

DATE: January 28, 2010  
TO: Planning & Development Committee  
FROM: District 6 County Board Members:  
McCann, Donley, Ryan & Schuster  
Re.: District 6 – recommended changed to the  
2030 Land Use Plan

.....

## Introduction Section

1. Page 12, Column 2, Bullet Point 2 - Eliminate #2 OR... replace it with:  
  
“Encourage key commercial, office and industrial to concentrate within and adjacent to existing communities.”

.....

## Community Character Section

2. Page 15, Column 4, Bullet Point 5 - ...should read “Limit the conversion of agricultural areas. . .” removing the word premature.
3. P&D 4: --- Page 16, col 1 - Leave paragraph 1 as is. We want paragraph’s 2 & 3 to read as follows:

“While McHenry County has many attributes that make it a desirable place to live and work, many would cite the County’s rural character as a primary contributor to the region’s appeal. As the number of people who call McHenry county home continues to grow, it is becoming clear that maintaining this rural character will become more and more of a challenge.

Although only 14% of the County’s population was classified as “rural” in the 2000 US Census, a 2007 USDA census shows that 55.2% of the land mass of McHenry County is in farms for a total number of 1,035 farms. The pressure to convert farmland for development and the county’s desire to preserve farmland to protect the rural character of the county, creates a paradoxical situation that underscores the need for a comprehensive plan that seeks to accommodate change while preserving this dominant rural lifestyle.”

Position: In paragraphs 2 & 3 the percentage of population that is rural, is not the percentage of land that is rural. That’s comparing apples to oranges. Using the percentage of land in farms is the

right one. The land mass is what determines whether character of the county is rural. According to the 2009-2010 Yearbook, USDA figures indicate that 55.2% of McHenry County land is in farms, a total of 1,035 farms averaging 208 acres each.

4. Page 16, column 2, para. 1: Delete sentences 1 and 2 of this paragraph or, restate as:

“Based on the 2007 USDA census, the greatest percentage of land mass in McHenry County remains farm based.”

Position: As amended it would be a factual statement.

5. Page 23, col 4, sentence 1: Remove this sentence.

Position: “Statistics” do NOT support this conclusion.

The important message in this paragraph is that... “The rural character that could once be applied to the majority of the County must be reassessed.”

Most recent, 2007 USDA census numbers show the county is 55.4% farmland...and, the plan and our own county mission statements support preservation of our natural resources...the major resource is AG.

6. Page 24, col 3, policy 12: Remove this policy.

Position: How can you make the streets narrower but increase on-street parking?

Wouldn't this be considered “micromanaging” and another example of today's solutions creating tomorrow's problems! i.e. in this case problems of, and/or for, snow removal; emergency vehicle access; children running out between parked cars; and a host of unintended consequences?

7. Page 25, point 31: Suggest pulling this policy.

8. Page 25, points 34, 35, and 36: Remove points #34, 35 and 36

Position: A commission addressing these point have been established.

9. Page 26, Policy 40 - Delete Policy 40.

Position: Poor planning in rural areas.

Not having high density, multifamily housing in the unincorporated areas is good planning for numerous reasons... not the least of which is that access to public transit in those areas is nonexistent and non-tenable; there is a total dependence on the automobile; and, shopping, health and all services are located in municipalities.

.....

## Agricultural Resources Section

10. Page 29, Column 2, Bullet Point 2 - Re-write to state:

“Maintain and protect productive agricultural lands by discouraging nonagricultural growth in these areas.”

11. Page 31, col 2, para 2, last sent: Remove the word “premature.”

12. Page 35, col 1, last sentence: Correct the text and any supporting figures/charts to reflect the 2007 USDA census numbers to reflect that we are/have 1,035 farms..

12a. Page 35: Add a definition of the “Groundwater Protection Plan here or in the Water Resources chapter.

13. Page 38, Policy 2 - Remove all the text within the parentheses (i.e. parcels in agricultural use with an LE score of 80 or greater and contiguous with other such parcels)

14. Page 38, policy 4 – Before ...in accordance with, insert “...within or at municipal boundaries...”

15. Page 38, policy 14 – Replace with the following text:

“Make every effort to protect Agribusiness in the County since the industry sustains a significant number and variety of supporting businesses, with fewer infrastructure demands than residential or other commercial development.”

.....

## Greenways, Open Space & Natural Resources Section

16. Page 57, Policies 1, 2, and 3– Change the word back to “require” rather than to “encourage”

**Position:** These policies are already requirements in the unincorporated area under county jurisdiction.

17. Page 58, Policies 23, 26, and 33 - Is it the County’s responsibility to do those items listed in these policies? Should the policies be to “encourage” the proper entities to take these actions?

Position: What “actions.”? Why not reference MCCD as the entity to address these issues... they have the funding mechanism to accomplish such projects.

.....  
**Water Resources Section**

18. Page 64, col 3, para 2, last sentence: Insert after decades..., “the McHenry County Groundwater Resources Management Plan studies indicate that demand will outstrip available supplies.”

19. Page 64, col 3, para 3, last sentence: Rewrite this statement to read: “It is imperative that the County recognize the finite nature of our water supply and sensitive recharge areas through firm commitment to plan for the protection of those resources.”

20. Page 72, col 4, line 2: - “Since its adoption in 1992, the *McHenry County Monitoring Ordinance* APPEARS to be successfully protecting the groundwater supply...”

Position: Reference must be made to the source in order to substantiate this statement.

21. Page 73, col 3, para 1: - Remove the wording “agricultural runoff” after stormwater discharge (See also page 65.)

Position: First, the paragraph is discussing “urbanization.” Second, ag runoff would have been considered by the RPC if they had not had Dennis Dreyer’s study disproving this premise.

22. Page 77, col 2, para 3: At the end of the first sentence: Insert, after the words “land areas...” “...prior to the county’s Stormwater Ordinance of 2006.”

23. Page 79, policy 2: See that reference to the SARA map is included.

24. Page 79, Policies 1, 2, 5 & 6: These policies are examples where the Plan suggests that development be allowed in sensitive areas “if” we do it carefully...

Position: To be proactive and serious about protecting these vulnerable areas we must be firm and consistent throughout the text of this document. Stronger, rather mushy words need to be used so as to prevent misunderstanding and/or misguided interpretation of our intent to protect our residents.

25. P&D 22: --- Page 79, Policy 9 - Consider revising to add or modify appropriate qualifying text.

**CMTE 12/3: Believe this point was missed in committee review...**

Position: There is concern regarding the horror stories where prescription drugs, yard chemicals, road and water softener salt etc. are being identified in municipal wastewater... How/why do we promote the spreading of this wastewater is a concern?

26. Page 79, Policy10: We need greater discussion of this topic. Further, controls for over-site of such techniques must be reviewed and amended should the policy remain in the Plan.

Positon: The policy is misguided. Nothing should be built in SARA areas. SARA areas are routes to contamination. Someone missed the point of SARA and the cleansing ability of wetlands. There is a saturation point and travel distance for impurities to be removed.

(There apparently was no chemist on this committee!!)

27. Page 79, Policy 11: Could there be a suggestion that municipal wastewater treatment/discharge be located in and around municipal wells for maximum recharge of those wells?

28. Page 79, Policy 15 - Consider revising to list the diverse water sources such as shallow aquifers, deep aquifers, and surface waters.

**CMTE 12/3: Staff will reword.**

Position: Is this giving the municipalities permission to go outside their immediate area and pipe in water to “diversify” their sources?

29. Page 80, among others, Policies 19, 20, 21 & 27: all... are examples of where we are suggesting development in sensitive areas...

30. Page 80, Policies 24 – Define for the reader... what a “a countywide source water protection plan” is.

31. Page 80, policy 25: What is the “legislation” being “supported” by WHOM?

Position: If we plan on including this in our Plan, we need to have the county board's support for the legislation.

32. Page 81, policy 40, 41 & 48: - Again, why are any developments being suggested in sensitive areas?

33. Page 81 policy 48: Replace the word "minimize" and/or "avoid" with "deny" development activities in hydric soil zones.

Position: CHALLENGE the concept that you can "ENGINEER" development in hydric soils. Use the subdivision just east of the courthouse as an excellent example of why we should not to even consider this concept.

Policies 40, 41 & 48 are prime examples of where requests for zoning changes need to be considered on a site-specific...case by case basis.

~~34. Page 83, References and Sources - Consider adding a reference to the Sensitive Aquifer Recharge Areas (SARA) map, including the date of adoption by the County Board.~~

~~Position: Done.~~

35. Page 82, Policy 63: Restructure this policy to reflect the fact that watershed organizations already do this???

e.g. "Recognize and join in the work already done by the various watershed planning resource agencies throughout the county by adopting and honoring the plans for streams and wetland open space they have developed."

.....  
**Economic Development Section**

36. Page 87, Objectives - Members agreed to a 65/35 objective to balance development.

Position: Clarify this to state whether it is meant for rural McHenry County or if it is intended to occur within the municipalities and villages.

Given the geophysical composition of most of the undeveloped lands in the unincorporated areas, the infrastructure costs to support most commercial business will be very costly. How will

the county see that these infrastructure needs are met and financed?

How about recognizing the economic value of the County's natural resources and tax such resources ( many people attending the public discussions agreed that gravel should be taxed to pay for impact on roads and the lost of tax dollars from future land use – this product generally goes to governmental entities and then is not taxed.

2ndly; Recognize the economic value of unique sensitive areas as a tourist attraction that generates tourism, and has little impact on infrastructure resources.

37. Page 97, Col 1: Do not know what this paragraph is intended to means as it references “regional facilities.” Clarification of all such facilities should be addressed so the reader fully understands the statement.

Position: The re-written text is unacceptable as it ensures destruction of farmland and water recharge areas.

38. Page 98, Policy 1, 2, 3 & 6 - As District 6 members, we firmly disagree with these and other like policies and text in the Plan.

Position: We request that all reference to the promotion of these concepts be removed throughout Plan. Then replace that text with the over riding goal of the Plan to develop at/within the municipalities and villages.

Planning need not mean that various zoning designations be identified in rural areas simply to meet some arbitrary population number. Planning can and should be to protect existing residents and vital resources necessary to sustain that population.

We have no mechanism under which we can “reserve” personal property for a purpose other than what it is currently zoned.

Further, in arbitrarily “reserving” a property currently zoned A1 or A2 where the Plan designates those properties for another use and it inadvertently negates the County's zoning process and personal property rights.

Proposing in various sections of the Plan that property adjacent to railways, interstates and various roadways in rural McHenry County be reserved for uses other than the current zoning.... contradicts the Plan's goal that development is to be compact and contiguous to

municipalities and villages able to provide the necessary infrastructure services.

The unintended consequence of policies such as these, include but are not limited to:

- a. The active intent to promotion urban sprawl;
- b. Explicitly undermines the agricultural community;
- c. Interferers with and prevents farmers the ability to farm their properties without the intrusion of urban sprawl, nuisance issues and with all other impediments to farm;
- d. Greater costs for current residents;
- e. Undermines the protection of food producing and water recharge land for future generations;
- f. Continues to promote an auto dependent population; and
- g. Greater financial cost to governing entities that cannot be recovered from such development.

County has very little power to expand/improve roadways when development moves in, that is why expansion should be within municipalities that have greater power to require major infrastructure improvements of those proposing new development.

Should policies such as these remain in the Plan and the map depicts these same concepts, will those property owners who find their A1 or A2 zoned properties, now identified as office/research/industrial and business, be taxed as the suggested zoning?

Put another way; those holding property zoned as A1 or A2, agricultural uses, have certain rights with that zoning designation. When government, for “taxing” purposes suggest that those properties are estate or residential, greater revenue dollars are generated. By the same token, should the Plan arbitrarily designate A1 properties as ORI&B, will the property owners be taxed for that designation?

39. Page 98, policy 7: - Replace the word “Limit” with the word “BAN” office/research/industrial and retail uses...”

Position: Why is anything allowed to be built, and/or encouraged, in SARA areas? That’s our children’s future water supply.

40. Page 98, policy 8: - This appears to be micro managing to the absurd...

Position: Why does the County care? Since when is bringing money into the county to be spent in the county a bad thing? How are commuters a financial burden to the county?

41. Page 98, policy 10 & 14: - Begin this policy with "Encourage the EDC to"...target industries...

Positions: McEDC should be doing this...NOT the county...so, lets encourage McEDC to do it by stating so.

42. Page 98, Policy 19: Suggest rewriting this statement to read: "Reclamation of spent aggregate mines are best suitable as open space where best management practices for such use can be maintained."

Position: To continue to suggest that gravel mines be reclaimed for agricultural use is not a real world suggestion. The most critical part of any mining operation is to protect the groundwater from contamination.

## Infrastructure Section

So many issues discussed in this chapter...and the entire document for that matter...confuse county, municipal and EDC functions and responsibilities. This makes it difficult to edit the text.

43. Page 104 – Col 1; Para 2; pt #1: This point appears to be suggesting that "the county" will provide economic development opportunities. Shouldn't this read: "Encourage the McEDC to promote economic development opportunities that will foster increased primary jobs in the county."

44. Page 104 – Col 1; Para 2; pt #2: states: "...create transportation system that will serve the changing mobility needs of people and freight which is the foundation of prosperity;"

Position: Is this saying that the county will create these systems...  
Is this a realistic suggestion?  
Has there been any study to support the concept?  
And, at what cost to the residents?

44. Page 104 – col 1; Para 2; pt #3: As currently written in the plan, points 1 & 2 conflict with this point where it states "...maintain an environment that is amenable to the existing agricultural industry; and,"

Position: Staying within the compact/contiguous concept... is about the only way that works.

45. Page 104 – col 1; Para 2; pt #4: To the statement "...provide quality open space." add the words "...by encouraging MCCD to continue their work to preserve sensitive land areas and to encourage

municipalities and villages to work with developers as land is annexed into their boundaries.”

46. Page 104 – col 2; Para 1; sent #2&  
col 2; Para 2; sent #1:

The following message is conveyed: (Am. Soc. Of Civil Eng.s’ 1988)...”a similar report card issued in 2005 indicated that most of the condition of the nations infrastructure, including that of northern IL and McHenry County, and its many components had worsened and most areas received grades of D (substantial) and lower.”

Position:

Speaking of roads, the “shortfall,” as graded by the Am. Soc. Of Civil Eng’s., is a direct result of past and proposed trends for auto dependent development. The concept of compact and contiguous development at or within current municipal/village areas would eliminate the need to build and maintain vast roadway networks. Working with this concept, main arterials could and should be upgraded and maintained to support those communities.

47. Page 104 – col 2; Para 3; sent #1:

states “...working under financial constraints, the county needs to... “3) create new infrastructure to expand networks of roads, mass transit, bus routes, bike paths, walkways, and energy grid components.

Position:

Next to the water issue...isn’t this a critical reason to reconsidering whether or not we should accommodate the projected “population” numbers?

Growth should pay its own way. If land is to be developed for commercial use, infrastructure must be improved at the developers’ expense.

48. Page 104 – col 3; para 1; sent #2:

states: “...the county’s economic strategy has been tenuous at best and does not work in an era of rapid population growth, changes in population mix, changes in the age mix, and a technology and tele-communications infrastructure that is not effective, efficient and accessible throughout the area.”

Position:

If this is not working... why continue with it?

49. Page 104 – col 3; para 2; sent #1: States: “...county also lacks a business or non-passenger aviation relief airport...”

Position: Define the “population” to be served by such an airport. Also, define the term “relief airport” and “reliever airport.”

For the most part, these airports do not pay their way... becoming a tax burden and going under, leaving blight and destroyed farmland.

50. Page 104 – col 3; para 3; It states that infrastructure improvements... “... will require upfront public investments that will take decades to deliver measureable benefits.”

Position: Cannot afford what we need to do now. What are they referring to or talking about?

51. Page 106, col 3, para 1: states: “...farm to market connectors have witnessed increasing traffic volumes and congestion as the roads have remained unchanged.” In the next paragraph... it outlines what is expected as we encourage 222,000 more residents to the already stressed county...

Position: Promoting rural development is the problem as it causes added stress on the farming community and rural roads.

52. Page 106, col 4, para 2: “by demographers”

Position: Who are they referring to? For credibility, NAME them.

53. Page 120, Policy 11 – Review the new wording in this point...but give serious consideration to deleting the policy. **(STAFF combined policies 2, 3, and 4. Ignored policy #11)**

P&D Cmte. 1/7/10: will be revised, to “Encourage intergovernmental cooperation in municipalities...” The word “utility” will be changed to “infrastructure.”

Position: What type of “utilities” are we talking about?

Keeping with the compact and contiguous concept, there would be little need for infrastructure on the magnitude needed for development promoted in rural areas of the county.

Who would pay for such “utilities/infrastructure?”

Isn't this suggesting more of the same rather than allowing what the current residents of the county can afford?

.....  
**Land Use Section**

54. Page 126, Existing Land Use Map Figure -

Consider either: 1) revise the map to show existing residential areas in the western portion of the County based on zoning rather than property tax assessment data; and 2) provide a text box clarifying the map source and limitations (similar to page 125, column 4, paragraph 2).

P&D Cmte. 1/7/10: – the “Map will remain as is. “

.....  
Following are the ALAW proposed amendments to the 2030 Land Use Map. The original amendment has been updated to include the new population numbers.

The Future Land Use Map of the 2030 Plan is hereby revised in the following steps:

- A. All areas outside of existing municipal boundaries are returned to green for agriculture. All the color designations for Estate, Residential, Office/Research/Industrial (ORI) and Retail areas are removed.
- B. All previously approved, pre- 1979 development parcels in any use category, will be indicated in a separate color from any other color currently planned for use on the Future Land Use Map, so as not to confuse them with future uses. The legend on the map is amended to indicate that parcels of that color are the result of pre 1979 zoning decisions, no longer relevant, and that the parcels are mapped for reference and not to be used as precedent for future zoning requests. Further, that zoning in areas where estate and residential zoning have been approved AFTER '79 are depicted in the appropriate color for that designation.
- C. Municipal plans will be used as overlays to create a Future Land Use Map, which will show only the amount of unincorporated land contiguous and able to be annexed to municipalities, that is necessary to accommodate 56,398 persons. This number represents the difference between the increase of 125,398 persons under the US Census population projection and the 69,000 persons Mr. Davenport indicates can be accommodated within existing municipal boundaries.

*“Municipal plans will be used as overlays to create a Future Land Use Map, which will show only the amount of unincorporated land contiguous and able to be annexed to municipalities, that is necessary to accommodate 108,000 persons. This number represents the difference between the increase of 177,000 persons under the P&D*

*amended population projection and the 69,000 persons.” - - - See Note below:*

- D. After consideration of municipal capacity for ORI and Retail development, all further designation of ORI and Retail necessary to create jobs for the projected increased population will be restricted to locations with existing systems and facilities that provide households and businesses with the basic requirements to function day-to-day, which includes existing transportation network, energy and utilities networks, water supply, wastewater and sanitation facilities, and communications network.

**Discussion:**

**Refer to “C” above:** ( Mr. Davenport indicates can be accommodated within existing municipal boundaries.

\*2030 Plan page 136, first column, last paragraph.

Also note: Charlie, Ken and others have repeatedly said that it is the intent of the plan for 90% or more of the growth to happen in and as annexed to the municipalities.)

**The plan does not do enough to protect water and agriculture. Accommodating an extra 96,602 persons (RPC 540,000 minus US Census 443,398) has enabled the RPC development majority to set aside large parts of unincorporated county land for development speculation.**

**The text of the Land Use Chapter puts agricultural land conversion at 28,000 acres or 43.75 square miles, an area almost as large as the county’s three largest cities combined!** (Crystal Lake is about 23 square miles, Woodstock is about 10.7 square miles and McHenry is about 12.1 square miles. Together they equal 45.8 square miles.)

These 28,000 lost acres are frequently located in sensitive recharge areas and prime farmland. Sensitive recharge areas and prime farmland areas must be set aside first and incoming population must be accommodated in other areas.

By 2030 the most valuable land in the county will be prime farmland, not for its development potential, but for its production potential. (*Footnote 1*) We will be facing a worldwide food crisis in 20 years, (*Footnote 2*) and we have some of the best remaining farmland in the world. We must not squander it. We are facing a worldwide water crisis right now. A simple on-line search will reveal serious water shortages in most developing nations. In third world countries people die every day because huge European water cartels control the water, forcing them to pay for the very water beneath their feet. (*Footnote 3*) Severe water problems exist in Western and Southern United States. How many international corporations are bottling water right here in the Midwest? We must not turn a blind eye and continue ignoring these issues the way we have in the past.

**Red Townships**

Two exhibits are attached. The first one is an exhibit from a 2005 Groundwater Resources Management Plan commissioned by the county. (*Exhibit 1*) It illustrates graphically the change in the next 20 years that the study predicts. In the year 2000, Algonquin Township was already on the watch list for potential water shortages. As we know now, Algonquin Township has already had to deal with water shortages and contaminants. The Township has begun to take aggressive

steps to control their water usage, but one thing they cannot do is simply UN Do the amount of recharge area paved over and the sheer number of users drawing water from their aquifer. It is too late to go back.

The second attachment is a comparison of the impervious surfaces in Algonquin, Grafton and Alden Townships. (*Exhibit 2*) It is not too late for western McHenry County.

**This Plan Map is an invitation to further controversy:**

The Land Use Map departs radically from the primary message of the text. Even with its inherent discrepancies, the text does not translate into the map. The text promotes Compact, Contiguous Development, in and at municipal boundaries, where infrastructure and services are available. The map clearly promotes sprawl. Large tracts of land miles from municipal services are set aside for industrial, retail and residential development following a failed, auto-dependent development model that society can no longer support.

There are discrepancies and conflicts in any plan. However in this one, there are blatant invitations for decision makers at Zoning and County Board levels, to make mistakes, leading to controversy and lawsuits. Developers will create spot zones without infrastructure and services, increasing taxes, maintenance and the destruction of farmland and recharge areas.

Large areas designated by the county for development in the mile and half municipal planning areas of the municipalities are disrespectful of municipal plans and invite litigation between municipalities and the county. The solution is to remove all the map designations and start over with a base of Agriculture. Only designate a truly necessary amount for estate, retail and other uses, and then make sure the designations are contiguous to municipalities with infrastructure and services. Leave the rest in Ag protection, and work on intergovernmental agreements with municipalities. Extend an olive branch to MCCG and try to win back goodwill and cooperation on these issues. Ideally, with cooperative agreements and buy-in from the municipalities, all development for the next 20 years could be contained within existing boundaries or close to them, and developed under the compact, contiguous development model that the RPC (*county actions set the stage for this concept*) chose to use, without destruction of additional farmland and recharge.

**Jobs and affordable housing:**

The plan does not adequately link jobs and affordable housing: These are irretrievably dependent on each other. Compact contiguous development espoused by the plan text is compatible with creation of affordable housing. But the jobs have to be located there too – not out in the countryside where getting to them costs more. The plan text actually admits that the previous development pattern is not compatible with this idea, (*Footnote 4*) and then conforms to that same previous development pattern with a huge isolated industrial area south of Marengo, and a huge estate area south of Union on the map. The ORI area is distant from any affordable housing and the estate area is not likely to attract affordable housing. In any event, both areas require new roads, utilities and services, which will raise taxes for existing residents.

Industrial/office/research centers and retail development far from affordable residential areas will not only break up farmland and decrease recharge but also create more roads and road maintenance problems, and add to CO2 emissions and other auto related pollutants.

Removing, reducing and relocating these areas to areas adjacent to infrastructure will put the “contiguous” back into “compact and contiguous”. The plan does a nice job promoting compact development; it just does not require it to be near infrastructure, i.e. contiguous with existing utilities and services. It must. In addition, the plan promotes the wrong kinds of jobs. To be compatible with compact contiguous development, the plan needs to 1) put the employment centers near the housing, and 2) encourage and facilitate small business, home-based businesses, neighborhood retail and service businesses, technology and communications. This plan promotes plastics and rubber manufacturing, specialty trade contractors, ambulatory health care services, merchant wholesalers and administrative and support services, in isolated parts of the county. In other words, business as usual. But the plan must also look to the future. The way America does business is changing. The county must be more forward thinking.

Footnote 1: *Farmland: Society's Windfall*, John R. Sheaffer, David Mullan and Ann Piasecki,

Footnote 2: *The End of Plenty*, Joel K. Bourne, Jr., National Geographic, June 2009, page 38

Footnote 3: Blue Gold: The Fight to Stop the Corporate Theft of the World's Water, Maude Barlow and Tony Clarke, The New Press, 2002. See also: Blue Covenant: The Global Water Crisis and the Coming Battle for the Right to Water, Maude Barlow, The New Press, 2007.

Footnote 4: *McHenry County 2030 Comprehensive Plan, RPC Recommended Plan*, page 22, Housing and Transportation.

Exhibit 1: 2000/2030 Water Use/Potential Yield Ratio By Township, COUNTY OF McHENRY, ILLINOIS GROUNDWATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLAN, Prepared By: Planning and Management Consultants, Inc. Carbondale, IL, and Baxter & Woodman, Inc., Crystal Lake, IL, 2005.

Exhibit 2: *Where Will We Get Water? Impervious Coverage of Three McHenry County Townships*, 2009. Green Alliance info Series: Poster #5.

[www.mchenrycountygreenalliance.blogspot.com](http://www.mchenrycountygreenalliance.blogspot.com).

**--- As of 1/28/10, District 6 comments, requests and suggested changes to the text & map of the McHenry County 2030 Land Use Plan**

---