

MINUTES (Revised)  
LIVINGSTON COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
Livingston County Historic Courthouse  
112 W. Madison St.  
Pontiac, Illinois

Recessed Meeting Continuation  
7:00 p.m.

October 5, 2017

The meeting came to order and roll call was taken.

Members Present: Michael Cornale, Richard Kiefer, Richard Runyon, William Flott, and Joan Huisman.

Members Absent:

Business:

Case ZT-3-17 - County Board of Livingston County

This is the continuation of the recess review of a zoning case that pertains to the review of an application for zoning text amendments to Chapter 56, Zoning, Code of Ordinances, Livingston County, Illinois, which focuses on the most recent considerations for amending the Livingston County wind energy regulations. Proposed text amendments are to Sec. 56.1- General Definitions to add the definition of Hearing Facilitator, are to Article VIII, Wind Energy, Code of Ordinances, Livingston County, Illinois, and to Sec 692-Procedures-9b.

Tom Blakeman began the meeting by explaining that Gerald Earing a member of the ZBA has reluctantly decided to recuse himself from further involvement in these proceedings on advice of counsel. Mr. Earing was appointed to the ZBA on May 11<sup>th</sup>, this text amendment had been filed in April of 2017, and prior to that time Mr. Earing had a contract with K4 that moved to Vision Energy, with that contract expiring on June 30<sup>th</sup> of this year, after this proceeding began and it gave an appearance of conflict. No detriment has happened and they can forth with the existing board members.

Chair Huisman opened up the meeting for more testimony. John Vitzthum, 24213 E – 1800 North Rd., Pontiac, came forward for comments. Chair Huisman noted that Mr. Vitzthum had previously been a member of this county zoning board of appeals. Mr. Vitzthum commented that no wind mill person had been present at these hearings, nor has any wind mill authorities and no one from that district had been present to say they could not get a contract because of the setback. If that is a problem why weren't they here. The only people heard from are the people worried about their property and taxing bodies concerned they will lose tax dollars. Mr. Vitzthum mentioned testimony in prior hearings were a wind mill expert said that the larger setback would not prevent a development but would make it more difficult. He believes if it is a less populated area that setback should still work. He has not heard any testimony otherwise.

The testimony and evidence section was closed, and it is time to ask any remaining questions prior to closing statements.

Chair Huisman asked Mr. Redlingshafer about the board not hearing from anyone about not putting a wind farm in with the setbacks as currently written in the evidence. Would he want to bring anyone in to testify about that, or about it being truly impossible with the setback and waiver being possible. Mr. Redlingshafer deferred it to Daryl and the committee, but in being present at two Agriculture, Zoning and Emergency Services Committee meetings with one meeting in March of this year were they spent a good two hours going through and deliberating trying to figure out what is possible and not possible and out of that came down to approval of the prior text amendment except for minor changes. Mr. Redlingshafer explained the approval of the prior document and how the Agriculture, Zoning and Emergency Services Committee beginning anew discussing changes part of this application. Chair Huisman asked if any wind farm representatives were present at those meetings. Mr. Redlingshafer did not notice any wind farm company representatives, and he did not know if any residents from the seven townships in question were present. Chair Huisman asked what the driving force behind this application. Mr. Redlingshafer said that as elected officials as part of an evolving process, that has been going on for years is culminating with an ordinance they feel is within the best interest of the county, including the proposed changes. Chair Huisman asked if it was the productivity of the land, the referendum results as she wants to write an ordinance that will last longer than six months. She does not want to see it come back and be revisited by the committee, the zoning board and the county board, so why are just these seven townships being addressed. Mr. Redlingshafer said that they can take notice of the March 28<sup>th</sup> committee meeting minutes at which a deliberative process ended with them believing that these changes were in the best interest of the county. Chair Huisman noted that the referendum results played a part in naming the seven townships involved, and is that the number one factor. Mr. Redlingshafer did not recall hearing anyone say that was not the number one factor. Chair Huisman asked about when the soil productivity began to be researched. Mr. Redlingshafer noted he did not attend all committee meetings. Chair Huisman asked if anything changed with the soil types. Mr. Schopp said the soil survey does not change from year to year and they are the same as when the discussion started. Chair Huisman then questioned as to if smaller setbacks should be based on soil types, as she does not want to change it on seven townships based on soil types and then is it justified to change the ordinance again if the other townships have similar soil types and want to change the ordinance. Mr. Redlingshafer clarified the question as to if creating the situation on soil type, with Chair Huisman asking if that is the main reason in part for more economic opportunities. Mr. Redlingshafer related that he stands by the testimony presented, though he does not have scientific knowledge on the soils. Chair Huisman stated she does not want to rewrite this ordinance again, especially starting within the next 12 months. Mr. Schopp this reiterated that the soil survey was present, that the poorer soils and using exhibit 7 the percentages of the soils were higher standing by the general idea, and that it is a combination of all the factors, not just one factor. Mr. Blackard asked if that included the area, wind resources, the density, and the referendum itself. Chair Huisman asked about the soil types in Reading Townships and how do they compare and why were they excluded. Reading Township soils are of higher quality. Mr. Cornale then asked if it is better to read the chart from top to bottom or bottom to top. Mr. Schopp noted at the top you start at the permeability levels. Mr. Cornale then asked about the best soils indicated on the chart. Mr. Schopp mentioned that the bottom two categories of soils would be the better soils. Chair Huisman's last issue is that she thought they found a happy medium for people that want or do not want wind turbines by creating a bigger setback with a waiver and the driving force was based on health reasons and on evidence presented by Dr. Schomer's studies and

nothing has been presented to refute any of that. So how do we justify it, in that economic benefits have always been there they have not changed over the last several years, but they have more information now on health issues, and they thought they had done that with nothing to refute it so how do they justify changing the regulations. What makes those people in that area of the county less worthy of potentially needing protection. Mr. Redlingshafer referred back to the Agriculture and Zoning committee making a decision for this zoning text application and the evidence in front of you represents this case. Chair Huisman said then you do not know, and she offered to allow for the minutes of the committee to come in, questioning that if their good reasoning from the last time has not been refuted how can they change things. Mr. Redlingshafer commented about witnessing the committee meetings were they reviewed the regulations line by line to present the application. Chair Huisman ask if there was anything to show if the health and safety of those people in that community would be less affected. Mr. Redlingshafer did not personally know.

Jason Bunting, an Agriculture and Zoning Committee member, asked the chair if he could speak now. Mr. Blakeman said that he has an attorney that speaks for him. Mr. Redlingshafer was okay with him testifying. Chair Huisman preferred it otherwise, but she asked the zoning board members. Mr. Bunting said if they do not want him to speak, he understands. But she may let others come forward to speak. Jason Bunting, 23485 North – 3100 East Rd. Emington came forward as a member of the AG and Zoning Committee and he had no testimony he just wants to address some of the Chairs questions. In regard to the driving force as to why these seven townships were picked, Mr. Bunting commented that he represents the seven townships involved and he looks back at the November 8<sup>th</sup> referendum and he sees how that vote went down. Mr. Bunting sees the productivity level of the ground up in that area as being less conducive to good crops and it provides an opportunity for wind farms to be developed. Mr. Bunting looks at the population of that area and unlike the Pleasant Ridge area, they are less populated. The people there are just important but there are less of them. Mr. Bunting noted that the seven townships are together and that they would be closing the gap between the two wind farms. So when he made his decision back in March, he voted because he thought it was common ground for everybody.

Mr. Cornale asked Mr. Bunting if he had any interests in wind energy. Mr. Bunting said that no body in his immediate family has an interest in wind energy. Chair Huisman inquired about Mr. Bunting's reasoning in voting in favor of the proposed text amendment. Mr. Bunting commented he thought that the 3250 was a common ground spot to be and he respects that, but he was willing to get away from the wind energy moratorium to vote for the 3250 while also voting for this text amendment. Chair Huisman mentioned that the soil types are no different and the economic factors are no different, while Mr. Bunting noted the combination of the four factors is why he chose to send back this text amendment to the zoning board. Including that the area that connects two wind farm areas, less dense population, and because of the seven townships being together and the results of the November 8<sup>th</sup> referendum. Chair Huisman questioned about the population being less dense, the wind farm would have a better area to work with. Mr. Bunting noted it would deter the number of wind turbines to work with, and you would need to make it conceivable to work with. Chair Huisman looks at as having less targets to move around and be concerned with, being fewer people to deal with. Targets were explained as residences. Mr. Bunting questioned as to if the larger setback distance would permit fewer turbines. Chair Huisman is unsure, with a discussion following with Mr. Flott commenting he thinks the larger setbacks reduces the number of turbines, with others expressing that it would depend on the waivers. Chair Huisman noted it would be harder for the wind farm companies, and she would address a siting the same way to start with moving down to waivers as needed. That the 3250 protects landowners including those that do not want them. So

if the majority of folks support it in the referendum that may be willing to waive, bringing us back to where we are without further amending the ordinances. She thought they wrote a good document when they wrote the last document. Mr. Bunting does not deny the 3250 is good, but he thought the document can be improved and not fix it listening to referendum, trying to listen to taxing bodies that provided services to the constituents they thought they were improving upon the existing ordinance. Chair Huisman does not look at as anything being drafted bad she just wants it to be able to stand the test of time, and that is what she felt they had come up with. Since she has been on the zoning board they work to try to reach a happy medium and she thought they had reached that happy medium protecting people for health reasons and then with the waivers you could still get turbines in there. Chair Huisman noted they had not heard from a wind farm company, to say they can't do it. Chair Huisman wants to know why they would do it, and if it soil type should it apply to every township with the same soils be included so they do not come back to look at it again. Mr. Bunting referred back to the results of the referendum and how the seven townships adjoin each other are open to 1640, so that along with his other factors is why he as a member of the county AG & Zoning Committee voted in favor to put this text amendment back to the ZBA. Chair Huisman asked Mr. Bunting as to if he looked at the referendum results closely. Mr. Bunting asked about if it was the point spread. Chair Huisman said yes plus as to if the voters lived in town or in the country. Because people in town may not care as much as people living in rural areas. Mr. Bunting said he has not asked about how people have voted, he just knows the results of the referendum. Zoning Board member Blackard asked as to if he had any feedback from his constituents on these wind energy matters. Mr. Bunting likes to believe that some constituents would like wind farm development, and some are opposed, but as a property owner he tries to justify how one can get a bigger bang for the buck while being polite to their neighbors. And, it is a balancing act they are trying to work on. Mr. Blackard asked if he has feedback from his constituents on this issue. Mr. Bunting said he has heard both anti and pro wind opinions. Mr. Bunting lives within 1.5 miles of one and he has his own opinion, but he listens to other opinions. Mr. Bunting related that the ballot box can determine if they do not want to reelect him. Zoning board member asked Mr. Bunting that if the wind farm next to him had been developed with 3250 foot setbacks how many of the wind turbines would qualify. Mr. Bunting speculated a half to a third, and he thinks Mr. Bryan described the difference between 3250 and 1600 and it hit home to him that a land owner with a 40 or an 80 would be less likely as to someone with a larger tract of land. Mr. Flott asked Mr. Schopp about the number of wind turbines that would be there at 3250. Mr. Schopp said it would be considerably less, in the 10 to 15 percent. Chair Huisman asked as to if he thought that many people would not waive. Mr. Schopp could not answer that since this same waiver option was not in affect at that time. Mr. Schopp questioned as to would a wind farm would come in to explore those options. Mr. Runyon pointed out those questions cannot be answered accurately, of which his statement was agreed to. Chair Huisman asked Mr. Bunting as to if he has heard negative comments on the wind turbines. Mr. Bunting related he has heard negative and positive comments both. Mr. Bunting said it was in terms of not in my back yard, but he does not know of any one that has moved because of the wind farm. Mr. Bunting then commented that during the two years of construction of the wind farm, was two years he wishes they were not here either, but once they got through the construction he does not see how the wind farms create any health concerns to his family. Chair Huisman asked as to why during the construction phase what factors made him feel that way. Mr. Bunting then commented on the poor road conditions during the wind farm construction. Mr. Bunting thinks the current wind farm has good operators that are open to comments, but there was some pain during the construction phase. Mr. Cornale asked about the closest turbine to Mr. Cornale being 1.5 miles. Mr. Bunting said it may be 2 miles away. Mr. Cornale said that is 10,000 feet with no negative effects. Mr. Bunting said he does not

remember of anyone moving or leaving because of the wind farms. Mr. Cornale asked if they had abandoned any properties. Mr. Bunting noted there are abandoned properties. Mr. Cornale asked about if the abandoned properties are within a half mile of a turbine. Mr. Bunting related that he has seen farmsteads abandoned since he can remember. Mr. Bunting noted that houses sit empty inside and outside the wind farm area. Mr. Cornale asked Mr. Bunting to pick two sites. Mr. Bunting said one site is five miles from the wind farm and another is three miles, and one has been abandoned for twenty years. Chair Huisman noted that no primary residence was their when the wind farm was developed, and the wind farm may limit the options to knock down the site and build new. Mr. Bunting said that is not going on, and his country side is not full of abandoned houses. Chair Huisman asked about the AG & Zoning Committee discussions as to if health concerns was discussed much, with there being opposing side with health concerns and that the county should review health concerns to protect those folks along with those that want more economic activity, a balancing act. Mr. Bunting agreed it is a balancing act. Chair Huisman thinks that is the hurdle they need to get over and they have not heard anything to refute those health reasons. She noted they have more information on the economic side, but she assumes that is why they have always been wanted. So that is her struggle so how much was that said at the committee meeting. Mr. Bunting said that as the attorney had said they had quite a bit of deliberations but he does not know how long. Chair Huisman wishes an ordinance could be written that addresses a 1640 setback but that those with seizures from the twirling blades that they be moved back but that is hard to factor in, so with the 3250 it is factored in with a waiver. Mr. Bunting said he would do nothing to put his family in harms way. Mr. Kulasik clarified with Mr. Bunting that he represented District 2 and that he Mr. Kulasik is a constituent of his district. Mr. Kulasik asked about the number of people that voted for it, noting that Dwight Township voted for it, but what percentage of the people would need to say yes for it to be a good idea to make it a mandate. Mr. Bunting said they are not looking for a mandate, they are looking at this proposed amendment to the current ordinance. Mr. Kulasik noted that the majority of the people in the county voted against it, so he is wondering about the people want it and do not want it, and at what percentage do you look at the will of the people to stay want they want or don't want. Mr. Kulasik asked him to clarify that he lives near Emington, and that Mr. Bunting has never signed a lease. Mr. Kulasik then asked as to if anyone has ever complained about any health effects. Mr. Bunting said not to him. Mr. Kulasik related that his property value has gone down, would a wind turbine within 1600 feet of his property raise his value. Mr. Bunting commented that there are several determining factors on property value in his opinion. John Vitzthum asked about how do you protect the people, using the 3000 feet or whatever with the waiver to protect the people in the district. Mr. Bunting related that would be a conversation between and land owner and a home owner. Mr. Vitzthum noted it is a question that has come up in the past as to how to protect the smaller land owners, that has to be done. Mr. Vitzthum related that no wind mill companies have come forward to say the 3000 feet will not work. Mr. Bunting referred to Mr. Bryan, with Mr. Vitzthum saying that no wind mill expert has testified other than to say it would create more work. Mr. Cornale asked about population asking Chuck if he has provided them with calculations on population density with in those townships. Mr. Schopp said he had provided the population figures from the county clerk's office and that the density has not been provided. Mr. Cornale then asked about the population data not being substantiated in details, Mr. Schopp said no other than the corporate and unincorporated data had been provided. Mr. Cornale asked about the population. Mr. Schopp noted he looked at all seven. Mr. Cornale asked if not all seven were looked at as a group the density issue may be different. Mr. Schopp noted you would need to look at specifics to answer that. Mr. Cornale then asked about election results and about how the incorporated areas were not included in the consensus. Mr. Schopp noted that the county clerk administered the elections, and that the incorporated voters would have also been

voting for the unincorporated area. Mr. Cornale asked Mr. Redlingshafer if there is any case law that would substantiate the desire to apply different zoning characteristics to different townships, placing those inhabitants at a greater loss of property values, negative health effects and nuisances including noise pollution and shadow flicker. Mr. Redlingshafer noted there is no case law on that specific issue, what they did was to have the Agriculture, Zoning and Emergency Services Committee to come up to this board then changes they wanted to bring before the zoning board of appeals, and they felt as counsel that the way to do that would be through a text amendment ordinance, and that is why they have the application before them. Speaking to the text amendment Mr. Cornale asked as to if Mr. Redlingshafer was aware of the attorney general's opinion. Mr. Redlingshafer is familiar with that opinion, written specifically to Livingston County that did not make a definitive decision on this. So Mr. Cornale asked why they chose to go this route instead of the map amendment route. Mr. Redlingshafer said that in their position the map amendment is not the legal process by which to do it, that was their advice to their client. Mr. Cornale asked what that was based on. Mr. Redlingshafer said it is based on his legal ability and opinion. Mr. Cornale asked about case law, and Mr. Redlingshafer said when case law does not exist, legal opinion needs to be based on his opinion. Mr. Cornale asked about what factors, and working within the authority of the law and the attorney general saying we should not do this. Mr. Redlingshafer advised him to have that conversation with his counsel. Mr. Cornale questioned about the certification of publication seeing it was published in the Daily Leader, and it has been represented that The Paper represents that area circulating within that region, and why was it his advice not published it the media published in area affected. Mr. Redlingshafer deferred as to how notices are always handled. Mr. Schopp said they are always published in the Pontiac Daily Leader as a paper published county wide, as a text amendment affects the county as a whole, as general operating procedures. Mr. Cornale noted that this particular text amendment goes to a selected seven townships and not circulate within that publishing area. Mr. Redlingshafer said that Chuck answered the question by following general operating procedures. Mr. Cornale asked Mr. Redlingshafer about meetings to prepare for this and have any members of this zoning board of appeals been present at any of those meetings that he has had. Mr. Redlingshafer asked about what meetings. Mr. Cornale is asking about meeting pertaining to this process. Mr. Redlingshafer said his client meetings are a protected privilege, but he has not seen anyone from this board at those meetings but he is not going to speak about those meetings. Mr. Cornale asked that the record indicate that he does not know where to go with this in that you (Redlingshafer) may have just perjured yourself. Chair Huisman, had admitted that she had attended a meeting. Mr. Redlingshafer pointed out she had not met with her. Chair Huisman said she had met with Tom, the state's attorney Randy Yedinak, Bob Young and Chuck, at her request to try to help educate both sides to reduce the friction. Mr. Cornale apologized and his apology was accepted. Mr. Cornale wanted to be clear about not zoning board of appeals being present. Mr. Redlingshafer is not aware of any. Mr. Cornale asked if sound zoning decisions are based on popularity or following the predetermined zoning process as defined by the local ordinance that considers the overall use of land and the impacts on property, people and entities. Mr. Redlingshafer of unsure of the question, but if he is asking for legal opinions Mr. Cornale has counsel. Mr. Cornale asked about it on this professional and ethical opinion. Mr. Redlingshafer said he is not here to offer guesses. Mr. Cornale asked a question of Mr. Bryan about when he said he had met with other superintendents. Mr. Bryan said he has been at meetings with other superintendents. Mr. Cornale asked if he had ever met with a gentleman Bill Mulvaney. Mr. Bryan said he knows it is not a Livingston County Superintendent, and he does not know he had met in a bigger regional meeting. Mr. Bryan cannot put a face with a name or school. Mr. Cornale referred to the Armstrong District. Mr. Bryan said that school is not within their region.

Closing Statements took place:

Mr. Blakeman explained that you must have testified to make a closing statement and if you are represented by an attorney the attorney will make the closing statement for you and no new information can be introduced in closing arguments. The order of closing arguments was discussed as the applicant first, followed by the school district, followed by people represented by attorneys, and then people not represented by attorneys. Those not represented by an attorney will be taken in the order they spoke.

Mr. Redlingshafer began his closing comments by thanking the zoning board of appeals chair and the entire zoning board of appeals for the time that has been put into this and their professionalism. Mr. Redlingshafer then noted they had a county that presented them with an application based on its own through analysis, with text amendments with what is felt to be in the best interest of the county. The county provided their evidence and testimony, and he thanked them for the opportunity to do so and we conclude with basically that a process will remain in place to allow for wind farm companies to present an application, so there will be the opportunity for the second portion of this with an application coming in that still has to go through all of the procedures. Thank you all very much.

Mr. Bryan echoed what counsel said about the amount of hours put in and the amount of work put in by everyone on this, and as he attends a lot of night meetings he understands the burden these meetings create, acknowledging that you lose family time. Mr. Bryan related that he also will not add anything new, but one of his premises is the economic impact of the school district. He said during his presentation that they are not a wealthy school district and they do not have a lot of economic growth and this is the way to provide economic growth to fund the education for the kids. Thank you.

Mr. Luetkehans thanked them for their time and he has already given the UCLC statement and he has nothing further to add.

Mr. Kulasik looking at from an emergency and safety point of view, but bringing attention to other exhibits brought forward earlier. Such as the Illinois Average Wind Speed document having no date or time frame or how it was done, so he asks the board to weigh that article as questioned. Mr. Kulasik questioned County exhibits 5 and 6 of which he considers out of date, and that the board take a look at that. Mr. Kulasik related that he thinks everything is hinging on dollars, that it is all he heard it is an economic thing, with the schools he gets it, but he is losing property value right now and one of them gets put up he will be one that will be leaving the county. Mr. Kulasik said that the health problem that you cannot take into effect is a psychological one; there are no studies on them and what impact will that have on people that leave. This is not for today, you need to think 30 to 40 years down the road and it is not easy to plan that far out. Politicians are terrible in that they live in the moment, and has gotten us to the problems we have in the state today. What is a boom today can be a bust later on when they come down, and how will we survive then. Take these things into consideration thank you.

Mr. Gerber was not present.

Mayte Callegas had nothing to say.

Judy Campbell was not present.

Mr. Slagel was good without making a closing statement.

Mr. Vitzthum did not have a closing statement while expressing his thanks.

Mr. Bunting thanked the zoning board for their time.

Chair Huisman asked for a motion to close this hearing, zoning board discussion to follow that motion.

Mr. Flott moved, seconded by Mr. Blackard, with Chair Huisman clarifying they have motion in the positive. Mr. Flott was okay with that. Chair Huisman had items she would like to discuss; clarifying the hearing portion was closed with the motion, to allow for discussion.

Mr. Schopp clarified that the motion was to either close the meeting or to approve the zoning case. Chair Huisman related if the motion is to close, and if that is the understanding, then they can recess and come back later. Mr. Flott moved, seconded by Mr. Blackard, the Livingston County Zoning Case ZT-3-17 be approved. Mr. Blackard confirmed his second so they can move on to deliberations. Of which the chair confirmed, allowing them to get on to discuss it.

The chair noted it was ten minutes to nine with one other issue of reviewing the minute before they complete their deliberations. Mr. Schopp said the minutes would be a couple weeks away. Mr. Blakeman noted that the Ambrose's have it on tape, of which Mr. Blackard said he had viewed. Mr. Blakeman mentioned transcripts of the meetings. Chuck will do the minutes but are transcripts desired also, while suggesting since they have access to the tape it may be better to just watch what you want and transcripts are needed. Chair Huisman said she just needs the minutes and if they have any issues they can go back to the tapes. Mr. Kiefer asked if the minutes could be delivered by email so that they had the minutes prior to their meeting. Mr. Schopp said that he would send them out by email. Chair Huisman revised Chuck testifying and doing the minutes and in an effort to remove any bias or conflict then they need to review what Chuck drafts, and she wants to make part of the deliberations. Mr. Kiefer wanted to clarify that they would have the minutes prior to the deliberations so that the time to review them at the minutes is reduced at the meetings. Chair Huisman stated about how they should be reviewed at a meeting in detail to show people that they did read them to remove any conflict. Mr. Kiefer said in reviewing them ahead will reduce time reviewing them in the meeting. The Chair questioned as to how late they get them. A potential meeting date was discussed as being their regular November meeting date. Mr. Schopp commented that the Ziegenhorn special use and the cemetery special use review, are to be reviewed for sure on November 9<sup>th</sup>. Chair Huisman questioned if that would that be enough time to get them done. Mr. Schopp noted that Mr. Runyon would not be at the November 9<sup>th</sup> meeting, and Chair Huisman mentioned setting another meeting date as an option. Mr. Runyon said they he wants to be at the meeting. November 2 and November 16 were discussed as possible meeting days. Mr. Schopp said that he would attempt to have the meeting minutes done by October 27<sup>th</sup>. November 6<sup>th</sup> was discussed as a potential date. Mr. Schopp he would try to have them on the 27<sup>th</sup> and a couple days later, or they could be read at the meeting. Monday November 6<sup>th</sup> was then discussed, with Chair Huisman preferring that the meetings begin a 7:30 pm. It was mentioned that the county board property committee will meet that evening, and will hopefully be done by 7:30 pm. Mr. Cornale wanted to make sure they have the links to the videos, and possibly have the availability to look at them at the meeting. Mr. Slagel said the first meeting is not public. Mr. Blakeman asked if the first meeting would need to be transcribed. Access to tapes and the video Chair Huisman confirmed that



Chuck is using the recorded tapes and not the videos for the minutes. Mr. Luetkehans suggested if you have questions were the video tapes would be needed that contact them to prepare those sections ahead of time. Chair said the minutes will be prepared as can be by October 27<sup>th</sup>, with the meeting on November 6<sup>th</sup> at 7:30 pm. So they need to recess tonight and after the 6<sup>th</sup> they can pick another date as need be. Mr. Blakeman said a second date will be needed to approve a report and recommendation, Chair Huisman and Mr. Blakeman did not know how long those would take to compile so they can schedule another date then. Mr. Cornale confirmed that November 9<sup>th</sup> date is still a regularly scheduled meeting date.

Motion to recess this meeting to November 6, 2017 at 7:30 pm was made by Mr. Blackard, seconded by Mr. Kiefer.

This motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

This meeting was recessed at 9:05 p.m.

Material regarding these proceedings is on file in the Livingston County Regional Planning Commission Office, in the Livingston County Historic Courthouse, 112 W. Madison St., Pontiac, Illinois.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles T. Schopp, Secretary  
Livingston County Regional  
Planning Commission