

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Champaign County Environment & Land Use Committee	DATE:	October 27, 2009
Champaign County Brookens Administrative Center Urbana, IL 61802	TIME:	7:00 p.m.
	PLACE:	John Dimit Meeting Room Brookens Administrative Center 1776 E. Washington Street Urbana, IL 61802

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

OTHER COUNTY BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Pius Weibel

MEMBERS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: John Hall, Lori Busboom, Susan Monte, Susan Chavarria, Andrew Levy

OTHERS PRESENT: Eric Thorsland, Hal Barnhart, Gerald Henry, Steve Burdin, Mike Tague, Ben McCall, Birgit McCall

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

II Roll Call

The roll was called and a quorum declared present.

III. Approval of Agenda/Addendum

Mr. Kurtz moved, seconded by Mr. Langenheim to approve the agenda as presented.

Ms. Wysocki asked that Item #7 be dropped from this agenda. She noted that Mr. Hall has informed her that this item will be discussed at the October 29th meeting of the Champaign County Zoning Board of Appeals.

The motion carried by voice vote.

1 **IV. Public Participation**

2
3 Ms. Wysocki thanked the Committee members for scheduling and attending the meeting this to work
4 through the Land Resource Management Plan. She asked whether the Committee members would be
5 willing to adjust the regular November meeting date should the weather be decent for farming. Mr.
6 Moser commented that the December meeting date may have to be adjusted as well depending upon the
7 weather.

8
9 Ms. Wysocki noted that the weather forecasts will be studied and meetings may be rescheduled to ensure
10 that the maximum number of Committee members can attend to allow progress on the LRMP and other
11 matters before the Committee.

12
13 Mr. Eric Thorsland stated that he was in support of the LRMP. He said that this has been a very long
14 process. He said that the mantra had been heard through the development of Big.Small.All and the
15 Comprehensive Zoning Rewrite that the County, municipalities and villages have to either grow or die.
16 He said that everyone grew and now they are dying. He said that he was not sure what went wrong,
17 except that there was not a good plan in place. He said that that way has been tried and now it is time to
18 put some cohesive plan in place. Mr. Thorsland noted that the LRMP is a plan that has been worked on
19 very hard and for a very long time. He said that the LRMP is not perfect, nor will it ever be perfect,
20 however, it is a framework to go by. He urged the Committee to pass the LRMP and continue to work to
21 get it implemented county-wide.

22
23 **V. Zoning Case 520-AM-05. Gene and Carolyn Bateman. Request to amend the Zoning Map**
24 **to allow for the development of 3 single family residential lots in the AG-1, Agriculture**
25 **Zoning District by adding the Rural Residential Overlay (RRO) Zoning District. Location:**
26 **Approximately 12.04 acres of an existing 62.90 acre parcel in the E 1/2 of the NW 1/4 of**
27 **Section 29 of Newcomb Township that is commonly known as the farm field that borders**
28 **the south side of CR 2600N and the west side of CR 200N**

29
30 **Mr. Schroeder moved, seconded by Mr. Moser to recommend approval of Zoning Case 520-AM-**
31 **05.**

32
33 Mr. Kurtz asked whether the subject property consisting of twelve acres are being currently farmed. Mr.
34 Hall stated that the land is currently being farmed.

35
36 Mr. Kurtz stated that he visited the Department of Planning & Zoning earlier in the day and discovered
37 that the soils are not classified as best prime farmland. He said that under the LRMP guidelines,
38 agriculture land is protected. He said that if these types of requests are continually approved, then the
39 farmland will continue to be cut into which goes against what the LRMP stands for. Mr. Kurtz stated
40 that he could not support this request at this point.

1 Mr. Moser stated that he could not support this request either. He noted that previously there have been
2 three lots sold already. He said that if this request is approved, then the end result will be fifty acres with
3 six houses and six mailboxes close to the Manlove Gas Field. He said that this request reminds him of a
4 few other subdivisions the County has approved that have had problems since they were approved. Mr.
5 Moser said that this development may be done correctly, however, with the proposed layout, it would be
6 more difficult for the land to be farmed. He noted that the number of mailboxes are also a concern when
7 farm equipment is moved from one field to another.

8
9 Mr. Schroeder said that he would vote for approval because the request does meet all of the Rural
10 Residential Overlay requirements. He noted that he concurred with Mr. Moser's statement, however, the
11 applicant has waited for a decision while an amendment to the *Zoning Ordinance* was adopted with
12 respect to the gas pipeline. He said that the request meets the Rural Residential Overlay and the lots
13 have been laid out to follow the County guidelines.

14
15 Mr. Schroeder noted that the LRMP has not been adopted and therefore, this request should not be
16 denied based on the LRMP requirements.

17
18 Mr. Doenitz agreed with Mr. Schroeder. He said that while he may not like or agree with the request,
19 the applicant has met all of the requirements in place today so he would vote for it based on that.

20
21 Mr. Langenheim said that he would vote against the request based on its proximity to the Manlove Gas
22 Storage installation and the possibility of the location of windmills close to and in the Manlove Gas
23 Storage fields.

24
25 Ms. Anderson asked whether a reason would have to be stated for voting against this request. Mr. Hall
26 said that he was not aware of any requirement for justifying a decision in a rezoning request.

27
28 Mr. Hall said that with respect to the gas pipeline, the County has addressed those concerns during the
29 text amendment case. He said that this RRO contains other items in addition to the gas pipeline
30 location. He noted that Mr. Langenheim stated that he could not vote for this item due to the location of
31 the gas pipeline. Mr. Hall said that perhaps Mr. Langenheim was also in disagreement with the County's
32 amendment to the Zoning Ordinance with respect to pipeline separation requirements.

33
34 Mr. Langenheim noted that he was being consistent by not voting for this request from the very
35 beginning.

36
37 Mr. Kurtz said that he was trying to think more of the future when trying to make his point. He said that
38 a decision can be made to approve or disapprove of this request, however, that decision should be
39 justified. He noted that the future is changing and that's why he suggested using the LRMP
40 requirements for voting no.

1 The vote was:

2				
3	Anderson - no	Doenitz - yes	Ammons - yes	Jones - yes
4	Langenheim - no	Kurtz - no	Moser - no	Schroeder - yes
5	Wysocki - yes			

6
7 The motion carried.

8
9 VI. A. ELUC Approval of Draft Goals, Objectives and Policies (Stage 2) and the Future
10 Land Use Map (Stage 3)for the Land Resource Management Plan
11

12 Ms. Ammons moved, seconded by Mr. Kurtz to recommend approval of the Draft Goals,
13 Objectives and Policies and the Future Land Use Map for the Land Resource Management Plan.
14

15 Mr. Kurtz stated that he would like to revisit 4.1.5, which is the one plus one per forty acres. He said that
16 when thinking about the goals of the LRMP the initial goal is to protect best prime farmland. He said
17 that when looking towards the future, any opportunity to sustain agricultural land should be taken. He
18 said that the agricultural practices in Champaign County affect not only the local community but the
19 national community as well. He said that it is important to protect Champaign County's most important
20 aspect which is farming.
21

22 Mr. Kurtz moved to amend Item 4.1.5 to one lot per forty acres from one lot plus one lot per forty
23 acres. Ms. Anderson seconded the motion.
24

25 Ms. Anderson agreed with Mr. Kurtz. She said that the County Board has an obligation to protect the
26 farmland in Champaign County.
27

28 Mr. Moser said that he moved to adopt the one plus one per forty acres because the one lot per forty
29 acres has been a fly in the ointment with the Republican caucus. He said that the one lot per forty acre
30 proposal has gone through two Zoning Ordinance rewrites and failed due to a lack of enough votes. He
31 said that he did not know whether the one plus one per forty acres is more palatable to the public.
32

33 Mr. Moser said that the one lot per forty acres is not the problem with urban development in the rural
34 districts. He said that the areas that are the most sought after are properties along a river where there are
35 trees. He said that his constituents would not support this provision because they do not want to give up
36 their rights to sell off a lot if needed or desired. He said that he did not believe that the one per forty acre
37 provision is the problem.
38

39 Mr. Moser said that there are rural subdivisions which cause more problems than one home. He said
40 that when landowners get over their heads financially, they want that right to be able to sell their land.
41 He noted that the adoption of the Rural Residential Overlay in 1999 was the first regulation on rural
42 development that was palatable to the County Board.

1 Mr. Moser said that he did not want to spend the money, nor waste anyone's time, to rewrite the Zoning
2 Ordinance with provisions in it that will not pass. He said that he would not sell any of his land for a
3 home site unless it is to one of his children. He noted that properties within one and one-half miles of a
4 municipality with subdivision jurisdiction are beyond the control of the County. He said that there isn't
5 that big of a problem beyond the mile and one-half.

6
7 Mr. Moser said that he would not support the change back to one lot per forty acres. He said that the one
8 plus one per forty is an alternative that might work to get something done with the Zoning Ordinance in
9 the future.

10
11 Ms. Anderson asked whether a simple majority vote will be needed to pass the LRMP. Mr. Moser said
12 that the LRMP can be passed with a simple majority. He said that he did not know how much money
13 has been spent on the previous Zoning Ordinance rewrites. He said that a decent product has been
14 presented to the County Board who will not approve it. He said that it has been a nightmare trying to get
15 21 people to vote for something.

16
17 Mr. Kurtz asked whether the County Board was obligated to have 21 vote to pass the LRMP. Ms.
18 Wysocki clarified Mr. Moser's position. She said that Mr. Moser was not looking at a simple majority
19 to pass the LRMP. She said that once the LRMP is approved, the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance
20 must be amended and the Zoning Ordinance is subject to protest and that is where the super majority
21 vote comes into play.

22
23 Mr. Doenitz agreed with Mr. Moser's statement regarding the municipalities. He said that the
24 municipalities do not care whether the soils are the best or the worse, they are going to develop it when
25 the time is right to expand to that area. He said that for all intents and purposes, development outside of
26 the mile and one-half of the municipalities has stopped. He noted that the RRO that was recommended
27 for approval this evening is the first one in the last two or three years. He said that the LRMP is going to
28 have very little impact within the County because development has been curtailed under the RRO
29 provisions. He commented that the municipalities are still the problem.

30
31 Mr. Kurtz stated that he understood that Mr. Moser has a better understanding of what goes on inside the
32 Republican caucus, however, this provision needs to have a discussion at the full County Board. He said
33 that maybe there are some changed minds. Mr. Kurtz commented that he believed the next major war is
34 going to be over water and food and Champaign County needs to protect its farmland.

35
36 Mr. Kurtz noted that he rode along with a local farmer harvesting his crop this past week. He said that
37 the farmer's final words to him at the end of the day was to please protect the farmland. Mr. Kurtz said
38 that he would like to pass this provision onto the full Board and discuss it with all of the members.

39
40 Mr. Langenheim said that he was going to vote with Mr. Kurtz on this provision because it represents a
41 higher level of compliance with what the Committee has stated as the objectives. He said that the
42 practical politics of it are really beside the point. He said that none of these objectives are going to get

1 into the Zoning Ordinance until and unless it survives a round of objections and a super majority vote.
2 He said that making small adjustments in an attempt to get this past that hurdle is feckless.
3

4 **The vote was:**

5				
6	Anderson - yes	Doenitz - no	Ammons - yes	Jones - no
7	Langenheim - yes	Kurtz - yes	Moser - no	Schroeder - no
8	Wysocki - yes			
9				

10 **The motion carried.**

11
12 Ms. Monte reminded the Committee that Item 2B has three proposals with regard to Page 22. She noted
13 that two of the proposals are requested by the Farm Bureau and one of them is an adjustment requested
14 by staff. Ms. Wysocki noted that this is revised Policy 5.1.9 which reads ‘The County will encourage
15 any new discretionary development that is located within municipal extraterritorial jurisdiction areas and
16 subject to an annexation agreement but which is expected to remain in the unincorporated area to
17 undergo a coordinated municipal and county review process with the municipality considering any
18 discretionary development approval from the County that would otherwise be necessary without the
19 annexation agreement.
20

21 **Mr. Moser moved, seconded by Mr. Kurtz to recommend approval of revised Policy 5.1.9.**

22
23 Ms. Ammons asked for more detail regarding this change. Ms. Monte said that Page 10 of the first
24 memo has the Urban Land Use Goals, Objectives and Policies. She said the language of Policy 5.1.9
25 that was recommended by the Steering Committee is located there. She said that after discussion with
26 some of the municipal planners it was brought up that the language should be modified to include
27 coordinating the process.
28

29 Ms. Ammons asked with whom would the coordination be taking place. Ms. Monte said that the Policy
30 recalls for two reviews of a discretionary development. Ms. Monte said that if a property is outside of
31 city limits and is subject to annexation, the review would give the residents the opportunity to voice their
32 opinions on the change of zoning prior to annexation.
33

34 Mr. Doenitz said that he was confused about having to include the municipalities in the review process.
35 Ms. Monte said that the County would be encouraging the municipalities to consider a County review.
36 She said the municipalities do not have to include the County review. She said that the County would
37 encourage the municipalities to consider the outcome of a discretionary review with the County.
38

39 Mr. Doenitz said that this appears to be a ‘feel good’ thing and what the County has to say is not going
40 to make one bit of difference to a municipality.
41
42

1 Ms. Monte said that this item was well discussed and received extensive consideration at the Steering
2 Committee. She noted that Mr. Hall proposed the policy and felt that it is an improvement over the
3 present situation and it may give a voice to the County residents.
4

5 Ms. Anderson said that this item will encourage the County residents to become more vocal with what is
6 going on in their neighborhoods.
7

8 Mr. Schroeder noted that the City of Urbana has been a pretty good partner for encouraging review of
9 properties in the mile and one-half. He noted that the City of Champaign has been the problem. He said
10 that he believed the County should be more suggestive in what goes on in the mile and one-half and
11 perhaps this item will encourage all parties to be active in the review process.
12

13 Ms. Wysocki asked whether this provision would have included the proposed Casey's General Store
14 Map Amendment that occurred earlier this year. Mr. Hall said that proposal was a prime example of
15 how this policy should work.
16

17 **The vote was:**

18	Anderson - yes	Doenitz - yes	Ammons - yes	Jones - yes
19	Langenheim - yes	Kurtz - yes	Moser - yes	Schroeder - yes
20	Wysocki - yes			
21				
22				

23 **The motion carried.**

24
25 Ms. Monte stated that in September 2009, the Champaign County Farm Bureau sent a letter regarding
26 Policy 7.2.3. She said that since the October meeting she has spoken with Jeff Blue, the County
27 Engineer and he suggested deleting the 'as necessary' clause and inserting the text 'considering fiscal
28 constraints.' Ms. Monte said that the proposed policy would read 'The County will encourage the
29 maintenance and improvement of the existing county road system considering fiscal constraints in order
30 to promote agricultural production and marketing.' She said that staff would recommend this language
31 as it is consistent with other policies under the Transportation Objectives in 7.2.
32

33 **Mr. Doenitz moved, seconded by Mr. Moser to recommend approval the new Policy 7.2.3 as**
34 **amended and then renumber the subsequent Policies.**
35

36 Ms. Ammons said that she was concerned that the language proposed would not be very restrictive if in
37 the future the repairs would be made based on fiscal constraints. She said that someone may feel that
38 this is a fiscally constrained time even though it may not be and there may be the need to repair roads as
39 necessary. Mr. Doenitz noted that in the rural areas, there are fiscal constraints every day. He noted that
40 most of the townships can't repair what they currently have, let alone build new roads.
41
42

1 Ms. Wysocki noted that Mr. Blue does operate with a priority schedule of what needs to be repaired or
2 replaced and what can function for a few more years.

3
4 Ms. Ammons said that the reason she was suggesting to keep the ‘as necessary’ wording is because the
5 County has passed the amendment with respect to the wind farms and one of the Committee members
6 proposed the funds to go into environmental improvements. She said that perhaps there will be revenue
7 to allow this to happen if it is made a priority.

8
9 **The vote was:**

10	Anderson - yes	Doenitz - yes	Ammons - yes	Jones - yes
11	Langenheim - yes	Kurtz - yes	Moser - yes	Schroeder - yes
12	Wysocki - yes			

13
14
15 **The motion carried.**

16
17 Ms. Monte noted that the last proposed Policy is an additional policy under Natural Resource Policies,
18 Objective 8.4. She said that the Farm Bureau has requested the policy to read ‘The County recognizes
19 the importance of the drainage districts in the operation and maintenance of drainage.’

20
21 **Mr. Doenitz moved, seconded by Mr. Moser to recommend approval of amended Objective 8.4**
22 **with respect to drainage.**

23
24 Mr. Moser said that he did not know if the general public was aware of just how many miles of drainage
25 ditches are in districts and how important they are in making the tile systems work. Mr. Moser said that
26 when the ditches and tiles do not work, the land becomes a mosquito trap instead of the most productive
27 farmland in the world. He noted that he was glad that this provision was included and will support this
28 addition.

29
30 Mr. Kurtz agreed that this is an important addition to the LRMP especially after attending a seminar with
31 respect to drainage where he was told how drainage tiles can be rerouted to preserve nutrients that had
32 previously washed away.

33
34 Mr. Doenitz said that the bottom line is that the prime farmland that is proposed to be protected isn’t
35 worth anything without proper drainage.

36
37 Mr. Weibel said that he believed this was another ‘feel good’ proposal because the drainage districts in
38 the County are our own government entity. He said that he was aware that this is an important factor,
39 however, the County already recognizes the need for drainage with the appointment of Drainage District
40 Commissioners.

41
42 Mr. Doenitz said that if you want to get technical, all of the provisions are ‘feel good’ provisions.

1 Ms. Anderson said that the 'feel good' statements do help when applying for grant money for different
2 projects.

3
4 **The vote was:**

5	Anderson - yes	Doenitz - yes	Ammons - yes	Jones - yes
6	Langenheim - absent	Kurtz - yes	Moser - yes	Schroeder - yes
7	Wysocki - yes			

8
9
10 **The motion carried.**

11
12 Mr. Kurtz asked how Policy 4.1.1 would affect any proposed wind farms with respect to best prime
13 farmland. Mr. Kurtz said that it was his understanding that all of the wind farm projects are slated to
14 occur on non best prime farmland. Mr. Hall stated that all of the projects are slated for best prime
15 farmland. Mr. Hall stated that this Policy would not have any direct effect on wind farms.

16
17 Mr. Langenheim commented that this sounds good but it is all expressed in rather relative terms.

18
19 **Mr. Kurtz moved, seconded by Mr. Langenheim to recommend approval of the Draft Goals,**
20 **Objectives and Policies, as drafted and amended, of the Land Resource Management Plan.**

21
22 Mr. Schroeder stated that he would support this motion, however, he said that he may not support it at
23 the County Board.

24
25 **The vote was:**

26	Anderson - yes	Doenitz - yes	Ammons - yes	Jones - yes
27	Langenheim - yes	Kurtz - yes	Moser - yes	Schroeder - yes
28	Wysocki - yes			

29
30
31 **The motion carried.**

32
33 **Ms. Ammons moved, seconded by Mr. Schroeder to recommend approval of the Future Land Use**
34 **Map for the Land Resource Management Plan.**

35
36 Mr. Kurtz asked whether the discussion was for the 2030 Future Land Use Map. Mr. Hall said that that
37 was correct.

38
39 Mr. Kurtz asked for clarification on the legend of the map. He asked whether the solid pink lines were
40 the current mile and one-half extraterritorial jurisdiction and the dashed pink lines were for the projected

1 ETJ in 2030. Mr. Hall said that the dashed line is an area that is based on the area that is called the
2 Contiguous Urban Growth Area which is the area that can be served by sewers. He said that if all of that
3 develops then the dashed line represents the new mile and one-half boundary.
4

5 Mr. Kurtz asked whether it was possible for development that happens outside the solid pink line, and
6 the municipalities annex to that point, would the mile and one-half then be extended to that point. Mr.
7 Hall noted that a property cannot be annexed unless it is contiguous to a municipality.
8

9 Mr. Schroeder said that not only do St. Joseph's and Urbana's extraterritorial jurisdictions overlap, but
10 Savoy's and Tolono's overlap as do Champaign's and Mahomet's. He said that every time a property is
11 annexed, then the mile and one-half extends out. He noted that no one in the mile and one-half is
12 represented at the municipalities, however, the municipalities have three representatives on the County
13 Board. He noted that the smaller towns do not have the advantages that the larger municipalities
14 because they don't have the funding that the larger municipalities do. He said that once the larger
15 municipalities reach out with potable water and sanitary, then they just keep reaching farther and farther
16 out.
17

18 Mr. Kurtz asked what would happen if the map is not approved. Mr. Hall said that he hoped that there
19 was no bias against the map because the State Legislature has set up the annexation and extraterritorial
20 jurisdiction provisions.
21

22 Mr. Hall said that the map is meant to portray the results of the policies that have just been approved. He
23 said that if the Committee does not like the map, then the policies need to be changed.
24

25 Ms. Monte said that the LRMP Act requires a map as part of the plan.
26

27 Mr. Doenitz asked whether the map was correct with respect to Thomasboro or Gifford not having a
28 mile and one-half extraterritorial jurisdiction. Ms. Monte said that that was correct. Mr. Hall said that
29 they do have protest rights with respect to map amendments, but neither village has adopted a
30 comprehensive plan.
31

32 Mr. Moser noted that he was going to vote no because the dotted line goes through the middle of his
33 house.
34

35 Mr. Weibel noted that there was an error in the map to the west of Camp Creek where there are two
36 dotted lines showing the extent of Mahomet's extraterritorial jurisdiction.
37

38 Ms. Monte noted that this is a two-step map. She said that there is a Land Use Management Area Map
39 that is the second part which reflects the graphic extent of certain policies in the Goals, Objectives and
40 Policies document.
41

42 Mr. Langenheim asked whether it was correct that the dotted line is a prediction and not in existence.

1 Ms. Wysocki stated that was correct.

2
3 Ms. Anderson noted that the map is interesting and people who have not seen it before may find it
4 interesting. She noted that there are numerous people who believe that development should occur in
5 areas that are already developed instead of contributing to urban sprawl. She said that she has never
6 figured out why people would want to live in areas where there are no infrastructure or trees.

7
8 **The vote was:**

9				
10	Anderson - yes	Doenitz - yes	Ammons - yes	Jones - yes
11	Langenheim - yes	Kurtz - yes	Moser - no	Schroeder - yes
12	Wysocki - yes			

13
14 **The motion carried.**

15
16 **B. Review of Proposed Implementation Strategy (Stage 4) of the Land Resource**
17 **Management Plan**

18
19 Ms. Monte noted that a study session is planned prior to the regular Environment and Land Use
20 Committee meeting in November.

21
22 Ms. Monte said that the Implementation Strategy identifies tasks that are needed to achieve the Goals,
23 Objectives and Policies. She said that it identifies the responsible parties for completing those tasks, the
24 potential resources for completing those tasks, potential funding sources for completing those tasks and a
25 proposed time line for completion of those tasks.

26
27 Ms. Monte pointed out that page 7 has a time line of some of the larger scale implementation tasks. She
28 said that staff has organized the action items by time frame. She noted that 25% of the Implementation
29 Action Items are already on-going. She said that some of those items are administering relevant
30 ordinances that are already consistent with the Goals, Objectives and Policies, the County's support to
31 the GIS Consortium and to the Regional Planning Commission through membership fees, support of the
32 Technical Planning Service Contract with the Regional Planning Commission, and to fund and support
33 the GIS Consortium. Ms. Monte noted that another example of the ongoing implementation action is the
34 Champaign County Department of Planning and Zoning.

35
36 Ms. Monte said that there are fifty-eight actions in the Immediate to Ongoing category. They comprise
37 30% of the proposed Implementation Actions. She said that some examples would be to review all of
38 the Zoning Map amendments to ensure that they conform to the relevant Goal, Objective or Policy and
39 monitoring and pursuing potential funding sources to achieve the provisions of the Goals, Objectives and
40 Policies, and to provide recommendations to ELUC with respect to the minor map changes that might be
41 necessary each year as part of an annually prepared report to the County Board with regard to new trends
42 and new developments.

1 Ms. Monte noted the next time frame would be Near Term. She said that these actions would be
2 implemented within one to three years of the adoption of the LRMP. She noted that there are
3 approximately sixty-six action items in this category which is the bulk of the action items. She said that
4 some examples of these action items are to amend the *Champaign County Zoning Ordinance* or other
5 County ordinances to include provisions of the Goals, Objectives and Policies. She said that staff
6 expects this would take approximately a year to gear up to bring those amendments forward.
7

8 Ms. Monte said that the next time frame is entitled Mid Term. She noted that these are actions to be
9 implemented within three to six years of adoption of the LRMP. She said that there are only eleven
10 action items in this time frame because they are large scale action items so the numbers are not
11 deceiving, as are the Long Term Action Items that are proposed to be implemented within six to ten
12 years of adoption of the LRMP.
13

14 Ms. Monte said that Page 7 shows the proposed the long term strategy and the proposal on how to
15 achieve all of the action items. She said that these items can be adjusted as the Committee sees fit and as
16 funding is available.
17

18 Mr. Kurtz asked whether it was correct that some of these Action Items are being implemented. Ms.
19 Monte noted that approximately 25% of them are currently being implemented.
20

21 Mr. Kurtz asked what would happen if the County Board decides something needs to be removed. Ms.
22 Monte said that this is a strategy that was set out to identify one action per policy. She said that it was
23 tied directly to the Goals, Objectives and Policies which several of them are already taking place.
24

25 Ms. Wysocki asked if this stage will be the topic of discussion at the November study session. Ms.
26 Monte said that that was correct. She said that staff was seeking suggestions, corrections and concerns at
27 this stage.
28

29 Mr. Schroeder asked whether the Regional Planning Commission or the Planning and Zoning
30 Department would be looking at developing the legislation that the County Board would be reviewing.
31 Ms. Monte said that these are County actions, not the Regional Planning Commission. She noted the
32 County has a planning contract with the Regional Planning Commission.
33

34 Mr. Schroeder said he was aware of the contract, however, he wondered if the Planning and Zoning
35 Department staff would be working on these items. Mr. Hall said that most of the amendments Ms.
36 Monte was discussing would be done by the Regional Planning Commission staff with oversight review
37 done by the Planning and Zoning Department. He said that most of the new work items have to be done
38 under the County Planner Contract with the Regional Planning Commission.
39

40 Mr. Schroeder asked whether these Action Items would require new funding outlays from the County.
41 Mr. Hall stated that the Regional Planning Commission staff was not necessarily saying that every item
42 in every policy will be done within ten years. He said that it is easy to get confused by the time lines, but

1 staff is not saying that all of these items can be done within ten years given the current level of resources.
2 He said that if it is the County's goal to have everything implemented within the ten year time frame,
3 more money will have to be spent on planning.
4

5 Ms. Wysocki noted that some of the items may shift in priority due to receipt of grants or additional staff
6 persons being added if funding should become available.
7

8 Mr. Moser commented that he hoped that any ordinances passed are ones that can be enforced.
9

10 Mr. Kurtz noted that the Regional Planning Commission seems to be flush with money. He said that he
11 would like to have a chance to review these proposals before any action is taken.
12

13 Ms. Wysocki noted that the public hearings will not happen until the ELUC recommends approval of the
14 document to the County Board.
15

16 Mr. Doenitz said that this is a large amount of material to review in a short amount of time. Mr. Kurtz
17 asked whether this document has to be approved the same evening as the study session or could it be
18 continued. Ms. Chavarria stated that staff was not seeking approval of Stage 4 at this meeting, however,
19 staff was hoping to have Stage 4 signed off on at the November meeting. She noted the time frame
20 seems short but staff was hoping to avoid problems that might arise with the planting season.
21

22 Ms. Wysocki stated that given the harvesting schedule, she would consult with staff and Committee
23 members in setting up the November ELUC meeting.
24

25 **VII. Hiring Professional Consultants for Review of Certain Technical Studies for Wind Farm**
26 **County Board Special Use Permits**
27

28 Dropped from Agenda.
29

30 **VIII. Other Business**
31

32 There was none.
33

34 **IX. Designation of Items to be Placed on County Board Consent Agenda**
35

36 There was none.
37
38

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

X. Adjournment

Mr. Kurtz moved, seconded by Ms. Ammons to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried by voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary to the Environment and Land Use Committee
eluc\minutes\10-27-09.min