

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  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

**MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING**

---

<b>Champaign County Environment &amp; Land Use Committee</b>	<b>DATE:</b>	<b>June 11, 2007</b>
<b>Champaign County Brookens Administrative Center</b>	<b>TIME:</b>	<b>7:00 p.m.</b>
<b>Urbana, IL 61802</b>	<b>PLACE:</b>	<b>Lyle Shields Meeting Room Brookens Administrative Center 1776 E. Washington Street Urbana, IL 61802</b>

---

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

**OTHER COUNTY  
BOARD MEMBERS**

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

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

**STAFF PRESENT:** John Hall, Leroy Holliday, Susan Monte (Regional Planning Commission), Bren Rose (Regional Planning Commission), Susan McGrath (Senior Assistant State’s Attorney)

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Hal Barnhart, Tanna Fruhling

---

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

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

**2. Approval of Agenda**

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

**3. Approval of Minutes (May 14, 2007)**

Mr. Langenheim stated that he had a few minor corrections for the May 14, 2007, minutes and submitted those corrections to the clerk.

**Mr. Langenheim moved, seconded by Mr. Schroeder to approve the May 14, 2007, minutes as**

1 amended. The motion carried by voice vote.

2

3 **4. Public Participation**

4

5 Mr. Hal Barnhart, who resides at 469 CR 1500N, Champaign, IL, stated that he would like to address Item  
6 #10 of the agenda. He said that the June 5, 2007, memorandum indicates the following: To ensure the  
7 unity, paragraph 8 of the revised Resolution requires a 2/3 supermajority of the 18 Steering Committee  
8 members (a total of 12 members), with a minimum of four elected or former elected township officials for  
9 appointed township plan commissioners voting with the supermajority. He said that the total number of  
10 members should be corrected to indicate 12 members rather than 11 members. He said that this correction  
11 should be corrected in the memorandum as well as the Resolution.

12

13 Mr. Barnhart said that there is list of 16 interests and perspectives which is being accommodated with the  
14 Steering Committee members. He said that there was an earlier list of interests which contained  
15 approximately 46 interests but of the current list of 16 he found three very important interests which have  
16 been deleted from the original list. He said that he does not know how in Champaign County it can be  
17 contemplated to adopt a Land Resource Management Plan without specifically listing farmland preservation  
18 as one of those perspectives that need to be on the panel. He said that the Resolution calls for representation  
19 by two highway commissioners but drainage district commissioners are not listed. He said that from  
20 attending many Zoning Board of Appeals meetings and County Board meetings that farmland preservation  
21 and drainage issues are almost always part of the decision making process. He said that if a future plan is  
22 being discussed then some sort of clear historical base should be created to indicate where the plan was  
23 started and where it is going in the future. He said that the original list included a representative for  
24 historical preservation and this representation should be included on the current list as well.

25

26 Mr. Barnhart stated that Paragraph 8 of the Strikeout Version of the Resolution dated 6/07/07, indicates that  
27 a two-thirds majority of the 18-member Steering Committee, which equals 11 members (should be corrected  
28 to indicate 12), with a minimum of four elected or former township officials or appointed or former  
29 township plan commission members voting with the supermajority shall be required when deciding  
30 substantive issues or procedures. He said that aside from deciding what is a substantive issue or procedure it  
31 seems rather ham handed to prescribe to the members of the Steering Committee that it must vote with the  
32 supermajority. He said that this requirement is like instituting a super-supermajority and in effect sets up a  
33 two tiered Steering Committee membership regime in which certain member's vote carries more weight than  
34 others.

35

36 Mr. Hall stated that the only list which ELUC has seen was distributed at the May meeting and had only 16  
37 interests. He said that the categories which are included in Item #4 of the Strikeout Version of the  
38 Resolution dated 6/07/07, is the same list that ELUC reviewed at their May meeting.

39

40

41 **5. Correspondence**

42 **A. Kane County Farm Bureau letter dated May 25, 2007**

43

1 Ms. Wysocki stated that she assumes that the Kane County Farm Bureau is notifying Champaign County  
2 that they are pulling their support from HB3086. She said that no action is required.  
3  
4

5 **B. Mahomet Aquifer Consortium Member Meeting No. 53, April 13, 2007**  
6

7 Mr. Langenheim stated that he attended the June 6, 2007, Mahomet Aquifer Consortium Member Meeting  
8 and there are two things which must be brought to ELUC's attention. He said that the RWSPC is concerned  
9 with setting the perimeters so that the two studies will work together. He said that the Illinois State Water  
10 Survey presented the geologic mapping process and they will prepare very detailed maps of that part of  
11 Champaign County which is occupied by the Mahomet Aquifer and it will incorporate all old and new  
12 information.  
13

14 **6. CDAP Loan Request – Premier Printing of Illinois d/b/a Printec Press**

15  
16 **7. CDAP Loan Request – Premier Printing of Illinois d/b/a Printec Press**  
17  
18

19 **Mr. Schroeder moved, seconded by Mr. Langenheim to recommend approval of CDAP Loan**  
20 **Request s–Premier Printing of Illinois d/b/a Printec Press.**  
21

22 Mr. Doenitz asked why the County would give maximum loan approval in the amount of \$950,000 on a  
23 \$100,000 loan.  
24

25 Mr. Rose stated that in regard to Rate and Term of CDAP loan there is a typographical error on Page 2 of  
26 both loan memorandums.  
27

28 Ms. Anderson asked Mr. Rose why there were two separate loan requests for one business.  
29

30 Mr. Rose stated that Premier Printing of Illinois d/b/a Printec Press is purchasing two separate businesses  
31 and the County is participating with Busey for \$100,000 for one of the loan requests and \$950,000 on the  
32 other. He apologized for the mistake on the rate and terms indicated on Page 2 of the loan memorandum.  
33 He said that the same exact terms of 15 year amortization will apply to both.  
34

35 Ms. Anderson asked if the businesses will create new jobs.  
36

37 Mr. Rose stated that the applicant is purchasing two separate businesses therefore the jobs will continue.  
38

39 Mr. Moser asked if the \$950,000 is a set amount.  
40

41 Mr. Rose stated that this will be a term loan.  
42

43 Mr. Moser stated that he does not ever remember the County recommending approval of a CDAP loan of

1 this size.  
2  
3 Mr. Rose stated that this is the largest CDAP loan that has been requested through the County.  
4  
5 Mr. Moser asked if the County will be listed behind Busey Bank on the mortgage document.  
6  
7 Mr. Rose stated that there is no real estate involved on this loan because the real estate is a separate entity.  
8 He said that the owners of the business will be leasing the property from Scott Moore's father. He said that  
9 the County will have a lien on all of the equipment of the business.  
10  
11 Mr. Doenitz asked Mr. Rose what type of assets were involved and how much is Busey Bank participating  
12 with the second loan.  
13  
14 Mr. Rose stated that the participation from Busey Bank is over \$2 million. He said that the equipment,  
15 which is valued at over \$5 million, is being used for collateral.  
16  
17 Mr. Doenitz stated that if the applicant has these kinds of assets why isn't Busey Bank totally financing this  
18 business.  
19  
20 Mr. Rose stated that this is a highly leveraged deal and the reason that the County is involved is because of  
21 the jobs. He said that the applicant had an opportunity to leave the County and move to Coles County but  
22 they desired to stay in this area and expand.  
23  
24 Mr. Hall asked if ELUC is normally informed which businesses are being purchased.  
25  
26 Mr. Rose stated that the businesses being purchased are Custom Color Graphics and Crouse Printing and  
27 Mailing.  
28  
29 Mr. Langenheim asked what type of products the printing business produces.  
30  
31 Mr. Rose stated that their products vary from billboards to books and forms. He said that the applicant's  
32 personal assets are a lot more than the equipment is worth.  
33  
34 Mr. Doenitz stated that he does not know that the applicant's personal assets are reliable. He said that when  
35 the County is participating in a \$1 million loan he would like to see some type of personal financial  
36 statement on the applicant.  
37  
38 Mr. Rose stated that he is correct that \$1 million is a lot of money and personal financial statements have not  
39 be submitted for review in the past because it could become public information. He said that he would  
40 need to discuss this with the applicants to see if this would be a possibility. He said that the assets are there  
41 or he would not recommend that the County participate in a \$1 million CDAP loan.  
42  
43 Mr. Moser asked what type of assets the applicants have to back up this loan.

1  
2 Mr. Rose stated that they have cash and securities as well as commercial and personal real estate.  
3  
4 Mr. Moser stated that he does not understand why the applicants need to borrow this much money when  
5 they have so many assets.  
6  
7 Mr. Rose stated that they are requesting the funds because the interest rates are at a historical low.  
8  
9 Mr. Moser stated that he has seen a lot of people borrow in to bankruptcy.  
10  
11 Ms. Anderson asked if there was an average loan amount that the County has done.  
12  
13 Mr. Rose stated that the average is around \$75 thousand to \$150 thousand. He said that these loan requests  
14 are larger than most.  
15  
16 Mr. Hall asked if the loan was an immediate necessity.  
17  
18 Mr. Rose stated yes.  
19  
20 Mr. Moser stated that he would like to see a financial statement on the applicants to see if what they are  
21 pledging is accurate.  
22  
23 Mr. Rose stated that the debt service coverage is very high. He said that 1.0% in debt coverage is where the  
24 applicant can cover it and not make any money and the applicants are pushing 2.0% which is well above  
25 average.  
26  
27 Mr. Moser stated that at one time the County approved a CDAP loan for Parkhill and he was pleased to vote  
28 no. He said that anyone with these types of assets should not be requesting these types of loans.  
29  
30 Mr. Jones asked Mr. Hall to explain the point of the CDAP loans. He said that he was under the impression  
31 that the CDAP loans were for small businesses.  
32  
33 Mr. Hall stated that he thought that the purpose for the CDAP loan was to provide some incentive for job  
34 creation. He said that if the loan is granted to someone who does not have a lot of debt service coverage  
35 then the money is being loaned at risk but with the debt service coverage that is involved in the two requests  
36 there is little or no risk unless things go extremely bad. He said that the main purpose of the loan is for job  
37 creation.  
38  
39 Mr. Rose stated that there is no specific size restriction on the business. He said that this is something that  
40 could and still might leave Champaign County.  
41  
42 Mr. Gladney asked Mr. Rose what the applicants are basing their decision upon in staying in Champaign  
43 County. He asked if it was because of some sort of assumption that the availability of this loan is

1 guaranteed.

2  
3 Mr. Rose stated no. He said that he does not know what the applicant has been offered elsewhere but they  
4 are relying on this because Busey has requested that the County participate. He said that he does not know  
5 but Busey may finance more but right now the County is filling the gap.

6  
7 Mr. Langenheim stated that he had the impression that the CDAP loan program was aimed at small rural  
8 communities.

9  
10 Mr. Rose stated that the CDAP loan can be loaned any where in Champaign County and can only be loaned  
11 to a business in Champaign County if there are enough jobs being filled from residents coming from outside  
12 of Champaign-Urbana.

13  
14 Mr. Moser asked how many jobs were filled by residents outside of Champaign-Urbana.

15  
16 Mr. Rose stated that around 40 jobs are filled by residents outside of Champaign-Urbana which is over one-  
17 half.

18  
19 Mr. Doenitz stated that he is all for retaining jobs but he is concerned about approving a CDAP loan for \$1  
20 million without documentation to review.

21  
22 Mr. Rose stated that he might be able to submit the requested documentation for the Committee's review.  
23 He asked if the Committee would consider scheduling a special meeting prior to the June 21, 2007, County  
24 Board meeting. He asked if the Committee would like to review personal cash flow and business cash flow  
25 or both.

26  
27 Mr. Doenitz stated that he would like to see both.

28  
29 Mr. Rose stated that there are actually four transactions taking place and the County is involved in two of  
30 those transactions.

31  
32 Mr. Moser asked if the applicants are individuals or are they part of an LLC.

33  
34 Mr. Rose stated that Premier Printing of Illinois is a newly formed LLC. He said that there are two owners  
35 with one owning 35% and the other owning 65% of the business.

36  
37 Ms. Anderson asked if a new packet would be mailed to the members so that they can review the requested  
38 information prior to the special meeting.

39  
40 Mr. Rose stated that he will either mail the packets out immediately or hand deliver the information so that  
41 the Committee has adequate time to review the documents.

42  
43 Mr. Hall asked the Committee if fifteen minutes would be adequate for the special meeting.

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 stated that he would like to have more than fifteen minutes to make a judgment on something like this.

Mr. Doenitz stated that he understands that Mr. Rose would like to obtain permission from the applicants in regard to submitting their personal financial statements to the Committee for review. He asked Mr. Rose if this information isn't already public information.

Mr. Rose stated yes, but wouldn't their information be available to the entire public if these documents are distributed to the Committee for review.

Ms. McGrath stated yes by the terms of the *Freedom of Information Act*.

**The consensus of the Committee was to schedule a Special ELUC meeting at 6:30 p.m. prior to the June 21, 2007, County Board meeting.**

**Mr. Langenheim moved, seconded by Mr. Doenitz to defer agenda Items #6 and #7 to the June 21, 2007, ELUC Special Meeting. The motion carried by voice vote.**

**8. Recreation and Entertainment License: Champaign County Fair Association, 902 North Coler Avenue, Urbana. County Fair and Carnival. July 20-28, 2007.**

**Mr. Moser moved, seconded by Mr. Doenitz to approve the Recreation and Entertainment License for the Champaign County Fair Association, 902 North Coler Avenue, Urbana, Illinois. The motion carried by voice vote.**

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

Ms. Wysocki asked if this item is ready for discussion.

Ms. McGrath stated that this item is not ready for discussion.

Mr. Moser stated that he has a constituent who destroyed an unmarked telephone pedestal while he was mowing his roadside and the telephone company sent him a bill for over \$500. He said that he himself has destroyed a couple of telephone pedestals because they are unmarked and cannot be seen.

Ms. Wysocki asked why the telephone company does not mark the pedestals.

Mr. Doenitz stated they don't mark the pedestals because of cost.

Ms. McGrath stated that since ELUC will not meet in July this agenda item could also be addressed at the

1 Special ELUC meeting on June 21<sup>st</sup> meeting.

2  
3 Mr. Moser stated that this is the time to address this issue because this is the time of the year that the  
4 pedestals are destroyed.

5  
6 Mr. Hall asked Ms. McGrath if she anticipates an action from the ELUC special meeting to be forwarded to  
7 the County Board.

8  
9 Ms. McGrath stated no.

10  
11 Ms. Melin asked how someone would not know that these pedestals exist if they normally mow the areas.

12  
13 Mr. Moser stated that when you have seven miles of road ditches along fifteen farms it is hard to remember  
14 the exact location of all of these pedestals. He said that at times he will send someone else to go mow the  
15 road ditches and they are unaware of the pedestals location.

16  
17 Ms. Melin agreed that the pedestals need to be marked.

18  
19 Ms. McGrath stated that the telephone companies did use to mark the pedestals but for some reason they  
20 ceased doing so. She said that the State's Attorney's preliminary investigation into the FCC doesn't allow  
21 them to stop marking those pedestals. She said that the State's Attorney's office next step is to contact the  
22 telephone companies to find why the marking of the pedestals has not occurred and see if there is some way  
23 to enforce their marking. She said that the reason for the enforcement is not just because of the mowing  
24 issue but also because some of the pedestals are not marked and maintained properly and that should be the  
25 responsibility of the telephone company.

26  
27 Mr. Doenitz stated that one of the problems with the pedestals is that they are normally the same color as the  
28 tall grass that is allowed to grow around them.

29  
30 Mr. Schroeder stated that his road commissioner has had problems with this issue. He said that on a farm  
31 which is located north of his property there is a pedestal on the corner of the old farmstead and when the  
32 pedestal is hit by the snowplow it explodes into pieces. He said that such a regulation would not only be  
33 beneficial to the farmers who mow their roadsides but also to the township road commissioners.

34  
35 Mr. Langenheim asked if the pedestals were a road hazard or do they damage mowing equipment.

36  
37 Mr. Doenitz stated no.

38  
39 Mr. Moser stated that many pedestals have been hit and no one reports it and then there are honest folks who  
40 do report the incident, without loss of phone service, and they receive a bill for \$500 for the pedestals repair.

41  
42 Ms. Anderson asked if the marked pedestals are marked with a flag.

43



6-11-07

AS APPROVED AUGUST 13, 2007

ELUC

1 Mr. Moser stated no. He said that there is an orange fiberglass pole on both sides of the pedestal.

2  
3 Mr. Schroeder stated that in the past a 4" x 4" post would be used with an orange marker on the top. He said  
4 that when the pedestals are hit the mowing equipment is not damaged. He said that four years ago he hit an  
5 unmarked pedestal because he did not realize that it existed on the property and the only thing that the  
6 telephone company did was splice the wires.

7  
8 **The consensus of the Committee was to defer Item #8 to the June 21, 2007, ELUC Special Meeting.**

9  
10 **10. *Proposal to prepare a Champaign County Government Land Use Plan***

11  
12 Ms. Wysocki commended the Committee regarding the discussion that occurred last month about the  
13 Champaign County Government Land Use Plan. She said that the Committee used deliberation and care to  
14 talk about some very critical issues regarding this issue and she appreciates the respect and general purpose  
15 of what the Committee believes is in the best interest of the County. She noted that she hopes that the same  
16 spirit will exist tonight when some the items are revisited for recommendations to the County Board. She  
17 suggested that in the interest in making sure that the Committee addresses every one of the issues that are  
18 before them that they work on the resolutions in order. She said that by juggling the order of the resolutions  
19 it would be easy to lose track of some of the issues.

20  
21 Ms. Wysocki read Item #1. She said that this will be a nominating process where potential members of the  
22 Steering Committee will be nominated or recommended by a County Board member.

23  
24 **The consensus of the Committee was to recommend approval of Item #1.**

25  
26 Ms. Wysocki read Item #2.

27  
28 Mr. Doenitz stated that he agrees with Item #2.

29  
30 Mr. Hall stated that the provision of a super-majority vote is not absolutely necessary but it does raise the  
31 general question that since a tie is very unlikely should the Chair have any voting rights at all. He said that  
32 from staff's perspective the super-majority requirement is necessary in light of the fact that a tie cannot  
33 occur for anything that is substantive. He said that it can be left in the resolution, although it will not be  
34 necessary, but in the attempt to be comprehensive staff wanted to flag the general issue of having the Chair  
35 vote or not. He said that he received a call today from the President of the Champaign County Farm Bureau  
36 who was unhappy that the Chair and Vice-Chair were not voting members.

37  
38 Ms. Anderson stated that the Chair and Vice-Chair should be able to vote.

39  
40 Mr. Moser also stated that the Chair and Vice-Chair should be able to vote.

41  
42 Mr. Langenheim asked Ms. Wysocki what the rationale for depriving the Chair and Vice-Chair the right to  
43 vote.

1  
2 Ms. Wysocki stated that in last month's draft the Chair, Ms. Wysocki, was also going to be the Urbana  
3 representative to this group and therefore she would be casting a vote as representing Urbana's interests.  
4 She said that it is strictly by luck of the draw that she is a resident of Urbana and whether she is the person  
5 to represent Urbana's interests during this planning session is a daunting responsibility.  
6  
7 Mr. Moser stated that Ms. Wysocki could also represent Urbana Township.  
8  
9 Ms. Wysocki stated that she is aware of that fact.  
10  
11 Mr. Hall stated that the common practice for a plan commission is that there are no elected officials on it.  
12  
13 Mr. Langenheim stated that there are a large number of elected officials on this committee.  
14  
15 Mr. Hall stated that at a staff level the super-majority should be increased to 75% and drop the requirement  
16 for voting by the Chair and Vice Chair.  
17  
18 Mr. Langenheim stated that he agreed. He stated that the Chair person should not be deprived of the  
19 opportunity to vote.  
20  
21 Mr. Schroeder asked if he and Ms. Wysocki could jeopardize their potential voting as County Board  
22 members later on when this piece of legislation comes to the County Board in voting on the steering  
23 committee or having any kind of vote and giving opinions, collecting opinions, etc.  
24  
25 Ms. McGrath stated that this is not a zoning case so it is not a situation where the steering committee is  
26 holding a hearing in regard to a recommendation. She said that the steering committee is a citizens group  
27 that does not have any official authority in regard to what the County should and should not be doing  
28 therefore whether the Chair and Vice-Chair has the ability to vote does not jeopardize what authority they  
29 would have as County Board members.  
30  
31 Ms. Melin asked Ms. Wysocki if she was on the steering committee as the Chair would she not be the  
32 Urbana representative.  
33  
34 Ms. Wysocki stated that this is her understanding.  
35  
36 Ms. Wysocki asked Mr. Hall if Mr. Schroeder and herself became voting members wouldn't that increase  
37 the number of steering committee members to 19.  
38  
39 Mr. Hall stated yes. He said that if the Chair and Vice-Chair will be allowed to vote then the number will  
40 increase and this number must be reflected in the super-majority requirement.  
41  
42 Ms. McGrath stated that there will actually be 20 steering committee members not 19.  
43

6-11-07

AS APPROVED AUGUST 13, 2007

ELUC

1 Mr. Doenitz asked if Ms. Wysocki and Mr. Schroeder would be voting members of the steering committee  
2 all of the time.

3  
4 Ms. Wysocki stated that she is assuming if they are to become voting members then they will vote on  
5 everything.

6  
7 Mr. Doenitz stated that his only problem with this is that there will be two County Board members voting  
8 and he is not sure if he agrees with that.

9  
10 Ms. Anderson stated that she assumes that the Vice-Chair would only vote in the absence of the Chair and in  
11 the extent of a tie.

12  
13 Mr. Hall stated that assuming that the super-majority requirement is adopted there will be no ties that needed  
14 to be voted upon for substantive issues.

15  
16 Mr. Doenitz stated that if Ms. Wysocki is going to be a voting member all of the time then she should be  
17 representing her area.

18  
19 Mr. Hall reminded the Committee that all of ELUC is an *ex-officio* member which means that they will be  
20 treated just like a steering committee member although their presence at the meeting will not be required for  
21 a quorum and they will have no voting rights. He said that all ELUC members will receive the same  
22 information and will receive information for every steering committee meeting.

23  
24 Ms. McGrath stated that if the ELUC members are to be *ex-officio* members of the steering committee then  
25 it should be included in the resolution.

26  
27 Mr. Hall stated that this will be another issue for the Committee to consider.

28  
29 Ms. Wysocki stated that it should be a point to include this in the resolution.

30  
31 Mr. Gladney asked if there was a reason why the number could not be dropped back down to an uneven  
32 number so that the event of a tie would not occur therefore making this whole issue less complicated.

33  
34 Mr. Hall stated that it was set up this way because this is the way that it was drafted by staff but had staff  
35 realized that with the super-majority there cannot possibly be a tie then the part in Item #2 of the Resolution  
36 regarding the Chair having a vote only in the event of a tie would not be necessary unless the Committee  
37 wants the Chair to have the opportunity to vote. He said that from a staff level they are trying to give the  
38 Committee a structure which will guarantee that if the steering committee recommends something there is a  
39 high probability that it is something that ELUC can also recommend to the County Board because there is a  
40 high probability that the County Board will adopt it. He said that as we learned in the Zoning Ordinance  
41 revision there is only a small area where there is likely to be a super-majority agreement and that should be a  
42 base understanding to begin with but the greatest way to make that happen is to start off with a super-  
43 majority requirement at the steering committee.

- 1  
2 Mr. Moser stated that if everyone on ELUC is to be an *ex-officio* member of the steering committee then he  
3 will withdraw his recommendation that the Chair and Vice-Chair should have voting rights.  
4  
5 Ms. Wysocki stated that currently it has been decided that there will be a total of eighteen steering  
6 committee members with no voting rights for the Chair or Vice-Chair.  
7  
8 Mr. Hall stated that is correct.  
9  
10 Mr. Doenitz asked if the Project Manager has been chosen to lead this endeavor.  
11  
12 Ms. Wysocki stated that Ms. Susan Chavaria has been designated as the Project Manager. She said that she  
13 is currently a staff person at the Regional Planning Commission and has done a number of the highway  
14 corridor studies along with Rita Morocoima-Black. She said that Ms. Chavaria has been with the RPC for  
15 seven years.  
16  
17 Mr. Doenitz stated that he wants to make it perfectly clear that he does not want Mr. DiNovo involved in the  
18 project.  
19  
20 Ms. Wysocki stated that Mr. DiNovo has indicated that he does not want to be involved in this project.  
21  
22 Mr. Hall asked if the Committee would like to be so specific to clarify in Item #2, that neither the Chair nor  
23 Vice-Chair shall have voting rights.  
24  
25 Ms. McGrath stated that if the desire of the Committee is not to allow the Chair or Vice-Chair to vote then it  
26 must be included in the resolution.  
27  
28 Ms. Wysocki read Item #3. She said that the issue had been raised about the possibility of not being able to  
29 identify the individuals to serve on this Committee based on the geographic restrictions and elected  
30 positions that were indicated. She said that the intent of Item #3 is to broaden that base so that individuals  
31 can be solicited to serve on the Committee.  
32  
33 Mr. Doenitz asked why Hensley and Somer Townships were not included in Item #3, Paragraph 4. He said  
34 that he is the Mahomet Township Highway Commissioner and is automatically eliminated due to his County  
35 Board status therefore there are only two other people to draw from when theoretically there should be four  
36 because of the metro township area.  
37  
38 Ms. Monte responded the difference between “metropolitan” and “urban” townships is not clear.  
39  
40 Mr. Hall stated that metro townships are those townships that lose geographic area when the municipalities  
41 expand but urban townships are the townships experiencing the most growth which is Champaign, Urbana,  
42 and Mahomet.  
43

6-11-07

AS APPROVED AUGUST 13, 2007

ELUC

1 Mr. Moser asked Mr. Hall what will happen if the Urbana Township Road Commissioner and the  
2 Champaign Township Road Commissioner refuse to do it.

3  
4 Mr. Hall asked Ms. McGrath if there is a reason why County Board members who hold these positions  
5 cannot be appointed to the Steering Committee.

6  
7 Ms. McGrath stated that it would be irrational to say that there are occurrences when the Chair and Vice-  
8 Chair cannot vote yet other County Board members can vote because they hold these positions. She said  
9 that for consistency sake it would make sense not to have a County Board member be a member of the  
10 Committee.

11  
12 Mr. Hall asked Ms. McGrath if the Resolution should also address this issue.

13  
14 Ms. McGrath stated yes.

15  
16 Mr. Gladney asked if the people who hold these positions have been approached in regard to becoming a  
17 member of the Steering Committee.

18  
19 Ms. Wysocki stated that she has a list of people that she would like to contact but has withheld contacting  
20 these people until the Resolution is complete.

21  
22 Mr. Gladney stated that all of the perimeters and criteria are being set assuming that these people would  
23 want to be on the Steering Committee.

24  
25 Mr. Langenheim read Item #3, Paragraph 1. He asked if Champaign and Urbana townships include the  
26 cities.

27  
28 Mr. Hall stated no. He said that Champaign and Urbana townships only include the unincorporated portions  
29 of these townships and not the incorporated portions. He noted that the township which includes the City of  
30 Champaign is called the City of Champaign Township and the township which includes the City of Urbana  
31 is called Cunningham Township.

32  
33 Mr. Doenitz stated that any township, such as Champaign, Hensley, Somer and Urbana that deals with the  
34 City of Champaign and Cunningham Townships should be included in the metro area because they lose  
35 geographic ground. He said that he agrees with Mr. Moser in that he does not believe that the Urbana  
36 Township Road Commissioner will serve on the Steering Committee.

37  
38 Mr. Hall asked Mr. Doenitz if he is suggesting a change to the Resolution.

39  
40 Mr. Doenitz stated yes. He said that Item #3, Paragraph 4 should be consistent with Paragraph 1 with the  
41 inclusion of Hensley and Somer townships.

42  
43 Mr. Hall asked Mr. Doenitz if Mahomet should be included in Paragraph 1.

- 1  
2 Mr. Doenitz stated that this is a mute point because he is the Mahomet Township Road Commissioner.  
3  
4 Mr. Hall stated that he is aware that Mr. Doenitz is the Mahomet Township Road Commissioner and he  
5 would like the Committee to consider that very topic.  
6  
7 Mr. Moser stated that he could almost bet that the Urbana and Champaign Township Road Commissioners  
8 will not serve on the Steering Committee.  
9  
10 Ms. McGrath stated that the Draft Resolution specifies elected or former.  
11  
12 Mr. Doenitz stated that it will not do any good to have his predecessor included with Mahomet because he  
13 will not be interested.  
14  
15 Mr. Moser stated that there are several drainage commissioners in the County which are elected and should  
16 be considered equal to a township official.  
17  
18 Ms. Monte agreed and stated that this would widen the pool of candidates.  
19  
20 Mr. Doenitz stated that he agrees. He asked why someone from the Soil Conservation District could not be  
21 included.  
22  
23 Mr. Hall stated that the Soil Conservation District is just an interest and not an elected government position.  
24  
25 Ms. McGrath stated that one way to resolve this issue is to revise the text as follows: 2 elected or former  
26 elected township officials or appointed or former township plan commission members, and elected or  
27 appointed drainage district commissioners from rural prairie townships (Brown; Ludlow; Harwood; Kerr;  
28 Condit; Rantoul; Compromise; Stanton; Ogden; Ayers; Raymond; Crittenden; Philo; Tolono; Pesotum;  
29 Sadorus; Colfax; and Scott).  
30  
31 Mr. Langenheim asked if the drainage district commission member has to live in that district.  
32  
33 Mr. Moser stated no, but they do have to own property in the district.  
34  
35 Ms. Wysocki asked the Committee if the agreed with the revised text for Item #3.  
36  
37 **The consensus of the Committee was yes.**  
38  
39 Ms. Wysocki read Item #4. She said that Mr. Hal Barnhart suggested that the following three perspectives  
40 be added to Item #4: farmland preservationist; drainage district commissioner; and a representative  
41 involved in historical and cultural preservation.  
42  
43 Ms. Monte stated that farmland preservation should replace soil conservation as an interest or perspective.

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

Mr. Hall stated that Item #4(h);(i);and (j) have a residency requirement. He said that this seems to be contradictory to the intent of Item #4.

Ms. Monte stated that Item #4(i) public school (rural) was placed there because those schools and their issues are different than schools in a metropolitan area.

Mr. Hall stated that for clarity Item #4(i) should be revised to indicate rural public schools which is much different that Item #4(h) and (j) which indicates rural resident.

Mr. Jones asked if each Steering Committee member should be representative of one or more of the following interests.

Ms. Wysocki cautioned the Committee that when we go through the selection process and the backgrounds are reviewed on the candidates and it is discovered that no one is representing the fire/emergency services that this would not disqualify the Committee. She said that every attempt will be made to draw the remainder of the Committee from these categories but despite our efforts it may not be possible. She said that the spirit of the process is to tie in some diversity of opinions and perspectives but there is no guarantee that the Committee has every perspective that has a rural connection.

Mr. Hall asked Mr. Jones if he is concerned that Item #4 reads more like a requirement.

Mr. Jones stated yes.

Mr. Hall suggested that Item #4 be revised to state as follows: Each Steering Committee member should be, as much as possible, be representative of one or more of the following interests or perspectives:

Ms. Wysocki asked the Committee if they desired to replace Item #4(f) soil conservation with farmland preservation.

**The consensus of the Committee was to replace Item #4(f) soil conservation with farmland preservation.**

Ms. Wysocki asked the Committee if they desired to add historical and cultural preservation to the perspective list.

Mr. Gladney stated that ELUC is spending a lot of time in trying include all of the different perspectives but what guarantee do we have that these perspectives will be appropriately represented.

Ms. Wysocki stated that if she is making phone calls in trying to get people to serve on the committee she is going to make it clear to them that they are being called because they have an interest in a certain perspective and when it gets to the point in the discussion she is going to say to this person that they are the person that the Committee is going to look to in forming these statements.

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. Doenitz stated that at the last meeting it was decided where all of the different perspectives would come from. He asked what is being used for structure on finding those people now.

Mr. Hall stated it was the map of urban and rural areas. He said that instead of the very specific numerical requirement that was previously proposed, the general revised requirement is just keeping a two-to-one ratio of rural to urban. He said that with the new numbers 12 of the 18 members have to be from rural areas and only six can be from urban areas.

Ms. Wysocki stated that since there is no argument for or against she is going to recommend that historical/cultural preservation; clergy; and farmland preservation be added to the list of perspectives.

Ms. McGrath stated that there is problem with adding clergy to the list of perspectives and requested that it be stricken.

Mr. Langenheim stated that the clergy is interested in the community and should not be excluded.

Mr. Weibel stated that clergy are not being excluded because they may be an individual who is representative of one or more of the perspectives.

Ms. Wysocki agreed.

Mr. Gladney stated that eight of the twenty members or eighteen voting members will be acting or former officials leaving 12 members as members of the public sector.

Ms. Wysocki stated that Mr. Gladney was correct.

Mr. Gladney stated that it is beneficial to have the experience and knowledge of local leaders and officials but it is also beneficial to have the public included in this process.

Mr. Schroeder questioned Item #4(q) which was University of Illinois Administrative.

Ms. Monte stated that the University of Illinois has a landowner interest in the rural areas and has an interest in the welfare of the County. She said that the more vital and attractive the County is more benefit to the University of Illinois.

Mr. Schroeder stated that the University of Illinois is a landowner but they can do *eminent domain* and do anything that it wants. He asked Mr. Hall if there is a zoning classification in the County that has zoning where a child care facility could be placed next to a hazardous storage waste facility.

Mr. Hall stated in general, child care facilities are not allowed in Industrial Zoning Districts. He said that virtually all of the University of Illinois property in the County's zoning jurisdiction is zoned AG-2, Agriculture. He said that the University of Illinois is exempt from zoning.



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 this is his point because the University of Illinois is exempt from zoning therefore they can do anything that they want to do on any property. He said that if the University of Illinois administration is to be included as one of the interest or perspectives he would rather that they not be a voting member and be *ex-officio member*.

Mr. Doenitz agreed with Mr. Schroeder.

Mr. Moser stated that he also agrees with Mr. Schroeder. He said that the University of Illinois has taken away all of the property rights of many landowners between Ridge Road to Willard Airport and has left a bitter taste in many people's mouth in the way that the new South Farms has been handled.

Mr. Schroeder stated that an administrator of the University of Illinois cannot make any decision without having some sort of determined policy set by the Board.

Ms. Anderson suggested that this interest category broadened to include higher education administration and that would allow Parkland College administration to be included in the pool.

Mr. Weibel stated that perhaps we could substitute Item#4(q) with higher education rather than University of Illinois administration.

Mr. Doenitz agreed with Mr. Weibel.

Mr. Moser agreed with Mr. Weibel.

**The consensus of the Committee was to substitute Item #4(q) with higher education administration.**

Ms. Wysocki read Item #5.

Mr. Langenheim asked what happens if a proposed committee member lives in a subdivision which is in the County yet can step across the street and be in the city limits. He said that the population of an area like this probably exceeds the population of the rural part of the County.

Ms. Monte stated that if their property is not within the corporate limits then they would be considered rural.

Ms. Wysocki stated that she would like to see the current text in Item #5 stay as it is written because it appears to be very clear cut.

Ms. Wysocki read Item #6.

Mr. Langenheim suggested that Item #6 be revised to indicate the office of the person to be appointed as Chair of the Steering Committee and not the name of the person who will be appointed. He said that Item #6 should read as follows: The Environment and Land Use Chair, in their personal capacity, shall be

1 appointed as Chair of the Steering Committee.

2  
3 Mr. Hall stated that, as much as possible, from a staff perspective it would be advisable to have continuous  
4 leadership.

5  
6 Mr. Weibel stated that it could be the current Chair or former Chair of ELUC.

7  
8 Ms. Wysocki stated that this could go beyond the 2008 election.

9  
10 Mr. Moser stated the problem with indicating current Chair or former Chair of ELUC is that Ms. Wysocki  
11 may not be the only former Chair on the current Environment and Land Use Committee.

12  
13 Mr. Hall asked Mr. Langenheim if his recommendation would also apply to Item #7.

14  
15 Mr. Langenheim stated yes.

16  
17 **The consensus of the Committee was to revise Items #6 and #7 to indicate the office of the persons to**  
18 **be appointed as Chair and Vice-Chair of the Steering Committee and not the name of the persons to**  
19 **be appointed as Chair and Vice-Chair.**

20  
21 Ms. Wysocki read Item #8.

22  
23 Mr. Hall stated that staff recommends a three-quarter supermajority which equals 14 of 18 member Steering  
24 Committee. He said that revised Item #8 would read as follows: A  $\frac{3}{4}$  supermajority of the 18-member  
25 Steering Committee, which equals 14 members, shall be required in deciding substantive issues or  
26 procedures.

27  
28 Mr. Weibel asked what would be considered a substantive issue or procedure. He said that it should be  
29 indicated if the  $\frac{3}{4}$  supermajority requirement is for those present at the meeting or for the total 18 members.

30  
31 Mr. Doenitz stated that Mr. Weibel's statement is true but with ELUC if a supermajority vote is required it  
32 based on the total number of members not those members who are present at the time.

33  
34 Ms. McGrath stated different categories require different voting procedures.

35  
36 Mr. Weibel stated it should be indicated in the Resolution whether the  $\frac{3}{4}$  supermajority vote is for the 18-  
37 member Steering Committee or just those present at the meeting.

38  
39 Mr. Langenheim asked why a supermajority vote is required.

40  
41 Ms. Wysocki stated that when the Steering Committee makes a decision it is to be a loud sounding voice and  
42 is not squeaking through with a one vote majority.

43

6-11-07

AS APPROVED AUGUST 13, 2007

ELUC

1 Mr. Hall stated that staff's direction is to make sure that another Zoning Ordinance revision doesn't happen  
2 therefore staff recommends a supermajority. He said that if ELUC chooses not to accept staff's  
3 recommendation then so be it but it is noted that staff did make the recommendation.

4  
5 Mr. Langenheim stated that the Steering Committee cannot speak with a soft voice.

6  
7 Ms. Wysocki stated that knowing that ultimately this comes back to the County, through ELUC and the  
8 County Board, every County Board member should be assured that the decisions that were made were  
9 careful, deliberate and in close to agreement as any body could come. She said that the recommendations  
10 will be heard with a loud voice and she would hope that ultimately the County Board will remember that  
11 when they pass judgment on that recommendation and not dismissed.

12  
13 Mr. Gladney asked how many times the Steering Committee is anticipated to meet.

14  
15 Mr. Hall stated that the Steering Committee is proposed to meet 18 times over a period of two and one-half  
16 years.

17  
18 Mr. Gladney asked if there will be agendas for each meeting.

19  
20 Mr. Hall stated yes. He said that the agendas will be driven by the schedule and the decisions which need to  
21 be made at that time. He said that ELUC will be approving the work of the Steering Committee on a regular  
22 basis, but at least four to six times.

23  
24 Ms. McGrath stated that there is a requirement in the County Board rules that people attend the meetings  
25 and that there is a certain number of meetings that they can be excused from. She said that it appears that  
26 ELUC is concerned about attendance and would like to have a similar condition but the problem with such a  
27 condition is that there are many times when not all 18 members of the Steering Committee, for one reason or  
28 another, will be able to attend a meeting. She said that this is a situation that can be controlled by this  
29 Committee.

30  
31 Mr. Weibel recommended that Item #8 be revised as follows: A  $\frac{3}{4}$  supermajority vote be required of those  
32 present, of the 18 member Steering Committee. He said that the following text should be stricken: shall be  
33 required when deciding substantive issues or procedures.

34  
35 Ms. Wysocki asked the Committee if they agreed with Mr. Weibel's recommendation.

36  
37 **The consensus of the Committee was to revise Item #8 to indicate a  $\frac{3}{4}$  supermajority vote be required**  
38 **of those present, of the 18 member Steering Committee and strike the following text from Item #8:**  
39 **shall be required when deciding substantive issues or procedures.**

40  
41 Mr. Hall stated that earlier in the meeting there was concern regarding whether people who are currently  
42 County Board members and who hold township positions could not be nominated as a Steering Committee  
43 member. He said that there was also concern regarding if all ELUC members would be serving as *ex-officio*

1 members of the Steering Committee and if so it needs to be stated in the Resolution. He said that from a  
2 staff perspective this is what was anticipated but the Committee must make that decision.

3  
4 Mr. Gladney requested clarification of the definition of an *ex-officio* member.

5  
6 Ms. McGrath stated that an *ex-officio* member cannot vote and do not count as a quorum but they do have  
7 the right to participate in discussions.

8  
9 Mr. Doenitz stated that ELUC should be included as *ex-officio* members.

10  
11 Mr. Hall stated that in including ELUC members as *ex-officio* members would allow the Committee to  
12 participate but without it being included in the Resolution and using the traditional Steering Committee  
13 model would not have ELUC as an *ex-officio* member. He said that there would be a formal plan  
14 commission formally established that planning commissioners would be appointed to on a regular basis. He  
15 said that this is why this is different than what happens in other forums. He said that he is sensitive getting  
16 criticism from people who are used to the traditional municipal approach and do not understand that the  
17 County is a much different thing.

18  
19 Mr. Doenitz stated that he would respond to any criticism that the County is running the show.

20  
21 Ms. Wysocki stated that these distinctions will be made very clear at the first meeting.

22  
23 **The consensus of the Committee was to add an Item #9 indicating that ELUC members will be *ex-***  
24 ***officio* members of the Steering Committee.**

25  
26 Mr. Hall stated that the only item left to determine is the eligibility of serving County Board members.

27  
28 Mr. Hall stated that an Item #10 could be added indicating that serving County Board members are not  
29 eligible as Steering Committee members.

30  
31 **The consensus of the Committee was to add an Item #10 indicating that serving County Board**  
32 **members are not eligible as Steering Committee members.**

33  
34 **Mr. Schroeder moved, seconded by Mr. Doenitz to recommend approval the Resolution regarding**  
35 **Creation of Steering Committee to Guide Preparation of Champaign County Land Resource**  
36 **Management Plan, as amended.**

37  
38 Mr. Doenitz noted that this process is too expensive but it does need to be done.

39  
40 **The motion carried by voice vote.**

41  
42 **Mr. Doenitz moved, seconded by Ms. Melin to recommend approval of the Resolution regarding**  
43 **Development of a Champaign County Land Resource Management Plan. The motion carried by**

1 voice vote.

2

3 **11. Regional Planning Commission County Planner FY 2007 Work Plan**

4

5 Ms. Wysocki stated that the Land Resource Management Plan will apparently be the Regional Planning  
6 Commission County Planner FY 2007 Work Plan.

7

8 **12. Update on Enforcement Cases**

9

**A. Sale of property at 2603 Campbell Drive, Champaign (ZN01-30/14)**

10

11 Ms. McGrath stated that the Committee is being asked to approve the sale of Mr. Mefford's property.

12

13 **Mr. Doenitz moved, seconded by Mr. Moser to approve the sale of property at 2603 Campbell Drive,**  
14 **Champaign, IL. The motion carried by voice vote.**

15

16 **13. Monthly Report (May 2007)**

17

18 Mr. Hall stated that the May 2007, Monthly Report was not available for distribution but will be included in  
19 next month's packet.

20

21 Ms. Wysocki asked if ELUC would meet in July.

22

23 Mr. Hall stated that he is not aware of any license approvals which are required for July and he is not aware  
24 of any items which would require ELUC's input. He said that to date there is no ELUC meeting planned for  
25 the month of July.

26

27 **14. Other Business**

28

29 None

30

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

32

33 Mr. Hall stated that Item #10, Resolutions regarding the Champaign County Land Resource Management  
34 Plan; and Item 12A regarding the sale of property at 2603 Campbell Drive, Champaign, IL, should be placed  
35 on the County Board Consent Agenda.

36

37 Ms. Wysocki stated that she does not believe that Item #10 should be placed on the Consent Agenda.

38

39 Mr. Hall stated that Item #10 did receive a unanimous vote.

40

41 Ms. Wysocki stated that she is aware of the vote and it will be noted at the full County Board.

42

43 **The consensus of the Committee was to place Item #12A on the County Board Consent Agenda.**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

**16. Adjournment**

**Mr. Langenheim moved, seconded by Mr. Doenitz to adjourn the June 11, 2007, ELUC meeting. The motion carried by voice vote.**

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary to the Environment and Land Use Committee

eluc\minutes\minutes.fm