, but for the TIF. He thought the City has made great strides in the area with the work from North First Street, cleaning up University Avenue, and the preservation of existing buildings. The City was prevented from doing all that it wanted in the area because some owners refuse to improve their property. He wondered what the district will look like in thirteen years if the City abandons it and property owners move away. The City is proposing to incentivize infiel development that creates property tax revenue.

Kurtz commented that he was not informed the County received a \$77,000 check from the TIF district and asked if they would receive more. Blakeman said the County would also realize any new growth in the area cut from the TIF district. Busey verified the \$77,000 was not a surprise; it was budgeted revenue built into the General Corporate Fund FY2010 budget.

Schroeder said the City has demonstrated how TIF districts should work with rehabilitating the downtown and campustown areas. He asked what was the longest term for a TIF district and whether the City would expand the district after thirteen years. Knight answered the maximum TIF term is thirty-five years. There are no plans to create new TIF districts because no other areas really qualify. Blakeman added that state law prohibits expansion of a TIF district's original boundaries.

Cowart exited the meeting at 7:49 p.m.

Langenheim inquired what the City would do if the County does not support the extension. Knight said they would continue to work with legislators. If the bill does not pass it is a moot point. How they will proceed will be a City Council decision.

Motion carried with a vote of 14 to 8 with 2 abstentions. Anderson, Beckett, Betz, Carter, Gladney, Jones, Kurtz, Moser, Nudo, O'Connor, Rosales, Schroeder, Weibel, and Wysocki voted in favor of the motion. Doenitz, James, Jay, Knott, Langenheim, Michaels, Richards, and Smucker voted against the motion. McGinty and Sapp abstained from voting because they were waiting on advice from the County's legal counsel.

County Concurrence for Inclusion of Champaign County in the Service Area of Foreign-Trade Zone (FTZ) No. 114

MOTION by Weibel to authorize a service area concurrence letter to the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for the inclusion of Champaign County within the service area of Foreign-Trade Zone No. 114; seconded by Beckett.

Tuesday, April 6, 2010

Page 10

Weibel explained this request started with the letter on Page 48 of the agenda packet. This concurrence would reduce the paperwork and time it takes for entities in Champaign County to join a foreign trade zone, which reduces some tariffs. Weibel consulted with the Rantoul area County Board representatives and they supported this action. Beckett asked for an explanation for the downside. Weibel could not think of any downside.

Motion carried.

Approval of the Land Resource Management Plan

MOTION by Beckett to approve the Land Resource Management Plan; seconded by McGinty.

Wysocki commended Chavarria and Monte for their work since the last meeting in developing the proposed text revisions to LRMP to address Board members' requests at the March 2nd meeting.

O'Connor and Michaels exited the meeting at 8:01 p.m.

MOTION by Beckett to amend the LRMP to include the text revision items 1-8 on Page 52 of the agenda packet; seconded by Kurtz.

Nudo spoke about the addition of a clarifying clause with priorities to the document's beginning and the funding mechanism. Some language remains in the plan about things being done by a certain date, but he felt deadlines are the prerogative of the County Board to decide. He would like the deadlines addressed before the final LRMP is approved. Weibel noted that tonight is not the final vote on LRMP, so there is more time to work on it.

O'Connor re-entered the meeting at 8:04 p.m. Michaels returned at 8:05 p.m.

Jay expressed concern with the broad reach and complexity of the plan and did not see the rush in adopting it. He felt some policies in the plan had nothing to do with land use management. He suggested the Board could have adopted the plan in segments instead of as a whole document. Knott asked for a clarification about what exactly the Board was voting on. Wysocki reminded the Board they are considering including the proposed eight amendments found on Page 52 to the LRMP.

Motion carried to amend the LRMP to include the eight revisions listed on Page 52 in the agenda packet with a vote of 21 to 3. Anderson, Beckett, Betz, Carter, Doenitz, Gladney, James, Jones, Knott, Kurtz, Langenheim, McGinty, Michaels, Moser, Nudo, Rosales, Sapp, Schroeder, Smucker, Weibel, and Wysocki voted in favor of the motion. Jay, O'Connor, and Richards voted against the motion.

Wysocki drew the Board's attention to another set of proposed revisions placed at the members' desks. The revisions concerned Policies 4.1.5 and 4.1.6. Beckett stated those amendments would change a core part of the LRMP without the significant public input the rest of

Tuesday, April 6, 2010

Page 11

the plan has received. McGinty concurred with Beckett and statements made during public participation that it was impractical to bring forth these amendments at this point.

Moser said he proposed the amendments to Policies 4.1.5 and 4.1.6 in September. It was adopted and then removed. He was concerned about altering the plan at a late date, but his constituents in Broadlands and Longview would love to have more people and tax money for their townships and roads. He suggested the alternative that might be acceptable to the half of the Farm Bureau membership who oppose the policies. Moser does not like farming around houses, but felt people have a right to do what they want to with part of their property. He did not like the deadlines in the LRMP and could not support the plan with the one per forty policy because it is too stringent on rural property owners. The idea of three-acre lots were more detrimental than four one-acre lots. He was frustrated the County Board has not been able to come to any agreement on this issue in twenty years. The loss of farmland in Champaign County is occurring next to small towns and Champaign-Urbana. There are a lot of things in the plan that he likes, but he would not support it. Beckett suggested Moser make a motion to amend the plan to address his objections instead of criticizing the plan and offered to demonstrate.

MOTION by Beckett to amend the LRMP by adopting the alternative Policies 4.1.5 and 4.1.6 as documented on the handout from Susan Chavarria; seconded by James.

Beckett requested a roll call vote on the amendment. Schroeder spoke about how the Zoning Board of Appeals will be guided by the land use goals and policies in LRMP. He is concerned that the LRMP reads like an ordinance.

Sapp exited the meeting at 8:23 p.m.

Gladney felt presenting these revisions now circumvents the public review process the plan has undergone. He wished the plan had more teeth, but it was designed to be an advisory, free-flowing set of guidelines.

McGinty exited the meeting at 8:26 p.m.

Gladney noted the LRMP Steering Committee was carefully selected two years ago and great care was taken to appease certain groups to get everyone on board. If some Board members do not like what the Steering Committee has produced and planned to toss out two years of work or radically change it, he suggested ELUC hold extra meetings so the County Board members could develop a new plan themselves.

James stated the plan and information was well put together, but he would rather see it done right and re-examined. The things that seem right for urban areas do not always work for rural areas. He did not see a problem with spending more time on the plan to determine it was the tool the County Board wanted. He urged Board members to remember they represented the whole of Champaign County.

McGinty returned to the meeting at 8:29 p.m.

Tuesday, April 6, 2010

Page 12

Carter did not see why Board members who had objections did not put their changes on paper and bring them to the meeting for consideration.

Sapp returned at 8:32 p.m.

Anderson agreed with Gladney and reminded the Board that each goal had to receive the support of 75% of the Steering Committee to be included. She was not sure how to vote on the plan.

Knott had spoken with Wysocki about some of the Republican Caucus's issues with the plan, which lead to Moser bringing forward the revisions. The Republicans were asked for their input and provided it. These two issues are the core concerns of disagreement for Republicans.

Kurtz supported the one per forty acres policy because it has been used as a Farm Bureau policy for many years. All the policies can be compromised to prevent losing the entire two years of the plan's development. He wanted to see the LRMP passed with a supermajority at the County Board meeting.

Hall stated that Barnhart's example was ambiguous. In terms of by right lots, the alternative policies would result in approximately fourteen lots, which is three fewer lots than what would occur under the one per forty policy. He reminded the Board it was very difficult for a recent landowner to gain County Board approval for three lots on non-best prime farmland. The goal is to protect agriculture, not to save farmland. The agricultural impact is considered when the RROs are reviewed. The alternative policies would allow less best prime be used by right with Barnhart's example. However, the example is not an actual section and the impact varies depending on the parcel size distribution. The alternative policy only allows more to happen by right in the range of tracks from forty to seventy-nine acres. The alternative policy is the same as the one per forty policy on all lots with less than forty acres. The alternative policy is more conservative on all lots larger than seventy-nine acres. Schroeder thanked Hall and stressed they are not trying to get more houses built on farmland. In certain situations, the policy of forty acres would limit where a person could build a house. Twenty acres seems a better fit for those situations with a smaller parcel.

Gladney exited the meeting at 8:43 p.m. and returned at 8:44 p.m.

McGinty was not averse to change, however, he objected to receiving the proposed revisions at this meeting. McGinty was concerned with changing the plan without the input of the diverse, knowledgeable group of people who developed the plan. He would like LRMP to be forwarded to the County Board and have the opportunity to put more thought into the proposed revisions.

Moser and Beckett left the meeting at 8:46 p.m. and returned at 8:47 p.m.

Carter wanted to table the LRMP and set a deadline for people to bring grievances before the County Board. Weibel called for a point of order because Robert's Rules does not allow that motion to be made at a Committee of the Whole meeting. Carter objected and Wysocki referred to the information provided by County Board Chair.

Tuesday, April 6, 2010

Page 13

The County Board continued to discuss the proposed amendment to the LRMP. Smucker called the question.

Motion carried to amend LRMP with the alternative Policies 4.1.5 and 4.1.6 with a vote of 19 to 5. Anderson, Beckett, Carter, Doenitz, James, Jay, Jones, Knott, Kurtz, McGinty, Michaels, Moser, Nudo, O'Connor, Rosales, Sapp, Schroeder, Weibel, and Wysocki voted in favor of the motion. Betz, Gladney, Langenheim, Richards, and Smucker voted against the motion.

Beckett called the question on the main motion.

Motion carried to approve LRMP as amended with a vote of 18 to 6. Anderson, Beckett, Carter, Gladney, James, Jones, Knott, Kurtz, McGinty, Michaels, Moser, Nudo, Rosales, Sapp, Schroeder, Smucker, Weibel, and Wysocki voted in favor of the motion. Betz, Doenitz, Jay, Langenheim, O'Connor, and Richards voted against the motion.

Change to Electronic Recycling Agreements

MOTION by Beckett to approve the revised agreements for the 2010-2011 Countywide Residential Electronics Collection Events; seconded by Rosales.

Weibel exited the meeting at 8:58 p.m.

Motion carried.

Zoning Ordinance Amendments

Request to Amend Champaign County Zoning Ordinance Zoning Case 658-AT-09

Hall stated the amendment received no protest and was ready for final approval.

MOTION by McGinty to amend the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance per Zoning Case 658-AT-09; seconded by Beckett.

Moser asked about the airstrip at Allerton and Hall confirmed that is still a pending case. Anderson asked for the basis of the Zoning Board of Appeals' decision. Hall explained no other county has faced this situation. It was realized the setback could be tailored to preserve land and this amendment allows lesser setback. This adds a greater degree of protection along with protecting the land.

Weibel returned to the meeting at 9:01 p.m.

Motion carried.

Request to Amend Champaign County Zoning Ordinance Zoning Case 634-AT-09 Part B

MOTION by Schroeder to amend the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance per Zoning Case 634-AT-09 Part B; seconded by Kurtz.

Hall stated no pending application was waiting for a decision. This amendment could be deferred until next month at the Board's discretion.

MOTION by Moser to defer; seconded by Beckett. Weibel stated no items could be tabled or deferred at Committee of the Whole meetings under Robert's Rules.

MOTION by Beckett to suspend the rules; seconded by Moser. **Motion carried.**

The Board returned to the original motion to defer. Jay asked if there were different rules for Republicans and Democrats. Beckett stated an issue cannot be killed at Committee of the Whole meetings. Smucker made a point of information that the rules have to first be suspended to defer an item at Committee of the Whole meetings.

Motion carried to defer with all ayes.

Monthly Report

MOTION by Beckett to receive and place on file the March 2010 monthly report; seconded by James. **Motion carried with all ayes.**

Other Business

There was no other business.

Chair's Report

There was no Chair's report.

Designation of Items to be Placed on County Board Consent Agenda

No agenda items were designated for the consent agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kat Bork
Administrative Secretary

Secy's note: The minutes reflect the order of the agenda and may not necessarily reflect the order of business conducted at the meeting.