

1  
2  
3  
4 **MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING**

---

6 **Champaign County Environment**                    **DATE:**            **January 16, 2007**  
7 **& Land Use Committee**                            **TIME:**            **7:00 p.m.**  
8 **Champaign County Brookens**                   **PLACE:**           **Lyle Shields Meeting Room**  
9 **Administrative Center**                            **Brookens Administrative Center**  
10 **Urbana, IL 61802**                                   **1776 E. Washington Street**  
11    **Urbana, IL 61802**

---

15 **MEMBERS PRESENT:**    Jan Anderson, Chris Doenitz, Matthew Gladney, Brad Jones, Ralph  
16    Langenheim, Steve Moser, Carrie Melin, Jon Schroeder (VC), Barbara  
17    Wysocki (C)

19 **OTHER COUNTY**                                    C. Pius Wiebel, County Board Chairman

20 **BOARD MEMBERS**  
21 **PRESENT:**

24 **MEMBERS ABSENT:**                            None

26 **STAFF PRESENT:**                            John Hall, Jamie Hitt, Leroy Holliday, J.R. Knight, Susan Monte (Regional  
27    Planning Commission), Frank DiNovo (Regional Planning Commission),  
28    Susan McGrath (Assistant State's Attorney), Christina Papavasiliou  
29    (Assistant State's Attorney), Brent Rose (Regional Planning Commission)

31 **OTHERS PRESENT:**                            Teri Legner, Jason Barickman, Hal Barnhart, Louis Wozniak, Michael  
32    Tague, Reg Ankrom

---

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

38 The meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M. The roll was called and a quorum declared present.

40 Ms. Wysocki welcomed all members to the new session of the Environment and Land Use Committee. She  
41 said that the Committee has three new members, two of which are new to the County Board, and welcomed  
42 them to this experience in land use. She thanked the veteran members of ELUC for continuing to serve on  
43 the Committee with their wisdom and expertise. She said that she hopes that the newcomers can learn from  
44 the veterans and the veterans from the newcomers. She encouraged the Committee members to use their  
45 microphones and requested that they speak directly and clearly so that the tape can pick up their comments  
46 and the audience can hear the Committee's comments.

48 **2.        Approval of Agenda**

1 Ms. Anderson moved, seconded by Mr. Langenheim to approve the agenda as submitted. The motion  
2 carried by voice vote.

3  
4 **3. Approval of Minutes (December 19, 2006)**

5  
6 Mr. Schroeder moved, seconded by Mr. Jones to approve the December 19, 2006, minutes as  
7 submitted. The motion carried by voice vote.

8  
9 **4. Public Participation**

10  
11 Mr. Jason Barickman, who resides at 1401 S. State St, Champaign stated that he is present at tonight's  
12 meeting on behalf of Ivanhoe Estates, LLC as their agent. He said that Ivanhoe Estates, LLC has requested  
13 an amendment to the zoning map which would reclassify the mobile home park owned by Ivanhoe Estates,  
14 LLC from the R-2, Single Family Residence Zoning District to the R-5, Manufactured Home Park Zoning  
15 District. He said that the request is only for the portion that was involved in a court case which decided that  
16 the property should be designated R-5, Manufactured Home Park when the owners requested such but that  
17 request never occurred. He said that the property has changed owners several times and now the current  
18 owner is trying to get the property in conformance with the Zoning Ordinance.

19  
20 Mr. Michael Tague, Attorney for the Mr. Bateman (Case 520-AM-05), stated that he would be happy to  
21 answer any questions that the Committee may have regarding Case 520-AM-05.

22  
23 **5. Correspondence**  
24 **A. Mahomet Aquifer Consortium letter dated January 5, 2007, regarding the Committee on**  
25 **Regional Water Supply Planning for East Central Illinois.**

26  
27 Ms. Wysocki stated that this letter is for the Committee's information only. She said that ELUC is  
28 represented on the Mahomet Aquifer Consortium by Mr. Langenheim.

29  
30 Mr. Langenheim stated that the Committee on Regional Water Supply Planning for East Central Illinois is  
31 established under the terms of grant by the State to study the aquifer located in the Chicago area and the  
32 Mahomet aquifer. He said that this will be a consulting committee which will consist of 12 members and  
33 they have a long list of the type of people that they would like to serve on the Committee. He said that if  
34 any of the members are interested in the aquifer and would like to have influence on the three year study he  
35 suggested that they complete the attached application.

36  
37 Mr. Wiebel stated that he will be attending the February 16, 2007 organizational meeting.

38  
39 Ms. Wysocki thanked Mr. Langenheim for being so faithful about attending the Consortium meetings.

40  
41 Mr. Langenheim stated that he decided that the County should be represented and he requested that Ms.  
42 Avery (previous County Board Chair) appoint him to the Consortium.

43

1 Mr. Wiebel asked Mr. Langenheim if he knew the time of the meeting.

2  
3 Mr. Barry Suits, Illinois American Water Corporation stated that the agenda has not been published but he  
4 believes that it will be an all day meeting with registration beginning around 8:30 a.m. He said that the  
5 agenda for the February 16, 2007, meeting will be published on the Mahomet Aquifer Consortium website  
6 and on the State Geological Survey website.

7  
8 Mr. Langenheim distributed a copy of an article to the Committee for review which is a summary of the  
9 problems of large scale ground water development but it also deals with surface water development. He said  
10 that essentially this is a policy which must be considered in developing large scale water supplies in areas of  
11 limited supply. He said that he believes that this would be interesting reading for the entire County Board.

12  
13 Mr. Wiebel stated that the Department of Urban and Regional Planning at the University of Illinois is  
14 planning an annual planning institute. He said that if any members of the Committee are interested in  
15 attending the institute they should let him know and he will try to get the funds to pay for costs of  
16 attendance.

17  
18 Ms. Wysocki stated that Mr. Hall distributed the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, *Notice of*  
19 *Comment Period and Public Hearing Concerning the Proposed Issuance of a Construction Permit to The*  
20 *Andersons Marathon Ethanol LLC in Champaign*, to the Committee for review. She said that the hearing  
21 will be held January 27, 2007, at 6:00 p.m. at Parkland College in Room D244. She said that additional  
22 input will be taken at the hearing and written comments will be accepted if they are postmarked by  
23 midnight, March 29, 2007.

24  
25 **6. County Board Chair’s Report**

26  
27 None

28  
29 **7. Joint Champaign County – City of Champaign Enterprise Zone: Boundary Amendment:**  
30 **Illini Ethanol, LLC Project in Royal.**

31  
32 **Mr. Langenheim moved, seconded by Mr. Gladney to recommend sponsorship of the Joint**  
33 **Champaign County – City of Champaign Enterprise Zone: Boundary Amendment: Illini Ethanol,**  
34 **LLC Project in Royal.**

35  
36 Mr. Hall stated that this project requires a sponsor. He said that the Enterprise Zone is unique in that it does  
37 not require an application form and is typically handled by the City of Champaign staff. He said that  
38 typically the sponsor of such an amendment would be the staff from the City of Champaign, if the project is  
39 in line with what they would support. He said that this project is not supported by the City of Champaign  
40 and in order to continue with the request a sponsor is required.

41  
42 Mr. DiNovo stated that as a practical matter ELUC is asking the Regional Planning Commission staff to take  
43 this matter up with the City of Champaign staff and start the process of moving forward.

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

Ms. Anderson stated that after reviewing the letter from Mayor Schweighart to Mr. Wiebel and some of the points that he raises to Mr. Wiebel about the size of the current Enterprise Zone she would like to hear comments from Ms. Legner, Economic Development Manager for the City of Champaign.

Mr. Moser asked if this issue was worth discussing if the City of Champaign is not interested in supporting the request.

Ms. Teri Legner, Economic Development Manager for the City of Champaign, stated that the Enterprise Zone was approved in 1985 by both the City of Champaign and Champaign County and then the State of Illinois certified the zone and it became effective July 1, 1986. She said that the express purpose of the zone is to encourage job creation and redevelopment of slighted or depressed areas. She said that the zone was approved by the State based largely upon statutory evaluation criteria which relied heavily upon the City of Champaign's census data relative to income status and unemployment. She said that since its inception the City of Champaign and the County have considered and approved amendments to the ordinance for a variety of reasons including revisions to incentive programs, boundary expansion, and boundary expansions that are greater and larger than this specific request. She said that these amendments have been made after much consideration by the City of Champaign and Champaign County staff, ELUC, the County Board and the City of Champaign's City Council. She said that in each of these circumstances amendments are made that are mutually beneficial to the City of Champaign and the County. She said that the City of Champaign has strong concerns with the request to expand the boundaries of the Enterprise Zone to areas that will never become part of the City of Champaign. She said that such requests have been made in the past and have not been approved because of the City of Champaign's policy. She said that speaking on behalf of the City of Champaign they believe that the request to expand the boundary to include property near Royal also does not meet the City of Champaign's Policy objective and as a result the City of Champaign respectfully requests

that ELUC deny this request for expansion. She said that additionally in an effort to maximize the potential of the zone for its remaining life and capacity, the City of Champaign would like to work together with the County to establish zone operating policies, which are above and beyond what the ordinance prescribes. She said that the Enterprise Zone covers approximately nine and one half square miles that is assuming the approval of the pending Clearview and The Andersons amendments which have not been approved by the State to date. She said that the state statute limits the size of the zone to twelve square miles. The Enterprise Zone is scheduled to expire at the end of year 2016. She said that with these constraints it would be imperative that both bodies are in agreement on how the zone would be administered and what areas are anticipated to meet these needs for development and what would the process be for considering amendments and other issues.

Mr. Moser asked Ms. Legner how a strip of land which is 25 miles long and three feet wide and runs across numerous property owners is included in the zone without their permission.

Ms. Legner stated that in the process which has been utilized in the past because we have considered projects that are in proximity to the city limits or within the city limits annexation agreements have been required to be in place for continuity. She said that because of this requirement the City of Champaign has

1/16/07

AS APPROVED FEBRUARY 12, 2007

ELUC

1 needed bridge property owners to agree to the concept of the extension of the Enterprise Zone across their  
2 property. She said that this was the issue when the amendment for The Andersons was requested in  
3 October. She said that in the case of the Enterprise Zone expansions that do not require annexation there is  
4 not a process for objection or denial.

5  
6 Mr. Wiebel asked what has to be done to deny this request.

7  
8 Ms. Legner stated that a boundary amendment requires public notice and public hearing with legally  
9 described property for the expansion.

10  
11 Mr. DiNovo stated that this is not like a zoning case. He said that if ELUC does not want to proceed with  
12 this request it can defeat Mr. Langenheim's motion to recommend sponsorship.

13  
14 Mr. Langenheim asked Ms. Legner if the project in Royal does not have to be in physical contiguity with the  
15 existing zone.

16  
17 Ms. Legner stated no, the expansion has to come from a point of contact with the current zone but not in  
18 terms of the annexation contiguity.

19  
20 Mr. Langenheim stated that a while back the Village of Savoy extended its city limits south to a boundary  
21 line with Tolono occupying nothing but the highway. He asked Ms. Legner if it is possible to take a strip as  
22 part of a highway.

23  
24 Ms. Legner stated that the three foot strip that Mr. Moser spoke of earlier has been utilized in the past for  
25 Enterprise Zone boundary expansions.

26  
27 Mr. Langenheim stated that the entire proposal sounds ridiculous.

28  
29 Mr. Moser stated a similar project had been proposed to the Village of Rantoul and it was denied.

30  
31 Mr. Reg Ankrom, Project Development Manager for the Illini Ethanol, LLC at Royal stated that he  
32 appreciates the opportunity to speak to the Committee tonight about this project. He said that the project is  
33 basically the creation of 100 million gallon ethanol plant at Royal which would use approximately 37  
34 million bushels of corn from Champaign County. He said that currently the investment is at \$160 million  
35 and that investment continues to grow simply because ethanol is high in demand. He said that this plant  
36 would employ 40 people full-time and a few part-time workers with an annual payroll of \$2 million and  
37 since the City of Champaign is the largest trader in the area would benefit from a lot of services and retail  
38 and wholesale purchases that the ethanol plant would be required to make in the area. He said that the  
39 Enterprise Zone is important to them because the \$160 million does not include the peripheral types of  
40 things that they have to do. He said that each site has its own requirements and in the case of Royal there is  
41 one Union Pacific rail which requires unit trains therefore there will be a lot of rail installed on the property  
42 and that rail has been purchased amounting to a multi-million dollar project. He said that Royal is served by  
43 a two inch main from Trunkline Pipeline and it is insufficient to serve the plant therefore they will be

1 required to build a pipeline at a fairly significant cost. He said that at each of the Illini Ethanol, LLC plants,  
2 Royal is the second of several plants that are in process, organized labor has been used for construction  
3 therefore the cost for that organized labor will be greater. He said that this is the first time that rural taxing  
4 districts within the County would have the opportunity to enjoy this type of investment. He said that they  
5 paid substantially more than farmground is going for in Champaign County and the assessor will be  
6 reassessing the property from agriculture at 20% to industrial which is 33-1/3%. He said that the rural  
7 taxing districts will have an immediate substantial increase. He said that schools are somewhat penalized  
8 because of the nature of the way the law works in provision of foundation aid for students in schools and  
9 schools in the Enterprise Zone are held harmless up to the foundation level therefore they will not be  
10 penalized as a result of the abatement in property taxes. He said that they would be one of the first  
11 applications from the County and the process requires that both the council and the County Board approve  
12 the request. He said that there is a depletion of Enterprise Zone and if their application was granted for  
13 enterprise zone status that depletion would amount to 1/10<sup>th</sup> of one square mile. He said that extensions of  
14 enterprise zones may be made with a three foot swath from an enterprise zone boundary along a public right  
15 of way, such as in this case Leverett Road. He said that the total enterprise demand for a project would be  
16 1/10<sup>th</sup> of a square mile and asked if this is too high of a price to pay for a \$160 million investment. He said  
17 that the growing enterprise zone status to Illini Ethanol, LLC draws the benefit actually closer from that 12  
18 mile limitation currently. He said that the statute that created the enterprise zone in 1982 also allows  
19 enterprise zone boundaries to be extended another three miles. He said that the actual maximum is 15  
20 square miles and the participation of four intergovernmental units is required and that could include the  
21 Champaign County Board and the City of Champaign therefore two other units are needed. He said that he  
22 is asking for fairness in that the County has already approved the request by The Andersons who is a  
23 competitor of Illini Ethanol, LLC. He said that there is precedence for extension even beyond county  
24 boundaries. He said that the Great River Economic Development Foundation which is an enterprise zone  
25 administrator along with the City of Quincy have recently extended their enterprise zone approximately 50  
26 miles from Adams County in to Brown County for Dodd Foods. He said that Dodd Foods is a very large  
27 company that wanted to build a \$5 million warehouse and the Adams County enterprise zone was extended  
28 for that project.

29

30 Mr. Gladney asked Mr. Ankrom if Illini Ethanol, LLC would be using the Mahomet Aquifer.

31

32 Mr. Ankrom stated yes.

33

34 Mr. Gladney stated that he does not see how this appears to be in the spirit of the joint City of Champaign –  
35 Champaign County Enterprise Ordinance. He said that the County is already waiting to see if The  
36 Andersons are really going to build their ethanol plant west of Champaign and he has concerns with their  
37 usage of the Mahomet Aquifer. He said that he does not want so much competition for an ethanol plant in  
38 Champaign County to the point that it risks perhaps losing one or both of them. He said that since the  
39 County has already agreed to the enterprise zone expansion for The Andersons’ ethanol plant he would like  
40 to see if they follow through with their plans before another expansion is granted.

41

42 Ms. Melin asked Mr. Ankrom if any other avenues have been researched for placement of their ethanol  
43 plant.

1  
2 Mr. Ankrom stated that they did contact the Village of Rantoul because there are four capped wells on the  
3 old Chanute Air Force Base. He said that an engineering study was completed for the availability of water  
4 supply and seven sources of water were investigated. He said that the Village of Rantoul was one of the  
5 seven sources and in addition to their water supply they also had a wastewater treatment facility which puts  
6 out approximately 1.2 million gallons per day but there was too much risk with what could come with that  
7 wastewater. He said that the Village of Rantoul declined to provide the water for their project.  
8  
9 Mr. Moser asked how extending the enterprise zone for 20 miles would affect the adjacent property owners  
10 in regard to zoning.  
11  
12 Mr. Hall stated that the County Board would be the final vote for any rezoning requests.  
13  
14 Mr. Schroeder asked Mr. Hall if it was customary for the City of Champaign to sponsor an enterprise zone  
15 expansion request or the County to sponsor an enterprise zone request.  
16  
17 Mr. Hall stated that to date, projects that have come forward have only been sponsored by the City of  
18 Champaign but he is not aware of any prohibition of the County sponsoring an expansion.  
19  
20 Mr. DiNovo stated that one important thing to remember is that if the County wants to expand the enterprise  
21 zone the County along with the City of Champaign submits an application for the Department of Commerce  
22 and Economic Opportunity. He said that the County has to decide whether to ask for their own purposes or  
23 not. He said that people can propose that the County ask to expand the zone but the request would be as a  
24 joint applicant not as single applicant. He said that in the past the provisional waiver that the County  
25 established with the City of Champaign projects that would be annexed into the City of Champaign would  
26 managed by the City's staff and projects that would remain in the unincorporated area of the County would  
27 be managed by the County staff. He said that currently almost every project has been managed by the City  
28 of Champaign staff because almost every project has either been in the City of Champaign or proposed to be  
29 annexed. He said that in terms of the County's real authority to control the enterprise zone the City and the  
30 County are partners in that we are joint applicants for the zone and one party cannot do anything without the  
31 other party's concurrence.  
32  
33 Mr. Schroeder asked Mr. Ankrom if Illini Ethanol, LLC had discussed the expansion of the Enterprise Zone  
34 with any other municipalities.  
35  
36 Mr. Ankrom stated no.  
37  
38 Mr. Schroeder asked Mr. Ankrom if he was familiar with American Ethanol.  
39  
40 Mr. Ankrom stated that he only knows who they are but he is not familiar with their company.  
41  
42 Mr. Schroeder asked Mr. Ankrom if Illini Ethanol, LLC was affiliated with American Ethanol.  
43

- 1 Mr. Ankrom stated no.  
2
- 3 Mr. Schroeder asked Mr. Ankrom if the Royal plant has a planned date to begin construction.  
4
- 5 Mr. Ankrom stated that they had an anticipated date to begin construction in February, 2007. He said that  
6 they are going through financing at this point and they have raised the equity for both plants and are in the  
7 process of working with the banks. He said that this process has taken longer than originally anticipated  
8 therefore February will slip and construction should begin within the third or fourth quarter of 2007. He  
9 said that the debt financing process should be wrapped up by May.  
10
- 11 Mr. Schroeder asked Mr. Ankrom if any dirt has been moved at the Royal site.  
12
- 13 Mr. Ankrom stated no. He said that they have done some onsite studies but no dirt has been turned at this  
14 point. He said that they purchased a smaller parcel from Mr. and Mrs. John Bensyl which had an existing  
15 house on the property. He said that they anticipate using the house to begin the construction but it will be  
16 demolished at some point.  
17
- 18 Mr. Schroeder stated that over the past few months Jeff Blue, Champaign County Highway Engineer, has  
19 been in contact with Illini Ethanol, LLC and subsequently the County has applied for state grants for  
20 funding for road improvements. He asked Mr. Ankrom if there is anything that Illini Ethanol, LLC has  
21 applied for with the State for road improvement projects beyond what the County has applied for.  
22
- 23 Mr. Ankrom stated no. He said that he has worked with Jeff Blue on the TARP and DOT grant money.  
24
- 25 Mr. Langenheim asked Mr. Ankrom why they are not considering setting up an enterprise zone with the  
26 Village of Royal.  
27
- 28 Mr. Ankrom stated that the Speaker of the House, Mike Madigan, stated that there would be no more  
29 enterprise zones in Illinois and the Village of Royal does not have an established enterprise zone.  
30
- 31 Mr. Moser asked Mr. Ankrom if the road from Interstate 74 to the Village of Royal would be State  
32 improved.  
33
- 34 Mr. Ankrom stated that he cannot speak with the State of Illinois. He said that he did meet with the District  
35 5 State Engineer and they are anticipating improving the road between I-74 and the Village of Royal.  
36
- 37 Mr. Moser asked Mr. Ankrom if the ethanol plant will be built with or without the enterprise zone  
38 amendment.  
39
- 40 Mr. Ankrom stated that we are talking about a lot of money that this will help mitigate but the decision on  
41 whether to build or not is up to the investors of the plant.  
42
- 43 Ms. Anderson stated the Prairieview School is not included in the Enterprise Zone therefore the tax



1 abatement will only occur within the zone.

2  
3 Mr. Akrom stated that Prairieview School taxes the parcel that was purchased by Illini Ethanol, LLC,  
4 therefore if the request for the enterprise zone expansion is approved the school would be limited as to the  
5 growth in tax base.

6  
7 Mr. DiNovo stated that the only taxes that would be abated would be approximately 47 cents of the  
8 County’s tax rate. He said that school taxes are not abated and it is a very small reduction in the property  
9 tax rate. He said that the County has a misapprehension that enterprise zones trigger abatement of all of the  
10 taxing monies. He said that it is only the participating units of government and the only one that would  
11 apply to Royal is the County’s rate therefore it is a tiny reduction in the property base.

12  
13 Ms. Anderson stated that the area that will be affected more will be the City of Champaign.

14  
15 Mr. DiNovo stated that the City of Champaign will not lose a penny because they are not taxing the property  
16 currently. He said that the only expense would be to the County.

17  
18 Mr. Louis Wozniak, who resides at 401C CR 2425N, Mahomet stated that he is a Registered Professional  
19 Engineer and teaches at the University of Illinois. He said that he is not an expert on this subject but he does  
20 read journals that come through his office and the general view is that corn is a very inefficient source of  
21 ethanol. He said that because of the fossil fuels used in the process it contributes greatly to the “Greenhouse  
22 Effect” through carbon emissions. He said that most of the plants in the United States that produce ethanol  
23 produce it under government subsidies except for one in Oregon that uses cattle excrement during the  
24 heating process for the production of ethanol. He said that it is a very large national sentiment in the  
25 technical community that ethanol is not a good idea and it is probably not going to fly.

26  
27 Ms. Wysocki requested a roll call vote.

28	<b>Anderson-no</b>	<b>Doenitz-yes</b>	<b>Gladney-no</b>
29	<b>Jones-no</b>	<b>Langenheim-no</b>	<b>Melin-no</b>
30	<b>Moser-yes</b>	<b>Schroeder-yes</b>	<b>Wysocki-no</b>
31			

32  
33 Ms. Wysocki stated that the motion failed.

34  
35 Ms. Wysocki stated that Teri Legner stated in her closing remarks that perhaps this would be a good  
36 opportunity for the County and the City of Champaign to sit down and talk about establishing some  
37 guidelines for enterprise zone improvements. She said that this issue came up in the fall of 2006, when  
38 ELUC was dealing with the Clearview Development and some of the Committee members desired to have a  
39 checklist that could be utilized to assure that the enterprise requests meets a certain threshold.

40  
41 Mr. Schroeder stated that he would be in favor of establishing some guidelines for the enterprise zone.

42  
43 Mr. Langenheim asked what type of guidelines would be reviewed.

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. Schroeder stated that the City of Champaign’s Comprehensive Plan could be reviewed. He said that the City of Champaign has some goals in their plan and with all of the expansion they need to sit down with the County to determine what kind of expansion is anticipated in the future.

Ms. Anderson agrees with Mr. Schroeder.

Ms. Wysocki stated that she spoke with Steve Carter, City of Champaign Manager and he indicated that he did not want this issue to become a decisive issue between the City and the County. She said that she values the importance that the City of Champaign places on the communication and the cooperation between the two entities. She said that even though the City and the County may not always agree on the same issues the disagreements should not be of such a nature that it would interrupt the relationship between the two. She said that she and Mr. Carter believe that the two entities should meet.

**8. Remanded Zoning Case 520-AM-05 Petitioner: Gene Bateman Request to amend the Zoning Map to allow for the development of 2 single-family lots in the AG-1, Agriculture Zoning District by adding the Rural Residential Overlay (RRO) Zoning District. Location: Approximately seven acres of an existing 62.20 acre parcel in the East Half of the Northeast Quarter of Section 29 of Newcomb Township that is commonly known as the farm field that borders the south side of CR 2600N and CR 200E.**

**Ms. Anderson moved to recommend approval of Remanded Zoning Case 520-AM-05.**

Ms. Wysocki requested a second to Ms. Anderson’s motion and none was given.

**The motion failed due to the lack of a second.**

Mr. Hall stated that Remanded Zoning Case 520-AM-05 will proceed to the full County Board with no recommendation.

**9. Zoning Case 562-AM-06 Petitioner: Ivanhoe Partners, LLC and Jason Barickman, Agent Request to amend the Zoning Map to change the zoning district designation from the R-2, Single Family Residence zoning District to the R-5, Manufactured Home Park Zoning District. Location: The West 500 feet of the South 1,722.12 feet of the Southeast Quarter of Section 4 of Urbana Township comprising approximately 19.065 acres and that is commonly known as the blocks surrounding Richard Drive and Gurth Drive and the west side of Ivanhoe Drive in the Ivanhoe Estates Manufactured Home Park at 26 Ivanhoe Drive, Urbana.**

**Mr. Moser moved, seconded by Mr. Schroeder to recommend approval of Zoning Case 562-AM-06.**

**The motion carried by voice vote with one opposing vote.**

1  
2 **10. FY07 Regional Planning Commission County Work Plan (annual work plan for the county**  
3 **Special Projects Planner at the RPC)**  
4

5 Ms. Monte stated that the Corrected Copy of the Recommended 2007 Work Program – RPC County Planner  
6 dated January 11, 2007, contains a description of the scope of projects that the RPC County Planner would  
7 be contracted with the County to work on and prioritize each of these projects. She said that the first  
8 priority will be to complete the 5-year Update of the County Solid Waste Management Plan which is to be  
9 discussed as Item #11. She said that the second priority of the RPC County Planner will be to process text  
10 amendment cases for a limited selection (approximately five) of proposed text amendments receiving broad  
11 bipartisan County Board support during the recent comprehensive zoning review effort. She said that in  
12 approximately one month ELUC will receive a description of those specific amendments. She said that the  
13 third priority project would be the Subdivision Regulations Amendments. She said that a series of revisions  
14 have been identified as the Regulations has been used over a period of years and staff has requested that  
15 some changes be proposed to the Regulations. She said that in conjunction with the Zoning Ordinance  
16 Amendments there could be some modifications necessary to the Land Use Regulatory Policies that the  
17 County adopted. She said that the fourth priority would be Coordinating County Support of Recycling  
18 Efforts with Local Governments. She said that the County has received requests from the City of  
19 Champaign to consider funding of their local drop site to consider participating more and coordinating ‘e-  
20 scrap’ collection events. She said that recently a request was received for potential interest in a recycling  
21 transfer site in the County. She said that the fifth priority would be to take the County’s Solid Waste  
22 Management Plan and complete a comprehensive update. She said that attached to the plan are alternate  
23 tasks which could be considered such as further amending the Zoning Ordinance that relate to residential,  
24 commercial and industrial zoning districts and general site development requirements. She said also the  
25 development of a Local Pre-Disaster Mitigation Plan for Champaign County is included as an alternative  
26 task.  
27

28 Mr. Hall stated that if this plan meets the approval of ELUC, staff would request that the priorities are  
29 approved as Ms. Monte amended them. He said that if ELUC disagrees with the priorities as stated then  
30 staff can revise the plan for further review. He said that Ms. Monte has been working on the 5-year Update  
31 on the County Solid Waste Management Plan this month because of the deadline. He said that if ELUC  
32 agrees with the plan and how it is prioritized then the second item that Ms. Monte would be working on will  
33 be the Zoning Ordinance Amendments that ELUC believes can be approved by the County Board. He said  
34 that the idea is that something from CZR could be achieved and that is what staff would like to start with in  
35 regards the Zoning Ordinance.  
36

37 Mr. Doenitz asked Ms. Monte if she was at the same County Board meeting that he was when CZR was  
38 defeated.  
39

40 Ms. Monte stated yes.  
41

42 Mr. Doenitz stated that he does not remember any bipartisan support.  
43

- 1 Ms. Monte stated that staff was at caucuses and all of the public hearings and there were some items that did  
2 received broad agreement. She said that there some items which were soundly opposed but there were some  
3 items which were not.  
4
- 5 Mr. Hall stated that staff identified some things that would make it easier for citizens and staff to do certain  
6 things. He said that the impression that staff received was that those items are not very controversial but do  
7 need to be separated. He said that if staff cannot get support for this separation from ELUC then this task  
8 would not be a second priority. He said that there are other amendments to the Zoning Ordinance that need  
9 to be made that do not relate to CZR. He said that staff would like to produce a specific list and present it to  
10 ELUC for review.  
11
- 12 Mr. Doenitz stated that there were enough protests from the planning commissions to get someone's  
13 attention. He said that perhaps staff should speak to those planning commissions to see what they will agree  
14 to and what they will not.  
15
- 16 Mr. Hall stated that if ELUC wants staff to speak the planning commissions about these issues then staff can  
17 set up those meetings but staff gets direction from ELUC and not the planning commissions.  
18
- 19 Mr. Doenitz stated that he does not see any point in proceeding until these discussions take place.  
20
- 21 Mr. Moser stated that the only items which might have gotten passed were the tile protection buffer and the  
22 RRO revision. He said that the Republicans would probably agree to those items. He said that he does not  
23 want to see another rerun of all of this stuff going back to the ZBA because the same people that came to the  
24 meetings and raised holy cane about everything that was proposed previously will be right back again. He  
25 said that he doesn't see any reason to waste the ZBA's time, staff's time or anyone else's time if we can't  
26 get something done.  
27
- 28 Mr. Langenheim stated that the first set of suggested changes that were actually brought to a vote at the  
29 County Board meeting passed by a vote of 16 to 10. He said that if there were no objections it would have  
30 been passed therefore if some of these items were brought up again they would probably not be objected to  
31 and would only require a simply majority at the full County Board.  
32
- 33 Mr. Moser stated that there are only two items which might be able to be passed without a protest.  
34
- 35 Mr. Langenheim stated that some of the housekeeping amendments would probably not receive protests.  
36
- 37 Ms. Anderson stated that some of the amendments would have made it easier for citizen's to obtain permits  
38 and it would have been easier for staff to process those permits but the mood of the room was that none of  
39 the amendments were going to be passed.  
40
- 41 Mr. Doenitz asked why the County doesn't get things in order and produce a Comprehensive Plan first.  
42
- 43 Mr. Hall stated that a County Comprehensive Plan is listed as a future task.

1  
2 Mr. Moser asked who would create such a plan and what would such a process cost the County.  
3  
4 Mr. Hall stated that he does not know the cost or who would complete the plan.  
5  
6 Mr. Doenitz stated that it appears that this should be the first housekeeping item that needs to be done.  
7  
8 Ms. Monte stated that the Land Use Regulatory Policies as they stand currently would form a basis for a  
9 plan or would need to be consistent with a plan.  
10  
11 Mr. Moser stated that he and Ms. Wysocki attended a meeting this morning with the new Mahomet  
12 Administrator and he has a lot of the same concerns about the areas around the Village of Mahomet that the  
13 County has in the agricultural zones. He said that when you look at what is going on in Sidney, Philo,  
14 Savoy, St. Joseph, Mahomet and Tolono the building that is occurring in those towns is too fast. He said  
15 that now would be an excellent time to get the RPC involved with all of these municipalities that have  
16 different comprehensive plans and produce some sort of continuity.  
17  
18 Ms. Wysocki stated that she agrees with Mr. Moser. She said that she has thought about this issue before  
19 and the meeting with the Village of Mahomet Administrator really got her to thinking. She said that what  
20 occurred to her was that perhaps it would make sense if the County or RPC called together Sidney, Philo,  
21 Savoy, St. Joseph, Mahomet and Tolono and to sit down and talk about some of the issues from  
22 infrastructure to accommodation of growth. She said that for the County to say that a comprehensive plan is  
23 needed to make everything right is not going to happen unless there is some good honest dialogue  
24 established between the County and these small municipalities. She said that she has a copy of the Coles  
25 County Comprehensive Plan which was adopted on November 16, 2006. She said that this is an interesting  
26 document and she was reluctant to read it because given the different size of the county she wasn't sure if it  
27 would tell her a lot. She said that it took Coles County 18 months to complete their Comprehensive Plan but  
28 it was completed by a steering committee of 23 people who represented the County of Coles, the City of  
29 Charleston, the City of Mattoon and some participation from the smaller communities in the county. She  
30 said that what drove their plan was the fact that they are anticipating a lot of development along I-57. She  
31 said that it was discussed at the County Board and economic development circles and that is what gave  
32 impetus to this plan. She said that Coles County does not have zoning and it is stated three times in the plan  
33 that they are not going to approve zoning yet they did come up with a plan. She said that they were able to  
34 come up with a plan because they had excellent cooperation between the County and the municipalities.  
35 She said that Coles County hired a firm from Indianapolis who does this type of work and who incidentally  
36 was responsible for the City of Charleston's Comprehensive Plan and the Comprehensive Plan for the City  
37 of Mattoon and the same consultant is putting it all together for this county wide approach. She said that  
38 Champaign County has a relationship with the bigger entities in this County but we do not have a  
39 relationship with the smaller villages and towns and that is where we need to start.  
40  
41 Mr. Schroeder thanked Ms. Wysocki for her excellent observation. He said that he has been chewing on  
42 staff's hide for ten years for a comprehensive plan. He said that he was influenced by his sister-in-law who  
43 wrote an ordinance and a comprehensive plan in LaSalle County. He said that it is more than just deciding

1 where to put this and that in the future and he would encourage anyone to obtain a copy of a comprehensive  
2 plan and review it. He said that he obtained the Village of Savoy's Comprehensive Plan which was written  
3 in 2002, and they indicated that they were ready for an update of their plan in 2007. He said that he does not  
4 believe that the County has to wait for big.small.all to produce a comprehensive plan. He said that the  
5 County has not had the money or staffing to create a comprehensive plan but we are going to have to bite the  
6 bullet and do it.

7  
8 Mr. Doenitz stated that he agrees with Mr. Schroeder and the creation of a County Comprehensive Plan  
9 should be the first priority on the list.

10  
11 Mr. DiNovo stated that a comprehensive plan is something that needs some thought and the RPC could put  
12 together a memorandum to explain the options. He explained that in the State of Illinois there are three  
13 statutory ways to create a county wide plan. He said that one is to do one under the *Regional Planning Act*,  
14 in which case the Regional Planning Commission is acting as the County's plan commission. He said that  
15 there are five municipalities represented on the Regional Planning Commission and therefore St. Joseph and  
16 Tolono would have to be invited into the commission. He said that there is also something called *The Local*  
17 *Land Resources Management Planning Act*, which gives county governments themselves the ability to  
18 establish a county planning commission that is answerable strictly to the County Board and enables the  
19 commission to develop a plan to be adopted by the County Board to be the county government's official  
20 plan. He said that the *Local Legacy Planning Act*, would mandate that the County establish a completely  
21 new intergovernmental body outside of the Regional Planning Commission who would have the authority to  
22 develop an intergovernmental plan, very similar to what the County could do under the Regional Planning  
23 Commission. He said that there are several different ways of creating a comprehensive plan with the key  
24 difference being does the County want a planning document which is the official planning document for the  
25 Champaign County government or does the County want a plan that establishes the foundation for  
26 intergovernmental understanding and cooperation from different units of government. He said that prices,  
27 estimates and scenarios could be put together on how the County might be able to achieve this task.

28  
29 Mr. Moser stated that the RPC is the logical way to approach this task. He said that Mahomet, Savoy,  
30 Rantoul and Champaign-Urbana are already at the table. He said that there have been discussions with St.  
31 Joseph and they do not appear to have any interest. He said that today is the first time that he had seen  
32 anything that looked like Mahomet was interested in doing anything about their problems.

33  
34 Mr. Wiebel asked Mr. Moser how long it had been since St. Joseph was contacted about joining the RPC.

35  
36 Mr. Moser stated that he does not know how long it has been.

37  
38 Mr. DiNovo stated that it has probably been two years.

39  
40 Mr. Wiebel stated that perhaps someone should contact St. Joseph again.

41  
42 Mr. Moser stated that he would be willing to talk to the Mayor of St. Joseph but it would be better if County  
43 Board Member Greg Knott would discuss this issue with St. Joseph.

1  
2 Mr. Wiebel stated that he will speak with Mr. Knott and perhaps they can meet with the Mayor.

3  
4 Mr. Schroeder stated that all of the small communities who have ingress and egress to the interstates should  
5 be included in these discussions.

6  
7 Mr. DiNovo suggested that ELUC defer action on Item #10 until ELUC can decide on how the work plan  
8 fits in to potential ways of working on a County Comprehensive Plan.

9  
10 **Mr. Schroeder moved, seconded by Mr. Doenitz to defer Item #10 to the February, 2007, ELUC**  
11 **meeting and direct the RPC to report on the means of creating a Countywide Plan. Ms. Monte is to**  
12 **continue with her work on the 5-Year Update of the County Solid Waste Management Plan. The**  
13 **motion carried by voice vote.**

14  
15 **11. Review of update to Champaign County Solid Waste Plan (part of the FY07 RPC County**  
16 **Work Plan)**

17  
18 Ms. Monte stated that the Illinois EPA requires a report every five years about the progress that the County  
19 has made in implementing its recommendations from the original plan adopted in 1991. She said that two  
20 such reports have come before the County in 15 years and in the 1996 Report the recommendations were  
21 modified to exclude the landfill recommendation. She said that there are seven or eight recommendations  
22 with an implementation schedule that principally is “as possible” with no time implementation schedule.  
23 She said that the report is due to the EPA on January 23, 2007, and the County’s recommendations are  
24 reviewed. She noted that the recommendations are the same as they were in 2002, with one additional  
25 proposed recommendation to improve the reporting of recycling efforts throughout the County. She said  
26 that the EPA will provide review comments of the report within the next two or three months and the  
27 County would then review those comments. She said that if anyone is interested she does have a copy of the  
28 “*East Central Illinois Landfill Capacity Situation*”.

29  
30 **12. Update on Enforcement Cases**

31 **A. Foreclosure on the “Monty” Maxwell property in the Village of Broadlands (Enforcement**  
32 **Case ZN99-03/36)**

33  
34 Mr. Hall stated that the County did not have to expend any monies to get the property cleaned up because  
35 Mr. Maxwell’s heirs cleaned up the property. He said that because of the enforcement action leading up to  
36 the heirs cleaning up the property Mr. Maxwell had a Memorandum of Judgment ordered against him for  
37 \$9800 in fines. He said that a title search was completed recently and the Memorandum of Judgment does  
38 appear on the title work indicating to anyone who purchases the property that this is a cloud hanging over  
39 the property. He said that if the property is sold to the new owner the fines should be paid in full to the  
40 County but a more sure way to obtain the fines would be for the County to foreclose and force sale on the  
41 property. He said that this is property that Mr. Maxwell owned and not the property that was involved in the  
42 enforcement case. He said that this property was Mr. Maxwell’s only asset and the property in the  
43 enforcement case was not an asset of Mr. Maxwell’s. He said that the property was appraised at \$7500,

1 which is less than the fines. He said that staff has discussed expenditure of monies to clean up other  
2 properties and this would be a way to get some money to use in that cleanup.

3  
4 Mr. Moser stated that the lots are worthless.

5  
6 Ms. Hitt stated that a couple of years ago someone was interested in purchasing the property. She said that  
7 the prospective owner, a neighboring landowner, wanted the County to clean the lien off of the property.  
8 She said that perhaps the neighboring landowner is still interested in purchasing the property.

9  
10 Mr. Hall stated that regardless of what ELUC decides to do tonight there is still a Memorandum of Judgment  
11 on the Property.

12  
13 Mr. Schroeder asked Mr. Hall if the County forecloses on the property would the \$9800 be waived if the  
14 property is sold.

15  
16 Mr. Hall stated that based on the appraisal the County is not likely to see the full value of the Memorandum  
17 of Judgment.

18  
19 **Mr. Schroeder moved, seconded by Ms. Anderson to foreclose on the Edward M. “Monty” Maxwell**  
20 **property in the Village of Broadlands (Enforcement Case ZN99-03/36). The motion carried by voice**  
21 **vote with one opposing vote.**

22  
23 **B. Foreclosure on property of Joseph Mefford at 2603 Campbell Drive, Champaign**  
24 **(Enforcement Case ZN01-30/14)**

25  
26 Mr. Hall stated that the County spent \$7335, to clean up the property under the permission of Mr. Mefford.  
27 He said that the property was recently appraised at \$11,000, and foreclosure would allow the County to sell  
28 the property and hopefully regain what was spent in cleaning it up. He said that the agreement was that the  
29 County could only gain the cost of the cleanup.

30  
31 **Mr. Moser moved, seconded by Mr. Doenitz to foreclose on the Joseph Mefford property at 2603**  
32 **Campbell Dr, Champaign (Enforcement Case ZN01-30/14). The motion carried by voice vote.**

33  
34  
35 **13. Monthly Report (November and December 2006)**  
36

37 Mr. Hall distributed monthly reports for November and December, 2006, to the Committee for review. He  
38 said that historically December is when staff completes a yearly review. He said that there have been years  
39 when the ZBA has completed more cases but in all of those years the ZBA had more meetings. He said that  
40 the current ZBA worked very hard last year and completed an average of 2.3 cases per meeting and did this  
41 in 19 regular meetings and in addition to those 19 meetings the ZBA had 10 additional special meetings to  
42 deal with the Zoning Ordinance. He said that in addition to the regular cases that were completed they also  
43 completed the 13 parts of the proposed zoning amendments. He said that in the coming year there are six



1/16/07

AS APPROVED FEBRUARY 12, 2007

ELUC

1 RRO cases on the docket but today staff received notice that three RRO cases are being withdrawn. He said  
2 that it is still a record breaking year with three RRO cases on the docket.

3  
4 Mr. Moser asked Mr. Hall how many of the cases were under Ms. Lo.

5  
6 Mr. Hall stated that Ms. Lo informed staff via telephone that she was going to withdraw her three cases. He  
7 said that currently staff is booking cases in to May, 2007. He said that permitting in the office has been  
8 down since the City of Champaign annexed the southwest subdivisions. He said that with the decline in  
9 permitting staff has been doing more on enforcement but it hasn't made a big difference on the backlog. He  
10 noted that if anyone has any questions regarding the monthly reports they should call the office.

11  
12 Ms. Wysocki stated that the Finance Committee decided to increase the per diem for the members of the  
13 Zoning Board of Appeal, effective immediately. She said that the ZBA members will be receiving the \$100  
14 stipend that the County Board members will receive in 2008. She said that based on the work that the ZBA  
15 has completed and the dedication that has been given they are worth every penny.

16  
17 **Ms. Anderson moved, seconded by Mr. Moser to accept the November and December, 2006, monthly**  
18 **reports and place them on file. The motion carried by voice vote.**

19  
20 **14. Other Business**

21  
22 None

23  
24 **15. Determination of Items to be placed on the County Board Consent Agenda**

25  
26 None

27  
28 **16. Adjournment**

29  
30 The meeting adjourned at 8:45 P.M.

31  
32 Respectfully submitted,

Secretary to the Environment and Land Use Committee

eluc\minutes\minutes.fm