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WORD INDEX
(Proceedings had on August 31, 2023)
DR. WAX: Call to order. May we have the roll call please?

MS. NUSBAUM: Sure. Mr. Larson?
Mr. Harrington?
MR. HARRINGTON: Here.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Lovin? Mr. Wax?
DR. WAX: Here.
MS. NUSBAUM: Mr. Chambers?
MR. CHAMBERS: Here.
MS. NUSBAUM: State's Attorney Perry?
DR. WAX: County Board Members?
MS. NUSBAUM: Henricks?
MR. HENRICKS: Here.
MS. NUSBAUM: Edwards?
MR. EDWARDS: Here.
MS. NUSBAUM: Beem? Jones? Piatt? Foran?
MR. FORAN: Here.
MS. NUSBAUM: Thank you.
DR. WAX: Okay.
MR. KAINS: Yes, sir. Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. All right. It is night four, and we're moving along very expeditiously. I was very pleased with last night. Prior to beginning with witnesses, Counsel for Prosperity Wind has indicated to me they have a few
housekeeping matters with respect to some evidence exhibits. Mr. Hess?

MR. HESS: Thank you, Mr. Kains. Good evening. We have three exhibits that we would like to tender to be admitted into evidence. The first is a hard copy exhibit of Appendix F.4, Prosperity Wind's Special Use Permit Application. It came to our attention that for at least some of the binders that are in this room there is a printing error, and that particular Appendix which is the lighting plan was not included. We believe it was included in the electronic versions and everything that was officially submitted, but just to make sure every one has it, we wanted to submit an extra copy here. So, I believe that we have it. It's not small, and $I$ think this would be Exhibit Number 17. MR. KAINS: Is that right, Mr. Keyt, Number 17?

MR. KEYT: It would be Applicant's Exhibit Number 17.

MR. KAINS: All right. Applicant's Exhibit 17, the lighting plan, will be admitted into evidence. It's already probably in evidence, in any case, as part of the electronic submittal, but just to make the record correct, it will be admitted into evidence. All right,

Mr. Hess?

MR. HESS: These two other exhibits that I have tendered, we'd request that they be admitted into evidence. First would be the internet print-out of the Firetrace web site, the statistics that I summarized for Chairman Wax last night. I appreciate that this was at the request of Chairman Wax. It comes dangerously close to some very appropriate foundational requirements. I'm happy to tender it subject to whatever instruction you would like or whatever specification for the ZBA you have.

MR. KAINS: I would like to review it first.

MR. HESS: May I approach?

MR. KAINS: Yes. Absolutely. Jamie, let's go off the record for just a minute.
(Discussion had out of the hearing of the court reporter.)

MR. KAINS: Jamie, we're back on the record. Mr. Hess has tendered a document from a Firetrace Company's web site, Firetrace.com, with respect to the wind turbine fire detection and suppression system, and tendered that and is requesting that it be admitted. I'm going to take that under review, and wait until after Mr. Keyt's had a chance to review it and determine whether he has any objection to it or not. Then I'll
rule. You do have one more?
MR. HESS: Yes, sir, Mr. Kains. Thank you.
This will be a little bit more straight forward. I would like to tender as an exhibit, I believe it would be proposed Exhibit Number 18, a two-page table that Miss Anderson prepared. This table is just a different format of information that's already in the Permit Application, but what it does is it shows the five-foot distance for every single turbine compared to every single type of setback requirement.

MR. KAINS: Was this prepared by Miss
Anderson?
MR. HESS: This was prepared by Miss
Anderson. I would proffer that she would testify that she prepared this and we would move to admit that.

MR. KAINS: I'll accept that proffer and allow that table in evidence, as Applicant's Exhibit 18. Thank you.

MR. HESS: Thank you, Mr. Kains. We have nothing further.

MR. KAINS: All right. Very good. Mr. Keyt, do you have anything further before we begin?

MR. KEYT: No, sir.
MR. KAINS: Okay. Now Mr. Keyt, I see you have your witness, Mr. Minder here, and we appreciate
him coming. He is scheduled to be at, in the order of progression, point number twelve. Are you requesting, Mr. Keyt, that he be taken out of order at this time? MR. KEYT: Yes, sir. I think with respect to Mr. Minder's schedule and to ensure that we stay on track, that we take him at his availability.

MR. KAINS: Counsel, do you have any
objection?
MR. HESS: No objection.

MR. KAINS: And I have spoken to Miss Meg Miner, one of the citizens, and she was the one who was next up to testify in support of the Application, and she's graciously allowed Mr. Minder to jump in line ahead of her. I'll have to say that the schedule of progression is written in black and white, and I'm a rule follower, always have been, always will be, but sometimes circumstances require you to take things out of order and sometimes they require you to speed things up or slow things down and move things over to another night. But we'll have Mr. Minder testify. Mr. Minder, are you ready?

MATT MINDER: Yes.

MR. KAINS: Okay. Very good. Could you please stand and raise your right hand and be sworn. (Witness sworn).
$\begin{array}{llllllllll}M & A & T & T & M & I & N & D & R\end{array}$
called as a witness on behalf of Piatt county, in the above-entitled cause, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

MR. KAINS: Thank you, Mr. Minder, if you would please state your name spelling first and last names for the record?

MATT MINDER: Matt Minder, M-A-T-T, $M-I-N-D-E-R$.

MR. KAINS: Thank you, Mr. Minder.
Mr. Keyt, you may proceed.
MR. KEYT: Okay.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION BY

MR. KEYT:
Q. Thank you, Mr. Minder. Mr. Minder, let's just start with, for the Members of the ZBA and the public, what your professional education is.
A. Yes. I'm a Registered Professional Engineer in the State of Illinois, formally educated with both a degree in Civil Engineering from the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
Q. And can you give the Members of the ZBA and the public a description of your professional background?
A. Yes. I have over 26 years of experience in Civil and Environmental Engineering.
Q. And who do you work for today?
A. I work for Patrick Engineering.
Q. And do you evaluate projects on behalf of counties and other local governmental bodies from time to time?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Have you evaluated wind projects on behalf of counties previously?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. What about other types of projects that you've evaluated as well?
A. In terms of projects similar to this, I have evaluated a couple of solar projects, and I have also been involved more formally in design and construction of both solar and wind projects.
Q. When you say -- when the county requests your service, since the County asks you to look at an application, what is it that you do? How do you undertake that process that you do?
A. The initial process would be to obtain a full copy of the Application. We would review that information with respect to understanding its completeness with respect to the County's Ordinance. We
would also take a look at the information with respect to engineering judgment in regards to construction, design and operation.
Q. Do you know how many, by chance, how many wind projects you've evaluated in your career?
A. I believe $I$ have that in one of my slides. It's seven or eight, $I$ believe.
Q. Mr. Kains, $I$ would tender Mr. Minder as an expert in his field of Professional Engineering?

MR. KAINS: Counsel?

MR. HESS: No objection.
MR. KAINS: Very good. He will be -- he's
qualified as an expert to testify in this proceeding.
Q. Mr. Minder, at some point in time, did Piatt County staff reach out to you to evaluate the Prosperity Wind Project proposed by Apex?
A. Yes, they did.
Q. Do you know about when they did that?
A. I would say the last couple of months, some time in late June or July perhaps.
Q. And in that process, were you able to review the Application that Prosperity Wind had submitted?
A. Yes. Patrick Engineering did review the Application, correct.
Q. And did you also review the current county

Ordinance with regard to wind?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. When you say Patrick Engineering, I understand that it probably isn't just yourself that undertakes the review, but there may be others that undertake that?
A. Correct.
Q. They do so under your supervision; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And then once you've had an opportunity to review the Application and the County's Ordinance, did you then write up your findings?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you recently submitted those findings, did you not?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you, rather than me just offering you questions, why don't you run through what I'm going to mark as County Exhibit Number 1, which is your report to the County in regards to this particular project, and I'll ask that County Exhibit Number 1 be admitted into evidence.

MR. KAINS: Mr. Hess, Miss Antoniolli, Mr. Granholm, have you seen this exhibit? MR. HESS: We have.

MR. KAINS: Do you have any objection?
MR. HESS: No objection.
MR. KAINS: Very good. It will be admitted
as County's 1 .
A. Well this exhibit, I guess, basically coincides with the slide show presentation $I$ have prepared, so I will go through the slide show as well. As I go through, I may make a couple of notes regarding some details that aren't provided in Exhibit 1. All right, the slide show is essentially a summary of a review that Patrick Engineering performed for Prosperity Wind Farm Siting Application.

Just another basic overview, my experience, 26 years of professional experience. I have performed reviews of wind farm projects, Livingston, Woodford, Logan, Pike, Mason, Morgan and Piatt Counties here in Illinois. In some cases multiple projects within those counties. I also had a little bit of, excuse me, engineering construction support of a wind farm project in Bureau and Lee Counties.

Patrick, as a whole, has provided program management for a couple of large wind farms in Missouri, including quality control, monitoring and recording of the contractor activities. We've also provided various services for wind farm projects in seven U.S. states and
in Canada, and our experience includes civil, geotechnical, environmental, electrical, communications, and GIS support.

For the Application, our scope of services was three-fold. We did a general technical review of the Project. This case was a review of the full Application submitted by Prosperity Wind with the exception of Appendix A which essentially contained landowner information and agreements.

We conducted a sound compliance review, which is a review of the sound modeling report prepared by RSG in June of 2023, which is located in Appendix E. 5 of the Application, and we also performed a review of the decommissioning plan that was prepared by Westwood, which is located at tab E. 7 of the Prosperity Application.

In our review findings of the general technical review, it is our opinion that the Application complies with the required conditions in the county's Ordinance, or indicates the intent to design and operate the wind farm in accordance with the Ordinance requirements (for such items that will be completed after siting approval).

I do note we did identify a couple of technical issues in terms of, number one; the Preliminary Site

Plan. I did identify that it was missing the location of surface and subsurface drainage structures as required in Section V.B. 5 of the Ordinance. Also the Landscape Plan which was provided was missing dimensions as required under the Ordinance. We do note that in both cases we anticipate this information can be provided prior to applying for the construction permits if the Application is approved. So we do not consider those as significant concerns.

Getting back to our findings. We did also review the design, installation and operation information. It is our opinion that it is consistent with the requirements of the Ordinance.

The avian studies and mitigation measures are consistent with the requirements of the Ordinance. That was our opinion.

And then also with respect to setbacks, the setbacks that are required within the ordinance. We did also identify, based on our review, that they appear to be met or that required waivers are received. We do note that we did not receive a file in a format that allowed us to independently check that information. So we're essentially relying on the information that was provided within the Application itself.
Q. Understood. I believe, in addition to the general
technical review, you also reviewed the Application for Sound Compliance. Can you tell us about that?
A. That's correct. For the Sound Compliance Review, we basically took a look at the sound compliance report from RSG. Their report concluded that there were no receptors (primary residences) that were in the vicinity of the wind farm that would be impacted by noise coming from the Project turbines and substation, that would be in excess of the Illinois regulatory limits.

We conducted our own separate modeling for five receptors in the Project area, including two receptor locations that were specifically noted in the RSG report as being within two decibels an octave band limit. Essentially those were locations that were, I guess I would use the term, somewhat critical as they were close to the sound compliance limits. Our noise modeling confirmed the results of the RSG modeling; specifically that there were no receptors that would be impacted by noise coming from the Project turbines and substation that were in excess of the Illinois regulatory limits.
Q. In terms of your review, did you also look at Decommissioning Plan?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. And can you tell us what your findings were on the Decommissioning Plan?
A. For the Decommissioning Plan, our findings were for the estimate for decommissioning the fifty turbines of eleven point eight four eight million dollars, came out to around two hundred and thirty-seven thousand dollars per turbine, an estimate of five point three four million dollars for salvage of the fifty turbines, or approximately a hundred and seven thousand dollars per turbine.

And it's our opinion, in general, that there are some items within the Plan that should be given further consideration by the County and the Applicant; number one, that administrative costs for the County to oversee and manage the Decommissioning Process are not included in the estimate. There is a fifteen percent contingency that is provided within the estimate, and although that may be sufficient to incorporate those expenses, because how the administration process is outside the county's normal operations and activities, we believe that that should be specifically reflected in the estimate.

We also found the transmission line from the substation to the tie-in point, we did find the foundation removal, transportation and disposal is not accounted for in this cost estimate, and the gravel disposal costs from the substation are not accounted for in the cost estimate. Those were our main findings for
the Decommissioning Plan.
Q. Any other findings based on your review or recommendations to the County?
A. Nothing further.
Q. And then $I$ believe the report that you had submitted was essentially incorporated into the power point that you presented here tonight, and --
A. Correct.
Q. -- so I will ask, Mr. Kains, that County Exhibit Number 2, the power point from Mr. Minder be admitted into evidence.

MR. KAINS: Counsel?

MR. HESS: No objection.

MR. KAINS: It will be in as County Exhibit 2.

MR. KEYT: That's all the questions I have.

MR. KAINS: Very good. Thank you. All right. Questions for Mr. Minder first from Members of the Piatt County Zoning Board of Appeals?

QUESTIONS POSED BY

MR. CHAMBERS:
Q. Thank you. Quick question on the verification of the setbacks. So you said that you didn't receive
things in a file format that allowed you to check independently. So I'm assuming then that you are just going by the GIS map data and making a measurement off of the provided map to come up with setback distances then?
A. Well essentially because we didn't get a file format that would allow us to check it in detail, essentially we were limited to the information contained within the Application, which obviously the maps in there are, you know, to a rather large scale, so any sort of independent verification we do would have such a margin of error that, you know, it wouldn't be worth the time to try and do those.
Q. So in other words, there's nothing that -- that being much more, you know, a finer margin of measurement there, it wouldn't have affected the outcome?
A. Correct.

MR. CHAMBERS: That's all I have. MR. KAINS: Mr. Harrington? MR. HARRINGTON: You bet.

QUESTIONS POSED BY

MR. HARRINGTON:
Q. Mr. Minder, following up on Will's part, did I understand that right, that you said due to some other circumstance you were unable to do any physical verification of it? It's simply an estimate off of GIS?
A. What we would typically want to do is to --
Q. You might have to come out from behind the post.
A. What we typically try to do in this case is to obtain a file, typically a GIS file or a CAD file that we can actually, you know, take accurate measurements from the turbine location to, you know, the various setbacks, you know, roads, power lines, residences. That's our preference to do that, but in order for us to do that we needed a particular type of file that would have that level of detail to allow us to perform that independent review, but because we did not have that information we were essentially just relying on the information within, you know, the drawings within the Application itself.
Q. The drawing from the Applicant within the Application, correct?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. But in this situation we are asking you to verify
that, are we not?
A. Correct. We are trying to do an independent verification, but without additional information there's not very much else that we can do with the file that we received.
Q. Was there something about the style of file that is unattainable, or is there a time issue, or why can we not get that done?
A. I think it may have just been a time issue. I know that what we received from the county, we did have just only a couple of weeks to go through and then perform our analysis. So if there was additional time, if we were able to have more time to get that file and do that review, we could certainly do so.
Q. I understand. In the unfortunate event that there was a mistake or something in the data that you used, what recourse does a resident have in advance of construction? Anything, to your knowledge?
A. I don't have an answer to that question. I don't know.
Q. I understand. I see your note. You mentioned it. Item 1(a): "We note the Preliminary SP plan is missing the location of surface and subsurface drainage".

I think what you're saying is typically that's
not done until after the construction permit's issued. Is that what you're saying on that?
A. Typically, once if siting approval is received, then the Applicant would typically go out and do the detail design and investigation that they would need to do, probably go out and provide and obtain a survey of the various locations where the turbines would go in, and at that point that would be the time where you would expect to see more detailed maps and information provided, and I would expect that information to be obtained within that time period prior to construction permits being obtained.
Q. I understand. I guess, in regards to the adjacent non-participating landowners or participating landowners, for that information to be verified, do you have any suggestions on how they could, you know, will this be -- in your experience, is this forwarded to them once it is done? Are they notified of this? What line of communication should these folks look for?
A. I'm not sure if $I$ understand your question.
Q. So the topic here was missing location of surface and subsurface drainage structures in the Application. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So as a resident or a landowner, I would imagine
there's folks that are around this project that want to make sure their drainage, in whatever form, is identified correctly, right? They would want to verify that whoever locates this is doing it properly. Would that make sense?
A. Yes, I understand your question. I understand what you're asking, yes.
Q. Okay. So what I'm saying is how would those folks get an opportunity to review that if it's not submitted to the County until after the permit? There wouldn't be a hearing for that. How would these folks be able to know?
A. Well it would be my understanding that that information would be something that would need to be presented before the construction permits would be issued by the County.
Q. It would be need to be before the permit. Okay. I guess another item you brought up, that's probably a good point, is you say the administrative costs aren't per say accounted for. I see what you're saying in regards to this fifteen percent contingency. I guess the concern $I$ would have there is, if you use the fifteen percent contingency for the administrative costs, then where is the accounting for the increase in costs that the fifteen percent was gonna take care of?
A. Well what we would estimate in terms of the percentage of the project that would be required for administrative costs, I think in the past we have estimated around two or three percent of the costs. So, you know, with there being fifteen percent contingency, you would not expect the administrative costs to eat up that entire amount.
Q. As you're the engineering firm for the county in this scenario, right, would you advise that they maybe delineate the administrative costs so that it's not a question mark?
A. That would be what we would recommend, yes.
Q. Very good. In the case of the transmission line removal, transportation or disposal, in your findings was that delineated in the decommissioning? Did they say hey this is how we're gonna do it, what we plan to do? Or $I$ guess maybe expand on that a little.
A. It was -- essentially, you know, we understand that they are -- there is a certain amount of transmission line that they have to construct in order to get the power for their substation to the utility, and it was -- as we look through the Decommissioning Plan, we didn't identify that that component was estimated as part of the costs. So we find that to be a missing cost that should be accounted for.
Q. I would agree. I think that's a probably a sizable item depending on the length and size of these things. Right?
A. It may be, yes.
Q. Right. So on that note, you're talking about the transmission line. Was the decommissioning or removal of the substation accounted for by chance?
A. It was, yes. The only item within the substation that they did not calculate costs correctly, in our opinion, was that they did not address the disposal of the gravel material that was -- that would be the pad or the driving surface around the substation.
Q. I understand. I believe that is all for now, scott.

MR. KAINS: All right. Very good. Thank you, Mr. Harrington. Chairman Wax, do you have any questions?

DR. WAX: I may have one here.

QUESTIONS POSED BY
DR. WAX:
Q. The listing of the item one and two, under decommissioning, the cost. Is that the initial cost as of when they start the thing. As I recall, there's some
review and increase in these costs at certain years. Could you remind me of what those years are and how much the additional would be?
A. Right. According to the Department of Agriculture's Impact Mitigation Agreement, decommissioning estimate needs to be updated, $I$ think it's prior to year eleven of operation. So essentially within -- after ten years, and then every five years thereafter.
Q. Not until the tenth year?
A. Not until the tenth year.
Q. And every five years after that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Is the amount listed here from your past experience of other decommissioning plans of wind turbine farms, is this amount reasonable and comparable to what it costs in other locations?
A. We believe that it is a reasonable cost, yes.
Q. Okay. I had a question -- I think I must have missed this one. There was a good explanation from the presenters, and $I$ believe in the Application, about the damage, and how to handle boring under district tiles and drainage ditches, and that it would go straight through and it would be obvious they would trench and fix farmers' tile as they went through them. I
understood that. Then $I$ brought up the item of damage by cranes crushing tile. Now the answer we got was that yes, we plan to do that, and we'll take care of that as needed, as the grower or landlord or both determine that there's a significant problem, whether it be one, two, three, four, five years down the road. Would it be reasonable to expect the company since there's, and this is just an opinion, but $I$ 'm getting this from tiling companies. There's almost an assurance that tiles are going to be crushed wherever a crane goes. Would it be reasonable to expect the company to repair these when they're crushed at the time the crane goes over them as well as then follow up in years after and cover any additional damages that occur? Or is that unreasonable? I don't know. I'm just asking.
A. Well I would just say, and my opinion would be that, because you're simply driving over the area and not going down and exposing the tiles themselves, it may not be possible to know if that crushing did occur at the time of the work being performed, and it would be more one of the -- more of a situation where you would understand that that may have happened down the road as your tile system isn't working, you know, may not be working properly. That might be something you would have to explore after the fact.
Q. Could it be, in your opinion, that it would be very difficult to tell, and you need to wait and see what happens? Is that about it?
A. Yes.
Q. Was there a provision in there as to, and I may have just missed this, a provision as to what access roads, how access roads run through tile fields? What is done there? Do you recall that? I do not.
A. I don't recall that my self. I don't recall if there's --
Q. I'm sure the access roads are gonna run through some tiles at some point unless they're extremely lucky and very clever in placing the access road.
A. I would just say -(Multiple people speaking at the same time.)
Q. Isn't that right?
A. Yeah, $I$ know, typically the construction of the access roads generally doesn't put as much pressure on the ground as say a crane would where you would be less likely to expect crushing to occur from the road construction.
Q. So you think any access roads, the tile that runs underneath, is not likely to be affected?
A. I would say it's depending on the depth of the tile. If it's three, four feet down, you know, I would
expect it to not be adversely affected.
Q. Okay. Typically two and a half to three feet. Okay. Thank you.

MR. KAINS: Any other questions Mr. Minder
from Members of the Zoning Board?
MR. HARRINGTON: Yeah, Scott.
MR. KAINS: Yeah, Mr. Harrington.

FURTHER QUESTIONS POSED BY
MR. HARRINGTON:
Q. So sort of following up on Loyd's line of thought there in regards to the tile matter. So obviously I think it's easy enough to see we've got a lot of unanswered questions there naturally, and whether it be traffic, or a crane, or trenching for the transmission lines, the towers themselves, or whatever it is, since you've dealt with a number of these, from what $I$ understand, correct?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Give us some advice. What arrangements can these residents from Piatt County, these landowners, whether they're participating or not, what arrangements can these residents make for performance on that? This is not going to be a small bill in the end. So speak
candidly.
A. Well, $I$ think that the AIMA agreement that the developer is required to sign, includes protections in there regarding drain tile, that drain tile damages need to be repaired. It doesn't let them off the hook necessarily. So, you know, I believe that the AIMA provides coverage that both participating and non-participating landowners can utilize.
Q. Very good. In your sound portion, there's a statement here Patrick conducted a separate noise model for five receptors in said report including two receptor locations R22 and R142. I guess -- I'm sure there's a page I'm not finding, but is there any chance you have a schematic of where R22 and R142 are?
A. I do not.
Q. Is it something that you can provide for us?
A. I would probably have to go back and get that information, but yeah, in general $I$ don't have the exact locations of those, no.
Q. I think that's something that we would like.
A. Okay.
Q. So further, the reason I'm asking that is, first off, what was the reason for those two particular receptors that were mentioned?
A. The reason for mentioning those is, those were
two locations identified by the Applicant as being close to the -- spots that were close to the sound limits. So the reason for that is just obviously those would be kind of the critical locations that we would want to do an independent check for.
Q. So you're saying they're on the high end of the allowable limit? Is that accurate?
A. Yeah. They're underneath, but yeah, they're close to the allowable limit. Right.
Q. But they're on the high end, I think is what you're saying. So that's all the more reason we'd want to know what's going on with those.

The other question $I$ have is, why only five receptors out of all fifty turbines?
A. Number one, you know, we weren't looking to basically duplicate the work that RSG did. There is a lot of work involved in putting together a detailed sound model like that. We don't necessarily have that expertise to do that detailed modeling. We do have a commercially available model that we can look at, but we just do an independent check of a few sources in order to, you know, just provide a little more piece of mind to the county.
Q. I see. So, you guys you went out and did five locations and then that was it, right?
A. We checked five locations in our model. Yes.
Q. Right. That's all, Scott.

MR. KAINS: Very good. Thank you,
Mr. Harrington. Any other questions?
DR. WAX: I have one question.
MR. KAINS: Yes, Chairman Wax.
DR. WAX: March Chambers, did you have one
first?
MR. CHAMBERS: No. I just was finding the receptors here.

DR. WAX: Okay.

FURTHER QUESTIONS POSED
DR. WAX:
Q. Mr. Minder, in your experience of working with this thing over the years, exactly what are the conditions that result in, is it a default, or is it -I don't know. What are the conditions in which the County has to rely on -- the County is responsible for -- winds up being responsible for decommissioning and taking care of a field that has been left? What are the situations that bring that about?
A. So if $I$ understand you correctly, you're asking in what situation would the county be required to
perform the decommissioning?
Q. Yes.
A. It would essentially have to be a situation where the developer would in, whatever way, abandon the project where there's no one to perform that decommissioning work.
Q. Okay. In your experience at this time of all the experience, and your knowledge of the system, how many times has that actually occurred?
A. To my knowledge, it has not happened, but I would also say that all the wind farms that I'm aware of are still in operation in one way or another. So, there's not - -
Q. You're not aware of any, even though they were put in twenty years ago or more, none thus far have been decommissioned in total?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. Okay. So thus far, we don't have enough age and experience in the whole thing to know for sure how this is likely to happen, or how the decommissioning is really gonna work?
A. Right now, there's still not very much information out there regarding actual decommissioning costs and...
Q. Okay. Thank you.

MR. KAINS: Any other questions for
Mr. Minder from the Board?

FURTHER QUESTIONS POSED BY

MR. HARRINGTON:
Q. I guess one last one, since you're talking about decommissioning. Just a real brief overview of your quotes here, you're somewhere around a hundred and seven thousand per turbine on salvage at a total
decommissioning cost per what, of two thirty-seven? I guess I'm impressed that it's that much in salvage. Is that right? You'll be able to salvage that much out of it when it's all done?
A. The way they th calculate the salvage was assuming that they're not re-selling any components. It basically is taking everything down and processing it as scrap material.
Q. So I guess I'm curious in that scenario, you're gonna have scrap from, I assume, the metal of the turbine itself, but what happens with these blades? Is there a cost attached to those?
A. Yes. The blades are a composite material. Right now there currently isn't a recycle value to them. So those would just essentially be disposed -- processed
and disposed at a landfill.
Q. But how do you calculate that cost? I guess I was unaware any landfills took those blades.
A. Well, the material that would be generated is not special in any way, that it wouldn't be -- that it could not be accepted at a landfill. So it would just need to be processed to the size where the landfill could accept it and dispose of it.
Q. So I guess, you just -- did you estimate or take a wild guess at what it would take to break these things down? It has to be a tremendous amount of work, right?
A. There's a cost in there. I don't recall off the top of my head, but yeah, they do have costs in there for breaking it down.
Q. So they can be hauled off to a landfill?
A. Yes.
Q. Very good.

MR. KAINS: Any other questions from the
Board?
MR. CHAMBERS: One question.

FURTHER QUESTIONS POSED BY
MR. CHAMBERS:
Q. That fifteen percent contingency, in your experience, is that a common number, or an acceptable number? Have you seen higher or lower numbers in that?
A. I've not seen higher. I've seen generally between ten and fifteen percent. Usually ten percent. So fifteen percent is on the high end of what we've seen in the past.

MR. CHAMBERS: Okay. That's all I have. MR. KAINS: Chairman Wax, anything else? DR. WAX: No, thank you.

MR. KAINS: Very good. All right. Questions for Mr. Minder from members of units of local government including school districts? Questions from interested parties represented by licensed attorneys. Counsel, questions from Mr. Minder?

MR. HESS: Yes, sir.
MR. KAINS: Go right ahead.
MR. HESS: Thank you, Mr. Kains.

MR. HESS:
Q. Mr. Minder, I don't believe we've met before. My name is J. Hess, Associate General Counsel. Mr. Minder, thank you for your work on this. I appreciate it.

Let's start with setbacks. Your testimony here is that based on the information provided, Prosperity Wind's Special Use Permit complies with setback requirements of Piatt County's wind Ordinance, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. You testified that that's based on the information that you received, but you would've liked to have some of the data in a different format; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Prior to today, did you ever make that request of Prosperity Wind?
A. I did not make a request directly to Prosperity Wind, no.
Q. So prior to today, to your knowledge, did Prosperity Wind know that you wanted information in a different format?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. All right. Mr. Chambers asked you a question about whether you had any information about, I believe
his phrase was, finer measurements. Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. Mr. Kains, may $I$ approach and show the witness what has been admitted as Exhibit 18? It's that table. MR. KAINS: Yes, you may.
A. Thank you.
MR. HESS: Yes, sir.
Q. Mr. Minder, I realize that you're seeing this for the first time. So I will proffer to you what was admitted as Prosperity's Exhibit Number 18, a two-page table that we prepared, that shows on a per turbine basis, down to the foot, the distance from every single setback requirement. Is that the finer measurement that Mr. Chambers was looking for?

MR. KEYT: Can $I$ just interject here? I'm not lodging necessarily an objection, but maybe it's my poor eyes, but $I$ have a hard time reading the document. I'm not sure about Mr. Minder, but I'm not -- if Mr. Minder can read it and has had sufficient time to review it, $I$ think it would be appropriate for him to answer, but I'm not able to read it without let's say optical assistance.

MR. KAINS: All right. I know it's not an objection, but I'm just going to simply ask Mr. Minder,
can you read that exhibit, Exhibit 18 ?
A. Yes, it is readable.

MR. KAINS: Very good. What was the
question?
Q. My question is, is this the type of granular detail on a per turbine basis and a per setback basis demonstrating that every single turbine meets every single setback?
A. Yes. It is better than just the map that was received within the Application $I$ would say.
Q. So your testimony is that Prosperity Wind, to your knowledge, found out about your concern for the first time today, and has now provided that information; is that right?
A. Could you repeat the question?
Q. Sure. As far as you know, Prosperity Wind found out about your request for a different format of information today, and today has admitted into evidence an exhibit providing this information?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. All right. Now you also had some questions about well all of this information is from Prosperity Wind, so you have no way to independently verify that. Do you remember those questions?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's see if we can independently verify it another way. You testified in the Goose Creek Wind hearings, didn't you?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall you testified, quote:
"The setbacks, the multiple setbacks involved from the list of items from corporate limits, primary residences, public roads, right-of-ways, third-party power lines, communication towers, adjacent properties, they appear to be met or the required waivers were contained within the Application."

Do you recall that testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. So it would be that the Goose Creek Wind Project satisfied the Piatt County Ordinance that was in effect at the time; is that right?

MR. KEYT: I just object to the relevance of that, but $I$ don't -(Multiple people speaking at the same time.)

MR. HESS: I can establish the relevance --
MR. KAINS: I'm going to go ahead and
overrule the objection, just because I want to know the answer.

MR. HESS: Would you like me to repeat the question, sir?
A. Please.
Q. So you testified before this ZBA that the Goose Creek Wind Project satisfied Piatt County's setback requirements; isn't that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. That was in December?
A. Yes.
Q. As we sit here now, turbine locations have not changed, tip heights have not changed, right?
A. To the best of my knowledge, no.
Q. So then logically, Prosperity Wind has to also meet the setback requirements, wouldn't that be true?
A. It would be true.
Q. And in fact, as you're aware, Piatt county changed their Ordinance between December and now; isn't that true?
A. Yes.
Q. So today's setback requirements are even less stringent than they were in December?
A. Understood.
Q. So if Goose Creek Wind met more stringent setback requirements, which was your testimony, than Prosperity Wind, the same locations, the same tip height, has to meet Piatt County's current setback requirements, isn't that true?

MR. KEYT: Hold on now. I'm just going to object because it assumes a number of facts that are not before the Board, some of which include whether or not there were things like unoccupied or occupied buildings within the particular area now versus when the Goose Creek Project was applied for. So there could have been a building, homes, et cetera, that could have been built within that time frame. It also assumes that all of the turbine locations are exactly the same.

MR. HESS: May I respond?

MR. KAINS: Yes.

MR. HESS: I believe the evidence is that all of the turbine locations are exactly the same as has been testified to multiple times. I think his point is well taken. I'm happy to ask a hypothetical to address the first part of that objection.

MR. KAINS: Yeah. I'm going to sustain the objection, and then $I$ want you to ask that question, Mr. Hess. Very good.
Q. Hypothetically if there was absolutely no evidence of any change to homes, to community buildings, to any of the other on-the-ground information that is relevant to these setbacks, under that hypothetical, if Goose Creek Wind satisfied Piatt County's Ordinance requirements for setbacks in December, wouldn't

Prosperity Wind have to satisfy the setback requirements today?
A. Hypothetically, yes, I believe so.
Q. Okay. And then Mr. Harrington asked you what recourse would a resident have if, after construction, suddenly it was discovered that Prosperity Wind was in violation of a setback requirement. Do you remember that question?
A. Yes.
Q. Now the Piatt County Wind Ordinance has a whole section on remedies and enforcement, right?
A. Yes.
Q. If Prosperity Wind, at any point, was in violation of a setback requirement, Piatt county could come after us in a whole host of legal ways, correct?
A. I'm not qualified to answer that question, I believe.
Q. You haven't seen anything in the Prosperity Wind Application asking that -- suggesting we're asking for immunity if we violate the law, right?
A. Not to my recollection.
Q. All right. You talked about surface and subsurface drainage. And did I understand you correctly that your testimony is that that information is not contained in the Preliminary Site Plan, or in the

Application as a whole?
A. In the Preliminary Site Plan, more specifically the order we looked at.
Q. Okay. Did you review the 73-page Farmland Drainage Plan that's in Appendix C.3?
A. I did, but $I$ probably don't recall the specifics of it, no.
Q. Would you like me to show it to you?
A. That's not necessary. I believe that it is within the Application.
Q. Wouldn't you agree that it starts with a Project size map showing every single drainage district, and then it goes parcel by parcel with a map showing every drainage facility that we know of, every wetland and every waterway?
A. Again, to my knowledge.
Q. I'm not trying to make this a memory test. If you would like to see it, I'm happy to show it to you to refresh your memory. Would you like to see it?
A. No, that's okay. I understand.
Q. So you were asked several questions about the level of detail that you would expect to see at the time of building permits. Isn't the level of detail already in the Farmland Drainage Plan?
A. Yes. As much as I recall, $I$ believe it probably
is.
Q. So as to Mr. Harrington's question about how would residents know this information now or how would this ZBA know this information now, it's in our Application, isn't it?
A. I believe that's correct.
Q. Okay. Let's talk about decommissioning. Now the requirements for decommissioning are addressed in Section 16 of the Piatt County Wind Ordinance, right?
A. I believe that's correct, yeah.
Q. That section simply says, of the Decommissioning Plan, quote: "Shall comply with the terms of the AIMA, right?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And then the AIMA is in the Application at Appendix D.1, correct? And I'm not trying to make a memory test, so I'll show it to you if you would like?
A. The Decommissioning Plan is in Appendix --
Q. The AIMA is.
A. Okay. Sorry. Yes.
Q. You did review the AIMA as part of your review; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. In Section $21 A$ of the AIMA is what covers what
the AIMA calls deconstruction; is that right? And I'm happy to put it in front of you if that would be helpful.
A. I believe that's correct from my memory.
Q. And just help everyone understand, AIMA uses the word deconstruction, where here we're talking decommissioning. Would you agree those are the same subjects?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. So then Section $21 A$ of the AIMA then lays out all of the requirements of what must be in a Decommissioning Plan, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So I want to get to your three recommendations in a moment, but let's just start with, would you agree that the Decommissioning Plan complies with Section 21A of the AIMA?
A. I believe that it would, yes.
Q. And therefore, it's in compliance with the Piatt County Wind Ordinance, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So for example, your recommendation on administrative costs, you would agree that Section 21A doesn't say anything about administrative costs?
A. I do not believe that it does.
Q. In fact, nowhere in the AIMA is there any discussion of administrative costs?
A. I don't think that there is.
Q. Okay. And you've got some questions about the amounts that you would expect in administrative costs. Would you agree that two and a half percent of the decommissioning costs would be a reasonable administrative cost?
A. That's what we thought in the past, yes.
Q. So if Prosperity Wind wanted to comply with your recommendation, if we submitted a revised Decommissioning Plan that had two and a half percent administrative costs line added, that would comply with your first recommendation?
A. Yes.
Q. Your second recommendation had to do with transmission line foundation removal, transportation and disposal; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And let's be very specific here, because I want to make sure Mr. Harrington understands this based on the way he asked his question. The Decommissioning Plan includes decommissioning costs for the transmission line, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And all of the above-ground structures, right?
A. Yes. I mean if you're considering the foundations as not part of the above-ground structures.
Q. Fair point. Let me ask a more specific question. It includes everything but the foundation?
A. I believe it does.
Q. And so your technical critique, which I admit is a fair one, is that transmission line foundation itself is not specifically identified in the table of decommissioning costs; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have the Decommissioning Plan in front of you?
A. I have a copy of it.
Q. If you could go to that table. I'll just state for the record, that Attachment $A$ to the Decommissioning Plan is the decommissioning cost estimate which is a table, and $I$ want to make sure that we make this perfectly clear for the record, Mr. Minder, your recommendation is at the bottom of the first page under Electrical Collection/Transmission System. We should add, sounds like three rows - one row for removal of the foundation, one row for hauling it away, and one row for disposing it. Is that right?
A. I apologize. I don't have the Plan. I thought I
did, but yes, I would agree. It would need to require the removal, disposal and --
Q. May I give Mr. Minder a copy? I have extra if anybody else would like one. MR. KAINS: Yes. You may approach the witness.
A. Thank you.
Q. Yes, sir. So Mr. Minder, take your time and tell me when you're to the right page, but $I$ was directing to the first page of Attachment A, which is the first page of the big table that breaks down all the decommissioning costs.
A. Yes. The Electrical Collection/Transmission System.
Q. So your recommendation is that, at the bottom of that table, we should add those three entries, removal, hauling it away, and disposal?
A. Yes.
Q. Now I believe Mr. Harrington asked you a question about how much this might cost. Let's explore that a little bit. If you just go right up to immediately above that in the table, we talk about decommissioning of the ADLS tower -- ALDS, I apologize. ALDS -- the Aircraft Detection Lighting System. Are you there?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. In there we do have the exact entries that you are suggesting we should have add. You can see excavation of the foundation. You can see removal of the foundation -- I'm sorry, you can see removal, you can see hauling, and you can see disposal. You can see those three, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And when $I$ got your report today, I spoke with our Project Engineer who told me that the concrete foundation for the transmission tower is probably smaller than the foundation for the ADLS tower. Does that sound right to you in your experience?
A. I don't have experience with ADLS foundations.
Q. Let's just assume for a hypothetical it's the same size then.
A. Okay.
Q. All right. And then you also told me that based on our engineering specs, we will have twenty-three transmission line towers for this Project. Let's just use the costs for the Aircraft Detection Lighting System tower. The cost is two hundred and ninety-five dollars to tear it up, thirteen dollars to haul it away, and a hundred and twenty-seven dollars to dispose of it. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. So I'm bad at math, but when $I$ add that up it's four hundred and thirty-five dollars. Does that sound right to you?
A. That looks right.
Q. So four hundred and thirty-five dollars times twenty-three, it would cost us ten thousand and five dollars. Is that what we should add, in your expert opinion, to the bottom part of this table, ten thousand dollars?
A. Yes.
Q. So if we added those three rows and added ten thousand dollars, we would be complying with your second recommendation; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Your third and final recommendation was gravel disposal costs for the substation. That's addressed on the next page. So let's turn to the next page. Now Mr. Minder, do you recall that you got quite a lot of questions at the Goose Creek Wind hearing about gravel disposal. Do you remember that?
A. I believe that may have been from the opposition counsel.
Q. That's right, from Mr. Luetkehans. You're right. His questions were focused on the gravel for the access roads. Do you remember that?
A. I think so.
Q. Tell me if you would agree with this: The issue he was trying to raise is that there's a lot of gravel for the access roads, and so you might not be able to dispose of it, all of it, through daily ground cover at a landfill is that right?
A. I believe that may have been what he was saying.
Q. Let's back up and explain what all that means. What is daily cover at a landfill?
A. Daily cover at a landfill is simply the material that they place at the end of the day or at the end of operations to cover the exposed waste that they have placed that particular day.
Q. So, if one is trying to get rid of gravel through decommissioning, you've still got to pick it all up, right, from where it is currently? You've got to remove it which is pretty expensive?
A. Yes.
Q. You've still got to haul it, right?
A. Yes.
Q. The issue is, does it cost you anything to dispose it, right?
A. That is the question, yes.
Q. And the critique at Goose Creek Wind was, there is no way you would be able to dispose all of the gravel
for the access roads. So there needs to be a cost there. It shunt be zero, right?
A. I believe that's what Mr. Luetkehans may have been getting at, yes.
Q. So if you go to the top of this page under access roads, we've now included the full disposal costs, right, thirty-six dollars and sixty-seven cents per ton which adds up to over one point four million dollars to address that concern, right?
A. Yes.
Q. The issue you're now identifying, which like the last one, is fair. I just want to make sure the record is clear. We did not include the disposal costs for the gravel for the substation. If you go down under the substation, the disposal cost is listed as zero.
A. Yes.
Q. One explanation for that might be because we're assuming such a small quantity we could use for daily ground cover at a landfill. Does that sound plausible to you?

MR. KEYT: I'll just object as to the hypothetical.

MR. KAINS: I'm going to overrule it.
A. Could you repeat the question please?
Q. Sure. Does it sound plausible that the reason
why disposal of gravel from the substation site is currently listed at zero is because it is assumed a much smaller quantity could be disposed of as daily cover at a landfill?

MR. KEYT: I'll object as to speculation, because he used the phrase assumed.

MR. HESS: I'm happy to rephrase it.
MR. KAINS: I'm going to sustain the objection. Ask the question slightly differently.
Q. In your expert opinion, as a plausible explanation for why this zero is here, is because disposal of gravel from a substation site could be disposed of as daily cover at a landfill?
A. It's plausible. I don't necessarily agree with it.
Q. So let's just assume we want to be conservative and follow all of your recommendations then. Your recommendation is that instead of a zero we should take the per unit cost that we see up above, thirty-six dollars and sixty-seven cents a ton and apply it here instead of zero; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. So again, dangerous when I do math, but if I do thirty-six dollars and sixty-seven cents per ton times the three tons of gravel that we need for the
substation, the cost increase would be a hundred and ten thousand two hundred and thirty dollars and two cents. Does that sound right to you?
A. Sounds approximately right.
Q. And so if we replaced that zero with a hundred and ten thousand two hundred and thirty dollars and two cents, we would be satisfying your third recommendation?
A. Correct.
Q. So let's just make sure that the record is clear for every one. If we added the two and a half percent administrative costs, and we add in costs for the foundation of the transmission powers, and if we replace the zero with disposal costs, we would be satisfying all of your recommendations for the decommissioning plan?
A. That is correct.
Q. Even though none of these recommendations are technically required by AIMA; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. In the Goose Creek Wind hearing you also had three recommendations, right?
A. I believe so.
Q. Your first recommendation, and I have the transcript if it will refresh your memory. I'm not trying to trick you on a memory test, but your first recommendation goes to the some of the questions we've
got here tonight about the contingency amount. The Goose Creek Wind contingency amount was at ten percent, and you recommended during the Goose Creek Wind hearing before this ZBA that it should be upped to fifteen percent?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. We'll get to your other two recommendations in just a moment, but are you aware that after the Goose Creek Wind ZBA hearing, Goose Creek Wind submitted an updated decommissioning plan? You might have been done with Piatt County by that time.
A. I'm not sure. I don't recall that.
Q. Okay. Would you agree that it is fairly normal for a developer to submit a decommissioning plan to get feedback from somebody like yourself and then submit an updated decommissioning plan?
A. Yes. That has happened in the past.
Q. Okay. And you're not aware that that's in fact what happened with Goose Creek Wind? You just don't know one way or the other?
A. I don't recall -- I don't recall that I received at least an updated decommissioning cost estimate.
Q. Okay. What I want to do though is show that each of your recommendations from Goose Creek Wind are now in this plan. So you recommended ten percent contingency go
to fifteen percent contingency. We now have a fifteen percent contingency, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You recommended that the amounts that we were calculating for crop loss be increased, and we have now increased those, right?
A. Yes.
Q. That way the amount that's on hand for decommissioning would protect Piatt County in case there is some sort of crop loss and in case we somehow refuse to pay for it, they would have more money in the bonds to pay for it, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And your last recommendation had to go directly to a question that Mr. Harrington asked you about steel costs, and so, you thought that our calculation of salvage value was not conservative enough, that we should have been using an average over the years. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. Isn't it true that we have now followed your recommendation for Prosperity Wind, and we have dropped the salvage costs by using an average over-the-years cost of steel and other items?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. So then, in fact, you would agree that the salvage value for Prosperity Wind is significantly less than for Goose Creek Wind?
A. Yes. It is less than the Goose Creek estimate.
Q. Because that's what you recommended, right?
A. Indirectly, yes.
Q. Okay. Let's finally talk about sound. So Mr. Harrington asked you whether you had schematics for the locations of the five turbines that you modeled, right?
A. Yes, and I didn't have them on hand. We did receive them.
Q. They're all in the application, right?
A. They are part of the application.
Q. Every single one labeled down to the number s, right?
A. Yes.
Q. There's a big map that shows where they're located for the whole project, right?
A. Yes.
Q. So all of that information has been provided, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And your testimony here is that your sound model confirms the findings of Mr. Eddie Duncan of RSG
that Prosperity Wind is in compliance with the sound requirements imposed by the Illinois Pollution Control Board; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Now Mr. Duncan testified yesterday, and you were not here yesterday; is that correct?
A. I was not.
Q. He testified that he was also the sound modeling expert for Goose Creek Wind, which means that you would have also reviewed his sound modeling for Goose Creek Wind; is that right?
A. Yeah. If that's the case, yes.
Q. And you testified during the Goose Creek Wind hearing that quote:
"Our noise model was in agreement with the RSG modeling. Specifically we did not see that any receptors would be impacted by noise from the project in excess of the Illinois regulatory limits", end quote.

Do you recall giving that testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. So you have now confirmed twice that Mr. Eddie Duncan's sound modeling is correct and is in compliance with the Piatt County Ordinance, right?
A. It is in compliance with the Ordinance, yes.

MR. HESS: Thank you very much, Mr. Minder.

I have no further questions.
MR. KAINS: Thank you, Mr. Hess. Questions for Mr. Minder from interested parties? Normally I say members of the public opposed to or neutral on the application, but it can be anybody. If you support it, if you're opposed to it, or if you're neutral you may ask questions. Mr. Reed, come forward please. Go ahead.

## QUESTIONS POSED BY

JIM REED:
Q. Mr. Minder, first of all, I need to understand the full scope of your involvement with the county and the Project. Is Patrick Engineering only going to be involved in the valuation of the application?
A. Yes. Correct.
Q. So you'll not be doing any monitoring of the Project during or after completion? Your firm will not be the one assigned to that?
A. That hasn't been discussed at all with the County. I don't know what the answer to that is.
Q. Okay. Well given that, then we'll change direction a little bit. In your review of the 73-page drainage plan, do you see, within that, any Township or

County roads that are affected or impacted by drainage?
A. I don't recall.
Q. If the County or Township roads were impacted by the drainage, would you think the county then should monitor the districts that outlet that water that protects the Township and County roads?
A. You're asking if there is drainage impacts to the road, should the County monitor those?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes, I would agree that that would probably be something they should do.
Q. Okay, but you're not aware by reviewing the Application, the 73-page plan, whether or not any of those impacts are connected to drainage districts?
A. I don't recall.

MR. REED: Okay. No further questions.
MR. KAINS: Thank you, Mr. Reed. Any other questions from the general public for Mr. Minder regarding his testimony? Yes, Mr. Stillabower. Please come forward. Go right ahead with your questions, Mr. Stillabower.

QUESTIONS POSED BY
CHRIS STILLABOWER:
Q. I think this first one is a given, it's true you're still employed by the county for this Project?
A. We are still under contract with the county, yes.
Q. So there seems to be some uncertainty around the blades and recycling them, and $I$ was curious if the County were to ask you, would you be able to make some calls to landfills to see which places would take the blades for recycling?
A. If the County asked we to do that, yes. MR. STILLABOWER: Okay. That's all I have. Thank you.

MR. KAINS: Thank you, Mr. Stillabower. Any other questions for Mr. Minder from the general public? Questions from Piatt County staff and consultants? Any re-direct, Mr. Keyt?

MR. KEYT: No, sir.
MR. KAINS: Final questions come from the Zoning Board. All right. Mr. Minder, thank you very much. You may step down and you are excused.

MR. MINDER: Thank you.
MR. KAINS: Thank you. Mr. Keyt, are there any other Piatt County staff reports that you want to
present at this time?
MR. KEYT: No, sir.
MR. KAINS: All right. Very good. We'll go
back to where we were.

Persons in favor of the Application. Last
night $I$ called two names who weren't here, but if they're here tonight $I$ just want to know. Is a Mr. Dan Smith here in attendance? Mr. Smith from Farmer City? And a Mr. Philip Hult? Philip Hult from Mahomet? They're not here. Next on the list, the ever patient Meg Miner. Ms. Miner, could you please raise your right hand and be sworn.
(Witness sworn)
$\begin{array}{llllllll}M & E & G & M & I & E & R\end{array}$
having been first duly sworn, made a statement as follows:

MR. KAINS: Would you state your name, spelling first and last, for the record.

MEG MINER: Meg Miner, M-E-G, M-I-N-E-R.
MR. KAINS: Miss Miner, you are from
Mansfield?

MEG MINER: Yes, sir.

MR. KAINS: That's Piatt County. I'm
learning. All right. Miss Miner, because you are a Piatt County resident and a non-expert, you have thirty
minutes, and you may proceed.
MEG MINER: Thank you. I appreciate being offered this time to speak at this hearing. I'm going to start by asking you to forgive me for starting out on a slightly sour note. In the interests of full disclosure, $I$ have to tell you that $I$ have about as much confidence in corporate America as I do in political America. Comments by others in this room over this week indicate that I'm not alone in that. We are so often disappointed by both corporate and political America, that it's hard to resist becoming terminally cynical, and yet here we all are, civilly engaging in a process that none of us will likely choose.

Over the course of last year's hearings, I decided to support this Project, but $I$ was still pretty upset about the change to the state law, both in the way that it happened, and in the undermining of our local control. I have no direct knowledge of Apex's lobbying activities, but it's logical to expect that they might have done that. I do know lobbyists have to register with the government, so I looked into it. The Secretary of State's office published a list on line, dated April of 2023 , that has over twenty-two hundred registered lobbyists, and Apex Clean Energy is among them, but really even the Illinois Farm Bureau promotes political
involvement in its youth training programs, and in my own grade school or middle school education we were asked in Civics class to be participants too, and here we all are lobbying you. So none of this is real surprising. It's pretty much an expected strategy I think.

However, I am impressed with the overall behavior of Apex during this process. Yes, Apex plans to make money from the energy production here, and yes, some resident and non-resident property owners will be compensated for that land use. That's kind of the point of capitalism. I doubt that any farmer would plant a crop without expecting compensation of some kind.

What encourages me about Apex is the changes they've made for the Prosperity Wind Project. It wasn't clear to me last year that the normal wind industry practice is to apply for a Special Use Permit with a range of choices during site development, and then pin down things when the actual construction plans are determined. That really boggles my mind, but I'm probably too much of a stickler for planning. Apparently though that's the norm. Nevertheless, they listened to the community's concerns and have addressed the issues that they can. Short of packing up and going away, they have been responsive and solidified their plans.

Most notable is the automatic fire suppression system. On Tuesday the question about what took the industry so long to start installing them came up. I'm only guessing, but it could have something to do with the costs. It's probably hard to convince a corporate board that increases in expenses are necessary when a risk assessment doesn't indicate a need. I was reminded of a fire department educator $I$ once knew who said automatic fire suppression systems in residential buildings have been available for some years, and some homeowner insurance policies will actually lower rates for them if you have them. I Googled the topic yesterday morning and found out that only seven percent of American homes have automatic fire suppression systems in them. So, we could ask ourselves the same question. Why don't more of us install and protect our lives and property? I mean some people can't even be bothered with installing smoke detectors, and that's required by building codes. I'm just glad Apex has decided to invest in them for this Project, and $I$ really appreciate that the Board and the community members raised this concern.

Still, it is clear that some people will likely not want to have turbines in our community. To them, $I$ will invoke the memory of Abraham Lincoln and appeal to our better angels by reflecting on a comment made by

Adam Carlson on Tuesday. My heart really kind of lifted a little bit when he said that Apex would be producing for the greater good. He tied that phrase to the good this Project will bring to the schools, the community, and the state. Through all of the Apex presentations, the economic impact has been emphasized. I haven't heard anyone dispute that angle, and I'm not going to either. But $I$ took that phrase to include the greater good of our life expectancy on this planet. I wish that aspect was an explicit part of Apex's presentation, but I can guess that most communities probably don't put the good of the environment at the forefront of their thinking on these issues. I hope ours will.

To do that, we have to get past thinking about this Project only in terms of its effect on us as individuals. It's not about what's in line of sight or within hearing distance of any single property. It's not about any financial gain specific property owners will have. And although they are significant, it's not even about the economic benefits that Piatt county will receive. Our thinking about these turbines has to include what they will do for the environment that sustains us all, and as an example that Braden Ehrat gave last night, what a learning opportunity they represent for future generations.

I used to think that hydroelectric power was an elegant solution to energy problems when $I$ was growing up, and then $I$ found out how many communities were actually devastated when they dammed the rivers and created the power stations, and now the once reliable water sources are running low in those areas. Even the mighty Mississippi couldn't sustain the amount of traffic it normally does last year because of low water levels, and changes to patterns of precipitation have even caused long time local farm families to install irrigation systems.

Since our meeting last year, smoke from the specific northwest and different parts of Canada have impacted our air quality. That development literally brings our connection with environmental concerns to our doorsteps. How many more clues about the climate crises are we waiting for? Locally and globally we have got to get serious about addressing climate change. People seem to think this problem is too big for individuals to solve. There is a lot that individuals can do. There just don't seem to be a lot of individuals doing them. One thing we have got to do is stop saying that this isn't our problem. Last year I put my money where my values are, and just last month $I$ passed the one-year mark on solar production from my home. In all but four
winter months, the panels produced more energy than $I$ consumed, and even in those months they were still producing some electricity. In a year, their total production was just over six megawatt hours. Not much, but it's something. For comparison, I checked with Apex, and they expect Prosperity Wind to generate one million fifty thousand megawatt hours annually. That is equivalent to the energy needs of about a hundred and fifty thousand homes.

Today's electrical generating technologies are better than previous generations it seems. No doubt new technologies will replace this one some day. Global warming won't wait. We need wind farms like this here, and in any other place we can get them. We need solar on homes and businesses and any other place that we can get them. We need to plant more trees. And we also need to re-think our personal and business practices with an eye toward their environmental impacts.

The Prosperity Wind Farm presents Piatt County with a unique opportunity to do something tangible about climate change. I hope the ZBA, the County Board and the WIRE community will be proud to produce renewable energy here for the greater good. Thank you.

MR. KAINS: Thank you, Miss Miner. Questions for Miss Miner? First from the Zoning Board of Appeals?

All right, very good. Questions from Members of units of local government including school districts? Questions from interested parties represented by licensed attorneys? Counsel?

MR. HESS: No, sir. Thank you for your statement.

MR. KAINS: Thank you, Mr. Hess. Questions from Piatt County staff and consultants? Very good, Miss Miner. Thank you so much.

MEG MINER: Thank you.
MR. KAINS: Next in support of the
application, is it Rob Summer?
ROB SUMMERS: Summers, yes.
MR. KAINS: Summers. Very good. Go over to the podium. Sir, could you please raise your right hand and be sworn by the Court Reporter.
(Witness sworn.)
MR. KAINS: Could you please state your name spelling your first name and last name for the record?

ROB SUMMERS: Rob Summers, R-O-B,
$S-U-M-M-E-R-S$.
MR. KAINS: And you are from Weldon?
ROB SUMMERS: That's correct.
MR. KAINS: And is that in Piatt County?
ROB SUMMERS: DeWitt.

MR. KAINS: Okay. It's in DeWitt County?

ROB SUMMERS: Yes.

MR. KAINS: Then under the rules you have ten minutes. I don't know that you'll probably go longer than that?

ROB SUMMERS: I'd be surprised.
MR. KAINS: But under the rules you have, as a non-Piatt County resident, you have ten minutes. You may proceed.
having been first duly sworn, made a statement as follows:

ROB SUMMERS: Okay. I'm here to encourage the passing of the Prosperity Wind Farm. I'm originally from Champaign and moved to outside of weldon in about 2007. My wife Shannon has been on the DeLand-Weldon School Board, $I$ believe, for twelve years now. My oldest son started there in kindergarten and recently graduated. My oldest daughter started there pre-K and is finishing her senior year. My youngest daughter is currently in second grade, and my foster child is in kindergarten at Deland-Weldon.

Without sounding like a complainer, or pointing any blame at anything, it's just the way it is, my oldest kids, I believe, missed quite a few opportunities
there in sports, extra-curricular activities, and in education in general, basically for probably more than anything just lack of funding, and increased funding from these -- the taxes from the wind farm, I think will be a great opportunity for the school. I think, if $I$ remember hearing the number right, virtually a million dollars a year for the next thirty years, and $I$ think that will give my youngest kids great opportunities that my oldest may not have had along with the other students at school. That's about all $I$ have to say.

MR. KAINS: Thank you, Mr. Summers. Are there questions for Mr. Summers? First from Members of the Piatt County Zoning Board of Appeals? All right. Very good. Questions for Mr. Summers from members of units of local governments including school districts? Questions from interested parties represented by licensed attorneys? Counsel?

MR. HESS: No, sir. Thank you for your statement, sir.

MR. KAINS: Thank you. Questions from Piatt County staff and consultants? Very good, Mr. Summers. Thank you for your testimony.

ROB SUMMERS: That concludes the list of persons in favor of the Special Use Permit Application. And then according to the schedule of progression, we go
to those who are opposed. Right now it is about three minutes after seven o'clock. I think it would be appropriate at this time to take a ten-minute break, and then come back and we will hear from folks who are opposed, folks who are neutral, and then we will take up written comments that have been submitted to the Zoning Administrator for presentation to the ZBA. This Board will be in recess for ten minutes until about 7:14.
(Recess taken).

MR. KAINS: All right. Folks, if you could find your seats, please. All right. We're back on the record, Jamie. It is time to hear from folks in opposition to the Supplemental Use Permit Application from Prosperity Wind, LLC.

The first name on the list is Mr. Burton. I talked with Mr. Burton the other night and I don't see him in here. Claudia Coil?
(Witness sworn)

$$
\text { C L A U D I A } \quad \text { C O I L }
$$

having been previously sworn, made a statement as follows:

MR. KAINS: Could you please state your name, spelling first and last names for the record?

CLAUDIA COIL: My name is Claudia Coil, C-L-A-U-D-I-A, C-O-I-L. I'm a resident of Mansfield.

MR. KAINS: And you are a resident of Piatt County?

CLAUDIA COIL: I am.
MR. KAINS: Then you get thirty minutes according to the rules. You may proceed.

CLAUDIA COIL: All right. I am not testifying as an expert. I have a long history in health care and living in the country. When I graduated from nursing in 1973, and $I$ married shortly after that, we started farming different types of livestock.

To begin with, there was a time when the vote of people was heard. Unfortunately, in Illinois and Piatt County, this may no longer be true. Sadly, after hours and days of testimony by Apex and residents of Piatt County, resulting in the thoughtful decisions of the ZBA and County Board to reject Apex's Application for Goose Creek Wind Farm, this process has begun again for Apex's new Application of basically the same plan under the new
name Prosperity Wind. Since the rejection by the ZBA, the County Board, the County Referendum, and hundreds of signatures on petitions, nothing more positive seems to have developed in the wind industry. The heavily subsidized wind industry continues to depend on tax dollars for their seemingly unlimited generosity of promised millions to the County. The same talking points from Apex that we've heard at least three times in the last four years remain the same. The only difference I see is that a number of us who have been participating for four years have aged. As a matter of fact I realize tonight that I've seen Mr. Moore so many times that I'm starting to dress like him it appears (laughter). So our concerns about the effects of wind turbines, however, which were thoroughly presented in the last hearings by the expert witnesses and residents also remain the same despite the rosy model predictions from Apex.

Concerns for potential health issues. No new health studies, especially on children, have been done that I'm aware of.

Environmental damage. Wildife. Potential wildiffe damage. Loss of property values. The same misguided energy policy continues to drive this program; the same energy program that wishes to restrict
agriculture to reduce carbon emissions; the same energy policy that will ultimately make us less secure and safe. Where is the definitive study that wind energy reduces carbon emissions?

In this rapidly changing world new technologies in the energy sector are a positive. Innovation will continue to produce cleaner, more efficient, and dependable energy in all types of energy, without the huge carbon footprint and intermittent effectiveness of wind power.

I still find it remarkable that every community in the country is not insisting that a Project like Prosperity Wind be constructed. How is it that since 2015, at least three hundred and eighty-nine rejections or restrictions of wind energy projects have occurred? Why is every wind project met with opposition? I don't believe that this is all from misinformation. There are scientists, environmentalists that also back this.

The State of Illinois has helped eliminate the problem of opposition by mandating standards wind companies must meet in order to build an industrial wind project like Prosperity Wind, standards which were crafted in favor of the wind companies, but totally ignored the wishes and input of the citizens. Amazingly, in order that there is no further input from local
boards to protect citizens, the LaSalle Criteria has been eliminated from their decision-making process.

Recently I listened to a speaker who said modern life has sucked the joy of connecting with nature, especially in cities. He indicated this was leaving the nation with a wide feeling of doom and gloom. He indicated if one isn't able to experience nature, birds, silence, see the stars and God's creation, one loses their reference points and their ability to think clearly and rationally. What Apex has presented, I believe, is the picture of doom and gloom for Piatt County if we do not build the project. Unless they salvage it, Piatt County will be left only with debt and old people like myself. Apex sucks the joy out of rural America. Perhaps they've been looking at turbines too long. Let us not lose our reference point. Let us not lose our ability to think clearly and rationally. Let us not make Piatt County into an industrial park.

In closing, we want to thank our Zoning Board and
County Board for the long hours they have spent at present and past hearings. We hope you continue to support the opposition by rejecting Apex's new Application. Do not let the State take away your local control. Do not let Apex and the State silence you. We, in opposition, continue to reject their interference in
the quality of life in Piatt County.
MR. KAINS: Thank you, Miss Coil. Questions for Miss Coil from the Members of the Zoning Board of Appeals? Very good. Questions for Miss Coil from members of units of local government including school districts? Questions from interested parties represented by licensed attorneys. Mr. Hess?

MR. HESS: No, sir. Miss Coil, thank you for your statement.

MR. KAINS: Thank you. Questions from other interested parties? Members of the public who are in favor of the Application or neutral on the Application? Questions for Miss Coil from Piatt County staff and consultants? Mr. Harrington?

QUESTIONS POSED BY
MR. HARRINGTON:

MR. HARRINGTON: Claudia, remind me what your location is to the said map?

CLAUDIA COIL: Well we are now not directly in the footprint. We were north of Sangamon Township. I'm just what, three quarters, half mile up from Bob Chambers' place on 1300 .

MR. HARRINGTON: Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. KAINS: Any other questions from the Zoning Board for Miss Coil? Thank you, Miss Coil. You may step down.

CLAUDIA COIL: Thank you.
MR. KAINS: Next is Jim Reed. Mr. Reed, am I correct that during our discussion during the break that you wish to reserve your statement for the public comment period?

JIM REED: That is true.

MR. KAINS: Very good. Thank you, Mr. Reed.

Next is Mr. Hartke. After Mr. Hartke will be Bruce Paulsrud. I don't see him in the room. After Mr. Paulsrud is Kathryn Burton, and $I$ met her the first night, and $I$ don't see her in the room. Then after that is Pat Ryan. Okay, Claudia says he's not here tonight.

CLAUDIA COIL He can be here next week.

MR. KAINS: And also Steven Gantz? All
right.
T H E O D O R E $\quad \mathrm{H}$ A R T K K E
(Examination conducted as to Theodore Hartke being allowed to testify as Expert Witness:)

QUESTIONS POSED BY

MR. KAINS:
Q. All right. Before we get started, Mr. Hartke approached me during the break and indicated to me that
he would like to testify as an expert witness. I asked him his expertise, and he is a professional engineer as you can see from the second line in the black type on his power point presentation. I inquired as to whether he had ever worked on a wind farm, and he said he had been approached by Apex on two occasions to work on a wind farm and he turned them down each time. Then Mr. Hartke made a comment that he had done some -- he's also a surveyor. I think that's PLS, professional licensed surveyor, and that he had done some survey work with respect to an energy project, and I think that -I'm going to turn over to you, Mr. Hartke, reasons why you think that you should qualify as an expert witness on whatever testimony you plan to give, whether it's sound or shadow flicker. What areas are you going to testify on?
A. Today I'm going to testify on my personal experience, what $I$ went through personally as a family, what happened, what our reaction was at our house. I'm a surveyor, so I am thoroughly knowledgeable about property rights, property lines, boundaries, what people own and don't own. I think $I$ can represent people, no matter who I'm working for. No matter which side of the property line I'm surveying today, tomorrow I might be surveying for the other person. So I have that ethical,
moral obligation to be honest in my work and present facts and those things, and $I$ have to take that seriously, because if I don't I am under the observation and under the regulation of the Illinois Department of Professional Regulations. Every time I do something like this, I suppose someone could file a complaint that I'm not being professional or doing my due diligence or injuring the public or whatever it might be. So I'm kind of ham stringed to answer questions, answer them honestly. I feel like --
Q. All right. Mr. Hartke --
A. -- in that situation.
Q. Mr. Hartke, have you ever worked as a project manager on a wind farm project?
A. Yes, for the InvEnergy, boundary survey. It was an ultra survey and a topographical map for the entire InvEnergy project and $I$ was the surveyor on that job.
Q. That was as a surveyor, correct?
A. As a land surveyor. It was called the InvEnergy, California Ridge Wind Farm, located in Vermilion County.
Q. Have you ever worked though, aside from that survey, have you ever worked as a project manager for a wind farm?
A. I've never worked for a wind company directly. The closest thing $I$ can say I've done in relationship to
like a wind farm construction project was $I$ was hired by a structural engineer to do surveys of township box culverts and small bridges that were replaced as part of the project that was next to my house. So that's maybe worth connecting.
Q. Have you ever served as a safety expert on a wind farm?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever worked with fire suppression, detection and suppression systems?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever done permit applications, permitting type of work for a wind farm?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever worked with respect to spill prevention control on a wind farm?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever served -- I'm sorry, excuse me. Have you ever had occasion to prepare reports for a wind farm with respect to the financial benefits to taxing bodies?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever served or worked as a sound expert?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever done wildlife and environmental
work with respect to a wind farm?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever done property valuations for a wind farm?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever done shadow flicker analysis on behalf of a wind farm?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever worked on a decommissioning project for a wind farm?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever been involved in the development and implementation of a complaint resolution process for a wind farm?
A. Not for a wind farm, but for my own terrible experience. Just for myself, my personal experience.
Q. You made complaints with respect to a wind farm?
A. Yes.
Q. But you weren't involved in the development and implementation of that process on behalf of the wind farm?
A. Oh, definitely. My wife and I were heavily involved into the complaint process -(Multiple people speaking at the same time.)
Q. But did you --
A. -- things.
Q. I'm sorry to cut you off. Did you work on behalf of a wind farm?
A. No.
Q. With respect to complaint resolution?
A. No.
Q. Mr. Keyt, do you have any other inquiries with respect to this issue?

MR. KEYT: I don't have any inquiries, no. MR. KAINS: Mr. Hess, I've covered much of the areas. If I've left something out you may address those. MR. HESS: Thank you, Mr. Kains. I was going to ask for the opportunity to do a voir dire, but you did a better voir dire than I could. So I think I only have a few questions.

## EXAMINATION BY

MR. HESS:
Q. The basis of your expertise, I think $I$ heard you say Mr. Hartke, is your experience with InvEnergy; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. InvEnergy fired you; is that right?
A. No. That's not true. That was a made-up story
about -- I could divulge, and I'd like to have it on the record, it's a terrible, bad, weird story that had a weird ending, and $I$ could tell you all about it. If you guys would ask me that question later, I don't want to use up my time telling about what a farmer said and how it went crazy viral.

MR. KAINS: Okay, but $I$ don't know that the termination of his, employment, whether voluntarily or by the company, has much to do with what his expertise and background is as a potential expert witness. So -THEODORE HARTKE: I've never been fired from any job, ever.

MR. KAINS: Thank you, Mr. Hartke. Mr. Hess, do you have any other questions?

MR. HESS: Just a few. Thank you, Mr. Kains.
Mr. Hartke, you have not provided written credentials here today, correct?
A. I could of course provide all of my background information, and I've done so previously on slide shows. I've always given my licensure information, professional design firm.

MR. HESS: I have no further questions for Mr. Hartke. If Mr. Kains would allow it, I'd like to be heard briefly on argument, but $I$ have no further questions at this time.

FURTHER QUESTIONS POSED BY

MR. KAINS:
Q. In just a minute. I have a couple of other questions. Mr. Hartke, who are you employed by now?
A. I own my own business, Hartke Engineering and Surveying, Incorporated.
Q. Okay. In your business, what percentage of your time is spent doing land surveys?
A. I think approximately, income-wise, perhaps twenty-five percent of my income is from land surveying, boundary surveying type of work.
Q. And what about the other seventy-five percent?
A. I think perhaps another -- if you add another sixty percent of that is probably doing large construction projects, huge bridges, highway, heavy highway construction. We do a lot of utility construction for just huge land development-type projects.
Q. So about sixty percent doing roads and bridges and utilities?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And then that leaves fifteen percent?
A. The other fifteen percent, ten to fifteen is doing site civil plans for things like strip malls and small convenient stores. I did a Taco Bell once. Those
types of clients hiring me to do a design to build a new facility or redo, a site re-development plan.
Q. So you design businesses, roads, bridges, utilities. Are these designs that you personally do, or your firm does?
A. Okay. I am the only licensed engineer in my firm. So any kind of drainage work, pavement design, site plans, permitting, those types of things. I do not do drainage calculations for detention pond sizing. I have that done by a sub-consultant. I do his surveying and he does my drainage design work.

MR. KAINS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Hartke.
MR. KEYT: May I?
MR. KAINS: Yeah, Mr. Keyt, sure.

## EXAMINATION BY

MR. KEYT:
Q. Have you ever been accepted in either state or federal court as an expert witness?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever been accepted in an administrative proceeding as an expert witness?
A. Yes.
Q. Where was that?
A. I've been providing expert testimony in court for land boundary disputes. So property line disagreement type of work.
Q. In relation to either wind turbines, noise, or health issues related thereto, have you ever been accepted or given testimony as an expert in an any administrative proceeding?
A. Only in county board ZBA hearings under oath. In one instance $I$ did a three-hour testimony in Livingston County, and I got grilled and asked questions. I gave a presentation for an hour and a half, and $I$ got questioned for another hour and a half at Livingston County, I think approximately in 2014, perhaps.
Q. Okay.
A. It was a proceeding exactly like this.
Q. I'm familiar with the proceeding.
A. All right.

MR. KAINS: Based upon these subsequent
questions, do you have any other questions, Mr. Hess?
MR. HESS: No further questions on voir dire
at this time.
MR. KAINS: All right. Your statement on
whether this gentleman should be qualified by this Board in this hearing as an expert?

MR. HESS: I would respectfully object to
his request to be qualified as an expert, and $I$ would do so for two reasons: First, he's not satisfied the requirements of procedural rule eleven in this Board's hearing procedures that is established, and I'll explain that in a minute; and second, he's nowhere close to establishing the requirements under Illinois Supreme Court Rule 702 for expert testimony in court. I appreciate that that rule is certainly not binding on this proceeding, but $I$ do think it is important. So let me unpack both of those.

Procedural rule number eleven in this Board's hearing procedures imposes several different requirements on a proffered expert, but the two that I would just flag, is that first, the second and third line, a witness shall, quote:
"Shall identify their area of expertise and limit their testimony thereto."

I'm not quite sure $I$ follow to what the area of expertise he's proffering. It sounds like he's all over the place. So, I would certainly ask for a limiting instruction about what area of expertise, if we're going to go down that road, but $I$ don't think he's identified that. Candidly, with no disrespect to Mr. Hartke, but based on the questions that he asked the Apex witnesses, I think he's demonstrated that he's not going to limit
himself to whatever area of expertise we decide is appropriate.

The second requirement under rule eleven that he has not satisfied is the very last line, quote:
"Written credentials shall be provided for expert witnesses."

We have no written credentials for Mr. Hartke. He's been here all week. He could have presented us with a CV. Every single one of our witnesses followed the rules. The first thing we did was present their credentials. Mr. Keyt did the exact same thing with Mr. Minder. Now I appreciate that Mr. Hartke's not an attorney, but he testifies -- he tries to testify in these hearings all over the County. He had a copy of these rules. He's not following the rules. If everyone else has to follow the rules, he should too, which brings me to how he does not satisfy the standard under Illinois Supreme Court Rule 702. That standard says that an expert has to do two things: First;
"Assist the trier of fact to understand the evidence or to determine facts in issue."

I don't understand how Mr. Hartke's proffered expertise is going to assist this ZBA. There's no land boundary dispute. His experience as a surveyor, his experience doing re-development work for Taco Bell has
no relevance to what this ZBA is doing, and thus will not aid the trier of fact to understand the evidence or to determine a fact in issue.

Second requirement under Rule 702 is that an expert opinion must -- "it must be shown that it has established gained general acceptance in the particular field where it belongs."

I've heard nothing from Mr. Hartke that comes close to approaching that standard. So I do not mean any disrespect to Mr. Hartke. If he wants to testify in his personal capacity, he's certainly entitled to do so, but I think he's in violation of rule eleven of this Board's rules, and he comes nowhere close to meeting the standard in Rule 702 .

MR. KAINS: Thank you, Mr. Hess. Mr. Hartke, I'm going to allow you to respond to Mr. Hess's statements, but $I$ specifically want you to address the area of expertise that you are going to testify to as an expert witness.

THEODORE HARTKE: I'll agree to keep my testimony limited to -- my expert testimony, and we're going to talk about property lines, and we're going to repeat that word many times during my testimony, okay, because $I$ know what that is and $I$ know what that means. and $I$ can definitely probably out debate anyone in this
room about property lines. Okay?
The second thing I'm going to do, I'm going to spend time doing, is people who experience something first hand and give a firsthand accounting and firsthand knowledge of something, those are experts. Whether or not that person went through cancer treatments, they're an expert of their own cancer treatment path, whatever they went through.

In the court of law, firsthand knowledge and witness -- a witness that was present and saw everything happen, an in-person witness typically trumps over expert testimony or expert witnesses, because it's the firsthand true account of what happened in their presence, and unless you can degrade the quality of that individual's ability to tell the truth, you can -- you can't just dismiss a firsthand witness in court unless you deem them unable to testify. So as the person who's been through it, $I$ don't know anyone else that has been able to travel, and able to withstand the pushback to still no matter what, make sure everybody knows what happened to me so it doesn't happen to someone else. That's my an appeal. Thank you.

MR. KAINS: All right. Thank you, Mr.
Hartke. Here's what we're gonna do. Mr. Hartke does not qualify as an expert witness, in my opinion, and I'm
going to rule that he does not qualify as an expert witness. His expertise is with respect to property line or property boundary disputes. I do not find anything in the Application, I've heard no testimony here in the four nights of hearings with respect to any property boundary disputes, and that is, you know, that is your area of expertise. The other, how it affected you, I absolutely think you should be able to testify, but it does not qualify under the rules as expert testimony. So therefore, here's what we're going to do. Mr. Hartke, you're allowed to testify, but you're going to not be able to testify as an expert witness. You will testify as a non-expert witness, and $I$ believe that you are not from Piatt County, although we'll flush that out in just a second. But if you are a non-Piatt County, non-expert witness, you'll have ten minutes.

Now, Mr. Hartke, I believe it says you are from Sidney, Illinois. What county is that in?

THEODORE HARTKE: Sidney's in Champaign
County.
MR. KAINS: Very good. Thank you. Then Mr.
Hartke, I know you have a presentation there. I'm going to need you to pare it down to ten minutes.

THEODORE HARTKE: I've got it.
MR. KAINS: You've got it? Oh, okay,
because $I$ was going to give you time if you needed to cut and paste or slice and dice or whatever it is computer people do. All right. Then right now, I'm going to need you to be sworn. So if you could please raise your right hand.
(Witness sworn.)
T H E O D O R E $\quad$ H A R $\quad$ T $\quad$ K $\quad \mathrm{E}$
having been first duly sworn, made a statement as follows:

MR. KAINS: Very good. If you could please state your name for the record, speling first and last.

THEODORE HARTKE: When does my time start? MR. KAINS: As soon as I tell you it does. THEODORE HARTKE: My name is Ted Hartke. Theodore, $T-H-E-O-D-O-R-E, \quad P$. Hartke, $H-A-R-T-K-E$.

MR. KAINS: And we've established you're from Sidney, Illinois in Champaign County. Under the Board rules, you have ten minutes, and you may begin, Mr. Hartke, and thank you.

THEODORE HARTKE: This slide's been up long enough. Everybody has read it already. I grew up on a farm, and that's my background, and we're all involved in all kinds of ag related stuff. So I understand the rural mindset of things around here. My first slide, I
want to spend the most time with. This is a link for the instructions and protocol for the IPCB noise measurement. The first thing on here --

MR. HESS: I'm sorry. I'm respectfully going to object. I think the regulation speaks for itself. I don't know why he's reading it, and he was just rejected as an expert on sound issues. So -(Multiple people speaking at the same time.)

THEODORE HARTKE: I'm just expressing an opinion --

MR. HESS: He's about to give an opinion -THEODORE HARTKE: I'd like to re-set my time.

MR. HESS: May I finish please? If he's about to give an opinion --
(Multiple people speaking at the same time.)
THEODORE HARTKE: Am I using up my time
here?

MR. KAINS: He has the floor. You wait.

THEODORE HARTKE: Okay.
MR. KAINS: Go ahead, Mr. Hess.

MR. HESS: I think he's about to give an opinion on whether, in his opinion, we come into compliance with a legal requirement. He's not an expert to do that. If he's going to talk about what this means,

I think the regulation speaks for itself. So I have an objection. He's also not a qualified expert to tell the ZBA what a regulation means and how they should interpret it.

MR. KAINS: Thank you. Mr. Hartke, this
doesn't count toward your time. Okay? Objections aren't going to count toward your time. You get ten minutes, sir.

THEODORE HARTKE: Okay.

MR. KAINS: Now, I'm going to overrule the objection. You may talk about the law, but you're not an expert witness, so you can't give an opinion on the law, but what you can do is state how -- if this is an area under noise, you may talk about how it has impacted you and your family. All right. Now Mr. Hartke, you may proceed.

THEODORE HARTKE: The moment $I$ got given ten minutes, that gave me freedom to talk about whatever I wanted. I don't need to be an expert in anything if I've only got ten minutes. So I'm here as -- I'm here as just personal. Here's my all my beef. I'm not claiming anything here. So, can $I$ proceed without any more interruptions like --
(Multiple people speaking at the same time.)
MR. KAINS: Mr. Hartke, I want you to
understand. You may testify, and you have ten minutes. If counsel raises an objection, that is counsel's right. Whether it's Mr. Hess or one of his colleagues or Mr. Keyt, okay, people are allowed to object to your testimony. That won't count against your time. Okay? So Mr. Hartke, you may begin, but they have the right to object if they so choose, but we're going to try to get through this. We want you to have your ten minutes because we want to hear from you.

THEODORE HARTKE: Okay.
MR. KAINS: But only testify to things that you know about. All right?

THEODORE HARTKE: I know about this. MR. KAINS: Very good. You may go right ahead.

THEODORE HARTKE: All right. Number one. A, number one. Site selection. Position at 25 feet from the property line noise source.
"The 25-foot setback distance is from the noise source and not the property line unless the noise source is contiguous to the property line".

It says property line multiple times in this, and Apex's noise folks wish to ignore that there is a property line even in existence. They want to measure it to a residential use area, and that's never anywhere in
the IPCB protocol. I think that this is perhaps, perhaps the only technicality that the Piatt County Board has, if Apex files a lawsuit, and they say in their lawsuit we check marked all fifteen boxes, where they did not check box number -- noise, and they didn't do any of their sound measurement limits at any property lines for the receptors. If they had to do that they would not be able to build their wind farm if they had it to be combined to the property line with their noise level. MR. KAINS: Do you have an objection, Mr. Hess?

MR. HESS: I would respectfully raise the same objection. I have no idea how Mr. Hartke could possibly testify to this based upon personal knowledge, which is the requirement, given that he was not here yesterday for Mr. Duncan's expert presentation. So I would have the same objection if he's now giving what he wants to be an expert opinion, but also, as established, all of his testimony has to be based on personal knowledge. He has no personal knowledge of what he just said.

MR. KAINS: I'm going to sustain the
objection. Mr. Hartke, you need to limit your testimony to what you know about this, not give an opinion on the distance. Just talk about the sound and how it affected
you and your family, please.
THEODORE HARTKE: When my wife and I and my neighbors hired an acoustician, the very first thing that was pointed out to us, was that InvEnergy didn't have the right to enter our property. The noise had to be measured at the property line, and that's what happened to me. I hired a sound expert, and that sound expert rejected Michael Hankard and Doctor Schomer's plan to measure noise up near my house, and InvEnergy acousticians agreed to that and they ended up putting their microphones on my north property line because of that. That's how $I$ know that the measurement has to be at the property line, because InvEnergy didn't force me to make the measurement up next to my house, next to my residential use. I'm gonna keep going.

I'm not getting paid anything for my
testimony. That's a picture of my family and my kids. This is the wind turbines next to my house. They're huge. And that's how tall they were. And we're just gonna go through this.

This is my daughter with her headphones on in bed during the month of July trying to sleep. I took the cord of the headphones and wrapped it around the top over here and fastened it so she wouldn't roll over and be choked by this cord, okay? Here's a six-year-old
girl wearing headphones to bed. This was within the IPCB noise levels at my residence.

These are the beds that are in my living room because the bedrooms are in the extremities of the house. We have windows and two walls that are on the outside walls of my home. My living room only had one exterior wall.

This closest photo's of my son. He's sitting reading a book. The far one is my daughters, and then the bed, you can just see the corner of it, is my wife and my's bed. This is how we lived from the Fall of 20 -- it's the Fall of 2013 until we left Christmas weekend, 2013. And this was under the maximum noise level allowable by the IPCB at my residence. That's what you are going to have in Piatt county, perhaps.

MR. HESS: Well I would make the same objection to that last statement.

THEODORE HARTKE: Are you hitting pause for
me? I don't want --

MR. KAINS: I'm going to overrule the objection. Go ahead.

THEODORE HARTKE: Okay. This is how far the distances were from my house to the turbines. The Apex Piatt County Wind turbine distances are very similar to these, and $I$ believe you're going to have the same ill
effects that we had because you don't have enough separation between homes and turbines.

For us it was about noise. There is no other reason I'm hire. Everything came from the noise from our home. If there had been no noise issue, I would have never been anti-wind for any reason. I wouldn't have been aware of all the other problems if it wasn't for noise.

This is some stuff from Steve Ambrose. He wants a low noise limit so people can sleep. This is a community response chart that shows adverse health effects begin at 40 dBA. That's where sleep impacts begin.

This is part of the InvEnergy Wind Farm Application, and it says here, HDR Engineering says in the California Ridge and Energy Project, it says:
"A majority of the houses' locations would experience turbine sounds of less than 40 dBA outdoors. This level is sufficiently low to minimize or eliminate any potential for sleep interference," whereas that achieving noise permit that they want the residents to endure is about 45 or 46 dBA."

I have all of Dr. Schomer's slides in here from his 2015 testimony in Boone County. I'll just fly through these. I don't want to slow us down on some
small little thing.
Doctor Schomer, who worked for InvEnergy and did the sound study as a partner with Mike Hankard at my house, eventually came out and said, that the minimum setback because of noise was three thousand two hundred and fifty feet. I'll have that slide here in a little bit. One second and I'll find it.

MR. HESS: I would object to him trying to
offer, I guess, someone else's expert opinion testimony for all of the same reasons, and $I$ would also add that rule eleven of this Board's rules and procedures say experts shall clearly identify and provide any study they've completed on the subject matter of the hearing. He didn't complete the study. It hasn't been provided. Doctor Schomer's not here to be cross-examined. I don't think, for all of those reasons, he can provide Dr Schomer's expert opinion.

MR. KAINS: I'm going to sustain the
objection, but I'm going to allow the summary of his statement about Dr. Schomer. Dr. Schomer is not here as a witness, not here to be cross-examined, but Mr. Hartke is giving a summary presentation of what he has learned about sound levels and noise. So go right ahead now, Mr. Hartke.
THEODORE HARTKE: Okay. I'm going to go
move on to the Apex Weather. Here's Apex Weather offering good neighbor agreements. They want to pay their neighbors, anybody within a half mile in this letter. They're going to pay them annually for whatever reason. Maybe it's for noise and shadow flicker.

This is a front page copy a deed of a home that Apex purchased in Vermilion County. This is public record. And Apex purchased three homes --

MR. HESS: Again, I would object.

THEODORE HARTKE: -- in Vermilion County.

MR. HESS: Sorry, Mr. Hartke, but he's now giving expert opinion on a project wholly unrelated to this one that has no relevance to what is going on here. He's not an expert. It's not relevant. He's just trying to get around --

MR. KAINS: Your objection is sustained as to relevance. Go ahead, Mr. Hartke. Let's skip through what's going on at the Hoopeston Wind Farm.

THEODORE HARTKE: At the part where I had ten minutes, that's where --

MR. KAINS: Mr. Hartke, talk about how it affected you.

THEODORE HARTKE: Okay. This is how it affected me on this Apex purchasing homes. I really wish that if InvEnergy was such a great company that they
would have purchased my home from me that $I$ could no longer live in. I think it was great that these homes got purchased by Apex. I think that the best good neighbor agreement and the best ultimate waiver of all time is for a wind company to buy a home from a family who can't use their home any longer or it's diminished to a point where they don't even want to be there any longer. So maybe it's perhaps my -- I wouldn't say jealousy but envy. I'm envious that I didn't get treated the same when I had a severe problem and Apex, to me, appears to have the ultimate admission that there's a problem when they buy a home. That's what my personal experience with this is.

Here's where Apex pays twenty-five hundred dollars a year for good neighbor agreements. There's got to be a reason for that. After Apex bought the house, they listed it for sale, and it sold for a hundred and seventeen thousand dollars after they purchased it for two hundred and ninety-five thousand dollars. I'm not going to give an opinion about this. These are just facts I'm going to show you guys.

In Vermilion County Apex had a big list of liens for non-payment of subcontractors. Here's a list of some of the liens here.

This is some of the political stuff that

Apex did up in Ford county that $I$ had experienced with my friend.

And this picture is after a dentist
appointment my daughter and $I$ were in my office, all I had was some pens and highlighters and she drew this thing up, and she was seven years old when she did this. So if a seven-year-old can convey to this Board that these are bad, I think that that's important to show you guys and spend time on. And this is her note:
"You may think wind turbines are good but when you have fifty by your home, you can't sleep in your own room, and you try to sleep but you can't because of the wind turbines' engine noise. I had to move into a mobile home because my mom and dad and brother plus me couldn't sleep."

MR. KAINS: Mr. Hartke, you have two minutes remaining.

THEODORE HARTKE: Okay. Here's a letter from the School Superintendent. This is about my kids. I'd like to submit this and make sure this gets in here. It says here it's never a good thing when children have health issues or their families have to leave their homes.

I'm going to go through some other fast ones. This is Dr. Schomer's slide where he said three
thousand two hundred fifty feet was a safe distance. I'm going to show this slide so it's here on the record for you folks to reject this project.

Here's some pictures of my kids. And I have one more last thing. Piatt county should deny a project that does not meet the IPCB noise standards at the property lines, and that concludes my presentation as to my short version, and $I$ would be happy to answer whatever questions these attorneys have or whatever you have.

MR. KAINS: Thank you, Mr. Hartke. We really appreciate it. First of all, questions for Mr. Hartke for Members of the Piatt County Zoning Board of Appeals? Very good. Questions for Mr. Hartke from members of units of local government including school districts? Questions for Mr. Hartke from interested parties represented by licensed attorneys? Mr. Hess?

MR. HESS: Mr. Granholm.

MR. KAINS: Mr. Granholm.

MR. GRANHOLM: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Kains.

## EXAMINATION BY

MR. GRANHOLM:
Q. Mr. Hartke, first of all thing you for your testimony here this evening. Mr. Hartke, you stated that noise concerns are what caused you to become anti-wind; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And at this point in time, is it fair to say that you spent a significant amount of time traveling to proceedings like this one in different areas of the State?
A. Yes, to help people from this happening to them in their homes.
Q. And so today you are opposed to all wind energy projects in Illinois, correct?
A. Due to the noise, yes.

MR. GRANHOLM: Thank you. No further questions.

MR. KAINS: Thank you, Mr. Granholm. Questions from other interested parties, members of the public who are in support of the Application or neutral on the Application? Any questions from the public for Mr. Hartke? Questions for this witness from Piatt County staff and consultants? And final questions come
from the ZBA. Mr. Hartke, thank you for your testimony, for your presentation, and for your patience with me and the process. We appreciate you.

THEODORE HARTKE: Okay, thank you.
MR. KAINS: Very good. I called out the other witnesses' names while Mr. Hartke was getting set up, but $I$ am going to run down the list of folks. Craig Burton? Bruce Paulsrud? Kathryn Burton? Pat Ryan? And Steven Gantz? All right. What I'm going to do is, I am going to allow those folks, if they would appear on Tuesday evening, they will be able to testify then.

Guideline number five allows for the Chairperson or acting Chairperson of the $Z B A$, and while it does not say or their designee, I'm going to assume that $I$ am allowed to stand in the place of the Chair, and it says there's a bunch of language with regard to scheduling of the appearance of witnesses adopting reasonable limits upon questioning of witnesses and take other action deemed reasonably necessary by the Chair in order to conduct the hearing in an orderly efficient and professional manner, and $I$ 'm going to, under that paragraph five, allow for folks who are not here both for, in support of, and in opposition to. We have a couple who are in support of who haven't been here, and we have six $I$ believe who are in opposition. They're not
here. I'm going to allow them to testify on Tuesday night. We do not have any persons who have signed in who are neutral on the Application. So now we move on to, in the order of progression, acceptance of written comments by the ZBA. Miss Nusbaum, do you have written comments?

MS. NUSBAUM: I do.
MR. KAINS: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Zoning Board of Appeals. At the hearing involving the Goose Creek Wind, LLC Supplemental Use Permit Application, $I$ was directed by the Board to read into the record each and every written correspondence, written comments that had been addressed to the Zoning Administrator and to you the Zoning Board of Appeals. If I may suggest that these will be admitted into the record as public comment, and as admitted into the record they will be photocopied for each of you and for each County Board Member and also for the Zoning Board Members who are not here. So I guess I ask, Mr. Chairman and Board Members, do you want me to still read these in? There appears to be probably twenty -- oh, these are copies?

MS. NUSBAUM: I think there's four or five.
MR. KAINS: Give me four or five and I'll
read them. I thought $I$ was going to read 25 letters.

MR. KEYT: Mr. Kains, one of our Zoning Board Members also received a public comment directly to him in the form of a text message, which has now been sent to me which $I$ can read in the record too.

MR. KAINS: Very good. I don't want Mr. Ryan, if he's going to be here Tuesday. If he's not, then I'll read it then. How about we start with you, Mr. Keyt, while $I$ look to see if there's anything in here that $I$ can't pronounce. If you would read, and I believe you indicated to me that this was a public comment, written public comment, and it was sent to Mr. Harrington, is that correct?

MR. KEYT: Yes, sir.

MR. KAINS: And I guess first, before you read that, I'm going to ask Mr. Harrington, did you have any other communication with the person who sent this text message to you?

MR. HARRINGTON: No, sir. I received it and responded accordingly.

MR. KAINS: How did you respond?
MR. HARRINGTON: I said I understand what you're asking, however I'm not there tonight but $I$ will be sure to ask your question you have.

MR. KAINS: Did you have any other ex-parte communication regarding the Supplemental Use Permit Wind

Application with this person?
MR. HARRINGTON: No.
MR. KAINS: Thank you. Does that --
MR. HARRINGTON: I would clarify, I believe Andy can comment on it. I think he was asked that question.

MR. KAINS: Very good. Thank you,
Mr. Harrington. Mr. Keyt, go right ahead with this public comment or written question.

MR. KEYT: Understood.
"Hello, Tim. My name is Calvin Teubel, T-E-U-B-E-L. Last winter I attended many of the wind farm meetings, but was not able to make last night or tonight. I would like Alex" -- I think he means Apex, but -- "Apex has pledged to care about the citizens here in Piatt County. If the Zoning Board and County Board and seventy percent of residents voted you down, how do you demonstrate your care for the local people? Further, have you counted the costs of installing in a community where you aren't wanted? Installing where people aren't really aware is one thing, but installing with significant opposition and being voted down in the majority. Did the clients welcome significantly higher scrutiny for every single zoning ordinance, flicker shadow counting, noise majoring and continuously
reporting on various effects that violate the ordinance of the residents being able to fully enjoy their rural properties? How should you answer someone wondering if Apex's word of care is trustworthy, if we can't trust that you respect the wishes of the community and the Board here?"

That's the end of the comment.
MR. KAINS: Thank you, Mr. Keyt. Now we do have four letters or e-mails. One letter, three e-mails. And I will read them into the record. I'll read them chronologically. The first was submitted or was dated August 24, 2023. It a from Howard and Barbara Patrick.
"Piatt County Board Members and Citizens of Piatt
County. As farm land owners of Piatt County we are opposed to the Prosperity Wind, LLC's proposal to bring wind turbines or any other proposals to bring wind turbines into our County which has some of the finest -some of the richest farm land in our State. It is a detriment to farmers and their future as well as affecting the value and production of farm land. It has been said that by 2030, the world is going to need twice as much food as it currently does now. The profitability of farming and the ability to produce should be protected and not be reduced due to the promises of big business. We also have an air strip on our farm which
has existed for several decades that would have to be shut down due to the turbines. There are several air strips in our area. The danger from the height of the turbines and the wind shear from the propellers would make it impossible to continue to pursue our interests in aviation. This right should not be taken away from us or any other resident of Piatt county. We are not trying to take any rights away from Prosperity Wind or Piatt County. Thank you for your time in hearing our concerns. Howard and Barbara Patrick."

An e-mail message from Paul and Kimberly Reynolds dated Tuesday, August 29th, 2023, just two days ago.
"August 29, 2023. To whom it may concern: With regards to the windmill issue in Piatt County, Illinois. We the taxpaying people of Piatt County have already voted on this once, and the public has made their opinions known. We are opposed to it, and the County Board rejected it and voted it down. This windmill issue should be a done and mute", I believe they mean moot, but "done and mute issue. These windmills are not only an eyesore, but a hazard to aircraft, pilots and wildlife, a health concern to humans and a land disturbance to farmers. They are also lowering the values of our homes and our properties. Why do they, Apex, insist on throwing their deep pockets of money
around just to wear people out? Not okay. This concernment attitude of theirs alone to persuade you to be as persistent in opposing it as they are in pushing it through. If you insist on falling weak to their pressures, then you should at the very least heavily lower the property tax across the board of Piatt county taxpaying residents. Piatt County taxes are already some of, if not the highest taxes in our Illinois area, and insist and require that Apex pay a significant fee to each Piatt County taxpaying resident property indefinitely or until the windmills prove to fail and are removed. Regards, Ryan Bower and Kimberly Reynolds, Mansfield, Illinois."

An e-mail from Jerry Halcomb, $H-A-L-C-O-M-B$, dated Wednesday August 30, 2023.

> "Hello. As a lifetime resident and property owner in the path of the windmills, I vehemently oppose the construction. This filing for zoning shows a blatant disregard for due process. The Board voted against the wind farm less than a year ago. My final point is the bulk of the size of the turbines, and my absentee landlord make up the largest owners of Goose Creek Farms. Thank you for listening. Jerry L. Halcomb."

The final one is from James L. Ayers, dated today

August 31, 2023. "On behalf of the Board of Directors of the Illinois Association of Drainage Districts" -- by the way, Mr. Ayers is Counsel for the Illinois Association of Drainage Districts.
"On behalf of the Board of Directors, please show our objection to the pending Application because it does not accurately address the rights of the property landowners affected by the proposed project, and that of the affected drainage districts protecting the property and drainage rights of both. We would suggest a delay in proceeding with this ordinance until the issues involving drainage have been decided by the courts. Respectfully submitted, James L. Ayers, Counsel for IADD, 114 S. Charter Street, Monticello, Illinois, 61856. Phone number (217)762-7957."

That concludes the reading of written comments, written public comments from the public to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Now at this time is there any rebuttal evidence from the Applicant?

MS. ANTONIOLLI: No.
MR. KAINS: Very good. Thank you. On Tuesday evening, we're going to hear from persons who have signed in and who may sign in on Tuesday in support of, in opposition to, and neutral on the Application. So
we will have more verbal testimony from the podium. Okay? Then after that, if there are any additional written comments -- we have not closed the evidence. If there are any additional written comments, those will be considered as well. Then once we have done that, then it will be time for closing statements from Counsel for the Applicant. That will be Tuesday evening.

Then there will be public comment by interested parties, three minutes per person, and we will allow for the public comment period to go on, but three minutes per person. Then there will be a rebuttal statement if counsel so chooses, rebuttal statement by the Applicant, and then at that time we will close the evidence with, it's my understanding, one exception; is that correct, Mr. Keyt?

MR. KEYT: Yeah, we may be receiving
additional information either through written report or oral testimony from the Soil \& Water Conservation District. So we're determining what that will be and the time frame for it.

MR. KAINS: But we will close the evidence after Counsel gives a closing statement, public comment, Counsel's rebuttal closing statement, and then we will close the evidence with the one exception of the Soil \& Water Conservation District report or reports. Then
we'll convene at a time to be noticed up by the Board, in consult with folks who need to be here. We'll have to come up with dates we're available, and then we'll hear -- we'll either accept the report or review the reports for determination of whether they're going to be admitted, or hear oral testimony, and at that time, after that, then there will be the Board deliberations on findings of fact and conditions of the permit, if any. Would that be a fair assessment of where we're going with this, Mr. Keyt?

MR. KEYT: Yes, $I$ believe so, with the caveat that the ZBA has not heard all evidence yet and may want to call a witness back or hear further evidence.

MR. KAINS: Miss Antoniolli, is that a fair assessment of where we're going, at least --

MS. ANTONIOLLI: I would just ask that we put a time limit on the length of time that the record can be left open to accept additional information from the Soil \& Water Conservation District. Our understanding of the statute, of the Soil \& Water Conservation District Act is that once the time frame from the date that we submitted our Application to the District triggered a 30-day time limit to provide the reports, and we're not objecting to that at that moment to provide information past that deadline. That deadine
would run on September 5th. But we do ask that it be reasonable after that time.

MR. KAINS: Yes.

MR. KEYT: Can I make a comment on that?
MR. KAINS: Mr. Keyt.
MR. KEYT: So first of all, I think Soil \& Water needs a fair opportunity to be able to review essentially a banker's box worth of documents that was submitted to them, number one. Number two, I don't believe they've -- the Applicant has submitted a written Application that Soil \& Water Conservation District has requested, except for two parcels. Number three, the issue, $I$ don't think, as to when or how long to leave it open, should be considered tonight because we need to know from Soil \& Water how long they need to be able to complete an adequate review. So, I think that it's premature to make that determination because Soil \& Water would need a fair opportunity to do that review. MR. KAINS: Miss Antoniolli, do you have any other comment on this issue?

MS. ANTONIOLLI: Yes. I would say that the 30-day time frame is a statutory deadline that can't be changed or extended. Again, we don't object to extending that for the purposes for informational purposes, but it should be reasonable given the fact
that it wasn't -- it's not something that changes depending on how large the Application is according to the Act. It's just set by statute.

MR. KAINS: I understand. The one thing I have understood from discussions with each of you, with respect to this issue, and it's been very limited, is you are working together --

MS. ANTONIOLLI: Yes.
MR. KAINS: -- to reach some accord on this, and I do appreciate that, and I think the Board would appreciate that. So, yeah, it's going to -- I know you'll work together. You guys with Mr. Keyt will work together to find an adequate deadine by which Soil \& Water Conservation can do these reports.

MS. ANTONIOLLI: We're telling you our position now for the record.

MR. KAINS: Absolutely, yes.
MS. ANTONIOLLI: We are confident we can work together with Mr. Keyt and the District on that. We don't want the deadine to extend unnecessarily long.

MR. KAINS: Very good. Thank you. Anything further, Mr. Keyt, on that?

MR. KEYT: No. Just to clarify, I don't represent Soil \& Water, but I do represent the County in this in relationship to getting adequate information.

MR. KAINS: Very good. Thank you for the clarification. We have one other matter that has been hanging since the beginning of the night. There was an exhibit submitted for consideration, an internet print-out from Firetrace.com. I think we originally talked about it being Applicant's Exhibit 18 , but we already have an 18. So this would be Exhibit $19 . \quad$ I have reviewed it. Mr. Keyt has reviewed it. He does not have any objection to it. Quite honestly, it's not a document that's going to make or break anything in this proceeding, and it is not anything that is, $I$ was going to use the word inflammatory, but that would be just plain corny. There's not anything in here that's going to cause anybody any great consternation over this. So I'm going to allow the Firetrace.com Operations and Maintenance document in as Applicant's Exhibit 19, and I apologize for another bad joke. I can't help it.

Mr. Hess, Miss Antoniolli, Mr. Granholm, anything else tonight?

MS. ANTONIOLLI: No. Nothing further tonight. Thank you.

MR. KAINS: All right. Thank you. Mr. Keyt, anything further?

MR. KEYT: No, sir.
MR. KAINS: Mr. Chairman, do you have
anything?

DR. WAX: No, I do not.

MR. KAINS: All right. Folks, we are going
to be in recess. Our next scheduled night of this particular public hearing is Tuesday, I have to look to see what the date is, September 5, in this very room, beginning at 5:30, and $I$ anticipate some testimony, closing statements, public comment. We will probably go most, if not the entire time, on Tuesday evening. That's our road map for Tuesday. We will see you Tuesday at 5:30 in this room, and the Board, with your consent, Mr. Chairman, is in recess.

DR. WAX: Yes.

MR. KAINS: Thank you.
(Proceedings concluded.)
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| \# | 3 | A | Adam [2] - 1:19, 66:1 | ag [1] - 93:24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \# 084-002330[1]- \\ & 121: 13 \\ & \# 17[1]-2: 19 \\ & \# 18[1]-2: 20 \\ & \# 19[2]-2: 20,2: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3_{[1]}-2: 11 \\ & 30[1]-113: 15 \\ & 30 \text {-day }[2]-116: 23, \\ & 117: 22 \\ & 31[4]-1: 4,2: 7,3: 1, \\ & 114: 1 \\ & 33_{[1]}-2: 7 \\ & 35_{[1]}-2: 8 \\ & 36_{[1]}-2: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { abandon }[1]-32: 4 \\ & \text { ability }[5]-76: 9, \\ & 76: 17,91: 15, \\ & 111: 23,121: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 2,50: 1,50: 7, \\ & 54: 11,85: 13,101: 10 \\ & \text { added }[4]-46: 13, \\ & 50: 11,54: 10 \\ & \text { addition }[1]-14: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { aged }[1]-74: 11 \\ \text { ago }[3]-32: 15, \\ 112: 12,113: 20 \\ \text { agree }[13]-24: 1, \\ 43: 11,45: 7,45: \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 22,51: 4,51: 25, \\ & 61: 9,76: 7,91: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20:12, 25:3, 26:14, } \\ & \text { 115:2, 115:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51: 2,53: 14,55: 13 \\ & 57: 1,60: 10,90: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{1}[6]-2: 4,2: 21,11: 19, \\ & 11: 21,12: 4,12: 9 \\ & \mathbf{1 ( a}[1]-20: 22 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 61:9, 76:7, 91:19, } \\ & \text { 92:8, 92:12, 97:8, } \\ & \text { 107:11, 110:13, } \\ & \text { 111:2, 117:7, 117:15 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 115:2, 115:4, } \\ \text { 115:17, 116:18 } \\ \text { address }[6]-24: 10, \\ 41: 15,52: 9,83: 11, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { agreed }[1]-98: 10 \\ & \text { agreement }[3]-29: 2, \\ & 58: 15,103: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 4 |  |  |  |
| 106[1]-2:17 | 12, 2:19 | above-entitled [1] - | $90: 17,114: 7$ | Agreement [1]-25:5 agreements [3] - 13:9, |
| 11/12 [1]-2:21 | -100:12, 100:18 | above-ground [2] 47:1, 47:3 | addressed [4] - 44:8, 50:17, 64:23, 108:13 | agreements [3] - 13:9, 102:2, 103:15 <br> agriculture [1] - 75:1 |
| $110{ }_{[1]}$ - 2:18 | $45[1]-100: 22$ |  | addressing [1] - 67:18 |  |
| $114[1]-114: 14$ | 46[1]-100:22 | Abraham [1] - 65:24 <br> absentee [1]-113:22 | adds [1]-52:8 <br> adequate [3]-117:16, <br> 118:13, 118:25 | Agriculture's [1] -25:5 |
| 119 [1] - 2:21 |  |  |  |  |
| $1300{ }_{[1]}-77: 24$ $16{ }_{[1]}-44: 9$ | 5 | Absolutely [1] - 5:14 absolutely [3]-41:20, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ahead }[11]-7: 14, \\ & 35: 20,39: 21,59: 8, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 17[6]-2: 5,2: 22,4: 15, \\ 4: 17,4: 20,4: 22 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5[3]-2: 13,2: 20, \\ & 120: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { accept }[4]-6: 16,34: 7, \\ 116: 4,116: 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ADLS }_{[3]}-48: 23, \\ 49: 11,49: 13 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 60:20, 94:21, 96:15, } \\ & 99: 21,101: 23, \\ & 102: 17,110: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 18[7]-6: 5,6: 17,37: 5, \\ & 37: 11,38: 1,119: 6, \\ & 119: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 59 [1]-2:9 |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 30[3]-1: 4,120: 7, \\ & 120: 11 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | aid ${ }_{[1]}$ - $90: 2$ <br> AIMA $_{[13]}-29: 2,29: 6$, |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 19[3]-2: 5,119: 7 \\ & 119: 16 \\ & 1973_{[1]}-73: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 5th [1]-117: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { acceptance }[2]-90: 6 \text {, } \\ & \text { 108:4 } \end{aligned}$ | 16:17 <br> administrative [15] - | $44: 22,44: 25,45: 1 \text {, }$ |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { accepted }[4]-34: 6, \\ 86: 19,86: 22,87: 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:12, 22:19, 22:23, } \\ & 23: 3,23: 6,23: 10, \end{aligned}$ | 45:5, 45:10, 45:17, |
| 2 | $6[1]-2: 20$ $61[1]-2: 9$ | access [10] - 27:6, <br> 27:7, 27:11, 27:13, | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 23,45: 24,46: 2, \\ & 46: 5,46: 8,46: 13, \\ & 54: 11,86: 22,87: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { air [3] - 67:14, 111:25, } \\ & \text { 112:2 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 2[4]-2: 10,2: 22, \\ 17: 10,17: 15 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61856[2]-1: 23, \\ & 114: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27: 18,27: 22,50: 24, \\ & 51: 4,52: 1,52: 5 \end{aligned}$ | Administrator [2] - 72:7, 108:14 | aircraft $[1]-112: 21$ <br> Aircraft [2]-48:23, |
| $20[1]-99: 11$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { accordance }{ }_{[1]} \text { - } \\ & 13: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { admission }[1] \text { - } \\ & \text { 103:11 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 49:20 } \\ \text { Alan }[1]-1: 18 \end{gathered}$ |
| 2007 [1] - 70:16 |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 [2] - 99:12, 99:13 | 7 | $\begin{gathered} \text { according }[4]-25: 4, \\ 71: 25,73: 12,118: 2 \end{gathered}$ | admit [2] - 6:15, 47:7 | ALDS [2] - 48:23 <br> Alex [1] - 110:14 |
| 2014[1]-87:13 | $\begin{aligned} & 70[1]-2: 11 \\ & 702[4]-88: 7,89: 18, \\ & 90: 4,90: 14 \\ & 73_{[1]}-2: 12 \\ & 73 \text {-page }[3]-43: 4, \\ & 59: 24,60: 13 \\ & 78[1]-2: 14 \\ & 7: 14[1]-72: 8 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Admitted }[2]-2: 19, \\ & 2: 20 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $2015[2]-75: 14$, $100: 24$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { accordingly }[1] \text { - } \\ & 109: 19 \end{aligned}$ |  | 19:17, 84:23, 90:16, |
| 2023 [9]-1:4, 3:1, |  | account ${ }_{[1]}-91: 13$ <br> accounted $[5]$ - 16:23, | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 22,4: 25,5: 3,5: 22, \\ & 11: 21,12: 3,17: 10, \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 13:12, 63:23, |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 101:19, 107:10, } \\ & \text { 107:22, 108:1, } \end{aligned}$115:9, 119:15 |
| 111:12, 112:12, |  | accounted [5]-16:23, 16:24, 22:20, 23:25, | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 21,12: 3,17: 10, \\ & 27.5 \text { 27:11 20:10, } \end{aligned}$ 37:5, 37:11, 38:18, |  |
| 112:13, 113:15, |  | accounting [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 108:15, 108:16, } \\ & \text { 116:6 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 115: 9,119: 15 \\ \text { allowable }[3]-30: 7, \\ 30: 9,99: 14 \end{gathered}$ |
| 114:1 |  |  |  |  |
| 2030 [1] - 111:21 | $7: 14[1]-72: 8$ | 22:24, 91:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Admitted)..... [2] - } \\ & \text { 2:21, 2:22 } \end{aligned}$ | allowed [7]-7:13, <br> 14:21, 18:1, 78:21, <br> 92:11, 96:4, 107:15 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 217)762-5861 [1] - } \\ & 1: 24 \end{aligned}$ | 8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { accurate [2]-19:12, } \\ & 30: 7 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 217)762-7957 [1] - | 8 [1] | accurately ${ }_{[1]}-114: 7$ <br> achieving [1] - 100:21 | Admitted)............ [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 92:11, 96:4, 107:15 } \\ & \text { allows [1]-107:12 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 114:15 |  |  | adopting ${ }_{[1]}$ - 107:17 | almost ${ }_{[1]}$ - 26:9 |
| 21A [4] - 44:25, 45:10, | 15 | acoustician [1] -98:3 | advance [1]-20:17 <br> adverse [1]-100:11 | alone [2]-63:9, 113:2 <br> amazingly $[1]$ - 75:24 |
| 45:16, 45:23 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { acousticians }[1] \text { - } \\ & 98: 10 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| $24[2]-2: 6,111: 12$ $25[2]-96: 17,108: 25$ | $\begin{aligned} & 86[1]-2: 15 \\ & 8: 30[1]-1: 4 \end{aligned}$ | Act $\left.{ }^{2}\right]$-116:21, 118:3 <br> acting [1] - 107:13 <br> action [1] - 107:18 <br> activities [4]-12:24, 16:18, 63:19, 71:1 <br> actual [2] - 32:23, 64:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { adversely }[1]-28: 1 \\ & \text { advice }[1]-28: 21 \\ & \text { advise }[1]-23: 9 \\ & \text { affected }[10]-18: 16, \\ & 27: 23,28: 1,60: 1, \\ & \text { 92:7, } 97: 25,102: 22, \\ & \text { 102:24, 114:8, 114:9 } \\ & \text { affecting }[1]-111: 20 \end{aligned}$ | Ambrose [1] - 100:9 <br> America[4]-63:7, $63: 8,63: 10,76: 15$ |
| 25-foot [1] - 96:19 |  |  |  |  |
| $26[2]-9: 1,12: 13$ | 9 |  |  | American[1] - 65:14 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{2 8}[1]-2: 6 \\ & 29[1]-112: 13 \\ & \text { 29th }{ }_{[1]}-112: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 93 [1]-2:16 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { amount [10] - 23:7, } \\ & \text { 23:19, 25:14, 25:16, } \\ & 34: 11,55: 1,55: 2, \\ & 56: 8,67: 7,106: 10 \end{aligned}$ |


| ```amounts [2] - 46:5, 56:4 Amy [1] - 1:16 analysis [2]-20:12, 82:6 and.. [1] - 32:24 Anderson [3] - 6:6, 6:12, 6:14 Andrew [1] - 1:14 Andy [1] - 110:5 angels [1] - 65:25 angle [1] - 66:7 annually [2] - 68:7, 102:4 answer [10]-20:19, 26:2, 37:22, 39:23, 42:16, 59:22, 80:9, 105:8, 111:3 anti [2] - 100:6, 106:6 anti-wind [2] - 100:6, 106:6 anticipate [2] - 14:6, 120:7 Antoniolli [5]-1:16, 11:23, 116:14, 117:19, 119:18 ANTONIOLLI[7] - 114:21, 116:16, 117:21, 118:8, 118:15, 118:18, 119:20 Apex [34]-10:16, 63:24, 64:8, 64:14, 65:19, 66:2, 66:5, 68:5, 73:21, 74:8, 74:18, 76:10, 76:14, 76:24, 79:6, 88:24, 97:3, 99:23, 102:1, 102:7, 102:8, 102:24, 103:3, 103:10, 103:14, 103:16, 103:22, 104:1, 110:14, 110:15, 112:25, 113:9 Apex's [7] - 63:18, 66:10, 73:23, 73:24, 76:22, 96:23, 111:4 apologize [3] - 47:25, 48:23, 119:17 appeal [2]-65:24, 91:22 Appeals [8] - 17:19, 68:25, 71:13, 77:4, 105:13, 108:9, 108:14, 114:18 appear [3]-14:19, 39:10, 107:10 appearance [1] - 107:17``` |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { approved }[1]-14: 8 \\ & \text { April }[1]-63: 22 \\ & \text { area }[13]-15: 11, \\ & \text { 26:17, 41:5, 88:16, } \\ & \text { 88:18, 88:21, 89:1, } \\ & \text { 90:18, 92:7, 95:14, } \\ & \text { 96:25, 112:3, 113:8 } \\ & \text { areas }[4]-67: 6,79: 15, \\ & 83: 11,106: 11 \\ & \text { argument }[1]-84: 24 \\ & \text { arrangements }[2]- \\ & \text { 28:21, 28:23 } \\ & \text { aside }[1]-80: 21 \\ & \text { aspect }[1]-66: 10 \\ & \text { assessment }[3]- \\ & 65: 7,116: 9,116: 15 \\ & \text { assigned }[1]-59: 20 \\ & \text { Assist }[1]-89: 20 \\ & \text { assist }[1]-89: 23 \\ & \text { assistance }[1]-37: 23 \\ & \text { Associate }[1]-36: 4 \\ & \text { Association }[2]- \\ & \text { 114:2, } 114: 4 \\ & \text { assume }[4]-33: 20, \\ & 49: 14,53: 16,107: 14 \\ & \text { assumed }[2]-53: 2, \\ & 53: 6 \\ & \text { assumes }[2]-41: 2, \\ & 41: 8 \\ & \text { assuming }[3]-18: 2, \\ & 33: 16,52: 18 \\ & \text { assurance }[1]-26: 9 \\ & \text { attached }[1]-33: 22 \\ & \text { Attachment }[2]- \\ & 47: 16,48: 10 \\ & \text { attendance }[1]-62: 8 \\ & \text { attended }[1]-110: 12 \\ & \text { attention }[1]-4: 7 \\ & \text { attitude }[1]-113: 2 \\ & \text { Attorney }[1]-3: 11 \\ & \text { attorney }[1]-89: 13 \\ & \text { attorneys }[6]-35: 17, \\ & 69: 4,71: 17,77: 7, \\ & 105: 9,105: 17 \\ & \text { August }[7]-1: 4,3: 1, \\ & 111: 12,112: 12, \\ & 112: 13,113: 15, \\ & \text { 114:1, } \\ & \text { automatic }[3]-65: 1, \\ & 65: 9,65: 14 \\ & \text { availability }[1]-7: 6 \\ & \text { available }[3]-30: 20, \\ & 65: 10,116: 3 \\ & \text { average }[2]-56: 18, \\ & 56: 23 \\ & \text { avian }[1]-14: 14 \\ & \text { aviation }[1]-112: 6 \\ & \text { aware }[9]-32: 11, \\ & 32: 14,40: 14,55: 8, \\ & 55: 18,60: 12,74: 21, \end{aligned}$ | 100:7, 110:21 <br> Ayers [3] - 113:25, <br> 114:3, 114:13 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| brief [1] - 33:8 | care [7]-22:25, 26:3, | check $[7]$ - 14:22, | 115:24 | comparable [1] - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| briefly ${ }_{[1]}$ - 84:24 | 31:22, 73:15, | 18:1, 18:7, 30:5 | closed [1]-115:3 | 25:16 |
| bring [4]-31:23, 66:4, | 110:15, 110:18, | 30:21, 97:4, 97:5 | closest [2]-80:25, | compared [1] - 6:9 |
| 111:15, 111:16 | 11:4 | checked [2]-31:1, | 99: | comparison [1] - 68:5 |
| brings [2] - 67:15, | career [1] - 10:5 | 68:5 | closing [5] - 76:19, | compensated [1] |
| 89:17 | Carlson [2]-1:19 | child [1] - 70:2 | 115:6, 115:22, | 64:11 |
| brother [1] - 104:14 | 66:1 | children [2]-74:20, | 15:23, 120:8 | compensation [1] - |
| brought [2]-22:18, | case ${ }_{[7]}-4: 23,1$ | 104:2 | clues [1]-67:16 | 64:13 |
| 26:1 | 19:10, 23:13, 56:9 | choices [1] - 64:18 | codes [1] - 65:19 | complainer [1] - 70:23 |
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| 43:23, 65:19 | cents [5]-52:7, 53:20, | CHRIS [1] - 61:2 | 78:16 | completed [2] - 13:22, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { buildings [3] - 41:4, } \\ & 41: 21,65: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 53: 24,54: 2,54: 7 \\ \text { certain }[2]-23: 19, \end{gathered}$ | Christmas [1] - 99:12 chronologically ${ }_{[1]}$ - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { COIL............... } \\ & \text {..... [1]-2:12 } \end{aligned}$ | 101:13 <br> completeness |
| built [1] - 41:7 | 25:1 | 111:11 | coincides [1] - 12:5 | 9:25 |
| bulk [1] - 113:21 | certainly [4]-20:14, | Circuit [1] - 121:3 | colleagues [1] - 96:3 | completion[1] - 59:19 |
| bunch [1] - 107:16 | 88:8, 88:20, 90:11 | circumstance ${ }_{[1]}$ | Collection/ | compliance [8] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bureau } \\ & 63.2]-12: 20, \end{aligned}$ | Certified [1] - 121:2 certify ${ }_{[1]}$ - 121:4 | 19:6 | Transmission [2] | $13: 10,15: 4,15: 16,$ $45: 19,58: 1,58: 22$ |
| $\text { Burton }[5]-72: 16,$ | cetera [1] - 41:7 | circumstances [1] 7:17 | combined [1] - 97:9 | 45:19, 58:1, 58:22, 58:24, 94:24 |
| 72:17, 78:13, 107:8 | Chair [2]-107:15, | cities [1] - 76:5 | coming [3] - 7:1, 15:7, | Compliance [2]-15:2, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { business [4] - } 68: 17, \\ 85: 5,85: 7,111: 25 \end{gathered}$ | 107:19 <br> chairman [6] - 3:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { citizens }[4]-7: 11 \\ & 75: 24,76: 1,110: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $15: 19$ <br> comment [16] - 65:25 | $\begin{aligned} & 15: 3 \\ & \text { complies }[3]-13: 18, \end{aligned}$ |
| businesses [2] - | 24:16, 108:8, | Citizens [1] - 111: | 78:8, 79:8, 108:16, | 36:8, 45:16 |
| 68:15, 86:3 | 108:19, 119:25, | City [1]-62:8 | 9:2, 109:11, | comply [3] - 44:12, |
| buy [2] - 103:5, 103:12 | 120:12 | Civics [1] - 64:3 | 10:5, 110:9, 111:7, | 46:10, 46:13 |
| BY ${ }_{[16]}$ - 8:14, 17:21, | Chairman [6]-1:9, | civil [2] - 13:1, 85:24 | 15:8, 115:10, | complying [1] - 50:12 |
| 19:1, 24:20, 28:9, | 10, 5:6, 5:7, 31:6, | Civil [2] - 8:22, 9:1 | 5:22, 117:4 | component [1]-23:23 |
| 33:4, 35:1, 36:1, | 35:12 | civilly [1] - 63:12 | 117:20, 120:8 | components [1] - |
| 59:10, 61:1, 77:16, | Chairperson [2] - | $\text { claiming }{ }_{[1]}-95: 2$ | comments [9]-63:8, | 33:16 |
| 78:22, 83:18, 85:1, | 107:12, 107:13 |  | 72:6, 108:5, 108:6, | composite [1] - 33:23 |
| 86:16, 106:1 | chambers [3]-3:9, | 119:2 | 8:13, 114:16, | computer [1] - 93:3 |
|  | 36:24, 37:15 | $\text { clarify }[2]-110:$ | 114:17, 115:3, 115:4 | concern [6]-22:22, |
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