

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

CHAMPAIGN COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

1776 E. Washington Street

Urbana, IL 61801

DATE: February 26, 2009

**PLACE: Lyle Shields Meeting Room
1776 East Washington Street**

TIME: 6:30 p.m.

Urbana, IL 61802

MEMBERS PRESENT: Catherine Capel, Thomas Courson, Melvin Schroeder, Eric Thorsland, Paul Palmgren

MEMBERS ABSENT : Doug Bluhm, Roger Miller

STAFF PRESENT : Lori Busboom, Jamie Hitt, Leroy Holliday, J.R. Knight, Christina Papavasiliou (Assistant State's Attorney)

OTHERS PRESENT : Chris Doenitz, Al Kurtz, Shirley Schroeder, Brad Uken, Andrew Larson, John Doster, Herb Schildt, Sherry Schildt, Tom Swierczewski, Steve Burdin, Eric McKeever, Russ Taylor, Bruce Stickers, Dwight Farber, Jamie Stevens, Kenn Davis, Birgit McCall, Rob Parker, Stephanie Holderfield, John Chandler, Kim Schertz, Vince Early, John Lannon, Barbara Gerdes, Marvin Johnson, William Davidson, Bill Routh, Bud Parkhill, Gerald Henry, Carl Smith, Bill Fabian, Dean Rose, Dwight Farber, Brian Sullivan, Don Wauthier, Vic Smith

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

Mr. Knight informed the Zoning Board that Mr. Doug Bluhm, Chair, is absent tonight therefore the Board needs to appoint an interim Chair for tonight's meeting.

Mr. Palmgren moved, seconded by Ms. Capel to appoint Eric Thorsland as interim Chair for the February 26, 2009, Zoning Board of Appeals meeting. The motion carried by voice vote.

2. Roll Call and Declaration of Quorum

The roll was called and a quorum declared present.

3. Correspondence

None

4. Approval of Minutes (February 12, 2009)

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
43
44

Ms. Capel moved, seconded by Mr. Courson to approve the February 12, 2009, minutes as submitted.
The motion carried by voice vote.

5. Continued Public Hearing

Case 634-AT-08 Petitioner: **Zoning Administrator** Request: **Amend the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance as follows: A. Authorize the County Board to approve Special Use Permits (SUP) and to change the requirements for development of wind turbine developments (wind farms) to a County Board Special Use Permit (CBSUP) and a rezoning to the new Wind Farm Overlay Zoning District (WFO); B. Change the requirements for private wind turbines; and C. Add a requirement for a CBSUP for subdivisions in a Rural Residential Overlay.**

Mr. Thorsland requested that County Board members refrain from presenting testimony at tonight’s public hearing.

Mr. Knight stated that due to staff illness there is no new information to present at tonight’s meeting although staff intends to present a lot of information at the next meeting. He said that the biggest difference between a rezoning and a Special Use Permit is formal protest rights. He said that in a Special Use Permit the adjacent landowners, townships and municipalities do not have formal protest rights although they are welcome to attend the meeting and voice their concerns to the Board. He said that in a rezoning the landowners that own property which is adjacent to the subject property for rezoning and townships that have plan commissions have formal protest rights. He said that the landowners and plan commissions can file their protest with the County Clerk which will raise the requirement for a super-majority vote for approval by the County Board.

Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Knight.

Ms. Capel asked if a Map Amendment would be required each time a wind farm is proposed.

Mr. Knight stated yes. He said that each time a wind farm is proposed a Wind Farm Overlay Zoning District (WFO) and a County Board Special Use Permit (CBSUP) would be required.

Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any additional questions for Mr. Knight and there were none.

Mr. Andrew Larson, Superintendent for Heritage School District stated that Heritage Schools is a K-12 district located in the southeast corner of Champaign County. He said that the school district covers about 105 square miles, has 540 students and their existing assessed valuation is \$60 million. He said that he is attending the meeting tonight as an advocate not only for the school district but also as a community member of the Broadlands area and is in support of the proposed wind farm project. He said that it is often a struggle for rural school districts to generate dollars for continued funding of their projects and they do not have the luxury of some of the bigger districts that have the residential and commercial properties that generate property tax dollars for their districts. He said that he understands the importance of zoning regulations but he fears that if the process for approving the proposed project drags on the developers could

2/26/09

AS APPROVED MARCH 12, 2009

ZBA

1 move elsewhere. He said that the development of this project in Champaign County will put us on the map
2 as a big time player regarding cutting edge eco-friendly technology that will produce energy courtesy of
3 Mother Nature. He said that he has spoken with community members and everything that he has heard
4 about the possibility of the wind farm has been positive. He distributed a handout similar to the handout
5 distributed at the February 12, 2009, ZBA meeting by Mr. White, Superintendent for Prairieview-Ogden
6 School District #197, regarding wind turbine-tax calculation for Heritage School District.
7

8 Mr. Thorsland stated that Mr. White indicated that their school district would obtain approximately \$3240
9 per mega-watt. He asked Mr. Larson if his numbers were similar.
10

11 Mr. Larson stated that since they are a K-12 school district their tax rate will be different than Prairieview-
12 Ogden's, but \$6,046.00 would be generated per mega-watt for the district. He requested that the ZBA
13 forward a recommendation for approval to the full County Board.
14

15 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Larson and there were none.
16

17 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Mr. Larson and there were none.
18

19 Mr. John Doster, Representative for Invenergy stated that they are developing a project that is partially in
20 Champaign County and Vermillion County. He said that as he has reviewed and discussed the proposed
21 *Ordinance* with Mr. Hall. He said that he likes the use of the *Model Ordinance* but his biggest concern is
22 the Map Amendment and County Board Special Use Permit. He said that as a developer they are trying to
23 find the best way to put projects together without having to go through the same hoops multiple times and
24 trying to fight an up-hill battle when right across the county line it is a much easier process. He said that as
25 a developer he would be inclined to say that they will try to do a project in Champaign County but if it is
26 going to be very cumbersome and very restrictive and difficult to get things permitted then they are more
27 likely to move the project to a less restrictive county. He said that he wanted to be clear that he is not stating
28 such as a threat but is being very honest about it because they have a project that is moving very rapidly and
29 they are planning on applying for the County Board Special Use Permit and Map Amendment by the end of
30 summer so that they can start construction within 12 to 18 months. He said that they need to move things
31 quickly and efficiently while maintaining all of the safety standards, completing engineering studies, etc.
32 and they need to understand what is the process and likelihood of getting things approved. He said that if
33 they find that the likelihood of a project will be delayed and dragged out then they will move the project to a
34 location where they can get it approved in an efficient manner. He said that he would rather not see the Map
35 Amendment Requirement with the overlay and leave it up to the County Board for final approval of a
36 Special Use Permit. He said that he is not excited, as a developer, about obtaining a Map Amendment each
37 time a project is proposed because it would only drag out the project and make it difficult for them to meet
38 their development and construction timelines at which point if there is a development delay they will move
39 the project to a different county.
40

41 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Doster.
42

43 Ms. Capel asked Mr. Doster how many wind farm projects he was involved in currently.
44

1 Mr. Doster stated that currently he has three wind farm projects being developed. He said that he has not
2 personally gone through the entire process but Invenenergy has many project across the country and their
3 biggest project in Illinois is the Grand Ridge Wind Farm in LaSalle County.

4
5 Ms. Capel asked Mr. Doster if he had personal knowledge of projects that have been moved due to
6 difficulties or a drawn out permit process.

7
8 Mr. Doster stated that there have been situations where, if things had moved quicker, particular projects
9 would have been built by now but due to delays in the permitting process the projects were not able to be at
10 the right maturity when trying to sell the power and create the next step from development to construction
11 and operation phase.

12
13 Ms. Capel asked Mr. Doster if those projects were abandoned.

14
15 Mr. Doster stated that the projects were not abandoned and they are trying to get them moving along but it is
16 a lot more expensive therefore it is not as competitive when trying to sell the power to the utilities.

17
18 Ms. Capel asked Mr. Doster if he has an idea of how long Illinois will be a viable market for these projects.

19
20 Mr. Doster stated that he would not be a good judge but his personal guess would be that it will be viable for
21 some time. He said that once the grids are used up it will become more expensive for the utilities to
22 purchase the power because the grids will need to be upgraded. He said that the goal is not to create
23 expensive power but to create renewable energy at a competitive price but development does cost and the
24 timeline of the development all plays in to the overall cost.

25
26 Mr. Thorsland asked Mr. Doster if the process becomes too cumbersome in Champaign County will he
27 move to Ford, Piatt or Vermillion County.

28
29 Mr. Doster stated that when doing development there is a specific location where you are connected and in
30 this particular case, under the new rules, they have been fast tracked through the study process and normally
31 there are 18 months of study. He said that under the new rules they went straight to a definitive planning
32 phase which means no general upgrades for transmission are required just a matter of here is your timeline,
33 get your inter-connection signed and you can go straight into construction as soon as permitting is approved.

34 He said that they are looking at an extremely compressed timeline compared to the normal situation
35 therefore in their particular case they need to find locations where they know the project will be allowable
36 without delays. He said that if they do have significant delays they will miss their inter-connection
37 requirement and thus the whole project goes away. He said that they are not going to just throw millions of
38 dollars away if the locations in Champaign County are too much of a risk and they will locate the turbines in
39 Vermillion County. He said that he does not want to move the project because there are a significant
40 number of landowners that are already signed up hoping to get turbines.

41
42 Mr. Thorsland asked Mr. Doster if he had more than 50% of the landowners signed up.

43
44 Mr. Doster stated that they are probably at 70% or more.

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
43
44

Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Mr. Doster and there were none.

Mr. Knight noted that the Map Amendment and the County Board Special Use Permit cases would be run at the same time therefore there should be no reason why the rezoning would cause any significant delay.

Mr. Doster stated that he did not attend the last meeting therefore he did not have that information before him.

Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any additional questions for Mr. Doster and there were none.

Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Mr. Doster and there were none.

Mr. Dwight Farber, Representative for Horizon Wind Energy stated that they are in the process of developing a project in Champaign, Douglas, Edgar and Vermillion County and one of the things that they feel is important is that an *Ordinance* is put together that is not only fair for the landowners who want to be a part of the project but is fair for everyone in the community. He said that as they build a wind farm in a community they want to make sure that those community members are protected and also that it is flexible enough that it will encourage developers like Invenergy and Horizon and other developers to come to the county. He said that he appreciates the process that Champaign County is using and he better understands the Map Amendment process than he did a couple of weeks ago although he is concerned that it is an extra step although he does see how it can work in concert. He said that he sent comments to Mr. Hall regarding the tile proposal and he feels that the *Ordinance* should indicate what depth the developer should have to remove things to and not get into the detail of how a company implements that and deals with the repair of tile, etc. He said that as they look at the depth of cable placement or the depth of removal that most of the ordinances that he has seen or has worked with the deepest requirement was 48 inches. He encouraged that the *Ordinance* not go deeper than 48 inches because an extreme amount of cost is incurred by the developers when they have to go deeper than that which can cause profits to go out and force developers to look at other areas. He said that Illinois ranks #16 in the nation in terms of wind resource but #8 in the nation in terms of electricity from wind energy and the reason why Illinois is #8 is because Illinois has very good transmission lines and those transmission lines generally will take the power to a place where the companies can obtain a good market for the product. He said that Illinois has a renewable portfolio standard that says that by 2025, 25% of the electricity in the state must come from renewable resources and 75% of that from wind therefore there is demand created in Illinois for wind energy and as long as there are good sites available that will continue to drive the market. He said that there is plenty of wind in the western states but they do not have the transmission to get it to the populated areas.

Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Farber and there were none.

Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Mr. Farber and there were none.

Mr. Herb Schildt, who resides at 398 CR 2500N, Mahomet distributed his written comments to the Board for review. He stated that he had several comments at the previous hearing on the 12th and tonight he has some follow-up information relating to those comments. He said that at the hearing on February 12, 2009,

1 he expressed concern about having commercial wind turbines within the Manlove Gas Storage Field and
2 later in the meeting, after the witness register had been closed, there were some questions about whether this
3 risk could be certified. He said that prior to the February 12th hearing he had spoken with John Jay, Chief of
4 the Cornbelt Fire Protection District, about the issue. He said that the Cornbelt Fire Protection District is the
5 district in which he and his wife live and it includes a substantial portion of the Manlove Gas Storage Field.
6 He said that after the meeting on February 12th, he asked Chief Jay if he could write a letter that expressed
7 his concerns. Mr. Jay did write such a letter and a copy has been provided to the Board for review.
8

9 Mr. Schildt stated that Mr. Jay’s letter states that the Cornbelt Fire Protection District can only fight fires to
10 a height of 110 feet and any turbine located higher than that, which in the case with all modern commercial
11 wind turbines, will be unreachable and therefore uncontrollable. Mr. Jay stated in the letter that, “Having an
12 uncontrolled fire within the Manlove Gas Storage Field will pose an increased risk to the surrounding area.”
13 Mr. Schildt stated that although this is only one of several reasons why he believes that it is necessary to
14 prohibit the placement of commercial wind turbines in the Manlove Gas Storage Field, it is an important one
15 and in light of this documentation he urged the Board to prohibit commercial wind turbines in the Manlove
16 Gas Storage Field.
17

18 Mr. Schildt stated that he wanted to emphasize that the concerns associated with locating commercial wind
19 turbines within the Manlove Gas Storage Field involves more than just fire. He said that as he explained at
20 the previous hearing, it involved potential damage to well-heads, pipelines, and tanks caused by a turbine
21 failure. He said that the core of the problem, as he sees it, is that the gas company has expertise in gas
22 storage fields, not wind turbines and the wind energy company knows about wind turbines, but not gas
23 storage fields. He said that the problem is not gas storage fields or wind turbines rather it is gas storage
24 fields and wind turbines and the unknowns that this combination presents. He said that until this
25 combination is understood and can be certified as safe by an accredited, independent authority, commercial
26 wind turbines should not be located in the Manlove Gas Storage Field even if the risks of an uncontrolled
27 turbine fire could somehow be eliminated. He said that on a related point, and again after the close of the
28 witness register, there seemed to be some question about the seriousness of the turbine failure in Denmark in
29 February, 2008 that is shown on the video from which he provided still shots. He said that he has included a
30 news story from the *Copenhagen Post* that reports that this turbine failure was, in fact, taken very seriously
31 by the Danish government. He read a sentence from the news story as follows: “The climate minister,
32 Connie Hedegaard, is calling for an investigation to determine the cause of two violent wind turbine
33 collapses in Denmark in the past week.” He said that as the story reports one of these collapses was the
34 turbine in the video and mentions that two turbines actually failed not just the one caught on the tape. He
35 said that clearly these events were not taken lightly by the authorities.
36

37 Mr. Schildt stated that although turbine collapses are not common events they are not extremely rare either
38 and he has enclosed a number of photos taken from the internet that show several examples. He said that he
39 has also included several examples of turbines burning and provided a copy of an article from *Business*
40 *Week* that describes some of the dangers of wind power.
41

42 Mr. Schildt stated that it is his view that 1,200 feet is far too short because of fundamental safety concerns
43 and as he showed last time the debris field of a turbine failure can reach at least 1,600 feet therefore, based
44 strictly on health and safety concerns, the setback must be increased. He said that he has some additional

2/26/09

AS APPROVED MARCH 12, 2009

ZBA

1 pieces of information that relate specifically to this issue that might prove helpful. He said that he has
2 included the results of a survey done at the January 19, 2009, Champaign County Farm Bureau Annual
3 Meeting which were printed in their February 2009 newsletter. He said that Question #13 asks, "Would you
4 lease farmland for a wind turbine(s) if it was profitable and reasonably risk free?" He said that 166
5 answered yes and 42 answered no to this question and what is interesting about this question is that about
6 20% of the respondents don't want turbines at all, and their property rights must be protected. He said that
7 about 80% would lease land for a turbine if it was both profitable and reasonably risk free. He said that a
8 wind farm ordinance can't ensure profitability it can ensure that the risks are mitigated.

9
10 Mr. Schildt stated that Question #14 follows-up with "If yes, what minimum setback would you prefer for a
11 wind turbine near your home?" He said that 16 answered less than 1,000 feet and 92 answered 1/4 mile to 1/2
12 mile, 38 answered 1/2 mile to 1 mile, 25 answered 1 to 2 miles and 22 wanted an even larger setback. He said
13 that 48% of all respondents wanted between a 1/4 mile and 1/2 mile setback, approximately 44% wanted 1/2
14 mile or more which means that about 92% of all respondents wanted a setback or 1/4 mile (1,320 feet) or
15 more. He said that given the way that the survey questions were framed it is difficult to pin down a specific
16 distance that represents the average setback desired but the results clearly cluster around the 1/2 mile mark
17 which is 2,640 feet. He said that 2,640 feet is more than twice the 1,200 feet specified by the current draft
18 amendment. He said that interestingly, 1/2 mile is the setback used by some other jurisdictions. He said that
19 he included a news story from the *Tomah Journal* which is in Tomah, Wisconsin. It reports that the
20 Township of Wilton, in Monroe County Wisconsin, chose to use a 2,640 foot (1/2 mile) setback from any
21 dwelling or occupied building and the Supervisor's quote explicitly mentions the health and safety of the
22 residents. He said that the story also reports that Wilton requires a 1,300 foot setback from a property line
23 and the Supervisor stated that, "We did some research and a wind farm manufacturer thought that no one
24 should be working within 1,300 feet of a wind tower." Mr. Schildt stated that this statement is consistent
25 with the Vestas V90 safety instructions that he presented last time. He said that the article reports that a 1/2
26 mile setback was also adopted by the Township of Ridgeville, Wisconsin, again in the interest of safety. He
27 said that apparently townships in Wisconsin have more power than they do here in Illinois and in
28 Champaign County they must rely on the County to get the setbacks right.

29
30 Mr. Schildt stated that although two townships specified a minimum of 1/2 mile, some jurisdictions require a
31 higher standard, for example, the Trempealeau County, Wisconsin Ordinance that John Hall included in the
32 first packet specifies a minimum of one mile setback from dwellings and other occupied buildings. He said
33 that it also requires a minimum setback of 1/2 mile from property lines and these setbacks help ensure that all
34 property owners are guaranteed at least a minimum of protection and he strongly recommends that
35 Champaign County follow their lead.

36
37 Mr. Schildt stated that although one mile might be sufficient for safety it might not be sufficient for other
38 reasons, such as quality of life, environmental risks, and property values. He said that Champaign County
39 has invested a significant amount of money and effort in establishing several parks and preserves and has
40 also established a CR district. He said that placing wind turbines too close to these will lessen the benefits
41 that they provide, for example, a primary benefit of areas like the Middle Fork River Preserve and the
42 Sangamon River Preserve is that they give the residents of the County places that reflect the original
43 environment of the prairie, including its quiet solitude and vistas. At one mile, the presence of the turbines
44 will simply overwhelm the natural setting of the preserves with the turbines being visible from essentially all

1 locations with in the preserve. He said that a setback of at least five miles is required if there is to be
2 significant area within the preserve from which the turbines are not visible and the ambiance of the natural
3 environment is maintained.

4
5 Mr. Schildt stated that having a turbine on farm ground does not provide a “second crop” as one person said
6 at a previous hearing. He said that a commercial wind turbine is an industrial scale power plant located
7 hundreds of feet in the air. He said that it is not agriculture and is certainly not “farming.”

8
9 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Schildt.

10
11 Ms. Capel asked Mr. Schildt if there were any wind farms located in Trempealeau County, Wisconsin.

12
13 Mr. Schildt stated that he does not know. He said that he was doing research on ordinances not whether
14 wind farms had been built.

15
16 Mr. Courson asked Mr. Schildt if he was aware of any laws that indicate that the fire protection district
17 would be required to put out a fire on a 500 foot tower.

18
19 Mr. Schildt stated that he is not aware of such a law and relies on Chief Jay to answer such questions.

20
21 Mr. Thorsland stated that according to the Farm Bureau Survey 80% of the people were in some agreement
22 with locating wind farms on their property and we heard from one of the wind farm developers that 75% of
23 the landowners have been contacted so far. He said that wind turbines will not be placed on landowners
24 who do not wish to participate and have adequate setbacks to assure their safety. He said that the Manlove
25 Gas Storage Field is not all owned by Manlove but by private landowners who have leases for the injection
26 wells therefore is it fair to deny that larger percentage of participating landowners’ potential income. He
27 said that testimony has been received from school districts that money will be generated for the schools.

28
29 Mr. Schildt asked Mr. Thorsland if the County should disregard safety.

30
31 Mr. Thorsland stated no.

32
33 Mr. Schildt stated that his comments are centered on health and safety. He said that he has made his opinion
34 very clear and is supported by the Cornbelt Fire Protection District that there is a unique situation in the
35 Manlove Gas Storage Field which has a known risk and releasing an unknown element into that situation is
36 adding to that risk. He said that the Cornbelt Fire Protection District cannot fight a fire that is 268 feet in the
37 air which is the height of the turbines in McLean County. He said that when a turbine fire occurs there is
38 burning oil and fiberglass dropping all over place which is a very dangerous situation in the Manlove Gas
39 Storage Field because of the various locations of the injection wells. He said that he does not want this
40 project to increase the risk and if the County can not prove that it is safe then he is asking that the County
41 take it off the table. He said that he does not want to be the guinea pig to find out whether a project like this
42 makes sense in a gas storage field and as far as he can determine it has not been done before.

43
44 Mr. Thorsland stated that at the last meeting Mr. Schildt spoke as the Chairman of the Newcomb Township

2/26/09

AS APPROVED MARCH 12, 2009

ZBA

1 Plan Commission and as an individual landowner and tonight he is speaking as a private citizen. He asked
2 Mr. Schildt if, as Chairman of the Newcomb Township Plan Commission, the Newcomb Township
3 Comprehensive Plan has any sections that deal with power production of any kind.
4

5 Mr. Schildt stated that Newcomb Township Plan Commission does not have a comprehensive plan at this
6 time.
7

8 Ms. Sherry Schildt, who resides at 398 CR 2500N, Mahomet stated that she agrees with her husband's
9 comments. She said that the Supplemental Memorandum dated February 20, 2009, indicates that the new
10 turbines would probably be 492 feet tall. She said that the Empire State Building is 1,250 feet therefore a
11 wind turbine would be almost half the height of the Empire State Building. She said that if a wind turbine is
12 one mile away from a preserve district it will look like it is right next to it therefore if it were that close to a
13 forest preserve district or even a CR district it would defeat the purpose of having those districts because it
14 would make it look more like a city than like the country. She said that it has been said that that the wind
15 turbines turn very slowly but because of the size of the rotors the average tip speed could average between
16 130 and 200 miles per hour. She said that it is her firm conviction that the setbacks need to be set at the
17 property line and not the residence. She said that if the 1,200 foot setback is adopted and a non-participating
18 person's house is 1,300 feet they will have 1,200 feet that they cannot build on which would take away their
19 ability to build on their own land.
20

21 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Ms. Schildt.
22

23 Mr. Knight stated that if the setback to the dwelling eliminates a non-participating landowner's ability to
24 build they can sign a waiver with the wind turbine company to build closer to the turbine as long as it is not
25 closer than 1.1 times the height.
26

27 Ms. Schildt stated that if you are a landowner that does not want to be any closer then it should not be a
28 burden on that non-participating landowner.
29

30 Ms. Thorsland stated that he believes that the *Ordinance* only addresses participating landowners and the
31 ability to sign a waiver.
32

33 Ms. Schildt stated that if she lived across the road from a neighbor who had wind turbines on their property
34 she would not feel comfortable if 1,200 feet of her property was within the impact radius that the wind
35 turbine manufacturer's determined unsafe. She said that the setback should be from the property line so that
36 all of her land would be safe especially since she would not be gaining any benefit from the wind turbine.
37

38 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Ms. Schildt and there were none.
39

40 Mr. Tom Swierczewski, Project Coordinator with Midwest Wind Energy, stated that he is standing in for his
41 associate Tim Polz who was not able to attend tonight's meeting. He said that the question was raised as to
42 the appropriate setback for health and safety issues to all the above ground equipment located within the gas
43 storage area. He said that their position is that 1,200 feet is an adequate setback to address health and safety
44 issues to those facilities and this is their standard setback. He said that they have approximately 200+ wind

1 turbines located at least that close to houses and as a professional wind developer and as a professional
2 planner he is not interested in being involved in a project where they would be endangering the lives and
3 well being of their participating landowners which are essentially their partners in these projects. He said
4 that they are comfortable with the 1,200 foot setback because it was chosen due to noise issues not safety
5 issues. He said that blade throws and ice throws typically happen inside the radius of the blades themselves
6 although there are certainly videos that indicate differently. He said that the reason why your county is
7 contemplating a certification standard for turbines developed in the county is so that old technology does not
8 get developed in your county which should not have those extreme blade throws and with modern
9 equipment it is unlikely to have anything thrown beyond 1,200 feet. He said that if the 1,200 foot setback is
10 established you will find that it is adequate for houses and the above ground parts of the gas storage facility
11 and developing inside the gas storage facility becomes irrelevant although they are certainly willing to avoid
12 that area but there shouldn't be any reason why they couldn't develop in the areas that are left over inside
13 the setbacks from houses and above-ground gas line parts. He said that they are willing to stipulate on that
14 issue and they are not going to be progressing through their development efforts inside that storage facility.
15 He said that they are on their fifth wind farm in Illinois, two are up and running, one is under construction
16 and his project in Bureau County will be under construction in the spring. He said that they have five
17 underground gas pipelines running through those projects and they are much closer, in some circumstances,
18 than 1,200 feet to those underground facilities and in some of those cases they do not have a setback. He
19 said that they agreed to separate agreements with the pipeline companies and they have a 50 or 100 foot
20 easement and his company agreed that the sweep of their blades could not go inside their easements and
21 they were perfectly comfortable with that agreement.

22
23 Mr. Swierczewski stated that his company has projects in Wisconsin and they are trying to develop
24 additional projects in Wisconsin. He said that another developer was asked if he had experience in dealing
25 with a county where they have gone elsewhere and he would basically submit that the entire state of
26 Wisconsin falls into that category. He said that basically the counties have gone out of control because there
27 is a specific Wisconsin State Statute which limits what they can do in terms of regulation and they have
28 essentially ignored it. He said that, in regard to the ordinances that were found on the internet, someone
29 asked if there were wind farms located in those counties in Wisconsin and the answer is no. He said that it
30 has gone so far that at the state level in Wisconsin that the State is considering uniform siting standards on a
31 state level which would basically take away the authority from the counties and townships and provide them
32 with a set of setbacks and development standards that they would have to implement because it has gotten so
33 out of hand.

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

36
37 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Mr. Swierczewski and there were none.

38
39 Mr. Steve Burdin, who resides at 2527 N CR 450E, Mahomet stated that he appreciates the opportunity to
40 address this hearing. He said that his message is positive in general and sees no reason why everyone's
41 concerns can't be addressed to make this project a reality. He said that last September he had the
42 opportunity to visit the Twin Groves Wind Farm with a small group. He said that he met a landowner at the
43 visitor site in Ellsworth, north of Leroy and after a while the group went to what the landowner called "her"
44 turbine, since it was the one on her farmland. He said that they stood approximately 500 feet from the base

2/26/09

AS APPROVED MARCH 12, 2009

ZBA

1 of the wind tower and being it was a very calm September evening everything was completely still and the
2 turbine was not turning. He said that most of the group were engineers so the questions were different than
3 what the landowner was use to, more technical and detailed, although some of the questions were just about
4 what it is like to have a turbine on her property. He said that she couldn't answer the technical questions
5 very well but she answered all of the questions about living with the turbine quite enthusiastically and he
6 didn't sense any negative sentiments from her and she seemed very happy with "her" turbine.
7

8 Mr. Burdin stated that after the last ZBA meeting that he attended he decided to send the landowner an e-
9 mail to ask a few more questions that mainly focused on safety. He said that he asked her how far the wind
10 turbine was from her home and from the nearest public road. He also asked her if she had witnessed the
11 turbine feather its blades or stop in response to high winds and what that was like. He said that she indicated
12 that the wind turbine on her land is 1/2 mile from her home and the county's setback requires less than the
13 guideline set by the developer which was 1,500 feet from any occupied building and from any road. She
14 indicated that this showed that they were concerned about the safety of the home on their farm. She
15 explained that she can see about 100 of the 240 turbines from her home and how she has watched the
16 turbines in at least two storms with winds over 50 mph shut down rather quickly when the wind reaches that
17 speed. He said that interestingly, she stated that she can watch the progression of the storm front by
18 watching the windmills shut down in succession.
19

20 Mr. Burdin stated that in his area he is concerned about the potential siting of turbines among the high
21 pressure gas storage lines that are located in Newcomb Township. He said that he paid a visit to the Zoning
22 office this past Tuesday to get a better handle on the situation and to find out where all these pipelines and
23 wells that are being talked about are located. He said that the question in his mind was: Is there a way we
24 can distribute some wind turbines among all these things while keeping them all a safe distance from each
25 other. He said that it isn't just in case something happens to the turbine but also in case something happens
26 to the pipeline or to a well because after all the wind turbine folks have just as much to worry about in terms
27 of damage as the gas pipeline folks. He said that he wasn't looking for specific locations but just wanted to
28 find out where they are in general and as it turns out the majority of them run along the roads and some
29 along quarter section lines. He said if we're going to design setbacks from roads these will automatically
30 become setbacks from the pipelines as well and all we have to do is add a few feet. He said that this should
31 be entirely do-able and his feeling now is that we have a lot less to worry about regarding this issue than the
32 feeling he left with the last time. He said that right now he is more concerned about the fact that some of the
33 well-heads in Newcomb Township are literally just a few feet from the road where typically a really strong
34 chain link fence protects them from the possibility of a vehicle running into them resulting in a predictably
35 dire event. He said that just because it has not happened does not make it impossible or any less likely, that
36 is not how probability works.
37

38 Mr. Burdin stated that the second thing that he would like to address is the issue of sound. He said that the
39 possibility exists that this may have more weight in determining a setback than the possibility of wind
40 turbine destruction does. He said that instead of an occasional or rare event this deals with prolonged
41 exposure during all times that the turbines are in operation and to make a comparison with occupational
42 exposure limits for noise there's a big difference between the limits imposed for impulse or transient
43 exposure versus limits that are imposed where there is continuous, regular exposure and rightly so. He said
44 that there's no doubt that wind turbines will make some audible noise but they will also make some sound

1 that's less audible and possibly inaudible, namely in the low frequency regime. He said that people are
2 widely varied in their ability to sense these sounds but they can be affected by them whether they hear them
3 or not. We can't ignore the possibility that this could cause discomfort to folks who are close to this source
4 of disturbance and this is one area where care should be exercised, as sound emission especially low
5 frequency emissions could cause harm to homeowners. He said that the most common harm mentioned
6 seems to manifest itself in the form of disturbed sleep. He said that the practice of using A-weighted SPL
7 measurements could be seen as a way to mask these effects. A-weighted measurements are tuned to the
8 response of human hearing which isn't all that efficient in the low frequencies so predictably A-weighting
9 de-emphasizes these low frequencies. He said that measurements known as C-weighted use a flat response
10 across the frequency range that the microphone can sense so there's no attenuation at the low end. This is a
11 more effective way to measure the low frequency emissions from a source and could be used to better judge
12 how much of this sound energy reaches a place of concern, like someone's home.

13
14 Mr. Burdin stated that it seems prudent to exercise caution and to be informed of the findings of multiple
15 sources on this issue. He said that if, after more study, these concerns have merit in the opinion of the body
16 drafting the *Ordinance* his feeling is that it would seem favorable to public safety if the County were to
17 adopt a policy that requires C-weighted data be used to determine if the developer will meet the SPL limits
18 imposed by the *Ordinance*. His main point is that this is not a deal breaker, but that as with any major
19 project it's better to have good data. He said that people will feel better when there's confidence in the data
20 and folks in proximity to the turbines will certainly be happier with a good night's sleep. The wind turbines
21 will be there for a long time and it's important to get this one right.

22
23 Mr. Burdin stated that his next topic is a specific thing that he discovered while reading the materials that
24 were made available during the last meeting. He said that it is found in the document excerpt called *Wind*
25 *Generator and Wind Generating Facility Ordinance for Trempealeau County*. He said that what is
26 numbered as page 230 of the document, item J the paragraph talks about what happens should the noise
27 levels exceed the limits in the *Ordinance* and if a waiver is arranged what happens should the property
28 change ownership. The *Ordinance* states that subsequent owners must be informed and he believes that we
29 should do better than this in Champaign County. He said that should our *Ordinance* allow this type of
30 waiver arrangement, if affected land were to be up for sale, he would hope that the County would require
31 this disclosure be made to prospective buyers and not allow "springing the trap" as it were, after they have
32 become the new owners.

33
34 Mr. Burdin stated that the final thing that he would like to address is simply a point that he feels requires
35 clarification. He said that with all due respect to the Newcomb Township Plan Commission and to what is
36 no doubt well intentioned testimony he must point out for the record that their views and concerns do not
37 necessarily represent a consensus among Newcomb Township's residents. He said that he would hate to see
38 this project hindered by the impression that this group speaks for the entire township and he urged the
39 residents of Newcomb Township and others in Champaign County to take advantage of these opportunities
40 to make their voices heard. Mr. Burdin submitted his written statement as a Document of Record.

41
42 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Burdin and there were none.

43
44 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Mr. Burdin and there were none.

1
2 Mr. Eric McKeever, Wind Specialist/Project Manager for Arends Brothers stated that they are more
3 interested in the private wind turbine section of the *Ordinance*. He said that his only comment is one to the
4 public in terms of landowners. He said that Arends Brothers would like the private landowners to be aware
5 that when they sign the land lease agreements make sure that there is a clause included that states they are
6 allowed to have their own private wind energy device. He said that many of the leases have a clause which
7 states that if a private wind turbine is a certain height it will not be allowed without going through the proper
8 channels. He said that the landowners have the power to include this agreement before they sign the land
9 lease and not lose the opportunity to have their own private wind device.

10
11 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. McKeever and there were none.

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

14
15 Mr. Russ Taylor, who resides at 1301 W. Hickory, Mahomet stated that he has been involved in real estate
16 for a long time. He said that obviously there are people attending this meeting who are all for the wind
17 turbines, some who are against them and some who are not sure. He said that his question to staff would be
18 why we have zoning in the County.

19
20 Mr. Knight stated that zoning is to protect an individual's property rights from everyone else's property
21 rights.

22
23 Mr. Taylor stated that Mr. Knight's explanation is what he assumed and he appreciates the amount of time
24 that staff and the Board puts in to assuring this protection. He said that he believes that zoning not only
25 protects property rights but also property values. He said that he mostly sells houses although he has sold
26 some farms and different properties in the Mahomet area, but he sells lots of homes to people who are
27 transferred and work with relocation companies. He said that with the relocation companies a lot of times
28 there will be a "red flag" checklist and wind turbine farms are not on that checklist yet but perhaps it is
29 because they are so new that they haven't been added yet. He said that high-tension lines, steep driveways,
30 etc. are used to check to see if the home needs a "red flag" in the value to hold it down some in case
31 anything would inadvertently affect it. He requested that when the Board is considering this *Ordinance* that
32 they keep land values in mind because these relocation companies that move so many people from the
33 university, hospital staff, agricultural industries, etc. use it to value property. He said that he spoke to a real
34 estate broker in Texas and is obtaining a copy of a study on values of agricultural land with wind turbines
35 located on them and perhaps at a future hearing he will be able to submit this study to the Board for review.
36 He said that currently it is tough to obtain loans for homes because people must have better credit and more
37 money down. He said that FHA is one of the main financiers of homes and they continuously change their
38 guidelines. He said that one of the guidelines that have changed recently is the distance from high-tension
39 lines and power sub-stations therefore it is unknown if wind turbines will be added to these guidelines in the
40 future but it may be something that the Board should consider as they study this matter.

41
42 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Taylor and there were none.

43
44 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Mr. Taylor and there were none.

1
2 Mr. Bruce Stickers, Resource Conservationist for the Champaign County Soil and Water Conservation
3 District stated that if someone desires to develop a subdivision and do any type of major construction they
4 have to obtain a Natural Resource Report from his office. He said that once the report is completed the
5 County is supplied a copy which covers drainage and any natural resource history that might have taken
6 place on that property. He said that obviously wind turbines would have a huge effect on our natural
7 resources therefore he is trying to get up to speed on wind turbines and wind farms. He said that recently he
8 met with his counter-parts throughout the State of Illinois that either had wind farms or proposed wind farms
9 and LaSalle County indicated that they expect up to 1,000 wind turbines in their county. He said that his
10 office is very well prepared to work with the County on this issue and are convinced that wind turbines
11 could be sited in the County with all natural resource concerns being answered.

12
13 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Stickers and there were none.

14
15 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Mr. Stickers and there were none.

16
17 Ms. Jamie Stevens, who resides at 809 S. First St, Fisher stated that she also lives in Newcomb Township.
18 She said that she supports the wind farm project because it will be an excellent alternative energy source and
19 it needs to be tapped in to. She said that it has been said that a wind farm will cause an environmental
20 hazard and ruin the ambiance of some of the preserves although she lives right next to one of the preserves
21 and she does not see how a wind farm could ruin the ambiance and even if it did it would not constitute an
22 environmental hazard. She said that we need to look into the statistics of how many wind turbine failures
23 occur each year in comparison to how many wind turbines are operating each year in the United States. She
24 said that she wanted to make sure that all of Newcomb Township's citizens were represented and all of their
25 opinions were represented to the Board.

26
27 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Ms. Stevens and there were none.

28
29 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Ms. Stevens and there were none.

30
31 Mr. Kenn Davis, Special Projects Manager for White Construction, Inc. stated that they are located in
32 Clinton, Indiana and have been building wind farms for the last five years. He said that he was born and
33 raised in Vermillion County and they just went through a similar proceeding because they were concerned
34 about being shut out of the project. He said that alternative power sources are in the limelight currently but
35 we have ethanol, coal, nuclear and wind although we also have a thing called natural gas or peaker power
36 plants. He said that of all of those potential sources of additional power that people are going to want in two
37 years when the flip they switch is wind because it does not require more water resources from your
38 community as opposed to ethanol and coal. He said that people do not think about water currently because
39 they have it even though they are paying \$1 dollar a bottle for it but when you are using one million gallons
40 a day it is another issue. He said that he has heard testimony at tonight's meeting regarding health and
41 safety on wind and concerns about property values. He said that in some of the counties that he has
42 constructed towers he has been told by the county assessors that the public schools have put themselves in a
43 position where they have some funds that are not allocated because of the new tax base revenue. He said
44 that from a public road standpoint, wind farms are the single most important things that are influencing

2/26/09

AS APPROVED MARCH 12, 2009

ZBA

1 township road building programs than anything that he has been in contact with in the construction business.
2 He said as the Special Projects Manager for the Twin Groves Wind Farm, a Horizon Wind Energy Project,
3 over 60 miles of county and township roads were rebuilt at no cost to the county. He said that a yearly
4 retainer was included which commits the company to put additional money back into the roads that they
5 completely rebuilt. He said that Illinois has been alot smarter in solving this problem than the State of
6 Indiana.

7
8 Mr. Davis stated that if the Board elects to set the wind turbines back one-half mile in their geographic area,
9 that is set up by section, with the road setback and resident setback you will essentially lock Champaign
10 County out of business. He said that no developer, in his opinion, would take a look at a county with a one-
11 half mile setback because that is only one wind turbine per square mile and not one of the three developers
12 in this room tonight would entertain a density of one turbine per square mile for their wind farm. He said
13 that wind is a very unique resource because not everyone has it and you are blessed if you do. He said that
14 the whole southern half of the State of Indiana does not have the resources to support a commercial wind
15 farm therefore take advantage of what you have. He said that the wind farm will take approximately one to
16 one-half acres out of production and the revenue generated from that wind turbine will be two to three times
17 more than what that acre will produce for the rest of its life on any basis. He said that the Board should be
18 very careful about establishing setbacks because you are talking about viability and if the Board insists on
19 those type of setbacks, beyond the health and safety issue, you will lock yourself out and your neighboring
20 counties will take over your wind resources, you will remain paying for your roads and school districts will
21 be dredging along with a locked in tax base that is not increasing at a rate that it should be in order to keep
22 up with modern society. He said that his company has been involved in construction of peaker power
23 plants, coal power plants and ethanol plants and from his company's standpoint wind if the most intelligent
24 form of alternative energy that our nation is looking at today.

25
26 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Mr. Davis and there were none.

27
28 Mr. Thorsland asked Mr. Davis how many construction jobs would be created for 100 towers.

29
30 Mr. Davis stated that they just completed Phase II of Twin Groves Wind Farm which was 120 turbines and
31 their firm alone, which only did the balance of plant construction, directly employed 125 people to construct
32 the local and access roads on that project. He said that in addition to that the erection contractor employed
33 75 people and the electrical contractor had in the neighborhood of 75 people employed. He said that they
34 started in March and pulled out in February of the next year and the mass of those people were there from
35 April thru December. He said that each wind turbine represents approximately 2000 to 2500 craftsman
36 hours to get in place and his company put over one million man hours into the wind project last year.

37
38 Mr. Thorsland stated that Mr. Farber previously indicated that the Twin Groves Wind Farm employed 50
39 permanent staff.

40
41 Mr. Davis stated that he is only referring to the construction phase.

42
43 Mr. Thorsland stated that the manufacturer of the tower parts is now located in Clinton.

1 Mr. Davis stated that this is correct. He said that an existing facility in Clinton was revamped and they are
2 producing three-section GE towers and they are committed to General Electric for tower production. He
3 said that those towers will be taken to Wisconsin and northern Illinois. He said that currently there are five
4 or six places that are manufacturing towers and since they are so long and awkward to transport the idea is
5 to bring some of that manufacturing closer to the wind areas so that the freight bills are not so high and the
6 inconvenience to the public is not as large.

7
8 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any additional questions for Mr. Davis and there were none.
9 He thanked Mr. Davis for his informative testimony.

10
11 Ms. Birgit McCall, who resides at 1085 CR 2200N, Champaign stated that she lives in Champaign County
12 but not in Newcomb Township. She said that there have been alot of interesting studies on how people
13 perceive risk and that the lower the risk and more spectacular the risk they tend to weigh significantly
14 heavier than a situation where there has been more risk in a more mundane fashion. She said that this is an
15 agricultural community and we tend to forget that agriculture is a somewhat dangerous occupation because
16 there are farm implement accidents and a lot of people get hurt just doing their day-to-day farming. She said
17 that just this week there was an incident at the Andersons where an explosion occurred and these are all
18 things that we have to deal with as part of doing our day-to-day work. She said that we cannot remove risk
19 but can reduce it to an acceptable level and identify up-front what those risks are and qualify those risks so
20 that they can be dealt with. She said that some of the submitted photographs show rather spectacular
21 failures of some of the older technology and as with the incident at the Andersons the new technology
22 minimized any loss. She said that wind turbines have evolved through technology and have been improved
23 so that these types of catastrophic events do not happen. She said that she appreciates everyone's concern
24 about some sort of spectacular failure but those failures are extremely rare. She said that energy is an
25 inherently riskful activity and in the past 40 years there have been more than 74,000 deaths in the mining
26 industry alone either from direct cave-ins or from secondary things like "black-lung" disease. She said that
27 the ability to get a clean energy that has a very, very low risk is something that we should seriously consider.

28
29
30 Ms. McCall stated that 110 feet is the equivalent of an 11 story building and many of the buildings being
31 built in Champaign are more than 11 stories in height and people live in those buildings. She said that if the
32 intention is to not build anything taller than what the fire district can deal with then we shouldn't be building
33 anything that tall. She said that she lived in California by the Altamont Pass and she loved driving through
34 that area and looking at the wind turbines. She said that the Altamont Pass is a high fire risk area and there
35 is a lot of concern about fires although there are hundreds of wind turbines located along those passes that
36 are dry as a bone. She said that she believes that it is great that the County considers the rights of the 20%
37 of people who do not want the turbines because she wants someone to protect her land rights from Wal-mart
38 and a subdivision in her back yard but unfortunately unless you have a lot of money so that you can buy all
39 the land around you it is hard to control what other people do with their land.

40
41 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Ms. McCall.

42
43 Ms. Capel asked Ms. McCall if she could reveal her sources for the figures used in her testimony.

44

2/26/09

AS APPROVED MARCH 12, 2009

ZBA

1 Ms. McCall stated that regarding the resulting deaths due to the mining industry was from website which
2 had a study of the number of deaths for coal workers. She apologized for not having the name of the source
3 with her at tonight's meeting.

4
5 Ms. Capel asked Mr. McCall if she could reveal her sources regarding risk.

6
7 Ms. McCall stated that this information came from stories that she has read from popular journals.

8
9 Mr. Rob Parker, who resides at 467 CR 2500N, Mahomet stated that testimony was received about noise and
10 the *Ordinance* indicates that the County will use the EPA recommendation for noise limits. He requested
11 that those limits be explained. He said that the noise is very subjective and questioned what the ambient
12 noise level is in Newcomb Township. He said that every 3 decibels is a doubling of the noise so when you
13 go from 20 decibels to 23 it is twice as loud and 80 decibels is considered detrimental to a person's hearing.

14
15 Mr. Thorsland asked Mr. Knight if he had a response to Mr. Parker's question.

16
17 Mr. Knight stated that at the last meeting a document was distributed titled, "*Title 35: Environmental*
18 *Protection, Subtitle H: Noise, Chapter I: Pollution Control Board*. He said that this document gave noise
19 pollution guidelines although since he is not familiar with the document he cannot quote numbers from it.

20
21 Mr. Thorsland informed the audience that if someone is in attendance but does not wish to speak they are
22 encouraged to sign the attendance record so that they will be included on the mailing list for the additional
23 two meetings regarding this case.

24
25 Mr. Schildt requested the opportunity to respond to comments submitted regarding his testimony.

26
27 Mr. Thorsland stated that he would allow Mr. Schildt to respond.

28
29 Mr. Schildt stated that he does not believe that it is right for one man to profit at the expense of another. He
30 said that property rights as well as property values need to be maintained and certainly his property rights
31 end at his property line. He said that everything he said about setbacks was always referred to non-
32 participating landowners. He said that a coal miner chooses to take the risk of being employed as a coal
33 miner but a non-participating landowner has this risk imposed upon them therefore it is important that the
34 setbacks, at the County level, are right. He said that the Cornbelt Fire Protection District does not cover
35 Champaign-Urbana and he does not believe that there are any buildings in that fire protection district that
36 are over 110 feet therefore the Cornbelt Fire Protection District does have the capability of fighting any fire
37 that occurs in their district and the comparison to Champaign-Urbana was not fair.

38
39 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Schildt and there were none.

40
41 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Mr. Schildt and there were none.

42
43 **Ms. Capel moved, seconded by Mr. Schroeder to recess the February 26, 2009, public hearing for a**
44 **ten minute break. The motion carried by voice vote.**

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
43
44

The meeting recessed at 8:07 p.m.

The meeting resumed at 8:17 p.m.

Mr. Knight stated that everything regarding Part A of the *Ordinance* is almost complete and should be included in the next mailing. He said that staff hopes to have the mailing for the March 12, 2009, public hearing out sooner so that people will have adequate time to review the information. He asked the Board if there was any information that they would like to have before the next public hearing.

Ms. Capel stated that it would be nice to have a more definitive number on the noise.

Mr. Thorsland agreed with Ms. Capel. He said that Mr. McKeever brought up the point about participating landowners who desire to have a private wind tower on their property therefore it may be an issue that staff should research.

Mr. Thorsland announced that the next meeting is March 12, 2009, and invited everyone to attend to present testimony regarding Case 634-AT-08.

Mr. Thorsland requested a motion to close the public hearing for tonight.

Mr. Schroeder moved, seconded by Ms. Capel to close the public hearing. The motion carried by voice vote.

6. New Public Hearings

None

7. Staff Report

None

8. Other Business

None

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

None

10. Adjournment

Mr. Schroeder moved, seconded by Mr. Palmgren to adjourn the February 26, 2009, meeting. The motion carried by voice vote.

2/26/09

AS APPROVED MARCH 12, 2009

ZBA

- 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

Respectfully submitted

Secretary of Zoning Board of Appeals

ZBA //

DRAFT SUBJECT TO APPROVAL DRAFT

- 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

DRAFT SUBJECT TO APPROVAL DRAFT

ZBA //

1
2