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MR. WAX: Welcome. Glad you're here. Can we have rollcall, please?

MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Larson?

MR. LARSON: Here.

MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Harrington?
MR. HARRINGTON: Here.

MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Lovin?

MR. LOVIN: Here.

MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Wax?

MR. WAX: Here.

MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Chambers?

MR. CHAMBERS: Here.

MR. WAX: Please call the county board.

MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Henricks?

Mr. Edwards?

MR. EDWARDS: Here.

MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Beem?

MR. BEEM: Here.

MS. NUSBAUM: Ms. Jones?

Ms. Piatt?

Mr. Foran?

MR. FORAN: Here.

MR. WAX: Thank you.

MR. KAINS: Good evening, ladies and

```
gentlemen. This is what we expect to be the
    timeline of this public hearing.
    I'm trying to remember how many sessions
    we've had. Seventeen, perhaps maybe 18.
    Anybody keep track?
    Seventeen. And we are in the process of
    the board considering the draft findings of fact
    prepared by Mr. Keyt, and we are on the first factor
    that the board is to consider under the ordinance,
    and there are various topics that Mr. Keyt has
    delineated under the first factor, and we are on the
    topic now of shadow flicker.
    Mr. Keyt?
    MR. KEYT: Okay. As you recall, we were
going through the shadow flicker, the finding of
    facts that are on the screen, page 14, of the draft,
    findings of fact, shadow flicker starts there.
    I would suggest we take shadow flicker
    through the end of that page and see if there are
    any suggested changes, additions or revisions.
    MR. WAX: Anybody have anything?
    Any of the board members have any comments
    or suggestions concerning the entire shadow flicker
    portion?
```

MR. CHAMBERS: None here.

MR. LOVIN: No.
MR. WAX: Anyone have any objections to

```
the way it's written at this time?
```

MR. KEYT: Okay. Next, over to page 15.

```
The top is a continuation of shadow flicker. Any
```

    changes to those two first paragraphs on page 15?
    This would be the section Shadow Flicker - Evidence
in Support of Objectors.

MR. WAX: You are just wanting a reply on those two paragraphs on the top of 15; is that correct?

MR. KEYT: Yep.
MR. WAX: Okay. We are in agreement. They are fine.

MR. KEYT: Okay. Next topic is
Environmental (Wildlife, Avian and Bats). It starts on page 15. It continues on through page 16 and through half of page 17. I would suggest that we take the material on page 15, under Environmental, and see if there's any changes, revisions or suggestions.

MR. WAX: At this time, we are going to talk about just page 15?

MR. KEYT: Page 15, Environmental, to the end of page 15.

MR. WAX: Okay. Mr. Keyt, could I ask a question for clarification here?

MR. KEYT: Absolutely.
MR. WAX: On the last two paragraphs, explain this, turbines will be curtailed at wind speeds up to 5 meters per second during the period of risk.

Does that mean external -- during external wind speeds then up to five meters per second the turbines will be slowed down or curtailed so that there is no damage? Is that correct?

MR. KEYT: Correct.
MR. WAX: So, after it reaches greater than five meters per second, apparently there is no curtailment? Or am I misreading this thing?

MR. KEYT: I believe the recommendation from IDNR -- and I would be happy to check -- the recommendation is to curtail at wind speeds up to five meters per second. So, if it's over, it would not be curtailed.

MR. WAX: Pardon me?
MR. KEYT: If it was over, it would not be
curtailed.

MR. WAX: Okay. I am not entirely sure if I get the logic, but if the IDNR put forward that recommendation, I don't see any reason why we have better knowledge.

What do you think, Jim?
MR. HARRINGTON: I agree with you. It seems a little counterintuitive. I guess, is there anything else you would want to add to that, or what are your thoughts?

MR. KEYT: I wouldn't add anything beyond what the IDNR recommendation was. I am happy to check to make sure that that recommendation is correct.

MR. WAX: I just don't understand the logic, but they clearly know a whole heck of a lot more about it than I do.

MR. KEYT: I don't want to speak for them, but I understand what you are saying.

MR. WAX: Other than that, are we okay?
MR. LARSON: Okay. Good.
MR. LOVIN: Yeah.
MR. WAX: I think we are okay with it.
MR. KEYT: Then the next page would be

1 page 16. It's a continuation of the same topic. I
2 would suggest that we take that page in its
3 entirety. Most of these are recommendations from 4 IDNR.

MR. WAX: Are there any concerns or suggestions from the zoning board members?

MR. CHAMBERS: I have one small one. On the bald eagle section, we've got all the species is likely to occur in the project area. I think we've got enough -- we've had testimony and pictures from within the project area of bald eagles in the project area, so I'd just change that from "likely" to "known" to occur.

MR. KEYT: What I would suggest is -- what I would suggest is we could add something under the evidence in favor of objectors, which is on the next page, or we could put in a sentence after that indicating that there has been evidence to the contrary, that there's bald eagles -- there's photographs of bald eagles within, however you want to phrase it. If you think it's in the project area --

MR. CHAMBERS: So, do you want to keep this language in as to what the IDNR is below?

MR. KEYT: So, what I would say is, if you want to add a sentence at the end, indicating there has been photographic evidence or evidence -- there has been evidence submitted of eagles within what area you would like to include?

The project area; is that right?
MR. CHAMBERS: Yeah.
MR. WAX: Okay. I will.
MR. CHAMBERS: Yeah.
MR. HARRINGTON: So, what did we end up with in the end there?

MR. WAX: Could you restate that so we can fully understand what changes were made?

MR. KEYT: Give me one second. I am scratching out the response here. My suggested last sentence to page 16, on the bullet point on bald eagles, would be a sentence that states: However, there has been evidence of bald eagles within the project area submitted.

MR. HARRINGTON: That's in place of there are no bald eagle nests? That is what you are saying?

MR. KEYT: I would add a sentence at the end as opposed to replacing the sentence.

MR. HARRINGTON: You are adding it?
MR. KEYT: Yeah. I think, for clarity, perhaps it should read: However, there has been evidence submitted of bald eagles within the project area.

MR. HARRINGTON: I guess I would also want to suggest the editorial of maybe there are no bald eagle nests currently within the project area. Do you have any issue with that?

MR. KEYT: I don't.
MR. HARRINGTON: Okay. That would be my suggestion.

MR. LARSON: Would you want the same on that last sentence, too, last thing on the page?

MR. HARRINGTON: Right. Good point.
Yeah. I would agree with that.
MR. WAX: I'm not sure I caught that.
MR. HARRINGTON: Run it by them again.
MR. LARSON: If we are going to do that, we might as well add "currently" to the last sentence of the page also.

MR. HARRINGTON: Referring to the statement that says there were no occupied eagle nests within a two-mile buffer of the project,
right, Dan?

MR. LARSON: Right.
MR. HARRINGTON: And you are just saying edit that to say currently there are no occupied nests within it?

MR. LARSON: If we are doing one, we ought to do them both.

MR. HARRINGTON: I gotcha.
MR. KEYT: Okay.
MR. WAX: Okay. Anything else?
MR. LARSON: No.
MR. HARRINGTON: Yeah. I do have one more.

MR. WAX: Go ahead.
MR. HARRINGTON: In regards to the subject matter or upland sandpiper, Andy, looking through that, as you moved through that, verbiage, start off with: If construction activities for linear facilities occur during the breeding season, suitable habitat will either be removed prior to April 15 (mowed) or nest surveys will be conducted by a biological monitor to determine if upland sandpiper nests are present.

We sort of have a question as to exactly
are we clear for future people to review this and say, well, who and when is that occurring? How do we see that working?

MR. KEYT: Yeah, that is a good question. But it's an IDNR recommendation, so it's hard.

Other than the recommendation that came, it's hard to know what is in the mind of IDNR.

MR. HARRINGTON: Right. I guess that is what $I$ am driving at. If IDNR made the suggestion, how are we going to facilitate that as a county? How does this work?

MR. KEYT: Well, that would be part of the recommendations that were placed in the conditions.

So, if you remember the wildlife portion, paragraph 31 of the conditions, it states: The company shall comply with all current or future requirements and all current recommendations from IDNR.

MR. HARRINGTON: So, in that case, we are saying the company will facilitate that?

MR. KEYT: Yes.
MR. HARRINGTON: Is there anything wrong with maybe restating that here?

MR. KEYT: You could.

MR. HARRINGTON: Or maybe a comment that refers to the condition.

MR. KEYT: You could refer potentially to the conditions, but typically the conditions are separate from the findings.

MR. HARRINGTON: Okay.
MR. KEYT: But that is what I would -- I wouldn't necessarily repeat it there because it's already there in the conditions if it's approved.

MR. HARRINGTON: So you feel we are covered in that regard?

MR. KEYT: I think you are covered in that regard.

MR. WAX: Are you okay with what we have so far?

Will?
We are in agreement with what we have put together so far.

MR. KEYT: Okay. So that covers
paragraph 16 or -- I am sorry -- page 16.
Then, going to page 17, starting at the top of the page and going down to the paragraph that starts with Physical Safety Issues, I think this is a continuation of the environmental. So, if you
take those first four paragraphs there and consider
those.

MR. WAX: Do we have any comments or suggestions from board members?

None here?
None here?
None here?
We are okay with that.
MR. KEYT: Okay. That will then take us to Physical Safety Issues starting on page 17. I would suggest just taking the rest of the page 17.

MR. WAX: How we doing?
Are there any comments or suggestions by board members?

MR. HARRINGTON: Pretty minor. The only thing I would maybe suggest, Andy -- correct me if I am wrong -- the sentence right before your clarification testimony in regards to the risk
assessment found, that is Dr. Rogers' risk
assessment, correct?

MR. KEYT: Correct.
MR. HARRINGTON: The only thing I would ask or suggest is we just say Dr. Jonathan Rogers' risk assessment found instead of the --

MR. KEYT: So, last sentence of that full paragraph that starts the risk assessment found, you want it to say, for clarification, Dr. Jonathan Rogers' risk assessment?

MR. HARRINGTON: Instead of the word "this."

MR. KEYT: Gotcha.
MR. LARSON: I got a couple minor things, too.

MS. NUSBAUM: There is also a typo in there where it says exceptionally rare (about in 10,000 turbines), I think we are missing a number in there.

MR. KEYT: I think it was 1 in about -- I think it was 1 in about 10,000 .

MR. LARSON: And on the last two bullet points they both say nonparticipating homes.

MR. WAX: Yeah.
MR. LARSON: Or maybe that should be like that, I guess.

MR. CHAMBERS: I think that is correct.
MR. KEYT: I think that is correct.
MR. LARSON: I was thinking of homes when I saw that.

MR. KEYT: There is a differentiation between homes and properties.

MR. LARSON: I see. Yeah.
MR. WAX: How are you changing that
particular wording?
MR. KEYT: I don't think -- the one sentence we have that starts with "the risk assessment found" is now going to read "Dr. Jonathan Rogers' risk assessment found," and the rest of that sentence remains the same.

I think there was a question about the first two bullet points talking about the risk impact from an ice fragment to nonparticipating homes.

I think the question was whether both of those are supposed to read as homes as opposed to one reading as homes and one reading as properties.

I think it is correct as is because there was a differentiation in the risk assessment between homes and properties I believe. So, I believe it's correct.

MR. LARSON: You are right.
MR. KEYT: But it's ultimately the zoning board's call.

MR. WAX: What was the conclusion? What did you do about the comment about rare in about 10,000 turbines? Did you make some change there?

MR. KEYT: Yeah. In that paren, I added "1 in."

MR. WAX: Yeah, okay.
MR. KEYT: The number 1 in about 10,000 turbines experience.

Anything else?
MR. HARRINGTON: No. I don't have anything.

MR. CHAMBERS: No.
MR. WAX: We don't have anything else.
MR. KEYT: Okay. That takes us over to page 18. I would take page 18 in its entirety there. It might take a little bit, but it's all on the same topic.

MR. WAX: Any suggested changes, concerns
from the board members?
MR. LOVIN: Yeah. The second bullet point down, the risk of impact from blade throw is an even smaller risk (1 in 10,000,000 years), do we know what that blade impact is referring to? property? house? road? Everything else has it listed.

MR. KEYT: Yeah. I don't know, without going back and looking at it. I could look at it during a break and clarify it.

MR. LOVIN: Thank you.
MR. WAX: Anything else?
MR. HARRINGTON: No.
MR. CHAMBERS: I had one toward the bottom
here where the second-to-last paragraph mentions testimony regarding fire risk and goes through that.

What's missing out of that is testimony about cropland fire risk, so not just fire risk to the turbine itself but to dry cropland that is around the turbine.

MR. KEYT: So, under the portion that starts Physical Safety - Evidence in Favor of Objectors, is that where you are?

MR. CHAMBERS: Yeah.
MR. KEYT: So, if you go down: There was testimony regarding fire risk of wind turbines, though not necessarily specific to Vestas.

Where do you want to put that information?
MR. CHAMBERS: So probably immediately after that paragraph. Note that there was additional testimony given about concerns for

```
cropland fire and the spread and containment of any
    cropland fire.
    MR. KEYT: Okay.
    MR. CHAMBERS: That was all I have.
    MR. KEYT: Okay. So, I added a sentence
    at the end of that paragraph that reads: There was
    additional evidence regarding the risk to cropland
    -- I am going to say risk of cropland fire and
    containment of same.
    MR. CHAMBERS: Correct.
    MR. KEYT: Okay. I'll just add that to
    the end of the paragraph, if that make sense.
    MR. WAX: Okay. Are we okay with that?
    MR. HARRINGTON: I am good with that.
    MR. WAX: Okay. We are okay with that
    page.
    MR. KEYT: Okay. That takes us to the top
    of page 19. There is some additional information
    there. This one is about the Mahomet Aquifer.
    There is -- I would suggest we take that redlined
    paragraph by itself.
    It reads right now: One of the primary
    physical safety issues is the utilization of water
    from the Mahomet Aquifer. Applicant submitted no
```

evidence of draw-down studies related to the batch plant or laydown yard. This is significant as it is unknown whether the water usage from the batch plant will have a negative impact on the surrounding owners. Applicant submitted no experts to attest the issue.

I believe that is largely accurate or it is accurate, but $I$ would suggest there was -- I think Mr. Carlson testified that there would not be a negative impact on the water. So, you could add a clause that says, after that first or the second sentence: Applicant submitted no evidence of draw-down studies related to the batch plant or laydown yard but did provide layperson testimony that there would not be a negative impact.

Up to the board, but that would be the one addition that would be possible if the board wanted to include something like that.

MR. WAX: Do you like that?
MR. HARRINGTON: I'm good with the way you've got it.

MR. KEYT: Okay. So, on that paragraph, leave as is?

MR. HARRINGTON: That's what $I$ am saying.

Yeah.

MR. WAX: I am okay with it.
MR. LARSON: I'm good with it.

MR. WAX: You okay with that, Will?
MR. CHAMBERS: Yeah. I am fine with it.

MR. WAX: Okay. We are okay with that paragraph.

MR. KEYT: The next paragraph deals with the Federal Aviation Administration Compliance. There are two paragraphs there on page 19.

Any suggested changes or revisions to those two paragraphs under the FAA Compliance portion?

MR. HARRINGTON: I am good.
MR. WAX: Any problems with that?

MR. LOVIN: No.

MR. LARSON: No.

MR. WAX: We agree that section is okay.

MR. KEYT: All right. There is another paragraph on Cultural Resources. Any changes to that paragraph?

MR. WAX: We are okay with that one.
MR. KEY: All right. The next section deals with Decommissioning. It starts on page 19
and continues on to page 20. I would suggest we take the remainder of page 19.

MR. HARRINGTON: I don't have any.
MR. WAX: No problems with that.
MR. KEYT: Okay. Next page is page 20. It is a continuation of decommissioning. I would suggest we take Decommissioning, the first paragraph of page 20.

MR. WAX: Do the board members have any suggestions, concerns or issue with this section that we are considering?

MR. HARRINGTON: I do not.
MR. WAX: We have none.
MR. KEYT: All right. Then there is a section on Additional Findings. There are two other factors listed in your zoning code: 1.) To assure that any development and production of wind-energy generated electricity in Piatt County is safe and effective and to facilitate economic opportunities for local residents.

And then a final sentence there that says:
These factors are addressed in the findings herein by application of these factors.

Any changes to that portion of the
findings?
MR. WAX: Any concerns, suggestions by the board members?

MR. HARRINGTON: In regards to just the additional findings you are saying?

MR. WAX: Yes.
MR. HARRINGTON: No. I do not.
MR. WAX: We have no concerns.
MR. KEYT: Okay. For clarity's sake, we are going to go through all of the factors -- I am sorry -- all of the evidence first and set the findings of fact because some of the findings apply across different factors. Then we'll come back and address each factor and whether the applicant has met the factor itself, okay? Just for clarification.

So that would then take us to factor number 2 which starts in with Property Values. That is on page 20. So, from Property Values, those first paragraphs there at the end of page 20 , changes or additions there?

MR. WAX: Do we have concerns regarding
the last two paragraphs on page 20?
MR. CHAMBERS: I just have a typo for you.

```
Above Property Values there where the factors are
    listed, that last part of the factor about
    diminished property "valued" should be "values"
    within the neighborhood.
    MR. KEYT: Okay. Any other changes or
    additions? Suggested revisions?
    MR. WAX: We are okay with that.
    MR. KEYT: That takes us to page 21,
    continuation of Property Values. Quite a bit of
    information there, but any suggested changes or
    additions there?
    MR. WAX: How far down do you want us to
    consider?
    MR. KEYT: I would suggest just taking the
    whole page.
    MR. WAX: Okay.
    MR. KAINS: Usually people want them blown
    up. There you go. Thank you.
    MR. WAX: Any concerns?
    MR. HARRINGTON: Pretty minor. In regards
    to paragraph 2, all the way down, towards the
    bottom, in the sentence beginning: Wind turbine
    leases can add value to agricultural land.
    And then there is a "; and". I don't
```

think we want to leave that in there, do we?
And assessors, does that all go together?
MR. KEYT: The way it's written now is
wind turbine leases can add value to agricultural
land; and assessor surveys do not reflect...
You want to remove the semicolon?
MR. HARRINGTON: I am not interpreting
that those two sentences go together. Do they?
MR. KEYT: Well, I think it's just a
matter of being within the list.
MR. HARRINGTON: Okay.
MR. KEYT: So, if you take the first part
of that paragraph where it starts, "The results of
marketing impact analysis he undertook found the
following:" and it just bullet points each one
separated by a semicolon.
MR. HARRINGTON: I am saying do we want to
get rid of the "and" so it doesn't lead someone at a
later date to believe there is some other piece of
information there, to that statement? But it's to
your preference.
MR. KEYT: Okay. It's up to the board.
Do you want to remove "and"? We can remove it.
MR. HARRINGTON: I would suggest we remove
it. It's up to you guys.
MR. CHAMBERS: I think the way it's written is grammatically correct. I don't see an issue if you move it.

MR. WAX: What do you want to do, gentlemen?

MR. CHAMBERS: I am okay with leaving it as is.

MR. WAX: Okay.
MR. HARRINGTON: There you go.
MR. WAX: I don't have a serious problem with it, but I think the sentence starting "Goose Creek Wind will create well-paid jobs in the area which will benefit overall housing market demand," I think that is a stretch myself, but I am not going to make a big issue out of it.

MR. HARRINGTON: I agree with you. I don't agree with that.

MR. LARSON: There is no evidence of that.
MR. WAX: I doubt there is evidence to show that in this area.

MR. KEYT: Do you want to remove the sentence?

MR. WAX: What are your feelings,

```
gentlemen?
```

I don't feel strongly about it. I just have serious doubts about it. I'll leave it up to the group here.

MR. LOVIN: I think it could create some well-paid jobs in the area, but that doesn't mean it's going to benefit the overall housing marketing demand.

MR. WAX: I agree.
MR. LARSON: So, cut it off after the "well-paid jobs."

MR. LOVIN: Cut it off after the
"well-paid jobs."
MR. WAX: Do you like the idea of leaving out -- leaving out "benefit overall housing market demand"?

MR. HARRINGTON: I think that is what we are saying.

MR. WAX: What about it, Will?
MR. CHAMBERS: Yeah. I would be okay with
leaving the well-paying jobs in there and then the area and taking off the market demand part.

MR. WAX: Okay.
MR. KEYT: Okay.

MR. WAX: Rest of that okay?
MR. HARRINGTON: Yeah.
MR. WAX: We are okay with the rest of that portion.

MR. KEYT: So, that would conclude paragraph 21 -- or I am sorry -- page 21.

MR. CHAMBERS: I have one thing that kind of runs from the end of 21 and a little bit into 22. So, the last paragraph, which details the testimony about -- mostly about financial security and personal income from the leaseholders, and that runs onto page 22 there, where it states, "The payments to the landowners will total up to $\$ 210$ million over 30 years," I would say that this section isn't relevant to property value. It's talking about the income of the leaseholder. So, I believe this section would be better moved to a different section; probably the economic impact section I believe.

MR. KEYT: So, it sounds like, rather than removing it out of the document, you want to move it within the document to the Financial Impact section, under factor number 1.

MR. CHAMBERS: Correct.

MR. KEYT: Which is?
THE COURT: Pages 8 and 9, Andy.
MR. KEYT: Yeah. Pages 8 and 9. It probably would make most sense on page 9, the last paragraph of those Financial Impact Studies Evidence in Favor of Applicant and just put it right above the italicized portion that states Financial Impacts - Evidence in Favor of Objectors, and just put it at the end of that section for the evidence in favor of applicant.

MR. CHAMBERS: Correct. I would be good with that.

And then another paragraph that's the same type of testimony would be the third paragraph up from the bottom on page 21, John Jordan's testimony about wind farm and sending his grandkids to college, and it's noted in here, well, perhaps not a direct property value issue. If removing the other one, I think that one would also go with it.

MR. KEYT: Okay. It would be moved and then edited to where you wouldn't have to have the sentence in there about it not being a property value issue, since it would then be in a different section.

Okay. That paragraph would read: John Jordan testified to his history on his farm in Mansfield, Illinois. He indicates the wind farm would allow him to send his grandkids to college.

And that would be the end of that paragraph?

MR. CHAMBERS: Correct.
MR. KEYT: And that paragraph and the last paragraph on page 21 and the very top of page 22 need to be moved to different sections on page 9 .

Yeah. Okay. Are we ready for page 22 ? Everybody good with the changes on page $21 ?$

MR. WAX: I think so. We are in agreement with the changes up to that time.

MR. KEYT: Okay. Then there is Property Value Information - Evidence in Support of Objectors.

We would then take the remainder of page 22. There's a couple of typographical errors that I need to note.

One, the very last -- I am sorry -- in the second-to-last paragraph, I have realtor misspelled, and then also realtor friend should have a plural.

MS. NUSSBAUM: I think that is another
area that Sandra Coile's name is misspelled.
MR. KEYT: Correct. Yes.
MR. WAX: Board Members, do we have
suggestions, changes, concerns?
MR. HARRINGTON: Yeah, I think in that
first paragraph, I believe it's the third sentence
in his report that concludes that properties, I
would suggest we clarify that and say that
residential properties within the wind farm
footprint will experience 35 percent -- correct me,
Andy, that that is what he's trying to say because
then, later on in this paragraph, he repeats and
says agricultural properties within the footprint
would experience an 8.5 percent decrease; is that
correct?
MR. KEYT: I believe that is correct.
MR. HARRINGTON: So, I think that is why
we ought to have that.
MR. KEYT: Yeah. Okay.
MR. HARRINGTON: To that point, I don't
know if you want to clarify the next one that,
semicolon, those within a mile. I don't know if you
need to clarify that also or not. Hopefully,
including "residential" will encompass that, I
guess.

MR. KEYT: Yeah. We could just state, for clarification, those residential properties within one mile.

MR. HARRINGTON: Probably a good idea.
MR. WAX: Any suggestions?

MR. LARSON: I just got one question.
MR. WAX: Yes.

MR. LARSON: On the Hardtke thing, was that his home or just another home?

MR. KEYT: I don't think it was his home, but I don't know for sure.

MR. LARSON: Okay. For some reason, I was thinking it was his home, but $I$ could be wrong.

MR. CHAMBERS: I have one clarity
suggestion here. So, on the second-to-last
paragraph, Sandra Coile's testimony referring to discussions she had with a realtor friend of hers indicated that -- I believe the testimony she gave she had spoken with both Russ Taylor and Steve Littlefield, which are both owners of a real estate practice. So, I think, for clarity, it would be however we would do this but to note the qualification level of those individuals rather than
just stating a realtor friend.
MR. KEYT: So, are you wanting to include
their names?
MR. CHAMBERS: Yes. I think that would do
it.
MR. KEYT: So, we could add "Sandra Coile
provided testimony regarding discussions she had
with" -- I think there were multiple ones --
"realtor friends of hers that indicated" -- so after
realtor friends of hers, probably open parens --
(Russ Taylor and Steve Littlefield).
MR. CHAMBERS: Yeah.
Mr. Wax: Anything else?
MR. HARRINGTON: That's all I have.
MR. CHAMBERS: No.
MR. WAX: We are okay with it then.
MR. KEYT: Okay. That concludes page 22.
Page 23, I think there is a very small
clause there at the top trailing off from the
paragraph. I think I will take that page as a
whole, if the board is okay with that, page 23.
MR. WAX: At this point are we considering
the entire page of Transmission Interference?
MR. KEYT: Correct. Up to the board, but
that is what $I$ suggested.
MR. WAX: Okay.
Looking okay so far?
MR. HARRINGTON: Yeah.
MR. WAX: Will?
MR. CHAMBERS: Yeah.
MR. WAX: I think we are okay with that section.

MR. KEYT: That is page 23.
Page 24 is a continuation of the transmission information. So, if you take that down to factor number 3, so page 24, top of the page, to about three quarters of the page where factor number 3 begins, $I$ believe there was one suggestion.

By the way, in the redlined portion at the bottom of that section, where it states "In addition, there is evidence that there could be interference with weather radar," I believe there was a suggestion from one of the board members to include "there could be interference with weather radar to include tornado detection."

MR. HARRINGTON: We are okay.
MR. WAX: We are okay with that section.
MR. KEYT: Okay. That takes us to factor
number 3. Factor number 3 --

MR. CHAMBERS: For clarity, that section, are we good with that section, with the addition of the --

MR. KEYT: So, making sure that everyone is good with the addition that $I$ read that is not on the hardcopy that you have, that redlined portion that states, "In addition, there is evidence that there could be interference with weather radar," I believe a suggestion of weather radar, including tornado detection," if everybody is good with that to include that.

MR. CHAMBERS: Yep.
MR. KEYT: Okay. Then the next factor would be factor number 3. Most of the evidence here is incorporated from factors 1, 2 and 4 through 7, the other factors. Is there any additional evidence/findings that the board would like to make under factor number 3 that are not already incorporated in the other sections?

MR. WAX: In other words, does anyone have any suggestions of anything to add in this section other than the reference back to factors 1 and 2 and 4 to 7 are also applicable here? Do you have

```
    anything?
```

Are you okay with that?
MR. LARSON: Uh-huh.
MR. HARRINGTON: Yeah, I am good with using the information that is considered for 3.

MR. WAX: Okay. We are okay with 3.
MR. KEYT: Okay. Then that takes us down to factor number 4, which starts on page 24. It's just listing of the factor. Then it leaves -- the substance of it starts on page 25, and the entirety of that is on page 25, so I would suggest taking the entirety of page 25.

MR. WAX: Do we have suggestions/concerns from the board?

MR. HARRINGTON: What do we think about Applicant has indicated and is working with both local drainage authorities on coming to a working agreement with those entities?

Is that what we want to say, or do we want to say they had submitted a proposal?

Maybe you are good with what you got. I don't know.

MR. WAX: My personal look at this thing is that, yes, technically it is not required;
however, I admit to being disappointed that no evidence of any degree of progress was presented to this board. I am not saying it's required. I am just saying I think this group felt that we did not get significant input as to what is going on at all or what is intended.

MR. LARSON: Maybe we could add that.
MR. WAX: Pardon me?
MR. LARSON: Maybe we could add that to the last of it.

MR. KEYT: It's up to the board. If it's not required, it may not be particularly relevant, but it's okay to include it.

MR. HARRINGTON: It's not required as says the SUP, but it does say it's required prior to the construction permit, correct?

MR. KEYT: Yeah, correct.
MR. HARRINGTON: So, it is sort of required as all of these items have been denoted, right?

MR. KEYT: Yeah.
MR. HARRINGTON: So, maybe that is where
you craft your statement -- right? -- and you say "To date, the zoning board is unaware of any

```
progress in this regard; however, it is still
    required prior to the issuance of a" -- I notice we
    use building permit in some cases and construction
    in others, so I don't know which one you are wanting
    to go with.
    MR. WAX: I think you are going in the
    right direction there. It is just a matter of it
    makes it kind of tough and you have to have kind of
    faith that everything is going to work out right
    because we don't have a lot of good evidence to date
    that there is much progress if any.
    MR. KEYT: So, a potential sentence for
    the ZBA to consider would be "The Zoning Board of
Appeals was not provided evidence of progress, if
any, on this issue."
    MR. WAX: That's reasonable. Okay.
    MR. CHAMBERS: With the additional note
    that that was not required for the special use
    permit but would be required for a building permit
    or prior to the issuance of a building permit.
    MR. KEYT: Okay. So I added a third
    sentence to that paragraph that would say, "For the
    ZBA's consideration, though not required for the
    special use permit application, such evidence is
```

```
required prior to the issuance of construction
permits."
```

MR. HARRINGTON: Yep.
MR. WAX: Okay. We are okay with that.
MR. KEYT: Okay. Any other changes or additions to page 25?

MR. WAX: Anything else, gentlemen?
MR. HARRINGTON: No.
MR. WAX: I think we are okay with it. Thank you.

MR. KEYT: Okay. That takes us to page 26. I would suggest we take factor number 5 in its entirety and then factor 6 after that.

Factor 5 deals with ingress and egress. It's fairly short.

MR. WAX: Any suggestions to this portion?
MR. LARSON: (Shaking head.)
MR. HARRINGTON: I don't know. We don't have any visibility of the road access agreement, so it's hard for us to say.

MR. WAX: I think that what you are saying is that, while we do not -- I am not sure we want to make a significant change in this thing, but we are kind of operating here on faith that there is going
to be a significant interaction and correction and make use of; and to make this, we lean heavily on this that measures will be taken because we are not aware of what's going on, where the roads are going to be, exactly what is going to be used today. So, we are just -- I think we're just going to have faith that the appropriate negotiations between the attorney and the applicant and the county board are going to make it work because right now we are not presented with a lot of information that gives us credit to say, yes, yes, this is a done deal. We have to have faith that it's going to happen.

MR. KEYT: In terms as to the ingress and egress portion and the design to minimize traffic conditions, so I think -- here is what I am trying to understand: Is there a change or removal that you want to make to that paragraph?

MR. HARRINGTON: I don't think there is. At least, not in my regard.

MR. WAX: Pardon me?
MR. HARRINGTON: I don't think so. I am commenting that we don't have any knowledge of the topic. MR. KEYT: Okay.

MR. WAX: I think we are in agreement with it.

MR. KEYT: Okay. All right. That would take us to factor number 6. I would suggest taking that one in its entirety, page 26.

MR. WAX: Members of the board, do you have questions, concerns, slight concerns, suggested changes?

MR. LARSON: The only thing $I$ have is, on the last paragraph, it says: The increase in revenue to the local farmers can assist in the protection of the land.

I think that should maybe be the landowners, instead of just stating farmers.

MR. CHAMBERS: I would agree with Dan on that one.

MR. WAX: It may not be something that anyone else thinks so, but I looked at that whole paragraph as a pretty stretch of imagination to believe that is reality.

MR. HARRINGTON: I would agree. You go right off the top and "The allowance of wind turbines on properties may assist in conserving agricultural property for farming activities as
opposed to other development..." I mean is that really something we proved? I mean I don't know about that.

MR. WAX: I don't know where the evidence for that is.

MR. HARRINGTON: "...and protect the value of the land on which farm-related equipment is placed." I can't really think of that case.

MR. WAX: Any thoughts?
MR. KEYT: Do you want it -- I am just trying to understand where you want to go. So, on that second paragraph, do you want to remove the second paragraph?

MR. HARRINGTON: I would be fine with that.

MR. KEYT: It's up to the zoning board.
MR. HARRINGTON: You guys should discuss.
MR. LOVIN: I am fine with it.
MR. LARSON: I am fine with it.
MR. CHAMBERS: Yeah.
MR. KEYT: So, the second paragraph under factor 6, on page 26, will be removed.

Any other changes to the evidence listed there under factor number 6?

MR. WAX: Are the rest of us okay?
We are okay with the rest of it.
MR. KEYT: Okay. That takes us almost to the end of page 27, factor number 7. I suggest we take the entirety of that factor that is listed there.

MR. WAX: Comments/suggestions about the verbiage in number 7?

MR. LARSON: Again, I think it should say landowners instead of farmers.

MR. LOVIN: Right.
MR. WAX: Okay.
MR. HARRINGTON: I agree.
MR. WAX: State again what you would like to change.

MR. LARSON: Where it says "The project also provides economic growth to the community and local farmers," I think it should say local landowners.

MR. WAX: Right. Do you like that change to landowners?

MR. LOVIN: Yeah.
MR. KEYT: Any other suggested revisions or changes?

Any other changes from anybody on factor number 7?

MR. WAX: Any other changes, gentlemen? No.

MR. KEYT: The rest of the document is the recommendation, which we'll get to in terms of a vote.

Is there a motion to approve the findings of fact as written?

Now, for clarification, this is not considering each factor yet. We will go through each factor and determine whether and take a vote or consensus on whether the applicant has met each factor, and then there will be a discussion and vote on whether to recommend approval, approval subject to conditions, or denial of the project. Those two votes will happen later. And if there is a motion to approve the findings of fact as written --

MR. HARRINGTON: Yes.

MR. KEYT: -- that would make sense at this point.

MR. WAX: I'll ask the board: Do you want just a motion, a voice vote? Or, I tend to prefer a rollcall in this.

MR. HARRINGTON: Rollcall.

MR. WAX: Rollcall. Open to a motion and
approve findings of fact as written.
MR. HARRINGTON: I make a motion.
MR. CHAMBERS: Second.
MR. WAX: Got a second from Will.

Any discussion?
If no discussion, may we have a rollcall,
please?
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Lovin?
MR. LOVIN: Yes.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Larson?

MR. LARSON: Yes.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Chambers?
MR. CHAMBERS: Yes.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Harrington?
MR. HARRINGTON: Yes.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Wax?
MR. WAX: Yes.

The Findings of Fact as revised and written here are approved.

MR. KAINS: It's 7:30. Do you want to take a break?

MR. WAX: I think at this point in time a
break would be appropriate.
MR. KAINS: Very good. All right. The time is 7:28. We'll take a 10 -minute recess, until 7:38, at which time the board will discuss each of the seven factors contained in the ordinance and take a vote. This board is in recess for ten minutes.
(BREAK TAKEN.)
MR. KAINS: The board has now approved the draft Findings of Fact. They are now the Findings of Fact for the Piatt County Zoning Board of Appeals and are made part of the record of this public hearing.

Now it is time for the board to consider each of the seven factors contained in the Piatt County Ordinance.

And, Mr. Keyt, I will again look to you to direct the discussion, and then you will then call upon the chairman to seek rollcall votes with respect to the issues.

So, Mr. Keyt?
MR. KEYT: Okay. Thank you.
My understanding is that the board has traditionally taken factors on special use permit

```
applications and had a discussion as to whether the
applicant has met each factor or not and voted on
whether or not that applicant has met that
individual factor.
    So, here we have seven factors that are
    before the board for consideration. Just so we're
    clear, votes on these individuals factors is
    separate from whether there is a recommendation of
    approval, approval with conditions, or
    recommendation of a denial.
    So, what I would suggest, to keep with
    your past practice, is to go through each factor,
        we'll talk about them individually, you will then
        have discussion on whether or not the applicant has
        met the factor or not, and then someone makes a
        motion, a motion as to whether the applicant has met
        the factor.
When making the motion on whether an
applicant has met an individual factor, make sure
    you are making the motion in the positive, whether
    you intend to vote yes or no, simply so that
    everyone -- so that the record is clear on what the
    intended vote was to be.
    So, the motion would sound something like,
```

```
    "I make a motion that the applicant has met factor
    number 1 or requirements of factor number 1."
    And then there will be a rollcall vote, so
each member then would vote individually on whether
the applicant -- whether the board feels the
    applicant has met that factor or not.
    So, any questions? I am happy to answer
    or assist in answering those questions.
    At this time, before we start with factor
    number 1 --
    MR. HARRINGTON: Correct me if I am wrong
    Loyd, in the past, we had a discussion but we didn't
    actually make a motion for each factor, but you are
    suggesting we do that tonight?
    MR. WAX: I am going to ask Mr. Keyt here.
    Traditionally parliamentary procedure is
    you need a motion and then a discussion, but I hear
    you saying that we -- what I think I hear you saying
    is that we go through and, if people have questions
    or discussions, comments about this thing, we
    discuss it back and forth and then have a motion, a
    positive motion to approve. Is that what you are
    suggesting?
    MR. KEYT: What I would suggest is on -- I
```

just want you to keep with whatever your past
practice is.
If you want to do it by consensus, you
could and just have a discussion on whether they met
that.
But you could also do it by making a
motion on every single factor, each one, one by one,
and then having a vote.
It sounded to me, from earlier, that your
preference was to have a vote as to each factor. Is
that correct?
MR. WAX: Right.
MR. HARRINGTON: That is your call.
We typically give a rollcall, don't we,
Keri?
MS. NUSBAUM: Yeah.
MR. HARRINGTON: I don't remember making
motions on the factors in the past.
MS. NUSBAUM: Well, we don't. In the past
we've kind of voted on each factor.
MR. HARRINGTON: Right.
MS. NUSBAUM: And we haven't necessarily
done a motion, but $I$ think if we are going to do a
rollcall for each motion or for each factor we
should have a motion.

MR. HARRINGTON: Okay. Let's do it.
MR. WAX: So, at this point in time do you want to have some additional discussions prior to a motion and then kind of come to a consensus and then have a motion, or do you want a discussion after the motion?

MR. HARRINGTON: I think, if I understand this right, we are going to actually make a motion and it will be voted on.

MR. WAX: Okay.
MR. LARSON: On each factor.
MR. WAX: Okay. That's what I am understanding now for clarity. I am not making myself clear on this thing.

MR. LARSON: You want it as a positive?
MR. KEYT: Yeah. Any motion you make, just by terms of the practice, regardless of here or anywhere, you want to make whatever the motion is going to be in the positive. If you make it in the negative, it's difficult to determine what the intent of the vote was. So, because you are going to rollcall the vote, you make the motion in the positive even if you are going to vote no or that
the applicant did not meet that individual factor. You would still make the motion in the positive, and there will be a rollcall vote, and if your vote is no, then no; if yes, then yes.

MR. LARSON: Okay.
MR. WAX: Are we ready for a motion?
Have you thought about this thing enough that you want to have a motion on this factor number 1 as to, I guess the motion should be a motion that the applicant has met this requirement?

To be positive, you would want a motion that I move that we make a motion that the applicant has met this requirement of factor number 1. Whether you are going to say yes or no, that would be the correct motion.

MR. KEYT: Correct.
MR. WAX: Is that correct?
MR. KEYT: Correct.
MR. HARRINGTON: Right.
MR. WAX: So, at this point in time, we've been through all the discussion. We've been through it. We understand these things, so we are open to a motion of that nature.

MR. KEYT: For clarity, we are on factor
number 1.
MR. WAX: Just for factor number 1 .
MR. KEYT: Right.
The establishment, maintenance or operation of the special use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare.

You can discuss it. You can -- somebody can make the motion. However you want to do it.

MR. WAX: What is your preference?
Any problem?
MR. CHAMBERS: I am assuming, since each factor would have a motion here, if we are going to have discussion on each one, it would be proper to do a motion and then discussion in each case.

MS. NUSBAUM: Correct.
MR. WAX: That was the point I was not able to explain myself clearly enough.

Do you want the motion first and then discussion?

MR. CHAMBERS: Right.
MR. WAX: Thank you.
MR. CHAMBERS: So, in that case, I will make the motion that Applicant has met the
requirements of factor 1 .

MR. WAX: Okay. We have a motion that the applicant has met the requirements.

Is there a second?
MR. LARSON: I'll second.
MR. WAX: And Dan has seconded this. Now, we have a motion and second that the applicant has met the requirements of factor number 1.

It's time for discussion or whatever you want to say.

Is there any discussion?
MR. CHAMBERS: I have my notes. I assume you may have thoughts or notes, too.

MR. WAX: Go ahead.
MR. CHAMBERS: I broke it down, you know, going through the factors. We have health and safety and morals, comfort and general welfare.

So, on health, I have the concerns outlined there that stood out most that I bring into the decision on that, would be the constant noise potential and then uncertainty in the discussion around possible negative health effects related to the noise potential there, especially in sleep
disturbance, and then the stress and what the IPCB classifies as noise annoyance. I put that under the health banner there.

And then safety, we've got cropland fire risk, of course, which is a big factor to consider. The blade or ice throw doesn't concern me. The only other note I had on safety was the risk to the safety of aerial applicators that operate within the footprint.

And then, on the last bit there, the morals, comfort and general welfare. Comfort, I think we'll get into a little more in factor 2 . There is a little bit of overlap there on use and enjoyment, but I think comfort of those residing within the footprint could be impacted. That's what I've got so far.

MR. WAX: Thank you. Thank you.
Other discussion?
MR. HARRINGTON: I would agree with Will. I had a lot of similar thoughts. I think it definitely needs to be taken into consideration. There are various numbers of conflicting information on multiple topics here.

I guess I agree there is some evidence of
detrimental factors affecting public health, safety, morals, comfort, general welfare.

I have a lot of your same thoughts, Will. I think one in particular that sticks out to me is the Gantz residence. I am concerned for that location. So, I would agree with what he's saying. MR. WAX: Okay.

Kyle?
Dan?
MR. LARSON: I agree with both of them.
MR. LOVIN: I think the fire concern is a real big issue with me, not having any kind of suppression or, you know, our best effort is to let it burn. We don't want field fires in this area when we have those days of 30 -mile-an-hour south winds in the fall and we've got dry corn. It's going to be hard to stop that. So, that is my biggest issue there.

MR. HARRINGTON: I agree. That just doesn't sound like a good plan.

MR. WAX: Will, you've hit on basically everything that I've listed here.

Any more discussion?
Okay. The motion we have and the second

```
    is motion that the applicant had met this
    requirement, and we've had the discussion. I think
    we are ready for a rollcall.
    MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Harrington?
    MR. HARRINGTON: No. We have not met.
    MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Lovin?
    MR. LOVIN: No.
    MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Larson?
    MR. LARSON: No.
    MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Chambers?
    MR. CHAMBERS: No.
    MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Wax?
    MR. WAX: No.
    MR. KEYT: Okay. That takes us to the
second factor. Same procedure. I'll read the
second factor just so that it's clear in the record:
    The special use will not be injurious to
    the use and enjoyment of other property in the
    immediate vicinity for the purpose already permitted
    nor substantially diminish property values within
    the neighborhood.
    MR. HARRINGTON: I make a motion.
    MR. LOVIN: I'll second.
    MR. WAX: Okay. We are ready for a motion
```

on this thing to recommend the applicant has met this requirement. You are saying motion to admit the requirement, and who made it?

MR. HARRINGTON: I made a motion.
MR. WAX: And Kyle has seconded it.
Discussion please?
MR. HARRINGTON: So, I guess one of my topics there would be, I believe we did see some reference to the fact that there could be effects on property values. I think that is in consideration of this matter in particular.

I do feel there is concern with that to the point that $I$ don't think we can go along with there is no effect there.

Use and enjoyment, I don't think it's very hard to argue the fact that, obviously, if you are in close proximity to this, you are going to, at least at the bare minimum, notice this in your backyard or something, I mean differing degrees based on location. I would say there is enough evidence that says it will adversely affect some individual's use and enjoyment. I'll just leave it at that for anybody else that wants to add to it. MR. WAX: My concerns are I believe there
is evidence for diminished property value, and I have concern about some health issues.

Will, do you have concerns?
MR. CHAMBERS: On the use and enjoyment, I pretty much agree with Jim that, you know, the noise level is a big consideration there.

And then the vista concerns, we've had a lot of testimony through the hearings that the reason a lot of residents live in the project area is because they moved there because of the peace and quiet, you know, the rural tranquility, and I think this goes against that in a way that would affect their use and enjoyment of that property.

And then, on the property values, this would be another case, like Jim mentioned on the last factor, where there is conflicting evidence that has been presented. So, even if you take a middle ground on the evidence that is presented, you end up somewhere between no effect and a very negative effect, and wherever that may be is still a negative effect.

So, on the property values, with the testimony we've had there, $I$ do feel that there is a significant risk to the property values within the

```
area.
```

MR. WAX: Thank you, Will.
Any other comments?
We have no more discussion.
Are you ready for rollcall on this?
MR. HARRINGTON: I am ready.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Chambers?
MR. CHAMBERS: No.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Larson?

MR. LARSON: No.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Lovin?
MR. LOVIN: No.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Harrington?
MR. HARRINGTON: No.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Wax?
MR. WAX: No.
MR. KEYT: Okay. That takes to us to factor number 3:

The establishment of the special use will not impede the normal and orderly development of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.

MR. WAX: I think we've been over and discussed a lot of this. We've gone back to these
other factors to look at the information there. I think we are ready for a motion on this one.

MR. CHAMBERS: I'll make a motion that the applicant has met their requirements of factor 3.

MR. LOVIN: I'll second.
MR. WAX: We have a motion and a second.
Time for discussion. Anybody over here?
I'll start it off then. I do not believe that there is as much concern about annoyance, property values and concerns about health as we had in number 2 or number 1 .

However, I still believe there is some degree of concern in this area and in those areas about health, general annoyance, some degree in property value.

MR. CHAMBERS: On this one, I think we've got a little bit of overlap with factor 2 . On property notes, $I$ have on this one would be impact to the future development by reducing the desire to develop property within the area for uses other than agricultural, specifically rural residential uses.

I think there would be a very steep decrease in any interest in developing anything rural residential within the area.

And then any future development, whether it's rural or commercial or not is hampered by the reduction in available area to develop because of the setbacks that we would have in place, it would narrow down the available space to develop. So, I would say that it does hamper or impede the normal and orderly development.

MR. WAX: Thank you, Will. That is very well stated.

Other comments?
MR. LARSON: I agree with Will.
MR. HARRINGTON: Yeah. I think he's on the right track. I agree also. Even if it isn't completely going to stop it or impede it, I would have to say it's going to be cumbersome due to adjacent setbacks and/or other items involved in the sheer size of these is something to consider, right?

MR. WAX: Right.
MR. HARRINGTON: So, I think that is a concern.

And I also think that the actual construction of them will probably be a little more -- what would I say? -- negative to that exact area than we realize. I think there is a lot of

```
consideration there, granted some of it being road
    debridement that we are not directly involved with.
    I do think there is reasons to have
    reservations at the very least about how that is
    going to play out.
    MR. WAX: Okay. What do you think, Kyle?
    Dan?
    MR. LOVIN: I think he covered it pretty
    well.
    MR. LARSON: I agree.
    MR. WAX: Are you ready for rollcall on
    this one, please?
    MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Larson?
    MR. LARSON: No.
    MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Harrington?
    MR. HARRINGTON: No.
    MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Lovin?
    MR. LOVIN: No.
    MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Chambers?
    MR. CHAMBERS: No.
    MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Wax?
    MR. WAX: No.
    MR. KEY: Okay. Next factor is number 4:
    Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage
```

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { or necessary facilities have been or will be } \\
& \text { provided. }
\end{aligned}
$$

MR. HARRINGTON: I would like to make a motion to consider that the applicant has met the adequate utilities access road drainage or the necessary facilities will be provided.

MR. KEYT: Okay. Is there a second?
MR. LOVIN: Second.
MR. WAX: Kyle got a second.
Discussion?
MR. HARRINGTON: Just pretty much what I said before. I just don't think we're -- I don't feel I am apprised enough of any road use agreements to make a firm decision on this. Mainly because there are so many details on that subject alone, I don't know that I have enough knowledge to formally tell you.

MR. WAX: It's a tough one.
MR. HARRINGTON: Right.
MR. WAX: It's kind of a deal based on faith that somebody is going do right in the future.

MR. LARSON: Same with the drainage.
MR. WAX: Right. The drainage deal is included in that one.

MR. HARRINGTON: Right. And I think it's good that we made the statements regarding that.

MR. WAX: Discussion, Will?
MR. CHAMBERS: Yeah. On this one, I think, just based on the way -- the way the structure of this is set up with the special use permit and then going on into construction and road use agreements, I would have faith that, you know, the county is going to only agree to a good and reasonable road use agreement, and the same on the drainage with the drainage commissioner.

So, I think, for the purpose of the factor, in the state that we are in with the hearing, I don't really have any concerns on this one. I think with everything, as in the preliminary stage right now and the framework that is in place for the future agreements to come into play, that I don't really see any major concerns on this one.

MR. WAX: Okay. I tend to lean in the favor of the idea that the negotiators -- that we can have faith on this one of getting it done.

Other discussions that we have?
Okay. We don't all have to agree on this. We can take our vote and see how it plays out.

MR. HARRINGTON: That's right.
MR. WAX: Are you ready for rollcall?
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Larson?
MR. LARSON: No.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Chambers?
MR. CHAMBERS: Yes.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Lovin?

MR. LOVIN: No.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Harrington?
MR. HARRINGTON: No.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Wax?
MR. WAX: Yes.
Three and two.
MR. KEYT: That takes to us factor number 5:

Adequate measurements have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.

MR. CHAMBERS: I will go ahead and make the motion that the applicant has met the requirements of factor 5 .

MR. WAX: Okay. Is there a second on this?

MR. HARRINGTON: Second.
MR. WAX: We've got a motion to second.
Discussion, please?
MR. LARSON: I think this one is more like what you guys were saying, kind of based on faith, because traffic is one thing, but destroying roads and drainage is another thing, in my opinion.

MR. WAX: Right.
MR. LARSON: But I do have faith that the right steps will be taken.

MR. WAX: Okay. I tend to agree with you. I tend to agree with you on this one.

MR. CHAMBERS: I would say that the factor concerns the project as a whole. So, you know, eight permanent employees, there is not much traffic congestion that can be caused by that during normal operations and with the access roads and everything. I am sure all of that will be fine.

It would be worth noting that, during construction, $I$ am sure there would be traffic congestion issues during construction, but there is not any getting around that. So, I don't think that construction phase really should get brought into the discussion on this one. I think it's more of an
overall picture. So, in that case, I don't have any issues.

MR. WAX: Okay. Any other concerns?
MR. HARRINGTON: I think the applicant has demonstrated a willingness to try and do everything they can do.

MR. WAX: Rollcall, please.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Larson?
MR. LARSON: Yes.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Lovin?
MR. LOVIN: Yes.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Harrington?
MR. HARRINGTON: Yes.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Chambers?
MR. CHAMBERS: Yes.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Wax?
MR. WAX: Yes.
MR. KEYT: Okay. That take us to factor number 6:

The establishment, maintenance and operation of the special use will be in conformance with the preamble to the regulations of the district in which the special use is proposed to be located.

MR. WAX: Want a motion on this one?

MR. CHAMBERS: I'll go ahead and make that motion that the applicant has met the requirements of factor 6 .

MR. LOVIN: Second.
MR. WAX: Okay. Kyle has come in with a motion to second the motion.

Okay. Is there discussion here? May I ask first? I suspect I may not be the only one who in this group or the audience who doesn't understand the reference to the preamble, and I would like for Mr. Keyt to explain that to us, where that document is and what his interpretation of this thing is so we know what we are actually comparing this against.

MR. KEYT: Okay. Understood. Where it refers to the preamble is I believe a reference to the Piatt County Zoning Ordinance as amended October 12, 2022, that zoning ordinance has various districts laid out, so there may be a district for agricultural or residential, etc.

There is an agricultural districts section under Article 5(a)(1), and it lists out essentially what I would consider the preamble is not necessarily titled that way, but there is another
section that is labeled as the preamble, but I think this is the reference that those factors are referring to as the preamble. The preamble -- I am just going to read it in the record, and $I$ will let you draw your inferences and let you think what that may mean.

1. Agricultural districts.
A. A-1 Agricultural, A-C Conservation:

Agricultural land is under urban pressure from expanding incorporated areas. This urban pressure takes the form of scattered development in wide belts around the communities of Piatt County, brings conflicting land uses into juxtaposition, creates high costs for public services and stimulates land speculation. Certain agricultural land constitutes unique and irreplaceable land resources. It is the purpose of the $A-1$ and $A-C$ Districts to provide a means by which agricultural land may be protected and enhanced as an economic and environmental resource of major importance to the County. Therefore, these Districts are intended to accomplish the following objectives, in order of priority:
(1) Promote the agricultural use of land
most suitable for farming activities.
(2) Protect the value of agricultural lands from indiscriminate, incompatible and conflicting land uses.
(3) Conserve and protect open space, wooded areas, streams, mineral deposits and other natural resources from incompatible land uses and provide for their timely utilization.
(4) Provide for the location and govern the establishment and operation of land uses which are compatible with agriculture and are of such a nature that their location away from residential, commercial and industrial area is most desirable.
(5) Provide for the location and govern the establishment of residential uses that are necessary to and necessary for the conduct of agricultural.
(6) Provide for the location and govern the establishment and use of limited nonfarm dwellings.
b. Agricultural Nuisance Disclaimer: Properties within the $A-1$ and $A-C$ Districts are located in areas where land is used for commercial agricultural production. Owners, residents and
other users of property in or adjoining these districts may be subjected to inconvenience, discomfort, and the possibility of injury to property and health arising from normal and accepted agricultural practices and operations, including but not limited to noise, odors, dust, the operation of machinery of any kind, including aircraft, the storage and disposal of manure, the application of fertilizers, soil amendments, herbicides and pesticides. Therefore, owners, occupants and users of property within the $A-1$ and $A-C$ Districts should be prepared to accept such inconveniences, discomfort and possibility of injury from normal agricultural operations, and are hereby put on official notice that the Illinois Right to Farm Law may bar them from obtaining a legal judgment against such normal agricultural operations.

I do have a copy of the zoning code. That is a reference on page 23. I do have a copy if each of the board members want that in black and white in front of them.

MR. HARRINGTON: I get the gist of it. I am good.

MR. KEYT: Gotcha.

MR. WAX: What kind of discussion do you have here on this matter?

MR. HARRINGTON: So the establishment, maintenance and operations of the special use would be in conformance with the preamble, what Andy just read, to the regulations of the district in which the special use is proposed to be located in.

So, I mean, in general terms, I don't know that the establishment of wind farms was necessarily outside of it. I don't think, however, we have to delineate priorities -- right? -- to a certain degree -- right? -- or at least to a scope that we encompass, and as he mentioned item number 1 --

Correct, Andy?
-- was to promote the use of production ag, as I perceive what you said.

MR. KEYT: I'll read it: Promote the agricultural use of land that is most suitable for farming activities.

MR. HARRINGTON: Right. So, that could be production of ag or, if you have one of these, you my say, well, it's within production, right?

So, we don't want to encroach too hard on that, but we also have to say, hey, we have to give
due consideration to all parties.
So, I think that the long and short of it, you know, there is, you know, the one that catches my eye -- I hate to say it -- is at the bottom of number 6. There is, however, evidence of farmland of adjacent property owners may suffer decrease value in the findings of fact; and $I$ have to say that is a concern of mine. So, I'll just leave it at that and say $I$ think it's within striking distance. However, the neighboring non-participants, I think, are at a bit of a disadvantage here.

MR. WAX: Right. I agree.
MR. LOVIN: Me too. I agree.
MR. LARSON: I agree.
MR. WAX: Will?
MR. CHAMBERS: I agree with Jim. There is not really too much grounds to pick at the zoning usage and whether or not that applies.

But the language in there about, you know, protection of property value and open space and just kind of the general feel of the language about prioritizing and protecting $A-1$ and ag and use, I think those parts of it lend themselves to being a

```
little more critical of this.
    MR. WAX: Okay. Any other?
    Okay. Are you ready for rollcall?
    MR. HARRINGTON: (Nodding.)
    MR. WAX: Would you do that, please?
    MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Larson?
    MR. LARSON: No.
    MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Harrington?
    MR. HARRINGTON: No.
    MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Lovin?
    MR. LOVIN: No.
    MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Chambers?
    MR. CHAMBERS: No.
    MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Wax?
    MR. WAX: No.
    MR. KEYT: Okay. Factor number 7 then is
the final one:
    The special use shall, in all other
aspects, conform to the applicable regulations of
the district in which it is located and the board
shall find that there is a public necessity for the
special use.
    MR. WAX: We've had time to think about
this a little bit.
```

Is there a motion that we are -- that the applicant has met this requirement?

MR. LARSON: I'll make that motion. MR. HARRINGTON: I will second. MR. WAX: We've got a motion and a second. Discussion, please? MR. CHAMBERS: Well, I'll start on this. My notes on this one would be the longest.

The bulk of this factor is on the board shall find that there is a public necessity for the special use.

So, if members of the public have testified for various needs or need for more tax relief, money for roads, money for schools, other members of the public have testified to a need to preserve the rural character of the area and protecting their lifestyle and rights as rural residents.

So, if there has to be a public necessity for the special use, it would seem, from the testimony we've heard so far, that there is not any consensus on what that necessity is.

As is noted in the finding of facts, we don't have a necessity for this as a means of electricity generation because we already have adequate electricity infrastructure in the area. So that, if the electricity needs of the county are already met, some other purpose of the project would have to rise to the level of public necessity in order for us to determine that it is a public necessity. I don't see anything of that level.

I do take note of the amount of money involved, especially for schools, that would benefit from the tax revenue.

I feel that the public institutions that would benefit are already well established and well-funded through tax revenues and those, while they could benefit, I believe that there is not enough benefit there to outweigh the negative impact to residents within the project area for that to be deemed a public necessity for those people to be outweighed.

MR. WAX: Thank you.
Are there other comments, or are you in agreement with Will?

I am open to other discussion.
MR. HARRINGTON: Yeah. I think Will did an excellent job hitting a lot of the key points. I

1 think, in the terms here, in all other respects

I got to say hats off to Apex. You guys went through a mountain of work to try and -- and you did in a lot of cases check the boxes of the SUP, etc. I think, once again, good job.

But I think when it comes to the other piece of this question, which is -- I agree with you, Will -- the board shall find there is a public necessity.

It's a contentious subject, right? As it mentions in the findings of fact, there is not a general need in the community for more access to electrical supply today, you know. That could change, but today we are well supplied. So, no in regards to that.

But in the bigger picture, I think that, yes, a lot of conflicting comments from the public -- right? -- for and against, all of them I take in due consideration and say, hey, that is respectable.

But I would also agree with Will that it would appear there is some maybe not so -- there is more than just financial effects here, is what $I$ am
driving at. I think the school revenue is
important. I think tax revenue is important. But
we also have to say, hey, would I want to live with
one of these? Would I want that? So, you know,
that is consideration that we have to take into that
conversation.
MR. WAX: Right.
MR. HARRINGTON: So, good job. Good job,
Will.
MR. WAX: I think both of you have made
some excellent points here in covering a whole
aspect.

There is no question Apex has made an enormous effort here in terms of providing financial support.

And let me compliment you on that, but we have to balance that against the quality of life in the environment and how people feel about this.

So, with that said, is that in general agreement with where you're hearing, Dan and Kyle?

MR. LARSON: Yeah. I think there is benefits. I think there is benefits, but I don't think there is a necessity, basically.

MR. WAX: That's sort of my feeling as
well.
Are you ready for a rollcall?
MR. HARRINGTON: I am ready.
MR. WAX: Please.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Chambers?
MR. CHAMBERS: No.

MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Lovin?
MR. LOVIN: No.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Harrington?
MR. HARRINGTON: No.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Larson?
MR. LARSON: No.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Wax?
MR. WAX: No.
MR. KEYT: Okay. That concludes the discussion of the specific factors.

Last task for the board to take is whether to recommend or determining what their recommendation to the county board will be.

For clarification, the factors that you are considering here and the evidence therein are not an all-or-nothing proposition. Those factors are a balancing test for you.

You could determine that the applicant
only met four of the factors, by example, and still vote for a recommendation of approval.

Conversely, you could find that the applicant met six of the seven factors and still recommend a denial because of a major issue that might be lurking there.

So, with that being said, you also have conditions that you are going to recommend or have recommended to the county board in the event of an approval.

There is a provision in your zoning code that discusses that aspect which states that before recommending the issuance of a special use permit, the board may prescribe such conditions as the will of the board's judgment to ensure that the factors that you just went through are satisfied.

But with that being said, I think you are at the time in this hearing process for you, the board, to make your recommendation to the county board.

There are essentially three options for the zoning boards to take. Those options are to recommend an approval, recommend an approval subject to conditions, or recommend a denial. So, those are
the options that are before the board.
MR. CHAMBERS: So as I understand it, we will be under the same rules as before with not having a negative motion and whatever motion we would want to send to the county board should include the conditions.

So, in that case, I would make the motion for approval subject to the conditions which we have drafted to the county board.

MR. HARRINGTON: I would second that.
MR. WAX: Got a motion to second.
Discussion?
We've covered about everything to be covered. Are you okay with rollcall?

MR. HARRINGTON: Yes, sir.
MR. LARSON: (Nodding.)
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Larson?
MR. LARSON: No.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Lovin?
MR. LOVIN: No.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Harrington?
MR. HARRINGTON: No.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Chambers?
MR. CHAMBERS: No.

MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Wax?
MR. WAX: No.
THE COURT: All right, folks. Please be advised that this is a recommendation from the Piatt County Zoning Board of Appeals. The final say goes to the folks on the Piatt County Board, many of whom are in the room tonight.

You would need to check with the county board office or administrator for the county to determine when the county board will take up the issue. That hasn't been decided. It's not on an agenda for any upcoming meeting that I am aware of, but this is the recommendation.

So, the next step will be for the full county board to consider this zoning board's recommendation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think there is just one thing left.

MR. WAX: I would like a motion to adjourn.

MR. HARRINGTON: I'm make a motion.
MR. LARSON: Second.
MR. WAX: All in favor say aye.
MR. CHAMBERS: Aye.

MR. WAX: Aye.

MR. HARRINGTON: Aye. MR. LARSON: Aye.

MR. LOVIN: Aye.
(HEARING ADJOURNED.)
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