

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

CHAMPAIGN COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

1776 E. Washington Street
Urbana, IL 61801

DATE: August 25, 2011 PLACE: Lyle Shields Meeting Room
1776 East Washington Street
Urbana, IL 61802

MEMBERS PRESENT: Catherine Capel, Thomas Courson, Roger Miller, Melvin Schroeder,
Eric Thorsland, Paul Palmgren, Brad Passalacqua

MEMBERS ABSENT : None

STAFF PRESENT : Connie Berry, Lori Busboom, John Hall, Jamie Hitt

OTHERS PRESENT : Brent Anderson, Debra Griest, Larry Frerichs, Matthew Childress,
Kurvilla George, Marsha Gates, Brian Waibel, Bill Ingram, Linton
Frerichs, Lewis Henry, Alice Englebretsen, Anita Povich, Herb Frerichs,
Bryan Schluter, Norman Davis, James Beauchamp, Mike Jarboe, Eileen
Jarboe, Robert Yardy, Andy Robinson, Marlene Chandler, Marsha
Goldenstein, Sue Naughtin, Kay Fiscus, Kim Cambron, John Clifford,
Gary Maxwell, Dennis Cummins, Matt Cavalenes, Pattie Cavalenes,
Elaine Osterbur, Roy P. Johnson, Michael Herbert, Rachel Vellenga,
John Fiscus, Diane Acton, Greg Acton, Barry Osterbur, Steve Burdin,
Dwight Redding, Pattsy Petri, Roger Carter, Nora Maberry, Marty
Edwards, Mary Jo Reik, Larry Kearns, Tim Casey, Dan Shearin, Deanne
Sims, Harold Hovel, Dwight Farber, Mitchel Fruhling, Bruce Stickers,
Sherry Schildt, Herb Schildt, Marvin Ideus, Earl Ideus, James Rusk,
Gary Freymiller, Marvin Johnson, Greg Frerichs, Doug Bluhm, Rob
Parker, Roy Knight, Jay Fruhling, Alan Kurtz, Greg Leuchtman,
Michael Blazer, Bryan Schueler, Michael Cavalenas, Steve Moser

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m.

2. Roll Call and Declaration of Quorum

The roll was called and a quorum declared present.

Mr. Thorsland informed the audience that anyone who desires to present testimony must sign the

ZBA

1 witness register. He reminded the audience that when they sign the witness register they are signing an
2 oath.

3
4 **3. Correspondence**

5 None

6
7 **4. Approval of Minutes**

8 None

9
10 **5. Continued Public Hearing**

11 None

12
13 **6. New Public Hearings**

14
15 **Case 696-S-11 Petitioner: California Ridge Wind Energy LLC and the participating landowners**
16 **listed in the legal advertisement. California Ridge Wind Energy LLC is wholly owned by**
17 **Invenergy Wind North America LLC, One South Wacker Drive, Suite 1900, Chicago, IL, with**
18 **corporate officers as listed in the legal advertisement. Request: Authorize a Wind Farm with**
19 **consists of 30 Wind Farm Towers (wind turbines) in total with a total nameplate capacity of 48**
20 **megawatts (MW) of which 28 Wind Farm Towers with a total nameplate capacity of 45 MW are**
21 **proposed in Compromise Township (Part A) and 2 Wind Farm Towers with a total nameplate**
22 **capacity of 3 MW are proposed in Ogden Township (Part B), and including access roads, wiring,**
23 **and public road improvements, and including the waivers of standard conditions in Section 6.1.4**
24 **as listed in the legal advertisement. Location: In Compromise Township the following sections**
25 **are included with exceptions as described in the legal advertisement: Sections 19, 20, 21, 28, 29,**
26 **30, 31, 32, and 33 of T21N, R14W of the 2nd P.M.; and Section 24, 25, and 36 of T21N, R10E of the**
27 **3rd P.M.; and Fractional Sections 30 and 31 of T21N, R11E of the 3rd P.M. In Ogden Township**
28 **the following sections are included with exceptions as described in the legal advertisement:**
29 **Fractional Section 6, T20N, R11E of the 3rd P.M.; and Fractional Sections 4, 5, 6 and 7 of T20N,**
30 **R14W of the 2nd P.M.; and Sections 8, 9, and 16 of T20N, R14W of the 2nd P.M.**

31
32 Mr. Thorsland asked the Petitioner’s representative if he would like to make a statement outlining the
33 nature of the request prior to introducing evidence.

34
35 Mr. Greg Leuchtmann, Invenergy project representative, stated yes.

36
37 Mr. Greg Leuchtmann, Invenergy project representative, gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding the
38 proposed special use permit. He said that Invenergy is a developer, owner and operator of large scale

ZBA

1 wind energy generation projects headquartered in Chicago with development offices in Denver, Austin
2 and Rockville, MD. He said that Invenegy is one of the top 10 wind energy developers in North
3 America, based on constructed projects over the last several years, and is the largest independent,
4 meaning unassociated with a large corporate parent, wind energy developer in the United States. He
5 said that Invenegy has completed close to 20 wind projects in the United States with over 2,200 MW of
6 capacity with more than 1,000 MW in construction or under contract all over the country and abroad.
7 He said that they also have an additional 688.5 MWs which are currently under construction in
8 Michigan and Illinois and also projects under contract which are approximately 406.5 MW.
9

10 Mr. Leuchtmann informed the Board as to who has been working on the California Ridge Project for
11 Invenegy and those people are as follows: Bryan Schueler, Senior Vice President of Development; and
12 Kevin Parzyck, Vice-President of Central Region Development; William Davidson, Land Agent and
13 himself. He said that Invenegy has been developing the project for a number of years and began in
14 August 2008. He said that they have performed wind measurements for the last 3 years by installing
15 met towers in Champaign and Vermilion County and have studied transmission requirements to connect
16 the electrical grid with Midwest Interconnect. He said that they have completed wildlife assessments
17 and studies and they are in the advanced stages of negotiating and finalizing a power purchase
18 agreement for the project currently. He said that Invenegy is working with a team of consultants for the
19 proposed project and those consultants are as follows: HDR Engineering, Inc, who is in charge of
20 permitting, noise, shadow flicker studies and decommissioning; and Western EcoSystems Technology,
21 which is a wildlife and environmental consultant, who has been doing studies related to bird and bats in
22 the project area; and BHE Environmental which takes measurements to record wildlife activity in the
23 project area; and a DNV company GEC, who records the data which is received from the met towers in
24 the project site area.
25

26 Mr. Leuchtmann stated that 48 MWs are slated for Champaign County with 214 MW being the total
27 project capacity. He said that 30 General Electric 1.6-100 wind turbine generators are proposed in
28 Champaign County with 134 turbines in the total project. He said that that there are more than 15,000
29 GE turbines in operation worldwide today. He said that the project area encompasses approximately
30 10,200 acres in Champaign County and there are approximately 26,000 acres under easement for the
31 project. He said that Invenegy looked at all of the setbacks in a geographical information system and
32 implemented participating and non-participating setbacks from dwellings, property lines, street right-of
33 way, and gas pipelines and the maps indicates those setbacks in a graphical format. He said that there
34 are a number of requirements that go into these facilities such as the ANSI standards as well as the PE
35 certification for the structural integrity of the towers. He said that there are other components of the
36 wind turbines which require review and are included in the application such as the controls and braking
37 system, electrical components, monopole construction, warning signs and FAA lights which are
38 required. He said that since the wind turbines are being constructed upon farmland they are required to

ZBA

1 provide information regarding mitigation to the damage to farmland which includes any damage to tile
2 as well as topsoil replacement, compaction, etc. He said that a requirement of the *Champaign County*
3 *Zoning Ordinance* is that they are required to complete a Roadway Upgrade and Maintenance agreement
4 and they have been negotiating with Champaign County, Compromise and Ogden Townships in
5 finalizing this agreement. He said that they have also had correspondence with the local fire protection
6 districts to see if they have any concerns regarding the proposed project. He said that one of the other
7 studies which have taken place is in regard to electromagnetic interference. He said that they submit
8 data to the National Telecommunications Information Systems Board to get information back to make
9 sure that they are not interfering with any of their requirements. He said that the Illinois Pollution
10 Control Board has noise restrictions for the State of Illinois and Invenegy has completed modeling to
11 assure that they are in compliance with those restrictions as well. He said that an Endangered Species
12 Consultation was completed with the Illinois Department of Natural Resources as well as the U.S. Fish
13 and Wildlife Service and they are continuing to proceed with the consultation process. He said that they
14 are conducting historical and archaeological reports for the Historical Preservation Agency in Illinois
15 and those consultations and reports are in process. He said that the Zoning Ordinance stipulates some
16 wildlife impacts which are listed as acceptable therefore part of what they have created with the U.S.
17 Fish and Wildlife Service is an avian and bat protection plan. He said that what is included in the
18 protection plan are certain monitoring studies as to what is being done before construction, after
19 construction and finding out what the impact will be to birds and bats after the project is in operation.
20 He said that the shadow flicker study is a model study that is based upon the layout and to assure that
21 they are within the limits of what is required in the Zoning Ordinance. He said that the Zoning
22 Ordinance liability insurance requirement is dictated in their application and not only are those
23 requirements listed but Invenegy's compliance with those requirements.

24
25 Mr. Leuchtman stated that there are operational standards that Invenegy must maintain to assure that
26 they are handling any maintenance, materials storage or hazardous components with the proper
27 requirements with agencies such as the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency. He said that the
28 Zoning Ordinance requires a decommissioning plan and site reclamation agreement and the
29 decommissioning plan has been included in the application and they are currently working on a draft of
30 the reclamation agreement to present to the County Board for consideration. He said that there are
31 several waivers which are being requested for the permit application. He said that they are requesting a
32 waiver for the 40 feet wide requirement for locations of electrical lines. He said that when the
33 collection system is put into place Invenegy is requesting that the special use area be determined once
34 they have it in place in the field and this is due to certain site issues which they run into therefore giving
35 them the ability to avoid drain tile during installation or any other field conditions that might be
36 encountered once the project begins. He said that that they are requesting a waiver for wind farm
37 facilities to be a minimum of one mile from the CR District. He said that this is a waiver that was
38 previously requested but since reviewing the waiver in the application they have changed their

ZBA

1 collection system to avoid that setback completely. He said that they have requested a waiver of the
2 requirement to submit private waivers of wind farm separation although this is not required. He said
3 that a waiver for design compliance from a third party has been requested because they are currently
4 working with GE to get design compliance for design of the wind farm turbines. He said that the wind
5 turbines are the GE 1.6-100 turbines with 100 meter rotor diameter and they are the next generation of
6 GE's 1.5 wind turbines which is the most common used turbine used today and there are over 15,000 in
7 use worldwide. He said that they hope to be able to provide the design compliance requirement for
8 review by the time of operation. He said that they are requesting a waiver for anti-climbing devices to
9 be 12 feet from the base of the structure. He said that the structures are monopole and are smooth and
10 solid structures that have lockable doors therefore there is no need for the anti-climbing devices. He
11 said that the signed roadway and upgrade and maintenance agreement is currently being worked on and
12 they are trying to address it and finalize it with the townships and the County and anticipate having it by
13 the end of the hearings and the County Board vote. He said that a waiver is being requested from the
14 standards for street upgrades and this is due to some standards which are related to the roads as well as
15 slopes for the ditches which are along the sides of the roads. He said that they are requesting a waiver
16 which is related to the Illinois Pollution Control Board regulation at the residential property line. He
17 said that they believe that the Illinois Pollution Control Board is more directly governing what the sound
18 limit is at the residence and what the land use is rather than at the property line. He said that they have
19 requested a waiver from the IDNR Agency Action Report even though they have recently received
20 consultation from the Illinois Department of Natural Resources which indicates that they do not
21 recommend that the project seek an Incidental Take Authorization. He said that they are requesting a
22 waiver for the letter of credit and escrow account for decommissioning because they would like to
23 present a more balanced approach to how the funds would flow from the time of operations for
24 decommissioning. He said that they request that the escrow amount be 25% of the total financial
25 assurance that would be calculated on the decommissioning plan so that they can take it into account if
26 and when decommissioning occurs that money would be available to get the project started but the
27 salvageable value of the project would be the item that would pay for any decommissioning expenses
28 that would be encountered. He said that the last waiver which is being requested is the zoning use
29 permit application increasing the noise impact approved in the special use permit. He said that they are
30 requesting that the noise limit that they are held always be the Illinois Pollution Control Board but the
31 language in the Ordinance stipulates that whatever they submit in the special use permit would be their
32 new limit.

33
34 Mr. Leuchtmann stated that they are excited about bringing this project to Champaign and Vermilion
35 County and some of the benefits with wind energy are zero emissions which has environmental benefits
36 from that as well as the property tax payment benefits, payments to the landowners and the job creation
37 of 150-200 jobs during construction and 10-15 fulltime operations and maintenance jobs.

38

8/25/2011

AS APPROVED SEPTEMBER 8, 2011

ZBA

1 Mr. Thorsland asked staff if there were any questions for Mr. Leuchtmann and there were none.

2
3 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Leuchtmann and there were none.

4
5 Mr. Thorsland called Mr. Michael Blazer to testify.

6
7 Mr. Michael Blazer, legal counsel for Invenergy, stated that Waiver #4 regarding design compliance is
8 not a request for a waiver from the requirement that they submit design compliance but simply asking
9 for a waiver regarding the timing. He said that this is an exhaustive process that is being conducted by a
10 third party testing agency which goes through and examines the components and also goes through and
11 examines the processes of the component manufacturers therefore it takes a long time to complete the
12 process. He said that the reason why all the testing is being conducted is because the proposed turbine
13 is an upgrade to the version of the turbine that has been used historically. He said that they are
14 requesting that they be allowed to produce design compliance prior to the time that they commence
15 commercial operation therefore they cannot start without producing the design compliance to the
16 County.

17
18 Mr. Blazer stated that Waiver #6 regarding the road agreement compliance has created extensive
19 discussions with Jeff Blue, Champaign County Highway Engineer and Cheryl Kuzma, legal counsel for
20 the township road commissioners. He said that everyone has been working very hard on the road
21 agreement and they believe that they will be able to have the road agreement complete by the end of the
22 month although that might not be possible due to the enormous amount of information that Ms. Kuzma
23 has received. He said that they are not requesting that the requirement be waived but allow that the
24 agreement be completed not at the end of the ZBA hearing but prior to the County Board final vote.

25
26 Mr. Blazer stated that Wavier #9 is in regard to the IDNR Action Report. He said that Invenergy has
27 submitted documentation from the IDNR which indicates that IDNR has terminated their consultation.
28 He said that the reason for the waiver is because the Ordinance identifies something called a
29 Consultation Agency Action Report which is an actual form which is generated by IDNR but Invenergy
30 did not obtain this information by form but by written communications and IDNR accepted it that way
31 therefore they are not requesting that the County waive the consultation requirement but to simply waive
32 the use of the form.

33
34 Mr. Blazer stated that Waiver #11 regarding the regulatory limits for noise established by the Illinois
35 Pollution Control Board (IPCB) which are limits set by the IPCB and indicated in the Administrative
36 Code and in most instances, according to the modeling, Invenergy is well below the regulatory limits.
37 He said that if the regulations established in a particular zone indicates a limit of 41 decibels and
38 Invenergy comes in at 36 decibels the Ordinance would impose a constant obligation to never exceed 36

ZBA

1 decibels and the Ordinance also requires that they constantly be in compliance with the regulations. He
2 said that Invenergy is requesting to waive the requirement that would in effect ratchet down the
3 regulatory limit to what the modeling reflects at the time.

4
5 Mr. Blazer requested that the following documents be placed as Documents of Record for Case 696-S-
6 11: 1. Application submitted by California Ridge; and 2. Notices of the legal advertisement; and 3.
7 Letter from IDNR dated August 18, 2011; and 4. Updated Project Setback Map. He said that if anyone
8 has any questions regarding the noise issue Tim Casey, Senior Environmental Scientist for HDR is
9 present tonight to address those questions and concerns. He said that Mr. Casey's resume has been
10 distributed for the Board's review and he requested that the resume also be added as a Document of
11 Record.

12
13 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Mr. Blazer and there were none.

14
15 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were questions for Mr. Blazer.

16
17 Ms. Capel requested that Mr. Blazer clarify requested waiver #8.

18
19 Mr. Blazer stated that the IPCB noise regulations are based on what is called land based classification
20 standards and those standards are based on land use and not on property boundaries. He said that there
21 is an Illinois Pollution Control Board opinion which directly addresses this issue. He said that when
22 you are measuring the impact on a parcel the issue is whether you measure at the boundary or at the
23 residence which is a significant issue because farmland is considered Class C land which imposes much
24 higher limits and you can distribute more noise on Class C land. He said that residential land is
25 considered Class A land and the limits are much more strict especially night time standards. He said
26 that the issue arises when there is Class C property with a Class A use and where the measurement is
27 taken to determine the impact and the IPCB has ruled that the measurement is taken at the Class A use
28 and not the property boundary unless it just so happens that the house is located along the edge of the
29 road.

30
31 Mr. Thorsland informed the audience that this is an Administrative Case and as such the County allows
32 anyone the opportunity to cross examine any witness. He said that at the proper time he will ask for a
33 show of hands for those who would like to cross examine and each person will be called upon. He
34 requested that anyone called to cross examine go to the cross examination microphone to ask any
35 questions. He said that those who desire to cross examine are not required to sign the witness register
36 but are requested to clearly state their name before asking any questions. He noted that no new
37 testimony is to be given during the cross examination. He said that attorneys who have complied with
38 Article 6.5 of the ZBA By-Laws are exempt from cross examination.

ZBA

1
2 Mr. Hall distributed a new Supplemental Memorandum dated August 25, 2011, to the Board for review.
3 He said that the Board is expecting a rather thick Summary of Evidence but it is not ready. He said that
4 staff has received several calls regarding the waivers therefore the new Supplemental Memorandum
5 basically does what Mr. Leutchmann's presentation did in regard to the waivers in that it reviews all of
6 the waivers. He said that the Supplemental Memorandum has Attachment B, Table of Necessary
7 Waivers, which simply tries to point out in a simple, quick way that many of the waivers are not 100%
8 waivers but are deferrals or deal with a technical requirement. He said that Attachment C, Relevant
9 Considerations for Necessary Waivers, reviews each waiver. He said that the Board members are aware
10 that the waivers of standard conditions require specific findings and as it was determined in a recent
11 hearing that the Ordinance needs to require all of the findings for a typical variance for any waiver of a
12 standard condition. He said that along with each of the waivers described in Attachment C he has listed
13 relevant evidence and has included an area for findings so that the Board members can find Attachment
14 C useful in preparing for the final determination. He said that he is still struggling with some of the
15 waivers in trying to understand exactly what is going on, for example, the waiver regarding the Bureau
16 of Local Road Standards. He said that he has heard different things from people therefore he hopes to
17 provide additional evidence on that standard as early as perhaps the next hearing but he believes that the
18 Board will not know everything about the road agreement until the road agreement is public. He said
19 that when the legal advertisement was published in July it appeared that the County would not have a
20 road agreement by September 29th. He said that if the waiver had not been included in the legal
21 advertisement there was no way that the public hearing would end in September therefore the waiver
22 was included and a close reading of the highway commissioner's letter indicates that they may be
23 opposed to the waiver which means that either the road agreement is completed by September 29th or
24 the public hearing goes past September 29th. He said that he believes that everyone who is involved in
25 the negotiations is making a good faith effort to get the negotiation over and if the Board recommends
26 approval on the waiver it does not stop negotiations and does allow them to continue but it is up to the
27 Board to decide whether the waiver is a good thing or bad thing. He said that he anticipates an update
28 regarding the road agreement at every meeting. He said that the last attachment to the Supplemental
29 Memorandum are excerpts from the Illinois Pollution Control Board Noise Regulations and he and Mr.
30 Blazer have discussed what the regulations really mean and he has informed Mr. Blazer that if he so
31 desires he can request the State's Attorney's opinion but Mr. Blazer did not feel that the State's
32 Attorney's opinion was required at this time. Mr. Hall stated that he has included the waiver because he
33 believes that it is necessary but if the Board feels differently the waiver can be eliminated.

34
35 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Hall and there were none.

36
37 Mr. Thorsland reminded the audience that they must sign the witness register in order to present
38 testimony and read the oath which is located on the witness register.

ZBA

1
2 Mr. Thorsland called Mr. Dan Shearin to testify.
3
4 Mr. Dan Shearin, who resides at 2431 Park Lake Drive, Morris, Illinois stated that he grew up on a farm
5 in northern Illinois and went to work at some side jobs and one of those jobs was with Enron which
6 eventually went bankrupt. He said that luckily he did not go bankrupt with Enron and was able to get
7 out in time and began a business with his wife that employed 27 employees and eventually sold that
8 company. He said that he and his wife are self-employed and they live on a certain percentile of their
9 assets through the interest rates therefore he purchased an 80 acre tract in Champaign County for a
10 percentile of return from a contract for a wind turbine. He said that the investment would have worked
11 but, due to State law the increase in the 1.5 mile offset from a municipality, the wind turbine contract
12 fell through which is similar to a situation that happened to them in a different county. He said that they
13 moved their investment to Champaign County and most likely they will move their investment to a
14 different location. He said that we all hear about interest rates and if you have a stable job the interest
15 rates may not mean much to you but if you have \$300,000 in the bank and you are someone who can't
16 work a drop in interest rate is a drop in their pay. He said that the world is involved in three wars.
17 Mr. Thorsland interrupted Mr. Shearin and requested that his testimony only focus on the proposed
18 project.
19
20 Mr. Shearin stated that his testimony is pro-wind and the County should help take care of the farmers
21 and the land owners and allow the wind farm to go through and encouraged the Board to stick up for our
22 soldiers because the wind farm could save a lot of oil because we do not need to be purchasing oil from
23 other countries.
24
25 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Mr. Shearin and there were none
26
27 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Shearin and there were none.
28
29 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone desired to cross examine Mr. Shearin and there was no one.
30
31 Mr. Thorsland called Ms. Kim Camberon to testify.
32
33 Ms. Kim Cambron, who resides at 2736 E CR 3700N, Rankin, Illinois stated that she has been
34 educating herself as to the wind industry and brought information to the Board to submit as Documents
35 of Record. She said that one of the documents is a letter dated May 8, 2011, from Gerry Meyer which
36 was submitted to the Vermilion County Board during their wind farm hearings. She said that the
37 proposed project encompasses two counties and she has looked over the application for Champaign
38 County and educated herself about the information for the requested waivers. She said that the County

ZBA

1 Board set up standards for such an industrial facility and she does not believe that any waivers should be
2 granted and at the time of application the standards should be met. She asked that the Board not grant
3 any of the requested waivers because the regulations are there for a reason. She said that there is a
4 project which is also being developed near the Paxton area and she would invite anyone from the Board
5 to drive up there and view that project. She said that she lives where Ford, Vermilion and Champaign
6 counties meets and she could see the crane installing the first wind turbine in Ford County which is a
7 perfect example of how what goes on in one county effects others who live in a nearby adjacent county.
8 She requested that the Board dig in their heels and protect the people of Champaign County by
9 enforcing the Ordinance.

10

11 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Ms. Cambron and there were none.

12

13 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Ms. Cambron and there were none.

14

15 Mr. Thorsland asked Ms. Cambron if she had a signed copy of Mr. Meyer's letter.

16

17 Ms. Cambron stated that Mr. Meyer e-mailed his letter to her but she could call Mr. Meyer and request a
18 signed copy of his letter or the Board could call Mr. Meyer themselves and request a signed copy.

19

20 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone desired to cross examine Ms. Cambron and there was no
21 one.

22

23 Mr. Thorsland called Mr. Dwight Redding to testify.

24

25 Mr. Dwight Redding, who resides at 2315 E. Main Street, Urbana, Illinois, stated that his main interest
26 is in general. He said that he has driven across the country in numerous areas and seen many, many
27 wind mills and he is curious about the noise. He asked if there were any given figures as to what the
28 decibels are that the wind turbine emits at the site, at 1/8th of a mile and at 1/4 of a mile. He said
29 generally speaking he is in favor of the wind turbines although some people do not want one in their
30 backyard although if they had the opportunity to house one, they would smile all the way to the bank
31 and they would leave their ear muffs at home. He said that if all of these questions that have come
32 forward over this project had arisen years ago we would not have a cross-country train.

33

34 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Mr. Redding.

35

36 Mr. Hall stated that he did not have a question for Mr. Redding but informed him that if he would like
37 to call the office he could provide the noise information which was included in the wind farm
38 application.

ZBA

1
2 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Redding and there were none.

3
4 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if any desired to cross examine Mr. Redding and there was no one.

5
6 Mr. Thorsland called Mr. Micheal Herbert to testify.

7
8 Mr. Michael Herbert, who resides at 1092 CR 1500E, Philo, Illinois stated that he is the representative
9 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers #601 in Champaign, Illinois. He said that as the
10 financial secretary he represents all of Champaign County, Livingston County and portions of 10 other
11 counties. He said that they currently have 364 turbines in their jurisdiction and with the 100 proposed in
12 Paxton there will be over 400. He said that the proposed 30 wind turbines in Champaign County are a
13 small portion of the proposed project. He said that the proposed wind farm will create jobs and the
14 Danville Area Community College is installing a wind turbine so that they can train people to do the
15 maintenance on the turbines. He said that although the classes are in Danville there are people in the
16 Champaign area who could take the training classes in Danville. He said that he has worked with
17 Invenergy before and he can attest that they build quality projects and having driven on the roads after
18 the projects are complete he can also attest that the roads are as good or better when the project is
19 complete. He said that the proposed turbines in Champaign County would probably only create 15 jobs
20 for his local but the overall project would create 35 or 40 jobs. He said that his local has spent over
21 \$12,000 dollars for tower rescue training and he has 20 people who are tower rescued trained and 50
22 more who are tower experienced and they are positioned to help complete this project and assure that it
23 is safe. He said that it is true that the first wind tower base was put into place in Ford County. He said
24 that the wind turbines are noticeable from a far distance but it is his opinion that there is not much noise
25 generated from the wind turbines.

26
27 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Mr. Herbert and there were none.

28
29 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Herbert and there were none.

30
31 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone desire to cross examine Mr. Herbert and there was no one.

32
33 Mr. Thorsland called Mr. Michael Jarboe to testify.

34
35 Mr. Michael Jarboe, who resides at 2792 CR 2400N, Penfield, Illinois stated that he would like
36 additional clarification regarding Waiver #10 regarding the decommissioning agreement.

37
38 Mr. Hall stated that no decommissioning agreement has been received to date but Invenergy is working

8/25/2011

AS APPROVED SEPTEMBER 8, 2011

ZBA

1 on a draft for review.

2
3 Mr. Jarboe stated that he believes that this is a worthwhile project because it will help our schools a lot
4 and he is aware that the wind farm ordinance will affect the whole county at some point but currently it
5 only affects his community. He said that Invenergy appears to be a good company and he would like to
6 see the project move forward.

7
8 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Mr. Jarboe and there were none.

9
10 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Jarboe and there were none.

11
12 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone desired to cross examine Mr. Jarboe and there was no one.

13
14 Mr. Courson asked Mr. Jarboe if he had any examples as to how the wind farm will assist the school
15 systems.

16
17 Mr. Jarboe stated no, he has only heard rumors that they well. He said that if anyone has figures
18 regarding how the wind farm will assist the schools then it should be made public.

19
20 Mr. Leutchmann stated that the wind turbines are assessed on a state wide basis therefore in terms of
21 dollars each tower is assessed on a \$360,000 dollar basis annually and that increases with inflation and
22 based on that assessment and what county or school district you are located in it is taxed on that basis.
23 He said that he is not sure what exact amount would go to a school district but it is a substantial
24 property tax benefit.

25
26 Mr. Jarboe asked Mr. Leutchmann if it decreases over a period of time or does it stay the same each
27 year.

28
29 Mr. Leutchmann stated that it is his understanding that it remains the same each year.

30
31 Mr. Jarboe stated that he would like to see the project move forward.

32
33 Mr. Thorsland asked if there were any additional questions for Mr. Jarboe and there were none.

34
35 Mr. Thorsland called Mr. James Rusk to testify.

36
37 Mr. Rusk declined to testify at this time.

38

ZBA

1 Mr. Thorsland called Mr. Marvin Johnson to testify.
2
3 Mr. Marvin Johnson, Compromise Township Highway Commissioner, stated that he submitted a letter
4 to the Board indicating that he would like to see the requirements for Waivers #6 and 7 stay in place
5 because of the issues that will be dealt with during the road agreement.
6
7 Mr. Thorsland clarified that Mr. Johnson does not want the Board to grant the waivers as requested.
8
9 Mr. Johnson stated that Mr. Thorsland was correct. He said that everything is moving along really well
10 and he would like to see it remain that way.
11
12 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Mr. Johnson and there were none.
13
14 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Johnson and there were none.
15
16 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone desired to cross examine Mr. Johnson and there was no
17 one.
18
19 Mr. Thorsland called Mr. Doug Bluhm to testify.
20
21 Mr. Doug Bluhm, who resides at 2019 CR 2500E, St. Joseph, Illinois stated that he is a member of the
22 Ogden Township Board and he would like to see the decommissioning and road agreements reviewed
23 and approved in a public setting because once the public setting is past the pressure will be on and it
24 would be better to handle the agreements out in the open in the public eye. He said that the
25 decommissioning waiver is a concern in regards to using scrap value because at that point the value
26 could be down. He said that if there is brand new technology which is coming out that quickly then
27 whatever is in existence will more than likely not have much value therefore he would rather see some
28 type of agreement which is more standard to what the Zoning Ordinance has in it because using scrap
29 metal prices is a shot in the dark. He said that he is not against the project and would like to see it move
30 forward but the road commissioner has spent three years in trying to get a road agreement in place with
31 Invenergy therefore everything should be out in the open so that everyone can see it.
32
33 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Mr. Bluhm.
34
35 Mr. Hall asked Mr. Bluhm if it is his opinion that even using the lowest value for scrap metal for the last
36 ten years is not acceptable.
37
38 Mr. Bluhm stated no. He said that testimony has been given that the turbines have already changed in

ZBA

1 two years from the standard turbine to a brand new turbine and no data is even available for the Board to
2 review. He said that if this type of technology progresses it will be unknown what the old head will be
3 worth if the new equipment is available. He said that the Board could figure the decommissioning at
4 whatever the scrap metal price is currently and then the Board will have an idea of what the turbines are
5 worth.

6
7 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Bluhm and there were none.

8
9 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone desired to cross examine Mr. Bluhm.

10
11 Mr. Matt Cavalenes, who resides in Catlin, stated that he agrees with Mr. Bluhm.

12
13 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone else desired to cross examine Mr. Bluhm and there was no
14 one.

15
16 Mr. Thorsland called Deanne Sims to testify.

17
18 Ms. Deanne Sims, who resides at 2765 CR 2500N, Penfield, Illinois stated that if you review the map
19 you will find that her residence will be surrounded by turbines. She said that she is not sure if the Board
20 has taken a field trip to see where the turbines are proposed to be located but it may be worth the drive.
21 She said that a lot of people may think that northeast Champaign County may be just a bunch of dirt and
22 a few houses but one of those houses happens to be her home that she has lived in for 21 years and
23 raised her family in. She said that to see this whole project evolve is very disturbing to her because they
24 live in the area of the proposed wind farm and they commute to Champaign because they feel that it is
25 worth the drive but if the wind farm is approved it won't be worth the drive anymore. She said that she
26 agrees with previous testimony regarding denial of the waivers. She said that she can remember rumors
27 from the neighbors that the road commissioner isn't going to do much with the roads because the wind
28 farm company is going to come in and make the roads perfect but according the letter that she received
29 in the mail the wind company is requesting waivers for the road agreement. She asked who will fix the
30 roads after the wind farm company is gone and whose taxes will increase to pay for any repairs. She
31 said that she does not believe that the tax money that will be received will do anything but maybe offset
32 the increase in personal property taxes. She said that it is her understanding that 40% to 100% of the
33 value of a home is lost when a turbine is located on or near the property and she will have a turbine right
34 outside her back door, one on either side and three in the section which is in front of her home. She said
35 that this is the first time that she has been invited to anything in regards to the proposed wind farm
36 project. She said that she is not part of the Champaign County Farm Bureau because they do not own
37 farmland so when she received a letter in the mail she was very excited. She said that she agrees with
38 Mr. Bluhm in regards to the decommissioning.

8/25/2011

AS APPROVED SEPTEMBER 8, 2011

ZBA

1
2 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Ms. Sims and there were none.
3
4 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Ms. Sims.
5
6 Mr. Courson informed Ms. Sims that County Board meetings are published in the News Gazette.
7
8 Ms. Sims stated that she only receives the News Gazette on Sunday.
9
10 Mr. Courson stated that he does not receive the paper at home either but he does review it on line.
11
12 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone desired to cross examine Ms. Sims and there was no one.
13
14 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone else desired to sign the witness register to present testimony
15 regarding Case 696-S-11.
16
17 Mr. Blazer stated that the last witness expressed a concern with respect to the waiver of the Local Road
18 Standards. He said that Invenergy is not asking the Board to waive basic road standards although the
19 Local Road Standards could require that a road be widened where it is not necessary therefore making
20 the project economically infeasible. He said that they are entering into road agreements with all of the
21 appropriate road authorities whether it be the townships or the County that will require Invenergy to fix
22 a road that they damage or if in advance they believe that they will damage a road they will upgrade the
23 road in advance. He said that the Local Road Standards will add an additional layer of requirements
24 over and above what is being agreed to do that simply are unwarranted and economically infeasible. He
25 said that Invenergy is not asking the Board to abandon road standards. He said that in regards to the
26 request that an extension be granted to have the road agreement prior to the County Board meeting does
27 not mean that Invenergy is trying to negotiate the road agreement in a non-public way because it will be
28 addressed during a public forum. He said that the problem is that between he and the attorney for the
29 applicable road districts there is a monumental amount of work to complete and it may not be done
30 before the ZBA is done deliberating.
31
32 Mr. Blazer said that Mr. Leutchmann can address the concern regarding the scrap metal value. He said
33 that we are not dealing with the value of a wind turbine but commodity value. He said that when a road
34 is torn out to repair it the rebar is salvaged because the rebar is a commodity that has a value. He said
35 that when a demolition contractor is contracted they always build the scrap value of the commodities
36 into the ultimate price that they are going to charge for tearing the facility down.
37
38 Mr. Leutchmann stated that the value that is being included in the decommissioning plan does look at

8/25/2011

AS APPROVED SEPTEMBER 8, 2011

ZBA

1 the potential scrap value for steel and does not include the scrap value for gravel or concrete that would
2 be extracted. He said that the gravel and concrete would still be extracted and is not an expense
3 recognized in the decommissioning plan because the value is simply the steel in the turbine towers.
4
5 Mr. Blazer stated the difference in the GE 1.5 and 1.6 does not mean apples and oranges because the
6 materials are the same and they are not fundamentally different.
7
8 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Mr. Blazer and there were none.
9
10 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Blazer.
11
12 Mr. Passalacqua asked if the GE 1.5 turbines are UL certified.
13
14 Mr. Leutchmann stated that there are a few different organizations which implement that certification
15 therefore it is either UL, GL, etc.
16
17 Mr. Blazer stated that anytime there is an upgrade it is important that the product is certified and the
18 agency which is certifying the upgrade is one of the agencies which is discussed in the Ordinance.
19
20 Mr. Leutchmann stated that there are three others listed and this is an equivalent third party that does the
21 same design compliance analysis that has been done for other turbines.
22
23 Mr. Thorsland asked if there were any additional questions for Mr. Leutchmann.
24
25 Mr. James Beauchamp, 1002 Eliot Dr, Urbana, Illinois asked Mr. Leutchmann to indicate what pays for
26 the decommissioning other than the scrap metal value.
27
28 Mr. Leutchmann stated that the analysis that is completed for the decommissioning plan reviews all of
29 the expenses for removing the turbines including the crane and removing the foundation in the soil. He
30 said that the total expense for decommissioning is reviewed as well as the steel that would come from
31 the turbine tower itself therefore based on that information they are recommending that the financial
32 assurance be based on both those numbers and not just the expense number. He said that the Letter of
33 Credit and escrow would be the initial forms of what will be used to pay for the expense of going
34 through this process.
35
36 Mr. Beauchamp stated that he did not ask how much it would cost he asked where the money would
37 come from.
38

8/25/2011

AS APPROVED SEPTEMBER 8, 2011

ZBA

1 Mr. Leutchmann stated that it would be a Letter of Credit and an escrow account and they are requesting
2 a waiver to be able to do both.

3
4 Mr. Beauchamp asked if the money would be set into place at the beginning.

5
6 Mr. Leutchmann stated that at the time of operation the financial assurance will be in place.

7
8 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if there were any additional questions for Mr. Leutchmann.

9
10 Mr. Rob Parker, who resides at 467 CR 2500N, Mahomet, Illinois asked why Invenergy doesn't give a
11 guarantee with cash in the escrow and when it is all said and done if there is scrap value then Invenergy
12 could put that money in their pocket. He asked why the County should bear that risk when it is to
13 Invenergy's financial gain.

14
15 Mr. Leutchmann stated that a demolition contractor who would be contracted to demolish a similar
16 facility would look at the scrap metal and include that in the price.

17
18 Mr. Parker asked if Invenergy has a contractor that will guarantee a bid for the future if the wind farm
19 requires decommissioning.

20
21 Mr. Leutchmann stated that no one knows what the scrap metal price will be in the next twenty years.
22 He said that Invenergy is requesting the opportunity to update the decommissioning plan and financial
23 assurance as the years move forward. He said that no one can give assurance as to what will happen in
24 the future due to commodity inflation and increases in wages therefore that is why they are requesting
25 that they have the opportunity to adjust it as the project moves forward.

26
27 Mr. Parker stated that in worst case the steel is worth nothing and if that is what the decommissioning
28 plan is based upon who will pay the difference.

29
30 Mr. Leutchmann stated that if scrap metal is worth nothing then there are bigger problems which exist.

31
32 Mr. Parker stated that if Invenergy goes bust and he has a junk wind turbine in his back yard then why
33 should someone else have to bear the cost of tearing down the junk turbine.

34
35 Mr. Leutchmann stated that what is securing the project is Invenergy which is a company that produces
36 and goes after projects where they have power purchase agreements. He said that the benefit of having
37 a contract like that is that they are selling power for twenty years to a company guaranteeing that they
38 are securing a project under a contract to a utility and guaranteeing that they are selling power for two

ZBA

1 decades. He said that he understands that decommissioning is only a secondary security for the County
2 and that is all that it is meant to be but the true security is how Invenenergy conducts their project and how
3 they move forward. He said that they have to look at the scrap value because that is how it has been
4 done in other decommissioning projects and that is what their professional engineer recommended.
5
6 Mr. Thorsland pointed out that there is no decommissioning agreement on the table for debate.
7
8 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone else desired to cross examine Mr. Leutchmann.
9
10 Ms. Cambron stated that the blades are not steel but fiberglass therefore how will they be dealt with in
11 the decommissioning process.
12
13 Mr. Leutchmann stated that the expense that would be incurred for the fiberglass blades would be the
14 expense of hauling off the blades and attempting to recycle them. He said that unfortunately fiberglass
15 is difficult to recycle therefore many times it is taken to a landfill.
16
17 Mr. Thorsland called Ms. Debra Griest to testify.
18
19 Ms. Debra Griest, who resides at 1802 Cindy Lynn, Urbana, Illinois, stated that she previously served
20 on the ZBA and this is a project which is near and dear to her heart. She encouraged the Board, as some
21 of the other witnesses have done, to make sure that the public has an opportunity at this Board to review
22 the road agreement and the reclamation agreement and discuss it in public forum. She said that she
23 understands the petitioner's position that they would have a limited opportunity to comment on that
24 agreement prior to a County Board vote but this is the Board where those discussions actually occur
25 constructively. She encouraged the Board to not waive those agreements and take away the public's
26 right to review those agreements and discuss them in an open forum for both the road agreement and the
27 reclamation proposal. She said that as the Chairman so noted there is no reclamation agreement to
28 digest and she believes that the public should have that opportunity.
29
30 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Ms. Griest and there were none.
31
32 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Ms. Griest and there were none.
33
34 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone desired to cross examine Ms. Griest and there was no one.
35
36 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone desired to sign the witness register to present testimony
37 regarding this case.
38

ZBA

1 Mr. Thorsland called Mr. Bill Ingram to testify.

2
3 Mr. Bill Ingram, who resides in Danville, Illinois, stated that he appreciates what the Board is doing
4 tonight and he is probably a small voice crying out. He said that he does not wish to offend anyone but
5 he fully believes that everyone should have the full amount of information available. He said that he
6 has a couple of handouts that his assistant can provide if interested. He said that knowledge is power
7 therefore if the Board had the knowledge of the history of wind farms the Board would run out of the
8 room. He noted that he has no affiliation with the wind company. He said that 150 years ago wind
9 power was dissolved because it was considered insufficient but there has been a new twist placed on it.
10 He said that global warming exists and there isn't much that we can do about it or the CO² that we are
11 trying to eliminate with our coal use. He said that everyone in this room is emitting CO². He said that
12 the legislators have mandated that the power companies use green energy when available but if you take
13 your electrical bill and multiply it by 3 or 4 you will find that green energy is not affordable. He said
14 that we make it affordable by dipping into everyone's pocket and subsidizing these wind farms with
15 about a 60% subsidy. He said that the cost of one windmill assembled on site is approximately 2-1/2
16 million dollars and 60% of that as a subsidy makes it very attractive to developers. He said that some of
17 the countries in Europe have folded and they have pulled the subsidies and as soon as they did the wind
18 mill farms and the owners leave therefore it is very good that Champaign County is asking about the
19 decommissioning because the foundation is not three feet deep but twelve feet. He said that the
20 standard procedure in many cases is that you are given the option of having a wind mill on your property
21 and paid \$500 dollars per month for 30 years without having to do anything. He said that it is unknown
22 as to how many years the turbines last but it is very hard to obtain anything from a company that does
23 not exist even if you have a piece of paper. He said that as of this time with all of the windmills that
24 everyone has seen all over the country they are only producing less than one 1% of the power that this
25 country uses. He said that only 1% of our energy is produced by oil and all of our oil comes from the
26 Middle East, Venezuela, Libya and Canada. He said that the country is economically going down the
27 toilet and we are going to subsidize something like 60% of a wind farm.

28
29 Mr. Thorsland stated that rather than reviewing one of the handouts that Mr. Ingram previously
30 mentioned he has submitted the document "Fifteen Bad Things with Windpower and Three Reasons
31 Why." He asked Mr. Ingram to please stick with the items that are relevant to this particular
32 application.

33
34 Mr. Ingram stated that the reclamation is good except there are 54 yards of concrete and the Board
35 should ask how much of that concrete will be reclaimed when the wind farm goes out of business. He
36 said that he has a lot of information if anyone is interested and reminded the Board that knowledge is
37 power and if the Board has no knowledge then it is only being used as a pawn by the people who do
38 have the knowledge.

8/25/2011

AS APPROVED SEPTEMBER 8, 2011

ZBA

1
2 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Mr. Ingram and there were none.
3
4 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Ingram and there were none.
5
6 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone desired to cross examine Mr. Ingram and there were none.
7
8 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone desired to sign the witness register to present testimony
9 regarding this case and there was no one.
10
11 Mr. Thorsland closed the witness register for tonight's hearing.
12
13 Mr. Thorsland stated that he would like to make sure that the following items are included as
14 Documents of Record: 1. IDNR letter dated August 18, 2011; and 2. Resume for Tim Casey, Sr.
15 Environmental Scientist with HDR; and 3. Letter from Mr. Meyer submitted by Kim Cambron.
16
17 Mr. Hall reminded the Board that the witness register has been closed for tonight but Tim Casey is here
18 to address any questions or concerns that the Board may have regarding noise. He said that he does not
19 believe that Mr. Casey is going to come to Champaign-Urbana for each of the next three Thursday
20 evenings and if he is then that would be great but the County does not have a noise consultant and Mr.
21 Casey is here tonight for Invenergy and if the Board has any questions now would be the time to ask.
22
23 Mr. Blazer stated that the Board has received a lot of information to digest and Mr. Casey is available to
24 come back to the September 1st meeting if the Board so desires.
25
26 Mr. Thorsland thanked Mr. Blazer and Mr. Casey.
27
28 Mr. Thorsland requested a motion to continue Case 696-S-11 to the September 1st meeting.
29
30 **Mr. Miller moved, seconded by Mr. Schroeder to continue Case 696-S-11 to the September 1,**
31 **2011, meeting. The motion carried by voice vote.**
32
33 Mr. Passalacqua stated that he would like to see a map of the project area indicating best prime
34 farmland.
35
36 Mr. Hall stated that staff has not received a map indicating best prime farmland but it is easily available
37 from the GIS Consortium.
38

ZBA

1 Mr. Thorsland stated that the Board will recess to allow the meeting room to clear but requested that the
2 staff from Invenergy remain.

3
4 **The Board recessed at 8:35 p.m.**

5 **The Board resumed at 8:47 p.m.**

6
7 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there was any additional information required for review from
8 Invenergy or staff.

9
10 Mr. Thorsland stated that he does not expect to have the road agreement or decommissioning agreement
11 to be completed at the next meeting but he is sure that the Board would appreciate an update on how
12 things are going and if anything is being moved forward he would like to keep it in the public record.

13
14 Mr. Blazer stated that he will check with Cheryl Kuzma to see if she has any issue with him sharing
15 their communication with John Hall. He said that during the last three or four weeks there is a very
16 large paper trail as to what has been discussed and allowance to share that communication would allow
17 the Board to see what is going on. He said that he will check with Ms. Kuzma tomorrow but he does
18 not see a reason why she would have any problem with sharing the information and if she does not he
19 will forward the information to John Hall by which he can forward it to the Board.

20
21 Mr. Thorsland thanked Mr. Casey for making himself available for the September 1st meeting. He said
22 that if there are questions or concerns regarding noise then the next meeting would be a great time to
23 address those questions and concerns.

24
25 Mr. Blazer stated that he would be more than happy to provide the IPCB decision regarding where the
26 noise levels are measured from on Class C and Class A land uses.

27
28 Mr. Passalacqua stated that he has not seen any wind resource data and why the chosen location for the
29 project area is suitable for the wind farm.

30
31 Mr. Courson stated that he would like to review information regarding what the percentage of output for
32 the wind farm will be per turbine.

33
34 Mr. Leutchmann stated that he will provide the requested information at the next meeting.

35
36 Mr. Thorsland reminded Mr. Leutchmann to send staff a hard copy of his Power Point presentation for
37 the record.

38

ZBA

1 Mr. Hall cautioned the Board that it would be nice to have all of the requested items but everyone
2 knows how much can be done within one week. He said that he almost made a mistake last week in
3 sharing information with the Board without receiving approvals from everyone therefore he wants the
4 Board to be careful. He said that he does not know why it has taken two years to not even have
5 something to review but that is what happened and trying to get this done by the end of September may
6 not be possible. He said that the Board should not be afraid to go past September rather than disturb the
7 delicate negotiation that has been going on for two years and the Board still has nothing to look at
8 although he is not saying that it should go on for three years either. He said that he does hope that
9 things change but expecting something within seven days is probably unrealistic and if Invenergy is
10 willing to try then that is fantastic but he doubts that it will happen.

11
12 Mr. Passalacqua stated that the information that he requested should be readily available for review.

13
14 Mr. Hall stated that the Ordinance does not require data as to how good the wind resource is at the
15 proposed location for the wind farm because the business' assessment is trusted as to where they can do
16 their business therefore the reason why the special use permit is being requested.

17
18 Mr. Blazer stated that if the Board is requesting specific information they will provide it.

19
20 **7. Staff Report**

21 Mr. Hall stated that phone interviews have been conducted with candidates for the Associate Planner's
22 position and he hopes to be arranging in-person interviews next week.

23
24 **8. Other Business**

25 **A. Review of ZBA Docket**

26 Mr. Thorsland requested that the Board review the distributed docket. He said that there are a lot of
27 meetings scheduled for September and Board attendance would be appreciated.

28
29 Ms. Capel asked if the wind farm meetings were to continue beyond September what would be the
30 earliest date that Case 696-S-11 could be docketed.

31
32 Mr. Hall stated that staff will check availability of the Lyle Shields Meeting Room for October 6th and
33 27th.

34
35 **9. Audience Participation with respect to matters other than cases pending before the Board**

36 None

37
38 **10. Adjournment**

8/25/2011

AS APPROVED SEPTEMBER 8, 2011

ZBA

1 Mr. Thorsland requested a motion to adjourn.

2
3 **Ms. Capel moved, seconded by Mr. Passalacqua to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried by**
4 **voice vote.**

5
6 **The meeting adjourned at 8:59 p.m.**

7
8
9 Respectfully submitted

10
11
12
13
14 Secretary of Zoning Board of Appeals

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

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

DRAFT SUBJECT TO APPROVAL DRAFT ZBA //

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8