IN RE: PUBLIC)
INFORMATIONAL MEETING -)
RICH GASTLER FARM.)

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had and evidence taken in the above-entitled matter before the Adams County Board on October 30, 2013, at the Adams County Courthouse, Quincy, Adams County, Illinois.

PRESENT:

MR. SCOTT FRANK
MR. WARREN GOETSCH
MR. BRAD BEAVER

Illinois Department of Agriculture.

MR. JACOB NIMS

Frank & West Environmental Engineers.

MR. RICH GASTLER

Applicant.

MEMBERS OF THE ADAMS COUNTY BOARD

MRS. GINA L. NOTTINGHAM, CSR
License No. 084-002584
2420 Klondike South
Quincy, Illinois 62305
(217) 224-7009

EXHIBITS

NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	MARKED
1	Notice of Intent to Construct	14
2	Department's Power Point Presentation	15
3	Facility's Power Point Presentation	32
4	Oral Testimony Sign-in Sheet	45
5	Attendance Sign-in Sheet	45

PROCEEDINGS

MR. POST: We will go ahead and call this meeting to order. The purpose tonight is for the public hearing for the Gastler livestock construction project.

At this time please rise and join us in the pledge of allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

MR. POST: I will take just a moment to remind the board members and the public of the responsibility of the county board. Our responsibility is not to determine whether we believe this facility should be built, but simply as it is spelled out in the state law, whether we feel they have met the seven citing criteria set out.

And our vote will be taken at our next monthly meeting in November, and our vote is simply a non-binding recommendation to the Department of Ag.

If there are no questions for me, I will turn it over to the Department of Ag for the public hearing.

MR. FRANK: Thank you, Mr. Post.

Good evening. On behalf of Bob Flider, director of the Illinois Department of Agriculture, we thank you very much for the invitation to come to Adams County today.

My name is Scott Frank. I'm with the Illinois Department of Agriculture, and I'll be serving as the hearing officer for tonight's public informational meeting.

Also with me on behalf of the Department are Warren Goetsch, bureau chief of the Bureau of Environmental Programs, and Brad Beaver, manager of the bureau's livestock program.

This meeting is being conducted pursuant to Section 12 of the Livestock Management Facilities Act. The informational meeting is being held at the request of the Adams County Board and is to afford members of the public an opportunity to ask questions and present oral and written testimony regarding the proposed construction of a 1,984 animal unit swine finishing facility owned by Rich Gastler.

My task this evening is to ensure that this meeting is conducted in an orderly fashion and to ensure that all comments and testimony received

are entered into the record.

Tonight's meeting is being transcribed. The transcript of the meeting will be sent to the Adams County Board, as well as used by the Department of Agriculture, in making its determination regarding the proposed construction of this facility.

In order to ensure that we have an orderly process, I will quickly explain how the meeting will proceed this evening.

First, following my comments Warren Goetsch will provide an overview of the provisions of the Livestock Management Facilities Act as it relates to this particular project, specifically outlining the current status of the project and how the process will proceed following this meeting.

Following Mr. Goetsch, representatives for the proposed construction project will be given an opportunity to describe the project and demonstrate how they believe it meets the citing criteria of the Livestock Management Facilities Act.

After their presentation, I will open the meeting to questions. Anyone wishing to ask

questions of the facility representatives or the Department of Agriculture will be given an opportunity to do so.

During the question and answer session I will ask that you state your name and spell your last name. You may then ask your question.

Please keep in mind that we are not here this evening to discuss or debate the perceived inadequacies or merits of the regulations. The Livestock Management Facilities Act and the accompanying rules have been in force for over 15 years.

Some people like them. Some people don't. We cannot change anything here in that regard, so we will not take the time to get into a discussion about changes.

We are here tonight to receive information on this particular livestock facility to determine compliance with the existing regulations.

Following the question and answer session, I will ask for oral testimony from the public. Sign-in sheets were placed, are outside the room as you came in, one sheet for attendance

and a second sheet for testimony. People who wish to provide comments during this oral testimony phase are asked to sign the oral testimony sheet.

People providing oral comments will be sworn in and will be subject to questioning from the public. Each person will be given three minutes to provide his or her comments.

Legal counsel speaking on behalf of multiple clients will be given a total of 15 minutes for all clients and will be asked to state the names of all the persons on whose behalf he or she is speaking.

Deferring time to other speakers will not be allowed. If you sign the oral testimony sheet, you may either speak or you may pass. You may not give your time to someone else.

Also, please keep in mind that if you do not wish to be asked questions regarding your oral testimony, do not sign the sheet, or, if you have signed it already, indicate you would like to pass when I call your name.

Following the oral testimony, I will ask for written testimony. Written testimony will be accepted in paper form and will be entered into the

record for this proceeding.

The meeting will then conclude with closing comments from the facility and the Department of Agriculture.

Again, we very much appreciate your hospitality in inviting us here tonight to consider the proposed construction of the Rich Gastler swine finishing facility.

Please remember to confine your comments and questions to that subject as we continue.

I will now turn the proceedings over to Warren Goetsch for remarks from the Illinois Department of Agriculture.

MR. GOETSCH: Good evening. My name is Warren Goetsch. I currently serve as the bureau chief of environmental programs at the Department of Agriculture. One of our responsibilities at the Department is the administration of the Livestock Management Facilities Act.

On behalf of the Department let me also welcome you to this public informational meeting.

Before we hear from the proposed facilities representatives, I would like to say a few words regarding the applicable provisions of

the Livestock Management Facilities Act and the current status of this proposed project.

The Livestock Management Facilities Act was originally passed and became law on May 21st of 1996. Since that time it's been amended three times, first during the General Assembly's 1997 fall veto session, second during the General Assembly's 1999 spring session, and most recently during the General Assembly's 2007 spring session.

The act can generally be thought of as covering five major areas; those being facility design standards, waste management planning requirements, facility operator training and testing, anaerobic lagoon financial responsibility demonstration, and facility setback requirements.

Each of those provisions impacts various types of facilities in different ways depending upon their size, expressed in animal units, and whether the proposed facility is considered as a new facility, a modified facility, or the expansion of an existing site.

The Livestock Management Facilities Act's provisions are quite complicated, and specific facility designs and situations certainly can

differ. It is, however, the Department's intention to always fairly and equitably apply these requirements to the livestock industry in this state.

Now, regarding the current status of this project, the Department received a formal notice of intent to construct application for the construction of a swine facility on July 26th, 2013.

The proposed project is to consist of the construction of one swine finishing building measuring 71 feet, 2 inches by 561 feet, with an eight-foot deep underbuilding livestock waste handling facility. The project is proposed to be located approximately 4.2 miles southwest of Bowen, Illinois, in northeastern Adams County.

The application was submitted by Frank & West Environmental Engineers, Incorporated, on behalf of Mr. Rich Gastler of West Point, Illinois. The maximum design capacity of the proposed facility is 1,984 animal units or 4,960 head of swine greater than 55 pounds.

As I mentioned earlier, the Department received the notice of intent to construct

application on July 26th and reviewed it for compliance with the applicable provisions of the act. On September 11th, the Department determined that the notice was complete and forwarded a copy of the completed application to the Adams County Board. Notice of that application was also published -- or notice of the application was also published in the appropriate newspapers at that time.

The design capacity of the proposed facility requires compliance with the residential setback distance of not less than 1,324 feet and a populated area setback distance of not less than 2,640 feet.

On October 16th, the Department received notice from the Adams County Board requesting that a public informational meeting be scheduled regarding the proposal. After further consultation with the county board, the Department scheduled this meeting and caused notice of the meeting to be again published in the appropriate newspapers.

An additional requirement of the Livestock Management Facilities Act deals with the design and construction plans of livestock waste

handling facilities.

The Department has received a formal submittal of detailed engineering design plans and specifications for the proposed project's underbuilding livestock waste handling facility. The Department's detailed review process of those plans has been completed, and the plans were found to be in compliance with the statutory requirements of the act.

We are here this evening to receive testimony regarding the proposed facility, or, excuse me, the proposed Livestock Management Facilities compliance with the eight citing criteria as defined in Section 12, paragraph D of the Livestock Management Facilities Act.

In general, information regarding the following would be appropriate for this evening's meeting: Manure management planning, potential impact of the proposed facility on the surrounding area's character, whether the proposed facility is located within any floodplains or other sensitive areas, odor control plans, possible impact of the proposed facility on existing area traffic patterns, and possible impact of the proposed

facility on community growth, tourism, recreation, or economic development of the area.

Copies of the specific criteria were available on the table with the sign-in sheets. If anyone would like to have a copy of the criteria but did not pick one up, please identify yourself, and we will see that you receive a copy.

Finally, the process that will be followed after this evening's meeting is as follows: The county board will have up to 30 business days from today's meeting to submit to the Department a non-binding recommendation relative to the proposed citing of this facility. Thus, a recommendation from the Adams County Board is due at the Department on or before December 16, 2013.

After the close of the county's 30-business day period, the Department will have up to 15 calendar days, or until December 31st, 2013, to review all of the information submitted to date, including the notice of intent to construct, the construction plans, transcripts from this evening's meeting, the county board's recommendation, and any other additional information submitted by the owners at the request of the Department. Based on

that review, the Department will determine whether the eight citing criteria have been met.

Once that determination has been made, the Department will notify both the county board and the applicant of the Department's decision.

Mr. Hearing Officer, at this time I would like to submit the completed notice of intent to construct application and its associated correspondence file for formal entry into the record as an exhibit.

I would also provide a copy of our Power Point for an exhibit, as well.

And with that, I will conclude my comments. Thank you.

MR. FRANK: Thank you, Mr. Goetsch.

Entered into the record as Exhibit Number 1 is a copy of the completed notice of intent to construct, including correspondence between the Department and the applicant, notices of the public informational meeting, and correspondence with the Adams County officials.

Entered into the record as Exhibit Number 2 is a copy of the Department's Power Point presentation.

At this time, we will hear comments from the facility.

Before you begin, for those who will be presenting information, please state your name and spell your last name for the court reporter, and then I will swear you in.

MR. GASTLER: Rich Gastler, finishing farm owner. Last name is spelled G-a-s-t-l-e-r.

MR. NIMS: Jake Nims, last name N-i-m-s.

(Mr. Gastler and Mr. Nims were sworn.)

MR. FRANK: You may proceed.

MR. GASTLER: First of all, I'd like to thank everyone for coming this evening and hearing our plans about the swine facility we are wanting to build on our family farm.

My name is Rich Gastler. Just to give you a little history of our farming operation, I am a third generation farmer starting with my granddad in Missouri.

We started farming in the Bowen area in 1970 when my mom married my step-dad. We have been in the livestock business since the '70's, since our two families merged together, so to say.

I have a 21-year old and a 15-year old

son at home. Looks like maybe one or maybe both would like to farm someday, and we are trying to carry on the family tradition of agriculture in our family, and we feel like this is one way to secure that opportunity to carry on the family farm.

I'm 47-years old. I've been married for 25 years to Gayla Gastler, and we just -- I've been farming since 1988, since the year we got married.

And for any questions about that, I would be glad to field them at this time. If not...

MR. NIMS: Again, my name is Jake Nims. I'm with Frank & West Environmental Engineers. We were hired by Mr. Gastler to evaluate the site and his potential plans to make sure that they conform with the Livestock Management Facilities Act.

I've got a quick presentation here I'll go through here tonight just to kind of detail the eight citing criteria and how his facility meets each one of those. Like I said, a quick introduction site overview and layout and then conformance with the LMFA.

Here is a zoomed out map of Adams County. You can see the facility is located in the northeast corner.

This next slide is more of a section distance and where that building sits within his particular section.

And then this map shows where the building is actually going to sit on that property in relation to the existing infrastructure.

As Warren alluded to a little bit, plans for one finish 561 feet long by 71.2 feet.

The eight citing criteria real quickly:

One, registration and certification requirements; two, design, location and operation standards; three, location compatibility; floodplain and aquifer protection; minimizing environmental impact; odor control and reduction; traffic patterns minimizing impacts; and the facility consistent with area development.

And as we go along on each individual one, I'll give a little more detailed definition.

Citing criteria 1: Registration and certification requirements: Whether registration and livestock waste management plan certification requirements, if required, are met by the notice of intent to construct.

As alluded to earlier, the notice of

intent was filed with the Department of Ag on July 26th and deemed complete on September 11th.

Part 2 of citing criteria number one is the waste management plan. According to the LMFA, a facility which exceeds 1,000 animal units but less than 5,000 shall prepare, maintain, and implement a waste management plan within 60 working days of after commencing separation.

This particular farm will prepare, maintain, and implement a comprehensive nutrient management plan. The farm will submit to the Department of Ag the waste management plan certification form certifying that the waste management plan has been prepared within those 60 days of putting the hogs in the building.

The farm will keep records for the nutrient management plan, as well as waste disposal on file at that farm. The plan and associated records will be available for all Department of Ag inspections.

Citing part 2, still of citing criteria 1:

The goal of the comprehensive nutrient management plan will be to utilize the waste

produced as approved agronomic loading rates that meet the nutrient needs of locally grown crops in an environmentally sound fashion.

This goal will be accomplished by developing a plan which includes the following:

Total annual manure volume calculation, historically proven yield in application areas, manure analysis to provide the nutrient content of the manure, agronomic loading rates of the manure, land application provisions for setbacks and incorporation standards, and documentation of all phases of that plan.

Citing criteria 2 definition: Whether the design, location, or proposed operation will protect the environment by being consistent with the Livestock Management Facilities Act.

Part 1 is design of the concrete structures.

All concrete work is designed according to Midwest Plan Service concrete manure storage handbook. This MWPS is a university-based publishing cooperative dedicated to publishing and disseminating research-based and peer-reviewed publications.

Within this manual there are concrete specifications, reinforcement requirements, and water-stop requirements.

The design of this particular farm will consist of construction plans for one finishing barn.

And here is just a quick picture of a typical or a similar building. You can see the fans on the end there. I believe this is approximately half the length of what the proposed facility will be, but the similar design.

Here is a picture of a typical pen layout for the inside. You can see the feeders within the pens and then the actual gating system itself.

Part 2: The location and setback distances have been met, both the occupied residence setback, the populated area setback. And these setbacks were deemed complete by Department of Ag on September 11th.

Part 3 is proposed operation. The manager of this particular farm will be a certified livestock manager. And this is a program developed by the Department of Ag to educate livestock managers on manure management handling and systems.

Managers of farms of over 1,000 animal units are required to attend a training course and pass an exam.

And also the livestock waste management plan that we talked about, the plan will detail the operation at the farm so that all manure applications will be based on site specific data.

Citing criteria 3: Whether the location minimizes any incompatibility with the surrounding area's character by being zoned for agriculture, where the county has zoning, or where the county is not zoned, the setback requirements established by the LMFA are complied with.

The proposed building location has no zoning. The Department of Ag deemed the setbacks for the facility complete on September 11, and the farm is compatible with the surrounding area in that the area is a rural agricultural area.

The setbacks, like Warren said earlier, had 4,960 animals greater than 55 pound equals 1,984 animal units. This equates to an occupied residence setback distance of a quarter mile or 1320 feet and a populated area setback of a half mile or 2,640 feet.

Here is a map of the proposed facility. Obviously the inner circle is the quarter mile setback and the outer circle is the half mile setback. You can see there is only one residence located within -- no residences located within the quarter mile setback and one located just inside the half mile setback at, I believe, 2300.

Criteria 4: Whether the farm is located within a 100 year floodplain or an otherwise environmentally sensitive area, which is defined as an area of karst area or with aquifer material within five feet of the bottom of the livestock waste handling facility and whether construction standards set forth in the notice of intent to construct are consistent with the goal of protecting the safety of the area.

This is a map of the 100 year floodplain. It's a little different maybe if you are familiar or seen a presentation before.

I will scroll through here.

The actual panel, this is almost not quite county wide, but within several townships, I guess. The particular township that Mr. Gastler's facility falls in his facility would be located

right about there (indicating).

That particular panel is not printed by FEMA because there is no 100 year floodplain within that entire township or either township or maybe just a shade less than a township. But, regardless, there is no floodplain area in the remote vicinity of his location.

Karst area is an area with a land surface containing sinkholes, large springs, disruptive land drainage, and underground systems associated with karstified carbonate bedrock, limestone, or dolomite, and caves or a land surface without these features but contain a karstified carbonate bedrock unit generally overlain by less than 60 feet of unconsolidated materials.

This is the general map of karst areas within Illinois, zoomed into the area around Adams County. Three-quarters of Adams County is concerned a potential karst area, but in the northeast corner where this facility is located it is not a potential karst area.

The farm is not located within an area indicated by the Illinois Department of Natural Resource, Illinois State Geological Survey's Karst

Terrains and Carbonate in Illinois map as being a potential karst area.

Aquifer material: Sandstone that is five feet or more in thickness or fractured carbonate that is ten feet or more in thickness, or sand, gravel, or sand and gravel, such that there is at least two feet or more present within any five-foot section of a soil boring.

A site investigation was conducted by Frank & West. A soil boring was advanced to a depth of 21 1/2 feet below the ground surface within the footprint of the proposed building. This is a distance of at least 15 feet below the planned bottom of the barn. And no aquifer material was encountered.

In actuality, for facilities that are not in potential karst areas, the Livestock Management Facilities Act only requires a boring five feet below the bottom. There was miscommunication on the day the person was out there, and he did an extra 15 feet or ten feet.

Here is a sketch of the bottom of the boring in relation to the bottom of the pit itself.

Citing criteria number 5: Whether the

owner or operator has submitted plans for operation that minimize the likelihood of any environmental damage to the surrounding area from spills, run-off, and leaching.

The facility has proper sizing and an adequate storage capacity. Required timeframe for storage for a facility like this is 150 days. This particular design will have storage capacity in excess of 365 days. The pit is operated as a closed system with no uncontrolled release of livestock manure.

There is a clean water diversion that will allow rainwater to be directed away from the farm so that fresh water is not running into the pit and decreasing the amount of storage days that pit would hold.

Leaching: The farm is designed so as to prevent a release of livestock manure. This consists of solid concrete construction reinforced with grade 60 steel rebar. And all water-stop is placed in all construction and stoppage joint.

All surfaces in contact with the livestock manure, in this case concrete, will meet the required permeability standard.

Odor control reduction, criteria number 6: Whether odor control plans are reasonable and incorporate reasonable or innovative odor reduction technologies given the current state of such technologies.

The proposed facility or the proposed farm will implement a comprehensive odor control plan. This will consist of controlled land application of manure, routine maintenance of the concrete pit and livestock facility itself, feed management, what's being fed to the animals, and the location of the building itself.

Controlled application of manure by injection based upon nitrogen and phosphorous loading from actual on-site data.

The proposed farm intends to utilize injection as the application method for livestock manure. This minimizes the contact with air and is widely accepted as the best available technology for manure application.

All livestock manure will be custom applied by a certified manure applicator. The application equipment will contain safety controls, not limited to the equipment will be visually

monitored continuously, emergency shut-offs in the cab, and communication between personnel available at all times.

Here is an example of an injection manure tanker. This particular design the manure is pumped into the pit itself and then driven through the field.

The injection equipment and the injection knives behind the tank.

And this next drawing shows a little closer. Injection knives place, inject the manure into the ground at the root depth, and then the wheels come behind and close the furrow that the injection knives create.

This is an example of an injection drag line system. The actual injection equipment is similar, but rather than have a tank, there will be a hose stretched from the facility itself to this equipment and drug through the field.

The Rich Gastler farm has at least 634 acres locally available per year for livestock manure applications utilizing local yields with local soil types and book values for nutrient content of the manure. It's anticipated that the

farm would utilize approximately 554 acres of a corn/corn rotation.

Farm will utilize regular maintenance to reduce odors generated by the facility and to minimize dust originating from the facility.

Regular maintenance will include routine visual walkthroughs of the facility to ensure there is no manure build-up above the slatted floor and walkways and the regular cleaning of fans to prevent the accumulation of dust.

The facility will be thoroughly pressure washed and sanitized between each production cycle. This will minimize the amount of odor causing parcels that are able to leave the facility through the ventilation fans. The farm will ensure that the facility's fans operate efficiently, thus minimizing dust build-up.

Regular facility maintenance is known to reduce odor concentrations and odor intensity.

The facility will immediately incorporate an animal diet formulated to allow the most efficient utilization of proteins and nutrients in the feed. This dietary practice aids in the reduction of overall odors from the facility by

reducing excess nutrients excreted by the animals.

The facility also complies with and exceeds facility setback distances as established in the Livestock Management Facilities Act. The residential setback is exceeded by 980 feet, and the populated area setback is exceeded by 19,360 feet.

Again, in the comprehensive odor control plan we utilize farm location and maintenance, proper nutrition, and injection of manure to minimize the odor impacts.

The farm has diligently planned and overall odor control strategy by incorporating numerous odor control techniques and technologies. The farm will also continue to look for and incorporate other technologies as they become available.

This strategic plan incorporates reasonable and innovative technologies that will allow the facility to operate with minimal odor impact to the surrounding area.

Citing criteria 7: Whether traffic patterns minimize the effect on existing traffic flows.

Here is a map of the proposed building location. The travel pass would be down the private lane to the Illinois state highway, 61/94.

Illinois Route 61/94 just east of the proposed facility, according to IDOT traffic counts, has a daily average of 650 vehicles, which equates 4,550 vehicles. Of that, almost 91 percent are personal vehicles, passenger cars, trucks; and 9 percent of those are multiple unit vehicles weekly, which are single axle, tandem axle, and semi trailer trucks.

Like I said, just east of the proposed facility the daily average of 650 vehicles and the 4,550 vehicles. This particular facility has an estimated number of four total trucks, four total trucks weekly, and this includes feed transportation and animal transportation trucks.

Just looking at the overall traffic numbers, this consists of 0.09 percent of the average weekly traffic on the state highway just out in front of the facility. Then, if you look at the truck numbers, the four total trucks, in relation to the previous numbers, that equates to .95 percent of the average weekly truck traffic on

that state highway.

The proposed farm traffic will comply with all the same seasonal posted road weight limits as all other traffic in the area.

Criteria 8: Whether construction of a new facility is consistent with existing community growth, tourism, recreation, or economic development or with specific projects involving community growth, tourism, recreation, or economic development that have been identified by government action for development or operation within one year through compliance with the applicable zones and setback requirements for populated areas as established by the Livestock Management Facilities Act.

The farm is consistent with existing and planned community development of this rural agricultural area by demonstrating compliance with zoning and setback requirements. And the farm will meet all the requirements of the Livestock Management Facilities Act.

We appreciate the opportunity, and thank you.

MR. FRANK: Do you have a copy of your

presentation?

MR. NIMS: I do.

MR. FRANK: Thank you very much.

Entered into the record as Exhibit Number 3 is a copy of the Power Point presentation from the facility.

We will now open the meeting for any questions that you may have of the facility or of the Department. If you have a question that you would like to ask, please raise your hand, and, when called upon, please state your name and spell your last name. Please indicate to whom you are directing your question.

I will remind you that this portion of the meeting will be limited to questions only. After this question and answer session, there will be a session dedicated to public testimony where you can provide your oral comments.

Are there any questions?

MR. HEIDBREDER: John Heidbreder, H-e-i-d-b-r-e-d-e-r, county board member.

We got a hand-out by e-mail about this meeting this evening. The residence of Peggy Redenius, 2,300 feet away, the map shows is 2,200.

It also shows that -- it says occupied residents and gives the lady's same name and the same distance, and then on a map it says it's a non-occupied.

And I just thought that probably you guys ought to make that correct if there, if that's required. I don't know. It's just for my information.

And then I guess for the engineer, I was surprised that the pit is smaller than the building. How does animal waste get from areas not above the pit to the pit?

MR. NIMS: They are the same size, I guess.

MR. HEIDBREDER: Well, the building is 561 feet by 71 feet, 2 inches, and that's what it says here.

MR. NIMS: Yeah.

MR. HEIDBREDER: And up above it says that the pit is 40 by 80 or 100 by 100, depending on which building you are talking about. Those are not the same dimensions, sir.

MR. NIMS: I'm not -- the 40 by --

MR. HEIDBREDER: It came to us on this

page.

MR. NIMS: Is that the approved notice of intent?

MR. HEIDBREDER: It's whatever you folks sent to our county clerk in preparation for this meeting.

MR. NIMS: I guess without knowing what you are looking at, the building and the pit are the exact same dimensions. I don't know where the discrepancy is.

MR. HEIDBREDER: That answers that.

MR. NIMS: Okay.

MR. HEIDBREDER: Then does your firm or some firm of the Department of Agriculture inspect the pit construction during construction?

MR. GOETSCH: (Nodded his head up and down.)

MR. HEIDBREDER: You do? Great.

MR. GOETSCH: We are required to make at least three visits during any proposed project; first before the facility would be allowed to construct, at least one time during construction, and then at least one time post-construction to make sure that what they have built is consistent

with what was proposed.

MR. HEIDBREDER: What prompted the question is a few months ago we had big time rain here in Quincy, and basements that weren't supposed to leak did, and that's what prompted the question to see if the water-stops are inspected by somebody other than the concrete contractor.

MR. GOETSCH: Yes.

MR. HEIDBREDER: And then the other thing, this came up again on the other hog farm that we approved about a year ago, how does the tractor pulling a drag line turn around to make another swathe without tangling the drag line? I can't figure that out up here.

MR. GASTLER: I've watched it. It's got a swivel in the middle of the tool, and they will come up, they go back around, and they will go right back in, and that swivel just switches from one side to the other just kind of on its own. It's fairly simple once you see it.

MR. HEIDBREDER: In case some fellow board members asks next week, I will be a little bit more informed. Thank you.

MR. GOETSCH: Yes. To just clarify what

the engineer represented, the waste handling structure is the same dimension as the building. The entire building covers the manure storage structure. I think the 40 by 80 number that you were talking or that you referenced was an example on the form itself. So, the waste management structure or the waste handling structure itself, the measurements are consistent with the building measurements.

MR. HEIDBREDER: Okay. So, in the finishing building and the farrowing building are just continuations of each other? It's not two separate structures?

MR. GASTLER: It's a finishing building only.

MR. HEIDBREDER: In your presentation you showed two building or just one?

MR. NIMS: No. Just one. Just one.

MR. HEIDBREDER: Thank you.

MR. FRANK: Mr. Gastler, did you want to comment on that?

MR. GASTLER: It was just a finishing building only. You had farrow to finish. It is just finishing only.

MR. NIMS: Maybe my friend should take that picture down with multiple buildings, but there is only one.

MR. HEIDBREDER: All right. Very good.

MR. FRANK: Are there other questions?

Yes, Mr. Nichols.

MR. NICHOLS: Lyle Nichols, N-i-c-h-o-l-s, member of the county board.

How often will you empty the pit?

MR. GASTLER: Ideally what we plan is to do it twice a year, but there is enough storage under the pit to go one full year without emptying it.

MR. NICHOLS: And I think I remember from Mr. Nims' presentation that there is no water drainage likely to be there or rain or snow melt that will get into the pit?

MR. NIMS: Correct.

MR. GASTLER: Correct.

MR. NICHOLS: Who is going to own the hogs and the building?

MR. GASTLER: I will own the building, or our family will own the building, and Cargill will be owning the pigs.

MR. NICHOLS: Where is your feed supply coming from?

MR. GASTLER: Ursa Farmers Co-op in Ursa.

MR. NICHOLS: So, they won't be coming from Bowen then?

MR. GASTLER: No.

MR. NICHOLS: When do you plan to have the building up and running and occupied?

MR. GASTLER: We hope -- well, given the time you folks have to decide, shortly after you all decide we will start construction, weather permitting.

MR. NICHOLS: So, sometime next summer probably?

MR. GASTLER: I would say somewhere between March and May, if I was guessing right now.

MR. NICHOLS: The private road going from, I guess, the building to 61/94, you maintain that?

MR. GASTLER: Yes, sir.

MR. NICHOLS: Is that like a gravel road now?

MR. GASTLER: Yes, sir.

MR. NICHOLS: What's the topography where

your private road meets 61/94? Is it flat? Is there a hill?

MR. GASTLER: It's flat, basically flat.

MR. NICHOLS: In what township is this located?

MR. GASTLER: Houston.

MR. NICHOLS: Houston. Thank you.

MR. GASTLER: Uh-huh.

MR. FRANK: Are there other questions for the Department or the facility?

Mr. Peter.

MR. PETER: Mark Peter, P-e-t-e-r, county board.

What about the water supply, Mr. Gastler, your water supply?

MR. GASTLER: Our plans are as of right now, we have it in front of the water board, we are going to invest in a water line from the rural water system to supply the building at this time.

MR. PETERS: So, there is no -- the last one of these we had there was concern from the local town. There is no -- I mean, your water supply is strong enough? Its volume is good enough?

MR. GASTLER: The volume is good enough, but the board does have to approve it since it's going to be such a bigger gallon usage.

MR. PETER: Thank you.

MR. FRANK: Other questions?

(No response.)

MR. FRANK: Seeing none, that completes the question and answer session.

I have the oral testimony sign-in sheet in front of me, and we have two people who wish to testify. We will have you come up to the table up here and use the microphone. When called upon, please step up to the table, have a seat, state your name, and spell your last name, please. I will then swear you in. You will have three minutes to speak.

First on the list is Kent Buckert.

Please state your name and spell your last name.

(Witness sworn.)

MR. BUCKERT: Kent Buckert, B-u-c-k-e-r-t.

MR. FRANK: You may proceed.

MR. BUCKERT: Speaking on behalf of the

Ursa Farmers Co-op, a potential feed supplier for this unit, and just its impact of feed usage of commodities from our area.

So, the facility such as this will use about 36 tons a year. At current prices that is approximately a million dollars in sales. It will use approximately 73,000 bushels of corn, which is a local market for about 450 acres of corn. It will use about 500 tons of bean meal, which is a local market for about 460 acres of beans.

As a whole, Ursa Farmers feeds about 60,000 pig spaces similar to this facility. That nets about 41,000 tons a year or about 12 million dollars in sales for Ursa Farmers Co-op. And uses about 830,000 bushels of corn and is a market for about 5,000 acres of corn, and 5700 tons of bean meal, which is a local market again for about 5200 acres of beans.

UFC as a whole has feed sales of over 65,000 tons a year, which is over 16 million dollars in sales.

Units such as this makes a feed department and feed mill sustainable for the rest of our community. And we have over 350 swine and

beef livestock producers that we serve from our feed mill in Ursa.

We have 17 employees that are involved in the feed mill production and the trucking of feed, and Ursa Farmers Co-op as a whole has 187 million dollars in sales annually, and we serve over 2500 producers and co-op owners and have 55 employees.

MR. FRANK: Thank you.

Are there questions for this witness?

(No response.)

MR. FRANK: I see none.

Thank you very much.

Next on our list is Tim Maiers.

State your name and spell your last name.

MR. MAIERS: Tim Maiers, M-a-i-e-r-s.

(Witness sworn.)

MR. FRANK: You may proceed.

MR. MAIERS: Hello. My name is Tim Maiers. I am an Adams County resident, live out in Payson area. I am in Illinois Pork Producers. I will be brief, because I don't know what the record for the shortest hearing on record is, but I don't want to stand between you and the Cardinal game. So, just a couple things.

Thank you for coming tonight.

We do think that Adams County is a good place to raise pigs and pork production and pork industry, and we know -- we work hard to find good sites. I think, as we see tonight, we can find them. They are out there.

We can be good stewards of the environment, care for our animals, and contribute to the economy. As Kent mentioned, this will help a local business support a lot of different farms.

The pork industry in Adams County has had a good long tradition here in the county. We know that the pork industry contributes about 29.8 million dollars to the county economy and about 2.2 million dollars in taxes. So, we do feel that it is a good place to raise pigs.

We can be, like I said, good for the economy and be good neighbors. We expect that, you expect that, and we know that's our role to carry that out and do that.

So, with that, I want to invite the board next Wednesday, everyone should have gotten an invite, but next Wednesday there is an open house at the Darin Duke barn up around Lima that you had

a hearing on several months back. An open house Wednesday, next Wednesday, from 11 to 3. So, if you want to come out and actually see a barn, see some of the manure structures, and the feed systems and kind of what a barn entails, that would be a good opportunity to do that.

There is also free pork chops that we will be serving, as well, too. So, if you can find time to come out next Wednesday at the barn from 11 to 3, we would love to have you.

MR. FRANK: Thank you.

Are there questions for this witness?

(No response.)

MR. FRANK: I see none.

Thank you.

Is there anyone else who would like to provide any oral testimony?

(No response.)

MR. FRANK: Entered into the record as Exhibit Number 4 is the sign-up sheet for oral testimony.

Also entered into the record as Exhibit Number 5 is the attendance sign-in sheet.

I see only four names on the list. If

anybody wants to sign this afterwards, you can come up and you can get your name put on it.

Is there any written testimony that anyone would like to present?

(No response.)

MR. FRANK: I see none.

Are there any closing comments from the facility?

Any closing comments from the Department?

MR. GOETSCH: I would just say thank you for having us. We appreciate the opportunity. I hope you've got your questions answered, and just let me assure you that we will look forward to receiving the recommendation from the county board, and we will certainly consider it along with all the other information as we move forward with this proposal and its evaluation.

Thank you.

MR. FRANK: As I mentioned earlier, a copy of the transcript will be provided to the Adams County Board. For those who would wish to receive their own copy, they can contact the court reporter and receive a copy that way.

Thank you for your attendance here

tonight. This public meeting is hereby closed.

Mr. Post, would you like to adjourn your meeting?

MR. POST: Go right ahead.

MR. FRANK: This meeting is adjourned.

(HEARING CLOSED)

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS.
COUNTY OF ADAMS)

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Gina L. Nottingham, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the County of Adams, State of Illinois, do hereby certify the foregoing to be a true and accurate transcript of the testimony and proceedings.

_____
Gina L. Nottingham, CSR

Dated this 6th day
of November, 2013.