



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

Site Assessment Update Committee

DATE: Wednesday, June 8, 2011
TIME: 6:30 p.m.
PLACE: Brookens Administrative Center
John Dimit Meeting Room
1776 E. Washington St.
Urbana, Illinois

Voting Members Present:
Debra Griest, Liz Jones, Kyle Krapf, Steve Moser, Patsi Petrie, Steve Stierwalt, Bruce Stickers

Non-Voting Member Present: John Hall

Others Present: Brad Uken

CCRPC Facilitator: Susan Monte

Minutes

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Ms. Monte called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. The roll was taken by written record and a quorum was declared present.

2. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Krapf moved to allow public participation to occur before business. Motion was seconded. Upon vote, the motion carried unanimously.

3. Public Participation

Brad Uken, Manager of the Champaign County Farm Bureau, informed the Committee that he and four other individuals affiliated with either the Champaign County Soil and Water Conservation District or the Champaign County Farm Bureau recently met with Terry Savko, Agricultural Land/Water Resource Specialist from the Illinois Department of Agriculture to develop and review a draft set of site assessment factors to consider for the Champaign County LESA. He distributed a copy to each Committee member and reviewed each of the 13 factors included in the draft site assessment factors.

4. Introduction

Committee members each introduced themselves. Ms. Monte explained the County Board vote to expand the scope of the Committee’s charge to include an update of the LE portion of the LESA.

MINUTES– AS APPROVED

- 1 **5. a) Review of Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) system objective and existing SA factors**
2 Ms. Monte reviewed the Committee’s charge and provided an overview regarding the inherent
3 problems with use of the outdated LESA scoring system. Mr. Hall and Ms. Griest attested to the
4 deficiencies of using Champaign County’s outdated LESA system over the past several years. Mr.
5 Moser explained his concerns about problems associated with the current LESA-based definition of
6 Best Prime Farmland in Champaign County.

7
8 Members reviewed the goal and outcome of the Committee and considered providing a
9 recommendation to the County Board to incorporate the LESA into County ordinances so that the
10 updated LESA rating system will have more meaning. Ms. Griest reiterated the importance of
11 updating the County’s LESA system so that the County can use it as a tool which effectively
12 distinguishes between sites that are important to agriculture and those that are not.

13
14 **b) Discussion regarding changes to propose regarding SA factors**

15
16 Mr. Hall distributed a draft set of site assessment factors for Committee review and explained each of
17 the six proposed factors and their application to hypothetical test sites. Ms. Monte distributed a third
18 draft set of site assessment factors for Committee review, consisting of the existing four SA-1 type
19 factors plus one new SA-2 type factor regarding relation to the County’s adopted Land Resource
20 Management Plan.

21
22 **c) Next steps: weighting and testing of SA factors**

23 Ms. Monte suggested as a next step that the Committee further review each of the submitted draft sets
24 of site assessment factors, and that staff provide feedback to the Committee regarding the application of
25 the three sets of draft site assessment factors to a series of test sites.

26
27 **6. Other Business**

28 Members considered a revised Committee timeline to include additional meetings and that these
29 Committee meetings occur as much as possible prior to this fall’s harvest.

30
31 Ms. Petrie requested that the Committee facilitator invite Lew Hopkins, Professor Emeritus, UIUC,
32 Department of Urban and Regional Planning, as a speaker at the next Committee meeting.

33
34 **7. Adjournment**

35 **There being no further business, Ms. Monte adjourned the meeting at 7:50 p.m.**

WHY Update the SA Portion ?

- LESA intended for periodic review and update
- zoning and land use policy changes have occurred since LESA adopted
- redundancy and relevance of existing SA factors to agricultural production

An 'agricultural LESA'..

If LESA objective is ...

to evaluate the agricultural value of a particular parcel relative to all other agricultural parcels in the jurisdiction, then **LE and SA-1 factors** may suffice.

SA-1 Factors measure non-soil site characteristics related to potential agricultural productivity or farming practices....

Typical SA-1 factors discussed on pp. 64-76 of Guidebook.

Select SA-1 Factors of Existing CC LESA

SA Factors (With Maximum Points Possible Shown in Parentheses)	SA Factor Type
A.1. Percentage of area in agricultural uses within 1-1/2 miles of site (18)	SA-1
A.2. Land use adjacent to site (18)	SA-1
A.3. Percentage of site in or suitable for agricultural uses (10)	SA-1
B.1. Percentage of land zoned AG-1, AG-2 and/or CR within 0.5 miles of site (10)	SA-2
B.2. Percentage of site zoned AG-1, AG-2, or CR (10)	SA-2
B.3. Have prior governmental actions committed site to development? (10)	SA-2
C.1. Distance from city or village corporate limits (10)	SA-2
C.2. Compatibility of proposed use and zoning change with surrounding agricultural uses (10)	SA-2
D.1. Size of site feasible for farming (8)	SA-1
D.2. Soil limitations for proposed use and proposed zoning change (10)	SA-2
D.3.a. Alternate sites proposed on less productive land; or (8)	SA-2
D.3.b. Need for additional land (8)	SA-2
E.1. Availability of central sewage system (10)	SA-2
E.2. Availability of central water system (10)	SA-2
E.3. Transportation (10)	SA-2
E.4. Distance of site from fire protection service (10)	SA-2
F.1. Impact on flooding/drainage (6)	SA-3
F.2. Impact on historic, cultural, unique or important vegetation areas, or other areas of ecological importance (6)	SA-3
F.3. Impact on recreation and open space (6)	SA-3
F.4. Impact on water quality (10)	SA-3
F.5. Impact on water supply (10)	SA-3

Add SA-2 Factor regarding planned land use designation in adopted comprehensive land use plans

“Consistency of proposed use with Champaign County Land Resource Management Plan and/or municipal comprehensive land use plan if site is within 1-1/2 miles of municipal boundary.”

- ‘not consistent’**
- ‘somewhat consistent’**
- ‘consistent’**

Preliminary SA Factors for COMMITTEE review:

40	1	Percentage of area in agricultural uses within 1-1/2 miles of site	
40	2	Land use adjacent to site	
40	3	Percentage of site in or suitable for agricultural uses	
40	4	Size of site feasible for farming	
40	5	Consistency of proposed use with Champaign County Land Resource Management Plan and/or municipal comprehensive land use plan if site is within 1-1/2 miles of municipal boundary	

200 points

John Hall Draft SA factors
June 8, 2011

GOALS:

- *Focus on productivity and “farmability” as much as possible but do not ignore LRMP designation
- *Simplicity, ease of use and resulting comprehensibility

BENCHMARKS FOR SUCCESS:

1. **LOW RATING FOR PROTECTION FOR:**
 - A. Small, non-CUGA, non-BPF w/ no LMF & some distance from populated area and particularly if some sides are non-AG
 - B. Large, CUGA, BPF (assume no LMF, populated area, no sides in AG)
2. **SIMPLICITY**
3. **REFLECTION OF REALITY**

PROPOSED SITE ASSESSMENT FACTORS

- 1. Does the Champaign County Land Resource Management Plan indicate agriculture as the planned use of the land proposed for development?**

(Note: In the LRMP agriculture is the planned use in all of the unincorporated area except for the Contiguous Urban Growth Area (CUGA))

NO 0

YES 50

- 2. How close is the land proposed for development to livestock management facilities of 50 or more animal units?**

(Note: Livestock management facilities of 50 or more animal units have no setback requirements in the *Illinois Livestock Management Facilities Act* (510 ILCS 77/ et seq); 50 animal units equates to 25 horses or 50 cows or 125 hogs over 55 pounds or 1,665 hogs under 55 pounds. See the attached table on the *Illinois Livestock Management Facilities Act* (510 ILCS 77/ et seq; close adjacency means the proposed development is more incompatible with the existing livestock management facility)

Adjacent	40
Less than .25 mile	32
.26 to .50 mile	24
.51 to .74 mile	18
.75 to 1.00 mile	10
More than 1.00 mile	0

- 3. How close is the land proposed for development to the nearest public assembly use (like a church) or 10 or more non-farm dwellings?**

(Note: The *Illinois Livestock Management Facilities Act* (510 ILCS 77/ et seq) defines “populated area” public assembly use (like a church) or 10 or more non-farm dwellings; greater separation means the land proposed for development could be used more easily for a livestock management facility.)

More than 1.00 mile	40
.75 to 1.00 mile	32
.51 to .74 mile	24
.26 to .50 mile	16
Less than .25 mile	10
Adjacent	0

4. How many sides of the land proposed for development are in agricultural land use?

4	20
3	16
2	13
1	10
None	0

5. How much land is proposed for development?

(Note: Current Zoning Ordinance has no maximum lot size for best prime farmland lots created out of 12 acre parcels that existed on 1/1/98)

40 acres or more	30
30.0 to 39.9 acres	23
20.0 to 29.9 acres	16
12.01 to 19.9 acres	10
12.00 acres or less	0

6. Is the land proposed for development best prime farmland (LE=85 or greater)?

(Note: This is separate from the LE and is proposed as a bonus factor under agricultural productivity to reflect the County's values regarding best prime farmland)

YES	20
NO	0

RESULTS FOR BENCHMARK PARCELS

BECHMARK PARCELS (hypothetical)	EXISTING LE	EXISTING SA*	EXISTING TOTAL*	ABOVE ALTERNATIVE SA	ABOVE ALTERNATIVE TOTAL
<p>Parcel A</p> <p>1.located outside of the CUGA; 2. with no LMF; 3. .75 mi. from a POP. area; 4. 3 sides in AG; 5. 12 acres 6.non- Best Prime Farmland</p>	84	138	222 (VERY HIGH RATING FOR PROTECTION)	98 <u>Factor ratings:</u> 1. 50 2. 0 3. 32 4. 16 5. 0 6. 0	182 (LOW MODERATE RATING FOR PROTECTION)
<p>Parcel B</p> <p>1.located in the CUGA; 2.no LMF; 3. sides in AG; 4.within .25 mile of POP. area; 5.40 acres; 6.Best Prime Farmland</p>	100	100	200 (HIGH RATING FOR PROTECTION)	76 <u>Factor ratings:</u> 1. 0 2. 0 3. 10 4. 16 5. 30 6. 20	176 (LOW RATING FOR PROTECTION)
<p>*see attached worksheets for existing LESA scores</p>					

Illinois Livestock Management Facilities Act (510 ILCS 77/et seq.)
General Requirements Related to Size of Facility

Number of Animal ¹ Units	Setbacks for New Facilities	Waste Management Plan	Livestock Manager Certification
Less than 50 animal units (less than 25 horses; or less than 50 cows; or less than 125 hogs over 55 lbs.)	Not Required	Not Required	Not Required
50 to 1,000 animal units (between 25 and 500 horses; or between 50 and 1,000 cows; or between 750 - 2,500 hogs)	1/4 Mile from Non-farm Residence ½ Mile from Populated Area ²	Not Required	Not Required
1,000 - 7,000 (between 500 to 3,500 horses; or 1,000 and 7,000 cows; or between 2,500 -17,500 hogs over 55 lbs.)	1/4 Mile + 220' for each additional 1,000 AU's from Non-farm Residence ½ Mile + 440' for each additional 1,000 AU's from Populated Area	General Plan Required (1,000 - 5,000 animal units)	Training Required
		Detailed Plan Required (More than 5,000 animal units)	
More than 7,000 animal units (more than 3,500 horses; or more than 7,000 cows; or more than 17,500 hogs)	½ Mile from Any Residence 1 Mile from a Populated Area	Detailed Plan Required	Training Required

NOTES:

1. An Animal Unit is roughly equivalent to 1,000 lbs. of animal body weight. The Act specifies a conversion for different types of animals. 1,000 AU's is equivalent to 500 horses, 1,000 cows, 2,500 hogs over 55 lbs. or 33,300 hogs under 55 lbs.
2. A Populated Area is an area containing a public assembly use like a church or 10 or more non-farm dwellings.
3. Certain Livestock Management Facilities are required to be supervised by a certified livestock manager.

Site Assessment Factors

1. Percentage of area in agricultural uses within and one-half (1.5) miles of site (measurement should be from property lines of site).

75% or more	20 points
50% to 74%	10 points
25% to 49%	5 points
Less than 25%	0 points

This factor is a major indicator of the agricultural character of the general area. Areas in the County that are dominated by agricultural uses are generally more viable for farm purpose. Agricultural land uses should be interpreted to mean all agricultural and related uses that can be considered to be part of the farm operation. This would include farmland (cropland), pasture lands, raising livestock, or timberlands whether or not in current production, farm residences, barns and outbuildings. In addition, land enrolled in a conservation program, with an installed agricultural best management practice (grassed waterway, filter strip, water and sediment control basin, grade stabilization structures etc.) a farm pond shall also be considered as part of an agricultural land use. (An expanded definition of agriculture is already in place in the current SE portion of LESA and should be utilized in the updated version as well.)

The 1.5 mile area of consideration for this factor was selected for two reasons. First, in the county, a 1.5 mile radius is a reasonable and manageable area when analyzing the land use and overall characteristic's of the area. Second, the State of Illinois has set 1.5 miles as the jurisdictional boundary for municipal planning. Since this factor is a major indicator of the agricultural character of an area, it has a maximum value of 20.

2. Area adjacent to subject site that is being used for production agriculture.

All sides in production agriculture	25 points
3 sides in production agriculture	15 points
2 sides in production agriculture	10 points
1 side in production agriculture	5 points
All sides in non-agricultural use	0 points

This factor gives more points to sites that are surrounded by other farming operations. The points are less when farmland has other land uses adjacent to it. This factor guides development to areas where development has already occurred and away from areas dominated by farming operations. The term "production agriculture" is defined as all uses related to the farm operation as in Factor 1 above.

3. Percentage of site in or suitable for agricultural uses.

80 to 100%	20 points
60% to 79%	15 points

40% to 59%	10 points
20% to 39%	5 points
Less than 20%	0 points

This factor is utilized to assess the site's current and future use. Additionally, this factor can indicate the viability of the site for agricultural purposes. Again, the term "agricultural uses" will mean the same as in Factors 1 and 2 above.

4. Percentage of land zoned AG-1, AG-2, Agriculture and/or Conservation Recreation within 1.5 miles of site (measurement should be from property lines of site).

75% or more	10 points
50% to 74%	8 points
25% to 49%	6 points
10% to 24%	4 points
Less than 24%	0 points

This factor is important since zoning regulations derive from police power. When land is zoned other than Ag-1, Ag-2 or CR, the potential exists for non-agricultural uses which may be incompatible with agriculture. The 1.5 mile area of consideration was selected for the same reason as in Factor 1.

5. Percentage of site zoned Ag-1, Agriculture, Ag-2 Agriculture or CR, Conservation Recreation.

75% or more	10 points
50% to 74%	8 points
25% to 49%	6 points
10% to 24%	4 points
Less than 24%	0 points

This factor is to be utilized as assess the site's current zoning. If the site is to be zoned other than Ag-1, Ag-2, or CR, the potential for non-agricultural uses which may not be compatible exists.

6. Consistency of proposed use with County Land Resource Management Plan, and/or municipal comprehensive land use plan if the site is within 1.5 miles of municipal boundary.

Not consistent	20 points
Somewhat consistent	10 points
Consistent	0 points

Specifically, consistency is determined based upon the examination of the local concept plan and/or comprehensive plan. A proposed use will either match (be

consistent) or not match (be inconsistent) local plan. In the instance when two plans are examined for consistency based on the project's location, if the proposed use matches one plan and not the other, then the use will be deemed somewhat consistent.

This factor addresses the relationship of the parcel's proposed use in comparison to the overall plan of development for the county or municipality. Plans will have a text which states official policy and a map that interprets in graphic form. These plans may be further reinforced by the regional policies. Consistency with the intent of these plans and policies should be examined every time a land use change is proposed. In this way, some reasonable order can be maintained between two various land uses as well as to allow governmental agencies some sound basis for future planning of public works and services to the county.

To ensure the cooperation between municipalities and the County, this factor recognizes the municipality's interest in development within its 1.5 mile jurisdictional boundary. It also recognizes that, for the most part, municipal plans do not include agricultural areas. If the parcel is within two municipal planning areas, the plan from the nearest municipality or the one most likely to annex the area shall be considered.

In cases in which a plan is being written, the Site Assessment review shall use the land use plan currently adopted.

7. Distance from city or village limits (measurement should be taken in a direct line from the point on the site nearest the municipality limits).

Greater than 1.5 miles	20 points
.75 mile to 1.5 miles	10 points
Less than 0.75 mile	0 points

Generally, the further a proposed project is from a municipality, the greater the risk of creating conflict with agriculture. This factor recognizes that development generally should be promoted to take place within 1.5 miles of a municipal boundary. The closer a development is to a municipality, the greater the likelihood that the development will represent an orderly extension of the urban area. In addition, municipal type services can be provided in a cost efficient manner on the boundary of the site to the corporate limits. The purpose of choosing 1.5 miles is because the State of Illinois has set 1.5 miles as the jurisdictional boundary for municipal planning.

8. Availability of public sewage system (measurement should be a direct line from the point on the site nearest to the sewage system).

More than 1.5 miles	15 points
0.5 to 1.5 miles	10 points
0.25 to 0.49 miles	5 points
Less than 0.25 mile	0 points

The availability to a site of a public sewer system with sufficient capacity encourages growth and reduces the long-term viability of a site for agriculture.

9. Availability of public water system (measurement should be a direct line from the point on the site nearest to the water system).

More than 1.5 miles	10 points
0.5 to 1.5 miles	8 points
0.25 to 0.49 miles	6 points
Less than 0.25 mile	0 points

This factor recognizes that the existence of a public water system encourages growth and reduces the long-term viability of a site for agriculture. As a central water system is extended into an agricultural area, the character of the area may change and more non-agricultural development may occur.

10. Transportation systems

Aggregate (gravel) or oil and chip	15 points
2 lane hard surface	7 points
4 lane hard surface	0 points

The type of road providing access to a site is a major factor in determining the suitability of the proposed use.

11. Public protection Classification (Fire Insurance Rating)

Classifications 9 and 10	15 points
Classification 8	8 points
Classification 7	6 points
Classification 6	6 points
Classification 5	2 points
Classifications 1 through 4	0 points

Fire protection requires a combination of equipment, manpower and availability and supply of water. This factor is also related to distance between fire station and proposed development. Fire insurance ratings in Champaign County are determined by the Fire Suppression Rating schedule, published by the Insurance services Office of Illinois, 101 North Wacker Street, Chicago IL 60606. These ratings are based on the fire fighting capability of the rural fire protection districts serving unincorporated areas of Champaign County.

12. Distance of site from Medical Response Service (measurement should be actual road miles to nearest Medical Response facility).

More than 5 miles from Medical response services	10 points
2.5 to 5.0 miles	8 points
1.5 to 2.49 miles	6 points
0.25 to 1.49 miles	2 points

Less than .25 miles

0 points

Medical response services require a combination of equipment, and manpower. This factor is also related to the distance to fire protection and the proposed development. Distance should be calculated by actual road miles from medical response services to the site.

13. Impact on flooding/drainage

Negative impact	10 points
Some impact	8 points
Little or none with special design or protective measures provided or required such as low impact development techniques	2 points
None	0 points

This factor addresses whether the proposed use or zoning change will have impact on neighboring properties from surface runoff; this factor is also concerned with environmentally sensitive areas such as floodplains and wetlands. This factor takes into account whether reasonable provisions have been made to collect and divert surface runoff in order to reduce the likelihood of damage to adjoining properties. The selection and design of measures will depend on varying local conditions such as soils, topography, physical features and the extent of impervious surface.

AGRICULTURE: The growing, harvesting and storing of crops including legumes, hay, grain, fruit and truck or vegetable crops, floriculture, horticulture, mushroom growing, orchards, forestry and the keeping, raising and feeding of livestock or poultry, including dairying, poultry, swine, sheep, beef cattle, pony and horse production, fur farms, and fish and wildlife farms; farm buildings used for growing, harvesting and preparing crop products for market, or for use on the farm; roadside stands, farm buildings for storing and protecting farm machinery and equipment from the elements, for housing livestock or poultry and for preparing livestock or poultry products for market; farm dwellings occupied by farm owners, operators, tenants or seasonal or year-round hired farm workers. It is intended by this definition to include within the definition of agriculture all types of agricultural operations, but to exclude therefrom industrial operations such as a grain elevator, canning or slaughterhouse, wherein agricultural products produced primarily by others are stored or processed. Source: Champaign County Zoning Ordinance.



Site Assessment Update Committee

DATE: Tuesday, June 21, 2011
TIME: 6:30 p.m.
PLACE: Brookens Administrative Center
Jennifer Putman Conference Room
1776 E. Washington St.
Urbana, Illinois

Voting Members Present: Debra Griest, Liz Jones, Kyle Krapf, Steve Moser, Pattsy Petrie, Steve Stierwalt, Bruce Stickers

Voting Member Absent: Steve Moser

Non-Voting Member Present: John Hall

Others Present: Alan Kurtz, Brad Uken

CCRPC Facilitator: Susan Monte

Minutes

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Ms. Monte called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. The roll was taken by written record and a quorum was declared present.

2. Approval of Agenda

Ms. Griest moved to approve the agenda. Mr. Krapf seconded the motion. Upon vote, the motion carried unanimously.

3. Approval of Minutes

Ms. Monte informed the Committee that at the June 8th meeting, the recorder malfunctioned. She will provide a report about the first meeting to the Committee in the next packet.

4. New Business

Ms. Monte reviewed Champaign County's present use of its LESA system. Ms. Petrie requested that the Committee continue the discussion about how the County might or should use the LESA system. Mr. Stierwalt said he previously had posed the question of what is the Committee's end goal in updating its LESA system. Ms. Jones said since the LESA system is so outdated, the Committee should consider the validity of using a LESA system and whether or not LESA systems have been used effectively in other counties. Ms. Petrie asked whether other Counties' use of the LESA systems is accomplishing the goals they have set out for it. Ms. Monte said that a number of other Counties are using updated LESA systems as an advisory tool.

MINUTES – AS AMENDED AND APPROVED

1 Mr. Hall asked whether any County actually has a LESA score written into the Zoning Ordinance that will
2 either let something happen or prevent something from happening. He said that Champaign County's
3 zoning ordinance is the only zoning ordinance that he knows of which has written standards for what a
4 LESA or an LE score means in a rezoning with regard to a higher degree of suitability. He agrees that is
5 not crystal clear. He indicated that staff should continue to work on trying to find examples of other
6 counties that have used LESA in their ordinances.
7

8 Ms. Jones said that if the County's LESA can become a tool that can have some teeth, if the Committee
9 would like to make that a recommendation, then it's worth getting it right so the County can consider it
10 for that use, or to be used at least as solid guidance. Champaign County has some of the best farm
11 ground in the entire world, and the Committee should look at making LESA a meaningful tool so that
12 County Board and ZBA members don't waste their time using an ineffective tool based on outdated
13 standards.
14

15 Mr. Stierwalt indicated the need to clarify whether LESA should be used as a tool to rate site suitability
16 for development as well as farmland protection. He indicated his preference to use LESA for protecting
17 farmland.
18

19 Ms. Jones said it appears that urban sprawl is the one overriding factor which overrules the use of LESA
20 as a tool to protect farmland.
21

22 Mr. Hall asked whether the Committee believe the development suitability factors are important in the
23 County's LESA. He said that the version he drafted did not include development suitability factors. He
24 indicated that the County already analyzes development suitability for each rural residential overlay
25 rezoning request, using a 12-factor scale, which includes the LESA score as one of the 12 factors. So the
26 County does analyze development suitability –separate from the LESA system—but LESA feeds into that
27 analysis. Mr. Hall said he has prepared a handout regarding the 12 factors used in the RRO review
28 process and that can be distributed to Committee members if anyone is interested.
29

30 Ms. Monte said that her understanding of the intent of a LESA system is to rate farmland for protection
31 and that is the primary intent of a LESA.
32

33 Mr. Stierwalt said that if the Committee's goal is not to include development suitability factors then as
34 we update the site assessment criteria, we have something to weigh it against. If the County already has
35 a very comprehensive method of reviewing suitability for development, then maybe those factors should
36 not be considered as important to include in our process in reviewing the site assessment factors in LESA.
37

38 Mr. Stickers said LESA is designed for farmland protection. He said that there are a lot of questions that
39 have nothing to do with farmland. He said we ought to let LESA do what LESA is supposed to do and that
40 is to answer the questions about farmland, because development suitability is a different question. He
41 prefers the idea of sticking to the agricultural farmland questions and trying to work those around so that
42 we end up with a good spread of sites. He thinks it would be helpful to narrow our focus to farmland site
43 assessment factors and work with those, as long as the County has a separate set of questions to review
44 for development suitability.
45

46 Mr. Krapf said that asking questions about roads and other site suitability is important and does need to
47 be asked at some point because when people consider moving out into the rural area they compare it to
48 living in the city and will tend to complain about dust and traffic. Somewhere it is important to ask those
49 questions.
50

MINUTES – AS AMENDED AND APPROVED

1 Mr. Stickers agreed that those are important questions to ask. He said the Committee should consider
2 whether those questions are adequately addressed at other points in the County's review process or not.
3 If they are already answered in the County's review process, then those questions should not be site
4 assessment factors in LESA. He said he is asking these same questions since he's not as closely involved
5 with the review process as others.
6

7 Ms. Griest said she agrees with Bruce. She said that the LESA as it's currently configured mixes too many
8 factors and then blurs them together, so that it doesn't give a clear distinction for the farm protection
9 factor. It blends it in with the other factors which are equally important, but different. She said that in
10 the RRO process they are very well handled and that the only aspect that she would want to make sure
11 that we address is that in the part of the process where the County is not dealing with an RRO and is still
12 taking ground out of production is that there is an adequate mechanism in play that takes those factors
13 into account. She said that the roads, the distance to emergency services, proximity to livestock
14 facilities, are the types of things in zoning that we struggled with more than anything. Whether the
15 ground, whether the parcel is well suited for protection or it deserves a high level of protection is really
16 clear-cut and that is what LESA should be dealing with is that ground in production. She said it is difficult
17 to find that balance between preservation of farm ground and development, but for Champaign County
18 to continue to flourish we have to have both and we have to find tools that give us the right information
19 to produce a good balance. She thinks that Bruce is right on target and that she would like to see the
20 LESA clearly deal with the farm ground protection aspect so that it is a very black and white issue in that
21 regard, rather than muddying it with the other development suitability factors.
22

23 Ms. Petrie suggested the Committee look to the State of Oregon and how they handle farmland
24 protection. They have two tiers, one which is intended to protect agricultural land and the other tier that
25 has more factors to it that plays into the edge of where they are protecting their farmland. When
26 development is filled out within that space, then they tend to move out a bit more, in a tentacle pattern
27 more so than a circular pattern. She said that currently have enough land already within boundaries of
28 where there is development planned for the next 15 to 20 years. So if we keep this in mind, where things
29 are already started, and if the verbalized goal as it seems to be evolving-- to protect farmland--, then we
30 look at those aspects of LESA to protect the farmland in outer areas. She said that farming is economics.
31 She said that we need to look at that area which is contiguous to that part that we want to protect, and
32 we could figure out how we can develop another tier of LESA that will encourage several different forms
33 of development in that area in which the County has control. We can start thinking of how we can really
34 contain sprawl. She said that sprawl costs all of us taxpayers, and it is in the best interest of taxpayers
35 not to have development in a scattered mode.
36

37 Ms. Petrie said that the Committee was given documents that helped us understand how other Counties
38 are doing this, and I provided the documents from Dane County. She thinks the Committee needs the
39 opportunity to talk with those people to see how this is working for them and learn from them. Are they
40 on the verge of adjusting theirs, or are they happy? How does their County compare to our County with
41 regard to how this works for them? She said we need some dialogues, e.g., via Skype. She suggested
42 that since the County contributes to the UIUC Extension, she thinks we could approach Extension to use
43 their facilities and that this could open the door to allow conversations. She said another example could
44 be to contact DeKalb County to ask about their use of LESA in their zoning ordinance. She had indicated
45 to staff that she'd be happy to call and talk to people in various counties to have some conversations
46 with them, once she returns from her trip.

47 Ms. Monte said that this is the type of task included in the scope of work of the project for which she is
48 prepared to do, and that would save the Committee's time. However, the Committee is also welcome to
49 contact persons as they please. She shared that her impression is that there is not a lot of activity
50 occurring with regard to updating of LESA systems presently.
51

MINUTES – AS AMENDED AND APPROVED

1 Ms. Petrie said maybe people have figured out other ways of accomplishing what LESA is designed to
2 accomplish. Maybe people are finding new ways.

3
4 Ms. Monte said that GIS is being used more and more to calculate LESA scores, and to make that process
5 easier.

6
7 Mr. Stierwalt said that we realize that development should be compact and contiguous, and as we
8 develop site assessment factors, I think that how close or far a site is to existing development ---whether
9 it is contiguous—is a critical factor to include as a site assessment factor.

10
11 Mr. Hall clarified, for those not as familiar with the Champaign County zoning regulations as others, that
12 Champaign County has never said there will not be development in the rural areas, and that the County
13 has explicitly always allowed some degree of rural development—much more so than many counties,
14 including McLean, Sangamon, or DeKalb Counties. Any high profile Illinois county will tend to have more
15 restrictive development regulations than Champaign County. So the Committee should not think that
16 the County does not want development to occur in the rural areas, since that is not what the Champaign
17 County Land Resource Management Plan (LRMP) says. Regarding the development around the
18 municipalities with sewer and water, Champaign County has virtually nothing to do with that. We could
19 have the world's best LESA system, it is not even going to be considered. It isn't considered today, and it
20 won't be considered in the future. It doesn't mean that you shouldn't have a good LESA system, it just
21 means that the municipalities are not obligated or interested in following it.

22
23 Ms. Monte said that the County does try to work with the municipalities with regard to land use
24 planning.

25
26 Ms. Griest said that the municipalities hold the trump card in that they trump any rules that the County
27 has.

28
29 Ms. Petrie said that the working together is like working with a neighbor that has creeping
30 incrementalism and you put the fence up. The extension of Lincoln and Olympian Drive will change the
31 boundaries of the City of Urbana. Every time that happens that changes the mile and a half, and then
32 we're moving into the County's turf. I just think it's time for the County to be a bit tougher on things.

33
34 Ms. Monte said that to restate John Hall's point, the County has no control over annexation.

35
36 Ms. Jones said that the LESA may indicate that important farmland is being converted, but to no effect.

37
38 Mr. Hall pointed out that the LESA score would not be used in those instances where land is being
39 annexed.

40
41 Ms. Petrie said that the LESA score might be useful as a leverage point in educating the public in what is
42 happening and the cost variable involved.

43
44 Ms. Jones said that where LESA would have an effect is, e.g., a 30-acre development out in the County.
45 If this site received a lower LESA score, then that would indicate less need for protection of that parcel.
46 So, is LESA effective in these instances, or is this already covered in the Zoning Ordinance in some way?
47 Are there zoning regulations that already limit development?

48
49 Mr. Hall said that the LESA would be absolutely essential in that example. He said that based on the
50 Champaign County Zoning Ordinance, it would appear that one can develop a 100-acre development out
51 in the rural area, provided that one goes through the process. He said that the County has never been

MINUTES – AS AMENDED AND APPROVED

1 happy with that, but that Champaign County has never been able to say you can't do 100 acres, but you
2 can do 10 or 12, or 20 or 40. He said that is why this has always been controversial and that we have
3 people on both sides of the fence and that the County has not been able to go one way or another. He
4 said that this is why LESA is seen as so critical—because LESA speaks to that.

5
6 Ms. Jones said so that is actually how LESA is actually useful as a tool then.

7
8 Ms. Griest said that right now LESA gets watered down with so many other factors that all of the scores
9 come out on the very high end, so that it does not give you good differentiation. She said she would limit
10 LESA to dealing with the farm ground and put the other factors in a different bucket taking them out of
11 the LESA scoring process and dealing with them separately.

12
13 Ms. Jones questioned whether conservation-recreation land or woodlands would end up with a low LESA
14 score.

15
16 Ms. Griest said maybe but not necessarily. Ms. Monte said it depends partially on soils.

17
18 Ms. Jones said she thought that the conservation-recreation land normally contained the woodland soils.

19
20 Mr. Hall said if for example, based on the LRMP information, if a site is 100 acres and located in the
21 Conservation-Recreation Zoning District, and is not best prime farmland and has no farms adjacent, one
22 would think that to develop that site would be a good land use. He said that the LESA score would end
23 up calling for protection on this parcel.

24
25 Mr. Krapf said it seems logical to let people build houses along the Sangamon River and that farmers also
26 don't understand why that unproductive type of ground would need to be protected for cropland.

27
28 Ms. Jones agreed with Karl. She said her concern is that typically only ½ acre or an acre or so from a five-
29 acre parcel would be converted and that the entire five acres would be taken out of production. She
30 sees this as a secondary issue.

31
32 Ms. Griest said these may be viewed as land division issues or zoning regulation issues that are equally
33 important but separate from the LESA update process.

34
35 Ms. Jones said that she and others on the Committee are learning more about which rules cover what.

36
37 Ms. Griest said back when the County considered a rewrite to the Zoning Ordinance to change many of
38 these rules, she observed that there is no consensus and that is part of the issue. She said that a lot of
39 people indicated they wanted farm ground to be protected—but not theirs. She said people reasoned
40 the farm ground was part of their retirement and they wanted to be able to subdivide and develop it and
41 make money. She said that LESA is just one tool in a very big morass of issues. She said LESA needs to
42 be a useful tool that clearly and precisely indicates that a parcel really deserves farmland protection or
43 that another parcel along the waterways or a river bank may deserve less farmland protection.

44
45 Mr. Hall said he has tried to think of other factors that might be relevant as to whether farmland should
46 be protected or not. He said the most difficult factor... technical factor,
47 Is the land wooded? If it's wooded, does Champaign County want to keep it as farmland? Because if it's
48 wooded, then it's not being farmed. It could be harvested, but it's not being farmed. In Champaign
49 County, farming generally means production agriculture, row crop agriculture. He asked whether, in
50 Champaign County, is it logical to indicate that if your land is wooded it needs to be protected for
51 farmland?

MINUTES – AS AMENDED AND APPROVED

1
2 Mr. Hall said that this week he went through the old Soil Survey to try to find good examples of best
3 prime farmland that is wooded. He said that it is out there everywhere. He said that these are parcels
4 on which trees were present in 1973 and are still present today. He said he does not know if the trees
5 are being harvested for timber. He said the point is that these parcels are still wooded and that the
6 County LESA system currently does not recognize that. He said that he thinks this is one thing this
7 Committee should consider: How should the LESA system treat any farmland that was in trees in 1973
8 (when the Zoning Ordinance was established) and is still in trees today?
9

10 Mr. Krapf said there is no protection of a woodland parcel. He said it is up to owners of such a parcel
11 and they have the choice of whether to harvest the trees for lumber or just sell it as a lot—best prime
12 farmland or not. He noted that there would be a lot of work involved in clearing a wooded lot and
13 removing roots on it for use as farm ground.
14

15 Mr. Hall asked Committee members whether they wanted to protect woodland parcels for farm ground.
16

17 Mr. Stickers said whether or not woodlands should be protected as woodlands is a different question
18 than whether a woodland parcel should be protected as a parcel of potential cleared farm ground.
19

20 Ms. Petrie asked whether we are protecting the soil or whether we are protecting what happens for a
21 moment in time on the soil. She said her view is that we are protecting the soil. She said if what
22 happens to be on that soil at a certain moment is woodlands, then that doesn't take away that quality of
23 that particular soil. She said maybe we need to change some of the definitions, for example: 'best prime
24 farmland' maybe should become 'best prime farmland for production'. And it could be production of
25 many different things. She said if LESA is an evaluation system to protect soils, and a certain soil is at the
26 top of the list, then the focus should be on protecting that soil.
27

28 Mr. Hall said that his point was that he has identified land that was forested in 1973 and it is still forested
29 today. He said it could well be that original growth forest may exist in Champaign County and that the
30 question is do you want to protect that as farmland?
31

32 Mr. Stierwalt said the Committee needs to acknowledge that obviously there will be some development.
33 He said his bias is to protect all farm ground but we have to acknowledge that some farm ground will not
34 be protected due to development.
35

36 Ms. Petrie noted that there are some soils in the County that may not need to be protected and that this
37 less than the best should be the first in line for use.
38

39 Ms. Monte said soil quality is one component of the LESA and that a LESA system includes site
40 assessment factors to numerically rate a site's importance as farm ground. She said the discussion
41 today implies that the Committee may want to consider adjusting the definition of 'agriculture.'

42 Ms. Monte said the LESA Guidebook suggests that the Committee may choose to develop a LESA system
43 for rating woodlands.
44

45 Ms. Jones said that would seem appropriate. Mr. Stickers said that would need to be a separate category
46 or system.
47

48 Ms. Jones said that today there are new products being farmed, e.g., wind. She said there are some new
49 uses for which a site can be rated as better for.
50

51 Ms. Monte questioned whether wind is considered as an agricultural product, or as a type of energy.

MINUTES – AS AMENDED AND APPROVED

1
2 Mr. Krapf asked Mr. Hall where those woodland parcels were located in the County.
3

4 Mr. Hall said the woodland parcels were located only around streams and around every stream. He said
5 every stream has best prime farmland in woodland and also other than best prime farmland in
6 woodland. He said in the County that there is one 40 acre tract of woodland that is not located adjacent
7 to a stream.
8

9 Ms. Griest said that maybe a factor that would accomplish what we are talking about is adding a
10 'protection factor' of the ground being currently in production, giving it a higher rating for protection if it
11 is currently in production with row crop or livestock or nursery stock. This would differentiate the
12 timbered soils that are just sitting idle along the streams and would give them a lower rating for
13 production.
14

15 Ms. Petrie said that she could envision a landowner who has already subdivided land, taking their rural
16 farm ground out of production for a couple of years to receive a higher LESA rating.
17

18 Ms. Monte said the Kendall County LESA includes a factor 'percentage of site in agricultural production,
19 in any of the last 5 years.'
20

21 Ms. Griest said during her 10 years as Zoning Board of Appeals members she said she's seen lots of
22 creative attempts to bypass regulations.
23

24 Ms. Monte said it will be important to have clear sets of definitions and instructions for scoring. She said
25 that 'scaling' is the assigning of point values to component of a factor score. She said data sources need
26 to be clear, and that a data source could consist of an expert opinion.
27

28
29 **4. Public Participation**

30 Mr. Kurtz introduced himself and said he believes that Committee work is very important and much
31 needed. He said he appreciates the Committee's efforts and will look forward to receiving the
32 Committee's recommendation.
33

34 Mr. Uken said that Brad Beaver at the Illinois Department of Agriculture in Springfield is the best contact
35 for information regarding the Illinois Livestock Management Program. He said in speaking with Mr.
36 Beaver, he learned that new applications for a livestock management facility are listed as part of a
37 statewide online database and that location information about livestock management facilities in the
38 County is available from the Illinois Livestock Management Program.
39

40 **5. Other Business**

41 The Committee decided to invite Terry Savko, Agricultural Land/Water Resource Specialist, Illinois
42 Department of Agriculture, to attend the next meeting, if she is available.
43
44

45 **7. Adjournment**

46 **There being no further business, Ms. Monte adjourned the meeting at 7:55 p.m.**
47

48 Attachment: Initial Analysis Detail
49
50



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

MINUTES– AS AMENDED AND APPROVED

Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) Update Committee

DATE: Wednesday, July 13, 2011
TIME: 6:35 p.m.
PLACE: Brookens Administrative Center
John Dimit Conference Room
1776 E. Washington St.
Urbana, Illinois

Voting Members Present: Kevin Donoho, Debra Griest, Liz Jones, Kyle Krapf, Bruce Stickers

Voting Members Absent: Steve Moser, Patsi Petrie, Steve Stierwalt

Non-Voting Member Present: John Hall

Others Present: Terry Savko, Jonathan Schroder, Brad Uken

CCRPC Facilitator: Susan Monte

Minutes

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Ms. Monte called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. The roll was taken by written record and a quorum was declared present.

2. Approval of Agenda

Ms. Griest moved to approve the agenda. Mr. Krapf seconded the motion. Upon vote, the motion carried unanimously.

3. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Krapf made the motion, seconded by Ms. Griest, to approve the minutes for the June 8, 2011 meeting. Upon vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Stickers made the motion, seconded by Mr. Krapf, to approve the minutes for the June 21, 2011 meeting. Ms. Griest requested a correction to page 7, 3rd paragraph, line 10 to change ‘production factor’ to ‘protection factor.’ Ms. Monte noted that a recording equipment malfunction at the June 21 meeting cut off the final 20 minutes of the meeting, and suggested that the request by Ms. Griest be added: that the detail of the initial analysis of the draft sets of site assessment factors be provided to the Committee. Ms. Griest requested that the initial analysis be provided as an attachment to the June 21 minutes. There being no further changes or additions, and with the suggested changes to the minutes being considered as a friendly amendment to the motion, upon vote, the amended motion carried unanimously.

MINUTES– AS AMENDED AND APPROVED

1 4. **New Business**

2 Ms. Monte welcomed Kevin Donoho to the Committee and he briefed the Committee regarding the
3 types of conservation projects he has been involved in over 25 years of public service in five Illinois
4 counties (Bureau, LaSalle, Madison, Mason, and Champaign).
5

6 Ms. Monte welcomed guest Terry Savko, from the Bureau of Land and Water Resources, Illinois
7 Department of Agriculture (IDOA). Ms. Savko described her area of expertise as farmland protection, and
8 described her background experience for the Committee. She said that since Champaign’s LESA was
9 adopted in 1984, things have changed a lot over the years and that in updating the County’s LESA system
10 the Committee should especially consider removing those factors which consistently tend to zero scores,
11 since those factors are not differentiating anything. She said the whole purpose of LESA is to protect
12 agricultural land. She advised understanding how much agriculture actually provides to the County and
13 its economic base. She thanked the Committee for inviting her to assist them by listening and providing
14 feedback or fine-tuning of information that she might provide to the Committee as they come to their
15 decisions.
16

17 Ms. Savko noted the status of some Illinois counties in the process of updating their LESA systems and
18 reiterated the importance of Counties adopting and updating their LESAs.
19

20 Ms. Monte reviewed the first agenda item as consisting of both selecting an initial set of draft site
21 assessment factors and indicated this could include refining the definitions of ‘agricultural productivity’
22 or ‘agricultural land’. She suggested the Committee select draft site assessment factors from the 21
23 factors listed in the packet.
24

25 Ms. Stickers said that the Committee should begin by answering the question from last meeting
26 regarding whether the Committee wants to include only those factors that are strictly about agricultural
27 production like some of the factors are, or does the Committee want to include the other types of
28 factors, such as ‘availability of public water’, ‘type of street access’, etc. He asked does the Committee
29 want the LESA to have ‘pure’ agricultural productivity site assessment factors or a broader set of site
30 assessment factors.
31

32 Ms. Monte said at the last meeting the Committee seemed to be moving toward a consensus that the
33 LESA should not include those types of site assessment factors already considered during the
34 discretionary review process that occurs during a zoning case. She suggested that the Committee may
35 wish to start the selection process by considering eliminating those types of factors from the submitted
36 Set A site assessment factors.
37

38 Ms. Griest said she agrees with Bruce. Ms. Griest asked Terry to comment regarding how the 38 county
39 LESA systems in the state compare or contrast. She asked whether other counties in the state are using a
40 more purist version and how that might be working for them, or have they encountered difficulties that
41 it does not address for them.
42

43 Ms. Savko pointed out that counties that don’t have zoning usually are the more rural and poor counties
44 that do not have a good infrastructure system and that they have the 2-lane highways. She said the
45 more populated counties in the north portion of the state have better roads and a site assessment factor
46 regarding roads is not usually included. She said that here in Champaign County, the 15-point factor that
47 addresses road surface could be eliminated and those points could be better spent elsewhere—possibly
48 to make another factor more important. She said in considering the water or sewer, she said public
49 sewer is considered as whether or not it is in a ‘facility planning area’ and regarding water, most people
50 can do a well. She said that running a sewer line out to a rural area opens up that area and everything

MINUTES– AS AMENDED AND APPROVED

1 else along that route to development. She pointed out that now the cost of running that and also getting
2 an EPA clearance to expand sewer lines in that way are much more difficult.

3
4 Ms. Savko said the County is blessed by having a long-range Land Resource Management Plan to indicate
5 where it wants development to occur, and that is excellent and modern, as well as zoning. Regarding
6 'pure', she advised comparing the LESA systems of Illinois counties that are the same size, same
7 development regulations, or same soils productivity. She considers that Champaign County as similar to
8 DeKalb County, both having approximately 98 percent of soils that are the best in the world. She said it
9 is important to consider where land should be developed and that floodplains should not be developed.
10 She said that some soils limitations will be addressed in the LE portion of LESA. She spoke of the
11 different development restrictions among the larger of the 38 Illinois counties with adopted LESAs
12 (Champaign, DeKalb, Rock Island, McLean, Peoria, McHenry, and Iroquois counties) and how each County
13 has a unique set of circumstances. She referred to a 'buyers beware' market that exists in counties with
14 no zoning restrictions where development can occur anywhere.

15
16 Ms. Griest asked whether Ms. Savko sees a corollary among those counties that have a zoning ordinance
17 versus those who do not.

18
19 Ms. Savko said zoning provides information about where cities and counties want to have developed.
20 She said that it used to be that cities would assume they would develop out 1-1/2 miles from their
21 boundary and nowadays the funding is not available to extend water and sewer. She said that often
22 what it is that the cities are trying to hit, if it's not an industrial park or an enterprise zone, is sufficient
23 kickback off of their development due to the upfront costs since they are so far out of town. She said
24 that in LaSalle County all along the Illinois River, there are enterprise zones or industrial parks that are set
25 aside. When the development comes in, that's what they are looking at: railroad, riverfront access, or
26 highway access. She said a long-range plan takes these types of factors into consideration.

27
28 Ms. Griest asked whether counties do this in their LESA system or in their zoning process.

29
30 Ms. Savko said LESA systems consider what a site is zoned for and planned for, and what the areas
31 around the site are zoned for and planned for, and this may seem redundant at times, but that it is not
32 necessarily redundant. Ms. Savko asked whether the County has development restrictions that limit the
33 amount of acres that can be converted from an ag to a non-ag use.

34
35 Ms. Monte said that the County does limit development that can occur in the rural zoning districts [by
36 right]. Ms. Griest clarified that for the RRO (rural residential overlay) rezoning process, the County
37 evaluates the amount of and type of development that may occur, but does not have a specific limit.

38
39 Ms. Jones asked Ms. Savko how much similarity there is between LESA systems, county by county and
40 whether they should be mostly standard. Ms. Savko generally described that most have had between 12
41 and 15 site assessment factors. She said that currently she advises that a county include some broad
42 'yes' and 'no' questions so as to initially weed sites out and so a level can be separately distinguished as a
43 good site to retain in ag. Ms. Savko talked about needing consistent and measurable standards to be
44 used as site assessment factors. She said for counties with zoning, that the site assessment standards
45 that she usually sees in a LESA include: the zoning or land use in the 1-1/2 mile area, land use on each
46 side of the site, percentage of land zoned for agriculture, and percentage of site zoned for agriculture.
47 She said to remember that the purpose of a LESA system is to rate the importance of a piece of land for
48 agricultural use—not a zoning use and not a proposed development use.

MINUTES– AS AMENDED AND APPROVED

1 Ms. Jones asked whether LESA could be used to help determine the direction a town should grow. Ms.
2 Savko responded yes, and gave an example about a town in Indiana which wanted to establish an
3 ‘agricultural area.’
4

5 Ms. Monte said the Committee is at the point of considering which types of site assessment factors to
6 include: those that are already considering during the zoning review process or those factors that
7 pertain strictly to agricultural production. Mr. Stickers suggested the Committee start by selecting with
8 those that pertain strictly to agricultural production and to go from there.
9

10 One by one, Ms. Monte went through the list of 21 distinct draft site assessment factors and the
11 Committee discussed each factor and decided whether or not to retain the factor in their initially
12 selected set of draft site assessment factors. Committee members agreed to select 11 draft site
13 assessment factors from the list to initially consider.
14

15 Committee members discussed how ‘farm dwelling’ is presently defined in selected draft site assessment
16 factor #8. Mr. Hall said that presently a house on any size piece of land that is less than 35 acres is
17 considered as ‘non-farm’. Mr. Hall said that this factor would be based on a drive-by survey and
18 knowing what is out there to begin with. Ms. Griest suggested this factor should be divided into two
19 since a public assembly land use is very identifiable whereas ‘farm dwellings’ is a separate question.
20

21 Regarding updating the Land Evaluation (LE) portion of the County’s LESA system, Ms. Monte reviewed
22 the staff memorandum content regarding the types of soils classifications systems used in LESA systems,
23 and noted that the adopted County LESA is partially based on a ‘soils productivity’ rating. She said
24 several of the Illinois county LESA systems which have been updated now include an ‘optimum soils
25 potential’ rating instead of the soils productivity rating.
26

27 Mr. Donoho provided an overview of the types of soils productivity and soils productivity rating numbers
28 provided in Circular 1156, Bulletin 810 and Bulletin 811. He said the Optimum Soils Productivity data in
29 Bulletin 811 is not perfect, but it is the best available information at present.
30

31 Ms. Monte suggested, as a next step, that the Committee consider the simple substitution of soils
32 productivity data from Bulletin 811 in place of the soils productivity data from Bulletin 810 and
33 Committee members agreed this was a good next step.
34

35 5. Public Participation

36 Mr. Uken, Champaign County Farm Bureau, commented regarding his concerns that the Committee is
37 relying on the Land Resource Management Plan (LRMP) Contiguous Urban Growth Area (CUGA) and that
38 the CUGA may be too reliant on what the CU Sanitary District does and to what Illinois American Water
39 does.
40

41 Mr. Uken said the Committee previously has talked about the amount of livestock that are on a particular
42 farm and how that number can fluctuate. He said that it was commented tonight, that these will be
43 based off of drive by surveys. He said that a drive by survey is not measurable because in the winter, the
44 livestock may be inside, or the livestock may have been sold. Mr. Uken questioned whether a drive-by
45 survey could measure livestock management facility or non-farm dwellings
46

47 Mr. Uken questioned that the County’s LRMP and following it was given points. He had the impression
48 that the LRMP was guiding principles for the Zoning Ordinance and not a comprehensive plan, and he
49 questioned the amount of points given to the LRMP–related factors.
50
51

MINUTES– AS AMENDED AND APPROVED

- 1 6. **Adjournment**
- 2 Ms. Monte reminded the Committee that the next meeting will occur on July 27th.
- 3 **There being no further business, Ms. Monte adjourned the meeting at 7:55 p.m.**
- 4



1
2
3
4 MINUTES– AS AMENDED AND APPROVED

5 ***Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) Update Committee***
6

7 **DATE:** Wednesday, July 27, 2011
8 **TIME:** 6:33 p.m.
9 **PLACE:** Brookens Administrative Center
10 John Dimit Conference Room
11 1776 E. Washington St.
12 Urbana, Illinois
13

14 ***Voting Members Present:*** Kevin Donoho, Debra Griest, Liz Jones, Kyle Krapf, Steve Moser, Pattsy Petrie,
15 Steve Stierwalt, Bruce Stickers
16

17 ***Non-Voting Member Present:*** John Hall
18

19 ***Others Present:*** Hal Barnhart, Terry Savko, Norm Stenzel
20

21 ***CCRPC Facilitator:*** Susan Monte
22

23 Minutes
24

25 1. **Call to Order and Roll Call**

26 Ms. Monte called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m. The roll was taken by written record and a
27 quorum was declared present.
28

29 2. **Approval of Agenda**

30 Ms. Petrie introduced a motion to allow Mr. Norman Stenzel to present his comments following
31 approval of the agenda. Ms. Griest seconded the motion. Upon vote, the motion carried
32 unanimously.
33

34 Mr. Stierwalt moved to approve the modified agenda. Ms. Griest seconded the motion. Upon
35 vote, the motion carried unanimously.
36

37 3. **Public Participation by Mr. Norman Stenzel**

38 Mr. Norman Stenzel, 545A CR North, Champaign, and Champaign County Farm Bureau Land Use
39 Committee member, summarized his position regarding the proposed update of the site assessment
40 factors of LESA. Mr. Stenzel said the admitted purpose of LESA was farmland preservation with the
41 intent to support the success of agriculture and said that after years of use, it's not altogether apparent
42 that the way these items are written actually support farmland preservation and the viability of
43 agriculture, especially in Champaign County where the definition of agriculture not only includes the
44 large scale row crop type farming, but includes orchards, truck farms and farming of that sort.
45

46 Mr. Stenzel questioned the appropriateness of the standard of 40 acres of land as a minimal view of what
47 is viable agriculture, disallowing for community farming, orchards, and farming that occurs on smaller

MINUTES– AS AMENDED AND APPROVED

1 segments than 40 acres. He questioned the appropriateness of using a 1-1/2 mile standard from
2 municipal limits, and cited examples of towns with no land use plans which have large-scale farming right
3 up to the edge of town, and, in fact, right at the corner of Duncan and Kirby in Champaign.
4

5 Mr. Stenzel urged the Committee to take a serious look at whether a site factor is really supportive of the
6 breadth of agriculture as defined, and whether it is really supportive of farmland preservation and the
7 support of the viability of agriculture. He said that the site factors may need to be significantly revised in
8 order to take those items into account. He said the work of the Committee is important. He pointed out
9 that the LESA is an instrument that should be biased toward preservation of broadly defined concept of
10 agriculture and the viability of farming.
11

12 4. **Approval of Minutes**

13 **Ms. Griest made the motion, seconded by Ms. Jones, to approve the draft minutes for the July 13, 2011**
14 **meeting.** Mr. Donoho requested a friendly amendment to the motion to approve the draft minutes to
15 include a revision on line 28, page 4, that the words 'soil potential' on page 4, line 28, instead read as 'the
16 optimum soils productivity data'. Ms. Griest inquired whether revisions were also desired on line 27, to
17 eliminate the phrase 'and soils potential' from the sentence, and on line 32, to revise 'soils potential
18 data' to be 'soils productivity data' and Mr. Donoho agreed that these revisions should also occur. There
19 being no further changes or additions, and with the suggested changes to the minutes being considered
20 as a friendly amendment to the motion, **upon vote, the amended motion carried unanimously.**
21

22 5. **New Business**

23 Ms. Monte welcomed Terry Savko, Farmland Preservation Specialist from the Illinois Department of
24 Agriculture as a returning guest of the Committee. Ms Monte distributed a preliminary draft of the LE
25 document, which is in the process of being updated to include the optimum soils productivity index data
26 from Bulletin 811 in place of the existing soils productivity index data from Bulletin 810, as discussed at
27 the Committee's last meeting. She said that Kevin Donoho had provided answers to some questions
28 regarding the assembly of this data. She said that the completed version of the draft LE document will be
29 distributed as soon as possible to Committee members.
30

31 6. **Old Business**

32 Ms. Monte asked Committee members if they'd each received a copy of the Champaign County Farm
33 Bureau letter containing comments regarding some of the site assessment factors. She suggested that
34 Committee members continue to consider each of the site assessment factors, and those five items in
35 the staff memorandum could be used as a guide for the discussion regarding each of the site assessment
36 factors. She displayed the 11 selected site assessment factors onscreen, and noted that the points
37 assigned to the 11 factors totaled to 315 and not 200 points as is typical. Ms. Monte said the Committee
38 members eventually will need to consider the balance of the site assessment factors and land evaluation
39 factors.
40

41 Ms. Petrie asked about the Committee's selection of site assessment factors at the last meeting and
42 whether the decision was final. Ms. Monte said the Committee made an initial selection of a set of site
43 assessment factors at the last meeting, and that the draft factors are subject to change.
44

45 Ms. Petrie mentioned her concern about the arbitrariness of percentages and points assigned to factors
46 without tangible reason for this being the case and she urged the Committee to work judiciously to get
47 this quantified so that LESA could be valuable as a defensible tool in a court case, such as occurred in
48 another County.
49

50 Ms. Griest said the Committee has only discussed the narrative descriptions so far, and Ms. Jones agreed
51 that has not yet been reviewed by the Committee.

MINUTES– AS AMENDED AND APPROVED

1
2 Ms. Petrie called for research or articles to provide guidance as to how to assign percentages or points to
3 particular factors. She said Ms. Monte had invited members to consider whether they wanted to have an
4 equal number of points for the LE and SA portion of LESA, or keep it as 1 to 2 as it presently is.
5

6 Ms. Savko indicated that no Illinois County has updated their LESA to allocated equal points to the LE and
7 SA portions of LESA. One County wanted to go from an SA point total of 200 to 150, and this was not
8 allowed. Soils are a constant and will never change with regard to productivity. Site assessment factors
9 will change by area, and that has more weight. She said that when you go back and review old LESA
10 scores, the soils in this County, just like in DeKalb County, are going to 90 to 100 probably 95% of the
11 time. She said site assessment factors will consider what is existing now, what is planned for, and
12 whether the infrastructure there, in order to see whether a location is primary—that will be variable and
13 that is why site assessment is afforded those additional points. She pointed out that 1-1/2 miles is not
14 necessary to use in a site assessment factor, and that another County (Rock Island) uses 1 mile.
15

16 Mr. Moser said he would prefer use of 1 mile distance. He noted that very little of the center portion of
17 the County is located outside of the cities' 1-1/2 mile extra-territorial jurisdictions. He said he
18 questioned whether points should be allocated to a farm on the edge of town or totally surrounded by a
19 city, and cited Mr. Stenzel's example of the totally surrounded 200-acre farm on Kirby Avenue, or other
20 100- or 200 acre farming operations that are surrounded by Urbana. He said the Cities do not have
21 eminent domain and cannot force an annexation. He said that most land in the 1-1/2 mile extra-
22 territorial jurisdictions of cities and towns in the County are in farmland and will remain in farmland for a
23 long time.
24

25 Ms. Monte said that the draft site assessment Factor 1 is a measure of 1-1/2 miles from the boundaries
26 of the particular parcel proposed to be converted.
27

28 Mr. Krapf asked whether the DeKalb County LESA was available and said members would like to see a
29 copy. Mr. Krapf said he too questions why use 1-1/2 mile and why not use 1 mile as a distance measure.
30

31 Mr. Hall said the 1-1/2 mile is a measure that relates more to development of rural land since within the
32 1-1/2 mile extraterritorial jurisdiction is an overlapping planning jurisdiction. He said this is noted in the
33 County's LRMP and that in the LRMP the major distinction is whether or not a parcel proposed for
34 development is located within the 'Contiguous Urban Growth Area' or CUGA, or in an area otherwise
35 without public sewer. He said 1-1/2 mile is not that important except that we need to be aware of what
36 County authority may be. He said since 1973, the County has been concerned regarding whether or not
37 public sewer is available, and that is represented in County policies as well. He said that he thinks the
38 distinction should be: whether the parcel is in an area served by public sewer or not.
39

40 Mr. Moser commented about the relevance of County zoning when annexation agreements exist and the
41 zoning gets changed accordingly, or when the cities rezone in accordance with their comprehensive land
42 use plans. He said he didn't see why the 1-1/2 mile distance is relevant for LESA and he said 1 mile is a
43 better distance measure to use.
44

45 Mr. Donoho recapped some of Terry's comments made at the last meeting.

46 Champaign County is considered similar to DeKalb County with regard to soils.

47 The 38 Illinois counties with adopted LESAs each have a unique set of circumstances. He said that this is
48 where the Committee needs to figure it out. Points happen way down the road.
49

50 He thinks this should not be a process where LESA paperwork is streamlined. He thinks the LESA needs to
51 stand a test of a 25-year time period and that 10 years is a shorter view.

MINUTES– AS AMENDED AND APPROVED

1 He said he thinks we need to consider more site assessment factors and whether or not factors can make
2 a difference and whether they should be considered or not.

3
4 Ms. Petrie said the 25-year timeframe for site assessment criteria down the line is not consistent with
5 community's way of thinking

6
7 Ms. Savko said LESA should focus on how to protect an area so it remains viable for agricultural uses. She
8 said site assessment factor questions that are 'yes' or 'no' tend to break things out and measurable
9 objectives, and that is what is desired for a site assessment factor.

10
11 Ms. Petrie said she believes communities are expanding at a phenomenal rate and that if LESA could
12 influence the communities in any way that would be good. She gave the example of north Lincoln
13 Avenue.

14
15 Ms. Monte said the LRMP Objective 4.5 regarding update of the site assessment portion of LESA
16 indicated a 10-year timeframe.

17
18 Ms. Petrie said she agrees with the LRMP goal and also believes that a 25-year timeframe could also work
19 for scenario planning and considering whether the site assessment factors will work in various future
20 scenarios.

21
22 Mr. Stierwalt commented that the one simple phrase mentioned by Terry helps him to review each site
23 assessment factor: 'does this factor protect for ag use or does it not?' He said that simple definition
24 allows him to more easily assess each factor.

25
26 Ms. Savko said she agrees that the 1-1/2 mile extra-territorial jurisdiction distance doesn't really relate to
27 the distance around a particular site as mentioned in draft site assessment Factor 1, for example.

28 Ms. Petrie commented that the 1-1/2 mile extra-territorial jurisdiction is prevalent as relates to land
29 development especially in central portions of the County and she said the LRMP's map showing
30 overlapping jurisdictions illustrates that. Ms. Monte said that the LRMP's map of the Contiguous Urban
31 Growth Area is a useful map to use to understand where urban development is planned for.

32
33 Ms. Savko suggested the Committee consider tightening the area around a site being reviewed for
34 farmland conversion from 1-1/2 to 1 mile. The Committee moved toward a consensus to try both the 1-
35 1/2 mile and 1 mile measure for Factor 1 and then to compare the outcomes. Ms. Petrie requested a
36 map with an overlay of both measurements for comparison.

37
38 Ms. Petrie said that she would like to see additional factors considered by the Committee before testing
39 of factors. She requested an analysis of how many 40 acres sites or greater are in the County. Ms. Griest
40 requested that the analysis include the total number of acres included as compared to a total number of
41 farming acres in the County. Ms. Monte said that the IDOA Census of Agriculture data includes the
42 number and size of farms in the County.

43
44 Mr. Krapf said his concern is that two adjacent 20 acre parcels used for farming as one farming unit
45 would not be considered in the number of parcels 40 acres and greater data. Ms. Monte said that this
46 concern might be addressed by reviewing test sites that represent two adjacent 20-acre parcels, and a 40
47 acre parcel, and then comparing the scoring results.

48
49 Ms. Monte asked Committee members regarding concerns regarding draft Factor 2, a factor that Terry
50 Savko recommended be retained. Ms. Petrie said she wondered about this factor being broadened

MINUTES– AS AMENDED AND APPROVED

1 because 'being used for production agriculture', but what about a site having the potential for
2 agriculture.

3
4 Mr. Donoho said this would be a guess or a judgment call. Ms. Petrie said if the land evaluation
5 information which includes the productivity data is available, that is useful information. Ms. Griest asked
6 for an example. Ms. Petrie said that tracts of land that are smaller acreage, triangular shape, and not
7 presently being farmed but have the potential since they are good farm land. So right now, these are
8 being ignored. If something came in and we were going to look around it, and we'd say this is not going
9 to be farmed so we would ignore this as part of our measurement. Prairefruit Farms could farm on
10 something that size and make it very productive.

11
12 Mr. Krapf said if it is not being farmed, then what is it? Mr. Stierwalt said that it could be in CRP. Mr.
13 Donoho said that it could be grass and in an agricultural production program.

14
15 Mr. Stickers said he thinks there is very little of that type of vacant land around, based on the definition
16 being used. Ms. Petrie asked whether there is any of land that falls into this descriptive category.

17
18 Mr. Krapf said he thinks what she is describing is ground that farmers have put into CRP. Mr. Stierwalt
19 added they may be taking a government payment to not farm the land. Mr. Stickers said it may appear
20 like nothing is happening on a site, but it is hard to tell. He said that there is very little abandoned land
21 where nothing is happening. Ms. Petrie said then this is not a major concern.

22
23 Mr. Stierwalt said that a small piece of land could be farmed and that this would fall into the USDA
24 definition of a farm that is 5 acres or less.

25
26 Ms. Monte asked Committee members regarding concerns regarding draft Factor 3 which has some
27 similar concerns and asked members to consider how 'suitable for' could be measured.

28
29 Mr. Hall said this is one way to deal with wooded tracts, but a narrative would be needed.
30 Is suitable for agriculture something that's covered with trees. The site is certainly suitable for
31 harvesting wood and it is not suitable for row crop until you remove the trees. Ms. Savko said on
32 timberland the soils are not usually as productive and are often not prime farmland. Mr. Stickers said in
33 the County there are some wooded tracts with productive soils such as Drummer and Flanagan.

34
35 Ms. Monte asked how one could tell that a stand of trees is being harvested for timber based on an aerial
36 photo. Mr. Donoho said that you cannot, based on an aerial, unless the outline is block-like and square,
37 or includes definite lines where selective harvests have been done. Aside from an aerial photo, you could
38 tell if it's harvested if there is a forestry management plan for the site.

39
40 Ms. Petrie asked whether soil quality could be considered as a factor. Ms. Savko said the LE score covers
41 that concern. Ms. Petrie said she understands now that if the soil quality is high (e.g., with a relative
42 value of 95) then it will remain high years from now. And if that is the case, why would we not use the
43 soil evaluation as a measurable criterion? Ms. Monte pointed out the draft site assessment Factor 11
44 includes reference to an LE score. Ms. Petrie asked then why couldn't draft Factor 3 include a similar
45 type reference to an LE score.

46
47 Ms. Griest referred to the DeKalb LESA handout and their description of the site assessment factor that
48 they include regarding suitability which include a review that is separate and distinct from the soils.

49
50

MINUTES– AS AMENDED AND APPROVED

1 Mr. Moser said that this type of factor needs to be considered and sited some examples of where these
2 concerns were raised in previous zoning reviews in the Mahomet area. Ms. Petrie agreed and suggested
3 that the Committee retain this type of factor. Ms. Monte said that this implies that for draft Factor 3 the
4 narrative would have to be expanded and each component would have to be able to be measured. Ms.
5 Griest said this would add great strength to the product. Ms. Petrie agreed the LESA needs to be a strong
6 instrument to stand up in a court case.

7
8 Ms. Monte asked Committee members regarding concerns regarding draft Factor 4 which the Committee
9 had placed on a hold.

10
11 Mr. Moser said that there is much land that is outside of the 1-1/2 mile ETJ in Urbana Township that is
12 zoned AG-2, and has been since zoning's been in existence in the County. He said he doesn't think the
13 AG-2 boundaries have changed much at all over the years and that needs to be corrected if the 1-½ mile
14 ETJ is going to be considered. Mr. Hall said that large-scale changes to agricultural zoning boundaries in
15 the County can be quite controversial. Ms. Griest agreed.

16
17 Ms. Petrie asked how draft Factor 4 differs from draft Factor 1. Ms. Monte said that draft Factor 4
18 relates to zoning. Ms. Monte recalled that the Committee's consensus to include only draft site
19 assessment factors that relate to the agricultural productivity of a site, with the one exception to include
20 a site assessment factor regarding conformance to the County LRMP. She said that draft Factor 4 is an
21 example of a factor that does not directly relate to agricultural productivity and which is considered
22 during a rezoning case. Mr. Hall said that he didn't know that the zoning of a property within 1-1/2 mile
23 of a subject property has anything to do with that property since it could have been a bad zoning
24 decision.

25
26 Mr. Donoho suggested the Committee continue to consider this factor as an option. He said that if a
27 property happens to have been rezoned in error, and now an adjacent property was being proposed for
28 development, then two wrong zoning decisions would be worse than one. He said that if this draft factor
29 is kept, then the 1-1/2 miles distance should be changed to be either gradations of this 1-1/2 mile or very
30 close distance to that site or adjacent.

31
32 Ms. Savko asked what the difference between Zoning District AG-1 and AG-2. Mr. Hall replied 'uses' and
33 explained that there are just a very few things that can be done in the AG-1 district with a special use
34 permit and that there are more things that can be done in AG-2 with a special use permit. He said he
35 believed the purpose of the Ag-2 district is to be located in closer proximity to a municipality and to allow
36 some gradation of urban to rural uses.

37
38 Ms. Monte summarized that the draft Factor 4 should be adjusted to something less than 1-1/2 mile and
39 then remain on hold. Ms. Petrie said that haste may make waste if this is rushed through. Mr. Krapf said
40 he thinks that's why this draft factor should remain on hold so the Committee can further consider it.

41
42 Ms. Griest said she thinks draft Factors 1 and 4 have a lot of commonality because agricultural uses occur
43 in AG-1, AG-2 and CR, so that if the essence of this question regarding the use of nearby or adjacent sites
44 is captured in Factor 1, then why replicate it in Factor 4. She said that she thinks draft Factor 1 captures
45 this information regarding use more effectively than Factor 4 does. She said Factor 1 is about use and
46 not about a zoning designation that may or may not be relevant or accurate.

47
48 Mr. Donoho said that the Farm Bureau's letter contained a comment about this draft factor.

49
50 Ms. Petrie said maybe one of the Farm Bureau Land Use Committee members present may want to
51 speak to this during public participation.

MINUTES– AS AMENDED AND APPROVED

1 Ms. Griest said that she takes the opposite opinion to the County Farm Bureau’s comment regarding
2 draft Factor 4: “This factor will assist in providing points to parcels that are further from a municipality
3 and are thus in a clear agricultural based area of the County.” She said she does not think Factor 4 does
4 that because AG-2 is adjacent to the municipalities. She thinks their objective is good but that draft
5 Factor 4 does not capture the objective in a manner that is called for.
6

7 Mr. Donoho said that he sees a grey area now that this has been discussed because the way it’s stated is
8 not a guarantee that it will happen in that way.
9

10 Ms. Griest said she would dispute that Factor 4 provides points for the parcel being further away, since it
11 doesn’t differentiate between AG-1 and AG-2. If AG-1 and AG-2 were rated with different point levels, I
12 would absolutely agree with this factor, but the fact that they are lumped together makes it an
13 ineffective factor.
14

15 Mr. Donoho said maybe a re-write of draft Factor 4 should designate a distance to AG-1 and a distance
16 for AG-2. Ms. Griest pointed out that CR falls into its own separate distance and so that would need to
17 be considered.
18

19 Ms. Monte asked Committee members regarding concerns regarding draft Factor 5: “Distance from the
20 subject site to the nearest city or village limits.”
21

22 Ms. Griest said that this is where Steve’s point about being within the 1-1/2 miles becomes valid. And I
23 suggest maybe lowering this point to 1 mile actually would provide greater protection to the land that is
24 farther out than a mile. So if it’s one mile or greater or within the mile, it would be more like a ‘yes’ or
25 ‘no’ question. We could validly debate the value of the farm ground that is within that adjacent 1 mile.
26 The soils are still just as valuable. If you are going to balance farmland protection and development, this
27 is a point where you make that trade-off is within that mile.
28

29 Ms. Jones said that the size of the community is a factor to consider and that 1-1/2 miles may be more
30 pertinent when you are discussing Champaign or Urbana but less pertinent when you are talking about
31 Homer.
32

33 Mr. Moser said that the further out a parcel is from a city limit, the more of a problem that volunteer fire
34 protection becomes for a development, and he said this is a critical factor. He said that some of the
35 existing homes nearby the Sangamon River and around Homer Lake have deficient roads for fire
36 protection access. Ms. Griest said that is a valid point regarding those collections of homes that were
37 established pre-zoning with only basically a modestly improved narrow driveway. She said that since she
38 has been on the ZBA, she has seen that the zoning ordinance now addresses these concerns and that this
39 is reviewed very carefully for each proposed rezoning for residential development.
40

41 Ms. Jones asked why 1-1/2 miles was being used for the distance measure for draft Factor 5. The
42 Committee discussed which towns in the County have adopted comprehensive land use plans and
43 zoning.
44

45 Ms. Monte asked Committee members regarding concerns regarding draft Factor 6: “Is the subject site
46 located within the Contiguous Urban Growth Area of the Champaign County Land Resource Management
47 Plan?” She noted that the County Farm Bureau letter contained an inaccurate count of the number of
48 municipalities in the County with an adopted comprehensive land use plan (6 as opposed to the actual
49 number, 12). She said that the LRMP map does not include information regarding planned public sewer
50 beyond the city limits of those towns without an adopted comprehensive land use plan, and that there

MINUTES– AS AMENDED AND APPROVED

1 are probably no public sewer expansions planned adjacent to those towns, but that this is improvement
2 that should be considered for this draft factor.

3
4 Ms. Petrie questioned whether a separate factor about planned infrastructure would be a better factor
5 than one regarding the Contiguous Urban Growth Area.

6
7 Mr. Hall said that he would prefer that information included in the LRMP regarding public sewer
8 availability for smaller communities was referred to. Ms. Monte suggested that the draft Factor could
9 include reference to the mapped CUGA for where it exists, and reference from the text of LRMP Volume
10 1 regarding existing sanitary sewer for the other communities.

11
12 Ms. Griest said maybe a better choice might be to add another factor for the communities with no
13 adopted comprehensive Plan with regard to sewer facilities. Ms. Petrie suggested that this be further
14 reviewed.

15
16 Ms. Monte asked Committee members regarding concerns regarding draft Factor 7: “How close is the
17 subject site to livestock management facilities of 50 or more animal units?” Ms. Monte said that Mr.
18 Brad Beaver of the IDOA Livestock Management Facilities Program has only partial database that is
19 specific to permit applications to build a new facility or to expand an existing facility and that this is a
20 database that is not useful for the purposes of a complete and consistent means to measure these
21 facilities in the County. She said that Mr. Beaver referred her to an IEPA representative to inquire about
22 a database that is complete with regard to livestock management facilities of this size in the County.

23
24 Ms. Petrie said she is interested in how the livestock could be counted and in the longevity of such
25 facilities.

26
27 Ms. Monte said that Mr. Beaver that when an application is sent to the IDOA it includes information
28 about the maximum design capacity in terms of animal units. She said a facility may not always house
29 that maximum number of animal units, but that is the number on file with the IDOA.

30
31 Ms. Petrie said that her primary concern about this factor is the potential for variability over the years
32 and that over time such a facility may no longer exist.

33
34 Ms. Monte said perhaps the factor could be expanded to include whether the facility is present on the
35 map and then whether it is still in operation.

36
37 Mr. Moser asked how many facilities are in the County and Ms. Monte replied approximately five or six,
38 based on the IDOA data provided regarding permit applications for new or expanded facilities.

39
40 Ms. Jones asked if the animal units are livestock. Mr. Stierwalt said that poultry and turkeys are included
41 as well.

42
43 Ms. Monte asked whether the Committee prefers to continue to review the four remaining draft factors
44 or to move to public participation since it is close to the end of the meeting. The Committee agreed to
45 go on to public participation.

46
47
48
49
50 **5. Public Participation**

MINUTES– AS AMENDED AND APPROVED

1 Hal Barnhart said that regarding draft Factor #2, the definition of 'adjacent' included in the narrative for
2 that factor, which differs from the use of the term 'adjacent' as found in the state LESA system, is more
3 detailed and that this is disturbing. He said that the additional detail regarding the term 'adjacent' may
4 not be reasonable. He said that regarding draft Factor 7, there are a lot of points given for the livestock
5 facilities and that he doesn't think there are a lot of livestock facilities in the County and so this factor
6 would be another reduction in the amount of points awarded in this County.
7

8 **6. Adjournment**

9 Ms. Monte reminded the Committee that the next meeting will occur on Wednesday, August 10.
10 Mr. Krapf said that he will be on vacation during the next meeting and that he is aware that Mr.
11 Donoho will also be on vacation. **There being no further business, Ms. Monte adjourned the**
12 **meeting at 8:10 p.m.**
13



Date: July 22, 2011
To: LESA Update Committee
From: Susan Monte, CCRPC Planner
Regarding: Meeting 4 on Wednesday, July 27

DRAFT SITE ASSESSMENT FACTORS

The draft set of updated site assessment factors selected by the Committee as of July 13, 2011 is provided as an attachment to this memo. (At present, the 'narrative' for each of the selected draft factors is as appears in the packet distributed prior to the July 13 meeting.)

At our upcoming meeting (on July 27), staff will address the following concerns noted by the Committee on July 13:

- 1) Review IDOA data regarding existing 'livestock facilities of 50 or more animal units,' and the measurability of these for Factor #7.
- 2) Propose a definition to be used for 'non-farm dwelling' and how these will be quantified in Factor #8.
- 3) Review pros and cons of dividing Factor # 8 into two separate factors.
- 4) Suggest to remove, replace or revise Factor #2 and/or Factor #9 since they are so alike.
- 5) Suggest a revised point scale for the draft set of site assessment factors so that the total is equal to 200.

LAND EVALUATION FACTORS

The Committee began review of the existing land evaluation (LE) scoring process and agreed to update the process to include 'soil potential ratings' in place of 'soil productivity ratings.' A draft of updated LE scoring process for Champaign County will be distributed to Committee members at the July 27 meeting.

GUEST

Ms. Terry Savko, IDOA Bureau of Land and Water Resources, Office of Farmland Protection, indicated that she also plans to attend the July 27, 2011 Committee meeting.

ATTACHMENT: Draft Site Assessment Factors as of July 13, 2011