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Chapter 1: Plan Introduction

Purpose of the Plan

The Comprehensive Plan for St. Clair County updates the 1991 Land Use Plan prepared with the support of Woolpert, Inc., in association with Thouvenot, Wade, & Moerchen, Inc. The continued movement of population from west to east and suburban to rural within the County, development pressures within the I-64 development corridor and the traditionally rural south-west and south-central portions of the County, and the completion of MidAmerica St. Louis Airport and opening of the MetroLink light rail system, required updating the Plan.

The purpose of the Comprehensive Plan is to establish a logical guidebook of land use, transportation, infrastructure and economic development policies that will influence public and private decision-making in St. Clair County. The Comprehensive Plan represents a vision of where County leadership and the general public want to be in the future and outlines strategies to achieve that vision. The Plan was crafted to meet the following goals:

- A Plan by and for the whole County
- A Plan with Citizen, Community, Regional, and Political Support
- A Plan for Future Land Use as a Tool to make Short-Term Zoning Decisions in a Long-Term Framework
- A Plan for Future Infrastructure as a Tool to prioritize Investment Decisions
- A Plan for Economic Development as a Tool to focus Investment and Marketing Initiatives

The primary objectives of the St. Clair County Comprehensive Plan are as follows:

- To provide the County Board and Zoning Board of Appeals with policy guidelines to assist them in their decision-making concerning public expenditures for future infrastructure projects, zoning and development review matters, and the provision of services to County residents and businesses.

- To inform the development process within St. Clair County to facilitate educated decisions by individuals and businesses regarding the location of land uses throughout the County.

- To establish a relationship between St. Clair County's future development, the local area highway and thoroughfare network, and patterns of general accessibility.

- To determine how to provide the best balance between areas earmarked for future development and agricultural and preservation areas.

- To establish the framework for coordinated action between St. Clair County, townships, municipalities, other units of local government within the County, the State of Illinois, and the Federal government.

- To provide continuity in terms of the direction of St. Clair County's future growth through successive County administrations and County Boards.
Plan Approach

The Comprehensive Plan evolved from interviews, county-wide open houses, working meetings with individual communities, and discussions with the Steering Committee, Zoning Board of Appeals, and County Staff. The planning process also included technical evaluation of demographics and socio-economics of the population, existing land use and zoning, public facilities, natural resources and composite development constraints.

Following meetings with many of the County’s communities, the County-wide land use, transportation, and utilities plans were prepared. In addition to the land use plan, a series of special use overlay categories were identified as a means of protecting sensitive or important areas. These special use categories provide an additional level of awareness and guidance regarding the type and intensity of development that should be permitted within these areas, as well as the need for additional coordination in reviewing and approving such development. These areas included the 1.5-mile municipal jurisdictional area, the Scott AFB/MidAmerica St. Louis Airport Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) area, Illinois Natural Area Inventory (INAI) sites, the Mississippi River bluffs, the Karst Topography region, and IDOT’s Gateway Connector corridor. The Plan further discussed improvements required to the Mississippi River/American Bottoms levee system and provided recommended strategies for economic development and affordable/workforce housing.

Planning Horizon

The Comprehensive Plan generally considers a 20-year planning period. The recommendations in the Plan do not represent a total "build-out" strategy for all developable land in the County, but rather, the Plan recommends and assumes that development will occur primarily adjacent to existing municipalities and developed areas.

Organization of the Plan

The Comprehensive Plan is organized into five chapters and an appendix:

Chapter 1: Introduction—describes the purpose for the Plan, the planning approach and components, the planning time frame, and key plan contributors.

Chapter 2: Planning Issues—provides a summary of the County’s important issues and opportunities, review of the relevancy of the 1991 Comprehensive Plan, and statements of policy that provided the foundation upon which the Plan was based.

Chapter 3: Situation Analysis—summarizes the technical review of existing conditions, including population demographics and economics, existing land use and zoning, public facilities, natural resources, and limiting environmental or man-made features.

Chapter 4: Plan Elements—describes the future land use, transportation, and utilities plans that are the foundation of the Comprehensive Plan.

Chapter 5: Special Use Categories & Special Topics—recommends the application of special use land use categories for unique sub-areas of the County and discusses several special topics related to flood protection for the American Bottoms, economic development, and affordable/workforce housing.

Appendix: Citizen Input—summarizes the interviews, county-wide open houses, and working meetings with individual communities and the Steering Committee.
Chapter 2: Planning Issues

The comprehensive planning process began with an identification of key issues and opportunities facing the County, a review of the 1991 Comprehensive Plan, and the updating of relevant policy statements from the earlier Plan. Collectively, this process yielded a clearer understanding of the future vision for the County and a framework for the data collection and planning phases of this plan.

Issues & Opportunities

Major challenges and opportunities facing the County were discussed with the Steering Committee and County Staff at the beginning of the planning process to provide a background for future interviews and data collection. Key issues and opportunities from these discussions are provided below.

- **Economic Development**—Identification of Targeted Industries, understanding Recent Regional Development Trends, building on St. Louis Relationships and Business Spin-Offs (e.g., suppliers of manufacturers that need to be close to assembly plants), and promotion of the County’s Enterprise Zones (5) and potential Zone expansions (for MidAmerica St. Louis Airport and Discovery Business Park).

- **Airport, Business Park & Riverfront Development**—Emphasize development of MidAmerica St. Louis Airport, Foreign Trade Zone Status, and the Joint Use Business Park, incorporate findings of the Scott AFB/MidAmerica St. Louis Airport Joint Land Use Study (JLUS), pursue I-64 Exit 21 new interchange at Rieder Road in O’Fallon, assist with Discovery Business Park and I-255 Exit 9 new interchange at Imbs Station Road in Dupo, facilitate growth opportunities at St. Louis Downtown Airport (Midcoast Aviation, Sauget Business Park, and proposed Martin Aviation AirPark), along the East St. Louis Riverfront, and at the St. Louis National Stockyards.

- **Transportation Corridors**—Key corridors for development include the new Mississippi River Bridge Corridor, the new Gateway Connector Corridor (Illinois 158 Outer Belt), the Illinois 3 corridor parallel to the Mississippi River, the Illinois 15 Corridor south of Belleville, the Frank Scott Parkway Corridor, MetroLink Light Rail Station Areas, and Interstate Highway interchanges.

- **Limiting Natural Conditions**—Existing constraints for development and natural areas to be protected include Hazardous Waste Sites, Landfills (active and closed), Surface & Subsurface Mining (coal mines and rock quarries), Wetlands, Flood-Prone Areas, Surface Drainageways, Karst Topography, the Mississippi River Bluff, Steep Slopes & Erosive Soils, Endangered & Threatened Species, Historic & Archeological Sites, and Prime Farmland.

- **Storm Water Management**—Prepare a County-wide Storm Water Management Plan by watershed, evaluate the impacts of pending decertification of the American Bottoms Levee System by the USACE as a levee-protected 100-year floodplain and the USACE American Bottoms Ecosystem Restoration Project (to manage surface runoff from above the bluff), and pursue floodplain management through existing Levee Districts, Drainage Districts, and FEMA.

- **Outdoor Recreation, Greenspace & Heritage Preservation**—Develop a network of Federal, State, County, and Municipal Parks and Trails through the County Property & Recreation Committee and Parks Grant Commission, and partner with the Metro East Park & Recreation District’s (MEPRD) funding and development programs.
• **Zoning Ordinance/Re-Zoning Process**—A Zoning Subcommittee of the Economic Development Committee has been appointed to review the County’s zoning process, history of zoning and variance decisions, and issues/trends with previous re-zoning and variance requests/decisions; review the 40-acre Rule for its impacts on slowing urban sprawl and preserving farmland, and consider municipal subdivisions’ impacts on County Roads.

• **Multi-Modal Development Assets & Location Factors**—County multi-modal transportation assets include the Interstate Highway System, Public Transportation including MetroLink, the Railroad System, Aviation Facilities, and River Navigation and Marine Facilities.

• **Waste Management**—Ensure adequate regulations for future expansions and new sitings of Landfills.

• **Population/Economy**—Population and economic gains are generally isolated above the bluffs resulting in numerous growth issues, while population and economic losses are generally isolated in the American Bottoms resulting in numerous decline/decay issues; the County’s tax base has become more reliant on retailing as the industrial sector has declined.

• **State Legislative and Regional Authorities**—Numerous State legislative and regional authorities overlap within the County including Port Districts (Tri-City, Southwest, and Kaskaskia), Levee Districts, Leadership Council of Southwestern Illinois, Southwestern Illinois Development Authority (SWIDA), The Tourism Bureau Southwestern Illinois, East-West Gateway Council of Governments (EWGCOG), and the St. Louis Regional Chamber & Growth Association (RCGA).

**Review of the 1991 Comprehensive Plan**

The key to updating the County’s 1991 Comprehensive Plan was to identify elements of the Plan that were still relevant and current, and those that needed to be updated through this planning process. The following assumptions were used as a basis for the 1991 Plan. Some assumptions were realized, while most were not. These assumptions and others were re-evaluated to establish a baseline for the new Comprehensive Plan.

**Land Use & Development**

• The Scott Joint Use Airport (MidAmerica St. Louis Airport) has not yet resulted in successes for the air transport industry or economic development in the metro-east.

• St. Louis Downtown Airport has not resulted in office-related opportunities, but has begun to develop as an industrial opportunity (Midcoast Aviation and Sauget Business Park).

• The East St. Louis Riverfront has not been the focus of any meaningful regional redevelopment effort.

• The new Mississippi River Bridge has not been constructed (though it is in design) to increase relocations to the metro-east.

• New residential development has placed burdens on some expanding school districts.

• Enterprise Zones along the Mississippi River have not, to this point, significantly increased industrial expansion in East St. Louis, Cahokia, and Dupo (though recent activity in Dupo is accelerating).
Transportation & Circulation

- MetroLink has attracted significant ridership from outlying residential areas.
- A circumferential highway around Belleville to ease congestion on IL 159 was identified as the Gateway Connector, but not constructed (though the corridor has been protected by IDOT).
- MidAmerica St. Louis Airport is not yet connected with Lambert-St. Louis Airport via MetroLink.

Economic Development

- East St. Louis has not benefited from the redevelopment of downtown St. Louis.
- The St. Louis National Stockyards has not resulted in significant redevelopment.
- Improvements have been completed on the Eads Bridge, but not a new Mississippi River Bridge, and neither has yet to spur economic development.
- MidAmerica St. Louis Airport has not increased commercial and residential development in the O’Fallon-Shiloh region; in fact, the airport when fully functional will likely inhibit residential development in the immediate area.
- The I-255 interchanges have not resulted in mixed-use developments, primarily due to their location in the American Bottoms.
- The distribution industry has not expanded and thrived in the County, however Madison County’s success at the Gateway Industrial Park (I-255 & IL 111) is an example of the potential of St. Clair County’s I-255 corridor.

Utility Systems

- The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has studied, but not facilitated improvements to water levels in the American Bottoms that would improve redevelopment opportunities.
- The Metro-East Sanitary District (MESD) has not expanded its boundaries to include its entire contributing watershed.

Quality of Life

- Recreation areas were only marginally expanded to include wetlands (Silver Creek Preserve), Kaskaskia River, East St. Louis Riverfront (MEPRD Gateway Geyser, Casino Queen), and reclaimed mining areas (Foley Park, St. Ellen Park, New Athens Wildlife Refuge).
- New schools were required and built in the O’Fallon-Shiloh area.
- Improved facilities in the American Bottoms have improved health standards.

Policy Statements

The policy statements are the foundation upon which the Plan recommendations are based, providing a link between the County’s current conditions and the vision for the County’s future. Key elements are highlighted in bold.

Land Use & Development

- Encourage clustered commercial development to minimize stripping out of major highway frontage (primarily municipal decisions).
- Ensure compatibility and coordinate development around Scott AFB/MidAmerica Airport.
- Direct development toward existing developed areas and areas capable of being provided water and sewer service; minimize scattered development in unserved rural areas.
• Maintain strong residential base, encourage development of a broad range of housing choices including affordable/workforce housing, and encourage clustered residential development that reinforces the concepts of neighborhood and community.
• Encourage commercial development that meets the needs of neighborhoods and communities.
• Minimize conflict between commercial and residential areas.
• **Create opportunities for planned industrial development.**
• Ensure compatible development (or no development) around Cahokia Mounds.

**Transportation & Circulation**

• Provide a safe, efficient, and affordable transportation system.
• Coordinate County thoroughfare system planned improvements with Interstate, State, and local systems.
• Minimize disruption of residential areas with the thoroughfare system.
• Reduce the incidence of congested thoroughfares in existing built-up areas.
• Reduce travel times within and through the County.
• Improve access management and limit curb cuts along major thoroughfares.
• Support a variety of public transportation modes; enhance effectiveness of MetroLink.
• **Ensure viability of St. Louis Downtown Airport for corporate and aircraft maintenance (Midcoast) aviation.**
• Use abandoned railroads for roadway corridors.
• **Construct an outer beltway to the JB Bridge (Gateway Connector).**
• Construct a new Mississippi River Bridge.
• Develop MidAmerica St. Louis Airport for commercial and freight air service.

**Economic Development**

• **Reserve portions of the Kaskaskia River corridor for industrial use and direct appropriate industrial growth to the corridor.**
• Recruit industries that utilize and enhance multi-modal transportation opportunities and available land.
• Diversify the County’s economy by attracting transportation and distribution businesses.
• **Direct transportation and distribution businesses to the American Bottoms to take advantage of the existing transportation infrastructure.**
• Correct infrastructure and environmental problems, particularly in the American Bottoms.
• Encourage redevelopment in the American Bottoms through public investments.
• **Develop the Mississippi Riverfront for entertainment/recreation as well as industrial/ports use.**

**Utility Systems**

• General:
  o Reduce duplication and competing utility systems.
  o Ensure utility system capacity to accommodate future development.
  o Ensure availability of utilities to support the County’s economic development initiatives.
• Water:
  o Consolidate water supply from large treatment facilities and ensure an adequate distribution system.
  o **Direct water system improvements to highly accessible areas and areas contiguous to existing development.**
• Sewer:
  o Direct sewer system improvements to highly accessible areas and areas contiguous to 
    existing development; improvements should accommodate future development for the 
    entire watershed.
  o Consolidate sewer treatment and collection facilities within watersheds and ensure an 
    adequate collection system.
  o Encourage rehabilitation of sewer systems in existing areas where redevelopment is 
    projected.
  o Discourage approval of development in unserved areas; require geological suitability 
    analysis where on-site sewage disposal systems are proposed.
  o Encourage review of FPA expansion requests based on long-range, cost-effective 
    service provision.
• Storm Water:
  o Ensure storm water management is handled on a County-wide and watershed basis.
  o Establish a County-level storm water management system.
  o Establish greenbelts (floodplain overlay district) along streams and rivers to prevent 
    development encroachment; allow minimal maintenance for flood prevention.
  o Create multi-functional detention basins for recreation/conservation.
  o Ensure adequate easements in new developments for maintenance of drainage systems.
  o Coordinate with the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) for floodplain mapping and 
    flood insurance qualification.

Quality of Life

• Preserve and expand recreation areas and open space; create a network of open space 
  corridors to provide “buffers” between developing areas; include strip mined land as part 
  of the open space corridor network; utilize a variety of public/private ownership/management 
  strategies to provide open space.
• Minimize wetland destruction; create new wetlands to mitigate threatened wetlands.
• Limit development in environmentally sensitive areas; cluster development on environmentally 
  constrained land.
• Minimize loss of sustainable prime farmland; maintain the agricultural heritage and economy of the 
  southern County.
Chapter 3: Situation Analysis

The planning team assessed current County assets and liabilities against the 1991 Plan and prepared a Situation Analysis identifying significant opportunities or gaps in meeting new recognized County needs. The assessment included interviews with County Stakeholders, public input open houses, and technical research and analysis.

County Setting

St. Clair County is located in southwestern Illinois within the Illinois portion of the St. Louis Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). The County is adjacent to the City of St. Louis on its west, separated by the Mississippi River, and is bounded by the Illinois Counties of Madison, Clinton, Washington, Randolph, and Monroe. Only Madison County is similar in population and economy to St. Clair County. The others are generally agriculturally-based rural Counties. The County is strategically located with ample transportation assets, served by the Mississippi and Kaskaskia Rivers, multiple railroads and rail yards, commercial air transportation at MidAmerica St. Louis and St. Louis Downtown Airports, and a comprehensive Interstate and State highway system.

Geographically, St. Clair County is characterized by the broad American Bottom floodplain of the Mississippi River on the west; upland areas predominated by residential and commercial development on the north; and expansive agricultural fields to the south and east. The landscape is marked with several large creeks and their associated watersheds including Silver, Richland and Prairie du Pont, as well as the sinkhole plain in southwestern St. Clair County and remnant coal strip mines visible to the south.

Demographic & Economic Overview

Population growth, changes in household structure, and other demographic trends impacting market forces were investigated to help guide St. Clair County’s future land use, infrastructure, and economic development strategy. The following was prepared by Economics Research Associates and highlights key trends helpful in planning for the future.

Population

As shown in the chart below, since about 1980 the St. Louis MSA population has been steadily increasing to about 2.8 million people in 2006. The 2010 US Census figure for the MSA was 2,878,255.

St. Louis MSA Population
The completion of Interstate 255, improvements to local downtown areas, and the economic benefits of Scott Air Force Base have all been major contributors to the growth of St. Clair County. St. Clair County’s share of the MSA population has remained steady at about 9 percent since 2000. The 2010 share of 9.4% was based on a County population of 270,056.

**St. Clair County Share of MSA Population**

![Graph showing St. Clair County Share of MSA Population](image)

**Housing**

Major infrastructure and community improvements mentioned above have resulted in a gradual housing shift to the Illinois side of the Mississippi River. This has been coupled with decreasing household size—a national trend, but in St. Clair County’s case, a 2.3 percent change is notable and suggests more specific market forces underway. Areas such as St. Clair County that are experiencing significant declining household size are typically seeing higher than average instances of an aging population, downsizing households, and younger households with fewer children.

**Decreasing Household Size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>St. Clair County</th>
<th>St. Louis MSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000 Average Household Size</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Average Household Size</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Average Household Size</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage change</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census, ArcView projections

Interestingly, the number of family households in St. Clair County and the St. Louis MSA has actually increased by 4.5 and 6.3 percent, respectively.

**Increasing Number of Family Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>St. Clair County</th>
<th>St. Louis MSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000 Families</td>
<td>67,323</td>
<td>708,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Families</td>
<td>69,277</td>
<td>734,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Families</td>
<td>70,329</td>
<td>753,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage change</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census, ArcView projections
While part of the increase in number of family households can be attributed to the natural lifecycles of an aging population, it is an important trend to note when considering the market forces that will impact a land use and development strategy (e.g., employment opportunities, public facilities planning, etc.), particularly because families can be important contributors to stable economic bases.

**Income**

As illustrated in the chart below, St. Clair County has a lower average personal income per capita, but has been growing at a rate comparable to the MSA and State of Illinois.

**Personal Income Per Capita**

A unique approach to understanding overall income trends and St. Clair County’s market position is to track annual bank deposits by location. Deposits at savings and commercial institutions in St. Clair County have grown from $3.1 million in 2002 to $3.4 million in 2007 with the number of institutions growing from 82 to 96. Despite this growth, St. Clair County’s financial position within the MSA and Statewide is not as strong as it was five years ago. From 2002 to 2007, St. Clair County’s share of MSA and Statewide deposits fell by an average annual rate of 2% and 3%, respectively. The following chart illustrates a volatile, but declining on average, five year trend.

**St. Clair County Deposits, 2002-2007**
Education

St. Clair County is mostly on par with the MSA and Illinois, with slightly lower shares of college and advanced degrees. A well-educated population is a key to successful economic development and employee retention strategies. Information related to the County’s demographic overview indicates that higher education (College and Advanced degrees) is an important area for improvement.

Highest Level of Education Completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>St. Clair County</th>
<th>St. Louis MSA</th>
<th>Illinois</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school, no diploma</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced degree</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Employment

With about 13,000 employees, Scott Air Force Base has an estimated annual economic impact of $2 billion. This asset has helped the government employment sector remain the top sector by share of the St. Louis MSA, followed by health care and retail. Real estate and education employment, however, experienced the highest percentage change growth from 2001-2006 and should be considered as emerging industries. Similarly, government, health care, and retail are the top three sectors by share of St. Clair County employment; real estate and wholesale trade increased by the highest percentage change from 2001-2006. Government and health care contributed the highest shares of MSA employment, but wholesale trade and services (information and professional/technical services) improved their shares of MSA employment the most from 2001-2006.

It is important to note that between 2001 and 2006, St. Clair County wages grew faster than the MSA in all but three employment sectors (manufacturing, administrative/waste services, and health care/social assistance). Even more significantly, St. Clair County’s wage growth outpaced the MSA by more than 25 percentage points in wholesale trade, professional and technical services, transportation and warehousing, and information.

The tremendous wage growth these categories in St. Clair County have experienced recently indicates the County’s notable progress toward an emerging service based economy—information wages alone grew by an average annual rate of 11 percent; nearly triple the MSA’s growth rate over the same time period. The following figure helps illustrate St. Clair County’s wage growth in various employment sectors.
Commuting Patterns

Based on commuting data and an analysis of historical trends, it can be inferred that the majority of County residents work within St. Clair County or St. Louis MSA. The following table and chart summarize commuting patterns over the last 30 years. Note the small, but growing, number of employees commuting to the more rural Illinois counties of Monroe, Randolph and Washington.

Top Localities St. Clair County Residents Commute To

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County of Work</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>CAGR '70-'00</th>
<th>CAGR '90-'00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Clair, IL</td>
<td>58,725</td>
<td>69,238</td>
<td>69,302</td>
<td>70,375</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis (Independent City), MO</td>
<td>19,111</td>
<td>17,957</td>
<td>19,187</td>
<td>18,250</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>6,944</td>
<td>5,567</td>
<td>10,464</td>
<td>12,590</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison, IL</td>
<td>5,060</td>
<td>4,943</td>
<td>6,146</td>
<td>7,039</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe, IL</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph, IL</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Charles, MO</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton, IL</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson, MO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, IL</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following chart illustrates commuting trends, highlighting the growth in Monroe and Randolph Counties. Note: The top four localities (St. Clair County, St. Louis City, St. Louis County, and Madison County) were divided by a factor of 100 to support the scale of the chart.

**Growth in Commuters from St. Clair County, 1970-2000**

^St. Clair County, St. Louis City, St. Louis County, and Madison County were divided by a factor of 100 to improve trend visibility.
Land Use & Zoning Districts Inventory

Existing land use and County zoning districts were mapped to describe the existing characteristics of land within St. Clair County. The existing land use and zoning maps were generated in ArcView format using County Assessor Codes, parcel themes, base map information (such as water bodies, drainage, and the major road network), and the most current attribute tables associated with the themes available through St. Clair County.

**Land Use**

The use of land constantly shifts as development and redevelopment occurs in rural and urbanized areas of St. Clair County. Because land use is constantly shifting, existing land use can only occur as a snapshot of what is in place at any given time. For this analysis, land use data was retrieved from the County GIS in January of 2008. Based on the following land use categories described below, the tables and map that follow illustrate the types, locations, and percentages of the various land uses in the County.

- **Agriculture** is the use of land for crop or livestock farming or continuous maintenance of land in a rural, undeveloped state.

- **Park/Open Space** areas are public and privately owned land used for active recreation, passive recreation, or the preservation of a natural resource.

- **Residential** areas are all parcels of land currently being used for housing including single family houses, mobile and manufactured homes, duplexes, and apartment buildings.

- **Commercial** areas include retail, office, and service businesses. The Commercial land use also includes parcels/buildings that are mixed use and contain one or more residences in addition to a business.

- **Industrial** uses include manufacturing, warehousing, and distribution facilities.

- **Transportation** includes railways and railroad yards.

- **Government** land use represents land owned and maintained by a local, state, or federal agency for a public purpose. Examples of Government land in St. Clair County include Scott Air Force Base, St. Louis Downtown Airport, MidAmerica St. Louis Airport, MetroLink, levees, drainage ditches, future road right-of-ways, and schools.

- **Vacant** land has been subdivided, purchased by a developer, or zoned for a use other than agriculture but is not developed.

- **No Data** represents parcels that have not been assigned a land use code.

- **Estimated ROW** (Right-of-Way) assumes that the area used for roadways can be calculated as the gaps in between parcels. Included in the 16,540 acres of county-wide estimated ROW are the approximately 1,800 acres of the Mississippi and Kaskaskia Rivers.
St. Clair County occupies a relatively robust 673 square miles, or approximately 430,000 acres. The incorporated communities within the County account for roughly 25% of the County’s land area. The other 75% remains unincorporated St. Clair County. Incorporated places and residential land use generally are clustered in the western and north-central portions of the County. The balance is represented by agricultural and rural residential uses.

Countywide, nearly 70% of all land is still in agricultural production, 12% is in residential use, and approximately 4% is in each of the commercial/industrial, government, and parks and open space categories. Large government land uses include such uses as Scott AFB, MidAmerica St. Louis Airport, and St. Louis Downtown Airport. Parks and open space uses, comprising nearly 16,000 acres, include such areas as the Cahokia Mounds and Frank Holten State Parks, the Kaskaskia State Fish and Wildlife Area, County and municipal parks, and golf courses.

### Countywide Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Percent Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>291,273</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park/Open Space</td>
<td>16,156</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>52,168</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>12,661</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>3,625</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>1,429</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>16,170</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>15,375</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>5,860</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated ROW</td>
<td>16,540</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>431,257</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land in just the unincorporated portion of St. Clair County is even more agricultural, representing more than 80% of the land use. Residential use is 9% of unincorporated land area; commercial/industrial is only 1%, and 3% is in parks and open space (at about 10,500 acres). By comparison, land in just the incorporated Cities and Villages of the County is divided into 26% agricultural, 22% residential, 12% commercial/industrial, and 5% park and open space (5,500 acres).

### Unincorporated County Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Percent Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>263,151</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park/Open Space</td>
<td>10,630</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>28,805</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>7,120</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>3,966</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>1,816</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated ROW</td>
<td>6,140</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>325,544</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Incorporated Places Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Percent Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>28,122</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park/Open Space</td>
<td>5,526</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>23,363</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>10,036</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>2,609</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>9,050</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>11,409</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>4,044</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated ROW</td>
<td>10,400</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>105,713</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Percent Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>291,273</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park/Open Space</td>
<td>16,156</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>52,168</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>12,661</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>3,625</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>1,429</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>16,170</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>15,375</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/No Data</td>
<td>5,860</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated ROW</td>
<td>16,540</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>431,257</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- *Incorporated Areas*: 105,713 (24.5%)
- *Unincorporated Areas*: 325,544 (75.5%)
Another way to analyze land use is to look at its comparative residential density. That is, on average, how many people are living on an acre of land Countywide, in unincorporated St. Clair County, and in the incorporated places within the County. The following table provides an insight into the County’s population density.

**County Population Density**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Total Acreage</th>
<th>Population per Total Acre</th>
<th>Residential Acreage</th>
<th>Population per Residential Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entire County</td>
<td>256,082</td>
<td>431,257 ac</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>52,188 ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated County</td>
<td>59,135</td>
<td>325,544 ac</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>28,805 ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated Places</td>
<td>196,947</td>
<td>105,713 ac</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>23,363 ac</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since 1991, the most identifiable change of land use is expansion of municipalities. In 1991, incorporated areas accounted for 14% of the county. In 2008, incorporated areas grew to 25% of the county. Most development that occurred in St. Clair County since 1991 would have been in municipalities or have been annexed. However, a majority of land annexed since 1991 is still used for agriculture. The table below shows the land use that exists in areas annexed since 1991.

**Current Land Use of Annexed Land Since 1991**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Land Use of Areas Annexed Since 1991</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Percent Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>20,956</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park/Open Space</td>
<td>3,356</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>8,336</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>2,079</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>4,097</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>1,846</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated ROW</td>
<td>2,591</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>46,518</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Zoning

Zoning is the division of a city or county into districts governed by legislative regulations addressing such land development issues as lot size, land use, building size, parking, signage and other development standards. St. Clair County’s Zoning Ordinance, adopted September 27, 1993, applies to all unincorporated areas and unzoned municipalities. Zoning Districts cover the traditional categories of Agricultural, Residential, Business, and Industrial, with the addition of several overlay zoning districts applied to floodplains (Conservation Overlay O-1), primary road corridors (Highway Overlay O-2), and Scott AFB/MidAmerica St. Louis Airport and environs (Scott Airport Overlay O-3). The table below lists the zoning districts and the number of acres contained in each zone. For a full definition of the zoning districts and the regulations associated with each, refer to the zoning ordinance.

Zoning and land use should ideally be a reflection of each other. Since zoning was adopted in St. Clair County many years after settlement and growth, the location of zoning districts generally reflects established settlement patterns. As expected, most zoning districts that contain development are located in zoned municipalities. Out of the 325,000 acres in unincorporated St. Clair County, 274,000 acres (or 84%) are zoned Agricultural Industry, 22,000 acres (7%) are zoned Rural Residential requiring a minimum of 1 acre lots, 9,000 acres (3%) are zoned for other Residential uses, and 10,000 acres are protected for Scott AFB, MidAmerica St. Louis Airport and their environs. Residential zoning in the County is generally adjacent to incorporated areas and is a logical extension of the region’s urbanization and proximity to municipal services. Only 1,600 acres are zoned for Business or Industrial use.

**County Zoning Districts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Agricultural Industry</td>
<td>274,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR1</td>
<td>Rural Residential - 1 acre</td>
<td>5,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR3</td>
<td>Rural Residential - 3 acres</td>
<td>16,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR1</td>
<td>Single Family Residence - 10,000 sf</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR2</td>
<td>Single Family Residence - 15,000 sf</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR3</td>
<td>Single Family Residence - 20,000 sf</td>
<td>6,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMH</td>
<td>Single Residence - Mobile Home</td>
<td>1,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHP</td>
<td>Manufactured Home Park</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR1</td>
<td>Two and Three Family Residence</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR2</td>
<td>Multi-Family Residence</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Neighborhood Business</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB</td>
<td>Highway Business</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Retail and Service Business</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>General Business</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1</td>
<td>Research and Assembly Industrial</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2</td>
<td>General Industrial</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-R</td>
<td>Conservation-Recreation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-1</td>
<td>Conservation Overlay Zone</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-2</td>
<td>Highway Overlay Zone</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-3</td>
<td>Scott Airport Overlay Zone</td>
<td>10,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Zoned</td>
<td>2,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporated Areas</td>
<td>105,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated ROW</td>
<td>6,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>431,257</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Facilities Inventory

An inventory of public facilities and services in St. Clair County was updated from the 1991 Plan along with a general assessment of the ability of those public services to meet the County’s needs in the future.

## County Facilities

St. Clair County owns and maintains land in a number of capacities related to health, welfare, housing, and recreation. Land owned and managed/maintained by St. Clair County Government is classified according to the following five categories and is recorded in the parcel-level GIS data. Additional facilities were identified that contain County offices and other functions.

- **St. Clair County Public Building Commission** includes properties owned and used by the County for administration or public services.
- **St. Clair County Trustee** includes properties vacated and/or confiscated for back-taxes.
- **Intergovernmental Grants** includes properties purchased or owned for public use. Examples include St. Ellen Park in O’Fallon and Tecklenberg Woods in Belleville, as well as some County-owned administrative properties.
- **FEMA Property** is property purchased in flood prone areas through grants from the Federal Emergency Management Agency.
- **MidAmerica Property** includes MidAmerica St. Louis Airport and surrounding parcels with the intention of supporting future airport expansion and airport-related commercial development.
- **Housing Authority** property is owned with the intention of providing low-income housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Facility</th>
<th>Property Description</th>
<th>Area (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Clair County Public Building Commission</td>
<td>Court House</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Building, 10 Public Square</td>
<td>Administrative Offices</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Building, 19 Public Square</td>
<td>Jail and Sheriff’s Offices</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Jail</td>
<td>Courts, 9-1-1, Administration</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Foreclosed Properties</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Clair County Trustee Property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foley Park</td>
<td>Active Park</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Ellen Park</td>
<td>Active Park</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Highway Dept.</td>
<td>Administrative Office</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Creek Preserve</td>
<td>Passive Park</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tecklenberg Woods Forest Preserve</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Grants Property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA Funded Buy-Out Property</td>
<td>Flood prone properties</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MidAmerica St. Louis Airport Property</td>
<td>Airport Operations, Joint Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Park, and future</td>
<td>4,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>airport expansion area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority Property</td>
<td>Low-income housing</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Acres: 6,194**
Utilities

The County’s inventory of public infrastructure was reviewed at a large-scale, planning level of detail including water, sanitary sewer, and storm sewer/flood protection systems, based on the following County GIS information:

- **Water Companies and Districts** are public and private entities whose main purpose is to supply potable drinking water.

- **Facility Planning Area (FPA)** is a state initiated program requiring the collection and treatment of sanitary sewage based partially on watersheds.

- **Levee Districts** are independent taxing authorities responsible for the maintenance of the Mississippi River flood protection devices.

Water Service

Water supply in St. Clair County is primarily provided by five companies or commissions: Illinois American Water, Commonfields of Cahokia Public Water District, SLM Water Commission, FSH Water Commission, and the Kaskaskia Water District. Other smaller municipal and public water districts also serve municipal, commercial, and residential customers in the County.

Illinois American Water is a subsidiary of American Water/RWE AG (Essen, Germany), draws water from the Mississippi River, and covers the more urbanized areas of the County including portions of the American Bottom and western Development Corridor areas. The SLM (Summerfield-Lebanon-Mascoutah) and FSH (Freeburg-Smithton-Hecker) Water Commissions are water wholesalers providing water to the communities reflected in their names. FSH purchases water from SLM’s water plant at the Kaskaskia River above Fayetteville. The Kaskaskia Water District also draws water from the Kaskaskia River at New Athens and serves the municipal, commercial and residential customers south of the Kaskaskia River in the southernmost portion of the County.

Sanitary Sewer Service

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 require states to develop and implement area-wide waste water treatment management plans. The Illinois Environmental Protection Agency is the agency responsible for overseeing the Act in Illinois. The resulting Illinois Water Quality Management Plan (IWQMP) identified the Southwestern Illinois Metropolitan and Regional Planning Commission (SWIMRPC) as responsible for making decisions regarding the Management Plan in Madison, Monroe, and St. Clair Counties. As a component of the IWQMP, areas in Illinois with sanitary sewer service were divided into Facility Planning Areas (FPA’s) and sub-FPA’s. SWIMRPC subsequently formed an Area-wide Management Coordination Board (AMCB) to define the boundaries of FPA’s and to hear petitions to change FPA boundaries.

Sanitary sewer FPA’s have been designated for 26 systems in St. Clair County. FPA’s generally include the sponsoring community or township containing one or more wastewater treatment plants and an area awarded to the jurisdiction for current and future sanitary sewer service. FPA’s are in part based on practical engineering solutions to serving areas based on watersheds and the cost to extend and maintain service. FPA’s have historically kept pace with, and more recently outpaced, the requirements of development surrounding County communities.
Storm Drainage & Levees

St. Clair County is served by two primary drainage and levee districts serving the storm water management and flood protection needs of the American Bottom: the Metro-East Sanitary District on the north and the Prairie du Pont Drainage and Levee District on the south. These two districts, in concert with the Wood River Drainage and Levee District and the federally-owned Chain of Rocks Levee system in Madison County and the Fish Lake Drainage and Levee District in northern Monroe County are responsible for the maintenance of the Mississippi River flood protection devices (levees, gates, pumps, and canals). Smaller drainage districts in the County include the Mascoutah Surface Water Protection District and the Richland Creek Drainage District No. 3 of Prairie Du Long Township.

Beginning informally in 1991, the regional storm water management effort in the metro-east got its start when St. Clair, Madison, and Monroe Counties formed the “Metro-East Stormwater” committee. In 1994, St. Clair and Madison Counties formalized financial support for the storm water effort, and in 1995, Monroe County added its participation into the operating costs of the committee’s work. Successes included securing Federal and State funds for various regional ditch clean-out and flood buy-out projects. In addition, the successful passage of Senate Bill 1910 provides St. Clair County the same storm water authority as upstate counties: to create a Storm Water Management Commission, to place a referendum on the ballot for a property tax or 1/10th cent sales tax, and to use the proceeds of the tax for storm water improvements and matching funds for Federal and State projects.

St. Clair County is the leader for coordination in meeting the EPA’s Phase II Stormwater requirements (NPDES) for the County and its municipalities—including programs and best practices to control runoff. In 2008, St. Clair County drafted a Stormwater Control Ordinance and proposed that it be implemented by the St. Clair County Soil & Water Conservation District on behalf of the County. Final adoption of the ordinance occurred in 2010.

Utilities Analysis

The Comprehensive Plan evaluated countywide gaps in service or capacity related to the ability to service the primary residential growth areas and business/industrial park sites throughout the County.

**Water Service:**
- Gaps in Illinois American Water Company (IAWC) service were evidenced east and south of Belleville, south of Mascoutah, and west, south and north of Millstadt. A new IAWC water main loop was planned to be installed along IL 158 from Belleville west to Millstadt, serving the area east of Millstadt.
- North of New Athens, the Summerfield-Lebanon-Mascoutah Water District (SLM) transmission line reportedly has a capacity issue and a deteriorating condition water pump house at the Kaskaskia River.

**Sewer Service:**
- Sanitary sewer Facility Planning Areas (FPA’s) in St. Clair County were established based on service areas of existing sewer treatment plants and therefore primarily follow township and municipal boundaries. Of the 26 FPA’s in St. Clair County, only 9 do not cross a major watershed boundary. Because many FPA’s are managed by municipalities, expansion of FPA boundaries is often a precedent to annexation. FPA boundaries are extended as development occurs and to include areas where development is expected to capture the future tax revenue. To a limited extent, an FPA can act as a growth boundary for a municipality as municipalities usually do not annex into neighboring FPA’s.
- Gaps in sanitary sewer FPA coverage areas were noted east of Mascoutah and Lebanon; south of Belleville, Shiloh, and Mascoutah, and in areas surrounding all of the smaller communities in southern St. Clair County.
- Sewer system capacity and treatment quality issues exist in some small communities within the County as the smaller communities have trouble financing infrastructure for growth, as well as maintenance of the existing system.

**Storm Water Management:**
- With improvements to the Metro-East Sanitary District and the Prairie du Pont Drainage and Levee District in St. Clair County, in concert with improvements to the Wood River Drainage and Levee District, the Chain of Rocks Levee system, and the Fish Lake Drainage and Levee District, the Mississippi River flood protection system should meet higher federally-mandated standards for designation of the American Bottoms as a levee-protected 100-year (1% annual chance) flood area (Zone X).
- St. Clair County also is taking steps to meet the EPA’s Phase II Stormwater requirements (NPDES) for the County and its municipalities—including drafting of a Stormwater Control Ordinance.
Transportation

The 1991 County Comprehensive Plan dealt considerably with the impact of transportation on the past, present, and future of the County. The primary planning issue was how to accommodate the increased need for transportation facilities across the Mississippi River and to serve the high growth I-64 corridor experiencing rapid commercial and residential growth. Key transportation issues included future MetroLink corridors, additional north-south and east-west arterials, relieving traffic congestion, a circumferential outer belt, and additional Mississippi River bridge capacity.

Current development patterns were shaped by past decisions. Improvements to the County’s major highway system have made possible substantial development along the I-64, IL-161, and IL-159 corridors. The plan also noted that opportunities for economic development were created along the 20 mile I-255 corridor in western St. Clair County, providing access to more than 73 business interchange sites with more than 8,000 developable acres. The Comprehensive Plan noted that since the interstate highway system precludes access to the adjacent land along its right of way, the focus of new growth would be concentrated at the intersections with other highways.

In the Analysis of Existing Conditions, the Plan noted problems with the transportation system’s connectivity and capacity. Connectivity gaps were identified as IL-15 from I-255 to the Poplar Street Bridge, IL-3 from Cahokia to the Poplar Street Bridge, and a number of area service highways and major collector roads with jogs or off-sets (IL-157 @ IL-163, IL-111 @ US 40, IL-158, IL-161, and IL-4). Capacity limits were noted as being approached at a number of locations, with the most significant concerns at the Mississippi River Bridge crossings and IL-159 from south of Belleville north to Edwardsville.

Airports

Two commercial airports serve St. Clair County:

- **St. Louis Downtown Airport** is located in the western portion of the County off I-255 with access to downtown St. Louis. St. Louis Downtown Airport is the third busiest airport in the State and the second busiest in the St. Louis region. Operations at the airport increased from 160,000 take-offs and landings in 1990 to more than 175,000 take-offs and landings in 2005, according to the FAA. Airport property includes 1,010 acres with two primary runways of 7,001 feet and 3,800 feet, and one 2,800-foot crosswind runway. The airport recently completed a new federally-funded $7 million, 138 foot tall air traffic control tower. The 10-story tower replaced the tower that had served the airport since 1973. A 5,000 square foot administrative support building replaced the mobile office trailer near the tower. The airport, owned by Metro (formerly known as the Bi-State Development Agency), generates an estimated $200 million annually for the region.

- **MidAmerica St. Louis Airport** (BLV) is adjacent to Scott AFB off I-64 and is readily accessible to the region’s growing population base. MidAmerica St. Louis Airport is a joint use airport with Scott AFB and a fully certified Part 139 passenger and cargo airport serving the greater St. Louis region. MidAmerica's construction included creation of a 10,000 foot (east) runway, adding 1,000 feet to the existing 7,000 foot Scott AFB (west) runway, adding passenger and cargo terminals on the east side of the facility and a 7,000-foot taxiway connecting the two runways. A new air traffic control tower staffed by Air Force personnel was also constructed midway between the two runways. Property owned by the County for MidAmerica St. Louis Airport totals 5,500 acres, of which 3,500 acres are part of Foreign Trade Zone (FTZ) #31. The airport is also a Port of Entry (Port 4581).
There are only two fully certified Part 139 airports in the St. Louis region certified for scheduled passenger service and cargo—Lambert St. Louis International and MidAmerica St. Louis. FAA Part 139 airports are commercial airports with added FAA, DHS, and TSA regulations and procedures in place not required by General Aviation (GA) airports including St. Louis Downtown Airport, St. Louis Regional Airport in Bethalto, Illinois, and Spirit of St. Louis Airport in Chesterfield, Missouri.

The “mission statement” of MidAmerica St. Louis Airport is to enhance the region’s air service and economic development through the enhancement and continuing pursuit of (in priority order): Scott Joint Use, International Air Cargo/Freight, and Leisure Passenger Service (e.g., Las Vegas, Orlando).

**Scott Air Force Base**

Scott Air Force Base (AFB) employs nearly 14,000 people and pumps over $2 billion annually into the regional economy. Scott has roughly 5,800 active duty military and 2,000 Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve members. The base also employs more than 3,100 Federal civilian employees and more than 2,400 non-appropriated fund contract civilians and private business employees. In addition, more than 8,000 family members and 17,000 retired military members in the local area are assigned to the base for services. Scott AFB comprises 2,560 acres of land owned by the U.S. Government and easement/right of way for another 1,029 acres. With the completion of the housing privatization construction/renovation program currently underway (2008) at Scott AFB, the base will contain a total of 1,597 family housing units.

As the host unit at Scott AFB, the 375th Airlift Wing (AW) supports four major headquarters and a numbered Air Force with worldwide responsibilities: U.S. Transportation Command (TRANSCOM), Air Mobility Command (AMC), the Surface Deployment and Distribution Command, Defense Information Technology Systems Agency, and the 18th Air Force. The 375 AW also provides support for the Air Force Communications Agency (AFCA), the Defense Information Technology Contracting Office (DITCO), the 932nd Airlift Wing (Reserve), and the Illinois Air National Guard's 126th Air Refueling Wing—along with approximately 66 other associate partner units.

The 2005 Base Realignment and Closure Commission (BRAC) demonstrated the Department of Defense’s desire to bring new missions to Scott AFB, adding 800 new jobs through the consolidation of the Surface Deployment and Distribution Command at the base. Future spin-off benefits will be associated with private firms doing business with the commands at Scott locating their offices near the base. Since 2005, additional relocations and funding announcements have added to the base’s growing significance in the U.S. military system.

- The *932d AW (Reserve)* and the 1,000 men and women who are assigned to the Wing were scheduled to be de-activated and leave Scott AFB. In 2004, $265 million was secured for three new C-40 aircraft and maintenance of the C-9 mission at Scott. In FY09, $88 million has been earmarked for an additional C-40 for the Wing, beginning the process of replacing the C-9 aircraft currently in use.
- A new $14 million *Joint Intelligence Operations Center* will be constructed at Scott AFB as an addition to the new U.S Transportation Command (TRANSCOM) headquarters complex.
- One of five new *regional Air Force contracting offices* will be established at Scott AFB. The office will employ an estimated 290 people—200 of which will be new jobs—and is scheduled to begin operation in fiscal year 2010 and be fully functional two years later.
A new 52,000 square foot, $15 million 932d Operations Group Facility will serve as a combined operations facility for the 932d Operations Group, 73d Airlift Squadron, and 54th Airlift Squadron.

A new $8 million Illinois National Guard Readiness Center to be used by the Illinois Army Reserve and Illinois National Guard.

Additional funded projects include $16 million for construction of a Security Forces Operations Complex, $20 million for a new 120-person airmen’s dormitory (Shiloh Hall), $8 million for a new Child Development Center, and various multi-million dollar building addition and renovation projects.

Waterways

Two port districts serve St. Clair County, the Southwest Regional Port District on the Mississippi River and the Kaskaskia Regional Port District on the Kaskaskia River.

Railroads

St. Clair County is served by 7 Class I rail carriers and 2 switching railroads.

Rail Carriers:
- Burlington Northern/Santa Fe (BNSF)
- Chicago and Northwestern (CN)
- CSX Transportation (CSXT)
- Illinois Central (IC)
- Kansas City Southern (KCS)
- Norfolk Southern (NS)
- Union Pacific (UP)

Switching Railroads:
- Alton and Southern (ALS)
- Terminal Railroad Association (TRRA)

Light Rail (Commuter Rail)

The St. Clair County Transit District (SCCTD) operates mass transit for participating townships within St. Clair County. SCCTD has partnered with the St. Louis region’s light rail transit system, MetroLink, to supplement the region’s transportation network. MetroLink runs from Shiloh/Scott AFB on the east to Lambert-St. Louis International Airport on the west. The County system covers a distance of 18.4 miles and 11 station stops. MetroLink opened in St. Clair County in 1994 with a connection to East St. Louis and was later extended to Southwestern Illinois College in 2001 and Shiloh/Scott AFB in 2003. The light rail system provides a needed supplement to the I-64 transportation corridor by serving many of the County’s largest employment and residential centers located between Scott AFB, Belleville, East St. Louis, and downtown St. Louis.

High-Speed Rail (HSR)

A proposal to provide High-Speed Rail (HSR) passenger service between Chicago and St. Louis (dubbed the Chicago-St. Louis HSR Project) was initiated by the U. S. Department of Transportation (Federal Highway Administration and Federal Railway Administration) in cooperation with the Illinois Department of Transportation. A Final Environmental Impact Statement was published in January 2003. If implemented, the proposed HSR would utilize the existing Amtrak tracks, running the approximately 280-mile Chicago-St. Louis route in under 4.5 hours at speeds up to 110 miles per hour. HSR trains would stop at all of the stations currently served on the Amtrak route, including St. Louis and Alton in the St. Louis metropolitan area.
Roadways

Woolpert updated the inventory of transportation modes, mapped traffic counts (provided by IDOT), and mapped roadways by their “intended” functional classification (according to the EWGCC system map). The following definitions summarize the Functional System Characteristics as outlined in the Federal Highway Administration Functional Classification Guidelines manual. (Full definitions can be found at http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/fctoc.htm.)

- **Interstates** are classified as Primary Arterial Roads and consist of all presently designated routes of the Interstate System. Trip lengths and travel density characteristics are indicative of substantial statewide or interstate travel.

- **Arterial** roadways carry the major portion of trips entering and leaving the urban area, travel between central business districts and outlying residential areas, and travel between major city and suburban neighborhoods and centers.

- **Collector** roads provide both access to and circulation within residential neighborhoods, commercial and industrial areas. The collector street also collects traffic from local streets in residential neighborhoods and channels it into the arterial system vice versa.

- **Local Streets** comprise all facilities not on one of the higher systems. It serves primarily to provide direct access to abutting land and access to the higher order systems. It offers the lowest level of mobility and usually contains no bus routes. Through traffic movement usually is deliberately discouraged.

The East-West Gateway Council of Governments (EWGCOG) is tasked with the responsibility of maintaining the region’s functional classification system. Using data available from EWGCOG and 9-1-1 street address records, it was estimated that St. Clair County has 49 miles of Interstate, 370 miles of Arterial Roadways, 300 miles of Collector Roads, and 2,100 miles of Local Streets.

In order to protect the function of key roadway corridors, St. Clair County has adopted a highway overlay zoning district (O-2) that provides for frontage roads, proper ingress and egress design, adequate setbacks for future roadway expansion, and proper storm water drainage. The designated Major Area Service Highways are:

- Illinois Route 4—North County Line to Illinois 15
- Illinois Route 13—Freeburg South City Limits to Illinois 156
- Illinois 15—I-255 to Illinois 4
- U.S. Route 50—Lebanon East City Limits to East County Line
- Illinois 158—I-64 to Illinois 161
- Illinois 158—Illinois 15 to Illinois 163
- Illinois 159—Illinois 15 to Illinois 156
- Illinois 161—Green Mount Road to East County Line
- Illinois 163—Illinois 157 to Illinois 158
- Illinois 177—Green Mount Road to East County Line
- Douglas Road (CH 47)—Illinois 15 to Illinois 158
- Scott-Troy Road—Illinois 158 to North County Line
- Green Mount Road—Illinois 15 to I-64
Natural Resources

Woolpert updated the County’s inventory of natural resources from existing sources including waterways, open space, wetlands, flood plains, plant and animal habitats, and other major land/geologic formations that may pose challenges or opportunities.

The two main waterways in St. Clair County are the Mississippi River and the Kaskaskia River. The Mississippi River runs for 11.25 miles along the county’s western boundary. The Kaskaskia River runs approximately 26.7 miles through the southeast part of the county. The 11.5 mile upper portion of the river runs from the eastern county boundary to State Hwy. 4 near Fayetteville and is characteristically meandering with a well-vegetated floodplain. The lower portion runs for 15.2 miles from Hwy. 4 to the southern county boundary as a channelized, commercially navigable waterway.

Two smaller waterways that impact St. Clair County are Silver Creek and Richland Creek. Silver Creek runs for 31 miles through the eastern portion of the County in mostly agricultural areas; however, it does border Scott AFB, MidAmerica St. Louis Airport, and the City of Mascoutah. A large portion of the County’s wetlands, floodplains, and vegetated areas are located adjacent to Silver Creek. It converges with the Kaskaskia River near New Athens. Richland Creek runs for 22.5 miles through the center of the County. Its northern reaches help drain the cities of Belleville, Swansea and Shiloh. South of Belleville, the creek has been straightened, channelized, and is more characteristic of a drainage ditch.

- **Wetlands** are defined by the U.S. Department of the Interior as lands transitional between terrestrial and aquatic systems where the water table is at or near the surface or the land is covered by shallow water. The Department of the Interior publishes the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) available in GIS. The NWI GIS shows areas identified as potential wetlands. True wetlands are not identified in the GIS because all areas have not been surveyed to see if they meet the DOI definition of a wetland. Potential Wetlands as shown in the NWI GIS are those areas identified using USGS topographic maps and aerial photography as having wetland characteristics but is only probable of being a true wetland.

- **Floodplains** are defined as the elevation a river will reach during an event which has a certain percent chance of happening. The 100-year floodplain is the elevation a river will reach given a flood event that has a 1% chance of happening. The 500-year floodplain is the elevation a river will reach given a flood event that has a .2% chance of happening. To protect the safety of persons and property, levees and other devices are installed to contain the waters of flood events up to a given elevation.

- For a definition of **Karst Topography**, see Development Constraints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Waterways, Floodplains &amp; Wetlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length (Miles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaskaskia River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the waterways, floodplains, wetlands, and karst topography, numerous state-recognized natural areas (Illinois Natural Areas Inventory Sites) and nature preserves (Illinois Nature Preserves Commission), and local, state, and Federal public open spaces dot the County landscape. St. Clair County also has begun the long and incremental process of creating a pedestrian/bicycle trail system, partnering County resources with municipal, regional (Metro East Park & Recreation District), and state resources. Primary components of the trail system include the Metro East Levee Trail atop the Prairie du Pont Levee in western St. Clair County, and the first leg of the MetroLink Trail paralleling the light rail corridor in east Belleville.

As recognized earlier, approximately 4% of the County, or more than 16,000 acres, are classified as Park and Open Space land use. This does not include the large amount of floodplain land protected by County overlay zoning.

**Development Constraints**

Development constraints are conditions of the land that limit the size and intensity of development that should occur there. These locations were identified using GIS data at the state-level. To determine the precise location of them, individual site surveys should be conducted. The following development constraints were reviewed for their potential impact on future land use and development in St. Clair County.

- **Landfills** are areas recognized as former waste disposal sites.
- **Quarries** are areas of mineral extraction visible at the surface of the earth and still in active use.
- **Coal Mined Areas** consist of land where coal was extracted from underground mines. These mines are no longer active.
- **Steep Slopes** include areas of bluffs and ravines where the ground slopes at 20% or greater.
- **Karst** areas are characterized by near-surface limestone bedrock. Fissures, underground streams, caves, and sinkholes are common in Karst areas.
- **Sinkhole Plain** is the combined watersheds of the creeks and rivers that run through Karst areas.

The largest constraints to development in the County are the steep slopes associated with the Mississippi River bluff, the Karst topography just east of the bluff in southwestern St. Clair County, and the broad band of previously mined coal seams running under the central part of the County. The steep slopes, bluff line, and Karst topography areas have generally been recognized as significant development constraints and avoided. In the case of the “undermined” areas, it has become more a practice of constraint mitigation or acceptance, rather than avoidance.
Summary Situation Analysis

Demographic & Economic Trends

- St. Clair County’s population is growing modestly, keeping pace with the St. Louis MSA and Statewide.
- St. Clair County is experiencing declining household size typically a result of an aging population, downsizing households, and households with fewer children.
- St. Clair County’s per capita income is significantly lower than the St. Louis MSA and Statewide, but its growth rate has been comparable.
- St. Clair County’s financial position is not as strong as it was five years ago, with its share of bank deposits falling an average of 2-3% compared to the MSA and Statewide.
- St. Clair County residents’ educational attainment is mostly on par with the MSA and Illinois, with slightly lower shares of college and advanced degrees, an important area for improvement.
- St. Clair County is experiencing a marked transition to a service-based economy, diversifying away from dependence on manufacturing. Information industry wages grew by an average of 11 percent per year; nearly triple the MSA’s growth rate over the same time period.
- St. Clair County’s wage growth outpaced the MSA by more than 25% in wholesale trade, professional and technical services, transportation and warehousing, and information, reflecting emerging and potentially targeted employment sectors for the County.
- St. Clair County has experienced a stable retention rate of the number of County residents who stay and work in the County, keeping pace with the other large urban counties in the MSA. However, a small, but increasing number, of County residents are commuting to the smaller, more rural Illinois and Missouri counties.

Land Use

- The incorporated communities within the County account for roughly 25% (165 square miles) of the County’s land area. The other 75% (500 square miles) remains unincorporated St. Clair County.
- Countywide, nearly 70% of all land is still in agricultural production, 12% is in residential use, and approximately 4% is in each of the commercial/industrial, government, and parks and open space categories. Land in just the unincorporated portion of St. Clair County is even more agricultural, representing more than 80% of the land use.
- Since 1991, more than 46,000 acres (or 71 square miles) of unincorporated St. Clair County were annexed by municipalities (an average of 4 square miles or 2,700 acres per year), of which 21,000 acres remain in Agricultural use.

Zoning

- Of the 325,000 acres in unincorporated St. Clair County, 274,000 acres (or 84%) are zoned Agricultural Industry, 22,000 acres (7%) are zoned Rural Residential requiring a minimum of 1 acre lots, 9,000 acres (3%) are zoned for other Residential uses, and 10,000 acres are protected for Scott AFB, MidAmerica St. Louis Airport and their environs.
- Residential zoning in the County is generally adjacent to incorporated areas and is a logical extension of the region’s urbanization and proximity to municipal services.
- Only 1,600 acres are zoned for Business or Industrial use.
Public Buildings & Grounds

- St. Clair County owns and maintains land in a number of capacities related to health, welfare, housing, and recreation. Land owned and managed/maintained by St. Clair County Government is classified according to the following five categories: St. Clair County Trustee, Intergovernmental Grants, FEMA Property, MidAmerica Property, and Housing Authority.

Utilities

- Water supply in St. Clair County is primarily provided by five companies or commissions: Illinois American Water (IAWC), Commonfields of Cahokia Public Water District, SLM Water Commission, FSH Water Commission, and the Kaskaskia Water District. Other smaller municipal and public water districts also serve municipal, commercial, and residential customers in the County.
- Gaps in water service were previously identified east and south of Belleville, south of Mascoutah, and west, south and north of Millstadt. Subsequently, a new IAWC water main loop was planned to be installed along Illinois 158 to serve Millstadt.
- Sanitary sewer Facility Planning Areas (FPA’s) have been designated for 26 systems in St. Clair County. FPA’s have historically kept pace with, and more recently outpaced, the requirements of development surrounding County communities.
- Gaps in sanitary sewer FPA coverage areas were noted east of Mascoutah and Lebanon; south of Belleville, Shiloh, and Mascoutah, and in areas surrounding all of the smaller communities in southern St. Clair County.
- St. Clair County is served by two primary drainage and levee districts serving the storm water management and flood protection needs of the American Bottom: the Metro-East Sanitary District on the north and the Prairie du Pont Drainage and Levee District on the south.
- These two districts, in concert with the Wood River Drainage and Levee District and the federally-owned Chain of Rocks Levee system in Madison County and the Fish Lake Drainage and Levee District in northern Monroe County are in the process of improving the Mississippi River flood protection devices (levees, gates, pumps, and canals) to meet higher federally-mandated standards.
- St. Clair County is taking steps to meet the EPA’s Phase II Stormwater requirements (NPDES) for the County and its municipalities—including adopting a Stormwater Control Ordinance.

Transportation

- Two commercial airports serve St. Clair County: St. Louis Downtown Airport in the western portion of the County off I-255 and MidAmerica St. Louis Airport adjacent to Scott AFB off I-64 in eastern St. Clair County. MidAmerica St. Louis and Lambert St. Louis International are the only two fully certified Part 139 airports in the St. Louis region certified for scheduled passenger service and cargo.
- Scott Air Force Base (AFB) employs nearly 14,000 people and pumps over $2 billion annually into the regional economy. The 375th Airlift Wing supports four major headquarters and a numbered Air Force with worldwide responsibilities: U.S. Transportation Command (TRANSCOM), Air Mobility Command (AMC), the Surface Deployment and Distribution Command, Defense Information Technology Systems Agency, and the 18th Air Force. The 2005 Base Realignment and Closure Commission (BRAC) demonstrated the Department of Defense’s desire to bring new missions to Scott AFB, adding 800 new jobs through the consolidation of the Surface Deployment and Distribution Command at the base.
- Two port districts serve St. Clair County, the Southwest Regional Port District on the Mississippi River and the Kaskaskia Regional Port District on the Kaskaskia River.
• St. Clair County is served by 7 Class I rail carriers and 2 switching railroads—the Alton and Southern (ALS) and the Terminal Railroad Association (TRRA).

• The St. Clair County Transit District (SCCTD) operates mass transit for participating townships within St. Clair County. MetroLink runs from Shiloh/Scott AFB on the east to Lambert-St. Louis International Airport on the west. The system is planned to be extended from the Shiloh/Scott AFB Station to the MidAmerica St. Louis Airport terminal to complete the airport-to-airport system originally envisioned.

• A Final Environmental Impact Statement was published in 2003 for the proposed implementation of High-Speed Rail (HSR) passenger service utilizing the existing Amtrak tracks between Chicago and St. Louis. HSR trains would stop at all of the stations currently served on the Amtrak route, including St. Louis and Alton in the St. Louis area.

• St. Clair County has a fairly complete road network including 48.9 miles of Interstate and 370.8 miles of Arterial Roadways. Planned improvements to the systems include construction of a new Mississippi River Bridge and associated highway interchanges, reconstruction of Illinois 3 north of I-64/55/70, extension of Frank Scott Parkway to MidAmerica St. Louis Airport, construction of the Gateway Connector connecting I-55/70 on the north with I-255 and the J.B. Bridge on the south, and analyses for potential new interchanges on I-64.

**Natural Resources**

• St. Clair County’s inventory of natural resources includes a broad array of waterways, open space, wetlands, flood plains, plant and animal habitats, and other major land/geologic formations. The two main waterways in St. Clair County are the Mississippi River and the Kaskaskia River. Two smaller waterways that impact St. Clair County are Silver Creek and Richland Creek. A large portion of the County’s wetlands, floodplains, and vegetated areas are located adjacent to Silver Creek which converges with the Kaskaskia River near New Athens.

• The County’s principal waterways contain approximately 90,000 acres of Federally-regulated floodplains, including more than 30,000 acres of potential wetlands. This represents about 140 square miles, or 20% of the County’s land area.

**Development Constraints**

• Development constraints are conditions of the land that limit the location, size, or intensity of development that should occur. Within St. Clair County, the following constraints were identified: landfills, quarries, underground coal mined areas, steep slopes, and Karst topography and its associated Sinkhole Plain.

• The largest constraints to development in the County are the steep slopes associated with the Mississippi River bluff, the Karst topography just east of the bluff in southwestern St. Clair County, and the broad band of previously mined coal seams running under the central part of the County.
Chapter 4: Plan Elements

Land Use Plan

The Land Use Plan portrays recommended future land uses for St. Clair County. It includes descriptive text and a future land use map which illustrates the proposed long-term land use development pattern for the County. Input from the results of the existing land use inventory, the Steering Committee, municipal officials’ meetings, the 1991 Comprehensive Plan and subsequent Sub-Area Plans, analysis of immediately bordering community industrial, commercial and residential activity, and emerging trends in County development were used in developing the plan.

Land Use Categories

- **Incorporated** land use designated areas located within existing municipalities, nearly all of which maintain their own comprehensive plans and zoning and subdivision ordinances regulating land use and development at the municipal level. Existing and future land use within the County’s incorporated municipalities was, however, used as a guide to observe the overall location and quantity of each land use County-wide. This assisted in determining the appropriate future use of land outside municipal limits (within unincorporated St. Clair County), but land within existing municipalities was excluded from the County’s official land use plan.

- **Recreation** land use recognized public or privately owned lands used for recreation. Recreation areas included such varying organizational structures as public parks (existing municipal, county and State parks), private country clubs/golf courses, and large-scale, privately-owned, not-for-profit recreational facilities. The objective of the Recreation land use category was to designate recreation as the intended future land use of certain existing and future property based on its ownership (public parks), size (golf courses), and/or life-expectancy (not-for-profit recreational areas) as an indicator of its substantial contribution to the County’s long-term recreational asset base. Future planned park and recreation areas in the unincorporated County were identified from discussions with municipal officials and review of their respective land use plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park/Recreation Areas (Existing)</th>
<th>Park/Recreation Areas (Planned)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frank Holten State Park</td>
<td>Future Park—East Carondelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Clair County Foley Park</td>
<td>Future Park—Mascoutah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Clair County Levee Trail</td>
<td>Future Park 1—Millstadt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanft Park (New Athens Park District)</td>
<td>Future Park 2—Millstadt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horner Park (Horner Park Commission, Lebanon)</td>
<td>Future Park 3—Millstadt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marissa Recreational Area (Privately owned and managed)</td>
<td>Future Park—O’Fallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle-Clair Soccer Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA of Southwest Illinois Camp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conservation land use was defined as public or privately-owned land dedicated to the management or preservation of unique, primitive or natural areas. The objective of the Conservation land use category was to designate conservation as the intended future land use based on ownership (publicly-owned or conservation easement), public recognition (State-recognized nature preserve), and/or significance within the County’s long-term natural resource asset base. Conservation areas included major storm water retention and conveyance facilities, Federal Emergency Management Area (FEMA)-funded flood buy-out areas (County-owned), publicly-owned Natural Areas (IDNR’s Illinois Natural Areas Inventory Sites), State Fish and Wildlife Areas, privately-held Nature Preserves (Illinois Nature Preserves Commission), County-owned greenspace preservation sites, and other unique geological, archeological, or historical areas. In many cases, passive recreational use may occur as a result of the preservation of these important natural resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publicly-Owned Conservation Areas</th>
<th>Privately-Owned Conservation Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaskaskia River State Fish &amp; Wildlife Area (IDNR)</td>
<td>Pruitt Sinkholes Nature Preserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabody River State Fish &amp; Wildlife Area (Peabody Coal-owned, IDNR-managed)</td>
<td>Stemler Cave Nature Preserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin Lake State Fish &amp; Wildlife Area (AmerenIP-owned, IDNR-managed)</td>
<td>Sally Brown Conservation Easement (The Land Conservancy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marissa Woods Nature Preserve (IDNR)</td>
<td>Boardman Conservation Easement (The Land Conservancy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stemler Cave Woods Nature Preserve (IDNR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Slough Woods Natural Area (IDNR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagon Lake Natural Area (IDNR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry White Research Farm (Illinois Dept. of Agriculture)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullins Slough (Metro-East Sanitary District and St. Clair County Soil &amp; Water Conservation District)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA Flood Buy-out Areas (St. Clair County)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Creek Preserve (St. Clair County)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tecklenberg Woods Forest Preserve (St. Clair County)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engelmann Farm (St. Clair County/The Land Conservancy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agricultural—Planned Service Area (PSA) land use category was created to identify areas located within all 1.5-mile Municipal Jurisdiction areas where the future land use is unplanned by the municipality and the County-designated future land use is Agricultural (see Agricultural Preservation land use category). However within the Agricultural—PSA category, it is acceptable that the land be converted to another use with the appropriate provision of public services. Conversion from Agricultural—PSA to another use would generally require the approval of St. Clair County and the Jurisdictional Municipality and coordination with utility and other public service providers. In this way, the County and municipalities can ensure that development is compatible with the community’s long-range plans for use, design, and construction, and that proper infrastructure and other services are available to serve the development.
- **Agricultural Preservation** land use designated areas traditionally used for agricultural farming, the raising of domestic animals and poultry, horticulture, forestry, and truck gardening. These areas generally encompassed prime and important farmland where soil, water, vegetal, and topographical conditions were well suited to the raising of crops and domestic animals. This land use category was intended to maintain the County’s strong agricultural heritage and contribution to its overall economy. All of the designated Agricultural Preservation areas fall outside of the 1.5-mile Municipal Jurisdiction areas.

- **Rural Residential** areas were designated for low-density, single family residential development on lots larger than one (1) acre. The purpose of the Rural Residential land use category was to recognize that there are areas outside of the 1.5-mile Municipal Jurisdiction areas where prime and important farmland is hindered due to topography or other natural conditions and where the full complement of municipal and public services is not readily available, creating difficulty and excessive costs for more compact residential development. Land appearing in this category is generally already developed or zoned for such use since any expansion of this land use would result in disturbance of the County’s prime agricultural land.

- **Residential** land use areas for future residential development on lots smaller than one (1) acre, including manufactured home parks and multi-family residences, were designated for areas that generally coincided with a municipality’s plan for growth within their 1.5-mile Municipal Jurisdiction. Future residential subdivisions within the County are intended to be based on coordination with municipal plans and the provision of appropriate public infrastructure and services. The largest concentrations of planned future residential growth are adjacent to the following municipalities: north of O’Fallon; north and west of Lebanon; west, east, and south of Mascoutah; south of Belleville; and all directions surrounding Millstadt.

- **Government/Institutional** land use include municipal, county, State, Federal, or private “institutions” owned or occupied lands including public utilities, public airports, religious institutions, fraternal institutions, hospitals, libraries, museums, and schools. Generally this land use category was applied to existing institutions. Large occurrences of Government/Institutional land use in unincorporated St. Clair County included Scott Air Force Base, MidAmerica St. Louis Airport, Our Lady of the Snows Shrine, and Southwestern Illinois College.

- **Commercial** land use was defined as retail, office, business and professional service, restaurant, and entertainment uses. Future areas identified for regional and community commercial development generally coincided with a municipality’s plan for growth within their 1.5-mile Municipal Jurisdiction. Major areas of commercial development were identified in cooperation with municipal officials for the following corridors: the Illinois 4 corridor between US 50 and I-64 between Lebanon and Mascoutah near MidAmerica St. Louis Airport; the Illinois 158 (Gateway Connector) corridor between I-64 and Carlyle Avenue southeast of Shiloh; the Illinois 159 corridor between Park Road and the future Gateway Connector south of Belleville; and the future Gateway Connector corridor south of Millstadt. An additional node of commercial land use was identified adjacent to the future interchange at I-255 and Imbs Station Road near Dupo.

- **Industrial** land use included such uses as manufacturing, warehousing, distribution, wholesale trade, research and development, mineral extraction, sanitary landfills, port facilities, and railroad yards. The land use category generally recognized the limited amount of existing industrial land use in unincorporated St. Clair County. With the intention of directing new development to interstate, rail, river, and/or airport locations with excellent access to municipal and public services, future industrial/business parks were planned in coordination with the following communities within their
1.5-mile Municipal Jurisdiction areas: O’Fallon Commerce Park on I-64 north of Scott AFB/MidAmerica St. Louis Airport located east of O’Fallon; Air World Park at Illinois 4 and Illinois 161 south of I-64 and Scott AFB/MidAmerica Airport northeast of Mascoutah; Belle-Valley Business Park (Phase II) on Illinois 15 southeast of Belleville; Discovery Business Park on I-255 located southeast of Dupo and East Carondelet; and a new Millstadt industrial park on the future Gateway Connector located southeast of Millstadt.

**Special Use Categories**

- **1.5-mile Municipal Jurisdiction** refers to the area defined by Illinois State Statute (65 ILCS 5/11 Division 12) giving municipalities authority to exercise subdivision and zoning jurisdiction by ordinance within unincorporated areas. This jurisdictional area is defined as a 1.5-mile radius from the municipal boundary. In areas where no boundary line agreement has been adopted by two adjoining municipalities, the jurisdiction of any one municipality extends to the median line equidistant from its boundary and the boundary of the nearest municipality at any given point on the line.

- **Scott AFB/MidAmerica St. Louis Airport Planning Influence Area** was defined through the recently completed Joint Land Use Study for the purpose of increasing coordination and communication among local jurisdictions, the airport, and the military related to proposed development. The Planning Influence Area provides guidance on height limitations. Within the Planning Influence Area lies the **Protection Area** which provides for several zones with increasing levels of land use compatibility guidance. The zones include the Installation Perimeter Buffer, the Military Clear Zone, the Runway Protection Zone, the Military Accident Potential Zone 1 (APZ 1), the Military APZ 2, the Military (Scott AFB) Noise Contours, and the Airport (MidAmerica St. Louis Airport) Noise Contours.

- **100-Year Floodplain** refers to the elevation a river will reach during a flood event that has a 1% chance of happening in any given year. Preservation of the storage capacity of the County’s floodplains through proper stormwater and floodplain management techniques is essential for the prevention of potential flood loss or damage to life, property, structures, and infrastructure.

- **Natural Areas** included all Illinois Natural Area Inventory (INAI) sites from a statewide inventory of outstanding examples of natural landscape features remaining in Illinois. Due to the small size or sensitive nature of the exact location of the conservation/preservation sites, many of the privately-owned natural areas were designated by name only and were not reflected on the Land Use Plan map. The publicly-owned natural areas were reflected on the map under the Conservation land use category. The Natural Areas designation included high quality natural communities or community restorations; specific suitable habitat of endangered and threatened (E&T) species or species translocations; state-dedicated nature preserves, land and water reserves, or natural heritage landmarks; outstanding geological features; and unusual concentrations of flora and/or fauna. The INAI is the primary tool used for land protection within the IDNR and many conservation agencies and groups throughout Illinois. It is also used to guide acquisition, management, stewardship, restoration, and monitoring efforts.
Data Sources:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publicly-Owned Natural Areas</th>
<th>Privately-Owned Natural Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marissa Woods Nature Preserve NA (IDNR)</td>
<td>Audubon Avenue Heron Colony NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stemler Cave Woods NA (IDNR)</td>
<td>Baer Brothers Woodlot NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Slough Woods NA (IDNR)</td>
<td>Dupo Prairie NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagon Lake NA (IDNR)</td>
<td>East St. Louis (Alorton) Heron Colony NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairmont City Site NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Falling Spring NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floraville Geological Area NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freeburg Rod &amp; Gun Club NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freeburg Woods NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lively Branch Woods NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Athens Woods NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silver Creek Marsh NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silver Creek Woods NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stemler Cave Area NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stemler Cave Woods NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sugar Loaf Hill Prairie NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West End Sportsman’s Club Woods NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wirth Island NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Blufflands** refers to the area along the Mississippi River bluffs in western St. Clair County that represents an outstanding environmental, historic, recreational, and aesthetic feature of St. Clair County. If left unprotected, these towering limestone bluffs lining the American Bottoms floodplain of the Mississippi River could be irreparably damaged by erosion and deterioration of natural habitats, lost to quarrying or other development, or visually obstructed or impaired by structures (e.g., buildings, power lines, cell towers, or water towers) or man-made landforms (e.g., earth mounding or scarring or access roads). Areas of pronounced bluff formations were identified here for protection, including areas along the top of the bluff (bluff crest), the face of the bluff, and the base of the bluff (bluff toe).

- **Karst Topography** refers to the area within the southwest portion of the county that is comprised of a geologic formation associated with limestone bedrock near the earth’s surface that is easily eroded by rainwater infiltration and groundwater movement. The movement erodes the limestone to create underground streams and caverns. In Karst areas, fissures, underground streams, caves, and sinkholes are common—resulting in a pockmarked look to the landscape. Sinkholes are the result of a cave roof collapse, or more often, the collapse of soil over a void in the limestone. Protection of the County’s Karst area will help protect this rare and fragile landscape and ecosystem as well as minimize loss of property that can result from sinkholes.

- **Gateway Connector “Corridor Protection Plan”** was filed by the Illinois Department of Transportation under Illinois State Statute (605 ILCS 5/4-510) giving the authority to declare rights of way for future additions to the State highway system and to declare a corridor in which development is limited and monitored by IDOT. The purpose of this authority is to inform the public and prevent costly and conflicting development of the land involved. In St. Clair County, following a lengthy public planning process, the Gateway Connector has been declared an addition to the State highway system and a 400-foot wide corridor established for its protection.
Transportation Plan

The Transportation Plan identifies recommended changes to the County’s long-range transportation system. The plan describes transportation improvements necessary in order to provide for convenient circulation within and through the County and to serve future land use needs. The plan also identifies proposed changes to the functional classification of the roadway system and additional policies for consideration as new transportation improvements are planned to serve new development or travel demands.

Federal/State Transportation Projects

- **Construct New I-70 Mississippi River Bridge:** The funding agreement for a new Mississippi River bridge crossing for I-70 north of the MLK Bridge in St. Clair County was reached in mid-2008 between the States of Illinois and Missouri, with significant funding provided by the Federal Highway Administration. Design began shortly thereafter. The first phase of bridge construction is intended to reduce A.M. westbound and P.M. eastbound traffic congestion. The improvements proposed in the first phase of the project do not provide any new access to or from the Interstate via local roads and will have little impact on future land use.

  The second phase of the project, based on the final design concept, includes two new interchanges. The first would provide access to and from I-70 at IL 203 just north of the Gateway International Raceway. The second would be an interchange at St. Clair Avenue and Packers Avenue off the access ramp connecting I-64 to I-70. Interstate access such as these will provide increased opportunities for commercial and/or industrial development off IL 203 and off IL 3 along the Mississippi riverfront.

- **Reconstruct Illinois 3:** This project is intended to reconstruct the IL 3 corridor between Sauget south of the I-64/I-55/I-70 bridge complex and Venice in Madison County north of the complex. The completion of this corridor will create a continuous north/south route parallel to the Mississippi River. Such a corridor will be advantageous for commercial traffic, access to the riverfront, and as a potential development corridor.

- **Construct New Gateway Connector (Illinois 158 Outerbelt):** IDOT has completed planning for the Gateway Connector project and filed a Corridor Protection Plan to preserve a 400-foot wide corridor through south-central St. Clair County. The eventual roadway will serve as an “outerbelt” within the regional transportation network, supplementing the I-255 “innerbelt”, connecting I-270 and I-70 in southern Madison County to I-255 and IL 3 in northern Monroe County. The corridor will connect Monroe, St. Clair, and Madison Counties outside of the current ring of suburban development to create development opportunities at numerous new intersections and in areas that are currently difficult to access.

- **Realign U.S. Highway 50:** U.S. 50 currently runs through St. Clair County from East St. Louis on the west through Lebanon and north of Summerfield on the east. As U.S. 50 reaches IL 4 in Lebanon from the west, the highway “T’s” at IL 4 and runs north for approximately ½ mile before turning east on its predominant east-west alignment toward Carlyle, Illinois. This project would divert through traffic around downtown Lebanon and a traffic bottleneck at the intersection of IL 4 and Main Street. Right-of-way east of Lebanon was purchased by the State of Illinois under the former F.A.P. 409 project, but no further action was taken.
• **Construct New I-255/Imbs Station Road Interchange:** A full interchange has been approved and is in design at I-255 and Imbs Station Road in southwestern St. Clair County, primarily to serve the planned Discovery Business Park area in Dupo/East Carondelet. This new interchange will enhance interstate accessibility in the vicinity and increase the viability of commercial development adjacent to the interchange and industrial development west of the interchange in Dupo, East Carondelet, and currently unincorporated St. Clair County.

• **Construct New I-64/Rieder Road Interchange:** A new interchange at I-64 and Rieder Road has been proposed by St. Clair County to provide an additional access to Scott AFB and to support the planned commercial development of MidAmerica St. Louis Airport land south of the Interstate. The interchange would also provide direct access to commercial/industrial land north of the Interstate. Land uses within this area will be subject to airport accident potential, noise, and height restrictions.

• **Extend MetroLink to MidAmerica St. Louis Airport Terminal:** The final planned leg of MetroLink light rail in St. Clair County is the completion of the “airport-to-airport” system from Lambert St. Louis International Airport on the west to the MidAmerica St. Louis Airport terminal building on the east. Due to funding, this final leg has been planned but not constructed. This important section should be completed as soon as practical.

• **Construct a Multi-Modal Passenger Station in East St. Louis:** High-Speed Rail (HSR) passenger service was proposed between Chicago and St. Louis by the U. S. Department of Transportation and a FEIS completed in 2003. If implemented, the proposed HSR would utilize the existing Amtrak tracks for the 280-mile Chicago-St. Louis route with plans to stop at all of the stations currently served on the Amtrak route, including St. Louis and Alton. With the current Amtrak route and proposed HSR route running through East St. Louis, and MetroLink and MetroBus already converging at the 5th & Missouri MetroLink Station in East St. Louis, a multi-modal passenger station in East St. Louis should be constructed. This station, similar to St. Louis’ recently opened Gateway Transportation Center, could serve both interstate and regional rail and bus passengers.

---

**St. Clair County Transportation Projects**

• **Extend Frank Scott Parkway to IL 4:** The eastern terminus of Frank Scott Parkway is currently located at Cross Street in Shiloh. The County is in the process of extending the road from Cross Street to IL 158 (Air Mobility Drive) not far south of the IL 158/I-64 interchange. Future plans include extending Frank Scott Parkway from IL 158 east to the MidAmerica St. Louis Airport passenger terminal area and direct connection to IL 4. This extension would not only provide convenient access to the airport passenger terminal, but provide an essential east-west corridor for commercial/industrial development between IL 158 and IL 4 south of I-64.

• **Improve Frank Scott Parkway Intersections:** The volume of traffic on Frank Scott Parkway has exceeded the original design expectations. Intersections with County and State roads have become bottlenecks due to limited capacity for turning movements. Intersection improvements, over time, at Greenmount Road, Hartman Lane, Old Collinsville Road, Illinois 159, Old Caseyville Road, IL 161, West Main Street (Belleville), North Belt West (Belleville), IL 13, and the IL 15 interchange would improve the traffic flow along this vital east-west corridor.

• **Extend Frank Scott Parkway to Gateway Connector:** With the eventual construction of the Gateway Connector through St. Clair County, an extension of Frank Scott Parkway south from Illinois 158 to the Gateway Connector along an alignment approximating Roachtown Road would provide a key access point for County travelers.
Municipal Transportation Projects (New Roads)

- **Belleville:**
  - South 74th Street south from IL 15 to Concordia Church Road
  - South 11th Street west from IL 15 to S. 74th Street
  - Park Road/Ross Lane west from Frank Scott Parkway West to IL 15

- **Millstadt:**
  - North, East, South and West Collectors
  - Gateway Connector intersection and frontage road system

- **O’Fallon:**
  - New Corridor from I-64 north to U.S. 40 along abandoned railroad corridor
  - New Corridor north from Seven Hills Road

Additional Transportation Project Considerations

In addition to the Federal/State, County, and Municipal roadway projects recommended for inclusion in the County’s long-range Transportation Plan, the following potential projects were identified and discussed during the planning process. Many of these projects were either identified, but never acted upon, under the previous County Comprehensive Plan or are recent projects that have been identified by a local sponsor but have not garnered enough regional involvement to warrant inclusion in the County’s official Transportation Plan.

- **Extend IL 15 to I-55/70/64 & IL 3 Complex:** In the 1991 Comprehensive Plan for St. Clair County, recommended highway improvements included the proposed extension of Illinois 15 as a four-lane, divided, partially access controlled highway on a new alignment from I-255 west to the approach ramps of the Poplar Street Bridge (I-64/55/70) near Tudor Avenue and Illinois 3.

- **Improve IL 159 through Belleville & south to County Line (to Red Bud/IL 3):** Illinois 159 is a significant north-south arterial road serving southwestern Illinois, from north of Alton at Illinois 16 south to Red Bud at Illinois 3. From Edwardsville to just north of Belleville, Illinois 159 is predominantly a five-lane commercial corridor with heavy traffic volumes, moderate traffic speeds, and unimpeded traffic flow. Within communities at the north end of the corridor—Edwardsville, Maryville, Collinsville, Fairview Heights, and Swansea—improvements have been completed or planned to move traffic through or around the commercial cores. To complete the system, Illinois 159 through Belleville needs to be improved or redirected through the downtown area.

- **Improve IL 15/13 through Freeburg & south to County Line (to Carbondale):** Illinois 15/13 through Freeburg carries an ever-increasing amount of traffic from growing residential communities and unincorporated areas in southern St. Clair County to working, shopping, and recreational destinations to the north and west, including the Missouri portion of the metropolitan area. As with Illinois 159 through Belleville, the section of Illinois 15/13 through downtown Freeburg will eventually restrict traffic flow. With the completion of improvements to Illinois 15/13 north of Freeburg to a four-lane section, discussions should begin regarding improvement options in Freeburg.

- **Construct New I-64/Union Hill Road Interchange (Fairview Heights):** The City of Fairview Heights has proposed the short-range construction of a new I-64 interchange at the Union Hill Road alignment between the Illinois 157 and Illinois 159 interchanges. The interchange would provide relief to the Illinois 159 interchange by providing access to U.S. 50/Lincoln Trail south of I-64 and west of Illinois 159. The interchange would also provide access to the populated County communities of Swansea and Belleville to the south via Union Hill Road/ Sullivan Drive/17th Street.
• **Construct New I-64/Old Collinsville Road Interchange (O’Fallon):** The City of O’Fallon has proposed the long-range construction of a new I-64 interchange at Old Collinsville Road between the Illinois 159 and U.S. 50 interchanges. The interchange would provide direct access to the growing Old Collinsville Road residential corridor in northwest O’Fallon and large commercial areas and residential populations to the south.

• **Construct New I-64/Summerfield Road Interchange (MidAmerica St. Louis Airport):** Long-range plans for MidAmerica St. Louis Airport envisioned the construction of two additional runways to the east of the existing runway. These parallel runways conceptually were located south of I-64, east of Illinois 4 and west of Summerfield Road. The accompanying Future Land Use Plan for St. Clair County designated this area for Government/Institutional use to preserve the area for future airport expansion. If this expansion occurs, a new I-64 interchange at Summerfield Road would be necessary to provide access to the eastern portion of the airport complex.

### Functional Classification Recommendations Based on Current Land Use

- **Sullivan Drive:** Change classification of Sullivan Drive/Union Hill Road from IL 161 in Belleville north to Longacre Drive in Fairview Heights from Collector to Arterial.
- **Old Collinsville Road:** Change classification of Old Collinsville Road from Lebanon Avenue in Belleville north to Lincoln Highway/East Highway 50 in O’Fallon from Collector to Arterial.
- **North Greenmount Road:** Change classification of Greenmount Road from Lebanon Avenue in Shiloh north to East Highway 50 in O’Fallon from Collector to Arterial. O’Fallon plans to upgrade the road to 5 lanes north of I-64 to East Highway 50.

### Functional Classification Recommendations Based on Future Land Use & Transportation Plans

- **Milburn School Road:** Change Milburn School Road west of O’Fallon from Collector to Arterial. O’Fallon plans to upgrade the road to 5 lanes.
- **Bethel Mine Road:** Change Bethel Mine Road west of O’Fallon from Collector to Arterial. O’Fallon plans to upgrade the road to 5 lanes.
- **Douglas Road:** Change Douglas Road between Freeburg and Millstadt (at Floraville Road) from Collector to Arterial.
- **Imbs Station Road:** Due to the approved new Interchange at I-255 and Imbs Station Road, change Imbs Station Road/Eiler Road east from I-255 to IL 13/15 from Collector to Arterial.

### Additional Transportation Policies

- Provide enhanced access to prime development properties.
- Provide local access from/to the new Mississippi River Bridge system.
- Provide frontage/internal circulation roads parallel to Arterials (designated major area service highways), as warranted, to support commercial development.
- Increase system capacity on Arterials and Collectors as warranted.
- Eliminate jogs or off-sets on Arterials & Major Collectors.
- Reserve R.O.W. in developing areas for future Collectors at a grid of ½ to 1-mile, along Section Lines where appropriate, to serve future municipal Residential land use.
- Standardize subdivision street design standards in County and Municipal ordinances (e.g., 30’ vs. 32’ curb-to-curb).
Utilities Plan

The Utilities Plan focuses on the provision of water, sanitary sewer, storm water drainage, and public facilities and services in developing areas of the County.

**Water Service**

- Water service expansion areas should be agreed upon by the various water districts so that service territories (existing and future) can be established and planning and infrastructure can take place to meet future water demand.
- Illinois American Water Company (IAWC) should be responsible for filling water service gaps east and south of Belleville and west, south, and north of Millstadt. Additionally, IAWC most likely would supply water to the City of O’Fallon to fill future demand for planned growth.
- Currently, the Summerfield-Lebanon-Mascoutah Water District (SLM) service area stops at Silver Creek on the west. With, Mascoutah planning growth west of Silver Creek, possibly as far as IL 158, water supply from either IAWC or SLM will be needed to provide water for future demand.
- With reported capacity and pump house issues north of New Athens, the potential for an SLM inter-connect with Illinois-American Water to the north should be explored.
- The Freeburg-Smithton-Hecker Water District (FSH) will need to expand its service area as its member cities continue to grow outward.

**Sewer Service**

- The Areawide Management Coordinating Board (AMCB) should favor FPA expansion petitioners who propose expansion within the appropriate watershed and who demonstrate existing capacity and a plan for funding expansion to meet demands for future development.
- Municipalities should include planning for their FPA facilities to handle the increase of waste water when planning for territorial expansion and development.
- The Belleville, Millstadt, Freeburg, Smithton, Mascoutah, Freeburg, and Summerfield FPA boundaries will need to be expanded to meet planned growth. This will require planning and investing in facilities to handle the additional waste water.
- The area south of Belleville and east of Belleville (south of Scott AFB and west of Mascoutah/Silver Creek) fall outside existing FPA’s. Options for providing sanitary sewer service in these growing areas should be examined based on existing facilities, watersheds, and financial capacity.

**Storm Water Management**

- St. Clair County should complete improvements to the Mississippi River flood protection system to meet the higher federally-mandated standards for designation of the American Bottoms as a levee-protected 100-year (1% annual chance) flood area (Zone X).
- To fund improvements to the stormwater management system, St. Clair County should seek Federal and State grants and other funding mechanisms to supplement local sources of revenue.
- St. Clair County should complete steps necessary to meet the EPA’s Phase II Stormwater requirements (NPDES) for the County and its municipalities—including adoption and implementation of a Stormwater Control Ordinance.
- The effects of storm water run-off, including erosion and flooding impacts, occur according to watershed geographies. Issues arise beyond political boundaries. St. Clair, Madison, and Monroe Counties should formalize a system to manage storm water at the drainage basin/watershed level.
Chapter 5: Special Use Categories & Special Topics

The following Special Use and Special Topic plans were prepared to provide additional guidance for the implementation of the County Comprehensive Plan. Special Uses and Special Topics included:

- “Special Use” Land Use Overlay: *Exercise of 1.5-Mile Municipal Jurisdiction*
- “Special Use” Land Use Overlay: *Scott AFB/MidAmerica Airport JLUS*
- “Special Use” Land Use Overlay: *Floodplain & Stormwater Management*
- “Special Use” Land Use Overlay: *Green Infrastructure*
- “Special Use” Land Use Overlay: *Blufflands Protection*
- “Special Use” Land Use Overlay: *Karst Topography Protection*
- “Special Use” Land Use Overlay: *Gateway Connector Corridor Protection Plan*
- “Special Topic”: *American Bottoms Levee System*
- “Special Topic”: *Economic Development Strategy*
- “Special Topic”: *Affordable/Workforce Housing Strategy*
**Exercise of 1.5-Mile Municipal Jurisdiction**

**Definition**

The *1.5-mile Municipal Jurisdiction* refers to the area defined by Illinois State Statute (65 ILCS 5/11 Division 12) giving municipalities authority to exercise subdivision and zoning jurisdiction by ordinance within unincorporated areas. This jurisdictional area is defined as a 1.5-mile radius from the municipal boundary. In areas where no boundary line agreement has been adopted by two adjoining municipalities, the jurisdiction of any one municipality extends to the median line equidistant from its boundary and the boundary of the nearest municipality at any given point on the line.

**Situation Analysis**

St. Clair County’s implementation of the 1991 Comprehensive Plan required significant modifications to the County’s Zoning Ordinance as evidenced by the release of the effective ordinance on September 27, 1993 and revised July 1, 1996. The ordinance applies to all un-zoned municipalities and to all properties in the unincorporated part of the County, except properties occupied by Scott Air Force Base. Development policies from the 1991 Plan impacting the County’s Zoning Ordinance were related to Agricultural Preservation, Land Conservation, Special Development Overlay Districts, Access Management, and Development Coordination Procedures.

Through this more recent Comprehensive Plan planning process, a land use strategy emerged that would in effect encourage all future development in the unincorporated part of the County to be coordinated with municipalities and other public service and utility providers. In this way, development of land that would more than likely be the target of future municipal annexation would meet the municipalities’ desires for use, design, and construction standards and be adequately served by urban, rather than rural, levels of public service.

**Recommended Approach**

To effect this change in development coordination and approval, in areas adjacent to municipalities that were covered under a local comprehensive plan, the County’s Land Use Plan generally reflects the municipalities’ future land use plans. The municipal land uses were debated and modified where necessary, and the resulting plan was adopted as the County’s Future Land Use Plan. Where the municipalities did not have a local comprehensive plan, or the plan did not extend all the way out to their 1.5-mile municipal jurisdiction, the County’s Future Land Use designation became County Agricultural Use—Planned Services Area (or Agricultural—PSA). Agricultural—PSA reflects that if the area should some day be developed, it should be coordinated with the adjacent community and any other public service providers. Outside the 1.5-miles, the County’s Land Use became simply County Agricultural Use (or Agricultural Preservation).

The general process for County adoption of an associated zoning strategy would start with the adoption of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, then rezoning of the land within all municipal 1.5-mile jurisdiction areas for “A” Agricultural Industry District—PSA. The County would then create and apply a “Planned Unit Development” Overlay Zoning District (as opposed to a Special Use Permit) that would be triggered based on the proposed use’s location (within the 1.5-mile jurisdiction), use (non-Agricultural), impact on traffic or infrastructure (urban level of service required rather than rural), and other potential qualifiers.
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Incorporated Area
The Planned Unit Development (or PUD) review and approval process would require meeting the County’s submittal and public hearing process for a PUD. The County submittal process would follow a checklist of submittal/additional studies requirements for the PUD re-zoning such as the jurisdictional municipality’s review, a traffic study, Soil & Water Conservation District submittal and response, water and sewer provider review, etc. The process could also require meeting the jurisdictional municipality’s submittal and public hearing process for development plan review or subdivision of property (e.g., preliminary plat approval process) and require providing assurance letters from the non-municipal service providers that the development can and will be served.

In areas outside the “A—PSA”, the PUD Overlay would generally not meet the more restrictive triggers, but would still have requirements for any non-Agricultural development. For areas outside the “A—PSA” that are currently County-zoned for development, the Permitted Uses would be greatly reduced, Special Uses would be eliminated, and the new PUD Overlay would provide the means for approving or denying a proposed use. Of course, the area also could simply be re-zoned to “A” for Agricultural Preservation.

**Conclusion**

This approach to proposed development in unincorporated St. Clair County recognizes property owners’ rights to development and to choose between the unincorporated County or an incorporated municipality, the ability of municipalities to provide urban levels of public services, and the impact improper development outside the community may have on municipalities as their borders expand to accommodate more and more residents and businesses. The County should be encouraging development to seek annexation to municipalities rather than developing in underserved unincorporated areas. Municipalities already are vested by the Illinois State Statute to exercise extraterritorial subdivision and zoning jurisdiction. Making municipalities and other public service providers an active participant in the development review and approval process through the County Zoning Ordinance will more often than not make it more advantageous for developers in the County to choose the annexation course of action.
Scott AFB/MidAmerica Airport Joint Land Use Study (JLUS)

Definition

A JLUS or Joint Land Use Study is a cooperative land use planning effort undertaken between a military installation and surrounding communities. The **Scott AFB/MidAmerica Airport Planning Influence Area** was defined in the Scott AFB/MidAmerica Airport JLUS as the area in which land use coordination and communication among local jurisdictions, the airport, and the military is essential.

Situation Analysis

A JLUS is intended to promote community growth that supports military training and operational missions and identifies actions that can and should be taken jointly by the surrounding community and military installation to solve existing encroachment problems and prevent future ones. Incompatible development too close to airfield operations exposes people to noise and air safety risks and can compromise the ability of the military to fulfill its mission.

The 2008 Scott AFB/MidAmerica Airport JLUS involved the Air Force, MidAmerica St. Louis Airport, St. Clair County, and the surrounding communities of Lebanon, Mascoutah, O’Fallon, and Shiloh. The study’s purposes were to maintain the effectiveness of military and airport operations, safeguard the safety and welfare of nearby residents, and accommodate compatible local growth.

The specific goals of the study were to:

- Clarify land use compatibility guidance and develop effective tools for assessing development around the Base and Airport.
- Increase communication between the military, the Airport and surrounding communities.
- Evaluate the potential impacts of current and future military and airport operations on surrounding communities.
- Evaluate the potential impacts of community growth on the long-term viability of Scott AFB and MidAmerica St. Louis Airport.
- Recommend action items to reduce encroachment and facilitate future collaboration.

Recommended Approach

The JLUS provided recommendations on several levels regarding land use, building codes, and other issues. The JLUS was being finalized during the formulation of the Comprehensive Plan and it was determined to have an important impact on the County’s Future Land Use. In addition to land use issues however, other recommendations need to be considered concerning activity density, site layout, and building design as development occurs. Recommendations defined in the JLUS are summarized below.

The largest geography defined in the JLUS for recommending policy is the **Primary Planning Influence Area**. Within the Primary Planning Influence Area lies the **Protection Area** which provides for several overlapping zones with increasing levels of land use compatibility guidance. The zones include the Installation Perimeter Buffer Area; the Military Runway Clear Zone, Accident Potential Zone 1 (APZ 1), and APZ 2; the Civilian Runway Protection Zone; the Military (Scott AFB) Noise Contours and the Airport (MidAmerica St. Louis Airport) Noise Contours; and Height Hazard Areas which are located both within and outside the Primary Planning Influence Area. The report recommended that the communities affected by the recommendations create and adopt a board whose purpose is to review development applications within the Primary Planning Influence Area that have potential incompatibilities.
The **Regional Advisory Board** (RAB) is intended to provide an interim step to address potentially incompatible land uses. Members on the RAB would be appointed by local zoning authorities and would convene only when a proposed project is deemed incompatible by Scott AFB. The Board would present an advisory finding to the local jurisdiction responsible for approval of the application. The local authority would then make the final decision.

The **Primary Planning Influence Area** lies within the larger JLUS study area with its boundary following natural and man-made features such as roads to assist local planners and officials in defining its limits. The recommendations for the Planning Influence Area deal primarily with standards for avigation easements and lighting and include:

- Adopt outdoor lighting requirements.
- Provide development permits to Scott AFB for review and advisory opinion.
- Require real estate disclosure of proximity to Scott AFB or Airport to potential buyers.
- Require avigation easements on all major subdivisions or rezoning approvals.
- Adopt height restrictions as delineated by the Scott AFB/Airport approach and departure model.

The **Protection Area** lies within the Planning Influence Area and is divided into several sub-areas based on noise contours, safety and risk zones, and proximity to the base. Separate recommendations are made for military (Scott AFB) and civilian (MidAmerica St. Louis Airport) safety and risk zones based on the different requirements for each.

- **The Installation Perimeter Buffer Area** includes all land within 1,500 feet of Scott AFB. The recommendations for the Installation Perimeter Buffer are listed below:
  - Provide land development activity applications to Scott AFB for a compatibility review. If the finding is incompatible, a meeting of the Regional Advisory Board is triggered.
  - No structures greater than 3 stories, or 35 feet above ground level, should be permitted.
  - Mobile home parks, multi-family residential, group homes or hotels should not be permitted.
  - Provide a maximum density of two single-family dwelling units per acre.

- **The Military Clear Zone** is defined as the area at the end of a military runway that has the greatest risk of experiencing an aircraft accident. The Air Force reports that 27.4% of aircraft accidents occur in the Clear Zone. The area of the clear zone is 3,000 feet by 3,000 feet. Within the Military Clear Zone, no uses should be permitted except roads, underground utilities, agriculture, livestock grazing, and permanent passive open space.

- **Military Accident Potential Zone 1 (APZ 1)** is 3,000 feet wide by 5,000 feet long and is located immediately beyond the Clear Zone. The Air Force reports that 10.1% of aircraft accidents occur in APZ 1. The recommendations for APZ 1 were as follows:
  - Prohibit all residential uses, hotels, hospitals and clinics, nursing homes, child care centers, schools, movie theaters and auditoriums, churches and places of worship, sports arenas, restaurants and other places of large assembly.
  - The maximum gross acreage coverage for buildings on a lot should be 10% and the maximum assembly should be less than 25 people per acre per hour and not more than 50 at any one time. A sliding scale of employment density per shift and maximum acreage coverage should be utilized for industrial uses.

- **Military Accident Potential Zone 2 (APZ 2)** is 3,000 feet wide by 7,000 feet long and is located at the end of APZ 1. The Air Force reports that 5.6% of aircraft accidents occur in APZ 2. General recommendations for APZ 2 are listed below:
• Prohibit all residential uses, hospitals and clinics, nursing homes, child care centers, schools, theaters and auditoriums, churches, sports arenas, restaurants and other places of assembly.
• The maximum gross acreage coverage for non-residential buildings on a lot should be 20% and the maximum assembly should be less than 25 people per acre per hour and not more than 50 at any one time. A sliding scale of employment density per shift and maximum acreage coverage should be utilized for industrial uses.
• Limit single-family developments to a maximum density of one dwelling unit per acre.

• **Military (Scott AFB) Noise Contours** reflect relative noise levels with each noise contour mathematically representing the average sound level, by decibel, over a 24-hour period. The recommendations for Noise Contours are numerous, but generally provide for a range of uses and noise mitigation (or attenuation) requirements for each 5 decibel interval from 65 on the low end to 80 and above on the high end.
• Require noise easements to be granted to the local jurisdiction on all major subdivisions and rezoning requests. Require notes on all subsequent subdivision plats that property is near an airport and therefore subject to operational noise impacts.
• Within **Noise Contours 65-69 (NZ-1)**, single-family residential use should be limited to one unit per acre. Require sound attenuation standards to achieve a noise reduction level (NRL) of at least 25 dB on all new or expanded construction.
• Within **Noise Contours 70-74 (NZ-2)**, all residential uses should be prohibited. Require sound attenuation standards to achieve a noise reduction level (NRL) of at least 25 dB on all new or expanded construction.
• Within **Noise Contours 75-79 (NZ-3)**, all residential uses, amphitheaters, hospitals, clinics, nursing homes, child care centers, schools, theaters, auditoriums, and churches should be prohibited. Require sound attenuation standards to achieve a noise reduction level (NRL) of at least 30 dB on all new or expanded construction.
• Within **Noise Contours 80+ (NZ-4)**, prohibited uses and sound attenuation should be generally the same as in NZ-3, with primarily trade and services uses prohibited in this higher noise zone.

• **The Runway Protection Zone (MidAmerica St. Louis Airport)** is the FAA equivalent of the Military Clear Zone and the recommendations for the Runway Protection Zone are the same as for the Clear Zone—no uses should be permitted except roads, underground utilities, agriculture, livestock grazing, and permanent passive open space.

• **Airport Noise Contours (MidAmerica St. Louis Airport)** are the relative noise levels for the MidAmerica St. Louis Airport runway and the recommendations are the same as for the Military (Scott AFB) Noise Contours—land use prohibitions and indoor noise reduction level requirements for uses within the 65 dB and above Noise Contours.

**Conclusion**

The Scott AFB and MidAmerica St. Louis Airport joint use airfield complex is an enormous economic engine for St. Clair County and the entire St. Louis metropolitan area. The protection of the airfield complex from unnecessary encroachment is essential. Through the Joint Land Use Study, the leadership of the military Air Base, the civilian Airport, St. Clair County, and the four surrounding municipalities were able to come together to map out a coordinated, cooperative approach to ensuring the long-term functional viability of the airfields. The County and participating communities should move ahead with modifications to their respective Zoning Ordinances and adopt the recommendations of the JLUS.
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Floodplain & Stormwater Management

Definition

The **100-Year Floodplain** refers to the elevation a river will reach during a flood event that has a 1% chance of happening in any given year. Preservation of the storage capacity of the County’s floodplains through proper stormwater and floodplain management techniques is essential for the prevention of potential flood loss or damage to life, property, structures, and infrastructure. Flooding hazards may also be caused by rapid flows or internal ponding as a result of improper **Stormwater Management**.

Situation Analysis

St. Clair County’s surface hydrology is comprised of a system of natural waterways and their associated floodplains, and a manmade system of canals and levees. Although all streams and stormwater runoff drain ultimately to the Mississippi River, the County’s drainage system is primarily divided between two rivers, the Mississippi and Kaskaskia, and two creeks, Silver and Richland. Two large canals assist in diverting drainage through the American Bottoms floodplain in St. Clair County, the Cahokia Canal at the northern end and the Harding Ditch/Blue Waters Ditch on the southern end, both part of the Metro-East Sanitary District. The levee districts protecting St. Clair County from the Mississippi River are the Metro-East Sanitary District and the Prairie du Pont Drainage and Levee District.

The American Bottoms floodplain hydrology is influenced by both the amount of runoff originating above the bluffs to the east that taxes the Bottoms’ stormwater storage and conveyance system, and the potential risk of failure of the Mississippi River levee system. Management of stormwater runoff is directly tied to proper floodplain management. Floodplains were created by a natural process that involved overflow and storage of floodwaters. Development in the floodplains adjacent to streams and the subsequent alterations to the natural drainage system are generally credited with producing increased stormwater flood hazard in, adjacent to, and downstream from, floodplains.

As a result, increased floodplain management practices have been enacted to regulate floodplain development through zoning ordinances, subdivision regulations, and building codes at the local level, and permitting requirements at the State and Federal levels. Within St. Clair County, adopted regulations have included the Flood Plain Code of Chapter 10 (Subdivision) and the O-1 Conservation Overlay Zone of Chapter 40 (Zoning). The Conservation Overlay is intended to protect and preserve lands “containing natural features such as natural water courses, areas subject to flooding or ponding, woodland areas, highly erosive areas, wetlands, and significant archeological and historic sites.” The code covers all lands subject to flooding, inundation, or ponding by waters of the 100-year interval flood and any land designated by the County as a stormwater management facility. Land uses are generally prohibited that alter or adversely affect a natural water course and most uses require a special use permit. In addition, Chapter 40 (Zoning), Article 8-15–Flooding, requires that in any location where the 100-year interval flood has been designated, the building must be constructed one foot higher than the 100-year flood elevation and must not impede the natural flow of water.

One of the largest initiatives for stormwater management has its roots in the 1965 Corps of Engineers study called the “East St. Louis and Vicinity Interior Flood Control Project”, since revised and expanded as the “East St. Louis and Vicinity Ecosystem Restoration and Flood Damage Reduction Project”, adding ecological restoration as a project purpose. The $200 million plus project seeks to restore the historic American Bottoms floodplain, restore the biodiversity of floodplain plant and animal communities, minimize upland erosion and manage sedimentation in the floodplain watershed, and reduce flood
damage in the Bottoms. Federal appropriations for 65% of the project are now required to move the project forward, in addition to the 35% match from non-Federal sources.

**Recommended Approach**

For long-range land use planning purposes, the 100-year floodplain should act as an overlay to the County’s Land Use Plan. While the underlying land use category would apply to the use of the land, development and the treatment of waterways and floodplains in the overlay area should be provided with additional guidance. The County’s policy regarding floodplains should reflect that floodplains should ideally be maintained as open space or greenspace to ensure proper stormwater handling properties. Construction of permanent structures in floodplains should be discouraged. If structures are to be located in the floodplain, but raised above the flood elevation by fill, the development should be encouraged to mitigate for the displaced flood storage within the same watershed.

Additional approaches to floodplain management should include managing stormwater on a watershed level, completing Clean Water Act/EPA Stormwater Program requirements, and returning channelized waterways to their natural state:

- The effects of stormwater run-off, including erosion and flooding impacts, occur according to watershed geographies. Issues can arise beyond political boundaries. St. Clair, Madison, and Monroe Counties should continue to cooperate and seek to formalize a funding and management strategy for stormwater at the drainage basin/watershed level.

- To fund improvements to the stormwater management system, the County should seek Federal and State grants and other funding mechanisms to supplement local sources of revenue.

- Related to floodplain management, St. Clair County should complete steps necessary to meet the U.S. EPA’s Phase II of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Stormwater Program requirements for the County and its municipalities—including adoption and implementation of a Stormwater Control Ordinance.

- As a means to actually increase the floodplain storage capacity within the County, the possibility for returning channelized waterways to more natural state courses should be examined.

**Conclusion**

Preservation of the storage capacity and protection of water quality in the County’s floodplains through proper stormwater and floodplain management techniques is essential for the prevention of potential flood loss or damage to life, property, structures, infrastructure, or the environment. Federal NPDES stormwater requirements, regional and watershed-level coordination, and County and municipal-level planning, zoning, and subdivision regulations should provide a solid foundation for the future. Authority and a funding source for improvements to the American Bottoms levee system have been established and improvements should soon follow. To address the County’s long-term stormwater management needs, St. Clair County should aggressively pursue funding from Federal and State sources.
Green Infrastructure

Definition

The interconnected network of outdoor recreation areas and trails, natural areas, and heritage preservation sites combine to create St. Clair County’s Green Infrastructure. The County’s outdoor parks, trails, and open spaces provide residents and visitors the opportunity for leisure, recreation, and education. Natural areas refer to open space in a predominantly natural vegetated state that is not significantly impacted by human activities and usually offers habitat for wildlife. Heritage areas recognize physical elements of the landscape that capture a piece of natural or human history.

Within the County Land Use Plan, Natural Areas were identified as a Special Use Category for added protection, including all Illinois Natural Area Inventory (INAI) sites from a statewide inventory of outstanding examples of natural landscape features remaining in Illinois. The Natural Area designation included high quality natural communities or community restorations; specific suitable habitat of endangered and threatened (E&T) species or species translocations; state-dedicated nature preserves, land and water reserves, or natural heritage landmarks; outstanding geological features; and unusual concentrations of flora and/or fauna. The INAI is the primary tool used for land protection within the IDNR and many conservation agencies and groups throughout Illinois. It is also used to guide acquisition, management, stewardship, restoration, and monitoring efforts.

Situation Analysis

Several organizations actively participate in the preservation, enhancement, and creation of new parks, natural areas, and heritage sites in St. Clair County. Included are the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Illinois Department of Natural Resources (IDNR), the Southwestern Illinois Resource Conservation & Development Council (RC&D), The Land Conservancy, the Metro-East Park & Recreation District (MEPRD), St. Clair County, local park departments and districts, various not-for-profit agencies, and private residents. County greenspace planning efforts, as well as activities of other agencies and organizations, are described below.

The 1991 County Comprehensive Plan recognized “greenspace” land uses associated with agricultural use, open space/vegetated use, and public recreational use. Agricultural use, or farmland, covered 60% of the County land area; however, conversion for development continues to reduce this percentage over time. Open space use included the forested floodplains of the Kaskaskia River and Silver Creek, as well as the undeveloped western bluff region. Public recreation uses included state and local park facilities, including Frank Holten State Park, Cahokia Mounds State Historic Site, and the County’s Foley Park. The following policies and practices found in the Comprehensive Plan provided early tools for greenspace preservation.

- **Agricultural Preservation**—The Plan recommended that the existing “A” agricultural district be modified to establish an agricultural preservation district to maintain very low residential densities and preserve productive farmland. The new “A” Agricultural Industry District limited the maximum number of dwelling units to 1 per 40 acres, a change from the previous maximum number of dwelling units of 1 per 3 acres as applied from 1969 through 1993. In addition, the County added the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) system to the Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 40, Article X).
Recreation/Conservation—The Plan recommended the establishment of one or more recreation/conservation districts, and the creation of a “C-R” Conservation-Recreation District and an “O-1” Conservation Overlay District within the County Zoning Ordinance.

Two state programs enable units of government to support land conservation: forest preserves and conservation districts. The County evaluated the benefits of conservation districts versus forest preserve districts in early 1992 and concluded that the Conservation District approach was the most favorable based primarily on 1) the flexibility of the Conservation District Act for the variety of uses and activities the County may want to pursue; and 2) the compatibility with the wetlands banking concept. A district, however, has not been created.

The County created a “C-R” Conservation-Recreation District in the Zoning Ordinance (Article IV, Division XIV) for “limiting the use and/or development of those lands to the usage appropriate for the preservation of unique, primitive or natural areas and areas for passive and recreational use”. Lands so zoned may include land controlled by St. Clair County, or land controlled by other than the County for which an agreement has been executed with the owner regarding use and development. The C-R District may be viewed as a “holding position” for lands that may later become part of a Conservation District landholding. Potential parcels for C-R zoning include FEMA flood buy-out property and County-owned property at the Tecklenburg Woods Preserve, Silver Creek Preserve, St. Ellen Park, and Foley Park.

The County also created an “O-1” Conservation Overlay District (Article IV, Division XV) in the Zoning Ordinance where use was contingent on compliance with the County Flood Plain Code (Ch. 10) and requirements for wetland preservation and/or mitigation. The Conservation Overlay Zone consists of all land in unincorporated St. Clair County that is: 1) within the 100-year interval flood zone or 2) designated by the County for a stormwater detention basin, drainage way, or other stormwater management facility.

The 1999 County Greenspace Plan (and 2011 update) summarized that significant open space preservation opportunities existed within the Kaskaskia River, Silver Creek and Richland Creek basins, within the American Bottoms, and along the bluff line that divides the American Bottoms from the remainder of the County (primarily the steeper slopes and erodible soils in a broad band along the bluffs, including western portions of the Sinkhole Plain/Karst Topography region, and certain areas of the American Bottoms generally just below the bluffs). The plan prioritized areas of particular interest as those that have the greatest potential to provide multiple benefits while also experiencing development pressure that could soon convert them to uses incompatible with greenspace preservation.

Ideally, greenspace preservation in St. Clair County would consider inclusion of remnant examples (or restorable parcels) of the pre-development landscape. Such areas include bottomland hardwood swamp, emergent marsh, upland woods, post oak flatwoods, savanna, prairie, and Karst caves. Likewise, the rare plants and animals that are recorded for St. Clair County are often found associated with these unusual habitat areas. There are a few Illinois Natural Areas and Nature Preserves and informally identified County Natural Areas in the county. They are generally based on preservation of unusual natural resources, but there are many other potential areas that are unprotected. Some of these special areas could be included in a “corridor concept” of greenspace preservation, but many of them could require “satellite” or “island” acquisition, and restorative management.

Such an example follows: “In western St. Clair County at the southwest portion of the steep slope upper bluff area lays one of the highest densities of Karst topography sinkholes in the United States. The scenic rolling topography harbors pockets of rare plants and animals associated with the sinkhole margins and the caves themselves. There are also rare dry hill prairies on some of the rocky knolls between sinkholes. Agricultural and residential conversion of this zone is ongoing. An effective plan to effect sustainable,
long-term management of the aesthetic, water quality and biotic resources of this area would require a local watershed approach. Much of this area also has little potential for linkages to larger regional corridors or trails.”

Likewise, the potential priority to consider heritage preservation of the “rural landscape” and farmland would require a different approach than corridor preservation. General row crop agriculture as well as areas of specialty use such as orchards and ranching may warrant consideration. There are already a couple of locations where research and education in sustainable agriculture occur. The Henry White Farm is one example. If expanding such areas becomes a priority, the Illinois Department of Agriculture, the St. Clair County Soil and Water Conservation District, and the University of Illinois Cooperative Extension Service are potential partners in such efforts.

Another avenue of possible cooperative acquisition and management funding could be the establishment of a wetland mitigation bank in St. Clair County. A plan was completed in 1994 that had developed feasible designs for ten wetland mitigation bank sites in four different watersheds. These areas had been screened from a set of 40 sites as having optimum potential for acquisition, least construction costs, and multiple benefits such as: water features within a larger park or greenway development, flood control, water quality, soil conservation, and wildlife value. Obviously, to the extent these areas could be incorporated into a greenspace plan, they would add to both funding opportunities and multiple benefits.

Since the adoption of the 1999 Greenspace Plan, the County has taken an active role in greenspace preservation and restoration. The St. Clair County Board appointed a Greenspace Committee to oversee the implementation of the County Greenspace Plan. The County’s vision was “to provide leadership in the protection, enhancement, and management of natural resources and natural resource-based recreation/education opportunities in the County.” The ad hoc County Board Greenspace Committee became part of a standing committee when it was later merged with the Property & Recreation Committee.

The Committee began its efforts with the purchase and enhancement of nearly 300 acres of resource-rich property along Silver Creek south of Mascoutah. The Silver Creek Preserve was purchased in 2000, 2001, and 2002 with help from nearly $400,000 in three rounds of State Open Land Trust (OLT) grant funds. The County recently completed improvements to the Preserve with support from a $200,000 State OSLAD grant (for road access, trails, and native vegetation plantings), and more than $75,000 from the County Farm Service Agency and the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Conservation Reserve Program (for the planting of more than 40,000 tree saplings on 100 acres), and the USDA’s Natural Resource Conservation Service’s Wetland Enhancement and Upland Wildlife Habitat Management Programs (for wetland and native grass restoration).

In addition to its work at the Silver Creek Preserve, the Committee advanced a resolution through the County Board in 2004 authorizing the County to accept gifts of real property and conservation easements for preservation of open space or public recreational purposes. The Committee also partnered with The Land Conservancy (established by the RC&D) to encourage private landowners to establish deed-restricted conservation easements on their property. St. Clair County, through the Property & Recreation Committee, continues to seek and evaluate outdoor recreation, greenspace, and heritage sites for potential acquisition, preservation, and restoration.

**In 2003, the Metro-East Park and Recreation District (MEPRD) Long-Range Development Plan** was adopted by the organization’s Board of Directors. In November of 2000, voters in St. Clair and Madison Counties created the Metro-East Park & Recreation District (MEPRD) funded by a .1% county-wide sales tax. Fifty percent (50%) of the revenue generated each month is given to the MEPRD, while the remaining 50% is distributed to the County where the sales tax was generated. In St. Clair County, one-
half of the 50% is directed to the Property & Recreation Committee and one-half to the County Park Grants Commission for awards to local park and recreation districts for park and trail development. The MEPRD is governed by a Board that consists of three representatives from St. Clair County and three representatives from Madison County.

The Long-Range Development Plan’s objectives were to facilitate consensus among residents and governments for a long range system plan for parks, greenways, and trails; prescribe a methodology for prioritizing the commitment of District funds for parks, greenways, and trails; and to develop a business plan for the District. Since adopting the Development Plan, the District has contributed funds to several park and trail projects including: construction of bicycle trails and ramps accessing and crossing the McKinley Bridge over the Mississippi River; construction of the Malcolm W. Martin Memorial Park and Mississippi River Overlook (a.k.a. Gateway Geyser); trail ramp access to the Eads Bridge; and construction of a District Office and bicycle trailhead in Collinsville.

In St. Clair County, the County Parks Grants Commission has awarded its 25% of the .1% county-wide sales tax ($2.5 million over the past 5 years) in matching grants to local park districts for construction and improvements to park and recreation facilities. The remaining 25% of sales tax is used by the St. Clair County Property & Recreation Committee to fund activities related to the 1999 Greenspace Plan.

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) protects natural resources in St. Clair County by owning and managing land themselves, acquiring easements on private property, and providing funding through various grant programs. The largest areas of INDR-owned properties are located in the Peabody River King and Kaskaskia River State Fish & Wildlife Areas and the Frank Holten State Park. Additionally, IDNR monitors Natural Areas in the State and County and, when available, purchases land or easements from land owners. Natural Areas include all Illinois Natural Area Inventory (INAI) sites from a statewide inventory of outstanding examples of natural landscape features remaining in Illinois.

The Southwestern Illinois Resource Conservation & Development Council, Inc. (RC&D) is a not-for-profit corporation formed in 1989 to address regional natural resource concerns within Bond, Clinton, Madison, Monroe, Randolph, St. Clair and Washington Counties in Illinois. RC&D develops and supports partnerships to assist in the protection and sustainability of natural resources in the region. Efforts are directed toward agriculture, economic development, education and outreach, natural resource management, outdoor recreation opportunities, regional growth management, and environmental resource areas.

The Land Conservancy is a division of the RC&D. The Land Conservancy is a not-for-profit land trust organization that works in partnership with landowners to permanently protect lands in Southwestern Illinois such as farms, forests, hunting lands, wildlife habitat, open spaces and scenic vistas. The Land Conservancy (TLC) holds conservation easements, accepts land donations, promotes partnerships, and fosters innovative land conservation techniques to protect farmland and other natural resources.

The Metro-East Greenway Alliance (MEGA) is comprised of the American Bottoms Conservancy, French Valley Initiative, Metro-East Stormwater Planning Office, New Spirit, St. Clair County Property & Recreation Committee, Southwestern Illinois Planning Commission, Southwestern Illinois RC&D, and Trailnet, Inc. MEGA prepared a Metro-East Greenway Plan in 2002 with the goal to preserve open space and recreation resources prior to urban development with a vision for a regional trail and greenway network connected to state and national greenways.

The St. Louis District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) was directed to study and define the need for interior flood control solutions in East St. Louis, Illinois and the surrounding vicinity due to flooding in the late 1960's and 1980's. No major project was ever initiated because proposed fixes to the
flooding were not economically feasible. From 1993 to 1996 the area again suffered severe interior flooding. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), USACE, and USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) spent tens of millions of dollars to provide emergency disaster relief, clean existing drainage ditches, and buy out frequently flooded areas. However, this work was only a temporary solution.

Congress once again funded the USACE to re-evaluate this problem in 1997. The USACE determined that an ecosystem approach to this problem could potentially not only reduce many of the flooding problems, but could be of great environmental significance. The result was the East St. Louis & Vicinity Interior Flooding & Ecosystem Restoration Study.

The Study identified several potential alternatives. These included combinations of different sediment detention scenarios, channel/canal configurations, and restoration/development of approximately 5,000 acres of habitat areas which would concurrently provide for the temporary diversion and detention of rainfall events. These alternatives focused on areas that provided suitable soils and hydrology necessary to reconnect a bottomland flood pulse. Ten American Bottoms areas were analyzed to determine their viability: Old Cahokia Creek, Judy's/Burdick Branch, Elm’s Slough, Dobrey Slough, and Brushy Lake in Madison County; and Indian Lake, Spring Lake, St. Clair Farms, Wedgewood, and Mullins Slough in St. Clair County. More than 140 upland dry detention basins were also analyzed for their ability to remove sediment from the water system in the bluffs while providing a stabilizing feature for stream banks.

Local Park Departments and Park Districts in St. Clair County finance the ownership and management of city parks either through their municipal budgets or Park Districts. For example, Horner Park (Lebanon) and Hanft Park (New Athens) are owned by independent Park Districts and located in unincorporated St. Clair County. Through the Comprehensive Plan process, the municipalities of Mascoutah, Millstadt, and East Carondelet have identified future parks in unincorporated areas outside their current municipal limits.

Recommended Approach

It is important for St. Clair County to continue to identify and protect its valuable natural resources. The known Green Infrastructure sites owned, managed, and proposed for protection or use by the above partnership organizations were identified as either “Recreation” or “Conservation” land use in the St. Clair County Land Use Plan.

Natural Areas were identified as a Special Use Category for added protection, including all of the Illinois Natural Area Inventory (INAI) sites from a statewide inventory of outstanding examples of natural landscape features remaining in Illinois. Due to the small size or sensitive nature of the exact location of some of the conservation/preservation sites, many of the privately-owned natural areas were designated by name only under the “Natural Areas” Special Use land use category and were not reflected on the Land Use Plan map. Ideally, the “Natural Areas” Special Use Category Map would be added by reference to the County’s “O-1” Conservation Overlay Zone.

As recommended in the 1991 County Comprehensive Plan, an Agricultural Preservation land use category was maintained in the Plan to encourage very low residential densities and preserve productive farmland outside of the 1.5-mile municipal jurisdiction. The land use category is, and should continue to be supported through the “A” Agricultural Industry District which limits the maximum number of dwelling units to 1 per 40 acres, and the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) system.

The County should continue to implement the 2011 County Greenspace Plan through selective preservation opportunities within the Kaskaskia River, Silver Creek and Richland Creek basins, the
American Bottoms and Karst topography areas, along the Mississippi River bluffs, and at significant heritage preservation sites.

The County should continue to evaluate establishment of a wetland mitigation bank to offset impacts from County or other public projects, and to potentially sell credits to offset private development wetland impacts within the County.

The County should take a greater role in acquiring gifts of land and conservation easements for preservation of open space or public recreational purposes. This is a low-cost means of preserving desirable land for future generations. The role should include increasing publicity on the process and the County’s desire to work with land owners on gifts or easements, providing funding to acquire the residual development rights or assist the landowner with costs associated with creating and monitoring easements, and partnering with other organizations such as The Land Conservancy to acquire conservation easements.

St. Clair County receives 50% of the revenue generated by the Metro-East Park & Recreation District county-wide sales tax. Aside from municipal and park district property tax levies, this is the primary source of funding for County-wide outdoor recreation, natural area protection, and heritage preservation. The County should continue to take advantage of this revenue stream to assemble large tracts of preservation landscape (through the County Board’s Property & Recreation Committee) and to assist local park and recreation districts with park and trail development (through the County Parks Grants Commission).

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) is the secondary source of funding for County-wide park and open space acquisition and development. The County should aggressively compete for funding on an annual basis through the State’s Open Space Lands Acquisition & Development (OSLAD) and Trails grant programs.

The County should support the implementation of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ (USACE) 2004 East St. Louis & Vicinity Interior Flooding & Ecosystem Restoration Study. Significant local funding will be required to assemble the land and complete the required improvements both in the American Bottoms and above the bluffs, but the benefits over time will be equally significant. However, a solution to funding the required 35% local share of the $200 million plus project (including credit for land acquired and projects completed to date) will likely need to wait for the financial and political impacts of the Mississippi River levee system improvement project to be absorbed. The likeliest source for the 65% Federal share is through the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (WRDA) (S. 1495), a political process that took seven years just to craft the pending authorization bill.

**Conclusion**

St. Clair County’s greenspace infrastructure is a mosaic of outdoor recreation areas and trails, natural areas, and heritage preservation sites. The County, through the County Board’s Property & Recreation Committee, has made a substantial commitment to playing a leadership role in protecting and expanding greenspace opportunities for today’s and future generations. Building upon the recommendations of the County Comprehensive Plan, the County’s Zoning Ordinance provides numerous means for avoidance, integration, or mitigation of development’s impact on the natural environment.

Other avenues for successful stewardship include continued implementation of the County Greenspace Preservation Plan, prudent allocation of the Metro-East Parks & Recreation District sales tax revenue, supplemental use of State grant programs predominantly through the Department of Natural Resources, and partnerships with other Federal, regional, and local agencies, organizations and volunteers.
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**Blufflands Protection**

**Definition**

*Blufflands* refers to the area along the Mississippi River bluffs in the western part of the County that represents an outstanding environmental, historic, recreational, and aesthetic feature of St. Clair County. If left unprotected, these towering limestone bluffs lining the American Bottoms floodplain of the Mississippi River could be irreparably damaged by erosion and deterioration of natural habitats, lost to quarrying or other development, or visually obstructed or impaired by structures (e.g., buildings, power lines, cell towers, or water towers) or man-made landforms (e.g., earth mounding or scarring or access roads). Areas of pronounced bluff formations were identified here for protection, including areas along the top of the bluff (bluff crest), the face of the bluff, and the base of the bluff (bluff toe).

**1991 County Comprehensive Plan**

The 1991 Comprehensive Plan recognized the “very unstable and highly erosive” characteristics of the loess soils that make up the bluff region of St. Clair County. The plan recommended that development be avoided along the crest and frontal parts of these “highly sloped (greater than 15%) St. Clair County bluffs.” The 1991 Plan also recognized the southwestern bluff region of St. Clair County east of Dupo and the bluff region east of Cahokia and northward as “archeologically important areas.” As a result, the County Land Use Plan designated the bluff region as a Recreation/Conservation area to “focus future land use on recreation uses.”

**Situation Analysis**

The environmental, historic, recreational, and aesthetic values of the Mississippi River bluffs could be lost if they are developed or disturbed. Some County residents and visitors place great value on the County’s natural resources, including the limestone bluffs lining the American Bottoms floodplain. Protecting the bluffs from development or other disturbance would help to preserve these unique qualities that people value. The following topics could be used as a framework to build a solid justification and further support for regulating the bluffs.

- **Environmental Value**—Documenting environmental value includes identifying and mapping vegetation communities and wildlife habitats, and identifying threats to these resources. Special attention should be paid to rare and endangered plant and animal species. Wildlife species often take refuge on undeveloped hillsides near the bluffs, even if it is not their native habitat, because their preferred habitats have been overtaken by development. Wildlife and open space management can be a key component of bluff protection. Possible mechanisms for open space management include creating greenways, wildlife habitat preservation areas, and conservation areas.

- **Historical Value**—The Mississippi River bluffs were formed during a series of glacial advances and retreats. As the glaciers melted, great quantities of water flowed from northern lakes and rivers into the Mississippi River which flowed from bluff to bluff creating the limestone cliffs. The Mighty Mississippi is over 2,350 miles in length; it is the world's second largest drainage basin, encompassing 30 states and two provinces; and it is fifth in the world in terms of water volume. The river bluffs and bottomlands support 45 amphibious and reptile species and 50 mammal species. Forty percent of the nation's migratory waterfowl use the river's corridor for their flyway. The river is vital to the basin's human inhabitants as well. More than 18 million
people rely on the Mississippi for their daily water supply. The river generates over $1.2 billion in revenue annually from upper river recreation.

- **Aesthetic Value**—When citing the aesthetic value for implementing a land protection program, it is important to carefully document the rationale. This would include evaluating the extent and quality of views to and from the bluffs. In addition, it is important to identify any sections of special symbolic value to the community, to survey community values regarding appearance of the bluffs, and to prepare maps and take photographs of significant aesthetic resources. One method for cataloging visual resources is to use the Visual Resource Management strategy developed by the United States Bureau of Land Management (BLM) for use on public lands (BLM Manual H-8410-1). This system analyzes the quality of the view, the sensitivity of the resource, and the impacts that development would have at different distances.

- **Recreational Value**—The bluffs can provide many popular and important recreational opportunities, including hiking, biking, wildlife observation, and more. Consideration of County-wide needs and opportunities for open space recreation should be noted as well as identification of specific possible trail connection and viewpoint locations along the bluffs.

A review of community and County-level protective measures related to steep slopes, ridgelines, and river bluffs found that they are generally considered to be environmental characteristics frequently covered under overlay districts similar to wetland protection, or through a special use permit process. Examples ranged from Wisconsin’s State Statutes, to Minnesota’s County and City overlay districts, to Pennsylvania and South Carolina bluff protection zoning codes and preservation plans.

In all cases, the proposed development needed to be consistent with the intent of the Statute, Zoning Ordinance, or Preservation Plan, and demonstrate that no alternatives were available for the productive use of areas outside of the district, that no practicable alternatives existed, and that all measures were taken to minimize the impact that the activity would have on the district. In addition to regulating steep slopes, ridgelines, and bluffs through zoning, some communities include site-specific performance standards for these sensitive lands in their subdivision and site plan regulations.

One example comes from Lyme, New Hampshire. The Lyme zoning ordinance has both a Steep Slopes Conservation District and a Ridgeline and Hillside Conservation District. The Steep Slopes Conservation District is defined as all areas where there is an elevation change of 20 feet or greater and the average slope is 20 percent (a 5:1 slope where there is 1 foot of elevation change for every 5 feet of distance) or greater. The Ridgeline and Hillside Conservation District is defined as those ridgeline and hillside areas which are visible from public waters or public roads at a distance of a half-mile or more.

“The primary objective of the Ridgeline and Hillside Conservation District is to protect the area’s scenic and rural character by providing that development be carried out so as to be visually unobtrusive to the greatest extent reasonably practicable while permitting the landowner to exercise his property rights.” Permitted uses generally include such uses as forestry and tree farming, agriculture, wildlife refuges, parks and outdoor recreation uses, and conservation areas and nature trails. Uses permitted by special exception are those that will not interfere with or degrade the visual features of the site or adjacent sites which contribute to the scenic character of the area as viewed from public highways or public waters.

Other bluffland preservation initiatives have been directed by either State natural resources departments or not-for-profit organizations. In Minnesota, the Department of Natural Resources assembled 3,000 acres over 30 years to create the Great River Bluffs State Park. In Iowa, the Natural Heritage Foundation collected conservation easement donations and participated in the U.S. Forest Service’s “Forest Legacy” program for purchase of permanent conservation easements. The Blufflands Alliance is a McKnight-
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funded coalition representing organizations in Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. And in southern Illinois, since January of 2006, the Clifftop Alliance in Monroe and Randolph Counties has been securing conservation easements through Federal, State and private funding sources with assistance from the Southwestern Illinois RC&D.

**Recommended Approach**

St. Clair County should treasure and protect the environmental, historic, recreational, and aesthetic values of the Mississippi River bluffs. To do so, several overlapping methods should be employed.

First, the County should designate the blufflands as a protected land under the “O-1” Conservation Overlay Zone of the Zoning Ordinance to limit the type and intensity of development within a designated bluff protection zone. The district would ideally prohibit any defacement of the bluff “face”, the bluff “crest and frontal” (top of the bluff), and the bluff “toe” (bottom of the bluff) areas within 50 to 200 feet. It should also limit the type and intensity of development in the area beyond the frontal area that is tied hydrologically to this area, i.e., surface and subsurface drainage including the Falling Spring water recharge area. Since the bluff protection zone extends into municipalities of the County, municipalities should be encouraged to adopt a similar overlay zoning ordinance.

Second, St. Clair County should use its County Board Property & Recreation Committee and MEPRD sales tax revenue to assist in assembling property or conservation easements in the bluff protection zone. This could include outright purchase of available property, or acquisition of conservation easements through purchase, payment of maintenance and monitoring costs, or donations.

Third, the County should provide the support of the Property & Recreation Committee and MEPRD sales tax revenue to organizing and seed-funding a not-for-profit “Blufflands Alliance”. This would serve to stimulate citizen-based initiatives to purchase property or conservation easements within the designated bluff protection zone and educate the general public on the many values of the blufflands. This effort could be joined with the Monroe and Randolph County Clifftop Alliance, band with the Southwestern Illinois RC&D’s Land Conservancy, or be a freestanding organization.

Lastly, St. Clair County should explore the opportunities for designation and funding of the bluffs area as a Federal or State Park, Nature Preserve, or Natural Area.

**Conclusion**

The limestone bluffs lining the American Bottoms floodplain of the Mississippi River in western St. Clair County are a unique and valuable environmental, historic, recreational, and aesthetic feature of the County. The bluffs should be protected from irreversible physical (and visual) damage. Development along the face, crest and frontal parts of the bluffs should be properly managed through a combination of Federal, State, County and private initiatives. These should include protecting the land under the “O-1” Conservation Overlay Zone of the County Zoning Ordinance and encouraging affected municipalities to adopt a similar ordinance; assisting the State of Illinois and directly in property assembly or conservation easements in the bluff protection zone; providing indirect support to a designated not-for-profit citizens’ bluff preservation organization to purchase property or conservation easements; and exploring opportunities for Federal or State protection of the bluffs.
Karst Topography Protection

Definition

**Karst Topography** refers to the area within the southwest portion of the County that is comprised of a geologic formation associated with limestone bedrock near the earth’s surface that is easily eroded by rainwater infiltration and groundwater movement. The movement erodes the limestone to create underground streams and caverns. In Karst areas, fissures, underground streams, caves, and sinkholes are common—resulting in a pockmarked look to the landscape. Sinkholes are the result of a cave roof collapse, or more often, the collapse of soil over a void in the limestone. Protection of the County’s Karst area will help preserve this rare and fragile landscape and ecosystem as well as minimize loss of property that can result from sinkholes. Karst topography, by its nature, has limiting building conditions but is generally scenic and offers recreational opportunities.

Situation Analysis

The Sinkhole Plain in southwestern Illinois (defined by the watersheds of the major creeks that run through, or “feed”, the Karst topography area) covers approximately 1,200 square miles of Madison, St. Clair, Monroe, and Randolph Counties. Approximately 50 percent of St. Clair County lies within the Sinkhole Region. In St. Clair County, watersheds include the Cahokia Canal, Canteen Creek, Lower Mississippi River, Harding Ditch, Blue Waters Ditch, Prairie du Pont Creek, Richland Creek, and Kaskaskia River drainage basins. Natural habitats in the Sinkhole Plain are most likely to be found in areas of and adjacent to floodplains, bluffs, exposed bedrock, prairies, wooded ravines, rivers, springs, and caves.

There are an estimated 10,000 sinkholes in St. Clair, Monroe, and northern Randolph Counties with 230 sinkholes per square mile recorded in places. Geology has a significant influence on topography, water resources, ecology and land use.

When managed properly, Karst topography provides a number of green infrastructure benefits, including drinking water, groundwater recharge, stormwater storage, open space, animal habitat, and recreation. When ignored, Karst terrain poses a natural hazard that can damage private and public buildings and infrastructure and threaten environmental quality and human health. Urbanization or development and other types of land uses can increase the natural hazard risks associated with Karst by affecting natural geo-hydrologic processes negatively. These activities can result in sinkhole subsidence or surface collapse, sinkhole flooding, groundwater contamination, and damage to specialized biotic communities. In more practical terms, these hazards can include structural damage to both private and public buildings (cracked foundations and walls, building collapse, sinkhole flooding damage); increased maintenance costs for infrastructure (sinkhole collapse in roads, broken underground utilities, pollution of public drinking water sources); pollution of private drinking water sources; and compromised health of residents as the result of unrecognized contaminants in drinking water (e.g., fecal coliform, E.Coli, nitrates, and other pollutants carried in stormwater runoff).

Karst aquifers are particularly susceptible to contamination due to the lack of filtration of water entering the aquifer. Contaminants thrown into sinkholes can flow directly into the aquifer without filtration, exposure to sunlight, or adequate dilution. Groundwater and surface water in these systems often are connected directly. Some common Karst contamination sources include landfills, hazardous waste spills, highway runoff, sinkhole dumps, and agricultural operations. In addition to their extreme vulnerability to contamination, Karst aquifers are extremely difficult if not impossible to remediate.
As mentioned above, human activity and pollution of Karst landscapes can have a detrimental impact on the biological community thriving within Karst areas. There are a variety of fish and wildlife species thriving within sensitive Karst habitats and even the slightest disruptions in the delicate balance of these ecosystems can significantly impact this native biota. Threatened Karst biota include several species of endangered bats, ferns, lichens, and invertebrates native to cave environments.

Nature Preserves and Natural Areas are areas of land or water in public or private ownership that are formally dedicated to receive maximum protection of their significant natural features. Nature Preserves in the Karst area of St. Clair County include the Stemler Cave Woods Preserve (120-acre nature preserve acquired by the Illinois Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) to preserve old growth forest remnants), Stemler Cave (one acre privately-owned preserve in the upland bluff region), and the Pruitt Sinkholes (a privately-owned preserve located east of the Stemler Cave Preserve). Illinois Natural Areas Inventory (INAI) Sites in the St. Clair County portion of the Sinkhole Plain include the Dupo Prairie Natural Area (13 acres), the East St. Louis (Alorton) Heron Colony (2 acres), Falling Spring (797 acres), the Floraville Geological Area Natural Area, the Stemler Cave Natural Area (2,812 acres), the Stemler Cave Woods Natural Area (177 acres), and the Sugar Loaf Hill Prairie Natural Area (53 acres).

Recommended Approach

The vulnerability of the County’s Karst topography requires special consideration and planning to manage effectively. Many of the same tools available for the protection of groundwater and drinking water can be used directly or modified to address the protection of Karst areas. Conservation of the natural and agricultural resources in the Karst area would benefit ecosystem functions, agricultural traditions, as well as mitigate the potential damage to public infrastructure and personal property.

The incorporation of Karst considerations in the Comprehensive Plan is an important step in the effective protection of Karst areas. The Comprehensive Plan addresses the Karst area by first identifying the area for Rural Residential or Agricultural future land use, and secondly by applying a Special Use category overlay designation to the area. This provides an added layer of significance to the importance of ensuring appropriate management of this sensitive landscape.

In addition to the Comprehensive Plan designation, the County should designate the Karst Topography area as a protected land under the “O-1” Conservation Overlay Zone of the Zoning Ordinance to limit the type and intensity of development. The overlay zoning district would establish additional development standards that apply over and above the base zoning. An overlay district is an especially useful tool for the protection of this type of resource because the Karst area has an irregular boundary that makes it hard to match up with underlying zoning districts. A variety of treatments can be used in conjunction with the overlay district, including the following:

- **Designation of Inappropriate Land Uses**: Inappropriate land uses are varied as a result of the specialized nature of this landscape. Development that requires blasting, is intense, or creates excessive weight can result in subsidence or surface failure. Industrial point sources can contaminate this sensitive system directly. Waste lagoons, septic systems, intense animal agriculture, underground storage tanks, and landfills can contaminate Karst aquifers directly and/or upon subsidence or surface failure. Land uses that change the local water table such as well pumping, modification of natural drainage patterns, and inadequate stormwater management can accelerate sinkhole subsidence and increase sinkhole flooding.

- **Karst Feature Buffer** restricts development around a Karst feature (like a sinkhole) by establishing a fixed radius or delineated area around the feature. This strategy helps both to reduce non-point source
pollution by maintaining vegetation and tree cover and to reduce the risk of subsidence and sinkhole flooding. Some communities have established varying buffer requirements based on specific Karst features and the relative hazard risk associated with them.

- **Geotechnical Studies** require more specific information from potential developers relative to Karst topography and a proposed site by identifying surface and subsurface soils, geology, and hydrology. These studies often are conducted in two phases: a preliminary site investigation and a site-specific investigation.

- **Performance Standards** provide flexibility regarding the specific actions to be taken to achieve local goals. For Karst areas, performance measures may include maintaining predevelopment stormwater runoff quantity and quality, stricter effluent standards for septic systems, and protection of wellheads.

The location of public infrastructure often drives development. Communities should be encouraged to develop Capital Improvements Plans to steer development away from sensitive environmental areas, such as the Karst terrain, and toward less sensitive areas. This management tool does not directly prohibit development in the Karst area, but may discourage the type and intensity of development.

Because failing septic systems are an increased hazard in Karst landscapes, enhanced regulation of these systems is appropriate. Typically, enhanced regulations include increased minimum setbacks from sinkholes, increased separation distance between septic system drainage fields and bedrock, mandatory periodic maintenance, and the reservation of an additional drain field.

Public education is critical to the management and protection of these complex and often hidden landscapes. Residents must understand that dumping and certain land use activities can have significant consequences in near and seemingly distant locations. Poor management can result in damage to private property as the result of sinkhole subsidence or flooding.

A conservation strategy for the Karst cave area should reflect the diverse interests of landowners in this area and the unique natural conditions. Because the diverse interests of landowners and natural resource conservation are sometimes conflicting, a variety of strategies would be necessary. These strategies should be intended to reestablish and enhance ecological function, balanced with development realities in St. Clair County. The strategies could address, for example, four distinct opportunities for preservation in the Karst area such as Watershed (recharge area) Conservation Areas, Prairie Grassland/Wetland Conservation Areas, Habitat Connectivity Conservation Areas, and Developed Conservation Areas.

**Conclusion**

The southwest portion of the County is comprised of a geologic formation associated with “soft” limestone bedrock near the earth’s surface known as Karst Topography. The bedrock is easily eroded by rainwater infiltration and groundwater movement creating underground streams and caverns. In Karst areas, sinkholes can result from cave roof collapse or the collapse of soil over a void in the limestone. The County’s Karst area should be protected from inappropriate development to preserve the landscape and ecosystem as well as minimize loss of property resulting from sinkholes.

Methods for managing development of the Karst area include planning for low intensity land use; protecting the land under the “O-1” Conservation Overlay Zone of the County Zoning Ordinance; encouraging municipalities to plan for future infrastructure improvements away from the sensitive Karst area; enhancing septic system regulations; educating the public on the sensitivity of Karst topography; and employing varied conservation strategies within the broad Karst Topography area depending on the unique natural condition and landowner interests.
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Gateway Connector Corridor Protection Plan

Definition

The Gateway Connector “Corridor Protection Plan” was filed by the Illinois Department of Transportation under Illinois State Statute (605 ILCS 5/4-510) giving the authority to declare rights of way for future additions to the State highway system and to declare a corridor in which development is limited and monitored by IDOT. Corridor protection plan maps were filed in St. Clair, Madison, and Monroe Counties in March of 2005. The purpose of this authority is to inform the public and prevent costly and conflicting development of the land involved. In St. Clair County, following a lengthy public planning process, the Gateway Connector was declared an addition to the State highway system and a 400-foot wide corridor established for its protection. Property owners within the protected corridor were not prohibited from using their property, nor were properties “seized” as a result of corridor protection. If and when IDOT needs to acquire any property in the corridor, its value would be determined at the time of purchase by IDOT.

Situation Analysis

The Illinois Route 158 Outer Belt Feasibility Study (1999-2001) determined the need for a new transportation corridor to serve the metro-east. The study examined existing and future transportation demand, land use, and environmental issues in the potential corridor. The Feasibility Study initially looked at a very broad study area that encompassed parts of Madison, St. Clair, and Monroe Counties. After technical and environmental evaluation, and input from stakeholders and the public, the study area was narrowed resulting in a “Recommended Study Corridor.”

Roughly 37 miles long and one to two miles wide, the final study area extended from the I-55/70 - U.S. 40 interchange near Troy in Madison County, south and west through St. Clair County, to I-255 near Columbia in Monroe County. Several conceptual options for connecting to I-55/70 and I-255 were created as well, with the expectation that future studies and design would be responsible for identifying the best location for these connections.

Data evaluated during the Feasibility Study showed that the three counties in the study area could expect to see population and employment increases of up to 25% by 2020 (based on 1996 figures). Traffic volume was projected to increase by at least 25% as well. The data used for the Feasibility Study (and the subsequent Corridor Protection Study) were developed and adopted by the East-West Gateway Council of Governments, the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the St. Louis region. East-West Gateway is vested by the Federal government and the States of Illinois and Missouri with legal authority and responsibility for developing long- and short-range transportation plans for the region.

In light of the Feasibility Study’s findings, IDOT recognized that if growth and development in the region continued at the current pace, the demands placed on existing transportation facilities would intensify. As a result, travel times and congestion would increase, existing facilities would require more maintenance, and, most importantly, the safety of the motoring public would be compromised. This population and traffic growth could be expected to continue well into the future, with or without a new corridor.

IDOT therefore completed the Gateway Connector Corridor Protection Study in 2004 in order to identify a future corridor that could accommodate many different kinds of transportation improvements, protect the corridor now to minimize impacts to people and the environment later on, and to reduce the cost to Illinois residents of improvements or a new facility in the corridor.
The study's traffic projections showed that (if a roadway facility is placed in the corridor) 15,000 to 48,000 vehicles could use the corridor each day. This is not “new” traffic but represents vehicles being "removed" from existing routes, thereby reducing congestion on existing roadways. These projections also showed that most people who would use the corridor would be making local trips rather than motorists traveling straight through the corridor.

The 400-foot wide alternative selected in the study represents a corridor that best meets the future transportation needs of the study area while minimizing impacts to the natural and human environments. The selected corridor was found to have a high degree of engineering feasibility, effectively avoids unique and sensitive resources, and provides the best service to the growing communities. The Corridor Protection Study did not recommend, specify, or rule out any improvements or facility types that could be located within the corridor. Although the corridor's width—400 feet—is wide enough to accommodate a “high type” transportation facility, like a multi-lane limited access roadway, such decisions were not made as a result of the Corridor Protection Study.

Corridor protection does not mean it has already been determined that an entirely new roadway facility is in fact needed. Like the Feasibility Study, the Corridor Protection Study was a long-range transportation planning study to help identify a corridor for future transportation needs in the region. These studies were not conducted to solve immediate problems on area roadways.

**Approach**

The following chart describes the Gateway Connector Planning Process originally initiated in 1999.

The next steps in the process include the Location and Environmental Study, Design and Land Acquisition, and Construction. Each step is estimated to take between 3 and 5 years to complete after completion of the previous step and as funded by the State of Illinois.

Location and Environmental Study (Preliminary Engineering) will include activities such as evaluation of potential environmental impacts and displacements, assessment of deficiencies and strengths of the existing transportation system, conduct of detailed traffic and land use studies, evaluation of a variety of transportation improvement options for the corridor (including revisiting the “No Build” option), recommendation of the appropriate solutions for the corridor and determination of facility type, coordination with communities and the public to identify access needs and issues, and the conduct of a comprehensive public involvement and outreach program.

The study’s findings will be documented in an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), which is mandated by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1967 (NEPA) for Federally-funded projects that could have significant effects on the environment. It is likely that any future construction would require some Federal funding. If the study finds that a new facility would be the best solution for the region, then a corridor will be in place for its use. Such a facility would not necessarily be a multi-lane, limited-access highway. It is possible that, depending on the traffic needs, a different facility type could be used in various locations.
According to IDOT District 8, there are no plans, timetable, or funding in place for any construction of a new regional transportation facility within the corridor. No funding is provided in IDOT’s FY2012-2017 Proposed Highway Improvement Program for preliminary engineering, design or construction. In June of 2010, Senate Bill 1856 was passed by the Senate and House and sent to the Governor that would, if signed into law, require IDOT to hold public hearings to discuss the viability and feasibility of each protected corridor in the State every 10 years. IDOT must give “due consideration to the information obtained at the hearings and abolish the protected corridor(s) if construction of the roadway is no longer feasible”. At a minimum, it could be 10 to 15 years before any construction takes place, assuming further study identifies a new facility to be the best solution to future transportation needs.

Conclusion

The Gateway Connector could represent a significant component of the County’s future transportation system. While it is unclear at this time what the nature of the improvement will be, it is safe to say that it will dramatically impact how residents travel about the County, between their homes, their jobs, shopping and recreation. An alternatives analysis (Location and Environmental Study/Preliminary Engineering) must be completed to determine the final corridor and facility type, followed by a detailed Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). If these studies validate that a new facility is the best transportation solution for the region, and if funding can be secured from Federal and State resources, then design, land acquisition, and construction can commence and a corridor will already be in place for its use. St. Clair County should continue to lobby for this long-range transportation project to provide a County “outer belt” for convenience and commerce.
American Bottoms Levee System

Definition

The American Bottoms of the Mississippi River floodplain is located on the Illinois side of the river running almost the entire length of Madison and St. Clair Counties. The region stretches 174 square miles from Alton, Illinois on the north to the Kaskaskia River on the south and as far across as twelve miles in places. The Bottoms were formed during a series of North American glacial advances and retreats, the last of which was the Wisconsonian ice age. As the glaciers melted, water flowed from northern lakes into the Mississippi, Missouri, and Illinois Rivers. The Mississippi River flowed from bluff to bluff creating the limestone cliffs seen today. During the glacial retreats, before vegetation became reestablished, huge amounts of soil and loess were carried by wind and water and deposited onto the bed of the river. Once the floodwaters from the melting glaciers receded, the Mississippi River retained a fraction of the flow it once had. Now located in a comparatively small channel, the river flows past a massive floodplain consisting of coarse sediment over 100 feet thick and lined with limestone bluffs.

Situation Analysis

The 1991 County Comprehensive Plan termed the American Bottoms the “largest undeveloped area closest to a large urban commercial core in the United States.” The adjoining Mississippi River in St. Clair County represents great potential for extensive national investment and development. The extension of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, MetroLink light rail stations, casino complexes, river terminals, and large-scale commercial/industrial developments from Collinsville to Dupo underwrite the opportunity that exists for economic development in this portion of the County. The American Bottoms is also home to thousands of businesses and residents—representing a large component of the County’s overall tax base and population.

Unfortunately, development within the American Bottoms is not without its difficulties. In the wake of heavy losses of life and property due to Hurricane Katrina, Congress provided added funding to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to review the status of the nation’s flood protection system. The purpose of the review was to ensure that local governments, businesses and residents understood the risk of flooding and that all affected property owners would have access to flood insurance at a reasonable rate.

The American Bottoms has not flooded in the 70 years since the current flood protection system was built, including during the flood of record in 1993, a 300-year event. Despite that fact, in 2007, the USACE indicated that the agency had “reduced confidence” that the levee system could protect against a flood that has a 1% chance of being equaled or exceeded in any single year (commonly referred to as a 100-year flood or a base flood) without floodfighting. Based on this assertion by the USACE, FEMA announced that it would decertify the levee systems in the area.

Previously, a large portion of the American Bottoms was designated a “levee-protected 100-year (1% annual chance) flood area” (Zone X). If FEMA was to issue a set of new flood insurance rate maps (FIRM’s) based on this decertification, the American Bottoms would have been designated a Flood Hazard Area Zone A (no base flood elevations determined), AE (base flood elevations determined) or AH (flood depths of 1 to 3 feet; usually areas of ponding), suggesting that it does not meet the requirements for protection from a 100-year flood. If issued as final maps, this classification would result in significant negative economic impacts. All property owners—residents and businesses—would need to buy flood
insurance to get a mortgage. Potential commercial and industrial developments may choose to locate elsewhere.

Flood control levees and facilities are owned by local levee and drainage districts. The Federal government (i.e., the USACE) currently can fund no more than 65% of improvement costs, when funds are available. So, the responsibility and cost of bringing the system up to at least the 100-year flood protection level would lie at the local (and potentially State) level.

**Approach**

The approach required to both ensure the long-term security of the American Bottoms levee system and minimize the financial impact on existing and future developments in the American Bottoms was two-fold.

First, FEMA was encouraged to delay issuance of new flood zone maps for the Illinois side of the Mississippi River by proceeding on the same review and issuance schedule as the Missouri side of the river. During this grace period, the American Bottoms would carry the new AR zone designation, defined as “Special Flood Hazard Areas formerly protected from the 1% annual chance flood by a flood control system that was subsequently decertified. Zone AR indicates that the former flood control system is being restored to provide protection from the 1% annual chance or greater flood.” This would provide short-term relief to property owners, but still would ultimately require major improvements to the flood protection system.

In 2008, H.R. 3121 (the Flood Insurance Reform and Modernization Act of 2008) was passed by Congress. The most relevant section of the bill, Section 108, prohibited the USACE Director from (1) adjusting the chargeable flood insurance premium rate for any property located in the St. Louis District; or (2) requiring the purchase of flood insurance for property located in the St. Louis District, until flood insurance rate maps for all areas in the St. Louis District of the Mississippi Valley Division of the Corps of Engineers are updated.

In addition, in March of 2011, H.R. 898 was introduced by local legislators and is awaiting the President’s signature. This bill (an amendment to the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968) postpones the adoption of new Flood Insurance Rate Maps by FEMA up to 7 years providing that a local sponsor can credibly demonstrate a good-faith effort to make levee improvements to address deficiencies in flood protection disclosed through a FEMA certification inspection. In order to take advantage of this provision, a local sponsor would need to have a funded plan to make necessary levee improvements, make significant efforts to promote the purchase of flood insurance, adopt a reconnaissance plan to be used during high water events, and develop and adopt an evacuation plan to be used during a catastrophic flood event.

Secondly, to address the funding need at the local level, new State legislation was passed to allow the Illinois Counties of Madison, St. Clair and Monroe to adopt a temporary ¼-cent sales tax to cover the costs of levee system and stormwater management improvements. Funds expended would be subject to up to 65% Federal reimbursement, if and when funds became available.

On May 21, 2008, Public Act 095-0719—the Illinois Flood Prevention District Act was signed into law. The Act provided that a flood prevention district may be created within certain counties of Illinois for the purpose of performing emergency levee repair, flood prevention, and stormwater control; that the affairs of the district shall be managed by a board of 3 commissioners; that the district may issue revenue bonds, impose a retailers' occupation (sales) tax within the territory of the district, and apply the power of
eminent domain; and that two or more County Flood Prevention Districts may enter into an intergovernmental agreement.

The St. Clair County Flood Protection District (FPD), Madison County FPD, and Monroe County FPD all approved resolutions requesting a sales tax for emergency levee repairs and their respective County Boards adopted ordinances levying a ¼-cent sales tax in each County to fund the upgrade and restoration of the “Southwestern Illinois Levee System”. St. Clair County and Madison County would cooperate on improvements to Metro-East Sanitary District facilities that overlap both Counties. Additionally in St. Clair County, improvements would be made to Prairie DuPont Drainage & Levee District facilities. In Monroe County, improvements would be made to the Prairie DuPont Levee (extending 2.4 miles into Monroe County) and the Fish Lake Levee (in Monroe County). The joint effort of the three Counties is being coordinated by the Southwestern Illinois Flood Prevention District Council, formed in July of 2009.

Results

In 2009, FEMA issued preliminary flood insurance rate maps (FIRMs) that showed the American Bottoms as a “Special Flood Hazard Area”. In response to complaints about the accuracy of the maps, FEMA did not make the maps official. FEMA has agreed to revisit the mapping process to recognize the effectiveness of the existing levee systems, but has not announced a timetable for release of the new preliminary maps.

In order to eliminate any uncertainty about the effectiveness of the flood protection system in the American Bottoms, significant investments are being made to improve the levee systems that protect the area. A new revenue source—a ¼-cent sales tax—was authorized, and a new agency created through intergovernmental agreement specifically to undertake levee system improvements. The Southwestern Illinois Flood Prevention District Council recently issued a plan to make about $150 million in improvements to the levee system so that it will meet all applicable regulatory and engineering standards. Those improvements can be financed through the dedicated sales tax and should be in place by late 2014 under the current schedule issued by the Council.

What remains is for the Council to complete improvements to the Mississippi River flood protection system to meet the higher Federally-mandated standards for designation of the American Bottoms as a levee-protected 100-year (1% annual chance) flood area (Zone X) before, or simultaneous with, flood insurance rate maps for all areas in the St. Louis District of the Mississippi Valley Division of the Corps of Engineers being updated. When issued as final maps, this classification would result in relief from flood insurance requirements for property owners in the American Bottoms and a boost to the attraction of new commercial and industrial development. St. Clair County, in cooperation with Madison and Monroe Counties and the State of Illinois, will also need to take steps necessary to secure Federal funding for up to 65% of the costs incurred for levee system improvements.

Conclusion

Floodplain management, stormwater management, and protection of the American Bottoms from flooding are all interrelated elements of managing the County’s hydrologic system for the benefits of human occupation as well as environmental stewardship. Authority and funding for improvements to the American Bottoms levee system have been established and improvements should soon follow. The newly created Southwestern Illinois Flood Protection District (FPD) and retailers' occupation (sales) tax for use in performing emergency levee repair, flood prevention, and stormwater control is an appropriate method to address the County’s levee repair needs. Beyond that, long-term flood prevention and stormwater control in the American Bottoms and throughout St. Clair County will require aggressive pursuit of funding from Federal and State sources.
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Economic Development Strategy

Situation Analysis

The 1991 County Comprehensive Plan emphasized St. Clair County’s link to the Mississippi River through the port districts in suggesting the County would continue to build its strategic position as an international transportation and distribution center. Primary transportation assets included the Melvin Price Lock & Dam to the north, Interstate 255, MetroLink light rail, Scott Joint Use (Scott AFB/MidAmerica St. Louis Airport), and the new Mississippi River Bridge. The Plan also recognized the significant availability of land in the County—adjoining the Mississippi River in East St. Louis and National City (subsequently dissolved as a municipality on March 11, 1998) immediately across from downtown St. Louis, as well as land available to compete for projects with land-depleted St. Louis County. Reference was also made to economic development opportunities from tourism growth, and from the quality of both the work force and the school system.

Long-range assumptions in the 1991 Plan were for the redevelopment of East St. Louis as an extension of downtown St. Louis, redevelopment of the National City Stockyards (now known as the St. Louis National Stockyards), construction of a new Mississippi River Bridge, increased commercial development due to MidAmerica St. Louis Airport, mixed use developments at the I-255 interchanges, and a thriving distribution industry in the County. These influential projects and trends were seen to ensure a sound economic future.

The economic development goal of the Plan was to “ensure a sound, balanced, and diversified economy.” To accomplish this, the Plan’s objectives included attracting river-dependent industrial activity to the Kaskaskia River corridor, recruiting multi-modal transportation/distribution businesses county-wide, encouraging public investment and redevelopment of the American Bottoms, and encouraging development of the Mississippi riverfront.

The Land Use Plan Recommendations of the 1991 Comprehensive Plan identified several key locations for commercial and industrial areas. Commercial land uses at St. Louis Downtown Airport, MidAmerica St. Louis Airport, and East St. Louis (north of the Dr. Martin Luther King Bridge) were recommended for office and flex-distribution uses, while the IL 159/I-64 triangle of Swansea, Fairview Heights, and O’Fallon was viewed as a regional commercial area with additional office uses. Industrial uses were recommended to be located in the National City area, St. Louis Downtown Airport vicinity, Scott Joint Use area, and the Kaskaskia River corridor.

Benchmarking

To help frame opportunities for St. Clair County the team went through a benchmarking exercise, comparing the county to other similar counties in competitive markets, ranging from St. Louis and Kansas City to Omaha, Cincinnati and Louisville. The exercise was based on a set of comparison metrics focusing on the share of regional economic activity located in the specific benchmark county. Metrics included:

- Share of MSA employment and wages in manufacturing and wholesale trade.
- Share of MSA industrial/warehouse inventory and vacancy.
The analysis suggested that the following counties would serve as valuable benchmarks for charting the future growth of St. Clair County. These counties include:

- Jefferson and Franklin Counties in St. Louis
- Pottawattamie County (IA) in Omaha
- Shelby County (KY) and Crittenden County (AR) in Memphis
- Floyd County (IN) in Louisville
- Platte County (MO) in Kansas City
- Kenton County (KY) in Cincinnati

The following chart identifies the comparison metrics for each target county in relation to St. Clair County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark Counties</th>
<th>Pottawattamie Cty, IA</th>
<th>Crittenden Cty, AR</th>
<th>Franklin Cty, MO</th>
<th>Shelby Cty, KY</th>
<th>Floyd Cty, IN</th>
<th>Kenton Cty, KY</th>
<th>Jefferson Cty, MO</th>
<th>Platte Cty, MO</th>
<th>St. Clair Cty, IL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manuf, Transp, Wholes Earnings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuf, Transp, Wholes Emplty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial &amp; Flex RBA-1Q08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average share of employment in industrial sectors (manufacturing, distribution, and transportation) out of total MSA employment for counties similar to St. Clair County is shown more specifically in the next chart. The chart shows that St. Clair currently sustains about 5.5% of MSA industrial employment, comparable to employment in Kenton County, KY, Platte County, MO, and Clermont County, OH. Of these examples, Clermont County, Ohio is notable in that it has taken a leadership role at the county level in applying smart growth principles and intermodal transportation planning for a 200-square mile county for 200,000 residents and 87,000 employees by 2020. The impetus of the plan is to focus future transportation dollars on projects that provide future residents and employees with more transportation options in the county. More information about efforts in Clermont County is available at www.easterncorridor.org.
Looking to the future, the last chart highlights comparison counties which are currently sustaining higher shares of MSA employment in industrial sectors than the benchmark counties. This chart includes counties such as St. Charles in Missouri; Boone County in Kentucky; Clark County in Indiana; and Pottawattamie County in Iowa; which have achieved higher percentage shares of their MSA’s industrial employment base, in the range of 8% to 15%. These counties can be viewed as future benchmarks, or models, for St. Clair County as the county’s economic development success grows in the future.
Current Economic Development Efforts & Strategic Concepts

Today, the key to job creation and economic development in St. Clair County is seen as large, flourishing business and industrial parks catering to the transportation/distribution industry. The County currently has a limited number of large business park sites to accommodate large corporate users, developers, and brokers. The objective of business parks is to provide a large site, with easy highway access, all necessary utilities, and supportive community infrastructure, to attract corporate users and developers who require a fully-prepared and secure location. Within St. Clair County, such large sites are best located along the County’s interstates (I-64 and I-255), adjacent to multi-modal (highway, water, rail) activity centers (Mississippi and Kaskaskia River Ports, American Bottoms rail yards, and St. Louis Downtown and MidAmerica St. Louis Airports), and in targeted redevelopment areas (such as the St. Louis National Stockyards).

Opportunities for a MidAmerica St. Louis Airport business park will take advantage of the benefits of Scott AFB, the proposed new I-64 interchange at Exit 21, and Foreign Trade Zone and Enterprise Zone status. Land adjacent to St. Louis Downtown Airport off I-255 has already been the catalyst for the initial development of the 700-acre Sauget Business Park and the Discovery Business Park is in design at the proposed new I-255 and Imbs Station Road interchange at Exit 9 in Dupo. Other opportunities have been considered related to the East St. Louis Riverfront and the St. Louis National Stockyards near the Mississippi River and along the Kaskaskia River in southeastern St. Clair County.

One of the County’s current economic development focuses is aviation-related development, linked to development of air cargo and passenger service at MidAmerica St. Louis Airport and expansion by defense contractors at Scott Air Force Base. The County is also an evolving hub for regional distribution activities as well. The County owns about 5,250 acres around the airport, a large portion of which is developable. Foreign Trade Zone #31 status exists for 3,500 acres and MidAmerica St. Louis Airport (BLV) is the newest U.S. Port of Entry (Port 4581). Importantly, however, as this land was originally acquired with the use of Federal support, it can only be leased to third parties and not sold. A 100-acre portion of this site is being marketed as the Joint Use Business Park. Several companies, primarily defense contractors related to Scott AFB are reportedly interested. The emergence of the 100-acre business park project is a significant step for the County, which had previously focused on a more limited facilitation role in encouraging County economic development efforts.

St. Clair County has seen a recent surge in development, driven in part by a gradual shift within the St. Louis region from the Missouri to the Illinois side of the Mississippi River. As well, demand for distribution and light industrial use has grown in southwestern Illinois, in part due to access to larger developable sites on the Illinois side of the river as well as growth in regional intermodal traffic.

Looking to the future, the County could benefit from further development of the regional transportation system. Several routes are being discussed, including the Gateway Connector outer belt. The principal benefit of new roads such as the Gateway Connector is to open up access to large sites, making them available for significant business or industrial development and job creation. Though in St. Clair County, development along the Gateway Connector is a long-term proposition given the fairly substantial amount of undeveloped land still available in the I-64 and I-255 corridors. Given that larger close-in sites are increasingly harder to find on the Missouri side of the river, St. Clair County seems well positioned to compete for a share of this evolving market.

In planning for new limited access routes, county planning efforts should focus on zoning policies that discourage parcel subdivision, primarily in areas not yet served by municipal services. From an economic development standpoint, efforts to maintain the integrity of larger parcels will have long term benefits.
The County also should consider strategies for improving connections between residential areas and employment centers. With gas prices on a continued long term growth trend, efforts to link employment centers with public transportation (particularly the MetroLink light rail system), will enhance the competitive position of the County in the future. In the long run, the County’s growth strategy should include further countywide expansion of the MetroLink system.

**Recommended Approach**

A comprehensive economic development strategy for St. Clair County should ideally represent a plan for growth across the residential, commercial and industrial sectors. Growth in the County is integrally linked to the physical, visual, functional, fiscal, and political qualities of its municipalities. Residential and commercial growth is primarily driven by these municipal qualities, as well as the overall development climate. Growth in these sectors will result from a strong national/regional economy and strong local communities operating under sound government practices with an emphasis on infrastructure, education, and quality of life.

Industrial growth (and the associated transportation/distribution sub-sector) is another story. While industrial sector growth is also the result of a business-friendly development climate, it can be positively influenced through a long-term cyclical strategy of preparation, improvement, and marketing. That is, preparing and organizing for economic development (e.g., business financing programs, education and employee training assistance, relationships with public and private sector development allies), improving the product (e.g., assembling land, investing in infrastructure, modifying the regulatory process), and marketing and closing the deal.

St. Clair County is vigorously engaged in each of these three strategic areas. However, the area most relevant to the comprehensive planning process is improvement of the product—public sector investment (or simply leadership) in land, infrastructure, and special projects to stimulate private sector investment and is the subject of the recommended economic development approach.

Throughout the planning process, it has been recognized that the County is comprised of up to six (6) fairly distinct economic sub-areas with their own unique strengths and opportunities for growth. The strength of the County, and its long-term success, has been in this diversity. One common economic development strength/opportunity lies in the transportation and distribution industry. A strategic economic development approach that “seeds”, or invests, in transportation/distribution drivers of future growth within each of the County’s sub-areas would provide both local and County-wide benefits. These drivers should be “visionary” projects that create jobs and make the County a magnet for opportunity-seekers. This approach would continue to target, yet diversify, opportunities for future growth.

Following are the County’s economic sub-areas and potential investment drivers:

- **North American Bottoms**—Transportation/distribution investment opportunities in the East St. Louis/Centreville area along the County’s north riverfront include completion of the New Mississippi River Bridge and an approach system that supports commercial/industrial development, infrastructure improvements needed at the St. Louis National Stockyards, transportation/distribution-related developments in East St. Louis and along the Mississippi riverfront, and pursuit of an intermodal passenger station linking highways, light rail and bus transit, and high-speed rail service.

- **South American Bottoms**—Transportation/distribution opportunities in the Sauget/Dupo area in southwest St. Clair County include Interstate 255-related development (such as the new interchange at Imbs Station Road in Dupo and associated Discovery Business Park),
infrastructure improvements at the Sauget Business Park, continued enhancements at St. Louis Downtown Airport, and intermodal rail yard expansion. A travel-related industry would be expansion of the river bluffs/Karst topography/French heritage tourism business. The I-255 corridor should continue to be attractive to large St. Louis-based corporations, including the auto assembly industry. However, based on interviews conducted as part of the comprehensive planning process, the success of large developments along I-255 in the American Bottoms will require not only improving the sites, but also in improving the “attractiveness” of the communities for investment. This would include the perceived political environment, reliability and cost of utility service, flood protection measures, the effective property tax rate after incentives, and the availability of convenience retail, food, and personal services.

- **West Development Corridor**—The West Development Corridor comprised of Caseyville, Fairview Heights, and Belleville extends along I-64 and IL 161 from I-255 on the west to O’Fallon on the east. This area has traditionally served as the County’s center for regional retail, office headquarters, and industrial park development (primarily the Belle-Valley Industrial Park in Belleville). This designation is changing as retail and office continues to move eastward along the I-64 corridor and larger industrial parks are developed along I-255 to the west and around the County’s two airports. From a transportation/distribution standpoint, this area should continue to be attractive for regional retail and office use. Land for the scale of industrial/distribution use that should be pursued is limited to the I-64/I-255 interchange in the American Bottoms. Related to the transportation industry is the investment potential for large-scale transit oriented/mixed use development (TOD) associated with the many MetroLink light rail stations within this area.

- **East Development Corridor**—The O’Fallon/Shiloh/MidAmerica St. Louis Airport corridor extending along I-64 from Fairview Heights to the Clinton County line provides great opportunities for the assemblage of land and development of the transportation-related industry. Key assets within the area include Scott Air Force Base (the military’s worldwide logistics management hub), MidAmerica St. Louis Airport and associated Foreign Trade Zone and U.S. Port of Entry, business parks planned both north and south of the proposed new I-64 Exit 21 interchange and the IL 4 corridor, and the land and quality of communities necessary to support opportunities for large-scale, mixed-use master planned developments.

- **North Kaskaskia**—This emerging area of rapidly expanding communities in south-central St. Clair County consists of Millstadt, Smithton and Freeburg. The current driver of growth in this area is the movement from larger community to smaller community within the County and region. The primary driver in the future could be the opportunities presented after completion of the Gateway Connector, or outer belt. This new corridor connecting the St. Louis region’s I-55/70 on the northeast with I-255/I-270 on the southwest allows for a much more efficient movement of people and goods through and within the County, as well as opening up large tracts of undivided land for potential development. The access nodes at intersections along the Gateway Connector corridor should be protected from premature subdivision to support the County’s and communities’ grander vision for economic development.

- **South Kaskaskia**—The southern-most portion of the County is also the most rural area, dominated by agriculture and the Kaskaskia River. The transportation/distribution driver in this area is the Kaskaskia River, with its associated Kaskaskia Regional Port District and tourism/recreation opportunities. Continued “seeding” of this unique asset will help the County “ensure a sound, balanced, and diversified economy.”
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Supplemental Approaches

There is an array of economic development strategy approaches that cities, counties, and states have followed to encourage economic development. For St. Clair County, where the majority of economic development efforts are focused at the municipal level, the county has the potential to help shape policy in several areas, all of which tend to have multi-jurisdictional implications:

- **Transportation reinvestment**, covering everything from roads, rail, and airports to bicycles and trail systems. Governments are also paying more attention to creating linkages between employment centers, using transit oriented development for example.
- **Communications infrastructure reinvestment**, including new wireless access opportunities.
- **Focused business retention strategies**. Most governments focus on the attraction of new businesses and pay less attention to the expansion needs of existing businesses. This choice is significant, in that about 75% of job creation and business investment is generated by existing businesses that expand, rather than new businesses.
- **Targeted industrial clustering strategies**, including such areas as biotech, biomedical, health care, and agricultural research.
- **Industrial, office, service, and retail business incubation** to support job growth and new business development.
- **Expanded educational infrastructure**, including growing workforce development roles for universities & community colleges, expanded educational clusters, and strategies to commercialize university R&D, and create linkages with sources of venture capital.

Conclusion

An economic development strategy for St. Clair County should include preparing and organizing for economic development, improving the support infrastructure and facilities, and targeted marketing and recruiting. St. Clair County’s Economic Development Department, with the support of the County Board and numerous affiliated economic development organizations throughout the region, provides a focused organizational framework to implement the County’s economic development strategy. To improve the product, a strategic approach should be taken to invest in “seed projects” in transportation/distribution drivers within each of the County’s sub-areas to continue to target, yet diversify, opportunities for growth. And finally, marketing should stay focused on recruiting industries that utilize and enhance multi-modal transportation opportunities and available land and facilities.
Affordable/Workforce Housing Strategy

Definition

In a recent report on Affordable Housing for the Region’s Workforce, Focus St. Louis defined “affordable workforce housing” as costing no more than 30% of family income located within a reasonable commuting distance from employment. They summarized that a diverse housing market enables employed people to change homes, not communities. The Urban Land Institute (ULI) definition further expanded on this by describing “affordable/workforce housing” as single or multi-family housing where monthly mortgage or rental payments don’t exceed 75% of a 30% housing expense factor that includes principal, interest, taxes, insurance, and utilities.

Situation Analysis

To put this definition into perspective for St. Clair County, the Median Household Income in the County was $46,643 in 2006 (http://www.co.st-clair.il.us). Per the ULI definition, 75% of 30% of Monthly Household Income would equate to an $875 monthly mortgage or rental payment. Doing the math, this would support a monthly rental cost of $875 or a 30-year fixed rate mortgage at 6% of $150,000. If the goal is to provide affordable housing for low-to-moderate income families making 80% or less of the Median Household Income (also known as Area Median Income, or AMI) in St. Clair County, at 80% this would support a maximum monthly rental cost of $612.50 or a 30-year fixed rate mortgage at 6% of $105,000; and at 50% this would support a maximum monthly rental cost of $437.50 or a 30-year fixed rate mortgage at 6% of $75,000.

In order to provide this type of local housing opportunity, two primary options exist: government subsidized housing programs to increase working families’ access to homeownership or lower-cost housing options. In St. Clair County, an affordable housing strategy should encompass both of these options, plus the evaluation of a host of secondary public/private tools for expanding the availability of affordable/workforce housing.

Affordable Housing Goals

- Provide for a full range of housing choices for all income groups, families of various sizes, seniors, and persons with special challenges.

- Preserve the existing municipal housing stock through housing rehabilitation resources to maintain the affordable housing that already exists in the County’s communities.

- Create model ordinances, policies, and programs in partnership with municipalities that encourage expanding housing opportunities for low- and moderate-income persons.

- Support the affordable housing activities of other entities within the County, including construction of affordable housing units, rehabilitation of existing housing, homeownership training, and marketing of assistance programs.

- Encourage the location of higher density housing within walking and convenient commuting distance of employment, shopping, and other activities, or within a short walk of a bus or light rail transit stop, through "mixed use" developments, residences on the upper floors of nonresidential downtown buildings, and other strategies.
• Partner with municipalities in the renewal of neighborhoods suffering from physical deterioration or from the inequitable distribution of public resources in the past.

Affordable Housing Approaches

The following strategies could be used to implement the Affordable Housing Goals. The strategies are the foundation of affordable/workforce housing programs found throughout the country in counties and communities, and a selection of these could be developed in St. Clair County through policies, ordinances, procedures, and programs.

• Inclusionary Zoning

Sometimes referred to as "fair share housing" or "inclusionary zoning," the intent is to encourage or require the construction of housing within the means of moderate-income families through government regulation, through incentives, or both. Two major benefits of this strategy are that housing is constructed by private developers and is scattered throughout the community, as opposed to being concentrated in a single area. Equity is achieved by requiring such housing be included in all but the smallest developments. Usually such ordinances require that housing be affordable (payments = 30% or less of a moderate monthly income) for a period of years (these range from 5 to 30 years).

The version popular among the high-growth, high-income municipalities around Washington, DC, mandates 15% of units of subdivisions of fifty or more units must be "modestly-priced" and within the reach of moderate-income families, as determined by the local housing agency. Developers of such subdivisions, as compensation for providing a public service, are allowed to develop at a higher density and thus recoup through the additional sales any profit lost by not being allowed to build only "market rate" housing.

• Fast Track Development Review

Reduce the time involved in approving a subdivision or site plan for projects that are bona fide affordable housing projects. These projects will be "first in line" for expedited staff approval. Although this tool doesn't contain clear, easy-to-calculate cost savings that translate into less-costly houses, it does at least make building affordable houses more attractive as a land development option since the adage that "time is money" is applicable to the field of residential construction. Any measures that will reduce approval time will be a type of non-cash public incentive for low-cost housing.

• Development Fee Reimbursement

Seek opportunities for eliminating or reducing development fees as a "carrot" for housing developers to encourage them to build lower cost housing and to reduce the cost of housing by passing the savings on to the buyers or renters. In some states, cities can waive the fees, in others—such as North Carolina—cities collect then reimburse after compliance is determined. The fees related to residential development include may include school, park, and traffic impact fees, water and sewer tap fees, and building permit fees.
• New Forms of Higher Density Housing

Land cost and building size contribute significantly to the sales price or rental rate of housing units. Therefore, the construction of less land intensive housing (including apartments) as well as smaller units with modest amenities should be evaluated and encouraged when appropriate. In many circumstances a given development site can absorb higher density housing while providing a quality living environment. Also, the current housing stock itself can be a resource for new housing through greater use of accessory apartments and other such strategies. Since County and municipal zoning ordinances regulate the density of housing development, appropriate amendments to these ordinances would be required.

• Land Purchase and Re-sale

Investigate options for acquiring land through purchase or donation as a contribution to affordable housing development in the County. Of the many variables that determine the cost of a house (land, labor, materials, fees), land price is a variable that can be radically different from one community to another. Materials and labor can be imported from less-costly neighboring communities but land is subject to the host community's (or County’s) market forces driven by relative scarcity, quality of life, and other factors that contribute ultimately to what a given building site costs the developer and eventually the consumer. Land acquisition enables a community or the County to exercise control over the land component of housing costs and either "write down" (meaning selling it for less than the cost of acquisition) the cost to a nonprofit or other affordable housing developer, or sell the land directly to low- and moderate-income homebuyers. The acquisition amount "forgiven," or not reclaimed in the property transfer, can be adjusted depending on the financial needs of the project or the homebuyer. Sometimes a land trust or other nonprofit intermediary is established to operate the program.

• Banking Partnerships

Investigate the feasibility of working with local financial institutions to further promote affordable housing through low-interest lending, outreach to low- and moderate-income residents and workers in the County, homeownership training, and other activities. Such partnerships build on the expertise of the banking community and provide additional private housing resources.

• Financial Assistance to Affordable Housing Developers

Seek opportunities for participating financially in affordable housing construction projects. Funds from municipal, County, State, and federal governments could be made available in varying degrees based on the proportion of housing to be made available to moderate income persons and households, the financial needs of the project for local assistance, the existence of clear evidence of affordability, and other factors.

• Down Payment Assistance/Closing Costs/Second Mortgages

Develop financial aid programs in coordination with municipalities, the State, and the private sector that include down payment, closing costs, and second mortgages to supplement other resources. Usually all of these tools are offered together in a "first time home buyer" program funded by HUD under its Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnership (HOME) programs. St. Clair County operates the CDBG and HOME programs for the entire County except for the City of East St. Louis.
St. Clair County has administered a Homebuyer Assistance Program since 1996, providing 50% of the down payment (up to a maximum of $2,500) and closing costs to a total maximum of $4,000 for households making 80% or less of the Area Median Income (AMI) or up to $5,000 for households making 50% or less of AMI. The County also administers a New Construction (Affordable Housing Development) program providing a subsidy toward affordable housing, (either for-sale or rental) to foster homeownership and also to assist in providing affordable housing for very low income households.

- **Employee Homeownership Programs**

Many units of government and private companies provide financial resources (low interest loans, matching grants, etc.) to enable their workers to purchase a home as an employee benefit. The County could adopt this program and encourage other major employers to offer such assistance.

- **Homeownership Education**

Virtually all of the major counties and cities that administer federally funded housing programs include homeownership education, either through their own staff or through nonprofit groups. These programs usually charge a nominal fee or are free and seek to familiarize moderate-income persons with lending requirements, home budgeting principles, special mortgage lending programs, and public resources available to income-eligible households. The County should encourage, facilitate, and sponsor training programs for successful home buying.

St. Clair County requires each homebuyer in a County affordable housing program (Homebuyers Assistance or New Construction) to take housing counseling classes (obtain a certificate of completion) from a qualified HUD certified housing counseling agency, selected by the County. The buyer pays a nominal fee for the cost of the class. The County pays most of the cost.

- **Infrastructure Support**

The County’s CDBG and HOME programs provide infrastructure assistance to income-eligible areas in communities within the County. The County should work with communities to leverage its investments with additional local investments in infrastructure to support the construction of new affordable housing while reducing development costs. Improvements should target water, sewer, drainage, and street improvements necessary to support the affordable housing development, both on- and off-site.

- **Housing Rehabilitation**

The existing, older housing stock in communities throughout the County holds great value in meeting the needs for affordable/workforce housing. Some of this housing stock requires assistance for needed repairs. The County should seek to increase the use of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) resources through distributions to in-need communities, as well as possibly directly from its own resources, for the rehabilitation of houses occupied (or to be occupied) by low or moderate income families. By this strategy, the County would increase its supply of decent, affordable housing by investing in existing units that are still viable for long term habitation.

St. Clair County provides Single-Family Housing Moderate Rehabilitation grants (using Community Development Block Grant or HOME Investment Partnerships Grant Funds) to households making 50% or less AMI, up to a maximum of $15,000 for architectural work (addressing major systems) and
up to an additional $8,000 for lead-based paint hazard control work. In addition, the County administers a revolving loan program for households making between 50% and 80% AMI for Single-Family Housing Moderate Rehabilitation, up to a maximum of $24,000 for 10 years at 2.5% interest. Emergency Housing Repair Grants up to $5,000 are available for single-family owner-occupied households addressing emergency housing system repairs.

The County also administers a HUD Lead Hazard Control grant to address only lead-based paint hazards in housing for households making 80% or less AMI, offering grants up to $15,000 maximum to make housing units lead safe. The County administers a Home Modification grant from IHDA, for disabled and elderly person at or below 50% AMI to address home accessibility up to a maximum of $15,000 per house, using CDBG funds to match IHDA Housing Trust Fund (HTF). And finally, the County administers the Illinois Housing Weatherization Assistance Program, providing federal and state funds to perform weatherization (furnace repair/replacement, water heater repair, and heat-loss measures using blower-door technology to identify leaks) on households at or below 150% of poverty income.

Conclusion

The ultimate objective of affordable/workforce housing is to enable families to live in decent homes within a reasonable commuting distance from employment opportunities. Across the St. Louis region and throughout the County, the cost of housing varies widely, primarily based on land prices and local ordinances and public sentiment regulating lot sizes and housing styles. Housing affordability is thereby subject to many tangible and intangible factors that contribute to what building a housing unit costs the developer and eventually the consumer.

An evaluation of affordable housing goals from throughout the U.S. generally include providing a full range of housing choices for all income groups; preserving the existing municipal housing stock; creating ordinances, policies, and programs that encourage expanding housing opportunities for low- and moderate-income persons; supporting other public and private entities’ affordable housing activities; encouraging the location of higher density housing within walking and convenient commuting distance of employment, shopping, or transit stops; and partnering with municipalities in the renewal of neighborhoods suffering from physical deterioration. St. Clair County’s Intergovernmental Grants Department provides a broad range of successful, federally-funded affordable/workforce housing programs. In order to address the goals of affordable/workforce housing for St. Clair County, additional public/private approaches and tools need to be evaluated and the best ones implemented.

Sources: Affordable Housing for the Region’s Workforce, FOCUS St. Louis; UrbanLand, the Urban Land Institute; Dane County, Wisconsin Comprehensive Plan; Town of Cary, North Carolina Comprehensive Plan/Affordable Housing Plan.
Appendix: Public Involvement

Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee

The St. Clair County Board’s Economic Development Committee served as the Project Steering Committee for the development of the Comprehensive Plan. This group, along with County Staff, was responsible for representing the County in working-level meetings with the planning consultant, Woolpert, Inc., on the Plan and assisting in the following manner:

- Reviewing and providing comments on the draft Plan
- Identifying strategies for raising public awareness of the project
- Disseminating information about the project to the public
- Keeping informed on public sentiment concerning Comprehensive Plan issues

Steering Committee Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chairman:</th>
<th>Rick Vernier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Members:</td>
<td>June Chartrand, Ed Cockrell, Marty Crawford, Ken Easterly, and Claire Prindable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

St. Clair County Staff Participants

Woolpert, Inc., worked closely with St. Clair County Staff on the Comprehensive Plan. In addition to technical reviews of draft Plans, County Staff assistance included:

- Setting Up and Facilitating Steering Committee Meetings
- Collecting and Providing Existing Studies
- Scheduling and Assisting at Public Meetings
- Distributing draft Plans to the Committee and Assembling Committee Comments on the Plan

Staff Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Development Department:</th>
<th>Terry Beach, Director; Janice Kerin; Dorothy Carlisle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Zoning Department:</td>
<td>Mike Mitchell, Director; Anne Markezich</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issues & Opportunities

In October of 2007, an initial meeting was held with members of the Steering Committee and County Staff to clarify the scope of the project, discuss an overview of the comprehensive planning process, and review the project schedule. Major challenges and opportunities facing the County were discussed during this meeting to provide a background for further interviews and data collection.

Economic Development

- Target Industries
- Recent Regional Development Trends
• St. Louis Relationships/Business Spin-Offs (e.g., auto parts manufacturers that need to be 30 minutes from assembly plants)
• County Enterprise Zones (5) and potential expansions (MidAmerica St. Louis Airport and Discovery Business Park)

Airport, Business Park & Riverfront Development
• MidAmerica St. Louis Airport
  o Joint Use Business Park
  o Scott AFB/MidAmerica St. Louis Airport Joint Land Use Study (JLUS)
  o I-64 Exit 21 New Interchange at Rieder Road, O’Fallon
  o Foreign Trade Zone Status
• Discovery Business Park
  o I-255 Exit 9 New Interchange at Imbs Station Road, Dupo
  o Commercial/Industrial Tax Base for the County’s future
• St. Louis Downtown Airport
  o Midcoast Aviation Growth
  o Sauget Business Park
  o Martin AirPark (proposed)
• East St. Louis Riverfront
• St. Louis National Stockyards

Transportation Corridors
• New Mississippi River Bridge Corridor
• New Gateway Connector (Illinois 158 Outerbelt)
• Ill. 3, Ill. 15 & Frank Scott Parkway corridors
• MetroLink & Station Areas (Metro & St. Clair County Transit District)
• Interchange Development (nodal)

Limiting Natural Conditions
• Hazardous Waste Sites
• Landfills (active and closed)
• Surface & Subsurface Mining (coal mines and rock quarries)
• Wetlands, Flood-Prone Areas, and Surface Drainage
• Karst Topography & Bluff Protection
• Slopes & Erosive Soils, Endangered & Threatened Species, Historic & Archeological Sites, and Prime Farmland

Storm Water Management
• County-wide Plan by watershed
• Pending Decertification of the American Bottoms Levee System by the USACE as a levee-protected 100-year floodplain
• COE American Bottoms Ecosystem Restoration Project (to manage surface runoff from above the bluff)
• Floodplain Management: Levee Districts, Drainage Districts & FEMA

Outdoor Recreation, Greenspace & Heritage Preservation
• Federal, State & County Parks & Trails
• Metro East Park & Recreation District (MEPRD) Funding and Development Program
• New Athens Wildlife Refuge
Zoning Ordinance/Re-Zoning Process
- Zoning Subcommittee of the Economic Development Committee
- Review zoning process, history of zoning and variance decisions, issues/trends with previous requests/decisions
- Revisit 40-acre Rule
- Municipal subdivisions’ impacts on County Roads (e.g., Jefferson Road)

Multi-Modal Development Assets & Locational Factors
- Interstate Highway System
- Public Transportation/MetroLink
- Railroad System
- Aviation Facilities
- River Navigation & Marine Facilities

Waste Management
- Requirements for Expansions and New Sitings of Landfills

Population/Economy
- Population and economic gains isolated above the bluffs, resulting in numerous growth issues
- Population and economic losses isolated in the American Bottoms, resulting in numerous decline/decay issues
- Tax base more reliant on retailing as industrial businesses declined

Numerous State Legislative and Regional Authorities overlapping within County
- Port Districts—Tri-City, Southwest, and Kaskaskia
- Levee Districts
- Leadership Council of Southwestern Illinois
- Southwestern Illinois Development Authority (SWIDA)
- The Tourism Bureau of Southwestern Illinois
- East-West Gateway Council of Governments (EWGCOG)
- St. Louis Regional Chamber & Growth Association (RCGA)
Key-Person Interviews

In addition to the Board Chairman, Steering Committee members, and County Department Staff, the planning team conducted several one-on-one interviews with County stakeholders in order to gain an understanding of the varying perspectives surrounding St. Clair County’s key planning issues. A summary of interview comments is provided below.

- Ed Weilbacher, Southwestern Illinois RC&D
- Jerry Rombach, Homebuilders Association of Southwest Illinois
- Tim Garvey, Southern Illinois Builders Association
- Tom Jett, St. Clair County Farm Bureau
- Wayne Barber, BarberMurphy Real Estate
- Pat McKeehan, Leadership Council Southwestern Illinois

Summary Interview Comments

Economic Development

- Industrial Development
  - Industrial/Office-Warehouse/Distribution is being attracted because of the people who were servicing the Residential Construction business. There are 10 small deals for every 1 large deal in commercial real estate.
  - Warehouse/Distribution is the old target. Focusing more on Office use, e.g. Red Cross, and IT/Back Office opportunities.
  - University & SWIC access on-campus and off-site for research and workforce: e.g., ExpressScripts@UMSL, Airport, MetroLink.
  - Focus more on benefiting from Scott AFB.
  - Transportation/Distribution/Logistics—Trucking Companies, large retailer warehouses, International Air Cargo, Call Center/back office service centers, Auto Parts subs for Chrysler and Ford plants.
  - Private development is healthy; strong growth pockets in O’Fallon/Shiloh and Edwardsville/Glen Carbon; Industrial development healthy.
  - Communities should work with what they have and the perception that they have and focus on what they can reasonably attract to create a Tax Base.
  - Office/Warehouse use does generate sales tax, not just Retail.
  - Brokers need more products to sell than developers are currently providing. Need to increase the supply.

- Comparisons of St. Clair County to Madison County and St. Louis
  - St. Clair County advantages over St. Louis include available land at more reasonable cost, closer proximity to St. Louis core business district, and spin-offs from St. Louis large industries, e.g., auto parts.
  - Similar qualities as Madison County, without the heavy industry. I-64 is more successful than the I-55 Corridor commercially. Along I-255, there are more attractive communities in Madison County than in St. Clair County.
  - Infrastructure-wise, better laid out than St. Charles County with highways and rivers.
  - Quality-of-life/families in smaller towns outside the core are very attractive for residents.
  - Available land for development.
  - Stigma of American Bottoms impacts whole County image.
  - Limited number of businesses that draw their business from outside the Region: Petroleum, Steel, SAFB, Sauget businesses. Being tied to the economy of St. Louis limits the County’s
ability to grow. Need to break through with externally-driven companies (non-
retail/service).
  - No difference in geopolitics between Counties, particular location is the driver.
  - Incorporated communities are more attractive than the unincorporated County due to utility
    service.
  - Dupo has zoning and infrastructure, and is aggressive for their type of development.
  - Address of political jurisdiction makes a difference, e.g., Collinsville vs. Pontoon Beach or
    Fairview Heights vs. Caseyville.
  - Tax Rate in the Bottoms communities along I-255 is too high.

- Courts & Costs
  - Workers Compensation and Unemployment Insurance costs are not the stated issues that
    they used to be; maybe unstated, not realizing full potential; Product Liability is not a large
    issue either. Court settlements are not an issue that is fought anymore. Perceptions of
    Madison and St. Clair court systems have subsided and improvements made.

- Organized Labor
  - Major perception issue with unions was with “difficulties” of organized labor in shops. It is
    not a big deal inside the shops anymore. Gateway Commerce Center businesses are 90%
    non-union. Those who look beyond the “label” of union find out it’s not a concern. Unions
    are prevalent on the construction side and can create some minor increases in initial cost.

- Tourism Industry Potential
  - Wine Trails Tour; Historic Lebanon; Small Town Trail Tour; Plan to retain history and
    character. Madison County Bike Trails attract visitors and residents to trail communities.
  - Cahokia Mounds, Raceway, Fairmount, Soccer Park, SAFB Heritage Park—Drivers with
    more spin-off potential.
  - Belleville “Art on the Square” could lead to Artists lofts/district in downtown; spread
    throughout the community (ref. Paducah).

- Green Building Methods/Low Impact Development/Conservation Development/Sustainable
  Communities
  - Start with County to “Set the Standard” through Comp. Plan, ordinances, flexibility, and
    incentives.
  - Elements to include: sodium soils conservation, natural resource areas conservation, karst
    topography conservation, cluster development, density bonuses, tap fee reductions,
    stormwater impact reductions.
  - Local ordinances should be flexible to allow New Urbanism/Green building.
  - See: I-55 Corridor Plan communities (Glen Carbon, Troy, Hamel, etc.) that are collectively
    discussing ordinance changes.
  - See: O’Fallon ordinances for Tree/Wildlife Corridor Preservation and Riparian Corridor
    Preservation.

- Impact Fees
  - O’Fallon has impact fees for Parks & Open Space; preparing to enact for Bike Trails.
    Existing ordinance has potential to add other public services, e.g., stormwater, fire, library.
  - O’Fallon Schools initiated school impact fee process in O’Fallon and Shiloh, but needed
    City approval. O’Fallon adopted ordinance subject to Shiloh and Fairview Heights
    approval, but both of them declined, so no school impact fee.
  - Cash in lieu of land for parkland is similar to impact fee.
  - Pre-annexation agreements are another way cities impose restrictions in lieu of impact fees
    on developers, e.g., % brick, minimum SF, greenspace.
  - Decisions made by cities on imposing additional development costs is weighed against
    whether they think they are growing fast enough or slow enough. In good times, the cost
    difference is no big deal.
Costs/profits of infrastructure to serve new development is being used to pay to improve deteriorating systems throughout the community.
Some opposed to impact fees; support responsible growth, expanded infrastructure investment, market-priced development.

- **City/County Relationship**
  - Cities should assume 1.5-mile jurisdiction for roads and stormwater.
  - Need to improve coordination of Building Code between cities and County.
  - Finalize and adopt County Stormwater Plan.

- **Riverfront Development**
  - Should have a residential component (See: Pittsburgh, Chattanooga).

- **Water/Sewer Infrastructure**
  - Aging infrastructure; expensive solutions for certain areas like Belleville and E. St. Louis.

### Business Park Development

- For Illinois businesses that don’t want to be in the Bottoms, St. Clair County does not have developed commercial/industrial lots above the bluffs. Some businesses won’t go below the hill.
- Belle-Valley Phase III—needs money for infrastructure to expand.
- O’Fallon Commerce Park—needs a plan to develop land.
- MidAmerica St. Louis Airport—Midwest businesses don’t generally accept “leased land” deals.
- I-255/Bottoms attracts those wanting to serve the St. Louis and National markets.
- Small towns need to do more with larger lot development; but issue is they are too far to attract businesses other than locals.
- O’Fallon is great location—access, location on Interstate, address.
- Discovery Business Park in Dupo is a good opportunity.
- St. Louis National Stockyards is within Fairmont City on the south end (Old Stockyards) and Madison County on the north end (greenfield site).
- County Funding of Infrastructure: Road to serve Fresh Warehouse funded with 50/50 IDOT Grant.
- Sauget Industrial Park: Balke-Brown & Clayco constructing up to 800,000 SF spec. “255 Logistics Center”.

### Transportation Corridors

- **New Mississippi River Bridge**
- **Gateway Connector**
  - Use I-55 Corridor Plan with heavy public input as “model” approach.
  - Ill. 3 by-pass in Waterloo was bad “model”; IDOT-heavy design has limited access which is good for transportation but bad for development.
- **Illinois Capital Program Transportation Improvements**
  - Greenmount Road and Frank Scott Parkway both need to be 4 lanes.
  - I-64 needs lane additions all the way to MidAmerica St. Louis Airport.
  - Improve Ill. 13 south to Carbondale.
  - FAP 413/US 50 needs smoother connection between O’Fallon and east of Lebanon (eliminate need for 4-way stop in Lebanon).

### Karst Topography & Bluff Protection

- Bluff Preservation—Work with the Clifftop Alliance for preservation of bluffline; mostly active in Monroe and Randolph Counties now.
American Bottoms Levee & Floodplain Management

- Levees Decertification
  - Developers take it seriously. Big problem today in Industrial real estate. Unknown what the development costs will be combining Federal Flood Insurance costs and Building Pad elevation. REITS not even considering investments until the cloud of uncertainty is lifted.
  - Perception is that there will be a “gap” in levee certification by the Corps. If there will not be a gap, then Counties need to educate the real estate community on what will actually happen.
  - Long-term solution could include a “regional” levee district.
  - Resolution to Levee issue will allow area to “Grow the Pie”.

Outdoor Recreation, Greenspace & Heritage Preservation

- Farmland Preservation
  - Is the 40-Acre rule enough to preserve farmland?
  - See “Agricultural Areas Act” (Illinois Statutes).
  - NRCS/SWCD Conservation Reserve Program provides good incentive for preservation.
  - County is technologically advanced in farming.
  - See list of “Impaired Streams” in the County based on the impact of farm run-off on water quality of streams.

- Conservation Easements
  - Should this be funded through a County-level tax authority? Several States have passed authorizing Legislation. Provides a checks-and-balance for stewardship of land vs. just County Board oversight.
  - The County “message” as green is enhanced by a Conservation Easement program.
  - Private Conservation Easements can hold land for future County purchase at residual value.

- Regional Trail System
  - Need Body to oversee “regional” trails, etc., other than a local jurisdiction. Appoint/hire a County Point Person. Take the lead in building trails, not just planning for them. Apply for Grants. Sponsor a “Trails Summit” for municipalities.
  - Consider a County Park Department.
  - Amend the County Zoning Ordinance to include corridor “protection” for future trails.
  - Focus on Scenic Vistas, Trails, Heritage Preservation; not just Active Recreation; apply for Scenic Byway grants.
  - Kaskaskia River Corridor (State-Owned Area)—In the Fayetteville to New Athens Corridor, the State prohibited horses. Be inclusive of horses in lesser used corridors. Create a 30-50 Mile Loop.
  - Old Rail Corridors—MCT has taken over all corridors. SCCTD or the County should be aggressive in taking over old rail corridors in St. Clair County.
  - Rails-to-Trails preferred over developer exactions for trails by County or cities.

- Natural Resource Protection
  - INAI Sites—Preserve identified sites, e.g., Hill Prairie, Stemler Cave.
  - Sodium Soil in western St. Clair Co. may have impact on homebuilding locations and costs.

- WRDA—Passed by Congress (See also: MARC 2000/Waterways Council websites for Upper Mississippi River and Illinois River).

- Associated Organizations—MEGA, MEPRD, Greenspace Foundation, Ecosystem Partnership, and Confluence Greenway—Seeking National Heritage Designation for Madison & St. Clair Counties in Illinois, and St. Louis City & County in Missouri.
Community Meetings

The planning process involved meeting with municipal representatives to discuss the formulation of the County Comprehensive Plan. These meetings were small working group meetings with the municipalities’ Mayor, Planner, and key Council and Planning Commission members, as well as special invited guests such as Township representatives. The purpose of the meetings was to discuss and develop recommendations for land use, circulation, utilities, and any special topics within the municipalities’ general area of influence (at a minimum, the 1.5 mile extra-territorial planning area). Following is a list of the County’s communities by planning sub-area. A ✓ indicates that official representatives of the community physically met with the planning team and discussed their respective future development plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Subarea</th>
<th>Communities</th>
<th>Contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>North American Bottoms</strong></td>
<td>Alorton</td>
<td>Randy McCallum 4821 Bond Ave. Alorton, IL 62207-2529 618-271-4586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centreville</td>
<td>Mark Jackson 5800 Bond Ave. Centreville, IL 62207-2324 618-332-1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East St. Louis</td>
<td>Alvin Parks 301 River Park Dr. East St. Louis, IL 62201-3028 618-482-6601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairmont City</td>
<td>Alex J. Bregen 2601 N. 41st St. Fairmont City, IL 62201-2205 618-274-4504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington Park</td>
<td>John Thornton 5218 North Park Dr. Washington Park, IL 62204-1645 618-874-2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brooklyn (part)</td>
<td>Nathaniel O’Bannon, III 312 South Fifth St. Lovejoy, IL 62059-9999 618-271-8424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madison (part)</td>
<td>John W. Hamm, III 615 Madison Ave. Madison, IL 62060 618-876-6268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South American Bottoms</strong></td>
<td>Cahokia</td>
<td>Frank Bergman 103 Main Street Cahokia, IL 62206-1019 618-337-9500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dupo ✓</td>
<td>Ronnie Dell 100 North Second St. Dupo, IL 62239-1202 618-286-3280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| East Carondelet ✓ | Herbert Simmons  
| | 950 State Street  
| | P.O. Box 122  
| | East Carondelet, IL 62240-0122  
| | 618-286-4660  
| Sauget | Richard A. Sauget, Jr.  
| | 2897 Falling Springs  
| | Sauget, IL 62206-1123  
| | 618-337-5267  
| Columbia (part) | Kevin B. Hutchinson  
| | 208 S. Rapp Ave.  
| | P.O. Box 467  
| | Columbia, IL 62236-0467  
| | 618-281-7144  
| East & West Development Corridor | Belleville ✓ | Mark W. Eckert  
| | 101 S. Illinois St.  
| | Belleville, IL 62220-2105  
| | 618-233-6810  
| Caseyville ✓ | George Chance  
| | 909 S. Main Street  
| | Caseyville, IL 62232-1513  
| | 618-344-1233  
| Collinsville (part) | Stan Schaeffer  
| | 125 S. Center St.  
| | Collinsville, IL 62234-2707  
| | 618-346-5200x115  
| Fairview Heights ✓ | Gail D. Mitchell  
| | 10025 Bunkum Rd.  
| | Fairview Heights, IL 62208-1703  
| | 618-489-2010  
| Lebanon ✓ | R. Scott Abner  
| | 312 West St. Louis Street  
| | Lebanon, IL 62254-1561  
| | 618-537-4976  
| Mascoutah ✓ | Gerald E. Daugherty  
| | 3 West Main St.  
| | Mascoutah, IL 62258-2030  
| | 618-566-2964, Ext. 104  
| New Baden (part) ✓ | Timothy J. Hoerchler  
| | One East Hanover Street  
| | New Baden, IL 62265-1807  
| | 618-588-3813  
| O’Fallon ✓ | Gary L. Graham  
| | 255 South Lincoln  
| | O’Fallon, IL 62269  
| | 618-624-4500  
| Scott AFB ✓ | Tim Stone  
| | 375 CES/CECP  
| | Bldg. 528  
| | SAFB, IL 62225  
| | 618-256-3701  
| Shiloh ✓ | James A. Vernier, II  
| | One Park Drive  
| | Shiloh, IL 62269  
| | 618-632-1022  
<p>|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summerfield</td>
<td>Lonnie Yates</td>
<td>304 W. Wakefield</td>
<td>618-934-3311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summerfield, IL 62289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swansea</td>
<td>Charles Gray, Jr.</td>
<td>1400 North Illinois Street</td>
<td>618-234-0044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Swansea, IL 62226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North &amp; South Kaskaskia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville</td>
<td>Brian Funk</td>
<td>2212 Main Avenue</td>
<td>618-677-3343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fayetteville, IL 62258-5004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeburg</td>
<td>Raymond Danford</td>
<td>14 Southgate Center</td>
<td>618-539-5545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Freeburg, IL 62243-3625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hecker (part)</td>
<td>Thomas Hootselle</td>
<td>P.O. Box 176</td>
<td>618-473-3011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hecker, IL 62248-0176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenzburg</td>
<td>Joseph E. Simpson</td>
<td>P.O. Box 156</td>
<td>618-475-2139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lenzburg, IL 62255-0156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marissa</td>
<td>Steuart McClintock</td>
<td>212 North Main St.</td>
<td>618-295-2351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marissa, IL 62257-1399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millstadt</td>
<td>Bruce E. Nowak</td>
<td>111 West Laurel</td>
<td>618-566-2964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Millstadt, IL 62260-1925</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Athens</td>
<td>Dennis Breithaupt</td>
<td>905 Spotsylvania Street</td>
<td>618-475-2144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Athens, IL 62264-1569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Libory</td>
<td>Phyllis Behrman</td>
<td>Village Hall</td>
<td>618-768-4366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Libory, IL 62282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithton</td>
<td>Lloyd Bush</td>
<td>101 S. Main St.</td>
<td>618-233-4180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smithton, IL 62285-0330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
County Open Houses

Six (6) public input open houses were held to present the findings of the Situation Analysis and solicit input on planning issues. These open houses were held at six (6) locations to provide easy access and a clear focus for sub-areas of the County. Open house publicity included a press release to the media; County web-site posting; meeting notice flyers to municipalities with request to advertise through their local outlets; direct mail to County Board Members, Mayors, and Township Supervisors; and meeting notice flyers to open house sponsors with request to publicize the event locally. Specifics for each of the open houses are provided below.

West Development Corridor: March 13th 3-6 PM

Host: Rick Vernier, Claire Prindable, Ken Easterly
Location: St. Clair County Building, Belleville (Public Building Commission)
Communities: Belleville, Caseyville, Collinsville, Fairview Heights, Swansea
Townships: Belleville, Caseyville, St. Clair, Stookey
County Board: #8,9,10,11,12,13,14,17,23,27,28,29

North Kaskaskia: March 13th 7-9 PM

Host: Frank Heiligenstein
Location: Freeburg Township, Freeburg
Communities: Freeburg, Hecker, Millstadt, Smithton
Townships: Freeburg, Millstadt, Smithton
County Board: #21,22

East Development Corridor: March 18th 3-6 PM

Host: Charles Lee
Location: MidAmerica St. Louis Airport, Mascoutah (Public Building Commission)
Communities: Lebanon, Mascoutah, New Baden, O’Fallon, Scott AFB, Shiloh, Summerfield
Townships: Lebanon, Mascoutah, O’Fallon, Shiloh Valley
County Board: #15,18,19,20

South Kaskaskia: March 18th 7-9 PM

Host: Ed Cockrell
Location: New Athens Township (Community Hall), New Athens
Communities: Fayetteville, Lenzburg, Marissa, New Athens, St. Libory
Townships: Engelmann, Fayetteville, Lenzburg, Marissa, New Athens, Prairie du Long
County Board: #7

North American Bottoms: March 20th 3-6 PM

Host: Lonnie Mosley
Location: JJK Center, East St. Louis
Communities: Alorton, Centreville, East St. Louis, Fairmont City, Washington Park, Brooklyn, Madison
Townships: Canteen, Centreville, East St. Louis, Stites
County Board: #1,2,3,4,5,6,24
South American Bottoms: March 20th 7-9 PM

Host: June Chartrand
Location: Sugar Loaf Township, Dupo
Communities: Cahokia, Dupo, East Carondelet, Sauget, Columbia
Townships: Sugar Loaf
County Board: #16,25,26

Open House #1 Summary Comments

March 13, 2008—West Development Corridor @ County Courthouse
- Development along Frank-Scott Parkway west of IL 159 should be residential.
- How is Route 13/15 widening going to help when 4 lanes change to 2 lanes in Freeburg?
- Enforce 40 acres per home in the rural areas.
- Use the word “relocation” and avoid the word “growth” when referring to population movement because the Metro-East is not growing.
- Stop planning for an outer-belt (Gateway Connector) that would encourage sprawl of which we have too much.
- Preserve Karst area from destructive development.
- Repair the levees.
- Save Falling Springs, protect the bluffs, preserve farmland, put in more bike/walking type trails, protect wetlands, redevelop brownfield sites, and generally encourage re-development instead of new development.
- Make sure that flood plains and wetlands are recognized as “constraints” to development.
- Consider using/planning for micro-power generation on a community basis using Wind/Solar, etc., to wean us away from the big power companies.

March 13, 2008—North Kaskaskia @ Freeburg Township
- County zoning may be required to adopt/enforce zoning in municipalities not doing their job. Should the County expand its zoning role in the American Bottoms?
- Pre-Annexation Agreements: What are the limits of the area that would allow cities to enforce their development codes vs. the County?
- 40-Acre Zoning Limitation: Relatives are abusing the rule. What about a 1-acre minimum lot size with 20 or 40-acre minimum development size and an ordinance that allows Cluster Development to preserve open space.
- SLM water transmission line has a capacity issue; SLM water pump house condition is deteriorating.
- Possible SLM Water inter-connect with Illinois-American Water to the north.
- Sewer capacity/quality issues exist in some small communities.
- Small communities have trouble financing infrastructure for growth.
- Consider impervious surface tax.
- No protection/support for landowners being affected by storm water/erosion caused by previous activity upstream in unincorporated County.
- Counties may impose a sales tax for ravine maintenance.
- Freeburg will study wastewater collection and treatment.
- Rte. 15 from Freeburg to the proposed Gateway Connector will be ripe for commercial development.
- The Gateway Connector/Rte.15 interchange will attract commercial development.
March 18, 2008—East Development Corridor @ MidAmerica St. Louis Airport
- Scott AFB Joint Land Use Study is planned to be completed in May, 2008.
- O’Fallon-Troy Road development along this County road will pose problems for the Gateway Connector concept.
- Rte. 50 Bypass through Lebanon should be revisited (connect to existing Rte. 50 east of town).
- Need conservation subdivision design principles in place.
- Preserve more open space on County approved developments.
- Preserve riparian corridors to ensure better storm water management.
- Limit County subdivision approvals within the 1.5-mile municipal extraterritorial jurisdictional area without at least being consistent with City Comprehensive Plans.
- If a project is proposed within the 1.5-mile extraterritorial jurisdictional area, a request by the County for the City’s input would be helpful.

March 18, 2008—South Kaskaskia @ New Athens Township
- None recorded.

March 20, 2008—North American Bottoms @ JJK Center
- East St. Louis Township is co-terminus with the City of East St. Louis, as is Belleville Township and the City of Belleville.
- Determine the latest alignment of the new Mississippi River Bridge and related improvements. What is the future impact on the Goose Hill neighborhood?
- Adopt Bluff protection plan and potentially an overlay district, Zoning District, conservation easements, or property donation/acquisition.
- Prepare an Economic Development Strategy for the underperforming land in the ESL area for local businesses, as well as out of town developers.
- State and County road improvements that improve accessibility to ESL are needed. Provide access to development property.
- Provide access from the new Mississippi River Bridge roads.
- Provide access to St. Clair Avenue to compensate for closure of 71st Street due to MetroLink construction.
- Provide 38th Street connection to I-64 to enhance the Landsdowne Area and north part of ESL.
- Look at ESL from the perspective of large areas that can be redeveloped for mixed use, including neighborhoods; use the County’s voice and money for infrastructure to prepare and access areas.
- County needs to keep properties maintained; County “manages” vacant property they own, but doesn’t properly maintain it; needs a routine cleaning and grass cutting program.

March 20, 2008—South American Bottoms @ Sugar Loaf Township
- Improve Imbs Station Road to the east to serve the new I-255 Interchange, opening May 2010.
- County Comprehensive Plan should be a Guide, not strict Policy; it must remain flexible.
- Support for trail system expansions in the Dupo area.
- Heritage Preservation and Restoration.
- Bluff/Karst Area Protection.
Following submittal of the draft Plan report to the Steering Committee, six (6) public input open houses were held at the previous six (6) locations throughout the County to present the draft findings and solicit input on the plan’s recommendations. Specifics for each of the open houses are provided below.

**North American Bottoms: November 12th 4-6 PM**

Host: Lonnie Mosley  
Location: JJK Center, East St. Louis  
Communities: Alorton, Centreville, East St. Louis, Fairmont City, Washington Park, Brooklyn, Madison  
Townships: Canteen, Centreville, East St. Louis, Stites  
County Board: #1,2,3,4,5,6,24

**South American Bottoms: November 12th 7-9 PM**

Host: June Chartrand  
Location: Sugar Loaf Township, Dupo  
Communities: Cahokia, Dupo, East Carondelet, Sauget, Columbia  
Townships: Sugar Loaf  
County Board: #16,25,26

**East Development Corridor: November 13th 4-6 PM**

Host: Charles Lee  
Location: MidAmerica St. Louis Airport, Mascoutah (Public Building Commission)  
Communities: Lebanon, Mascoutah, New Baden, O’Fallon, Scott AFB, Shiloh, Summerfield  
Townships: Lebanon, Mascoutah, O’Fallon, Shiloh Valley  
County Board: #15,18,19,20

**South Kaskaskia: November 13th 7-9 PM**

Host: Ed Cockrell  
Location: New Athens Township (Community Hall), New Athens  
Communities: Fayetteville, Lenzburg, Marissa, New Athens, St. Libory  
Townships: Engelmann, Fayetteville, Lenzburg, Marissa, New Athens, Prairie du Long  
County Board: #7

**West Development Corridor: November 18th 4-6 PM**

Host: Rick Vernier, Claire Prindable, Ken Easterly  
Location: St. Clair County Building, Belleville (Public Building Commission)  
Communities: Belleville, Caseyville, Collinsville, Fairview Heights, Swansea  
Townships: Belleville, Caseyville, St. Clair, Stookey  
County Board: #8,9,10,11,12,13,14,17,23,27,28,29

**North Kaskaskia: November 18th 7-9 PM**

Host: Frank Heiligenstein  
Location: Freeburg Township, Freeburg  
Communities: Freeburg, Hecker, Millstadt, Smithton  
Townships: Freeburg, Millstadt, Smithton  
County Board: #21,22
Open House #2 Summary Comments

November 12, 2008—North American Bottoms @ JJK Center

Discussions generally dealt with how to provide a plan and funding for infrastructure improvements needed in the East St. Louis area and ensuring access to and from the new Mississippi River Bridge roads.

November 12, 2008—South American Bottoms @ Sugarloaf Township

Residents and officials attending the public meeting were briefed on the plan by representatives of the County and generally were interested in the land use plan and special use categories that provide added protection for local natural resources, including the bluffs and the Karst topography areas.

November 13, 2008—East Development Corridor @ MidAmerica St. Louis Airport

Attendees at MidAmerica Airport discussed a broad range of land use and transportation issues, primarily related to the Agricultural—Planned Services Area within the 1.5-mile municipal jurisdiction and the Scott AFB/MidAmerica St. Louis Airport Joint Land Use Study.

November 13, 2008—South Kaskaskia @ New Athens Township

Attendees discussed planned and potential highway and bridge improvements through the southeastern portion of the County, including the potential for a new State highway from I-64 near New Baden south past St. Libory, presumably to serve the new power plant at Lively Grove in neighboring Washington County.

November 18, 2008—West Development Corridor @ County Courthouse

Discussions were broad ranging, but generally focused on the proposed future land use and transportation plans, and the desire to improve stormwater management in new development areas.

November 18, 2008—North Kaskaskia @ Freeburg Township

The final open house held in Freeburg covered topics related to the new Agricultural—PSA land use category and 1.5-mile municipal jurisdiction, the incorporation of community comprehensive plans into the County’s plan, the long lead time for construction of the Gateway Connector, and implementation of the plan through a new County Zoning Ordinance.

Conclusion

The six open houses held on the draft Comprehensive Plan yielded many positive comments and no significant objections to the proposed land uses, special use categories, and transportation plan for St. Clair County.
Adoption of the Plan

Following the public input open houses, the Steering Committee/Economic Development Committee provided a final review of the draft plan and approved forwarding the St. Clair County Comprehensive Plan on to the County Board for the formal adoption process. The County Board, in turn, appointed a County Planning Commission and forwarded the draft plan to the Commission for their review. The Planning Commission reviewed and discussed the plan and conducted an official public hearing. After the public hearing, the plan was returned to the County Board with a recommendation to adopt the County Comprehensive Plan.