

Susan Burgstrom

From: Kim Decker <kkdecker94@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 12, 2022 9:54 AM
To: Susan Burgstrom
Subject: Re: Champaign County Zoning Board of Appeals April 14, 2022 Meeting Packet
Attachments: list of setbacks.pdf

RECEIVED

APR 12 2022

CHAMPAIGN CO. P & Z DEPARTMENT

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: External email, be careful when opening.

I plan to speak briefly on Thurs and refer to the attached . Can it be given to the members ahead or do I have to leave it with you that day?

Thanks
Kim

On Wed, Apr 6, 2022 at 1:47 PM Susan Burgstrom <sburgstrom@co.champaign.il.us> wrote:
Hi Kim,

I believe he was referring to Dr. Punch's presentation:


http://www.co.champaign.il.us/CountyBoard/ZBA/2022/220317/220317_LBGA%20Exhibit%208.pdf

All the exhibits provided by Attorney Brian Armstrong are on the ZBA meetings website under the March 17 meeting. The links all start with LBGA.

http://www.co.champaign.il.us/CountyBoard/meetings_ZBA.php

Thanks,
Susan

From: Kim Decker <kkdecker94@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 6, 2022 12:46 PM
To: Susan Burgstrom <sburgstrom@co.champaign.il.us>
Cc: Aaron Fenter <aacfmach@icloud.com>; Adam Watson <awatson823@gmail.com>; Benjamin Rice <bjrice94@gmail.com>; Brad Shotton <Brad@feutzcontractors.com>; Brandon & Sarah Hastings <hastings329@yahoo.com>; Cary & Pam Leerkamp <pleerkamp@gmail.com>; Darrel & Regina Rice <ricebunch@gmail.com>; Dave & Traci Bosch <davetraci.bosch@gmail.com>; David Happ Township Assessor <happs65@yahoo.com>; Donald Carter <dcn321@yahoo.com>; Doug Downs <tractordoug69@hotmail.com>; Gary Place <gary.place@plantpioneer.com>; Heidi Leerkamp <heidi.leerkamp@gmail.com>; Jan Niccum <jcarnic@comcast.net>; Jennifer Eisenmenger <jce700n@yahoo.com>; Jennifer Miller <info@rushcreekfarms.com>; Justin Leerkamp <justin.leerkamp@gmail.com>; Kate Boyer <kate@boyerhomestead.com>; Kris Petersen <kris@pontiacflyingservice.com>; Lynn Rice <ricelynn85@gmail.com>; Michael Mooney <michaelmooney911@gmail.com>; Michelle Wiesbrook <buesinge@illinois.edu>; Mick & Mary Schumacher <mschum5691@aol.com>; Mike Lockwood <mike@loptics.com>; Natalie Thomas <nataliet2001@gmail.com>; rick@rickgallivan.com; Shannon Reel <sreel65@yahoo.com>; Stephen Smith <srsakssss@prairieinet.net>; Steven Herriott <stevenherriott@hotmail.com>; Tiffany Byrne <tiffany.byrne2@gmail.com>; Todd & Sharon Herbert <herberttodd@aol.com>; Todd Horton <todd.horton.pe.pls@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Champaign County Zoning Board of Appeals April 14, 2022 Meeting Packet

source: 

www.wiseenergy.org/Energy/wind-ordinance-setbacks.pdf

Some Locations, Sources, and/or Reports that have (or are recommending) 1± Mile (1500± m) Setbacks from Wind Turbines

1. 15,000 m (**9.3 miles**) range of infrasound problems (from this 2018 Finnish report).
2. 10,000 m (**6.2 miles**) exclusion zone recommended (p 90 of this Scottish report).
3. 10,000 m called for by a prominent physician (with many references: 2011).
4. 6,440 m (**4.0 miles**) to a residence - Darlington, Indiana (2018)
5. 5,000 m (**3.1 miles**). This French study concluded "wind turbines must not be sited less than 5 km from all habitation, because of infrasound risks." (2004)
6. 5,000 m - Dr. Robyn Phipps, New Zealand conducted a survey and wrote a detailed report concluding "wind turbine noise may well extend more than 5 km." (2007)
7. 5,000 m - Professional engineer discusses infrasound problems (2016).
8. 4,800 m (**3.0 miles**) from residences - Divide, North Dakota (2017).
9. 4,000 m (**2.5 miles**) 1 mile *per MW*: Rutland (VT) Regional Planning (2015)
10. 3,220 m (**2.0 miles**) to properly address infrasound. This is found in an outstanding study done by the town of Heath, Massachusetts (2013)
11. 3,220 m to a rural home - Walworth County, South Dakota (2017)
12. 3,220 m to a rural home - Umatilla County, Oregon (2011)
13. 3,220 m - Coconino County, Arizona (see this report page 29: 2011)
14. 3,000 m (**1.9 miles**) for turbines taller than 150 m - Wiltshire, UK (2012)
15. 3,000 m recommended as setback by German doctors (2016)
16. 2,600 m (**1.6 miles**) going from 2000 m: examining increasing the recommended distance between wind turbines and the nearest town or village: Scotland (2013)
17. 2,414 m (**1.5 miles**) Board of Health recommendation - Madison, Iowa (2019)
18. 2,414 m Board of Health recommendation - Chautauqua County, NY (2019)
19. 2,414 m from property lines - Caratunk, Maine (2011)
20. 2,414 m - Moscow, Maine (2011)
21. 2,414 m - Peru Maine (see this report page 29: 2012)
22. 2,414 m recommendation of Dr. Amanda Harry (British physician) (2007)
23. 2,253 m (**1.4 miles**) from people's homes - (Lincolnshire, UK: 2012)
24. 2,100 m buffer zone from property lines in Industry, Maine (2013)
25. 2,100 m for 3MW turbines - recommended in Denmark (2011)
26. 2,010 m (**1.25 miles**) - from property lines in Woodstock, Maine (2013)
27. 2,000 m (**1.24 miles**) - Poland's National Institute of Public Health (2016)
28. 2,000 m - Retexo (a wind energy consultant) advisory (2014)
29. 2,000 m - by Director of Finland's Ministry of Health (2014)
30. 2,000 m - by Dr. Hazel Lynn, who has extensively studied this issue (2014)
31. 2,000 m - by Dr. Robert Thorne's study (2014)
32. 2,000 m - "Bad Science Behind Wind Noise Guidelines" study (2013)
33. 2,000 m from a home in the Haut-Saint-Laurent, in the Montérégie, Quebec (2013)
34. 2,000 m restriction: Cambridgeshire, UK (2013)
35. 2,000 m away from housing in Scotland (2013)

36. 2,000 m to habitations & 5000 m from agglomerations – Victoria, Australia (2011)
37. 2,000 m from existing homes proposed in New South Wales, Australia (2011)
38. 2,000 m advised by Noise & Health Journal study: “setback distances need to be greater than 2000 m in hilly terrain”. (2011)
39. 2,000 m turbine setback bill debated by British House of Lords (2011)
40. 2,000 m setback affirmed by Scotland Government Official (2009)
41. 1,950 m (13 times the turbine height [est 500’]) - Freedom, Maine (2012)
42. 1,950 m (13 times the turbine height [est 500’]) - Buckfield, Maine (2010)
43. 1,950 m (13 times the turbine height [est 500’]) - Montville, Maine (2010)
44. 1,900 m distance scientific study found that residents “expressed annoyance” (2003)
45. 1,900 m Poland adopts 10x as national standard (2016)
46. 1,900 m Bavarian law (10x height & 600 feet in height) (2014)
47. 1,900 m for a 600 foot turbine (10x height) - The little Isle of Anglesey, UK (2012)
48. 1,770 m Fayette County, Pennsylvania (2008)
49. 1,740 m average of numerous communities found in this excellent study (2013)
50. 1,609 m (**1.0 mile**) from property lines - Gage County, NE (2020)
51. 1,609 m from property lines - Lancaster County, NE (2019)
52. 1,609 m from property lines - Craven County, NC (2018)
53. 1,609 m from property lines - Richland, NY (2018)
54. 1,609 m from properties - Buffalo Township, ND (2017)
55. 1,609 m from non-participating property lines - Letcher Township, SD (2016)
56. 1,609 m from non-participating property lines - Whiting, Maine (2016)
57. 1,609 m from non-participating property lines - Fort Fairfield, Maine (2015)
58. 1,609 m from non-participating property lines - Carteret County, NC (2014)
59. 1,609 m from non-participating property lines - Mason County, KY (2014)
60. 1,609 m from non-participating property lines - Sumner, Maine (2013)
61. 1,609 m from non-participating property lines - Frankfort, Maine (2011)
62. 1,609 m from non-participating property lines - Unity, Maine (2011)
63. 1,609 m from non-participating property lines - Eddington, Maine (2011)
64. 1,609 m from non-participating property lines - Dixmont, Maine (2011?)
65. 1,609 m from the nearest existing residence, etc - Madison County, Idaho (2011)
66. 1,609 m from inhabited structures - Trempealeau County, Wisc. (2007)
67. 1,609 m (1 to 1.5 mile) - UK Noise Association (2006)
68. 1,524 m from non-participating property lines - Town of Newport, NC (2014)
69. 1,500-2,000 m recommended by this European Human Rights study (2012)
70. 1,500 m in an environment characterized by a 35 DB ambient noise level Germany
71. 1,500 m “Weight of expert opinion is that this is the health limit” study (2015)
72. 1,500 m larger buffer zones needed in Wales (2012)
73. 1,500 m sleep expert warns of effects of wind turbines (2012)
74. 1,500 m Acoustical Ecology Institute Report on Wind Energy Noise Impacts (2009)
75. 1,500 m recommended by French National Academy of Medicine (2006)

Thanks for the helpful information on this [site](#), and on the [US DOE site](#).

For additions and/or corrections please contact [John Droz](#).

Rev: 9/13/20

Susan Burgstrom

From: Stephanie N. Berry
Sent: Thursday, April 14, 2022 1:07 PM
To: Susan Burgstrom
Subject: FW: ZBA Case 037-AT-22

RECEIVED

APR 14 2022

CHAMPAIGN CO. P & Z DEPARTMENT

From: Matthew Herriott <mherrio2@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, April 14, 2022 1:01 PM

To: zoningdept <zoningdept@co.champaign.il.us>; Jacob Paul <217jpaul@gmail.com>; Jim Goss <jegoss64@gmail.com>; Jodi Wolken <jwolken4@aol.com>; michaels@illicom.net; ale7496@yahoo.com; Stan Harper <stancharper@gmail.com>; Brad Passalacqua <bpassalacqua2020@gmail.com>; Jim McGuire <jimmcg1@gmail.com>; Bethany Vanichtheeranont <Champaigncbdistrict5@gmail.com>; Leah Taylor <leahtaylor100@gmail.com>; Samantha Carter <jazzielooks@gmail.com>; Jenny Lokshin <jenny.lokshin@gmail.com>; Eric Thorsland <ericfor1@yahoo.com>; Kyle Patterson <kylepatterson@co.champaign.il.us>; Stephanie Fortado <fortadoccb@gmail.com>; Emily Rodriguez <erodriguez@co.champaign.il.us>; Jennifer Straub <jennifer.straub61801@gmail.com>; Steve Summers <ssummers@co.champaign.il.us>; Chris Stohr <cstohr.ccbd10@gmail.com>; Mary King <maryking4countyboard@gmail.com>; Lorraine Cowart <lcowart@co.champaign.il.us>

Subject: ZBA Case 037-AT-22

I am writing to encourage the Champaign County ZBA to closely consider the proposed changes to the wind turbine ordinance and how they affect the current and future residents of Champaign County, especially those in the rural setting that would be most affected.

I am strongly opposed to increasing the tower height beyond 500 feet. If the reason given for allowing unlimited heights is out of convenience to the office that would process these variances, why is the health and safety of the residents not the main concern, but instead the convenience factor is? If in our everyday life, we are limited by regulations that are to protect citizen's health and safety, such as speed limits or the amount of pesticides we can apply to our food grade crops in a given growing season, why is the convenience of the zoning administrator the ultimate driving force behind this change, instead of the rural residents' well-being? There is no logical reason for a wind company to be permitted to have unlimited heights. It is only the beginning of a slippery slope.

The proposed setback changes to 2.4 times the tower height is not enough to protect the safety and wellbeing of the residents, as indicated with evidence in previous testimony. I propose the ZBA take a close look at the Livingston County Ordinance regarding setbacks and suggest to ELUC that Champaign County setbacks need to be 3,250 feet or six times the tower height, whichever is greater. Please take Livingston County's setbacks a bit further and require this to be to the property line so that families can enjoy their entire property that they have invested a lot of time and resources in. For many of us in the rural setting, our property is not just our home, but also our place of work, land for our animals, and a park for our young children.

The ALDS lighting is good in theory, but I question how often the lights would be off with the air traffic to Willard Airport. We have not only the commercial flights, but there are also the medical flights to Carle Hospital to and from the more rural areas south of us, private jets that come into the local airport, as well as the aviation program through Parkland. I am also concerned with who is going to ensure that this lighting will be operating as designed. This is automated system could fail and likely to over the lifetime of these towers. Is this something that will fall back on the zoning office? Does the zoning office have enough time and resources to enforce the zoning regulations?

The application fee increase is a nice addition but could be higher to help with the shortfalls of the zoning office. The added money should be funneled back to the zoning office to hire a neutral party to ensure that all complaints for

matters in their jurisdiction, including wind turbines, solar, etc, are dealt with in a timely manner, and that any violations are remedied quickly and in the best interest of the county residents.

The addition of the agriculture mitigation agreement great addition to the ordinance if the guidelines are enforced. I again question how these guidelines will be enforced on the wind companies and what ramifications, if any, the county will place on those in violation of the agreement. Perhaps my proposal for the higher fees and hiring of an "enforcement officer" can ensure the agreement is followed? There needs to be clear and concise dictation of how the county will enforce the regulations and how they plan to address a situation if the rules are not followed before amendments can be approved.

In summary, it is my recommendation that the Champaign County Zoning Board deny the current proposed changes to the ordinance regarding turbine height and setback distance. I recommend that you keep the turbine height limitation to under 500 feet and the setbacks be equivalent to Livingston County which is 3,250 feet or six times the tower height, whichever is greater. I also request that this distance be set at the property line and not the residence so that Champaign County citizens can enjoy every square foot of their property.

Thank you for your time and attention to this important matter facing the current and future generations in Champaign County. I trust that our ZBA will continue to look out for the best interest of the residents residing in this beautiful agricultural community.

Matthew Herriott

Philo, IL