

APPROVED AS AMENDED AUGUST 10, 2009

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Champaign County Environment & Land Use Committee
Champaign County Brookens Administrative Center
Urbana, IL 61802

DATE: June 8, 2009
TIME: 7:00 p.m.
PLACE: Lyle Shields Meeting Room
Brookens Administrative Center
1776 E. Washington Street
Urbana, IL 61802

MEMBERS PRESENT: Carol Ammons, Jan Anderson, Brad Jones, Ralph Langenheim, Steve Moser, Alan Kurtz (VC), Jon Schroeder, Barbara Wysocki (C)

OTHER COUNTY BOARD MEMBERS

PRESENT: Pius Weibel (County Board Chair)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Chris Doenitz

STAFF PRESENT: John Hall, Leroy Holliday, Deb Busey, Susan Monte (Regional Planning Commisison), Susan Chavarria (Regional Planning Commission)

OTHERS PRESENT: Hal Barnhart, Sherry Schildt

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

Ms. Ammons moved, seconded by Mr. Kurtz to approve the agenda as submitted.

Ms. Wysocki stated that discussion regarding Item #5, Chair's Report will follow Item #12, Monthly Reports.

The motion carried by voice vote.

3. Approval of Minutes (May 11, 2009)

Mr. Langenheim moved, seconded by Ms. Anderson to approve the May 11, 2009, minutes as submitted.

1 Mr. Weibel noted that Sherry Schildt is listed twice under "Others Present" and Mr. Langenheim's name is
2 misspelled several times throughout the document.

3

4 **The motion carried by voice vote.**

5

6 **4. Correspondence**

7 **A. Letter from Sodemann & Associates, Inc. dated May 26, 2009**

8

9 Ms. Wysocki stated that the letter from Sodemann & Associates, Inc. dated May 26, 2009, is for the
10 Committee's information only and no action is required.

11

12 **5. Chair's Report**

13 **A. Cancellation of July Committee Meeting**

14

15 Ms. Wysocki stated that traditionally ELUC does not meet in July so that any matters that come before this
16 committee or any other go directly to the County Board for action. She said that she has asked Mr. Hall to
17 look at what is coming through the pipeline that might give the Committee cause to meet in July.

18

19 Mr. Hall stated that Zoning Case 611-AM-08 was for Casey's General Stores which, in the neighborhood,
20 was a controversial case because there was a neighbor who he anticipates will protest who does not have
21 20% frontage. He said that the ZBA could take final action at their June 25, 2009, meeting and since
22 Casey's is in a hurry to start construction they would like to be able to present their case to the Committee at
23 the July 13, 2009, ELUC meeting. He said that Casey's is also going through an annexation agreement
24 process with the City of Urbana and the City of Urbana made them go through the County for rezoning
25 before they would grant the annexation agreement. He said that there was a good chance that the ZBA will
26 take action in June and Casey's would like to be before ELUC on July 13.

27

28 Mr. Schroeder stated that if the ZBA takes final action at their June 25, 2009, meeting then we should have a
29 meeting in July to accommodate Casey's.

30

31 Mr. Moser asked Mr. Hall if the LRMP will be wrapped up in July also. He said that there are a lot of things
32 within the LRPM which he does not agree with and he did not indicate those disagreements tonight but he
33 does intend to state them some place. He said that there was a lot of stuff within it that he does not like and
34 he would like his comments recorded.

35

36 Ms. Wysocki stated that the LRMP will come back before ELUC but it will not be in July. She asked the
37 Committee how many people will be available for a meeting on July 13, 2009.

38

39 Mr. Weibel stated that it would be easier to place a July ELUC meeting on the calendar and then cancel it if
40 it is not required.

41

42 Ms. Busey asked the Committee if they would be having the July meeting for only Casey's and all other
43 business will be forwarded directly to the full County Board as the other committees are doing. She said

6-08-09

APPROVED AS AMENDED AUGUST 10, 2009

ELUC

1 that if Casey's was not finalized at the ZBA on June 25th then the July 13th ELUC meeting would be
2 cancelled.

3
4 Mr. Moser asked Mr. Hall when the zoning case regarding the restricted landing area would be before the
5 ZBA.

6
7 Mr. Hall stated that Case 645-S-09, will be heard at the ZBA on June 11, 2009.

8
9 Mr. Moser asked Mr. Hall if that case would require action from ELUC.

10
11 Mr. Hall stated no.

12
13 Ms. Wysocki stated on July 15 thru July 16 there is a Wind Farm Conference in Bloomington and now is the
14 time to sign up for that conference. She said that the fee for attending is \$60 which includes a trip to a wind
15 farm.

16
17 **6. Public Participation**

18
19 None

20
21 **7. Recreation and Entertainment License: Champaign County Fair Association, 902 N. Coler**
22 **Avenue, Urbana. County Fair and Carnival. July 24 thru August 1, 2009.**

23
24 **Mr. Schroeder moved, seconded by Mr. Moser to approve the Recreation and Entertainment License**
25 **for the Champaign County Fair Association, 902 N. Coler Avenue, Urbana. County Fair and**
26 **Carnival. July 24, thru August 1, 2009. The motion carried by voice vote.**

27
28 **8. Updates:**

29 **A. Champaign County Hazard Mitigation Plan**
30

31 Ms. Monte stated that the final draft is out and staff has received preliminary word that FEMA had no
32 problem signing off on the draft. She said that a public meeting was held prior to this meeting and the next
33 steps would be to present the draft to each one of the participating 27 jurisdictions, answer any questions
34 that they may have and have them adopt it.

35
36 Ms. Wysocki asked Ms. Monte if the Champaign County Hazard Mitigation Plan will come before the
37 County Board this month.

38
39 Ms. Monte stated no. She said that the preliminary word that she received from FEMA was in the form of
40 an e-mail and until an official document from FEMA is received the County Board will not be presented
41 with the Plan. She said that she anticipates County Board action in August.

42
43 Mr. Kurtz asked Ms. Monte if the 27 participating jurisdictions could be presented with the draft at the same

1 time during one meeting.

2
3 Ms. Monte stated that each planning team member will submit the draft to their perspective jurisdiction and
4 some of the smaller jurisdictions may request a presentation and some may not.

5
6 Ms. Wysocki stated that she hopes that the Committee members have had a chance to review the draft
7 document. She said that it was a very good document which certainly reflects a lot of planning, talking,
8 organizing and the mere fact that 27 jurisdictions could be joined together to work on this plan, little alone
9 sign off on it is incredible. She said that a great deal of compliments should go to Susan Monte and the
10 entire planning team for executing this entire document.

11
12 **B. House Bill 466 (regarding Chatham decision)**

13
14 Mr. Hall stated that the County’s bill regarding the Chatham decision, House Bill 466, was approved by
15 both houses of the legislature. He said that House Bill 1003, Representative Poe’s bill, which corrected the
16 situation for all counties in the state was also approved. He said that both bills are now on the governor’s
17 desk awaiting his signature. He said that the City of Champaign has taken the initiative to write a letter to
18 the governor asking him to sign House Bill 466 but due to their position in the municipal league they have
19 remained silent about House Bill 1003. Mr. Hall encouraged the County Board to have the County Board
20 Chair write a similar letter in support of House Bill 466 and House Bill 1003.

21
22 Mr. Weibel stated that if the Committee would like him to write such a letter then he will do so.

23
24 Mr. Schroeder stated that he is in support of a letter from the County Board Chair regarding this issue and
25 would like the letter expedited as soon as possible. He requested that in the future if such a letter is required
26 then he would appreciate the matter being expedited by phone calls or e-mail notification to the Committee
27 members rather than waiting for a meeting for discussion and approval.

28
29 Ms. Wysocki asked if it is the consensus of the Committee to ask Mr. Weibel to draft such a letter.

30
31 **The consensus of the Committee was yes.**

32
33 Mr. Weibel stated that he will prepare the letter tomorrow and send it immediately.

34
35
36 **C. 2009 Countywide Computer and Electronics Recycling Collection Report**

37
38 Ms. Monte stated that this is the third year that the County has coordinated this countywide event and this
39 year it was held at the Champaign County Fair’s Parking lot. She said that the new location worked very
40 well because it allowed a good flow of traffic with no or very little waiting. She said that figures have been
41 provided in the report but if the Committee has any questions regarding this event they should contact her.

42
43 **9. Preliminary Overview of Draft Goals and Policies for the Land Resource Management Plan**

1
2 Ms. Chavarria distributed a handout titled, *Highlights of Proposed LRMP Goals, Objectives and Policies as*
3 *of May 7, 2009*, to the Committee for review. She said that the most recent version of the LRMP Goals were
4 distributed to the Committee at the last meeting and are included in the ELUC packet as pages 37 thru 54.
5 She said that the next LRMP meeting will be convened on Thursday, June 11, 2009, at 7:30 a.m. and they
6 are hoping to begin or actually finish finalizing the goals, objectives and policies that will be sent to this
7 Committee later this summer. She said that the June 11, 2009, meeting is open to ELUC members and as
8 *ex-officio* members of the steering committee can contribute to the discussion and any agenda point.
9

10 Ms. Chavarria stated that staff would like to discuss the approximately 150 goals, objectives and policies
11 with ELUC members before it comes to the Committee for consideration this summer. She said that staff
12 and members can either meet in small groups or one-on-one to discuss any concerns or questions regarding
13 these topics. She said that in an effort to make the approval process as easy as possible for everyone,
14 considering the size of this document would be to refer to the distributed handout. She said that the
15 document contains some information about how some of the controversial proposed policies could differ
16 from the current practices of the County. She said that there are five controversial items which she would
17 like to review with the Committee tonight and those are only 5% of the goals, objectives and policies and
18 there are many other controversial items which could be discussed at the Committee level therefore this is
19 only a small glimpse of a bigger picture.
20

21 Ms. Chavarria stated that the background section of the distributed document indicates that there is not much
22 difference in the number of existing goals and policies from 1977, 2001 and 2005 that the County was
23 currently working with versus the 146 proposed LRMP Goals, Objectives and Policies. She said that the
24 proposed LRMP Goals, Objectives and Policies are meant to supersede those previous documents so that
25 there would be one working document rather than three.
26

27 Ms. Chavarria said that Section One, *More Restrictive By-Right Development Allowance*, proposes to have
28 the LRMP Policy to be more restrictive for the By-Right Development Allowance so this policy seeks to be
29 more protective of the agricultural base and to conserve farmland. She said that existing county practice
30 allows one to four lots to be developed per parcel plus any lot over thirty five acres but the proposed policy
31 provides for one new lot allowed per 40 acres with a total of four new lots to be allowed on a tract of land as
32 it existed on January 1, 1998. She said that the table on page one indicates how many lots would be allowed
33 on a given parcel size according to the Existing County Practice on the left column and the proposed LRMP
34 Policy 4.1.5. She said that the Steering Committee vote on approving this more restrictive policy was 12-1
35 approving this policy with 5 members absent.
36

37 Ms. Chavarria said that Section Two, *No Rural Residential Overlay Subdivisions on Best Prime Farmland*,
38 *is* proposed policy 4.1.6 that limits rural residential subdivisions on Best Prime Farmland to by-right
39 development only. She said that this policy also seeks to minimize fragmentation of the agricultural base and
40 to conserve farmland. She said that currently Rural Residential Overlay requests for development are
41 allowed on Best Prime Farmland right now. She said that there were twenty proposed RRO's since 1999 and
42 eight were approved. She said that the Steering Committee vote to approve this more restrictive policy was
43 12 -3 with three members absent.

1
2 Ms. Chavarria said that Section Three referred to the polices under the proposed Objective 6.2 that would
3 required higher compliance with building standards than existing practices do. She said that the policies
4 referred to fire codes, building codes and energy standards. She said that for the fire codes, the State Fire
5 Marshall has a code but the enforcement is not as thorough as it could be so the proposed policies would
6 place some enforcement capability with the County with some building types such as high occupancy
7 dwellings and premises seeking liquor licenses. She said that for the building code, the County does not
8 have one at this point but the proposed policy would require the creation and adoption of a building code by
9 2015. She said for energy standards the State has a requirement that the County and municipalities enforce
10 minimum energy efficiency standards and the proposed policy reflects this newer law which was passed in
11 2004. She said that the Steering Committee voted on approving these more restrictive policies in general by
12 a significant margin for each one.
13
14 Mr. Weibel said that there was some legislation in Springfield that would require counties to adopt a
15 residential building code and if they do not have a building code already how would this impact those
16 individuals.
17
18 Ms. Monte said that he was referring to the Illinois Residential Building Code Act and that assigned the
19 default building code. She said that this legislation requires that every contract for building construction
20 indicates what building code is being adhered to and there are certain restrictions on which building code to
21 be selected so it has to be adopted by any zoning jurisdiction within so many miles. She said that this act
22 requires if there is not a building code indicated in the signed contract by default it assigns certain building
23 codes that apply.
24
25 Mr. Weibel asked if that would apply for commercial structures.
26
27 Ms. Monte said that this was the Illinois Residential Building Code Act so for every residential building
28 contract there should be a building code adhered to.
29
30 Ms. Weibel said that he and Mr. Hall had discussed a building code for commercial structures.
31
32 Ms. Monte said that there was an Energy Efficient Commercial Building Act and asked if that was what you
33 may be referring to.
34
35 Mr. Weibel said that's not what he was referring to there was another one.
36
37 Mr. Moser asked Ms. Monte if there would be any exemptions for farm buildings.
38
39 Ms. Monte said yes.
40
41 Mr. Moser asked if this was strictly for residential dwellings.
42
43 Mr. Weibel said that it talks about dwellings so it is not farm buildings. He said that it would be commercial

1 buildings, retail buildings and apartment buildings.

2
3 Mr. Moser said that it was hard to define commercial against agriculture.

4
5 Mr. Weibel said that he would get the Bill. He said that it was moving slowly but it was moving.

6
7 Ms. Monte said that she was not sure which legislation they were talking about but we have to make sure
8 that we are aware of it as it applies to our policies so she will check as well and follow up with Mr. Moser
9 and Mr. Weibel. She said that the Energy Efficiency Commercial Building Act applies to all non residential
10 buildings.

11
12 Ms. Ammons asked Ms. Chavarria how far back would this go when it goes into effect.

13
14 Ms. Chavarria said that she thinks it would be from the date of passage rather than grandfathering.

15
16 Ms. Monte said that typically that is correct.

17
18 Mr. Langenheim said that he had attended a number of those meetings and he was impressed with the
19 diligence, dedication and high level of participation by committee members.

20
21 Ms. Chavarria said that Section Four, *Protecting Existing Natural Habitat Areas*, proposes policy 8.6 which
22 is currently under discussion by the Steering Committee and where the discussion was focusing on whether
23 the policy should apply for existing by-right development, discretionary development and or new
24 development or if it should be removed entirely from the goals, objectives and policies. She said that this
25 Thursday they will be discussing this matter again to see where the Steering Committee wished to go with
26 that. She said that currently the Zoning Ordinance has no quantitative assessment of natural habitat areas
27 that is required but the Zoning Board of Appeals could request an assessment be done of a natural habitat
28 area or they could require a setback from such an area. Ms. Chavarria said that it would be slightly different
29 depending on how they would go with this objective.

30
31 Ms. Chavarria said that Section Five, *Contribution to Parks and Preserves*, is Policy 8.7.3 that would
32 require discretionary development to provide a reasonable contribution in cash or land to support
33 development of parks and preserves. She said that there was no requirement for such a contribution in the
34 current policies. She said that the Steering Committee vote on approving this policy was 13 – 0 with 5
35 members absent so it seemed to be supported by the Steering Committee. She said that some municipalities
36 are going in this direction to help out with parks and preserves and the paying for them.

37
38 Ms. Chavarria said that with the two months remaining before they return to ELUC for approval she hopes
39 that the Board takes advantage of the staff resources that are available to them to discuss any questions they
40 may have. She said that this Thursday would be a good a time to come and see how the Steering Committee
41 is working and to participate in the discussion if the Board so choose.

42
43 Mr. Schroeder said that in Section 3A of the handout ,what we are looking at is whether construction

1 complies with the standards the County will require and basically refers to the State Fire Marshall Life
2 Safety Regulation. He said that he thinks that the County does not have to be in the business of enforcing
3 state regulations or statutes. He said that he thought that it was in compliance and he does not know how the
4 County is going to make anyone comply with the State Fire Marshall Life Safety Regulations.
5

6 Mr. Hall said that the easiest way to do that was to require submission of some statement signed by a
7 licensed architect or engineer that certifies that the new construction complies with the State Fire Marshal's
8 Life Safety Code. He said that their department was not qualified to review it but he wanted to make sure
9 that some one qualified did review it but this should be a questions for the County Board if they want the
10 Planning and Zoning Department to make sure that someone had vouched that this meets the State Fire
11 Marshal's Life Safety Code or we could do like we are doing now and never ask the question. He said that
12 as staff we proposed this to the Steering Committee and they did discuss this to some extent and they
13 decided to recommend it but it is up to the County Board to accept the recommendation. He said that he was
14 not suggesting bringing an architect on staff to review things and in this instance all that would be necessary
15 would be making sure that we have a statement from a licensed architect.
16

17 Mr. Schroeder asked Mr. Hall if we built something today like a multi-family residence would we have to
18 comply.
19

20 Mr. Hall said that at the present time you have to be in compliance but the State Fire Marshal does not begin
21 to have the staff to review and they will try to monitor inquiries or complaints when they get them and
22 review plans when they are submitted but they don't enforce it unless it is brought to their attention.
23

24 Mr. Schroeder said that he would not be opposed to any type of safety codes for multi family housing but he
25 did not think that the County needs to be involved in handling the states building code business and they
26 should figure out how to enforce them.
27

28 Mr. Hall said that whenever there is a public assembly type use where life safety issues arise the ZBA at
29 least for the past fifteen years has been making sure that they get some type of submittal on that which
30 amount to the same thing but they do that because the Zoning Ordinance require the County to protect
31 public health and safety and the only way to do that is to actually make that a requirement and this would
32 formalize that.
33

34 Mr. Schroeder said in Section 3C of the handout he thought that it was economically beneficial to anyone
35 that has new construction to try to have it as energy efficient as possible. He said that he could not
36 understand why we have an overbearing idea that we can control everything in the State with these
37 minimum energy efficient standard and he thinks that it is non-sense in places of business. He said that it
38 just makes sense to move in that direction even for personal construction because if you are even putting up
39 a house you would put in something that would be energy efficient, insulated well and probably geothermal
40 heating and cooling system but to enforce that and make the State to have a minimum standard is way out of
41 line.
42

43 Mr. Moser said that Urbana is enforcing some kind of building code in their mile and a half. He said that he

1 has a neighbor that put up a tool shed that is really a shop and it had to be wired in conduit and all kinds of
2 things which added to the cost tremendously. He said that some of these municipalities are doing it so why
3 can't Rantoul do it as well in their mile and a half.

4
5 Mr. Hall asked Mr. Moser if that property under an annexation agreement.

6
7 Mr. Moser said that it was a just inside the mile and a half west of 130 and they would not let them do
8 anything until he got a permit from Urbana.

9
10 Mr. Hall said that sounds unusual because Urbana does not require annexation agreements that far out.

11
12 Mr. Moser said that it is not an annexation agreement they got these building codes and you're in a mile and
13 a half you are going to do it that way.

14
15 Mr. Hall said that they can't do that.

16
17 Mr. Moser said that they did it.

18
19 Mr. Hall said that he would be happy to follow up on that if he gets the name and the property after the
20 meeting.

21
22 Mr. Moser said he know of another one that they a florida room on a house that was barely in the mile and a
23 half and if we are going to turn all this over to the Zoning Department of these municipalities in the mile and
24 a half we won't have anything to worry about.

25
26 Mr. Hall said that the County had not done that yet so he would like to follow up on those to see how that is
27 occurring.

28
29

30 **10. Recommendations of the East-Central Illinois Regional Water Planning Committee**

31
32 Ms. Wysocki said that these are pages 55 to 64 in the agenda.

33
34 Brad Uken said that back in 2006 the governor by Executive Order organized this and this did not go
35 through the legislature. He said that the former governor identified two areas within the state to study water
36 resources, one in northeastern Illinois, Cook County and collar county areas and East Central Illinois which
37 is the Mahomet Aquifer area. He said that the Mahomet Aquifer area covers fifteen counties and starts near
38 the Gilman, Watseka area and the flow of water comes down through the Paxton, Rantoul area to
39 Champaign-Urbana then takes a turn to the west and south to Monticello then slightly north to the Illinois
40 River. Mr. Uken said that he wanted to clear up some myths that were out there, one that the Mahomet
41 Aquifer is not a flowing river like the Illinois River or the Mississippi River and it does not flow miles per
42 year it may flow 8 to10 inches or maybe a foot per year. He said that the water we drink today does not
43 come from West Virginia or Pennsylvania our water comes from East Central Illinois from the fifteen

1 county area. He said that as we get into Indiana that water flows from the Pennsylvania and West Virginia
2 area and does not come here the water that we're enjoying today comes from East Central Illinois.
3

4 Mr. Uken said that as a Committee they had been going on for two and a half years and they have four
5 charges look at the Mahomet Aquifer supply, the demand on the aquifer, develop a management plan to the
6 year to 2050 and education. He said that we were not talking about only our generation but multiple
7 generations of planning. He said that the last one was the education part. He said about 95% of the people
8 don't think about where their water comes from as long as they can get up and start their showers or coffee
9 pot and the water comes out of the faucet that is all they care about. He said that we must be more aware of
10 where our water comes from in East Central Illinois. He said that without the Mahomet aquifer we would
11 not have water here, we are not like Bloomington that looks at Lake Bloomington and Lake Decatur or Lake
12 Springfield. He said that we do not rely on surface water reservoirs because ours is ground water and
13 without the aquifer we do not have water in Champaign County so we need to take a look at management of
14 the aquifer.
15

16 Mr. Uken said that there had been some turnover in the Committee and at this time there are twelve of us on
17 the Committee. He said that they split the fifteen counties into three sections and four members each and he
18 is on the east side and represents the general public so he was not there on behalf of the Farm Bureau but he
19 was there on behalf of the public and he serves as Chairman of that Committee and had served for the past
20 fourteen to fifteen months. He said himself along with Bill Smith, who was on the Savoy Village Council
21 and Steve Wegman from Illinois American Water and Dwayne Bergren from Urbana represent this section
22 on the east side.
23

24 Mr. Uken said that to begin with, East Central Illinois is not facing an immediate water crisis but we don't
25 want to get there either. He said we heard about last summer and continue to hear about California having
26 some water issues and also Georgia and other areas of that state having land and water shortages and we
27 don't want to get there but we are not at that point and we do not need to panic. He said that they had
28 identified six guidelines for regional planning guidelines. He said first and foremost is self governance. He
29 said that their Committee had been very clear from the beginning they did not want a management plan
30 dictated to them by the State of Illinois or someone from southern Illinois, northern Illinois or pick your
31 region of the state. He said that if we are going to develop a management plan it must be brought in through
32 self governance here in the fifteen county area and that is critical in our think.
33

34
35 Mr. Uken said that sustainable water supply needs to be a guideline, along with adaptive management,
36 sound science, shared responsibility and an inform public. He said that the demand for water and water
37 withdrawal will increase just like electricity, and the community believes there will be an increased demand
38 for water and that is across the board and not just talking about population. He said that total surface water
39 and ground water withdrawals in the region by 2050, excluding electric power generation, will be 220 to 420
40 million gallons a day more than modeled normal weather withdrawals of about 340 in 2005. He said that
41 normal weather condition ground water withdrawals in the Mahomet Aquifer are reported to increase from
42 220 million gallons per day in 2005 to 260 million in what's called the less resource intensive scenario. He
43 said that even if we adapt a less resource intensive approach and use less water, the numbers say that we will

1 increase our water consumption even doing conservation efforts.
2

3 Mr. Uken said that if we keep on the same path that we are on today we would go to 280 million gallons per
4 day by the year 2050. He said that if we say we need to use all the water we can and it does not matter what
5 we are doing with our water it would probably increase to 320 million gallons per day compared to 220
6 million as we know it today so in any of the scenarios we need more water. He said that if you throw in an
7 extreme climate scenario for water supply which means a decrease annual precipitation, a reoccurrence of
8 severe multiyear droughts and an increase in temperature, that changes everything. He said that if we have a
9 little drought with adequate planning we could have an adequate water supply but we have to be prepared
10 for drought conditions. He said that the state has a process for drought preparedness and they are updating
11 that and if you look at Bloomington, Decatur and Springfield those areas are relying on surface water and
12 their reservoirs are filling up due to sedimentation which happens naturally and they are using more water
13 from the aquifer. He said that if those communities decide to tap into the aquifer we are talking about a
14 totally different situation about where the numbers go for the future.
15

16 Mr. Uken said that one of the recommendations was to make sure that we don't actually get into the
17 Mahomet Aquifer and that basically the aquifer is a pressurized area so when you go down into it we want
18 to make sure that we stay above it in the pressurized area and we think that would be achievable by
19 monitoring and planning. He said that if you look at the entire aquifer it changes as you go from east to west
20 and on the west side you could take your spade and dig down and hit the aquifer and at times the aquifer is
21 at ground level in wet times. He said that it is completely different on the east side and that's why a lot of
22 people consider there is a lot of irrigation on that side for fruits and vegetables but that is a completely
23 different scenario because the recharge is so different because the aquifer is so shallow. He said that the soil
24 types and uses are different so it is sustainable but on the east side the recharge is longer. He said that if he
25 poured a cup of water on the grass outside it would take hundreds of years before it would get to the aquifer
26 and recharge. He said again, we are pulling water backwards or importing water from Piatt County and
27 tomorrow he would be speaking to the Piatt County Board about this.
28

29 Mr. Uken said that out of the entire fifteen counties there are certain areas of concern but for the immediate
30 short term it is us and that's where we need to take a look at this and that's why stake holders like
31 yourselves, municipalities, the general, public, industry, small business, and electric generating need to take
32 a look at this report because we need to start to manage this.
33

34 Mr. Uken said from a county stand point he thinks the question would be what role does the County have in
35 this process. He said that the Mahomet Aquifer Consortium was started back in the 80's with a goal of doing
36 an exact study like this. He said that the study was not cheap but the former governor gave us three years of
37 funding then cut the funding the last year. He said that due to the conservativeness of the Committee they
38 were still able to produce a quality report that is currently in draft form and are seeking comments from the
39 public until June 15th. He said that the entire draft is on their website and their goal is to approve the final
40 report on June 29th and start the education process on this. He said that Mr. Langenheim from this committee
41 attends the Mahomet Aquifer Consortium Meetings and that is a great step to stay engaged in the process to
42 see where they are going. Mr. Uken said that the financial option, although this was not the committee that
43 takes those issues under consideration, but to implement some of these management plans we have to have

1 funding sources and he was not looking only at Champaign County but all sources be it our community,
2 individuals, other counties, state and federal government as well. He said that they must have buy-in for a
3 management option from all stakeholders, from all businesses, and from all individuals as they move
4 forward.

5
6 Mr. Jones asked Mr. Uken if anyone examined the effects of the rate increases from Illinois American Water
7 on the aquifer usage.

8
9 Mr. Uken said yes but he could give only a generic answer, there were studies done nationally not only
10 around here that says one of the ways to practice conservation of water was to raise the rates but he was not
11 saying that's what Illinois American Water was thinking but studies had been done that show as your rates
12 go up water consumption goes down so that's proven. He said that he did not know when Illinois American
13 Water got their last increase but the one before that they indicated that water consumption went down but
14 after several years it went back up to its previous levels so the data is there that says as water prices go up
15 the consumption goes down just like gas prices did last summer.

16
17 Mr. Schroeder said that in 1983 when he was in Illinois State they were always complaining in Bloomington
18 about how to figure out how to get more water and by the time Mr. Uken got there in that dry spell they
19 were sucking mud out of Lake Bloomington to get water out. He said that Normal had wells out there and
20 after that they tried going out to Danvers to try to get wells out there and it would be something else if they
21 tried to tie in to the aquifer and really start pulling water out of there. He said that when John Potts was
22 Director of the Champaign County Forest Preserve and the Forest Preserve was able to acquire what is now
23 the Forest Preserve at River Bend, the City of Decatur contacted him and they wanted water pumped out of
24 Sunset Lake into the Sangamon and float it down to Lake Decatur and he said to go fly a kite so he did not
25 know if they were still interested in that or not but that was one way for them to get aquifer water and both
26 of those lakes are ground and natural fed.

27
28 Mr. Uken said that there are a lot of larger communities that currently use surface water and they could
29 decide to come in and tap into the aquifer and basically the law says "reasonable use" so what could happen
30 is that a community could come to an area within the aquifer and buy five acres of land and put a well down
31 then they can pump that water and pipe it all the way to Springfield. He said that Chicago could come down
32 and buy a parcel and put a well down and do the same thing and that's all in existing law right now.

33
34 Mr. Moser said that in California they are reusing water and we are sending enough down the Kaskaskia and
35 the Sangamon River and the Salt Fork to drown this County if we could pull some of it back.

36
37 Mr. Uken said that at some point we have to look at reuse in some shape or form and there are fire fighters
38 that are reusing water instead of potable water to put fires out. He said that it sounds like an easy concept
39 and the logical thing the that means that the entire city has to run a separate set of water lines to pump reuse
40 water and now you are talking all over the city having to put in every inch of new pipe to use reuse water but
41 what about golf courses, golfing is a great sport and they like green golf courses could they be using reuse
42 water on those, but again you are talking about pipelines, you are talking about Illinois American Water in
43 our local case putting in pipe to get it there and it is not an easy pill to swallow but in the long run it may be

1 something to look at.

2
3 Mr. Langeheim asked Ms. Wysocki if it would be appropriate to have a motion to place this on file and if
4 there were any provision for this report to be copied and sent to the full Board.

5
6 Ms. Wysocki said that it would be easy enough to have the Executive Summary to be distributed to the other
7 Board members. She said that if the other Board members have an agenda they have this summary in it. She
8 said that it would not be inappropriate to place this on file.

9
10 **Mr. Langenheim moved, seconded by Ms. Anderson to place the executive summary of the East**
11 **Central Illinois Regional Water Supply planning Committee. The motion carried by voice vote.**

12
13 Mr. Weibel said that he believes the City of Decatur has a number of wells in the aquifer around the Macon
14 County, Piatt County, and Dewitt County where they do pump water out of the aquifer and pump it back
15 into their lake but they don't do that on a regular basis.

16
17 Mr. Uken said that may be true but their primary source is Lake Decatur and only randomly do they use the
18 aquifer. He said that another example would be the Equistar Plant in Tuscola which has a well within the
19 Mahomet Aquifer just west of Champaign-Urbana and they are pumping at times out of those wells into an
20 open ditch down to Tuscola where they collect it and use it.

21
22 Mr. Langenheim said that the City of Decatur is pumping water and is dumping it into a creek for their lakes
23 water supply.

24
25 Mr. Moser said that they are set up to do that already and they are doing it.

26
27 Mr. Kurtz asked Mr. Uken if there was any way that we could prevent that by a Bill through Senator
28 Frerichs or Representative Naomi Jakobsson.

29
30 Mr. Uken said that in the Executive Order it was clearly indicated we had to operate within current and
31 existing laws so this would not be in their scope.

32
33 Mr. Moser said that the there was a place around the Middle Fork Forest Preserve where that thing is almost
34 at the top of the ground.

35
36 Mr. Uken said that part of the additional studies that need to be done is to confirm where we have recharge
37 points. He said that they believe there are a number of recharge points but like anything else it takes money
38 and time to look at. He said that in their Committee discussion they talked about a number of places where
39 there could be a recharge, one is up towards the Dogtown area north of Penfield. He said that if you go up
40 on Route 47 around the Hunt Club and when you cross the river there is believed to be one and then down
41 near Allerton Park he believes that the Sangamon River has a recharge point with the shallow aquifer above
42 it and then down to the Mahomet Aquifer. He said that those were speculation but if they could identify
43 those as they move forward in the coming years we must at all cost protect those recharge points.

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. Moser said that that one in Dogtown is supposedly back where Ogle dug that gravel out in Ford County and they may really be on top of that.

Mr. Uken said that there was belief that there was one there although it was unconfirmed but they must take a look at the recharge points. He said that there were a number of things that the report did not do and one of them that they did not look at was water quality but this was a water quantity report not a quality report. He said that water quality is a whole separate issue and the Committee didn't take a look at that. He said that there was not enough time by their Committee to look at water quality.

Mr. Langenheim said that there had been a research program in the State's Water Survey and Geological Survey investigating flow patterns in the Mahomet Aquifer and the recharge in the Sangamon River and some of the others, and the Sangamon cuts down into the higher aquifer and there is an exchange there when the river is high it feeds into the aquifer and when the river is low the aquifer feeds into the river and then there are connections between the Glasford and the Sangamon and there are on-going investigations as to the extent and the effect on it.

Mr. Uken said that Mr. Langenheim was correct that there continues to be research and that is occurring down towards the Allerton Park area where the Glasford recharges which is a shallow aquifer above the Mahomet Aquifer and then there is a connection between the Glasford and the Mahomet Aquifer and they are actually recharging each other.

Mr. Moser asked Mr. Uken if that was the same thing that's happening in Ford County.

Mr. Uken said that may be a possibility there.

Mr. Hall said that there were four policies in the LRMP specifically focusing on the Mahomet Aquifer. He said that he was referring to policies 8.1.2, 8.1.3, 8.1.5 and 8.1.6 on page 10 of these goals and policies. He said that at least the LRMP was trying to incorporate as much as it could.

Mr. Uken said that he did not want to come here tonight to try to make people believe that the sky is falling on our water resources but again what we have to do is to educate more people about the aquifer, what it is, what it isn't and we must start managing the resource as we move forward. He said that he thinks that they could have a sustainable water supply without question into the future but we must start now and this report is a step in the right direction to get us started on that management plan.

Ms. Wysocki asked Mr. Uken if he could give the Committee the website for the full report.

Mr. Uken said [sic www.rwspec.org.] He said that if nothing else at the very minimum the Committee should take a look at the Executive Summary. He said that the Committee could submit comments to the website or get in touch with him if there were any other questions.

11. Hiring Professional Consultants for Review of Certain Technical Studies for Wind Farm

1 **County Board Special Use Permits**
2

3 Mr. Hall stated that staff is expecting the first wind farm application in August by which there are a number
4 of studies required as part of the application and three of the required submittals will require professional
5 assistance. He said that a noise study proving compliance with the Illinois Pollution Control Board noise
6 standards (par.6.1.4I.) is required and will probably be one of the more critical studies that neighbors are
7 going to be interested in because they will want to know that the County can actually verify compliance. He
8 said that the developer will be submitting a study which will assert that they are meeting the standard and
9 the County's planning staff cannot evaluate that assertion because they are not trained to and do not have the
10 proper tools. He said that the Board should expect wind farms to be controversial to some degree and the
11 County Board will be put between the developer who asserts that they have done everything that they need
12 to do and the neighbors who would really like to have some verification. He said that the site risk
13 assessment study regarding bird and bat mortality including if necessary a site specific one year bird and bat
14 use survey (par.6.1.4L.) is required and although he does not expect a problem he cannot guarantee such
15 because he is not qualified to evaluate it. He said that this issue may not be controversial and the County
16 Board may get a lot of free advice from local bird and bat researchers but it is one of the things that people
17 can easily pick on just to oppose the wind farm and staff cannot give any guidance. He said that evaluating
18 the independent engineer's estimate of decommissioning costs (par. 6.1.1A.5) to make sure that there is
19 enough in the letter of the credit, and eventually in the escrow account, to pay for the decommissioning will
20 be required. He said that he has been an estimator before but he has never worked on a wind farm and he
21 does not know that much about it. He said that the costs have probably changed greatly since wind farms
22 have become so common and the County Board needs to know that they are getting realistic costs. He said
23 that he would like to have the Committee's permission to hire a consultant regarding these three reviews.
24 He said that he was only aware of one consultant in east central Illinois that can do all of these things and
25 they have evaluated a noise study that Livingston County had submitted for a wind study and they have
26 completed some other work for Livingston County. He said that Livingston County was the only county
27 that he is aware of that has gone so far as to hire consultants therefore clearly the Committee would not be
28 so unusual if they chose not to authorize this request but staff cannot evaluate any one of these three really
29 critical studies therefore the County Board will be on their own if we don't have access to a consultant.
30

31 Mr. Kurtz stated that, in Mr. Hall's own words, it was very unusual for any county to do what staff is asking
32 in regards to noise, bird and bat assessments. He said that he has evaluated a number of national studies
33 (National Academy of Sciences) concerning noise and the key here is that the Illinois Pollution Control
34 Board Noise Standards have been complied with all across the state and the same energy companies that are
35 in other counties will be in Champaign County. He said that he does not see why the energy companies
36 would not comply with the Illinois Pollution Control Board Noise Standards in Champaign County when
37 they already comply in other counties therefore he does not see the need to expend money for a noise study
38 when the energy companies already have to comply with the Illinois Pollution Control Board in providing
39 them with information regarding noise levels. He said that some of the national studies completed all over
40 the country on birds and bats indicate small bird kills therefore he does not feel that we do not necessarily
41 need a study done in Champaign County.
42

43 Mr. Kurtz stated that he does believe that an independent engineer's estimate of decommissioning costs is

1 warranted because the decommissioning cost is a key component to putting up a wind farm. He said that he
2 spoke to Horizon's Chief Project Manager and he indicated that they have decided to expand the Twin
3 Groves Wind Farm from McLean County into Champaign County and to increase the number of turbines in
4 Champaign County to 200 or 300 which increases the estimates for the amount of taxes that Champaign
5 County will receive. He said that due to the size of the projects we have to have a decommissioning study.
6

7 Mr. Moser stated that the County Board is going to ask each department in the County to cut 6% in their
8 budget therefore he was not sure where the fees will come from for an independent engineer's estimate.
9

10 Mr. Hall stated that there were fees included specifically for this. He said that the minimum application fee
11 is \$20,000 and the justification for that fee was to pay for such studies.
12

13 Mr. Moser stated that we need the \$20,000 more for the zoning office to start enforcing the junk ordinance
14 and some other things that are not getting done because there is not enough staff to do it. He said that this
15 issue will have to go to the Budget Committee and he and Mr. Jones have sat through the last three meetings
16 being told by Deb Busey what has to be done to keep the County's nose from going under during the next
17 fiscal year. He said that the budget will be a project which every department will be required to help with
18 and hiring a consultant will be a tough sell to the County Board.
19

20 Mr. Langenheim stated that it was the County Board's responsibility to represent the public's interest in this
21 situation and what we will be facing is a wholesale industrialization of the entire rural landscape of this
22 County. He said that constructing structures which are as large as the Statue of Liberty or larger and will be
23 built on the basis on what the promoters are telling us and what non-professionals are telling us. He said
24 that it behooves us to make sure that we, personally and individually as a county, seek independent,
25 professional opinions on all matters pertaining to this development.
26

27 Mr. Moser stated that he can counter Mr. Langenheim's comments by stating that this was an individual
28 decision that every landowner that is either in or outside of the individual wind districts can tell the wind
29 company that they either want or do not want a wind turbine on their land. He said that it was up to the
30 landowner if they do take one of the wind turbines and it was their own individual responsibility as to what
31 they did with their own land and Champaign County does not have one bit of business dictating to each
32 individual owner that is involved in this project as to whether they should or shouldn't. He said that the
33 landowners and the wind companies should take care of themselves because it appears that they have done a
34 good job of it in McLean County.
35

36 Mr. Schroeder asked Mr. Hall if he had any estimates, per tower, of how much money the County will
37 receive and then what kind of cost estimate would be for consultants.
38

39 Mr. Hall stated that there is a minimum \$20,000 application fee for the special use permit and once it is
40 authorized and construction starts it is \$5,000 per tower. He said that Livingston County spent \$3,500,
41 although they did not review the noise to every non-participating dwelling but identified the dwellings that
42 were critical so that if they knew that the noise study was adequate at those locations they felt that it was
43 accurate.

1
2 Mr. Schroeder asked Mr. Hall for clarification if he was talking about \$3,500 per tower for a noise study
3 regarding bird and bat mortality.
4
5 Mr. Hall stated no. He said that Livingston County paid a total of \$3,500 to make sure that the noise study
6 they got was accurate and the total that they paid the consultant for all their reviews was \$10,000. He said
7 that it was not clear if it will be \$3,500 for Champaign County but the total for Livingston County was
8 \$10,000 and our minimum application fee is \$20,000. He said that perhaps he was wrong but the time that
9 the ZBA is going to spend with people complaining about noise versus being able to walk in and say that the
10 consultant has reviewed the noise study and it is accurate will be appreciated and valuable.
11
12 Mr. Schroeder stated that he was not trying to make judgments but only gathering information. He asked if
13 the wind farm in Livingston County was the same scope in size to what is proposed in Champaign County
14 and how long ago was it that they were charged the \$3,500 by the consultant.
15
16 Mr. Hall stated that it has only been a couple of years ago because Livingston County has not had a wind
17 farm that long.
18
19 Mr. Schroeder asked Mr. Hall if this was the company, as described in his opening comments that does all
20 three studies.
21
22 Mr. Hall stated yes.
23
24 Ms. Ammons asked Mr. Hall how it would affect the study if the project increases in the number of towers.
25
26 Mr. Hall stated that the wind towers are limited by the numbers that are approved.
27
28 Ms. Ammons asked Mr. Hall if the consultant would be able to do all of the required studies.
29
30 Mr. Hall stated that we cannot look at studies done elsewhere.
31
32 Ms. Ammons stated that if the fee for the consultant does not exceed the application fee then the studies
33 should certainly be done to protect the public's interest.
34
35 Mr. Langenheim stated that the notion that the individual landowner owns a wedge of the universe from the
36 edge of his property to the center of the earth through his property line does not hold water. He said that the
37 County regulates the private use of private land in many ways and this is a major alteration of our mode of
38 existence in this County and we should exert ourselves to find out the facts about this matter and represent
39 the public's interest. He said that the County may or may not make too much money from this project, we
40 may or may not have too much noise, we may or may not severely alter the climate and we should make
41 ourselves available to any information or studies that can be completed and not just listen to the arguments
42 of those who are enthusiastic about this project for personal or financial reasons. He noted that he was not
43 opposed to wind farms or wind energy but we want to be very careful about what kind of noise we stick our

1 neck in to when we put these things up.

2
3 Ms. Anderson stated that birds and bats vary from place to place and she is not so sure that our area is
4 penetrated with bats and if that is true then the consultant would not have to spend as much time with the
5 study.

6
7 Mr. Weibel stated that this is the first time that this type of project has been introduced to the County
8 therefore we should do it right. He said that we do not know if there is a difference between the bird and bat
9 population in Champaign County than in other counties therefore there is no reason why we should not do a
10 study in our County. He said that there are no major rivers near the Twin Groves Wind Farm therefore their
11 study will be different than a study near the Middle Fork. He said that we should check into the costs of
12 these studies.

13
14 Mr. Hall stated that he can get more information and did not want to focus too much on what the one
15 company indicated although he has not found any others.

16
17 Mr. Weibel stated that we should do the study now rather than in the middle of the project because it could
18 cost us more.

19
20 Mr. Kurtz stated that we represent the vast majority of those who are positive for wind farms. He said that
21 80% to 90% of the farmers are in favor of the wind farms and if a vote was taken we would find that we are
22 representing our residents and constituents by the positive action of the wind farms. He said that we may be
23 discussing residents of the County but we cannot appeal to every single one of our residents and whatever
24 action we take there will always be some that do not agree but when the vast majority do then we are
25 representing our residents in a fair and proper manner.

26
27 Mr. Moser asked Mr. Hall if he could send out an RFP on this matter. He said there was more than one
28 company that does this and if we get two or three bids on it then we will know what kind of money we are
29 talking about. He said that the important part is what it is going to cost and that is what we have done with
30 all the other building projects in the County.

31 Mr. Hall stated that as far as he knows there was only one company that has an office in the State of Illinois
32 that does this and obviously there are multiple companies across the country but travel raises the costs.

33
34 Mr. Moser stated that if an RFP is sent out and two or three responses are received then we would at least
35 know what we are talking about.

36
37 Mr. Hall stated that if it takes an RFP to get the support of the Committee then he will do so.

38
39 Mr. Weibel stated that an RFP is not needed.

40
41 Ms. Busey stated that professional services are not normally done by bid although it could be done. She said
42 that it is possible to do this by a less formal process just by finding out what companies provide the service
43 like the request for information instead of a formal request for proposal. She said that it will be under the

1 threshold for requiring a competitive process under the County's Purchasing Policy. She said that it is a
2 professional service so we typically do not do a bidding process through an RFP.
3

4 Mr. Schroeder stated that approximately two years ago he met with Mr. Hall, Ms. Busey and Ms. Wysocki
5 to discuss potentially increasing staff at Planning and Zoning as we were looking forward to handling wind
6 farms in the county. He said that at the meeting Mr. Hall stated that he may hire someone at the University
7 of Illinois who was obtaining an advanced degree in planning and using that individual for medial planning
8 issues and utilizing Mr. Hall and Mr. Knight for the larger items such as the wind farms. He asked Mr. Hall
9 if that is still the plan.
10

11 Mr. Hall stated that with the new reality facing how limited our permitting is we may be able to just shift
12 duties around in the office with our current staff. He said that we currently only have two planners and we
13 cannot make two planners do the work of three but we might be able to shift some task and have our other
14 staff help with that. He said that it would save us more time if we could get some help on these critical
15 studies because that will cause the public hearing to take less time. He said that this is more important than
16 finding just the bodies to do all of the work. He said that staffing is still an issue but our permitting is much
17 reduced than what it was when we had that discussion and that concern is secondary right now in his mind.
18

19 Mr. Jones stated that the wind farm companies will be conducting studies especially in relation to the bird
20 and bat study therefore he does not see the need in redoing it. He said that he does believe that the noise
21 study is important but reminded the Committee that the fees will come out of the County because the
22 \$20,000 fee for the wind farm will be paid for one way or another. He said that other counties have not been
23 doing this and are accepting the studies which have been conducted by the wind companies. He said that we
24 are at a time when we are wary about spending additional monies. He said that he does not know that we
25 should assume that someone local could do the job as well as a consultant hired by the wind farm who has
26 been doing these studies all over country with their projects.
27

28 Ms. Anderson stated that she does not believe that anyone on the Committee that has concerns are opposed
29 to the wind farm project and it is a small amount of money that is being requested to reassure those in the
30 County that are not sure about the wind farms and that the wind companies are complying with the
31 regulations. She said that these studies would also protect the County as well.
32

33 Mr. Kurtz stated that we should get the actual numbers as to what these studies will cost the County. He
34 asked if the studies would be a package deal or would they be charged individually.
35

36 Mr. Hall stated that we will not have actual numbers until we have an actual wind farm and at that point we
37 need the studies completed.
38

39 Ms. Busey stated that all we would get in terms of professional services is probably the firm telling us what
40 their hourly rate will be and what their reimbursables would be and give an estimate for the time it would
41 take. She said that when it comes down to an actual wind farm application, the firm would get that specific
42 wind farm information and they would use the guidelines that staff negotiated with them.
43

1 Ms. Wysocki said that a motion is needed to give Mr. Hall some direction on what to do.

2
3 **Mr. Moser moved, seconded by Mr. Langenheim to contact the local firm or put out an RFP for an**
4 **estimate on each technical review individually and collectively as a group and report those costs to**
5 **the Committee for review.**

6
7 Mr. Moser stated that Mr. Hall should work with Ms. Busey because she has had a lot of experience in that
8 area.

9
10 **The motion carried by voice vote.**

11
12 **12. Monthly Reports (October-December 2008 and January-May 2009)**

13
14 Mr. Hall distributed the October, November and December 2008 Monthly Reports and unfortunately one of
15 the pages in the December report did not get reproduced therefore it will be redistributed next month. He
16 said that he did not get a year end report for the Committee’s review to compare how the year went. He
17 said that in terms of zoning case load it is not that far down for 2008 but it has gone down a great amount
18 since the end of that fiscal year because our zoning case log is very much reduced. He said that permitting
19 continues to be much reduced and we have been more successful in the past year in doing more of the
20 compliance inspections that we have not been doing for a long time and we have to do more of those in the
21 coming year because we still have a backlog. He said although it does not appear number wise we are doing
22 more on enforcement but it takes a lot of work to make it be visible. He said that in the past few months we
23 have sent two or three cases to the State’s Attorney and there is nothing more rigorous than getting a case
24 ready for the State’s Attorney.

25
26 **Ms. Ammons moved, seconded by Mr. Schroeder to accept and place the October and November 2008**
27 **Monthly Reports on file. The motion carried by voice vote.**

28
29 Mr. Moser asked Mr. Hall if there is anything in the law that is going to allow staff to deal with the same
30 people (junkers) who time after time clean up one mess and the next day make another.

31
32 Mr. Hall stated the only thing we could do is add a penalty but Mr. Moser knows how much those people
33 have to spend for penalties. He said we could add a penalty but they probably won’t be able to pay it.

34
35 Mr. Langenheim stated that we could perhaps stiffen up the Ordinance so that those folks will not be repeat
36 offenders.

37
38 Mr. Hall stated that this is a behavior aspect with these people and you can’t change someone’s behavior and
39 all you can do is be there to clean up when the behavior gets bad enough. He said that another thing that we
40 have in this county is certain people who spend an enormous amount of time on the telephone complaining
41 about things to staff that are not even under our jurisdiction yet staff has to spend hours every week listening
42 to them.

1 **13. Other Business**

2
3 Mr. Kurtz stated that AmerenIP and American Water have approached the County and the City of Urbana
4 and City of Champaign indicating that they intend to raise their rates tremendously on the residents of the
5 Champaign County and he is very opposed to this horrendous increase on water and electric services. He
6 said that he believes that this matter should be placed on the agenda to discuss and have a consensus of the
7 County Board in stating opposition to these proposed increases.

8
9 Mr. Weibel stated that a resolution opposing the increase in water rates by American Water has been passed
10 although nothing has been done for AmerenIP.

11
12 **14. Determination of items to be placed on the County Board Consent Agenda**

13
14 None

15
16 **15. Adjournment**

17
18 **Mr. Kurtz moved, seconded by Ms. Anderson to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried by voice**
19 **vote.**

20
21 The meeting adjourned at 8:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary to the Environment and Land Use Committee