

**MCHENRY COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
FEBRUARY 14, 2008**

**Call to Order**

Chairman Eldredge called the meeting to order at 6:25 p.m.

**Roll Call**

Commissioners Present: Charles Eldredge, Chairman; Dennis Dreher, Bill Swenson, Jerry Davenport, RB Thompson, Nancy Schietzelt, Frank Harrison, James McNutt, John Jung, Jr. and Craig Hubert

Commissioners Absent: Ronald Bauman, Jim Coughlin and Jeremy Shaw

Staff Present: SuzAnne Ehardt, Maryanne Wanaski, Matthew Hansel and Cindy Sassaman

Also present: Tammy Valentine-Garza, Richmond Township; Anna Moeller, MCCG; Scot Hartman, City of Marengo, Patricia Kennedy, Jane Collins, Cindy Skrukud, John Gardner and other interested members of the public

**Minute Approval**

Motion by Mr. Harrison seconded by Ms. Schietzelt to approve the minutes of September 13, 2007, October 11, 2007 and January 10, 2008. Mr. Harrison requested that his name be removed from the list of Commissioners present in the October minutes. All members present voting aye. Motion carried.

**Public Participation**

Ms. Valentine-Garza, Supervisor for Richmond Township, expressed her concern with comments made by County Board member Virginia Peschke at the County Board meeting on February 7, 2008. Specifically of concern were the statements about school districts and farmland in Richmond Township. Ms. Valentine-Garza requested that the Commission revisit the information from the farming community and noted for the record that there are 13 farms still in production in Richmond Township. Mr. Harrison spoke on behalf of the agricultural subcommittee and mentioned that the farmers that attended the meeting did not show any interest in farming except for agritourism. However, he did agree that there is still substantial amount of farmland in production in that area of the county. Chairman Eldredge apologized to Ms. Valentine-Garza and noted that the Planning Commission will take her comments into consideration. Mr. Davenport suggested that maybe the confusion came from the maps.

Mr. Hartmann, Administrator for the City of Marengo, voiced a strong objection to the Intergovernmental Coordination Summary Report, Item #10, regarding the I-90/Route 23 corridor and the creation of another community. Specifically, Mr. Hartman took exception to the comment that Marengo and Union were not able to provide services for that development corridor. He asked for an opportunity to discuss this issue further.

County Board member, Barbara Wheeler stated she did not like the language of Item #10 and told the Commission to strike the statement from the report.

Ms. Kennedy presented two resolutions to the Commission; one from ALAW and another from the Bull Valley Garden Club. Both are in support of what has been done thus far, because most of their issues were being addressed.

Mr. Gardner of Crystal Lake said he was impressed with the work from the Water Resource Subcommittee. Work from the subcommittee reads clearly and he hoped the rest of the draft will read as clearly. He supports the great work.

Cindy Skukrud from the Sierra Club felt what she read from the Water Resource Subcommittee was well organized, readable and addressed critical water resources such as flooding. She said that water should be treated as a resource.

### **Director's Remarks**

Ms. Ehardt noted that there were several housekeeping issues that needed to be discussed.

- She asked Commissioners about their preference for receiving meeting packets either via email or regular mail. By consensus the Commission decided to receive packets via regular mail. The packet will be sent out one week prior to meeting dates. Items not contained in the packet will not be discussed at the meeting.
- Ms. Ehardt stated that the few comments she received on the County Board presentation were excellent. The presentation was not to contain recommendations and was only an up-to-date fact finding summary. However, she voiced great concern over chapters being released to the public prior to the full Commission's review. Mr. Dreher explained that his subcommittee worked with advisors for comments. Ms. Ehardt reminded Mr. Dreher that the Commission agreed not to release any work-in-progress prior to review by the whole Commission.
- Again, regarding the 12-month Report to the County Board, there were accusations by some Commission members that staff changed subcommittee reports. Ms. Ehardt stated that the only changes made were grammatical type changes. Ms. Schietzelt reported that she sent her subcommittee report on January 18<sup>th</sup> for the packet to be distributed on January 21<sup>st</sup>. Ms. Ehardt noted that her email was not received until January 22<sup>nd</sup> for several reasons. One being "scrubbers" that county email must pass through and two, January 21<sup>st</sup> was a legal holiday. Additionally, the County Board packet was already compiled and distributed based on two previous deadlines. Mr. Dreher reported that he submitted the Water Resources Subcommittee Report on December 27<sup>th</sup>. He noted he did not mind the changes but felt some were substantial in nature. Staff provided Mr. Dreher a copy of the email noting all of the changes he approved which resulted in the same version included in the report. Where upon there was some discussion on the events. Mr. Thompson suggested the Commission move forward. Ms. Schietzelt asked if staff could telephone Commissioners if there were no responses to emails.

- Ms. Ehardt provided the Commission with an updated 2030 timeline. She asked that the Commission focus on the new schedule of work.

### **Old Business**

Ms. Wanaski handed out a booklet with LEAM templates developed by the University and told the Commission that LEAM would like feedback as to whether or not the modules encompassed the direction and issues the Commission wished to pursue; if so, initial findings could possibly be back to the Commission as early as April. By consensus, the Commission decided to review the modules and comment to staff no later than February 24<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Wanaski also provided Commissioners with the Imagine McHenry County Survey results as requested.

### **New Business**

Mr. Harrison made a motion, seconded by Mr. Swenson to dissolve all subcommittees and to review all items/reports/drafts by the Commission as a whole.

Discussion: Mr. Harrison felt that the subcommittees' jobs were to gather information, not to compose chapters. He recalled that at one point it was discussed that a professional writer could be obtained to write the entire plan. Mr. Hubert said that the Commission made the decision to go the route they are heading. Mr. Harrison did not remember the decision. It was Mr. Harrison's feeling that everyone should understand each area as well as each subcommittee chairman understands his area.

Chairman Eldredge said that he would need to speak with Mr. Bauman, and Mr. Shaw to get their feelings on the matter. He, personally, is in favor of going forward as a whole Commission.

Mr. Dreher said that he did not understand the premise.

Mr. Harrison stated his concern was that there was a perception that the Commission's only focus was in special interest groups. He feels the Commission should move on.

Ms. Schietzelt noted that the subcommittees have been urged to involve as much of the community as possible.

There was discussion on amending the motion to state that after the March 2<sup>nd</sup> except for the Communications Subcommittee meeting and the Open Space meetings on February 28<sup>th</sup> the Commission would eliminate all subcommittees and go to two Commission meetings per month.

Motion amended to eliminate all subcommittees with the exception of the Communications Subcommittee and to hold two monthly meetings [minimum] starting in March with the entire Commission. All members present voting aye. Motion carried.

The focus of each meeting is to be selected the month prior. Motion by Mr. Thompson, seconded by Mr. McNutt to hold the meetings on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Thursday of the month at 6:00 p.m. All members present voting aye. Motion carried.

Mr. Dreher questioned why advisors should not be able to view written material as he felt they were much more informed than Commission members. The experts attended meetings and submitted comments in writing. County Board Member John Jung stated that he sees both sides of the dilemma. Mr. Davenport felt that we do not need spokesmen. These are drafts, thinking points. Mr. Eldredge clarified that public is anyone that is not staff or a commissioner. Currently, nothing has been adopted, any information that is disseminated should be to all groups and discussed and approved by the entire Commission. Completed chapters will be reviewed by the Planning & Development Committee for a "reality check" and then sent back to the Commission for any revisions.

Mr. Thompson recommended that all documents be altered in front of everyone by using a laptop and overhead and by making the changes on screen. Changes would then be approved at the next Commission meeting. Ms. Ehardt stated that would allow time for staff to wordsmith without changing the content with revisions ready for the next meeting.

Chairman Eldredge suggested the Commission try this method.

Chairman Eldredge stated he had not read the Groundwater Resources chapter and would like this item deferred to the next meeting.

Scheduling for future meetings was discussed. In March the Board of Realtors would like to be on the Commission's agenda. The second meeting in April tentatively will have Civiltech traffic modeling. Staff is hoping to have LEAM also attend so that Civiltech and the University can discuss their joint working efforts.

### **Subcommittee Reports**

None

### **MCCG**

Anna Bicanic Moeller stated that several mayors attended the County Board presentation. She stated that the mayor's caucus discussed the presentation and it was the consensus that the objectives were laid out but there is concern with the Intergovernmental Subcommittee report where veto power is discussed. She also mentioned that veto power by the County is against state law.

She asked the Commission to consider the existing municipal land use plans when moving forward; also to remember the importance of community "buy in".

### **Members Comments**

Mr. Thompson asked about the vacancy. Ms. Ehardt stated that the Planning & Development Committee will be interviewing in March to fill that position on the Commission. When asked about Mr. Coughlin, Ms. Ehardt stated he has been absent due to family issues. Ms. Schietzelt mentioned she will be unable to attend the next two meetings.

### **Chairman's Comments**

Mr. Eldredge reviewed the items to be address:

- Format new agenda – scheduling meetings on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Thursday of each month
- Schedule presentations with Board of Realtors, Civiltech and LEAM

Ms. Wanaski reminded the Commission that in July the 18-month report to the County Board will be due. She suggested the Commission consider writing a white paper regarding LEAM modeling results. She mentioned that in March staff would like to bring the population forecasts to the Commission so that everyone can look at the distribution developed by CMAP now, versus later in the planning process. Staff will develop some working overheads.

### **Public Comment**

Ms. Collins requested the LEAM templets be available on the website. Ms. Collins also requested the Imagine McHenry County Survey be posted on the website. Ms. Wanaski noted that as soon as permission was granted, that too would be made available.

It was brought up by a member of the public that some links do not work on the website

### **Adjournment**

Motion by Mr. Dreher, seconded by Mr. Harrison to adjourn the meeting. All members present voting aye. Motion carried

Meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.