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MR. WAX: All right. Let's call the meeting to order. I would appreciate it if you would join me in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.
(PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.)
MR. WAX: We can have a rollcall, if you
would, please.
MS. NUSSBAUM: Mr. Larson?
MR. LARSON: Here.
MS. NUSSBAUM: Here Mr. Harrington?
MR. HARRINGTON: Here.
MS. NUSSBAUM: Mr. Lovin?
MR. LOVIN: Here.
MS. NUSSBAUM: Mr. Wax?
MR. WAX: Here.
MS. NUSSBAUM: Mr. Chambers?
MR. CHAMBERS: Here.
MR. WAX: Do you want to call the county board?

MS. NUSSBAUM: Mr. Henricks?
Mr. Edwards?
MR. EDWARDS: Here.
MS. NUSSBAUM: Mr. Beem?
MR. BEEM: Here.

MS. NUSSBAUM: Ms. Jones?
MS. JONES: Here.
MS. NUSSBAUM: Ms. Piatt?
Mr. Foran?
MR. FORAN: Here.
MR. WAX: Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER: Well, good evening, folks. Another night.

One matter before I turn it over to
Mr. Keyt and the Zoning Board to continue their discussion on proposed conditions and proposed findings of fact.

I have been made aware that there were additional letters that had been submitted to the zoning board or to the zoning office, and these are all in support of the application.

Mr. Gerson, do you think -- do you want me to read all of these letters?

MR. GERSHON: No. Definitely waive reading of the letters. I believe these were all submitted on December 21.

HEARING OFFICER: Okay. We will waive the reading of the letters, but $I$ will state the date and who they are from:

October 25, 2022, from Amanda Borden, Vice-President of Development, Eastern Illinois Food Bank.

Undated correspondence from Jake Lieb, L-i-e-b, of Monticello.

An undated letter from Cindy Heiniger, H-e-i-n-i-g-e-r, Sixth Grade Science MMS, Garden Club Sponsor, Monticello Middle School.

An undated letter from a Matthew Kitzmiller -- Matthew with two t's. Kitzmiller, K-i-t-z-m-i-l-l-e-r -- from Monticello.

A letter dated October 27, 2022, from Jill A. Maxey, $M-a-x-e-y$, Executive Director, Willow Tree Missions.

An undated correspondence from Merv, M-e-r-v, Peters and family, Mansfield, Illinois.

And an undated letter from a Walter Proksch, P-r-o-k-s-c-h, 27 Lange, L-a-n-g-e, Lange Avenue, Savoy, 61874.

A letter dated September 21, 2022, from Ralph Howard, Administrator of Tatman Village, Inc., 2000 East Washington, Monticello.

Those letters will be made part of the record and have been distributed to zoning board
members, and as part of the record they will be also included in the packet, the large packet of material that will go to the Piatt County Board for its consideration once we're through with this particular hearing.

With that said, we're moving into a time of reviewing conditions, proposed conditions. We began that process a week ago when we met, and I will turn the floor over to Mr. Andy Keyt.

MR. KEYT: Thank you, Mr. Kains.
I think everybody can hear me okay. Just as a reminder, we are working our way through the draft conditions and the draft findings of fact. As a reminder, these are up to the Zoning Board of Appeals as to what information to include, not include, supplement or remove from either document.

Again, as a reminder for everyone, the approval of any recommended conditions to the county board does not mean that there will be any sort of approval or not approval of findings of fact or recommendation to the county board. Just so that it's clear, these are simply recommended conditions in the event that the county board approves the
project.
With that, there is an updated version that I provided based on the comments and discussion from last week, and that is before the Zoning Board of Appeals. That same document that is before them is also up on the projector screen to my right. It's the exact same document that they have in front of them.

With that, we will start going through the conditions.

There is one recommended suggested condition about the turbines that is listed in yours as a comment on condition number 7 .

The suggested addition from a ZBA member is: If any shadow flicker reduction, noise reduction, fire suppress and/or bird and bat protection systems are available on said model, the company shall acquire and install those systems. Is there any suggestion as to including it? Consensus on including it? Not including it? Any thoughts?

MR. HARRINGTON: I'm in favor.
MR. LOVIN: Me too.
MR. CHAMBERS: What do you think about

```
that? I was thinking of the discussion we had
    during the hearing of what is marketably available
and what is not. So, I'm okay with it. I don't
know if it needs any language about, you know,
availability.
    MR. KEYT: Just to dovetail that, you
could say any commercially available and list the
items available, if the board should so view.
    MR. WAX: I believe it says if it's
    available. Okay.
    MR. CHAMBERS: On this specific model?
    So, yeah, I would be in favor of that.
    MR. KEYT: It sounds like there is a
    consensus. If opposed to it, speak up now.
    MR. WAX: May I ask one other thing?
    MR. KEYT: Sure.
    MR. WAX: Would it make any sense to the
    group here to request some degree of proof that
    these things, if they are available and if they are
    installed, some proof that would come back to the
    county board that in fact they are?
    I doubt that any of us would be capable of
    driving down the road and determining whether those
    have been installed or not.
```

MR. KEYT: If I were to make any suggestions on that, any conditions listed herein, the zoning administrator or the county board could request proof of any of the conditions that required some action on behalf of the applicant. At any point in time the zoning administrator or the county board could request proof that that item has been checked off.

You don't necessarily have to list it in there, but if you do what to list it specifically in that section, you could.

If I were to make a suggestion, it would not necessarily be to list it specifically in that section.

MR. HARRINGTON: I think you are not referring to only this but any other conditions. I would have to agree with that.

What kind of language?
It probably encompasses more than just one subject here. So, how do you want to frame that?

MR. KEYT: We can always add a separate paragraph at the end just listing that any items required by the applicant herein shall be applicant -- Company shall provide some measurement/proof that
the mission has been accomplished or some language to that effect, but I haven't thought all of that through actually, but $I$ would suggest we just want to include it. Specifically, you could include it as a separate paragraph.

MR. HARRINGTON: I would be in favor of that.

MR. WAX: I think the separate paragraph later that you would construct would be good.

In the meantime, for this particular aspect on the blue section, on page 2, item 7, 1 think there is a consensus since that we would approve that.

Would that be right, Will?
MR. CHAMBERS: Yes.
MR. WAX: Okay? We are in consensus to approve that.

MR. KEYT: Sounds good. All right.
So, we left off -- well, before we get there, what would be new paragraph number 13 is where we left off.

But before we talk about that, there was request for a paragraph dealing with crop damage. I provided a draft of language to include there on

1 crop damage. It is listed up on the screen in red. It appears on your documents as blue. I am not sure why the difference, but crop damage is listed as a separate condition:

Company shall investigate complaints of crop damage within seven days. The results of any investigation shall be provided to the zoning administrator and the person making the complaint within 60 days, including the resolution or proposed resolution of said complaint. This paragraph does not preclude any private right of action by an affected party. This paragraph does not apply to any contractual agreements between the Company and landowners or farmers regarding crop damage issues.

That would -- the reason for that last sentence is that, if there are contractual arrangements between the company and a participating landowner, this would except out that agreement between them so that that is handled separately by an already existing lease, so we wouldn't necessarily be dealing with that issue.

MR. WAX: I am good with that.
MR. CHAMBERS: Same.
MR. KEYT: Okay. That takes us to what is
the new paragraph 13 which talks about decommissioning and security. It's a pretty lengthy paragraph. If the board wants me to read it, I can. Also, the other option would be, if there are specific changes or suggestions in there that the board would want, we can do that.

I think, to break it down into parts, I would start with that first introductory paragraph. There is a suggested inclusion to refer to the WECS Appendix as WECS Appendix A. That is probably appropriate for specificity.

There is also a new sentence included that would be: Any applicable County Decommissioning Agreement and Financial Assurance is subject to the terms and conditions of the county board and subject to separate county board approval of the same.

It is similar to the road use language that we had. Is there any consensus on whether to include or not include that language listed there or any revisions to that paragraph?

MR. HARRINGTON: I think it's good.
MR. WAX: Gentleman?
MR. LARSON: Good.
MR. CHAMBERS: Yeah.

MR. WAX: We are good with that.
MR. KEYT: The next, paragraph A, deals with the project being decommissioned upon the termination of special use. If the board wants, I can read it; but is there any suggested or requested changes to supplement or revision to that?

MR. WAX: Anything to clarify?
MR. HARRINGTON: One question $I$ would have, Andy, is section D, about the second line there, it says: Prior to receiving any construction permit, the company shall negotiate and agree upon a decommissioning agreement and financial assurances pursuant to Section 13 of the said WECS Ordinance, Appendix A of the County Zoning Ordinance.

So, I guess my question to you is: How do you interpret that?

We are saying the company shall negotiate assumedly with the county or the zoning officer, or how are we referencing this?

MR. KEYT: Often how that process goes is -- you may recall that they submit a plan, but the plan is the only requirement at this point is that they submit some sort of a plan.

Typically, if the county were to approve

1 the project, they then have to come to the county and come to some sort of agreement on a road use agreement, and a decommissioning plan agreement and then financial assurances for both of those, separate financial assurances for both. So, often the way that process ends up working is there is, after the county board, if they approve it, there would be some back and forth between the developer and typically the zoning administrator, sometimes it can be a committee of the county or the county board if they really wanted to do that, but typically it's the zoning administrator, and often it will involve the attorney, and we go back and forth until -- and the engineer for the county, and we go back and forth until there is some agreement as to that decommissioning plan and what it's supposed to say.

So, the plan submitted is simply their plan to meet their condition for the special use siting hearing requirement.

The agreement may look substantially different than that because what often happens is our engineer may look at their updated plan because you remember they are submitting some -- a plan will

1 be based on the 50 turbines. We'll go back and
2 forth. Oftentimes the engineer will say -- they will pick apart their plan to say we need more labor costs or you need more engineering costs or your salvage value is too high, and we go back and forth until there is some agreement that everybody is comfortable with taking to the county board for approval, and then the county board has the approval of that land just like they do a road use agreement. So, that is separate -- that is a separate and distinct approval from the county board. It is not wrapped up within this approval. It only comes after and if the county board were to approve a special use permit.

Then there would be some agreement that would have to go to the county board separately along with some agreement as to what the financial assurances and what the amount would be.

I hope that explain that.
MR. HARRINGTON: Yeah. I think I
understand the process. I guess my concern in this language would be do we need to delineate that and say who they are negotiating with versus just saying pursuant to the section?

Do we need to clarify that is my question.
MR. KEYT: We could.
MR. CHAMBERS: Does the section that is referred to, does that do any of that?

MR. KEYT: Not necessarily.
MR. CHAMBERS: Okay.
MR. KEYT: So, if you were to delineate that with specifics, you would -- what I would suggest is that third line down -- I'll pull this up so the people in the audience can see it. The third line down, I would make some reference to the agreement being with the county board or the county.

It would start with: The company shall negotiate and agree upon a decommissioning agreement and financial assurances with the county pursuant to --

MR. HARRINGTON: Right. That is what I was looking for, is something along those lines.

Do you guys got any suggestions?
MR. WAX: I think it's a good idea.
MR. HARRINGTON: I do too.

Will?

MR. CHAMBERS: Yeah.
MR. KEYT: There appears to be a consensus
to, in that fourth line down, it will read -- or
starting with the third line: The company shall
negotiate and agree upon a decommissioning agreement
and financial assurances with the county pursuant to
-- and then rest remains the same.
There is a specification there as to WECS
Appendix A of the County Ordinance.
I assume the board is okay with that
specification. If not, let me know.
The second part there: Salvage value
shall not be included as a discount to any financial
assurances to the county unless allowed by the
county board.
That would give the county board the say
on whether to allow salvage value or not. They
would have it regardless, but it specifically states
that so that it's clear.
MR. HARRINGTON: It clarifies it.
MR. KEYT: Yeah.
MR. CHAMBERS: I am good with that.
MR. WAX: Thank you. I appreciate that
clarifications and the change of wording there.
Are we okay with that whole package?
Mr. Chambers?

MR. CHAMBERS: I am.

MR. WAX: Okay. I am with the group, and we approve it.

MR. KEYT: When you say you are okay with that and there is a consensus, are we talking about the entirety of paragraph 13? Everybody is good with that?

MR. HARRINGTON: Anything on it. Sounds good.

MR. WAX: I think we are good with 13 with the suggestions that you made.

MR. KEYT: Okay. Gotcha. There is one typographical error or change or typographical error, my error, in subparagraph -- paragraph number 14 deals with nonoperational or obsolete turbines. Essentially, this would deal with a turbine that is not being diligently repaired. If it's not being diligently repaired by the company, it shall be decommissioned or removed by the company within 30 days, subject to reasonable adjustment for adverse weather conditions or other factors outside the company's control.

So, for example, one thing that might be out of the company's control would be something like a supply chain issue that they can't deal with.

Also, any wind energy turbine which is declared by the company to be obsolete and nonfunctional or otherwise subject to only a nominal taxation, excluding allowable statutory appreciation, shall also be decommissioned or removed within 30 days.

That supplemental language there that
appears in red on the screen and blue on your document is to account for the statutory depreciation of wind turbines.

As you may recall, wind turbines are depreciated by a certain percentage based on the state statute, and so we can't make them remove a turbine that is subject to statutory depreciation. So that is the reason for that clarification that is in there.

MR. WAX: Questions on 14?
MR. HARRINGTON: I am good with that.
MR. LOVIN: Good.
MR. WAX: Okay.
MR. CHAMBERS: Good.
MR. WAX: We are okay. We approve that.
MR. KEYT: Okay. Paragraph 15 deals with

```
liability insurance: The company shall maintain
    liability insurance as required by the Piatt County
    Zoning Ordinance.
    This is a specific provision that deals
    with the liability insurance and the amount that it
    shall be. If the zoning -- the code increases that
    liability insurance amount, it would automatically
    have to automatically increase it.
    Changes, suggestions, suggestion revisions
    to paragraph 15?
    MR. HARRINGTON: I guess, since it really
    sort of comes to you, Keri, do you have any concerns
    or thoughts that you are good with that?
    MS. NUSBAUM: Yeah.
    MR. HARRINGTON: If they provide proof of
    insurance, that is enough for you?
    MS. NUSBAUM: Uh-huh. I am good with
    that.
    MR. WAX: We are okay with 15 as is.
    MR. KEYT: Okay. Moving to paragraph 16,
    paragraph 16 deals with assignment. It's relatively
    lengthy, but paragraph }15\mathrm{ deals with assignment.
    There would be one change, an additional
    change, that I would suggest on paragraph 16 simply
```

because the numbering is a little different now because we've added a paragraph.

So, in that first line: Except as provided in this paragraph 16 -- it should be 16 instead of 15.

Any suggested changes, questions, revisions as to paragraph 16?

I would include subparagraphs (a) and (b) in that question. And if you need time to read it then, I think this would probably be a good time to do that.

MR. WAX: Right now we are considering everything in $16(a)$; is that correct?

MR. KEYT: If you want to separate (a) and (b), that would be fine.

MR. WAX: Okay. We can do the whole thing, if you would like, $16(a)$ and (b).

MR. KEYT: Okay.
MR. CHAMBERS: In (a)(xii), in reference to paragraph 12, without renumbering of the paragraphs, is that still the correct paragraph?

MS. NUSBAUM: I think it is.
MR. KEYT: I think it would be changed. I think that would remain, but $I$ am just going to

1 double check. I think that would remain the same.
2 Yeah, that information would remain the same.
double check. I think that would remain the same.
Yeah, that information would remain the same.
Paragraph 12 deals with complaints and resolution.
MR. HARRINGTON: In Section 5, Andy, it
refers to written acknowledgment by authorized
signatory of the acquirer that it understands,
recognizes, agrees to assume responsibility for all
terms conditions and standards of any road agreement
or any other agreement then in force and that it has
provided any security for road repairs under such
agreements.

I guess I was looking to see decommissioning listed there. Should it not be?

MR. KEYT: It could be. Any other agreements would encompass that.

MR. HARRINGTON: Right. But I think we want to be really clear about that part, don't we?

MR. KEYT: We can. So, we could list responsibility.

So, let me reread it: Written acknowledgment by an authorized signatory of the acquirer that it understands, recognizes, and agrees to assume responsibility for all terms and conditions and standards of any road use agreement,

```
decommissioning, or any other agreement then in
force and that it has provided a security for road
repairs under such agreements.
    MR. HARRINGTON: I guess that is the part
    I am saying why I want it there, is because listing
your securities for decommissions.
    MR. KEYT: Yeah. So, then we would add it
to right after the third line, any road agreement,
decommissioning agreement or any other agreement
that enforces and that it has provided any security
for road repairs --
    MR. HARRINGTON: Decommissioning.
    MR. KEYT: -- decommissioning or other
    agreements.
    MR. HARRINGTON: This is just my thought.
    These guys should talk about it.
    MR. WAX: I agree.
    MR. LARSON: Good with me.
    MR. LOVIN: (Nodding.)
    MR. WAX: Okay with you, Keri?
    MS. NUSBAUM: Yeah.
    MR. WAX: Will?
    MR. CHAMBERS: Yeah.
    MR. WAX: I think we are in agreement with
```

```
suggestion of how the amendment is made.
```

    MR. KEYT: We'll include that.
    Any other additions, changes to paragraph
    (a) ?
    MR. WAX: Your suggested changes look good
        to me.
    Jim, do you have some concerns?
    MR. HARRINGTON: Section 8, Keri, in
    regards to designate a representative, that
verbiage, are you okay with that because that really
falls within your --

MS. NUSBAUM: Yeah. They would have to have somebody meet with me within 15 days. I think that is fine.

MR. HARRINGTON: Right. Okay. I am good with (a). I got some questions on (b).

MR. WAX: We are good.
MR. KEYT: Looks like we have a consensus on paragraph (a). If anybody is opposed to it, say so now.

Paragraph (b) then, the difference, by the way, on paragraph (a) and paragraph (b), is there would be certain requirements if somebody came in and purchased a project, for example, an acquirer
under that definition, purchases the project from the developer, the requirements of section (a) would be some sort of come in and talk to us, we have to do these and make sure they signed off on all the things that they have to do, etc. The conditions would still apply to them regardless, but we want to make sure that it's abundantly clear to them that is what they have to do.

Paragraph (b) deals with a little different scenario. Paragraph (b) would deal with a scenario, for example, there are people that are financing the project, but it is a bank or tax credit investors, it would be difficult to have all of those individuals or entities come in and sign off on all these issues, and we wouldn't really want to do that because we would have a number of, you know, a number of people that would come in and do that whereas the project itself is already subject to those conditions.

So, the reason of paragraph (b) is the company shall have the right to assign at the sole discretion, without any consent from the county, certain transferring of interests.

For example, subparagraph (xi) would say
the company may assign and transfer an interest,
including 100 percent interest, to qualified lenders
in the event the company defaults on financing.
And there are other ones similar to that
type of provision, including being able to sign or
transfer up to 50 percent ownership interest to an
acquirer subject to the conditions of $15(\mathrm{a})(\mathrm{i})$
through (ix). That would be now paragraph 16.
And I think Mr. Harrington had a question.
MR. HARRINGTON: So, you answered part of
it. I guess my question to you more formally would
be, with that verbiage, is there anything we need to
consider there?
Not that we think it's a very likely
scenario, but this is also the premise of these
conditions, is to prepare for the unexpected.
MR. KEYT: Yeah. I wouldn't necessarily
try to change anything within paragraph (b). I
think it encompasses the ability of the developer to
do things like financing, etc., without having to
come in and seek permission to do that.
Now, of course, a normal project building,
we wouldn't normally require those things, but
because of the magnitude of this type of project, we
would still want that notification to come to us within 30 days, which is what that last paragraph provides. So, I think that paragraph encompasses the aspects that we would want to consider but also allows the developer the leeway to get investors and not have to come to the county every time that they change.

MR. HARRINGTON: In case of the
unfortunate situation of default, is there anything that we need to think about in that regard? Do you feel this encompasses all of it?

MR. KEYT: I think this encompasses as much as we can get within that purview.

MR. HARRINGTON: That's all I've got for you. I'm good with it.

MR. LOVIN: (Nodding.)
MR. WAX: We agree with the suggested changes there.

MR. KEYT: Okay. So, paragraph 16, there will be a couple changes to references to old 15 that is now 16. There are some specification changes as to WECS Appendix A. There is also a specification change as to Apex Clean Energy, which is a more clarifying statement. Then there is also
the clarifications as to paragraph number (a) (v) which will include a decommissioning agreement and decommissioning or other financial assurances being referenced. Specifically, with that it sounds like we have a consensus on paragraph 16. If anyone is opposed, please let me know.

Moving on to paragraph 17, it talks about operating requirements: The company shall operate the facility according to the following guidelines.

It lists off certain guidelines. For example, it deals with the turbine color. It deals with displaying, not being allowed to display advertising on the turbine, making sure that there are clearly marked signage on the turbines or in interest to the turbines anyway, things like that.

But read through it. If there's any questions, changes, revisions, let me know.

MR. HARRINGTON: The only suggestion I've got, Chairman, is on $17(e)$. It references responding promptly to any emergency or casualty event. I didn't know if we wanted to be clearer in "promptly" or what your thoughts were.

MR. WAX: I think this has come up before where we have trouble with different people defining

```
promptly in different ways.
```

    MR. HARRINGTON: Right.
    MR. WAX: Open to your suggestions.
    MR. CHAMBERS: I would just change the
    language to, because of the seriousness of those
issues, obviously, the company will respond
immediately to any emergency or casualty. I don't
think you need to put a timeline on it necessarily,
just immediately.
MR. HARRINGTON: I am good with that.
MR. WAX: Change it to immediately and it
sounds good.
MR. KEYT: Okay. Again, as to
paragraph 17, we'll change paragraph (e) will now
read: Company will respond immediately to an
emergency.
The remainder of paragraph (e) will remain
the same.
Any other changes or revisions to $17 ?$
MR. WAX: I think we are okay with it for
that. Yes. We are okay with that.
MR. KEYT: All right. It appears we have
a consensus on 17 with the change.
Okay. Number 18 deals with noise
reduction and monitoring with one suggested change: Company shall not install any turbines which cause or -- it currently reads cause or may cause a violation of the noise regulations.

We removed that to say the Company shall not install any turbines which cause a violation of the noise regulations. The difference being, of course, for example, they could obtain some component or some turbine that feasibly could operate in such a way that it might cause a violation of a pollution control board standard but cannot be but for the fact that the noise pollution control standards exist.

For example, I could buy a car that could go 120; but if the speed limit is 55, I have to operate within the speed limit. So, I feasibly have a car that may cause a violation; however, I can't operate it that way.

So, that's the reason for that change or suggested change in that first sentence.

In paragraph -- I would suggest we take it by paragraph because there's more suggestions within the second paragraph.

But the first paragraph, any suggested changes or revisions as to the second or the first paragraph?

MR. WAX: Mr. Keyt, the third paragraph from the end of -- the second paragraph, third line from the end of the second paragraph, am I reading this correctly that the county's consultant whose fees and costs who shall be paid by the county; is that correct?

MR. KEYT: I changed that. That is one error that I was going to get to. The noise study shall be performed -- let me pull it up on the screen so that everybody can see it. The noise study shall be performed using the methodology approved by the zoning administrator and/or county's consultant whose fees and costs shall be paid for by the county -- that should be the company, not the county.

MR. HARRINGTON: So, a couple questions I would have is, in the fourth line from the beginning of paragraph 18, the verbiage, upon any complaint regarding noise related to one or more wind turbines by Resident or Landowner in the immediate area, how are we defining immediate area I guess?

MR. KEYT: It's not defined. You are free
to define it if you want to give it a shot.

You could define it in terms of miles from a turbine if you want to do that, but it's up to the board. It would require a little bit of a lengthier change just because just to make it clear that the landowner or the resident, $I$ think we want to define it by a property within rather than close to a landowner or residence because you could have a landowner that does not necessarily live at the property that might have a noise complaint and that they may request.

So, you may want to change it to read:
Upon a complaint regarding noise related to one or more wind turbines by a resident or landowner of property within the immediate area, in the immediate area thereof, and could you define immediate area. We could just do a parenthetical stating immediate area for purposes herein shall mean -- fill in the blank.

MR. HARRINGTON: I am good with his initial suggestion about the landowner.

I guess, Keri, do you have any suggestions on immediate area?

Or do you guys?

What are your thoughts?
I don't know. Do you want to leave it alone? I am fine with that, too.

MR. CHAMBERS: I think it's hard to decide what to use as a measurement there. I mean you could say one mile, but that's going to be a pretty wide radius in some cases.

MR. WAX: What if somebody is 1.1, 1/10th of a mile over?

MR. CHAMBERS: If there is a legitimate complaint, there is not really going to be an issue whether they are in the immediate area or not, if there is grounds for, you know, actually measuring the sound and stuff. It doesn't matter if it's a half mile or 1.1 mile, so we might as well leave it as immediate. I think immediate doesn't constrain the process from starting, so I don't think it's necessarily restrictive.

MR. KEYT: I mean, if you leave it as is, it is also up to the zoning administrator to determine what is the immediate area. If the zoning administrator gets a call from somebody in Texas complaining about the sound, okay, that might be. But if you got and sound complaint from someone living next door, then, of course, you know, that could be an area that would be considered.

So, I don't know that $I$ would define it just because you then based on the distance, how it is measured, is it in front of an edge of a property to the next property, is it from, you know, the opposite edge, is it from a residence that might be there to where the wind turbine is.

So, if I were to make a suggestion, it would be to not define it; however, my suggestions are up to the zoning board's approval, so I don't want to deter you from putting some sort of limit on it.

MR. HARRINGTON: I'm fine with that. I was making sure we read it.

MR. WAX: I agree.
MR. HARRINGTON: So, I have a couple others, if you want to approve one at a time.

MR. WAX: We are okay with leaving it as, immediate area.

Next concern?
MR. KEYT: Before we move on to the next one, just so I am clear, do you want to include the language of by a resident or landowner of property?

MR. HARRINGTON: Yeah.
MR. KEYT: Okay.
MR. HARRINGTON: I am good with that.
MR. KEYT: Okay. Okay. I am ready for the next one.

MR. HARRINGTON: It's more of a question. It said actually may include but not limited to an action before the IPCB. Is that simply notifying them, or what are we saying there?

MR. KEYT: No. There is kind of a process for opening a case or making a complaint before the Pollution Control Board, so that is what that it is referring to.

What I would not suggest is to try and define that in some way because the process changes over time. So, you know, the way it actually could be started before the Pollution Control Board 20 years ago or 30 years ago is different than how that happens now, so I wouldn't necessarily try to define that in some way.

MR. HARRINGTON: I was just curious what it meant.

MR. KEYT: No. I get you. It typically would be some sort of complaint that is filed.

MR. HARRINGTON: The only other item that caught my eye would be the second-to-last line. Once again, "promptly" is used. Just making sure we are comfortable with that.

MR. LOVIN: Do you want to change that?
MR. HARRINGTON: I was just making sure everybody is good with it. I don't have any suggestions per se.

MR. WAX: Well, the first case you brought that up, we changed to immediately. It was for the company to actually investigate and be noticed of the things, and this one refers to a promptly to actually remedy the problem.

MR. HARRINGTON: Right.
MR. WAX: I think it's probably reasonable.

MR. HARRINGTON: Okay. Let's leave it then.

MR. CHAMBERS: I am okay with it.
MR. WAX: Okay. It sound like we are okay with the changes that we've talked about on 18. Do you understand all of those?

MR. KEYT: Yeah. So far the change would be including, in that fourth line down, of property
and then no other changes to that paragraph.
The second paragraph, any changes to that or comment on the suggested conclusion of language?

The one change I would suggest is my typographical error of saying fees and costs should be paid for by the county, that should be fees and costs should be paid for by the company.

MR. HARRINGTON: I am good with that.
MR. WAX: I am good.
MR. CHAMBERS: Yeah.

MR. WAX: We are good with that.
MR. KEYT: Okay. That would take us to paragraph 19, which deals with: Aboveground transmission lines. Electrical transmission and collection lines connecting the towers, substations, etc., shall be placed underground. The transmission line for the project extending for the substation to the point of interconnection may be installed as an aboveground line pursuant to the plans and specifications set forth in the application for the project.

Any suggested changes or revisions?
MR. LARSON: I am okay with it.
MR. CHAMBERS: I am okay with this one. MR. WAX: I did have one question, and I think I visited with you about this. I am not sure there is anything we could do about it because it involved setbacks, but later in the next document we are going to talk about someone has made/provided evidence in a statement that 200 feet away from a high-powered transmission line shouldn't cause any problem with a land value devaluation or anything. That concerns me a little bit, but it doesn't refer here, and I am not -- I think when we discussed it, it probably is difficult to address.

MR. KEYT: Yeah. For clarity, in the findings of fact, there is a reference to a statement by one of the property evaluation experts. I believe it was Mr. Marous for the applicant, but I am not positive, but he made some reference to being greater than 200 feet away from a high-powered transmission line would not cause a devaluation in property. I am paraphrasing of course.

MR. WAX: Right.
MR. KEYT: The suggestion or issue would be then would it require or could we require some sort of a setback from a transmission line. The only obstacle that $I$ could see is that setbacks are
set by zoning code.
MR. WAX: Right.
MR. KEYT: To include some sort of
additional setback as a condition would be, in my
view, arguably inappropriate because it would be in
addition to a setback that is not included within
the zoning code.
So, you can set conditions that are not
inconsistent with your zoning code, but if you don't
have a setback dealing with transmission lines, you
probably shouldn't try and create one now. That is
an issue for -- like, that would be an issue for a
text amendment, if that was an issue so important
you want to address.
MR. WAX: It concerns me, but I fully
agree that we don't have anything on setback in the
ordinance, and it would be inappropriate to attempt
to change it at this point in time. Is that
correct?
MR. KEYT: I would agree, but I would say,
you know, it's arguable whether you could or could
not. I don't want to say it's a black and white
issue.
MR. HARRINGTON: I agree with it.

MR. WAX: Okay. We okay with this one? MR. LOVIN: Yeah. MR. WAX: We are okay with 19. MR. KEYT: Okay. Condition number 20 deals with: Water use. In order to protect the water supply and viability of wells, the county shall have the right to reasonably limit or otherwise regulate the use of water and the discharge of wastewater related to manufacture, transportation and use of concrete in any manner related to this special use. The county shall have the right to conduct or have conducted such studies and tests as may be necessary or helpful it this regard at the county's expense. The company shall promptly correct any degradation to the water supply or any well negatively impacted including but not limited to the providing of temporary alternative suitable water and the drilling and connection of a suitable replacement well. At a minimum -- some suggested language -- at a minimum, prior to applying for construction permits for any portion of the project, the company shall have received results of water drawn down studies. If the water usage of the company will negatively impact water resources
for others, the applicant must provide alternative sources of water to those affected.

I think that last sentence is probably already dealt with in the portion above in black as opposed to that portion in blue.

The last sentence which reads: If the water usage of the company will negatively impact water resources for others, the applicant must provide alternative sources of water to those affected.

I am not sure that last sentence is necessary because you've got a provision already in there that states the company shall promptly correct any degradation to the water supply or any well negatively impacted including but not limited to the providing of temporary alternative suitable water and the drilling and connection of a suitable replacement well.

You can include it if you want but perhaps --

MR. HARRINGTON: Does it hurt anything to leave it?

MR. KEYT: It probably doesn't hurt anything. It may be a little bit -- it probably
does not hurt anything; let me put it that way.
MR. HARRINGTON: The only other question I

```
would have -- and, you know, this is all
```

hypothetical. We don't obviously know what their
usage is going to be per se -- but the second line,
shall have the right to reasonably limit or
otherwise regulate, I mean do we really have the
capacity to do that, or how do we see that working
out?

```
    MR. KEYT: It's kind of open-ended. It's
difficult to regulate how much water is being drawn.
    MR. HARRINGTON: Right.
    MR. KEYT: It would be a hard one to
police; let me put it that way. It's a lot easier
to police things like shadow flicker or noise or
something like that than water use.
    MR. HARRINGTON: Okay.
    MR. WAX: Are you okay with it?
    MR. HARRINGTON: Yeah. Any other
    suggestions?
    MR. WAX: What about Kyle or Dan? Do you
    have any concerns?
```

        MR. LARSON: I am okay with it.
        MR. LOVIN: Do we have any language for
    them capping wells when they are done with them?
MR. KEYT: There is not language currently about capping a well when they are done.

MR. LOVIN: They are keeping one at the maintenance facility, right?

MR. LARSON: We assume.
MR. LOVING: I'd kind of like to have something for them to take care of that.

MR. KEYT: We could include language in here as either a separate paragraph or separate last sentence just stating any wells no longer in use shall be capped in accordance with any state and federal local law.

MR. HARRINGTON: Yeah. Do we want to leave it no longer in use or maybe at the end of construction is what we are trying to say.

MR. KEYT: We could write it at the conclusion of the construction.

MR. HARRINGTON: I think that is what you are driving at, isn't it?

MR. LOVIN: Right.
MR. WAX: That sounds like a good idea. Thank you, Kyle.

> MR. KEYT: Let me scratch something out
here real quick. Okay. I included as a draft a final sentence to that condition number 20 that reads: At the conclusion of construction, all wells shall be capped within 15 days of the conclusion of construction or sooner if required by other law or regulation.

MR. LOVIN: That will work.
MR. WAX: Okay.
MR. CHAMBERS: So, I have one other. So, at the start there, the county board shall have the right to reasonably limit or otherwise regulate the use of water. Since we are dealing with the Mahomet Valley Water Authority on this, I think that should probably, as long as they have the proper jurisdiction here, that would read the county and the Mahomet Valley Water Authority shall have the right to reasonably limit or otherwise regulate the use of water.

MR. KEYT: If I could make one suggestion
just from a legal standpoint, the relationship between the company and another public body or another authority, I don't want the county to be meddled into the middle of that. So, what I would probably suggest is that, rather than writing it

1 that way, is that perhaps if you want to address it

MR. KEYT: Correct.
MR. CHAMBERS: If that is the case, I am fine with that.

MR. KEYT: If you wanted to make it abundantly clear that that's the case, you could put in a last sentence that says no portion of these conditions impact the Mahomet Valley Water Authority's ability to enforce any law, regulation, if you want to do that, but it would not be necessary.

MR. CHAMBERS: If it's not necessary, then that is fine. I just wanted to make sure that was the case.

MR. WAX: I was talking. You are saying it's not necessary?

MR. CHAMBERS: If you are saying it's not necessary, it's already in place that way.

MR. WAX: Do you go along with that?

Okay.

If we understand how you have it written, I believe that we are in consensus in approving what you have as revised.

MR. KEYT: Okay. Okay. So, I think at this point the additional sentence at the end would read: At the conclusion of construction, all wells shall be capped within 15 days at the conclusion of construction or sooner if required by other law or regulation.

No other change in that paragraph.
MR. WAX: That is my understanding. We are in agreement with that.

MR. KEYT: Okay. Gotcha. Sounds like we have a consensus.

MR. WAX: With that we agree.

MR. KEYT: Condition 21 deals with fire
protection districts and emergency response. It essentially requires the company to assist in emergency response, provide training, etc., and funding for training for new fire equipment or prepare districts to respond to fires or emergencies concerning the project.

I'll give you time to read it. If there are any questions or concerns, revisions, please let me know.

MR. HARRINGTON: I am good. Do you have any other suggestions? I assume not.

MR. KEYT: I would not. I don't have any other suggestions for condition 21.

MR. CHAMBERS: I have one quick one here. Six lines down, Company shall assist emergency response agencies in developing emergency response plan for the project, but it shall be the responsibility of Company to remove employees or other persons who become ill and/or injured in or on a turbine tower to the base of tower to receive medical assistance by local emergency response agencies.

I read that as kind of it's that we're not encouraging the emergency response personnel to go into the tower, which I don't think we should limit that necessarily. So, I don't know if we can add like "if necessary" type language there. You know, if possible, the company is to remove employees or other persons who become ill or injured in or on the turbine, but $I$ don't think it would be reasonable to

```
set anything to prevent the county emergency
    response personnel.
    MR. KEYT: You could leave it open by
removing that clause which then it would just be up
to whoever the emergency response people and the
company to decide who's bringing somebody down.
    So, what you could do is: Company shall
    assist in emergency response agencies in developing
    an emergency response plan for the project.
    Just leave that; put a period there. And
    then, in their emergency response plan, they could
    address who is taking somebody out of that tower in
    their plan as opposed to addressing that
    specifically there.
    But if you want to do something specific,
you could do something.
    MR. CHAMBERS: I would be okay with
removing that language as to remove any sort of the
restriction on the type of response that is given.
    MR. HARRINGTON: Does the verbiage
    restrict EMS or does it just say, hey, it's the
    company's liability?
    MR. KEYT: It's the company's
    responsibility. If the company wanted to, you know,
```

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { defer to the local agency, they could. } \\
& \text { MR. HARRINGTON: Right. } \\
& \text { MR. KEYT: So, I don't think -- it's not } \\
& \text { intended to restrict. It's not intended to limit } \\
& \text { who could -- it's not intended to limit who could go } \\
& \text { in and do the rescue to just people from the company } \\
& \text { if they think somebody from the fire protection } \\
& \text { district would be better suited to do so. You could } \\
& \text { change it to say -- no, I wouldn't. Scratch what I } \\
& \text { was going to say. I was going to make some wise } \\
& \text { comment, but that turns out not to be so wise as I } \\
& \text { started to frame it in my mind. } \\
& \text { So, I don't think there would be a } \\
& \text { tremendous change to remove it or make substantive } \\
& \text { change, to just leave it as is or to add some } \\
& \text { company is unable to do that, that this doesn't } \\
& \text { clarifying language. } \\
& \text { thought is it states that it's the company's } \\
& \text { responsibility to remove the employees from the } \\
& \text { memergency response agencies from taking }
\end{aligned}
$$

```
it on themselves to do that themselves. And I
    assume in an emergency situation that that's not
    really a thought process that is going to go on.
    Nobody is going to pull this out and read it.
    But as far as what to say what the
    training is for the company, if they are trained,
    oh, we have to get people out of the tower for EMS,
    I think that, in some cases, it puts them at more
    risk than just coordinating with EMS to have them do
    it however they see fit.
    MR. KEYT: Yeah. You could phrase -- you
    could put a second additional sentence there that
    says this paragraph does not preclude the company
    from deferring or allowing emergency response
    personnel from performing any activities at the site
    or something.
    MR. CHAMBERS: I would be okay with that.
    I would be okay with that as clarifying that.
    MR. WAX: I believe everyone else here is
    in agreement with including that statement, and as
    that would be written in, we would approve 21.
    MR. KEYT: Okay. So, I added a sentence
    immediately after the one in question that: This
    paragraph does not preclude or restrict emergency
```

response personnel or -- I am sorry -- this
paragraph does not preclude or restrict emergency
response personnel of any governmental or private
entity from performing any rescue activities.
MR. HARRINGTON: I am good with that.
MR. WAX: We are good with that.
MR. CHAMBERS: (Nodding.)
MR. KEYT: Okay. That was paragraph 21.
Any other changes to condition 21 ?
MR. HARRINGTON: I do not.
MR. WAX: No.
MR. KEYT: I believe we have a consensus
there. If not, please say so.
Moving on to condition 22: Existing
underground utility lines. Company shall work with
appropriate pipeline and other underground utilities
and shall ensure that the integrity of the pipelines
and underground utilities in the area of the project
are maintained during construction and operation of
the project.

That could be governed by separate legal
requirements that they would have, so it's not
really necessary to delineate all those issues out
here. So, I would leave that. If there are
suggested changes or revisions, we can address it.
Subject to my comments, are there any
changes or revisions to paragraph 22?

MR. WAX: No. We approve 22.
MR. KEYT: Okay. Paragraph 23 deals with aviation. I'll give you a moment to read that provision.

MR. WAX: Any concerns or comments on this?

MR. HARRINGTON: I do not.
MR. WAX: I would raise one question with the group here. There is a plan that, prior to construction, there apparently is supposed to be an agreement with the zoning administrator for a plan to put lighting on the towers during the construction phase.

I don't see any evidence in there that actually requires them to actually do that or any penalties if they don't do that during the construction phase to put lighting on, and I believe there probably have been a number of instances where, not by this company -- I am not claiming this, but I think there have been a number of instances where no lights have been visible on

```
    things during construction.
```

    But I see, at the end of this, a very
        severe penalty if you don't keep the ADLS system
        going but no reference to you shall actually, in
        addition to having a plan, you shall actually put
        lights on construction during the construction
        phase.
            And then, who do you report to if in fact
        that is not done? And what kind of possible
        penalties are there? These are just questions.
    MR. CHAMBERS: I think this might be
        covered by the paragraph you are adding at the end
        for the county being able to verify compliance on
        the issue.
            MR. WAX: Do you think that would do it?
            MR. KEYT: Yeah. So, a couple things I
        think might help is the last paragraph.
            MR. WAX: Okay.
            MR. KEYT: But then, also, there is a
        provision that the company shall provide a plan for
        temporary construction lighting to be placed on the
        top of turbines during construction, and such plan
        must be approved by the zoning administrator.
            I think by perhaps adding a clause that
    says at the end. We currently have, if not, the specialty permit shall be revoked. Perhaps any violation of the requirements of this condition 23 shall result in the special use permit being revoked, or something like that.

MR. HARRINGTON: What do you think about that, Loyd? Is that what you are looking for?

MR. WAX: I don't see anything except a plan for it.

MR. HARRINGTON: Right.
MR. WAX: So, what happens if they don't do it?

MR. HARRINGTON: Right.
MR. LARSON: I also think it ought to be functioning at a certain time after construction.

MR. WAX: You would think so.
MR. LARSON: Because I know that other county said they had it in theirs but it still isn't working. So, we need to put that in there.

MR. WAX: I am just raising the question. MR. KEYT: So, perhaps what might help is, on the sentence that reads prior to installation of any wind turbines, Company shall provide a plan, perhaps it would be helpful if it said prior to the

```
installation of any wind turbines, Company shall
provide a plan and implement said plan for temporary construction lighting to be placed on top of the turbines during construction.
Then the last sentence could perhaps read: Any violation of the provisions of condition 23, paragraph 23, may result in the special use permit being revoked.
```

MR. HARRINGTON: Maybe. I guess, Andy, do you think that is where you want to go or some sort of fee so it really instigates the action?

MR. LARSON: What $I$ was getting at it is we just need a timeframe after construction that that ADLS is actually going to be functioning.

MR. HARRINGTON: Not just the temporary, the permanent.

MR. LARSON: The permanent, yeah, because they could say we had a plan for it, we had the system. But is it actually functioning as it should.

MR. WAX: Two things here: Ensuring that there is some kind of temporary lighting during the construction phase on these towers and then absolutely ensuring that the ADLS system is working
from the day of electricity production throughout the whole project. I don't know if that is covered in this or not.

MR. HARRINGTON: I agree.
MR. KEYT: I was scratching out notes while you were talking. I apologize, but I didn't catch the last part of what you said.

MR. HARRINGTON: I think he was just saying there is sort of two parts to this that we wanted to address. One was the not just plan but implementation of temporary ADLS and then the other is, to Dan's point, we needed a timeline written into this to say, hey, it doesn't just have to work, it has to be operational say, for example, within two weeks of final construction.

Is that what you are thinking, Dan?
MR. LARSON: Yeah, or even a month after creating electricity, like you were saying.

MR. WAX: Right.
MR. LARSON: Or when they are operational I guess.

MR. KEYT: It currently reads -- there is a sentence that says: The approved ADLS must be installed and operated during the duration of the
life of the special use permit.
So, I would read that as once it's
operational. So, once the temporary lighting
construction phase, once it's operational, they
would be subject to that provision.
MR. LARSON: Right then. That makes
sense.
MR. KEYT: Stating the ADLS has to be,
except as otherwise directed by the FAA, because it
could be a time the FAA says you need to switch
back. We don't know what the FAA will say, but the
county does not preempt or trump the FAA's
requirements as to lighting. So, the FAA currently
would be in a position to approve it. But if the
FAA changes their mind at some point, we don't want
to be in a circumstance where we are at odds with
what the FAA is stating.
MR. CHAMBERS: I would be good with that
language on ADLS as is.
But for the concern on the timeliness of
the temporary lighting, $I$ would just change that to
say: Company shall provide a plan and timeline for
temporary construction lighting to be placed on the
top of the turbine.

That way that plan is submitted to the zoning administrator and would have some sort of a timeframe for when the construction lighting is put up, the temporary.

MR. KEYT: So, I had a couple revisions there to address the implementation of temporary lighting, and if I just -- I am kind of spitballing here a potential revision.

So, that sentence which currently reads: Prior to installation of any wind turbines, Company shall provide a plan for temporary construction lighting, I think maybe one change which I am coming up with here on the fly is, prior to installation, Company shall provide a plan (including timeline) and implement said plan for temporary construction lighting to be placed. The rest of the sentence to remain the same.

MR. CHAMBERS: I agree with that.
MR. WAX: Okay. Sounds good to you guys?
MR. LARSON: I am good with that.
MR. LOVIN: Yeah.
MR. KEYT: And then the last sentence would read -- right now it says if not, comma. The last sentence would read: Any violation of these
provisions of conditions of paragraph 23 may result
in revocation of said special use permit.

MR. HARRINGTON: Okay.
MR. WAX: I think that revision that you just read is approved by us as a group.

MR. HARRINGTON: Are you good with it, Loyd?

MR. WAX: Yeah.
MR. KEYT: Okay. Any other changes or suggestions on paragraph 23?

Okay. Paragraph 24 deals with reimbursement for county expense. This is kind of a backstop paragraph to all the other provisions that deal with similar issues: If during the time of the special use and decommissioning period for the project the Company retains outside engineers, consultants, contractors, attorneys or other parties in order for the county board to enforce turbine compliance or obtain compliance with applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and these conditions, Company shall promptly reimburse the county for all such expenses.

I think the one item I would probably add is, after or obtain compliance with applicable laws

```
or regulations, I think it said, and these
    conditions, I would write and these conditions.
    That would be the only change I would perhaps
    suggest.
```

MR. WAX: Okay with 24?
MR. HARRINGTON: I guess my question I would have to Keri is, since it would appear we have a fair bit of work set forth if, by chance, it was approved prior to the building permit, is there anything there that needs to be addressed in expenses that you know of, or you are good with this?

MS. NUSSBAUM: Not that $I$ can think of that isn't already addressed somewhere else in here.

MR. HARRINGTON: Okay.
MR. WAX: So, are we in agreement with 24 I presume?

MR. LARSON: Yes.
MR. WAX: Yes. We are in agreement with 24 as written.

Would this be an opportunity for a break?
MR. KAINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, it depends on how much -- if we can get through the next seven or eight conditions.

Holly, how are your fingers doing?
COURT REPORTER: Fine. Whenever you want a break, I'm ready.

MR. KAINS: Mr. Chairman, up to you. If you want to break now or address this in 15 minutes and see how far we get, does that work for you?

MR. WAX: Okay. We'll proceed.
MR. KEYT: So, paragraph 25 deals with: Validity of conditions. By constructing and operating the project pursuant to the special use granted by the county board with these conditions, the company shall be deemed to waive any and all claims concerning the lawfulness, authority or reasonableness of any of the conditions set forth herein.

The intent of the paragraph is to prevent some complaint by the applicant or company about the conditions after they started constructing.

MR. HARRINGTON: You are good with that, Andy?

You don't have any suggestions I take it?
MR. KEYT: I don't have any other suggestions other than the paragraph itself.

MR. HARRINGTON: I don't have any
authority on it.

MR. WAX: We don't have any suggestions for it either.

MR. KEYT: Okay. Sounds like we have a consensus on number 25.

Condition 26 deals with: Defense against claims. In the event that the project or any or matters relating to the project is the subject of a lawsuit or other legal action against the county, county board or its officials (including any county officers, directors, administrators, attorneys or agents), the company shall reimburse the county for all reasonable legal fees and other expenses, including expert fees incurred by the county in defending such legal action.

This is if there is some sort of challenge. For example, this is in special use or some other special use permit the county is not stuck dealing with legal fees associated with that.

Is there a consensus on paragraph 26?
MR. HARRINGTON: Good, unless you have other ideas.

MR. WAX: No.
MR. CHAMBERS: I am good.

MR. WAX: I think we are good with it.
MR. KEYT: The condition in paragraph number 27 deals with: Turbines on adjacent property. The county board may, in the future, approve wind turbines to be installed upon property adjacent to or nearby the wind turbines to be installed by the company. By commencing construction and operation of the project, the company shall be deemed to waive any claims against the county board -- I would suggest removing "board" -- just against the county related to the approval of wind turbines for adjacent property for reasons which include but are not limited to wake loss or other claims relating to the production of energy by Company's turbines.

So, if they somehow claim some sort of interference from other turbines to their turbines, they can't come back and make a claim to the county on that.

MR. HARRINGTON: Good enough.
MR. WAX: Sounds good to us.
MR. KEYT: Okay. Consensus on 27, number 27.

Number 28: Financial assurance. Prior to
the commencement of construction, Company shall
provide to the satisfaction of the county board
either: (i) a surety bond or other form of financial
assurance as defined by the zoning ordinance to
cover the cost of the construction of the project;
or (ii) reasonable evidence of financing, as
approved by the county board, demonstrating the
financial ability of the company to complete
construction of the project.

This does not deal with the decommission plan. This is financial assurance. It deals with the event that some sort of financial ability to complete the project once they start it. In other words, the county needs to know they can complete it, not start it and walk away from it.

MR. HARRINGTON: So, the only question $I$ would have there would be: Keri, are you comfortable with prior to commencement or prior to issuing said building permit?

MS. NUSSBAUM: I think it would be prior to issuing -- doesn't it say somewhere else in our ordinance that prior to issuing the permit that a surety bond -- that the county board has to accept whatever the financial consideration is?

MR. KEYT: It may. I just don't recall specifically. What I would suggest is, if that is the concern, I would just change that to prior to the issuance of construction permit.

MS. NUSSBAUM: That would be great. We could clarify that by adding prior to the building permit.

MR. HARRINGTON: I would agree with that.
MR. WAX: Yeah.
MR. KEYT: So, first line there will be prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the rest of the sentence would remain the same?

MS. NUSBAUM: Uh-huh.
HEARING OFFICER: Any other suggested revisions or changes on paragraph 28?

MR. WAX: Anything else?
MR. CHAMBERS: No. I don't have anything.
MR. HARRINGTON: No.
MR. KEYT: Looks like 29 goes with aerial application. Company shall work with landowners and aerial applicators to address concerns with aerial application in wind farm areas. The goal is to create a set of the best management practices and protocols to guide wind farm development and improve

```
1 health and safety of operations within the wind farm
2 area. Company shall compensate farmers/landowners
3 for any reasonable increased costs for aerial
health and safety of operations within the wind farm
area. Company shall compensate farmers/landowners
for any reasonable increased costs for aerial
application due to or as a consequence of the
presence of the project.
    I think there was one suggestion to
    include language that would state Company shall work
    with farmers, landowners and aerial applicators in
    that first sentence, and then Company shall
    compensate farmers, landowners or aerial
    applicators, in the last sentence.
    MR. WAX: So, you are adding farmers,
    landowners and aerial -- adding farmers to the
    thing?
    MR. KEYT: Correct.
    MR. WAX: A number of the operators are
    not landowners.
    MR. KEYT: Correct. So the first sentence
    would be or it would read Company shall work with
    farmers, landowners and aerial applicators. The
    rest of the sentence would remain the same. The
    last sentence would change to say, Company shall
    compensate the farmers, landowners or aerial
    applicators for any reasonably incurred cost.
```

Because you could have a farmer that was incurring the cost as opposed to a landowner. You could have an aerial applicator as opposed to a landowner. That way it's clear that somebody is getting reimbursed.

MR. WAX: We are in agreement as you've rewritten it.

MR. KEYT: Okay. So paragraph 29, it sounds like we have a consensus on 29.

Paragraph 30 just deals with calling JULIE for any digging that is going to take place.

Any suggested changes or revisions in paragraph 30 ?

MR. HARRINGTON: I don't have any.
MR. WAX: We have no suggested changes.
MR. KEYT: Okay. Paragraph 31 deals with: Avian, bat, wildlife, environmental. The company shall comply with all current or future requirements and all current recommendations of the Illinois Department of Department of Natural Resources and US Fish \& Wildife Service during the duration of the construction, operation, and decommissioning of the project. Company shall perform three years of post-construction monitoring as represented during
the special use permit hearing.
The purpose for the delineation of those requirements versus recommendations, there is really two different things that take place from either IDNR or the US Fish \& Wildlife Service. They occasionally will issue new requirements that they have to follow. They occasionally issue recommendations which sometimes can be somewhat whimsical at times. So, they have testified during a hearing that they are able to meet all current recommendations from both IDNR and US Fish \& Wildlife Service, so I think to be fair they should have to meet those recommendations since they testified they can meet them and will meet them at this time and, of course, they have to meet any current or future requirements.

They also testified that they would be committed to performing three years of post-construction monitoring as represented during the special use permit.

MR. WAX: What is the thinking of the board on this matter?

MR. CHAMBERS: I am okay with it, with the changes. MR. WAX: We are okay with this as written.

MR. HARRINGTON: I'm sorry. I got one question. Let me -- if by chance -- I know they are talking about complying with current and future IDNR regulations, but if, by chance, ecology -- right? -wildlife changes, and at some point a bat or eagle or whatever the species in question is is identified at a closer range, is there really any reach back there, or are we just saying as is, 2023, current-day scenario?

MR. KEYT: If IDNR or the US Fish \& Wildlife Service issued a new requirement as to that issue, they would have to follow that.

MR. HARRINGTON: So, in the event that this IDNR, what we essentially are using as our baseline, identified something in a particular turbine was close enough to affect it, are we saying that it would exclude that turbine at that point? MR. KEYT: So, if IDNR or the US Fish \& Wildlife Service came out with a new requirement that said -- I'm coming up with a hypothetical requirement. It may not be the best one. But if they said something like any turbine within half a

```
mile of an eagle nest would need to be
    decommissioned, then they would have to follow that
    requirement.
    MR. HARRINGTON: Okay.
    MR. KEYT: Requirements and
    recommendations are different things, so that is why
    it is written the way it is.
    MR. HARRINGTON: Right. And you feel
    "comply" encompasses that, right? That is going to
    cover our bases in regards to that?
    MR. KEYT: Yes.
    MR. HARRINGTON: That's all I got,
    Chairman.
    MR. WAX: Looks like it covers current or
    any future recommendations that they might have.
    MR. HARRINGTON: Right.
    HEARING OFFICER: Are you guys okay with
    the changes?
    Will?
    MR. CHAMBERS: Uh-huh.
    MR. KEYT: Just to clarify, it covers any
    future or current requirement or recommendation.
    MR. WAX: Right. Okay. With that as
    written, we approve that.
```

MR. KEYT: Okay. Number 32 deals with work on substation sites. So, as you know, there is a substation parcel. Before they start working on that substation they have to submit a survey of a parcel demonstrating compliance with applicable setback requirements. They have to show they have any applicable IDOT approvals in connection with the substation construction, and then also a certificate of liability insurance regarding that substation parcel.

MR. WAX: Any concerns from the ZBA members?

MR. LARSON: I am good with it.
MR. HARRINGTON: I guess, out of curiosity, what are we saying when we reference or at the time noted below? What are we referencing there?

And then we go on to say either substation parcel. Do we anticipate multiple substations? What are we saying?

MR. KEYT: Yeah. Prior to commencement of construction or the time noted below, so if there is a different time period that would be noted therein, they would have to provide the compliance.

So, for example, the certificate of assurance compliance, Section 12 of the Wind Ordinance, may come at a different time.

Now, to avoid confusion, I don't know if this is more than one time that it would be noted. So, we could remove that section.

MR. HARRINGTON: That would be my suggestion, is to just simplify it and say prior --

I guess in regards to this, Keri, do you want prior to commencement of construction or prior to the building permit being issued?

MS. NUSBAUM: I think it would be the building permit.

MR. HARRINGTON: I do, too.
MR. LARSON: Uh-huh.
MR. KEYT: So that one I am going to revise to prior to issuance of any construction permit -- it will read prior to the issue of any construction permit -- currently it reads on either substation parcel -- I am just going to rephrase it as on any substation parcel, if that makes sense, the following shall be provided to the county, and the rest remains the same. Okay.

Any suggested changes or revisions to

```
paragraph 32?
```

MR. WAX: We are okay with that.
MR. KEYT: Paragraph 33 deals with: Additional site surveys. Company shall provide site surveys for each turbine, tower and substation before applying for the construction permit and after construction demonstrating compliance with the code requirements.

MR. WAX: Any thoughts on that?
You are looking pretty seriously at this thing.

MR. HARRINGTON: I guess I don't see anything horribly.

Andy, I mean since their particular location to turbine seems to be a little bit un-permanent/certain, is there anything you advise we should include?

MR. KEYT: I wouldn't necessarily advise anything additional to it. It requires them to provide those surveys and what they are going to show in those surveys which then the zoning administrator could go through and make sure it complies.

Paragraph 34 kind of dovetails with all of
this in that the company has to provide as built drawings for the entirety of the project which would be, of course, as built steel as it got constructed.

So, there could be changes in the process as they are going along, for whatever reason as to construction, and this would give us, give the county, as built drawings of exactly how it was built in case there is some question later on. So, I think 33 and 34 will dovetail with each other. Are there any suggested changes or revision to 33 or 34 ?

MR. HARRINGTON: No.
MR. WAX: We are okay with those. Okay.
MR. KEYT: Okay. That brings us to 35, which is a cure period paragraph.

So, as you may recall, there is a number of conditions that are set forth in here, and rather than having some ambiguity to it, this would make sort of a cure period for all the conditions uniform unless otherwise stated. So, the cure period, subject to any other provision of these conditions, any alleged breach of violation of the conditions listed herein, including an alleged failure to comply with any federal, state or local regulation
now or hereafter in effect, and any penalty herein, including termination of rights granted by the invalidity of the special use permit, as a result of such breach or violation, shall be subject to the company curing or commencing to cure and thereafter diligently pursuing such cure of any violation within 60 days after receipt of written notice from the county of such breach or violation.

That would make it clear that if there is a breach, and if we believe -- the county believes there is a breach, we give them a written notice that sets a procedure in place for them to diligently attempt to cure that within 60 days' timeframe.

If there are shorter or longer cure periods within individual paragraphs of the conditions, those individual paragraphs cure period would control. So, anyone that doesn't have something specifically listed would fall into this cure period. I would also note that --

MR. HARRINGTON: I don't have any problem with this.

MR. KEYT: -- in paragraph 2 there is a provision dealing with written notice of a default
within the 60 -day period. We could remove that out of paragraph 2 since paragraph 35 would cover all of that information or all those requirements -- excuse me.

MR. WAX: What is your recommendation?
MR. KEYT: I would use paragraph 35 and remove the corresponding language that is in paragraph 2. It wouldn't remove the entirety of the paragraph 2, just the language that would be redundant of paragraph 35.

MR. WAX: That would make sense. I think we are thinking your suggestion would make a lot of sense and you've covered all of 35.

MR. KEYT: So, I'll remove that language. That is duplicative in paragraph 2, and it sounds like there is a consensus that paragraph 35 is the language approved.

MR. WAX: Are you okay with those changes?
MR. HARRINGTON: Yeah.
I don't know at what point you want me to bring this up, but $I$ was going to ask the board to consider one more condition, Andy. So, I don't know where that fits, before or after your 35 .

MR. KEYT: There was one more condition we
talked about earlier tonight about proof of compliance, and so I scratched out a paragraph, and we could maybe cover yours after we cover this one.

So paragraph 36 I scratched out some language that reads: Proof of compliance. Company shall provide any requested proof of compliance with these conditions, the Piatt County Zoning Ordinance, any other applicable laws and regulations to the Piatt County Zoning administrator upon request.

MR. WAX: How does that sound to you?
Zoning Board Members, are we in agreement that that sounds good, 36?

We agree.
MR. KEYT: Okay. 36 will be included.
And that would take us to Mr. Harrington's 37.

MR. HARRINGTON: I am going to throw it out for you guys to discuss, but I would like to see a condition speaking to fire suppression in these, and I don't have the terminology or the knowledge to say what/how far we should take it, but I would like to hear some discussion in regards to that.

MR. KEYT: Would it be a provision dealing with including a fire suppression system?

MR. HARRINGTON: At least in the turbine, right? To my knowledge, looking through all of it, we don't see anything about active intention to use fire suppression in the turbine housing.

MR. CHAMBERS: I am trying to find it here. We went over the language about the commercially available fire suppression, shadow flicker management, bat deterrent, all of that, if $I$ can find it again.

MR. KEYT: So, if you look at paragraph/condition number 7, it deals with the turbine. There is a comment. There is a comment listed there that governs a variety of systems that could be or may become available, and I am going to pull that comment up on the screen so that everybody can see it.

The addition states: If any shadow flicker reduction, noise reduction, fire suppression and/or bird and bat protection systems are available on said model, Company shall acquire and install said system.

MR. HARRINGTON: I get what you are saying, but what $I$ am saying is didn't we receive some information on there are fire suppression

```
available, and it's just a question of whether the
company is utilizing that?
    MR. LARSON: But that says that they have
to.
    MS. NUSBAUM: It says if available.
    MR. HARRINGTON: That is my question to
    you guys. Do you want to leave it to available or
    do you really -- I do want to take it a step
    further.
    MR. KEYT: I think the --
    MR. CHAMBERS: I think the language as is
    covers it.
    MR. HARRINGTON: If it's available, they
    have to.
    MR. CHAMBERS: They shall acquire and
    install.
    MR. HARRINGTON: Right, but I guess my
    question is how do we know what is available for
    this particular model or not? How do we know?
    MR. KEYT: I think that kind of goes to
    the aspect of proof of compliance. So, if it is
    available, they have to install it.
    MR. HARRINGTON: Okay.
    MR. KEYT: What the zoning administrator
```

```
or the county could do is ask for proof of
```

compliance with that section. So, we could ask the
applicant to provide us all systems available on
that model and proof of whether those have been
installed or not.
MR. WAX: If that is listed as an option
on that model.
MR. HARRINGTON: I am in agreement with
that. If you want to repeat it, I didn't hear you,
Chairman.
MR. WAX: I believe it's listed as an
option on the model Vestas turbine.
MR. KEYT: Is there a suggested language
change you want to make?
I think what you are saying is if it is
available in the model.
MR. WAX: Is that okay?
MR. KEYT: I think the language currently
there would cover the issue you are talking about.
MR. WAX: You feel most comfortable with
the language as written there?
MR. LOVIN: Do we want to put something in
that, if it's not available now, we can retrofit
these systems down the road, that it is to be
retrofitted on; not at the time of construction because it may not be available now, but five years down the road it might be.

MR. KEYT: So you could add a sentence on that condition number 7 currently reading if any shadow flicker reduction, noise reduction, fire suppression and/or bird and bat suppression systems are available on said model, Company shall acquire and install those systems. If those systems become -- do you want to say commercially available?

MR. LARSON: Throughout the life-span of the turbine.

MR. KEYT: Become commercially
available --
MR. WAX: Tell him how you want it.
MR. KEYT: -- during the operation period of the project, Company shall acquire and install those systems.

MR. LARSON: That is good.
MR. HARRINGTON: What do you think, guys?
Is that what you are thinking, or do you have some other verbiage you want to add to it?

MR. LARSON: If that covers the life-span of the project.

MR. HARRINGTON: You want to say life of the project, probably not life of the turbine.

MR. LARSON: Right. That is what he already said.

MR. KEYT: Okay. So, let me read the addition to paragraph 7 currently. If any shadow flicker reduction, noise reduction, fire suppression and/or bird and bat protection systems are available on said model, Company shall acquire and install those systems. If such systems become commercially available during the operation of project, Company shall acquire and install those systems.

MR. CHAMBERS: Would it be if previously unavailable systems become commercially available during the life of the project the company shall acquire and install those systems?

MR. KEYT: You could maybe make the same meaning with a couple less words, but what if $I$ just throw this out: If such systems become commercially available during any period of the operation of the project.

MR. LARSON: Should we say anything about if say a system gets an update or something where they have to update it, or are we covered with that?

MR. WAX: Speak to the microphone.
MR. LARSON: I just meant, you know, like if there is 20 years from now there may be a heck of a lot better system out. If one is already installed, do they just keep the old one or do they go with the new technology?

MR. CHAMBERS: I think that would be a little bit of a rabbit hole because you don't know if there is going to be a newest, greatest and latest thing every five years. You wouldn't want to have everything change every too often.

MR. KEYT: I think the problem you run into is software updates every single time you are going to ask for proof of compliance. But I mean, you know.

So, right now I have it written as: If such additions become commercially available during any period of the operation of the project, Company shall acquire and install those systems.

MR. HARRINGTON: Sounds good.
MR. WAX: Is that acceptable to the board members?

MR. LOVIN: Yeah.
MR. WAX: Appears to be acceptable as
written.
MR. KEYT: Okay. Okay. That concludes all of the separate conditions that would be potentially recommended to the county board.

What I would suggest, if it makes sense, is we take a short break or recess and then we come back and vote on approval of those conditions as a recommendation to the county board.

HEARING OFFICER: Yeah. We are going to take a ten-minute recess. It is 8:00 now. This board will be in recess for ten minutes, and we'll resume at 8:10 to vote on the proposed conditions and then begin the work of going through the findings of fact that have been drafted by Mr. Keyt. So, the board is in recess until 8:10 p.m. (BREAK TAKEN.)

HEARING OFFICER: Just a reminder that we will be continuing this public hearing on Thursday night from 6 to 9 p.m. in this very room.

Mr. Keyt?
MR. KEYT: Okay.
HEARING OFFICER: Back to you. Now that proposed conditions have been discussed, a vote on these conditions.

MR. KEYT: So, we've come to, at this point, a consensus on the language for proposed recommended conditions to the county board.

Again, for clarity, the vote on approval of any recommended conditions to the county board is only in the event that they would approve the project. It has no bearing on whether the ZBA will recommend approval of the special use as a whole; just merely that these are recommended conditions should the county board vote for approval of the project as a whole.

With that as normal procedure, is there any motion for approval of these conditions to be recommended to the county board in the event of approval of the project?

MR. WAX: Okay. Zoning Board Members, what we are looking for is a positive motion to approve these conditions to be recommended to the county board. Do I hear such a motion?

MR. LARSON: I make a motion.
MR. WAX: Done. We have a motion.
Is there a second?

MR. HARRINGTON: Second.
HEARING OFFICER: Jim is second.

Is there any discussion? Further discussion on this matter? If not, let's have a rollcall, please.

MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Chambers?

MR. CHAMBERS: Yes.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Loven?

MR. LOVEN: Yes.
MS. NUSSBAUM: Mr. Harrington?
MR. HARRINGTON: Yes.

Mr. Larson?

MR. LARSON: Yes.
Mr. Wax?
MR. WAX: Yes.
The motion has been approved to move forward to recommend to the county board these conditions to the county board. Thank you.

MR. KEYT: Also, just for clarification for everyone, the conditions as we've stated before are entirely within the purview of the county board whether to adopt, approve, revise, etc., those conditions that have been recommended by the zoning board. There is not a document to sign in terms of the conditions, unlike the findings of fact. I have what I am going to call the master copy of revisions
we talked about tonight. I will make those revisions and have them for the board on Thursday.

Okay. Any questions at all regarding the conditions that we --

MR. WAX: I have a question. It is my understanding just that we are approving these. The motion is to approve them to recommend these to the county board in the event that we would like them to consider them in the event that they approve the SUP; is that correct?

MR. KEYT: Correct.
MR. WAX: Okay.
MR. KEYT: Yeah. Okay. With that, any other questions from the zoning board or county staff in relation to the conditions?

Hearing none, we'll turn now to the findings of fact and ultimate recommendation on the special use permit application to the county board.

So, for clarity, on findings of fact from the zoning board, the zoning board -- one of the zoning board's jobs is to make finding of fact as to all the facts that have been adduced here at the hearing. Those findings then the board uses to make a recommendation to the county board as to whether
to approve the special use permit, deny the special
use permit, or approve the special use permit
subject to conditions.
Ultimately, the decision on whether to
approve or deny the special use permit is within the
purview of the county board, but this board's job is
to make those findings of fact required and then
forward a recommendation to the county board on
whether to approve or not approve the special use
permit and, if to approve, whether to make that
approval subject to conditions.
With that, I've pulled up the draft set of
Findings of Fact. There might be a few extra copies
around. They are the same copy that was distributed
last week that were part of the copies that were up
here, the same copy as what the zoning board has in
front of it tonight, and so we can start walking
through the findings of fact.
Is there any questions before we start
down the path of going through the findings of fact?
Okay. With that, we'll begin.
I think we'll probably -- this first page
is probably not very controversial, but the first
page that is up here on the screen for everybody to
see is sort of a summary of the project, who the applicant is, the application itself, when it was filed, and then the hearing process that we've conducted here during these past several nights. Listed is, of course, the hearing dates that have occurred. There will be, of course, at least one, if not likely, very likely, two additional nights listed under the hearing process dates.

The document goes through the witnesses that have testified in this matter. There are a couple of changes just in terms of clarifications, you know, those listed witnesses, and I'll walk through those, but I am just going to get through sort of this introductory stuff first.

Then it walks through the list of exhibits. Both the witnesses that have testified and the exhibits are separated by those in favor of the applicant, those testifying on behalf of objectors and county witnesses. The exhibits are also separated the same way.

Then, at the conclusion of that, is a listing of the applicable standards, 1 through 7. Then we talk about the evidence and the
findings, and then we start going through each factor that the zoning board is to consider and all of the draft facts for the board to consider. Again, just like with the conditions, the findings of fact are within entirely the purview of the Zoning Board of Appeals and also the recommendations within the purview of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

As has been the practice of the zoning board after each factor is essentially a question, if you will, of whether or not the applicant has met the factor being discussed or not met the factor being discussed.

And then at the conclusion of going through the findings of fact and having findings of fact set, then the board will have to vote on their recommendation to the county board.

So, with that as our background, are there any changes to either paragraphs I, paragraph II, paragraph III or paragraph IV which deals with Applicant, the project summary, the application, the hearing process? And then I'll deal with the witnesses that have testified on the exhibits separately.

MR. HARRINGTON: I do not.

MR. WAX: How far are we going? Do you want it approved?

MR. KEYT: I went down through -- I would suggest taking them as a whole, paragraph -- I am sorry -- section $I$, which is applicant; section II, which is project summary; section III, which is the application; and section IV, which is the hearing process but only the first paragraph of the hearing process.

MR. WAX: Okay. We are just going as far as I through IV at this point in time?

MR. KEYT: Correct, excepting out the witnesses and exhibits because I'll address those separately.

MR. WAX: Okay. Zoning Board Members, do you have any changes or any problems with this?

We do not have any changes to I through IV.

MR. KEYT: Okay. I am going to add at least the additional dates that we've heard so far.

Okay. Let's talk very briefly about the witnesses that have testified. There are a couple of clarifications on these witnesses. So, anything
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that you would like to change on those witnesses
    that have testified on behalf of the applicant?
    Just the first section dealing with on behalf of the
    applicant.
    MR. WAX: So, right now we are looking
    through and trying to see if we agree upon or have
    any changes to the witnesses on behalf of the
    applicant down through about two-thirds of page 2;
    is that correct?
    MR. KEYT: It's probably the first third.
    I was stopping at Scott Koziar, Senior
    Vice-President of Apex Clean Energy.
    MR. CHAMBERS: I have no changes.
    MR. WAX: Pardon me?
    MR. CHAMBERS: No changes.
    MR. WAX: We have no changes. Thank you.
    MR. KEYT: Let's go to that. Those
    witnesses in support of the project. There is a
    clarification on one of the witnesses listed as
    David Hepler. I've listed him as Dr. David Hepler,
    as I believe he is a chiropractor. He was from
    Logan County not Ford County.
    Any changes to those listed witnesses?
    MR. WAX: Zoning Board Members, do you
```

have any changes to those or suggestions?
Will, have anything?
MR. CHAMBERS: (Shaking head.)
MR. WAX: I don't either. We have no changes.

MR. KEYT: Okay. Then it gets to the list of witnesses in opposition to the project. Any changes to the list of witnesses in opposition to the project?

I have listed here those witnesses as either resident or citizen. Resident meaning a resident of the county. Citizen just meaning a citizen, not necessarily of the county.

MR. WAX: I am open to the -- correct me if I'm wrong here -- but is Sandra Coyle's name spelled correctly, the last name?

MR. KEYT: I don't know, but I believe it's supposed to be C-o-i-l-e.

MR. WAX: I think you're right.
MR. KEYT: Also, I would correct that Hardtke is not a citizen of the county. He is a resident of the state. He is listed as a citizen here. That is correct.

If you go down to the next line, neutral

```
on the project, Mr. Reed is listed as a citizen. I
```

believe he is a resident of the county.
And then the last listed person is
Mr. Minder, who is an engineer for the county.
Any other changes to the list of
witnesses?
MR. HARRINGTON: Is Colleen Kidd K-i-d-d
or K-i-d?
MS. NUSBAUM: Colleen Kidd is K-i-d-d.
MR. HARRINGTON: Yeah.
MR. KEYT: I believe we have a consensus
on the list of witnesses.
MR. WAX: I believe we are okay with that.
MR. KEY: That brings us to the exhibits.
The exhibits are listed in the same grouping
category, so applicant exhibits are listed first.
Are there any changes to the applicant
exhibits to what is before the board?
It is now including clarification for the
wildlife study. It was the Brown PowerPoint, which
was Exhibit 16, and then the additional exhibits
that we had Mr. Kanis had heard evidence on
concerning Objectors' counsel and allowed in
Exhibits 47, 48, 49, 50, 51. Those would then be --
have now been admitted and so those are listed there.

Any changes to the applicant's exhibits?

And for clarification, so the board is aware, the written application in the appendices is that giant white binder that the applicant submitted that is listed as Group Exhibit Number 1.

MR. WAX: Zoning Board Members, do you have any suggested changes or concerns about the exhibits we are talking about?

MR. CHAMBERS: No.

MR. WAX: We have no concerns.

MR. KEYT: Okay. If we could go back to the witnesses listed under Brian Stevens, objectors to the project $I$ believe. I have been informed rather than Brian Stevens, it should be Brian Sebens. We believe $S-i-e-b-e-n-s . \quad I$ could check the transcript.

MS. NUSBAUM: Sebens. If it's supposed to be Brian Sebens, then it's $S-e-b-e-n-s$.

MR. KEYT: Okay. We'll make that change then. If some reason we are wrong, somebody will catch us at some point.

So we've concluded that Applicant exhibits
are properly listed.
That takes us to Objectors' Exhibits,
those represented by counsel. Any objection to
objectors' exhibits as represented by counsel?
MR. WAX: This may be a memory lapse on my
part. Exhibit 35 to 22, what does reserved mean?
MR. KEYT: The applicant had miss numbered
some. They didn't have any exhibits for that. So,
what had happened is they finished Exhibit 24 and
then they submitted Exhibit 33 next. So, what that
means is that there are no exhibits between 25 and
32 for the applicant.
MR. WAX: Okay.
MR. KEYT: That was the applicant's error,
not to pick on the applicant. I am just saying.
HEARING OFFICER: With this much paper, it
is easy to misplace things.
MR. GERSHON: Thank you.
MR. KEYT: So, any changes to applicant's
exhibits? Hearing none, I think we can move to
Koziar exhibits. I don't think there is going to be
a change to that one.
Fox exhibits, that was the professor that
had provided information from various individuals.
I doubt there are any changes to that one. I took
that one right off Professor Fox's exhibit list that
she provided.

Any changes to that one?
Okay. Hearing none, why don't we just take the remainder of the exhibits; that includes county exhibits, Bill Gallagher Exhibits, Kayla Gallagher Exhibits, McKanik Exhibits, Hepler Exhibits, Statler Group Exhibit, Ryan, letters from the public, and then those exhibits that have been excluded.

Any changes to those exhibits as listed?
The one that $I$ would suggest is on letters from the public there be an additional Exhibit 3, which is the letter from January 17, 2023, letter from the Mahomet Valley Water Authority which was previously admitted into evidence.

Subject to that, any changes to those remaining exhibits?

MR. HARRINGTON: I do not.
MR. WAX: I do not. No. We do not have any changes.

MR. KEYT: Any changes to the applicable standard? I don't believe there would be any
changes to those standards.
MR. WAX: We have no changes.
MR. KEYT: Okay. Moving along, we are now getting into the substance of findings. So, we'll go to factor number 1.

I will address that paragraph section number 6 listed their evidence. I don't believe there would be any changes or revision to that paragraph. If there are, please let me know.

With that, we'll get into the specific findings of fact.

The first one listed there is paragraph or factor number 1 , the establishment of maintenance or operation of the special use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public, health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare.

I have listed out here essentially by topic the various issues that could be considered under paragraph number 1 .

The zoning board may decide there are other factors -- I am sorry -- not other factors but other topics they want listed there.

The paragraph -- I am sorry -- factor number 1 goes from page 7 of the draft findings all
the way to page 20. To be clear, there are various
factors listed in -- I am sorry -- various topics
listed in factor number 1 that can apply to other
factors within these findings. That's why factor
number 1's length is as it is. So, I think we'll
take it by particular topic.
The first one is overview of project by
developer and developer's witnesses. This provides
a three-paragraph summary of an overview of the
project.
Is there any suggested changes or revision
to those first three paragraphs listed under there,
under overview of project, by developer and
developer's witnesses?
MR. WAX: Board Members, do you have any
suggested changes?
MR. HARRINGTON: I do not.
MR. CHAMBERS: No.
MR. WAX: We have no suggested changes for
the areas that you mentioned.
MR. KEYT: Okay. Then going down to
turbine systems and tower heights, which begins on
the bottom of page 7 and continues to the top of
page 8. Any suggested changes or revisions to that
portion?

```
    MR. WAX: Okay. We are considering just
    the turbine system and tower height verbiage at this
point in time?
    MR. KEYT: That's right.
    MR. WAX: Do any of the zoning members
    have a suggested change? Are you okay with it?
    We are okay with it.
    MR. KEYT: Okay. That takes us to setback
    requirements listed there on page 8. Any suggested
    changes or revisions to that portion?
    MR. WAX: Well, Zoning Board Members, do
    you have any suggested changes?
    MR. CHAMBERS: No.
    MR. WAX: We do not.
    MR. KEYT: Okay. The next section is
    starts with I would say the beginning of those
    sections that have evidence that essentially goes
    both ways. So there are financial impacts is the
    next section listed. There is the beginning of that
    that lists financial impacts, evidence in favor of
    applicant. It is an italicized portion.
    Then, later on, on page 9, starts
    financial impact, evidence in favor of objectors.
``` That is listed there and continues on to the top of page 10.
```

    My suggestion is you take that first
    paragraph listed, it starts financial aspects. Are
    there any changes to that very first paragraph,
    financial aspects may impact -- and then I put
    (positively or negatively) the health, safety,
    welfare of the general.
    Property values are addressed elsewhere in
    these findings. So, I put property values in factor
    number 2 as they more seemed to be appropriately be
    addressed there.
    Is there any change to that first
    ```
    paragraph?
    MR. WAX: Are you okay with it as written?
    Will?
    MR. CHAMBERS: Yeah.
    MR. WAX: We are okay with it.
    MR. KEYT: Okay. Then taking the section
    that begins with Financial Impacts - Evidence in
    Favor of Applicant, beginning on page number 8 and
    continuing on to about three-quarters of the way
    down, page 9, just before financial impacts,
    evidence in favor of objectors, so taking that
```

information listed there in favor of applicant, any
changes to that, revisions, removals, additions,
etc.?

```

MR. HARRINGTON: I guess the only question I would have: Did we ever actually find facts that there was going to actually be 30 new long-term jobs in Piatt County?

MR. KEYT: Well, that's up to the zoning board.

MR. CHAMBERS: That is what \(I\) was about to say with the way things are worded I would be looking for language in there that those numbers presented are the result of modeling.

When we are talking about the job numbers, we probably want to add in there or at least make sure it's clear that the numbers are the result of the model.

MR. KEYT: So, one change that you could potentially make to address that is, if you look on page 9, second paragraph, the last sentence of the first paragraph, which starts according to this testimony, to address that, you could potentially make the change according to written support, the project modeled have the following economic impact.

That would address the potential -- address the issue that it's based on modeling. I just wanted to make sure that was clear. Maybe that would do it. Are you good with that?

MR. HARRINGTON: Yeah. I think we definitely want to say per the model or maybe even, on that line item, say something like according to Dr. Loomis, 32 new jobs were estimated in Piatt County or something.

MR. LARSON: Maybe change it to projects could have the following economic impact instead of will have?

MR. KEYT: According to his testimony and written reports, the project is modeled to potentially have.

MR. LARSON: Yeah. That would work.
MR. KEYT: Any other suggested changes or revisions to that section which is titled Financial Impact - Evidence in Favor of Applicant?

MR. WAX: Any other changes, suggestions? What do you have as far as any -- what we suggested? What do you have as far as any suggested changes right now?

MR. KEYT: Currently, in the second
paragraph on page number 9, the last sentence of that paragraph will read: According to his testimony and written reports, the project is modeled to potentially have the following economic impacts. That is the current change.

MR. WAX: Okay. Zoning Board okay with that?

MR. HARRINGTON: Yeah.
MR. WAX: Okay. We agree with that.
MR. KEYT: Okay. It sounds like the board is okay with that section.

Moving on to Financial Impacts - Evidence in Favor of Objectors. It begins three-quarters of the way down on page 9 and continues through the top of page 10.

If \(I\) were to suggest one addition to what
is listed there, there was a letter that was read into evidence from the Flying Illini Aerial Service. I believe that was the name of that service. So, at the end of this paragraph that is on the top of page 10, after the testimony of Mr. Bauer that is listed there, I would suggest including additionally the information that came from that letter which would read: As a potential change additionally,
```

Mr. Herman of Flying Illini Aerial Service provided
correspondence via letter that serious risk to
applicators increase the cost of application.
And then make a reference to the letter
received.
MR. WAX: How far are we supposed to be
considering at this point in time?
MR. KEYT: I would go, if you look on the
bottom of page 9, the portion that is in italics
starting with financial impacts in favor of
objectors.
MR. WAX: And including the first
paragraph on page 10?
MR. KEYT: Yeah. I would go to -- see the
bold on page 10 that says sound?
MR. WAX: Okay.
MR. KEYT: I would read to that portion,
up to that portion.
MR. WAX: Are we okay with up to sound?
MR. LARSON: Yes.
MR. HARRINGTON: Yes.
MR. WAX: Will, are you okay with that?
MR. CHAMBERS: Yeah.
MR. WAX: We appreciate you including that

```
one letter.

MR. KEYT: Okay. Moving on to the sound portion. That begins on page 10.

We heard a significant amount of testimony about sound. It starts on page 10 and goes to page 14. So, what \(I\) would suggest is we start with the Piatt County Zoning Ordinance, and it begins on page number 10. It's the first portion, and it continues on to page number 11, at the top of page number 11. So, if you read from the bolded Sound and then stopping at Sound and Evidence in Support of Applicant on page number 11, the one change I would make is a typographical error. There is a typographical error on that first italicized portion, which says through the use of a qualified professional as part of the special "sue" application. It should be special "use" application. That is the only change \(I\) caught after I submitted it to the board.

Any suggested changes or revisions to those first?

MR. WAX: Any changes?
MR. KEYT: Four paragraphs.
MR. WAX: No. We have no changes to the
section you have mentioned.
MR. KEYT: Okay. That then takes us to the top of page 11. The italicized portion beginning Sound - Evidence in Support of Applicant, I would suggest that we just consider the remainder of the information on page 11 for now.

MR. HARRINGTON: I do not have any.
MR. WAX: Will, do you have anything?
MR. CHAMBERS: No.
MR. WAX: We do not have any changes.
MR. KEYT: Then, proceeding to page 12, I would suggest you consider the first two paragraphs listed there on page 12 stopping at the italicized portion that reads Sound - Evidence in Support of Objectors, so the first two paragraphs of page 12.

MR. HARRINGTON: I don't have anything.
MR. LARSON: Good with it.
MR. WAX: We don't have any changes to that section.

MR. KEYT: That takes to the sound evidence portion, and I suggest we review the remainder of page 12. It starts with Sound Evidence in Support of Objectors, the first three paragraphs there.

MR. WAX: What do you think?
MR. CHAMBERS: Just for clarity -- so let me find it in here. So, the beginning of the second paragraph talking about Punch's testimony and he testified as to the unique characterizations of wind turbines and causal links between infrasound and low-frequency noise. I think that is supposed be causal links between infrasound and low-frequency noise and his testimony would have been about adverse health outcomes, but that is not clear. He wasn't talking about the link between infrasound and low-frequency noise. He was making note to the health outcome.

MR. KEYT: So, the proposed change, I guess, would be Jeremy Punch, Audiologist, testified to the unique characterizations of wind turbines and the causal links between infrasound, low-frequency noise and health outcomes?

MR. CHAMBERS: Correct.
MR. KEYT: Do you want to list it as adverse health outcomes, to be clear?

MR. CHAMBERS: Yeah. That would match up with the last paragraph there.

MR. KEYT: Is the rest of the board okay
with that potential change?
MR. HARRINGTON: Yep.
MR. WAX: Yep. We agree.
MR. KEYT: Okay. The rest, any changes to the remainder of page 12, from Sound - Evidence in Support of Objectors to --

MR. WAX: No other changes.
MR. KEYT: Okay. Hearing none, we'll go
to page 13. This is a continuation of the objectors' evidence in relation to sound. I would suggest you consider the entirety of page 13, if that is agreeable with the board.

MR. HARRINGTON: I am good.
MR. CHAMBERS: I have an important clarity to add.

MR. KEYT: That's okay.
MR. CHAMBERS: About mid -- that first big paragraph there about two-thirds of the way down, that sentence, he also cited other studies, indicating wind turbines, being associated with wind turbines and addresses health outcomes, I'd just delete that, the redundant, double mention of wind turbines.

MR. KEYT: Oh, I see. That's the
drafter's error.
    MR. HARRINGTON: That was a little farther
    down.
    MR. KEYT: He also cited other studies
    being associated.
    And then, Mr. Harrington, I think you had
    a reference.
    MR. HARRINGTON: Yeah. It's just right
    after that. It says heart rate, heart health,
    hormone levels, hormone levels. It just mentioned
    it twice. It's not a big deal.
    MR. KEYT: No, no, no. I am willing to
    have my errors vetted in public.
    MR. CHAMBERS: You are down to an A-.
    MR. KEYT: Okay. Any other
    changes/revisions to page 13?
    MR. WAX: Any other changes?
    MR. HARRINGTON: I do not.
    MR. WAX: Will, do you have any other?
    MR. CHAMBERS: No.
    MR. WAX: We do not.
    MR. KEYT: With that, I would suggest we
    go to page 14 and handle that remainder of the sound
    portion which would stop at shadow flicker. It's
just the first two paragraphs of page 14.
    MR. CHAMBERS: I would suggest -- I
    believe the sound receptor that is referred to here
    1104 is Gantz property.
    MR. KEYT: Okay.
    MR. CHAMBERS: I would first verify that,
    but I believe that's correct, and then probably add
    that in there for clarity since he did also provide
    testimony.

MR. KEYT: So, we could add at the end of the second paragraph on page 14, while the modeling of the applicant was consistent with IPCB, it is suggested that sound mitigation efforts be undertaken for those turbines impacting sound receptor 1104 (Gantz property). Does that comport with the suggested change?

MR. HARRINGTON: If that is accurate.
MR. KEYT: Okay. Any other suggested
changes to the first two paragraphs of page 14?
Any others?
MR. WAX: We have none.
MR. KAINS: Okay. With that, we are at the 9:00, 9:02 hour. What is the board's pleasure here?

We have a ways to go, but we have Thursday night scheduled. We could embark on a discussion of shadow flicker. It appears to be approximately one page in length, but then the next topic is Environmental which is several pages in length.

We could either go into a recess until Thursday right now or we could discuss shadow flicker.

MR. HARRINGTON: I would vote to recess until Thursday.

MR. WAX: Will?
MR. CHAMBERS: I think at the pace we are going we shouldn't have a problem getting done. We are halfway through now, so we shouldn't have a problem getting through the other half and then taking a vote for the next.

MR. WAX: I think we have a consensus here to recess until Thursday.

MR. KAINS: Very good. We'll take up finding of facts documents on page 14 with shadow flicker.

The board is in recess until Thursday February 2, 2023, at 6:00 p.m. at this address in this room.
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Thank you. Have a good night.
(END OF PROCEEDINGS.)
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