

Monroe County Comprehensive Plan Committee
March 11, 2020
Minutes

Members Present: Dennis Brand, Laurie Brown, Carl Daubach, Dale Haudrich, Aaron Metzger, Carlyle Mueller, Chris Voelker, Walter Wetzler, and Dave Glosecki.

Others Present: Rick Harsey, Pen Daubach, Alex Knoll, and Courtney Schweickhardt

Dale Haudrich opened the meeting.

Two topics to address

1. Wind Tower Ordinance
2. Traffic Study Requirements

Chris Voelker mentioned that he also wants to bring up a fence concern if time.

Wind Tower Ordinance

- Pen Daubach proposed a change in page 5, section 1 – to add “and sole user.”
 - Carl Daubach that it goes along with state law.
- Carl Daubach – page 10 #6 – International standard of what defines sound wall. When a sound wall merited.
 - Suggestion to add at the end on page 10 #6 (4) – The requirement for sound barriers or sound walls will be governed by the Institute of Electrical and Engineers Standards Association Standard 1127-2013.
- Pen Daubach proposed a change on page 19 (c) – drop existing language and add “Strategies or technologies to replace Operational Minimization may be approved by the MoCo Planning Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals only if the Developer/Operator provides full documentation and approval from IDNR and recommendations on greater mortality reductions from independent organization including the BWEC, Bat Conservation International, and the American Conservancy.”
 - Dale Haudrich confirmed the change
- Pen Daubach added that the document presented the red print indicates everything and she had no other questions, comments, or concerns thus far.
- Courtney Schweickhardt commented that a big bulk of it was taken care of at the last meeting.

- Dave Glosecki – Starting where left on – now page 12 – Standard Conditions for Use of Public Roads and Bridges
 - Rich Harsey and Aaron Metzger’s comments are close.
 - Aaron Metzger’s suggestions are as follows:
 - General
 - Suggest removing decommissioning from all sections and add a paragraph at the end stating that upon determination that decommissioning is eminent, a road upgrade and maintenance agreement shall be revisited per the preceding requirements.
 - Section 1
 - Suggest rewording as “approved by the County Engineer, State’s Attorney, Road Commissioner, Municipality, and State were relevant.”
 - C
 - The County Engineer issues oversized/overweight (os/ow) permits on County Highways and Road District Roads.
 - Suggest rewording: “The applicant/owner/contractor shall provide a schedule of oversized/overweight loads including, at a minimum, size, weight, number of movements and estimated dates. Said schedule shall be a part of the Agreement. Any deviations from the schedule shall be approved by the County Engineer prior to the os/ow movement. Any bridges in question of load rating shall be analyzed at the expense of the applicant/owner/contractor.
 - F
 - The County Engineer approves road closures on County Highways and Road District Roads.
 - Suggest rewording: A schedule of anticipated road closures should be a part of the agreement and any deviations shall require prior approval from the County Engineer. At least 48 hours advance notice shall be provided to the public of each closure.
 - G
 - Suggest changing 14 days to “7 calendar days.”
 - H
 - This paragraph is unclear if it relates to public roadways or private access roads and site construction. For public roadways – I can understand the issue during construction but requiring dust control for one pickup during operation and maintenance is extreme. For access roads and site construction – dust control should be addressed elsewhere in the ordinance and with their EPA permit.

meeting. It would seem to be just as effective to leave decommissioning in all the places where it originally appears if we're going to go to the trouble of addressing it elsewhere in the agreement. Decommissioning will place the same amount of stress and destruction on or roads and bridges as construction did. Ultimately if decommissioning is addressed somewhere within the roadway agreement, we can probably go along with some type of change.

- Section 1
 - The suggested rewording of Section 1 from the original “approved by the County Engineer and State’s Attorney; or Highway Commissioner; or municipality where relevant,” to his suggestion “approved by the County Engineer, State’s Attorney, Road Commissioner, Municipality, and State were relevant,” cleans up and makes this statement more detailed and addresses the proper authorities. This is a positive change to the roadway agreement as written and should be supported.
- C
 - Since the County Engineer issues oversized/overweight permits for the County Highways and Road District Roads the rewording of this paragraph corrects whom is the authority over these permits and lays out the needed details for the permits themselves as well as the details of the moves. Being the County Engineer, Aaron would be more versed on the details of this subject and because he issues the permits himself, I would suggest we support his recommendations.
- F
 - In this paragraph, I assume Aaron wants to replace the last sentences which reads “The applicant/owner/contractor shall provide any road closure or traffic congestion information 48 hours in advance and make is accessible to the public so that residents can make alternate plans for travel.” With his suggestion of “A schedule of anticipated road closures shall be part of the agreement and any deviations shall require prior approval from the County Engineer. At least 48 hours advance notice shall be provided to the public of each closure.” This change in wording doesn’t alter the original intent of the paragraph and is a change that we could support. This is assuming that the rest of the paragraph stands as written or is written in a similar manner. This can be further discussed as a group and with Aaron himself at the meeting to specify any other changes.
- G
 - The suggested change to this paragraph of reducing the timeframe for the repair of “means of moving water” from 14

days down to 7 calendar days is more stringent than what we suggest in the original document which is a plus and should have our stamp of approval.

- H
 - The original intent of this paragraph was directed toward dust control on public roadways although it wasn't specified. I can agree that "during operation" could be removed from this paragraph because generally during operation there wouldn't be heavy traffic. The issue I have with removing "maintenance" from the paragraph is the degree of maintenance that's being discussed. Due to the size, height, and weight of the components comprising a wind turbine maintenance could mean replacing a turbine blade. Maintenance could also be repowering the units with new nacelles or changing a gearbox. This type of maintenance could involve large oversized/overweight transport trucks, large cranes, and crews of workers. This is the type of maintenance that the original paragraph was meant to address. Further discussion on the suggested changes in this paragraph will be necessary so that together with the Commission and County Engineer this can be addressed properly. We should have more discussion around dust control for access roads and the construction site. There should be further investigation into whether the wind companies EPA permit would cover private access roads or construction sites which might mitigate the entire issue. Maybe Aaron could shed more light on this or would have a contact that may be able to.
- I
 - I think this paragraph is important to the ordinance if only to protect the interests of our residents and the overall appearance of the area after construction. It puts some restraint on the wind company and lets them know that we've covered our bases. The changes suggested including switching from "9th addition" to "latest addition" and adding "schedule of trees to be removed" to the agreement sound like fantastic additions and will be fine.
- Section 3
 - This paragraph pertains to a post-construction survey after WECS would be up and running to assesses the aftereffects of construction traffic and the repairs needed as compared to the pre-construction baseline survey called for in section 1a. We may also consider adding baseline survey or even combine paragraph 1a. and Section 3 to this paragraph as heavy traffic would likely be minimal if at all if the WECS are operating. This again leaves a what if in the maintenance area because maintenance could mean replacing a light bulb or could mean bringing in heavy

overweight/oversized trucks and cranes which could cause damage to roads. I would be open to discussion on this subject maybe we could come up with a term or phrase that would fit more properly in the realm of “maintenance.” We could also discuss adding a phrase that would force the wind company to consult with the County Engineer anytime that “maintenance” entails heavy or oversize/overweight equipment that may damage roads. At that time another assessment may be deemed necessary.

- Conversation regarding the above suggestions occurred. All agreed with the presented suggestions.
- Courtney Schweickhardt – we are now on page 20
- Carl Daubach – suggested to look at other states and their verbiage.
 - Rich Harsey – did this
- Laurie Brown – stated that it basically says that they have to put the ground like it was before they did anything.
- Discussion continued about the ground settling. Repairs may need to be down years later after settling. Additional dirt may have to be brought in.
 - Chris Voelker – suggested to add a timeline.
 - Walter Wetzel – doesn’t think there should be a timeline, just that it must get fixed.
 - Pen Daubach – suggested that it is the life of the project.
 - Dennis Brand – suggested that any future settlement they would have to fix it.
 - Dale Haudrich – Take out “in the 1st year” in #6 (2).
 - All accepted the recommendation changes
- Discussion regarding “Decommissioning”
 - Aaron Metzger – no changes with the decommissioning
 - Carlyle Mueller – if we take decommissioning out of road condition, do we need to add road conditions under decommissioning?
 - Carlyle Mueller – Is it possible to have a financial person love over decommissioning?
 - Pen Daubach – maybe keep decommissioning as a separate section. All of the same things on roads and farms as they did to construct it.
 - Carlyle Mueller – nothing that would be unique to construction.
 - Chris Voelker – proposed if we should have someone like TWM review the decommissioning section.

- Carlyle Mueller – thinks we should go back to the counties that they’ve looked at their ordinances from and see what they have now.
 - Chris Voelker – suggested to see if other counties have had problems.
 - Rich Harsey – a lot of it came from other counties in Indiana, Missouri, and Wisconsin.
 - Carl Daubach – suggested to talk to Chris Hitzman, State’s Attorney.
 - Suggestion was made to run the two sections “Decommissioning and Site Reclamation Plan” and “Financial Assurance for Decommissioning and Site Reclamation” pass someone and to get other counties information.
 - Courtney Schweickhardt – Her opinion was to have TWM review it.
 - Dale Haudrich – asked about the cost. Chris Voelker – was going to look it up.
 - Courtney Schweickhardt – asked if other counties are at the point of decommissioning.
 - Carl Daubach – answered – yes, Lee County. With each new generation more is produced. Lee County was the 1st in Illinois 20+ years experience.
- Proposed to accept recommendation on the changes made tonight (Aaron Metzger will reword the road information)
 - Motion – Laurie Brown, Second – Walter Wetzel. Voice Vote – all aye.

Traffic Study Requirements

- Introduction – Wedding Venue – Traffic study for special use. There is an ordinance on Route 3 – produce traffic impact analysis (study)
- Planning Commission asked for a traffic study
 - Aaron Metzger asked for clarification
 - IDOT, as a favor, is going to see if turn lanes are needed.
 - They will be using traffic projections
- Traffic impact analysis study can cost between \$30,000-\$100,000. Then construction could be \$150,000-\$200,000.
- Aaron Metzger does not think it will be based on the different traffic times.
- Chris Voelker asked if a traffic count is included.
- Aaron Metzger – the answer is yes. They will have a camera. We have counters we can also set out.
- Stumpy’s was brought up – we don’t even know what is going on there. We can’t project and we can’t go back to them.
- Points brought up to address:
 - What if the study says turn lanes are warranted or a right of way is needed?
 - What is going to trigger a traffic impact analysis?
 - The ordinance is there, it just needs to be expanded on.
 - Dave Glosecki – Asked if it was possible to reduce the speed.
 - Dale Haudrich – said if enough people call in to IDOT they may reduce it.

- Aaron Metzger – the backroads were not designed for the amount of traffic. Do we make them bring it up to standards or widen the roads?
- Chris Voelker – does not see how we can pick and choose.
- Dale Haudrich – no one is going to do anything because of the cost and possibly of lawsuits.
- Carlyle Mueller – if we require a traffic study for everyone – every meeting when we vote, we are voting on our discretion. We make a judgement call. It is a lot easier to make a judgement call with a waiver than with a restriction.
- Chris Voelker – we will decide when it comes to the Planning Commission than tabled for a month (for the study).
- Carlyle Mueller – Take 60-day review period to 90 days. Or the applicant can come in a month before he puts in the application to make the decision.
- Chris Voelker – would say no because everyone wants it today. No on projects.
- Dan Davis – things morph and change. Need to figure out what the volume to determine traffic study.
- Aaron Metzger – most of our items are reactive. Can't think of too many that have caused problems. We have always just fixed them when things are broken. Escrow accounts for improvements based on traffic count is an option.
- Carlyle Mueller – the Wedding Venue can justify anywhere from \$5,00 to \$15,00 now you come up with the number as judgement.
- Aaron Metzger – estimate 10 cars for a single-family house. Subdivision 70 per day. The wedding venue 150 at a time.
- Alex Knoll – maybe take the number times 10 to come up with number.
- Aaron Metzger – something based on occupancy.
- Dennis Brand – many things in county that impact traffic.
- Aaron Metzger – for subdivision can put provisions.
- Dave Glosecki – Can the intersection of Centerville and 155 be squared.
- Walter Wetzel – have to worry if the landowners will give up to improve.
- Carylye Mueller – running into St. Clair County.
- Aaron Metzger – doesn't think we can resolve anything tonight, but the escrow maybe a start. This was done with St. Elizabeth's on Route 3.
- Carylye Mueller – The idea of the escrow would send a good example for future.

Fence Ordinance

- The working is loose
- Chris Voelker – 6-foot height restriction – no barbwire or electric except agriculture.
- Dennis Brand – asked if it requires a permit.
- Chris Voelker – only requires a permit if it over six feet.
- Chris Voelker – Has had a problem with a man having a junk yard. Scrap yard between Waterloo and Red Bud. The man said if he has to have a fence it's going to be made out of car hoods, etc. He went to court last week over it.
- Dave Glosecki – suggested a review board similar to subdivisions.
- Chris Voelker – doesn't know if we can set a standard.

- Dennis Brand – could it fall as a nuisance in ordinance (junk)
- Laurie Brown – can the fence out of junk be a nuisance.
- Dale Haudrich – look at other counties and see what they have.

Will need a meeting to approve the Wind Tower Ordinance.

Chris Voelker will set up the next meeting at the April 2nd Planning Commission meeting.

Motion Walter Wetzel to adjourn, second Dennis Brand. Voice Vote – All Aye.