

1 **MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING**

3 **Champaign County Environment** **DATE:** **May 11, 2009**
4 **& Land Use Committee** **TIME:** **7:00 p.m.**
5 **Champaign County Brookens** **PLACE:** **Lyle Shields Meeting Room**
6 **Administrative Center** **Brookens Administrative Center**
7 **Urbana, IL 61802** **1776 E. Washington Street**
8 **Urbana, IL 61802**

10
11
12 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Carol Ammons, Jan Anderson, Chris Doenitz, Brad Jones, Steve Moser, Alan
13 Kurtz (VP), Jon Schroeder, Barbara Wysocki (C)

14
15 **OTHER COUNTY**
16 **BOARD MEMBERS**

17 **PRESENT:** Pius Weibel (County Board Chair), Alan Nudo

18
19
20 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Ralph Langenheim

21
22 **STAFF PRESENT:** John Hall, Leroy Holliday, J.R. Knight, Susan Monte (Regional Planning
23 Commission), Susan Chavarria (Regional Planning Commission), Deb Busey

24
25 **OTHERS PRESENT:** Eric Thorsland, Russ Taylor, Sherry Schildt, Brad Uken, Tim Poltz, Trish
26 Gale

27
28
29
30 **1. Call to Order, Roll Call**

31
32 The meeting was called to order at 7:02 p.m. The roll was called and a quorum declared present.

33
34 **2. Approval of Agenda**

35
36 **Mr. Jones moved, seconded by Mr. Kurtz to approve the agenda as submitted. The motion carried by**
37 **voice vote.**

38
39 Mr. Schroeder arrived at 7:03pm.

40
41 **3. Approval of Minutes (April 13, 2009)**

42
43 **Ms. Ammons moved, seconded by Ms. Anderson to approve the April 13, 2009, minutes as submitted.**
44 **The motion carried by voice vote.**

45
46 **4. Correspondence**

47 **A. Letter from the Champaign County Farm Bureau received May 5, 2009.**
48

1 Ms. Wysocki said that there was a letter each County Board Member received dated May 5, 2009, from the
2 Champaign County Farm Bureau. She said that it was there for information only.
3

4 **5. Chair’s Report**

5
6 None
7

8 **6. Public Participation**
9

10 Brad Uken, said that he was the Chairman of the East Central Illinois Regional Water Supply Planning
11 Committee. He said that about two and a half years ago a committee was formed to study the Mahomet
12 Aquifer to look at the supply and demand and develop a management plan out to the year 2050. He said
13 there were 12 individuals appointed to this committee that was created under an executive order by the
14 former Governor Blagojevich. He said that in the letter that was distributed you will see that there were 12
15 individuals representing various interest groups. He said that they started off by looking at the demand side
16 and how much was going to be needed in the aquifer to the year 2050. He said that they hired a company
17 from Bloomington, Indiana. and that portion of the study was done. He said that Illinois. State Water Survey
18 was a part of the University of Illinois is working on that side of the equation using the demand information.
19 He said that the third part is to create a management plan to the year 2050 so that’s where the challenge
20 comes up and how did they come up with the year 2050. He said that was directed to us by the Governor and
21 the best reasoning behind that was that it was multiple generations over a span of time to plan for.
22

23 Mr. Uken said that on May 15 they will release a draft report with information on the demand and supply of
24 the Mahomet Aquifer and also a recommendation on how to manage the aquifer out to the year 2050. He
25 said that there was a variety of things that were included but he liked for the Board to review the handout
26 that was distributed but one of the interesting things was the Champaign-Urbana area. He said that the Water
27 Survey has information that the aquifer generally flows from the Paxton and Gilman area down to
28 Champaign-Urbana then heads down to the Monticello area and then northwest and ends up at the Illinois
29 River at Havana. He said that in Champaign-Urbana we are actually pulling water backwards from the flow
30 of the aquifer. He said that the aquifer moves approximately inches or feet per year and it is not a fast
31 moving river like some people believe and it does not come from Pennsylvania but our water comes from
32 here.
33

34 Mr. Uken said that there is a reason for concern and management because we are using a lot of water and
35 pulling the water backwards from its natural flow. He said that the aquifer is a totally different animal when
36 you get to the far west side and you could practically take a spade and dig down to the aquifer but here
37 recharge would take a lot longer. He said that another concern is that Springfield, Decatur and Bloomington
38 may try to locate wells in the aquifer. He said that currently they are using mostly surface water but if they
39 look into things and they get into drought conditions they would look stronger at tapping into the aquifer for
40 their water supply and that will have impacts on us as well as anyone that uses it. He said the Mahomet
41 Aquifer is a limited natural resource and that is why it is critical that we develop the management plan and
42 start to look at it.

5-11-2009

AS APPROVED JUNE 8, 2009

ELUC

1 Mr. Uken said that a draft of this plan will be available to the public to take a look at on May 15 with a final
2 document by the end of June and at that point they would have everything approved by their committee so
3 that we along with others will start to implement some of the actions that we should be undertaking.
4

5 Mr. Uken said that this must be locally managed and not allow a statewide group or organization to try to
6 give us direction on how to manage our aquifer.
7

8 Russ Taylor, representative of the Mahomet Township Plan Commission said that they had not filed a formal
9 protest but they met and although they did not get the protest submitted properly they voted unanimously to
10 oppose the dropping of the Map Amendment. He said that he wanted that to be on the record.
11

12 **Mr. Schroeder move, seconded by Mr. Kurtz to suspend the rules. The motion carried by voice vote.**
13

14 Mr. Schroeder asked Mr. Taylor if the vote was unanimous.
15

16 Mr. Taylor said yes.
17

18 Mr. Schroeder asked Mr. Taylor if the Mahomet Township Plan Commission has drawn up a
19 Comprehensive plan or does Mahomet Township have any planning.
20

21 Mr. Taylor said that a lot of the township is covered by the Village of Mahomet plan but they do not have a
22 separate plan for the township.
23

24 Mr. Moser arrived at 7:08pm.
25

26 Ms. Sherry Schildt distributed a news article from a website. Sherry Schildt said that she lives at 398 CR
27 2500N in Mahomet. She said her husband wanted to be here tonight but he had a conflict in scheduling with
28 a township meeting. Ms. Schildt said that she had found a newspaper article today that was published May 9.
29 She said that this newspaper was from New York and the article pertains to setbacks, noise and property
30 values.
31

32 Ms. Schildt read from the article she submitted.
33

34 After reading her prepared statement Ms. Schildt said that she looked at the zoning code for the state and she
35 could not find anything that specifically addresses what happens after a public hearing of the Zoning Board
36 of Appeals. She said that for a Special Use Permit it says the County Board may by ordinance or without
37 further public hearing adopt any proposed Special Use upon receiving the report from the ZBA or it may
38 refer the proposal back to the Board of Appeals for further consideration. Ms. Schildt said that this seems to
39 be the principal in state law and if ELUC changes the proposed ordinance after the public hearing is closed
40 that would violate this principal. She said that she could not find anything in state law that talks about what
41 happens after a ZBA public hearing on a text amendment but she was just holding that out as a question and
42 she did not know if there was an answer.

1 Mr. Hall said that a Special Use Permit could be sent back to the ZBA to make changes.

2
3 Ms. Schildt asked Mr. Hall if a change could be made even after the public hearing is closed.

4
5 Mr. Hall said yes particularly in this case with a text amendment. He said that you yourself said that it may
6 get sent back to ZBA.

7
8 Tim Poltz of Midwest Wind Energy addressed the Board regarding shadow flicker. Mr. Poltz said that his
9 comment has to do with the revised Ordinance in particularly in Section M on page 74 of the Ordinance. He
10 said that his understanding and in talking to the Zoning Administrator regarding the revised language is that
11 it keeps the standards the same as they were in the previous draft while simply allowing a private waiver for
12 any shadow flicker without putting a number on the maximum number of hours of what the County would
13 deem acceptable with shadow flicker. He said that shadow flicker could be a very suggestive thing. He said
14 that they could submit a shadow flicker study and a map which shows the average number of minutes or
15 hours per year of possible shadow flicker and it is difficult to have a zero tolerance rule in the Ordinance and
16 from their perspective it would make the Ordinance very difficult for them to work with because there would
17 be no room for error. He said that if they were to come and build a turbine where they would expect to have
18 very minimal impact on any surrounding dwellings and if there is a small amount of shadow flicker this
19 Ordinance would hold them in violation of the Ordinance and the consequences would be to comply with the
20 Ordinance or remove the turbine altogether and that was not a risk they would be willing to take nor would
21 anyone that would be financing the turbines. He said that his suggestion would be that the Ordinance be
22 amended to allow some maximum number of shadow flicker or at least allow for mitigation measures.

23
24 Ms. Wysocki asked if there was anyone else to speak.
25 Ms. Wysocki declared public participation closed.

26
27 **7. Recreation and Entertainment License: Eastern Illinois A.B.A.T.E., Inc, for live bands,**
28 **camping bike rodeo. June 5 and 6, 2009.**

29
30 **Mr. Schroeder moved, seconded by Mr. Kurtz to approve the Recreation and Entertainment License**
31 **for Eastern Illinois A.B.A.T.E., Inc. The motion carried by voice vote**

32
33
34 **8. Updates:**
35 **A. Champaign County Land Resource Management Plan**
36 **B. Champaign County Hazard Mitigation Plan**
37 **C. House Bill 2518 (regarding Chatham decision)**

38
39 **A. Champaign County Land Use Resource Management Plan**
40 Susan Chavarria, Regional Planning Manager with the Regional Planning Commission distributed a packet
41 for the Committee to review and spoke regarding the Land Resource Management Plan. She said that they
42 are the consultants for the Land Resource Management Plan that Champaign County had decided to

1 undertake. She said that they started in September 2007 with this planning process and is now in Stage Two
 2 which is the goals, objectives and policies. She said that this is one of the most controversial parts of the
 3 whole plan because it's detailing how our land resources could be used in the next 20 to 50 years. Ms.
 4 Chavarria said that she wanted to get the Committee started thinking about the approval of the goals,
 5 objectives and polices and they will be coming in August seeking signoff on Stage Two so she wanted to
 6 make sure that the Committee had the resources they needed to have a good conversation about it among
 7 themselves and then fully take into consideration what all these goals, objectives and policies mean.

8
 9 Ms. Chavarria said that in the packet there are three items and the first one is a summary of some of the
 10 information we had gone through in the past, where they are with the current status and next steps.

11 Ms. Chavarria said that the number of meetings they originally anticipated for this Stage Two process was
 12 six. She said that the number that they have for this stage to this date is nineteen. She said that the number of
 13 months they had originally anticipated for this date was seven but they have spent twelve so far trying to put
 14 the goal, objectives and policies together as a committee. She said that the committee members spent forty
 15 five hours just in meetings not counting the review time. She said that there were one hundred forty six
 16 goals, objectives and policies that had been written, revised and revised again during the course of a year or
 17 so.

18
 19 Ms. Chavarria said that as far as the current status they had reached a milestone last week making it through
 20 the entire document for the first time. She said that they have one objective and seven policies that they need
 21 to go back and look at again so staff will be rewording and bringing it back to the Committee again in June
 22 and the Committee was also requesting additional objectives and policies in there and she hoped to have that
 23 done by the June 11th meeting. Ms. Chavarria said that they anticipate coming to ELUC in August and by the
 24 Committee signing off on this document they are signing off on stage two.

25
 26 Ms. Chavarria said that Stage Three is the Future Land Use Map and Stage Four is the Implementation Plan
 27 and staff had already started on both of those so they hope to bring that to the Committee quickly so she
 28 hopes to have a completed draft document by November 2009 and if it goes to the County Board then it
 29 would be approximately six months which includes a review process, public hearings and a couple of visits
 30 to ELUC and the County Board so the final document would be done by May 2010.

31
 32 Mr. Kurtz said that he would like to congratulate the Chair, Committee and staff for the excellent work and
 33 persistence in the years and hours they put into this. He said that he sat in on a number of these meetings and
 34 it was a job well done.

35
 36 **B. Hazard Mitigation Plan**

37
 38 Ms. Chavarria said that they have the Planning Team, staff and Regional Planning Commission Technical
 39 Committee reviewing what is the Draft Hazard Mitigation Plan Document and FEMA is also reviewing it at
 40 this time. She said that there is a public hearing set for June 8 at 6:30pm before the next ELUC meeting and
 41 that meeting will be an opportunity for the public comment on the draft document and for ELUC members to
 42 attend and provide comments before the regular meeting. She said that they will provide an overview of the

1 plan and Susan Monte will be facilitating that.

2
3
4 **C. House Bill 2518 (Regarding Chatham Decision)**

5
6 Mr. Hall said that he had not had a chance to check the General Assembly website to see if there had been a
7 vote on this since the last meeting so he did not have any new information.

8
9 **9. Case 634-AT-08 Petitioner: Zoning Administrator Request: Amend the Champaign County**
10 **Zoning Ordinance as follows: A. Authorize the County Board to approve Special Use Permits**
11 **(SUP) and to change the requirements for development of wind turbine developments (wind**
12 **farms) to a County Board Special Use Permit (CBSUP) and a rezoning to the new Wind Farm**
13 **Overlay Zoning District (WFO).**

14
15 **Mr. Kurtz moved, seconded by Mr. Doenitz to amend the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance to**
16 **authorize the County Board to approve Special Use Permits and change the requirements for**
17 **development of wind turbine developments for a County Board Special Use Permit.**

18
19 Mr. Kurtz said that there had been a lot of discussion over a number of months concerning what many
20 people felt are problems with wind farms. He said that the concerns regarding noise, shadow flicker and fire
21 and the other information that they had been getting were completely exaggerated and when you talk about
22 noise he thought that the Illinois. Pollution Control Board which has tremendously good standards not only
23 during the day but even more strict in the evening and at night that the wind farm developers must adhere to.
24 He said that it would mitigate any of the noise problems even at the separations in place right now. He said
25 that they had handled the noise concerns in a matter necessary to negate any problems for a period of time.

26
27 Mr. Kurtz said secondly there was talk of fire hazard. He said that he had researched that area and it was
28 such a rare occasion that it would hardly be worth noting. He said that he talked to Chief Jay of the Corn Belt
29 Fire Protection District and discussed how they would fight a fire 400 feet in the air and his answer was that
30 they would not fight a fire 400 feet in the air much less fight an electrical fire 400 feet in the air. He said that
31 we are talking about a turbine in the middle of a farm field with pretty much no dwellings around it. He said
32 that Chief Jay said that they would watch the fire from the ground. He said that fire would burn out and any
33 debris that would fall would be doused so the fire hazard has been mitigated as well.

34
35 Mr. Kurtz said that thirdly, Ms. Ammons and Ms. Anderson were concerned at the last meeting about
36 shadow flicker. He said that he felt that he needed more information so he studied a report on impacts on
37 wind energy development on humans by the National Academy of Science and they talked about shadow
38 flicker. Mr. Kurtz said according to the impact project he said that shadow flicker caused by wind turbines
39 can be an annoyance and its effect needs to be considered during the design of a wind energy project. He said
40 that according to the study in the United States shadow flicker has not been identified as even a mild
41 annoyance. He said that he would like to remove M2 from the existing Ordinance and have M1 stand alone.

42 **Mr. Kurtz moved, seconded by Mr. Schroeder to remove M2 from the existing Ordinance and have**
43 **M1 stand alone and the wind turbine developers need to have a shadow flicker study and identify**

1 **locations of both summer and winter shadow flicker.**

2
3 Ms. Wysocki said that the motion had been made and seconded to remove M2 from the Ordinance.

4
5 Mr. Jones said what would be the point in the wind companies going through the expense of a study if we
6 are not going to use the study.

7
8 Mr. Kurtz said that last month when he asked that the whole section be removed it did not have enough votes
9 to do that so he felt we should just handle the exact problem which would be to remove Section Two.

10
11 Mr. Jones said that if we are going to remove Section Two then just remove the whole section.

12
13 Mr. Kurtz said that he would agree to remove the entire Section M.

14
15 Ms. Wysocki asked Mr. Jones if that was a friendly amendment.

16
17 Mr. Jones said yes.

18
19 Ms. Wysocki asked Mr. Schroeder since he seconded the motion if he was in agreement to the friendly
20 amendment.

21
22 Mr. Schroeder said yes.

23
24 Ms. Wysocki said that the motion now is to eliminate all of Section M.

25
26 Ms. Ammons asked if we eliminate it from the Ordinance totally and towers are put in place and there is a
27 concern with shadow flicker what would be the recourse if there would be a problem.

28
29 Mr. Hall said with what was being proposed there is no recourse because that's what the Board approved. He
30 said that in Bureau County he has seen a condition used although they do not have anything on shadow flicker
31 in their Ordinance but they added a condition of approval that says they will mitigate any shadow flicker that
32 may occur after construction. He said that Bureau County is concerned about any shadow flicker that occurs
33 after construction. He said that this may be a legal question but he thinks they could apply a condition like
34 that on the wind farm developer even though you don't ask for anything upfront.

35
36 Mr. Hall said that the alternative on page 74 did provide for a private waiver which was a big improvement
37 from what was in the version the Board saw last month.

38 Ms. Anderson said when the Zoning Board of Appeals went through this and recommended it to ELUC
39 someone had informed her that in their consideration of the overlay why they did not offer that based on the
40 1500 feet which was reduced to 1200 feet. She said that she thinks the concerns from some of the people
41 who wanted to have input by having the overlay was, among other things, shadow flicker.

1 Ms. Anderson asked Mr. Hall if he could speak on the difference of the separation and what the ZBA said
2 about that.

3
4 Mr. Hall said that his impression was that the Committee was aware that the ZBA had sent a system of
5 standards which the overlay was rejected but they increased the separation for non-participating dwellings to
6 1500 feet. He said that when you go in and take out parts of it you should be sensitive to the fact that they
7 had considered these trade offs so you should also consider those trade offs. He said that there was nothing
8 in writing where the ZBA said that this was a carefully balanced system and if you disturb any of it you are
9 completely destroying it and if you go through the minutes of those meetings they were having a discussion
10 like that and the tendency was to increase the separations and get rid of the map amendment and the effect of
11 the last ELUC meeting was to lower the separations to what they were when they were considering the map
12 amendment.

13
14 Ms. Anderson said Germany has a lot of wind farms but they don't have houses in the country so much
15 because they live in the villages and they go in the country to farm so there are not as many dwellings to
16 consider.

17
18 Mr. Kurtz said that in his mind when it says any dwelling, if it's touched at any time by a shadow because
19 that's exactly what it says, existing dwellings shall not be subject to shadow flicker there is not any if, and or
20 but here. He said that existing dwellings, as Mr. Hall stated last week, could be any kind of dwelling and it
21 does not even have to be occupied. He said so we are talking about shadow flicker which could be
22 momentary which is probably true because the National Academy of Sciences don't even see that as a
23 problem in the United States at all and most of the studies we had been seeing are from Northern Europe
24 which does have a problem with shadow flicker. He said that it would be a problem putting up a turbine
25 anywhere because somewhere shadow flicker will happen and moving a turbine or taking down a turbine
26 would be impossible.

27
28 Ms. Ammons said that she guesses the last point was the point of the discussion because you do not want to
29 put up anything that large just for someone else to say that it's flickering on my widow every twenty minutes
30 or an hour and have a big problem to deal with. She said that she did not know if she was opposed but at that
31 point she was not convinced that removing any regulatory standard was wise.

32
33 Mr. Kurtz asked Mr. Hall if this was removed would Ms. Ammons have the right to add a new shadow
34 flicker section here if she could replace it with a substitute that would be okay to the Committee.

35
36 Mr. Hall said yes if it passes.

37
38 Mr. Jones said that he believed that the Committee could have some type of provision in here to study and
39 possibly mitigate shadow flicker but on page 65 (M) he agreed with Mr. Kurtz but if you go to the revision
40 on page 74 he was concerned with that because it talked about non-participating dwellings having to sign a
41 waiver if there was any shadow flicker and to him the project just would not happen because they won't sign
42 a waiver.

1
2 Mr. Hall said that the idea of a private waiver was that they will get the buy-in of the non-participating land
3 owner by whatever means that was necessary. He said that he was talking to Dwight Farber and who by the
4 way had a previous meeting and he was saying one of the mitigation measures they used was to simply put
5 awnings on the dwellings that had the shadow flicker so Mr. Farber's mind as long as there was a way to
6 mitigate the shadow flicker he was not too concerned about this. Mr. Hall said that he did not mention
7 awnings on page 74 in paragraph M-3 and in fact if the Committee wished to go with alternative B on page
8 74 and was willing to consider awnings as a part of mitigation it should be in there because with awnings
9 you are still getting shadow on the house but if that is as little as it takes for the land owner to be happy then
10 that was certainly a modest requirement and according to Dwight Farber of Horizon Energy it's one that they
11 do.

12
13 Mr. Jones said that he was concerned that the non-participating land owner might not sign a waiver and that
14 could throw the whole project out.

15
16 Mr. Hall said how about a non-participating land owner who is getting 60 hours of shadow flicker per year
17 should that person sign off on 60 hours or 200 hours of shadow flicker? He said that he understands the point
18 Mr. Poltz made that taken to the extreme you are talking about a very small amount of shadow flicker being
19 an issue and maybe they could identify a threshold below which they are not interested such as Sangamon
20 County's threshold of an hour or North Carolina's State Ordinance which identifies 10 hours so between
21 having no shadow flicker requirements and just requiring a study there was a whole spectrum of where you
22 could cut it off. He said that he wished he could show a diagram of shadow flicker and what it means to have
23 it 10 hours in a year but those are the things he would like the Committee to consider.

24
25 Mr. Weibel asked Mr. Kurtz what was the date of that study.

26
27 Mr. Kurtz said that there was no date and it was given to him by Mr. Hall.

28
29 Mr. Weibel said that it could be 10 years old and there weren't hardly any wind farms in this country. He
30 said that Europe has had wind farms much longer than we have so they will have more studies on shadow
31 flicker. He said that we don't have that history here that's why it is important to know the date of the study.

32
33 Mr. Hall said that he thinks that study was done in 2004 and as Mr. Kurtz read, that study had recommended
34 reviewing shadow flicker even though it said that it had never been a big issue in the United States.

35
36 Mr. Weibel said that Europe had a lot of history in studying problems like this so we must address shadow
37 flicker in this Ordinance and he would not vote for it unless we do. He said that he thinks that the alternative
38 that Mr. Hall presented on page 74 was a step in the right direction and he agreed that it should have a
39 threshold but the question was what should that threshold be.

40
41 Mr. Poltz said that Mr. Hall was correct when he spoke with Dwight Farber and even Midwest Wind Energy
42 had implemented mitigation standards in measures when there had been any issue with shadow flicker. He

1 said that his concern and the concern of the entire industry was the standard that is in there right now can be
2 read if there is shadow flicker whatsoever to require compliance with the Ordinance of removal of the
3 turbine. He said that if the developer would be allowed to mitigate any affects of shadow flicker by
4 mitigation strategies like installing awnings or planting trees there would be much less issue. He said that the
5 issue right now was that it does not have that language in the standard.
6

7 Mr. Moser said that if the Board adopts the two and a half mile setback around all these towns there will not
8 be any place for any wind turbines in here anyway.
9

10 Ms. Wysocki said that's another issue.
11

12 Mr. Moser said that it may eliminate the need for discussing this.
13

14 Ms. Anderson said that she would have difficulty voting for this also if it's taken out completely. She said
15 that if it had some of the suggestions that Mr. Hall and Mr. Poltz made about the awnings that seems to be a
16 reasonable thing. She said that she would like to see wind farms but the Committee has to be careful if we
17 don't we may end up with a lot of public participation and complaints after the fact.
18

19 Mr. Schroeder said that since 20 minutes until eight he had watched a shade on that wall over there. He said
20 that the sun is at a particular angle with the earth right now where he could see the sun coming through some
21 of the port holes of the blinds. He said that blind is there for a reason and he could assume the sun set there
22 pretty similar because of the open field out there. He said that there was sunlight all the way down to where
23 the sun was setting at dusk. He said that if we remove that blind the sun would be obnoxious let alone
24 without seeing any blades moving in front of it and that's why we installed shades in here because at this
25 particular time of the year at this particular hour and he had timed it at ten minute intervals from about
26 twenty minutes till eight and at about ten till eight you could see sun shining through the holes there but if
27 we removed that blind it would be obnoxious. He said that the point was that's why we have that blind there.
28 He said that sun is there, it's beaming through and there is nothing we could do about that be it a blade
29 rotating through it or not. He said like a lot of homes in the urban areas that's why we have them there but
30 his point was that there isn't enough study in this country and we do not have enough experience in this
31 country with shadow flicker so we are left with studies from Europe and as Mr. Kurtz stated the latitude and
32 winds are different than what we have here so he is not opposed to removing this or if this is going to be a
33 big deal and if you want a study then require mitigation only and don't include the waiver because this thing
34 can get personal.
35

36 Ms. Wysocki asked the Committee if there was any other discussion.
37

38 Mr. Moser asked Mr. Weibel what he would propose for a substitute.
39

40 Mr. Weibel said that he would agree to what's on page 74 but have a threshold added to that so it would be
41 an amended version of page 74 but Mr. Hall would have to do research to get a threshold.
42

1 Mr. Hall said that he read off all the standards that he seen has which was 1 hour, 10 hours, 20 hours, 30
2 hours and he could not give the Committee any advice on how to evaluate those.

3
4 Mr. Weibel asked Mr. Hall where they were from.

5
6 Mr. Hall said that 1 hour was from Sangamon County, 30 hours was the standard that comes from Europe,
7 Denmark used 20 hours and that he was not sure where 10 hours came from but the point was that the
8 Committee could adopt 15 or 25 but the only thing he could say was in general shadow flicker should not
9 effect the structure more than 15 minutes a day on any given day but it's just a matter of how many days you
10 get that.

11
12 Mr. Weibel said that it also depends on how many days of clouds you have.

13
14 Mr. Hall said that sunny days and wind direction are the two data elements used in shadow flicker and as far
15 as he knew that was not available for Champaign but it was available for Springfield.

16
17 Mr. Poltz said that most ordinance that he had seen in the Midwest did not address shadow flicker but there
18 were some that did and the ones that did put a maximum number of allowable hours and they also allowed
19 for mitigation like installing awnings or planting trees they did not require shutting down of a turbine or
20 removing of turbines.

21
22 Ms. Ammons said that the energy here is to appease the builder and not the resident that may be affected by
23 the 15 minutes of annoyance. She said that just with that as the basic standard they should have something in
24 there to remediate so if it's planting tress or something else we would want to add to this but taking it out
25 totally and all the regulations previously on this same ordinance would be a concern for her. She said that she
26 thinks just possibly put some language in that the Committee could support to address shadow flicker and
27 not let it go without that.

28
29 Mr. Kurtz said that he would be amenable to working out a substitute, if they put in shades, awnings or trees
30 but he could not see moving turbines. He said that he would like to propose adding a new section, removing
31 (M) which is now on the table and he would like to call the question on that, and we will re-work this section
32 to satisfy their concerns.

33
34 Ms. Ammons asked Mr. Kurtz if he wanted to do that after the vote.

35
36 Mr. Kurtz said that this could not stand as it is, there are no exceptions here.

37
38 Ms. Ammons said except the alternative she was discussing was on page 74 which should be replacing page
39 65 unless she has it wrong.

40
41 Mr. Kurtz asked Ms. Ammons if she was talking about the Whole (M) or just Section 3.

1 Ms. Ammons said Section 1 or 2.

2
3 Mr. Kurtz said that Section 1 was the same thing as Section 2, they are talking about a private waiver but if
4 the land owner does not accept the private waiver we are back to the same exact ordinance again so what we
5 need to do is re-work M with mitigation for shadow flicker of awnings and trees and things to help mitigate
6 shadow flicker. He said that we have blown this thing out of proportion, when we talk about 15 minutes even
7 if its' everyday we could find a way to mitigate that concern with shades, trees or awnings but to kill this
8 entire project was absolutely ridiculous we are talking about millions of dollars, we are talking about roads
9 and bridges, we are talking about education and schools, we are talking about fire and police protection, we
10 are talking about hundreds of jobs and preventing teachers from being laid-off and fire and policemen being
11 laid off because we have no money. He said that this is an opportunity for a financial wind fall and we have
12 one of the most significant ordinances ever produced, this is one of the widest ranging ordinances that he had
13 read concerning wind farms. He said that this has more restrictions in it than any other wind farm ordinance
14 that he had seen and you could go to Kankakee County and see four pages of a wind farm ordinance and they
15 are reaping millions of dollars. He said that he talked to the administrator there and it's been a phenomenal
16 wind fall for them and they are positive. Mr. Kurtz said that he talked to people in McLean County, he talked
17 to people in Wisconsin he had studied this for months now and he finds that they are talking about
18 something and blowing it so far out of proportion that we are willing to scrap this entire project for that.

19
20 Mr. Schroeder asked Mr. Poltz if the wind turbines only produce 35% of the time.

21
22 Mr. Poltz said that in the industry they talk about what's called a capacity factor and that the amount of time
23 a turbine is operating at its fullest capacity so a turbine is only operating at its capacity only a certain
24 percentage of the time and it is the nature of all renewable energy.

25
26 Mr. Schroeder said that if Mr. Kurtz would withdraw his motion and friendly amendment he would
27 withdraw his second that he would suggest to include in Section M1 on the last line delete duration and
28 insert 30 hours of shadow flicker at these locations. He said that we could drop Section M (2) and renumber
29 (3) so that it becomes (2).

30
31 Ms. Anderson said that nobody wants to do away with wind farms but she thinks some of the counties that
32 we are referring to limit the number of subdivisions that pop up so they don't have as many dwellings
33 scattered around to deal with. She said when they talk about citing locations they are talking about before a
34 windmill is built so it's talking about taking this into consideration and the study would figure that out and
35 move it slightly so it would not be near that dwelling.

36
37 Mr. Weibel asked Mr. Schroeder if his last statement was the motion that was on the floor.

38 Mr. Schroeder said no.

39
40 Mr. Weibel asked if Mr. Schroeder if his question had been answered.

41
42 Mr. Schroeder said yes and the answer was it would stop a windmill from running at certain times because

1 that would be part of mitigation.

2
3 Mr. Weibel asked Mr. Hall if he would clarify if that was true or not based on what was said.

4
5 Mr. Hall said that it depends on how it was designed if it was not designed properly in the first place you
6 could have turbines that exceed that standard and he thinks that there are some areas where they do turn
7 turbines off since they have that ability to stop the flicker during certain hours. He said that the question he
8 had was if the Committee was concerned about shadow flicker 30 hours or more so up to 30 hours they did
9 not need mitigation at all but more than 30 hours they would have to mitigate. He said that again, he was not
10 familiar with the intensity of shadow flicker and that may not prohibit a wind farm developer from proposing
11 hundreds of hours of shadow flicker on a dwelling and all they may have to do is put up awnings.

12
13 Ms. Wysocki said that and plant trees.

14
15 Mr. Weibel asked Ms. Wysocki what was the motion on the floor.

16
17 Ms. Wysocki said that the motion was to remove references to shadow flicker.

18
19 Mr. Weibel said that he prefers that it be replaced by the alternative under number 3 and include any means.
20 He said that the other thing he wanted to point out was that shadow flicker normally occurs at sundown and
21 sunset and normally people go out and look at the sun between sundown and sunset and that's when shadow
22 flicker commonly occurs. He said that maybe it's only 15 minutes but it is an important 15 minutes for those
23 people who live in the country.

24
25 Mr. Nudo said that if you eliminate Section 2 on page 74 there was nothing on page 65 that says dwelling so
26 we should really identify what we are trying to achieve here. He said that secondly he drove down an east
27 and west street that was tree lined and we are talking about remediation with trees and the sun setting in the
28 west and there would be flicker in your eyes and even blinded at times so a tree could create shadow flicker.
29 So if you put a tree up to hide shadow flicker you would get the same thing.

30 Mr. Nudo asked the Committee if habitable dwelling assumed that a human being is living there if that is the
31 definition of a dwelling.

32
33 Mr. Kurtz said no.

34
35 Mr. Nudo said that he would add dwelling habited by a human being because if you have a barn and there is
36 flicker on that barn you may have to enforce something here.

37
38 Mr. Hall said that a dwelling is not a barn a dwelling is something with a kitchen and a bath. He said that
39 there are barns with kitchens and baths but that is not the intent.

40
41 Mr. Nudo said that dwelling was not mentioned in either section.

1 Mr. Schroeder said that was mentioned in both.

2

3

4 Mr. Nudo said that if you eliminate number 2 there would not be anything there.

5

6 Mr. Hall said that if you eliminate number 2 then you destroyed the whole idea.

7

8 Mr. Nudo said that he thought that the motion was to eliminate number 2.

9

10 Mr. Schroeder said that the motion was to delete the whole thing.

11

12 Ms. Ammons said the main motion was to remove all reference to shadow flicker

13

14 Ms. Wysocki said all of (M) on page 65.

15

16 Ms. Ammons said that regardless of who makes the money she was concerned that if we remove this we
17 have not put any regulations in there and she would not vote for it so we have to come to terms with either
18 some amendment that was recommended like putting a threshold of time which she was in agreement with
19 because there are other ordinances that do have some threshold and we can't ignore it because others did not
20 so there should be something put in to make sure that there is something to address this issue.

21

22 Ms. Ammons said that we can call the question but she would not support eliminating it totally.

23

24 Ms. Wysocki said that the question had been called.

25

26 Ms. Wysocki said that the vote again is to eliminate on page 65 Section M Items 1 and 2.

27

28 The roll was called.

29

30 Ms. Anderson – No

Mr. Doenitz – No

Ms. Ammons – No

31 Mr. Jones – No

Mr. Langenheim – Absent

Mr. Kurtz – Yes

32 Mr. Moser – Yes

Mr. Schroeder – Yes

Ms. Wysocki – No

33

34 Ms. Wysocki said that the motion failed by the vote of 5-3.

35

36 Mr. Moser said that he moved to accept Mr. Schroeder's amendment the way he stated it in the question.

37

38 Mr. Schroeder said that he would restate the amendment.

39 **Mr. Schroeder moved, seconded by Mr. Kurtz with the correction or addition of Section M1 on the**
40 **last line to include caused by project by expected duration of 30 hours of shadow flicker and remove**
41 **(2) and re-number (3) with the amendment of shadow flicker that exceeds the above standards shall**
42 **be mitigated by landscaping, awnings or fencing.**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

Mr. Jones said that it should include non-participating dwellings.

Mr. Schroeder said that he would accept that as a friendly amendment.

Mr. Weibel said that by any means could be added because so long as it is mitigated it's mitigated. If the wind farm developer was willing to move the tower before it's built its fine and dandy why restrict the way that it is mitigated.

Ms. Anderson said that she would like to amend the motion to include or by any other means necessary.

Ms. Wysocki asked Schroeder and Mr. Kurtz if they were okay with that.

Mr. Kurtz and Mr. Schroeder said yes.

The roll was called.

| | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Ms. Anderson – Yes | Mr. Doenitz – Yes | Ms. Ammons – Yes |
| Mr. Jones – Yes | Mr. Kurtz – Yes | Mr. Moser – No |
| Mr. Schroeder – Yes | Mr. Langenheim – Absent | Ms. Wysocki – Yes |

Ms. Wysocki said that the motion carried 7-1.

Mr. Kurtz said that he had received a call from Compromise Township opposing the map amendment being placed back into the Ordinance and was fully in support of wind farm development in their township. He said that they could not make the meeting this evening because they had a township meeting but they had sent a letter to the Committee for the County Board. He said that they were talking about how important they felt it was because it would be the only way to be able to repair their roads, bridges and help education for the children.

Mr. Moser asked why didn't they come to the meeting to tell us themselves.

Mr. Moser said that they had a meeting and they were not able to attend.

Ms. Wysocki asked the Committee if there was anything else.

Mr. Moser asked Ms. Wysocki about the extra mile to be added to the mile and a half.

Ms. Wysocki said that's what's next on her list.

Ms Wysocki said that she had a request from the City of Champaign asking for an extension of the ETJ to include an additional mile.

Ms. Wysocki said that the Committee has received a handout showing what Champaign County might look

1 like with the additional mile attached.

2
3 **Mr. Schroeder moved, seconded by Mr. Moser not to support the request from the City of Champaign**
4 **for extension of the ETJ to include an extra mile.**

5
6 Mr. Weibel distributed a map for the Committee to review. He said that the extra mile doughnut was
7 relevant north of Champaign and southwest of Champaign because to the northwest there is Mahomet and to
8 the east there is Urbana. He said that to the southwest is Savoy and Bondville. He said that current mile and
9 a half doughnut was 49 square miles and the extra mile was about 15 square miles because of county rules
10 and restrictions.

11
12 Mr. Schroeder said he still had a problem with what the City of Champaign staff did in Scott Township with
13 the water plant. He said that he and Mr. Moser went to that public hearing and they asked the City Council
14 not to pull a Chatham and they did and you can go out there and look at those roads right now and they are
15 beat to tar and they had not started moving those 80 thousand pound trucks with limestone through there yet.
16 He said that they leap frogged a mile and a half and they will do it again because staff doesn't have a
17 problem with going all the way to Piatt County if they want to and they will and on top of that you have
18 Savoy that's leaping around the mile and a half and they are building up all over the place and if you are
19 driving on any of those oil and chip roads they are a disaster and they are not going to get any better because
20 there is not any money to do those streets, gutters and four lane streets like they should be and to hand them
21 over another mile where you don't have any representation out there to a city counsel or village makes him
22 angry. He said that he appreciated the mayor and City Council allowing he and Mr. Moser to speak and those
23 residents have no recourse in the City Council so they're neighbors to the City of Champaign without any
24 recourse on what the City of Champaign does and that's one of the reasons we have county government for
25 representation but here we won't have it. He said that they want to build these two and a half mile doughnuts
26 out there and if you look at Rantoul and see what it will do to Thomasboro it would eat up two thirds of
27 Thomasboro's ETJ, you will have Savoy going all the way to Tolono and they are paranoid about what
28 Savoy's advances are that will get into another fight with them.

29
30 Mr. Schroeder said that if you give them another mile they will have more people upset because they would
31 not have any representation or any say in these governments. He said that if you go you out on the west side
32 of Savoy and south side of Savoy they are building anywhere they see fit and if you drive your car down
33 those roads at about 40 miles per hour and see if you can stay in your seat with your seatbelt off, you can't
34 and those will not get any better out there. He said that there is no public water, sewer nor gas and they are
35 just building wherever there is open land and he was totally against that.

36
37 Mr. Moser said that he did not think Mahomet had any problem with windmills with Champaign adding
38 another mile because there are only three places that he could see and they are spoken for unless somebody
39 wants to go towards Philo. He said that he did not know why we would worry about that mile because that
40 flat land would not get a wind mill because they built them on moraines everywhere he looked other than
41 Benton, County Indiana and they can't build them fast enough to cover up the whole place.

1 Ms. Anderson asked if the airport limits part of that area or do they have to be so far away from an airport.

2
3 Mr. Moser said that most of that ridge out there was in that corridor study between Mahomet and Champaign
4 now so they can't do anything there and that would take in that ridge north of Champaign to north of
5 Mahomet.

6
7 Mr. Weibel said that the only part that might be in that two and a half mile band for Champaign would be the
8 far northern edge of Champaign.

9
10 Mr. Moser said that he would also think that Philo, Tolono, Sidney, Rantoul and Gifford would be hesitant
11 to run any project out when their school systems would benefit from it.

12
13 Ms. Wysocki asked if each county determines their ETJ or is it determined by the State.

14
15 Mr. Hall said that the State sets it at a mile and a half.

16
17 Ms. Wysocki asked Mr. Hall if the counties are allowed to expand that.

18
19 Mr. Hall said that you are not free to assign jurisdiction but you are free to do what is requested in this
20 instance which is only relevant to wind farms and is not an expansion of the ETJ. He said that the City of
21 Champaign had not suggested that we give up another mile of the counties jurisdiction and it is only in
22 regards to wind farms.

23
24 Ms. Wysocki asked Mr. Hall if the County agrees to do this and the ETJ is now 2 ½ miles and hypothetically
25 if some one wants to put up a wind farm at three miles if there is an annexation in Champaign that
26 automatically pushes everything out but how could this be guaranteed if there is a wind farm at three miles.

27
28 Mr. Hall said that the same problem could happen there upon subsequent annexation.

29
30 Ms. Wysocki said that it doesn't appear to be any type of safeguard or a protection for the city if that's what
31 this is about.

32
33 Mr. Schroeder said that he understands that this only deals with the wind farm impacts that Mr. Moser brings
34 up a good point and it's not going to affect anything because the 2 ½ mile doughnuts are outside the
35 moraines anyway and if you go to the east side they are not going to push this issue anyway because they
36 want these windmills out there.

37
38 Mr. Hall said that there is a map of the moraines on the second page of the handout.

39
40 Mr. Poltz said that he thought that the extension would impact their project outside the mile and a half from
41 the Mahomet municipal limits and if this was extended another mile you will eliminate another mile of
42 potential turbine location.

1
2 Mr. Kurtz asked Mr. Weibel although the doughnuts show all of the townships it was only Champaign that
3 would be affected.

4
5 Mr. Weibel said that he included the others because theoretically you could apply the same thing to the other
6 townships.

7
8 Mr. Doenitz said that if all of the municipalities had the extra mile that would affect 22 of the 30 townships
9 in the county, there's not much room left.

10
11 Ms. Wysocki asked the Committee if there was any other discussion and there was none.

12 Ms. Wysocki said that the motion was to turn down the request from the City of Champaign for an extra
13 mile ETJ.

14
15 Ms. Anderson asked if we had a Special Use Permit for the windmills would it be a possibility that this could
16 still be turned down.

17
18 Ms. Wysocki yes

19
20 The roll was called.

| | | | |
|----|----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | Ms. Anderson – Yes | Mr. Doenitz – Yes | Ms. Ammons – Yes |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | Mr. Jones – Yes | Mr. Kurtz – Yes | Mr. Moser – Yes |
| 25 | | | |
| 26 | Mr. Schroeder – Yes | Ms. Wysocki – Yes | Mr. Langenheim – Absent |
| 27 | | | |

28 **Mr. Jones moved, seconded by Mr. Schroeder to accept a Decommissioning Funding Proposal.**

29
30 Ms. Wysocki said that this involves a letter of credit to be staggered over the first 13 years of a twenty five
31 year life of a wind turbine. She said that this letter of credit would remain with the bank that the Board
32 agrees to work through.

33
34 Mr. Nudo said that he had some discussion with a couple of loan officers of banks and he and Mr. Poltz
35 some discussion a little bit ago about the fact that letters of credit had changed and a letter of credit is
36 irrevocable and that it is backed by assets of the entity that is getting the letter of credit and it is renewable
37 each year sometimes now even six months because the banks are changing the rules to make it tougher and
38 tighter to get this kind of backing. He said that what this does is allow the developer of the wind farm not to
39 put the money upfront because there is a lot of upfront cost but it allows us to have a comfort level half way
40 through the lease that we have the money in hand and if something happens like the company were sold or it
41 ran into financial trouble in year seven we would have at least have six years worth of cash on hand to
42 handle decommissioning. He said that Mr. Uken provided a couple of documents for him today which he

5-11-2009

AS APPROVED JUNE 8, 2009

ELUC

1 had at home where they did some decommissioning and the cost could range from zero to \$100.00 per
2 kilowatt because these are mega kilowatt operations. He said that the reason it may be zero is because there
3 was some scrap involving the metals and the things that are used or to be sold elsewhere also people are
4 buying used turbines so there is some ability to get some scrap value out of it and it could be up to a\$100.00
5 dollars. He said that in a case in California they are talking about one with a lot more turbines but it says that
6 even with this modest amount some could easily cost land owners and tax payers which this is not the two
7

8 we want involved in this 23 million dollars so it would seem to him that this hybrid of having of credit and
9 then putting down one twelfth of the cash amount of decommissioning and reducing the letter of credit by
10 that amount each year allows us to get our money. He said that it will save the developer money because they
11 have to pay two to three percent on the bulk amount of the letter of credit but as it gets down to zero over
12 twelve years and for the last thirteen years it's zero and they could save 75% of their interest cost.
13

14 Mr. Nudo said that Mr. Poltz said that he will take it to his financial guys and see how this would work with
15 them but he sees this as a proposition that they could absorb because they don't have the upfront cost and it
16 eases the Committee's mind as to how we could get this thing paid for.
17

18 Mr. Kurtz asked Mr. Nudo if he knows what any of these payments would be at this point and how would we
19 ascertain the total amount of what it would cost to decommission one of these turbines.
20

21 Mr. Nudo said that in the write up on page 75 that outlines what the amount should be based on an
22 independent engineer's cost. He said that it would be a bone of contention and the parties would come up
23 with an accurate number and also factor in inflation but his proposal would not get into that and it basically
24 says once we figure what that amount is we fund it this way.

25 Mr. Nudo said that he did not have a problem with this being extended three, four, or five more years if they
26 can't afford to put that kind of money up for twelve years and he did not have a problem with it but he thinks
27 it could be a frame work to work with.
28

29 Mr. Kurtz asked Mr. Nudo if this has to be placed into this Section of the Ordinance and then we would find
30 out the exact numbers afterwards but at this point we have the guidelines for the payment.
31

32 Mr. Nudo said that's correct.
33

34 Mr. Jones said that he was not clear but if the firm was sold then we would not be covered and that would be
35 risky because more than likely it would be sold.
36

37 Mr. Nudo said that he did not know where the County gets involved in the sale of two entities and if there
38 are some legal documents to say this has to stay for the successor and the signee of any deals that come
39 forward so you have to factor that in or a sale.
40

41 Ms. Wysocki asked Mr. Poltz how long had the company been in existence.
42

1 Mr. Poltz said that Midwest Wind Energy had been in business since 2003.

2
3 Ms. Wysocki asked Mr. Poltz if it had been the same owner throughout.

4
5 Mr. Poltz said yes. He said that these projects are seldom setup with one company involved through the
6 lifespan of a project. He said that a project entity is created for example the Crescent Ridge Project (Crescent
7 Ridge LLC) and when you transfer ownership of that project the project entity remains just the ownership
8 interest changes hand so the obligation and the burden to fund the decommissioning plan goes along with the
9
10 entity.

11
12 Ms. Anderson asked Mr. Poltz if this would replace what we have on page 75.

13
14 Mr. Poltz said no.

15
16 Ms. Wysocki said that this would be an addition to it.

17
18 Mr. Nudo said that the description of the LLC would be that the assets of the LLC are all you can go after
19 you cannot go after the member's assets. He said that he was a little more comfortable if they could work
20 this out with us to basically hybrid what we are trying to do here.

21
22 Ms. Wysocki asked Mr. Poltz if this letter of credit would remain with the bank that we would agree to work
23 with and would this bank be a local bank.

24
25 Mr. Poltz said yes it would remain with the bank and it would be a mutually acceptable bank.

26
27 Mr. Nudo said that the escrow would be the same and the money derived from the money in escrow could go
28 towards the decommissioning.

29
30 Mr. Kurtz said that each year the letter of credit could be reviewed so any changes that need to be made are
31 made on a yearly basis so they are not surprised five years down the road.

32
33 Mr. Poltz said that the decommissioning plan and the funding for the decommissioning plan is something
34 that would be in place to protect the County and not necessarily be used to decommission a project. He said
35 that if a company is still solvent there's no reason they wouldn't fund a decommission themselves and it's
36 only in place if there is a reason why the project entity could not perform.

37
38 Ms. Ammons asked Ms. Wysocki who would be reviewing this.

39
40 Ms. Wysocki said that she thought that it would be the Finance Committee.

41
42 Ms. Busey said that it would be a function of Mr. Hall's office.

5-11-2009

AS APPROVED JUNE 8, 2009

ELUC

1 Mr. Hall said that was correct but he still has some questions regarding this. He said his is to make sure that
2 the County has enough money in this fund no matter how it is funded or the shape of the fund to pay for
3 decommissioning and in year 13 when you go to an all cash basis he believed there are questions on how
4 much interest continues to accrue there and in year 13 he assumes the Committee wants 100% of the
5 decommissioning cost that might happen in year 25. He said that he will do his best to get this integrated
6 with the Ordinance but he had a lot of questions about how this needs to look in the Ordinance.

7 Mr. Hall said that it is easy enough to write in an annual review at ELUC every year so that is the easy part.

8
9 Ms. Ammons asked Ms. Wysocki to state the motion again.

10
11 Ms. Wysocki said that the motion was to accept this formula for a letter of credit regarding decommissioning
12 wind farms.

13
14 Ms. Ammons asked if this was including staff's recommendations on page 75.

15
16 Ms. Wysocki said yes.

17
18 The roll was called.

19
20 **Ms. Anderson – Yes**

Mr. Doenitz – Yes

Ms. Ammons – Yes

21 **Mr. Jones – Yes**

Mr. Kurtz – Yes

Mr. Moser – Yes

22 **Mr. Schroeder – Yes**

Mr. Langenheim – Absent

Ms. Wysocki – Yes

23
24
25 **Mr. Kurtz moved, seconded by Mr. Schroeder to accept the Champaign County Ordinance as**
26 **amended and to forward it to the County Board.**

27
28 Ms. Wysocki said that we started with that motion so that motion had been on the floor already.

29
30 Ms. Wysocki asked for a roll call to forward Case 634-AT-08 to the County Board.

31
32 The roll was called.

33
34 **Ms. Anderson – Yes**

Mr. Doenitz – Yes

Ms. Ammons – Yes

35 **Mr. Jones – Yes**

Mr. Kurtz – Yes

Mr. Moser – Yes

36 **Mr. Schroeder – Yes**

Mr. Langenheim – Absent

Ms. Wysocki – Yes

37
38 **10. Monthly Reports (October-December 2008 and January-April, 2009)**

39
40 None

1 **11. Determination of Items to be placed on the County Board Consent Agenda**

2
3 None

4
5 **12. Adjournment**

6
7 **Ms. Ammons moved, seconded by Mr. Kurtz to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried by voice**
8 **vote.**

9
10 The meeting adjourned at 9:02 p.m.

11
12
Respectfully submitted,

Secretary to the Environment and Land Use Committee

eluc\minutes\minutes.fm