

Gary Lutjens  
10 Hawthorne Dr.  
Normal, IL 61761  
309-452-8132  
garylutjens@yahoo.com

*Lutjens, Gary Exhibit A*

December 8, 2020

Woodford County Zoning Board of Appeals  
115 N. Main St. Room 100  
Eureka, IL 61530

Thank you for this opportunity to provide testimony regarding the Special Use Application for the proposed Panther Grove wind energy project, and thank you for your time and effort considering the Application.

I'm asking you to not approve the Application due to its inability to meet the standards of Woodford County's Zoning Ordinance.

In the Application dated 10/14/2020, Section 4, the Applicant seeks approval to build its choice of any one of seven different specific turbine configurations and seeks approval for an eighth hypothetical configuration referenced on Page 4-7.

Regarding sound, in Appendix T, Page 5-1, the first paragraph, it states "the Vestas V140-4.3 with a 105-meter hub height was modeled to determine impacts to various residences."

The next paragraph states, "Provided another turbine model is selected, the Project would still be designed to meet the applicable IPCB sound level limits at each non-participating residence. Meeting the sound level limits at each non-participating residences may require the use of noise reduction modes to mitigate individual turbines or siting the turbines at specific locations to reduce impacts to below the respective limits." What does this mean? Does it mean the applicant has only modeled one turbine configuration, and that if it chooses another, it may need to mitigate or move them but aren't sure? That what it means to me. Why is there this uncertainty? Is it because not all the possible turbine configurations were modeled? Shouldn't each one be modeled? I'm not able to answer these questions. I hope you'll consider them before you make an approval decision.

Other aspects of the Application show it fails to satisfy all the standards of the County's Zoning Ordinance.

The project's impact on public health, safety, and welfare concerns me. Expert witness Jonathan Rogers made the following statements about blade safety: "I have not seen any safety zone specified for any modern turbine. Blade failure on modern wind turbines is exceptionally rare. It's so rare that it's extremely unlikely that a blade would fail at all during the project lifetime. And it's so rare in fact that we really haven't been able to gather statistics on how often it happens."

Just three months ago, less than 30 miles away at the Bright Stalk Wind Farm Wind Farm in northern McLean County, three blades broke. I have provided a news story from The Pantagraph as Exhibit B. The story states that construction was completed at the end of 2019. Two wind towers manufactured by Vestas experienced blade failures on Sept. 7, and a third experienced blade failure on Sept. 15.

The story quotes local farmer Tim Jolly as saying, "I've got one 2,000 feet behind my house. My property line is 600-700 feet from that windmill. Those things are 550 feet tall. I have seen some pictures of aerial shots around windmills that broke off and there is debris out into the field. The people who signed up to have those on their property should be deathly afraid of what could happen." Tim Jolly is here today as my witness, and he will share his testimony after me.

The story continues, quoting McLean County Board member Don Cavallini who voted against the project citing safety concerns. "It was a very contentious, controversial topic and probably one of the more contentious issues I had to deal with on the county board. We approved wind farms long before EDP Renewables and they have been around for a while, but there have always been questions as to their safety and issues like that. This really brings it home when you see what can happen."

I've also attached a news story from Radiolowa, as Exhibit C, reporting on blade breakage on 46 turbines during September and October in Iowa. If blade failure is so rare that an expert witness hasn't been able to gather statistics on how often it happens, perhaps it should seek the assistance of non-experts.

Panther Grove's Application falls flat on its face with respect to providing assurance that the Special Use will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare – Standard A of the Zoning Ordinance.

I've felt for some time that Woodford County's setbacks don't protect non-participating property owners sufficiently. My family was impacted when turbines were installed around our non-participating farm property and farmsteads at the Minonk Wind Farm. My plan had been to return to live on our farm property after I retired from my job in Bloomington-Normal. I just wanted to have a peaceful spot to live on, but no such spot exists there anymore.

I was glad that a public invitation was extended by the County's Conservation, Planning, and Zoning Committee to solicit public input on setbacks at its meeting on August 12, 2019. Several others and I attended to provide input. Three individuals stated they felt the setbacks were too short. Livingston County's setbacks were recommended as an example to follow. The minutes from that meeting, which I've provided as Exhibit D, stated the Committee later discussed the setbacks and felt "we are fine were [sic] we are."

These setbacks have now allowed Panther Grove to propose a new project to the west and south of the Minonk Wind Farm. Panther Grove's footprint is positioned such that Turbines T21 and T22 are sited in the section just east of our farm in Section 12 of Roanoke Township. The Applicant has provided no assurance that the Panther Grove project, if approved, will be less impactful than the Minonk Wind Farm, to the quality of life many rural residents value and expect in a rural agricultural setting.

If the Panther Grove project is approved, how many other families will have members who would like to live and raise families on family property but are dissuaded by industrial development nearby. How many outsiders will want to move here? How many current residents will want to leave? Does Woodford County care?

Regardless of the County's role incentivizing Big Wind, the Applicant still bears the burden to provide assurance that the Special Use will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate area for the purposes already permitted – Standard B. It has failed to do that.

In conclusion, Standards A and B of the Zoning Ordinance, at a minimum, are not met by Panther Grove's Special Use Application. Please don't let the County make the same mistake twice. I ask you to not approve this Application. Thank you.

Gary Lutjens