Thursday, November 14, 2013 at 4:00 PM
AGENDA

1. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance
2. Roll Call
3. Items of Business
   ➢ From Highway Committee
      Agreement with Huff & Huff, Inc. for professional services to remediate UST issues with IEPA at the Highway Department for a not-to-exceed cost of $42,625
   ➢ From Admin HR Committee
      The IMRF Notice to Governing Bodies regarding the 2013 Election of Executive Trustee
   ➢ From PBZ Committee
      Petition 13-17: Maly Processing Plant- Special use for a Small Poultry and Small Animal Processing Plant
      Petition 13-29: Historic Preservation Ordinance Amendment
   ➢ From the County Board Chairman
      Transparency Ad-hoc Committee
      Lease agreement between Kendall County and Kendall County Board of Health for space at 811 West John Street

4. Old Business
5. Review Draft Board Agenda
6. Public Comment
7. Executive Session
8. Adjournment
Kendall County, Illinois
Committee of the Whole

Thursday, October 10, 2013
County Office Building
Board Room 209-210
Meeting Minutes

Call to Order
The Committee of the Whole was called to order by Vice Chair Judy Gilmour at 4:05 p.m., who led the group in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll Call
Members Present: Amy Cesich, Elizabeth Flowers, Judy Gilmour, Scott Gryder, Dan Koukol, Matt Prochaska, John Purcell (4:29 p.m.)

Members Absent: Lynn Cullick, John Shaw, Jeff Wehrli

Other Employees Present: Leslie Johnson, Jim Smiley, Eric Weis, Jeff Wilkins

Others Present: Deb Darzinskis, DuPage/Kendall Housing Authority

DuPage Housing Authority Presentation - Deb Darzinskis, Executive Director, DuPage/Kendall Housing Authority provided a brief overview of the Kendall Housing Authority, its purpose and the Housing Choice Voucher assistance program. Ms. Darzinskis said that Kendall County has been assigned 160 vouchers, she briefly explained how the program works for low-income citizens, and the average income for program participants. Ms. Darzinskis explained that the Housing Authority pays approximately 77 percent of the monthly rent, port-ins and port-outs and the participant pays approximately 23 percent. Participants must meet eligibility requirements, and the unit landlords must also meet requirements and maintain units regularly.

Items of Business

➤ Summary of 2012-2013 Union Negotiations - State’s Attorney Eric Weis provided a summary of 2012-2013 Union Negotiations, and gave an estimate of attorney fees and hourly totals. Mr. Weis reported that based on negotiations, and by using Assistant State’s Attorney Leslie Johnson, the total savings to the County on Healthcare costs alone will be $126,183 for FY2014. Mr. Weis reported that the total cost to the County for negotiations counsel and services was $464,000 including KenCom. Mr. Weis stated that if the County used an outside counsel for all of the services provided, the cost to the County would have been $548,587. Judy Gilmour stated that there were also substantial savings to the KenCom Board by using the counsel and negotiations services of the State’s Attorney’s office. Eric Weis said the total for KenCom was $102,000.
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➢ From Admin HR Committee:

- Recommend approval of Health Coverage Plans with Blue Cross Blue Shield of Illinois – Jeff Wilkins stated that authorization from the Board for this item is needed at the October 15, 2013 meeting because Open Enrollment meetings are scheduled for later in October 2013. Mr. Wilkins briefly explained the plan changes to the PPO, HAS and Blue Advantage HMO plans with the committee. Mr. Wilkins said that the employee portion costs will increase slightly in the month of December 2013, but that the employee portion should be reduced by 1.2 percent beginning in January.

- Recommend approval of Dental Coverage Plan with MetLife – Mr. Wilkins explained that rates will not increase for employees or the County with the change to MetLife, but that there will be an increase in the annual benefit from $1250 to $2000, and additional providers available to the employee participants. Mr. Wilkins stated that the change to MetLife will begin on December 1, 2013, and that rates from MetLife will be guaranteed for 25 months.

- Discuss Educational Reimbursement Policy – Judy Gilmour stated that Assistant State’s Attorney Leslie Johnson reviewed the documents before the changes were presented to the Admin HR Committee. Mr. Wilkins reviewed the proposed changes to the policy.

- Recommend approval of Employee Handbook revisions consistent with Affordable Care Act – Mr. Wilkins stated that the intent was to make revisions to the handbook that would bring the County into compliance with the Affordable Care Act, and to make suggested corrections to the document after review by the State’s Attorney’s office. Mr. Wilkins proceeded to review the proposed changes with the committee.

➢ From Facilities Management Committee:

- Approve contract with Commercial Mechanical, Inc. for County Office Building Roof and Systems Upgrades in an amount not to exceed $825,000.00 including contingencies – Member Koukol stated that this contract would cover the Roof, HVAC and Heating project for the County Office Building.

Mr. Smiley explained the base bid, the work that needed to be completed, the 20-year warranty, and the alternatives. Discussion on the alternates, the timeframe for beginning the work, and the number of year options for the warranty. Mr. Smiley stated that the Facilities Management committee did not discuss the alternates specifically at their October meeting.

Ms. Johnson stated that the Board would be simply approving the contract with the vendor and the cost not to exceed $825,000 total for the project. Ms. Johnson stated that the State’s Attorney’s office will attempt to have the contract review completed in time for the County Board meeting on October 15, 2013.
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- Approve Wold Architects and Engineers for future Architectural and Engineering Services using the State’s Attorney’s Office approved Master Agreement – Member Koukol explained the agreement and why the Facilities Management committee wanted the item added to the Board meeting agenda.

- Authorization to submit a grant application to DCEO for Public Sector Energy Efficiency Funding in the approximate amount of $7000.00 – Member Koukol explained the request, and stated that the grant money would be used for the County Office Building project.

Old Business – None

New Business - None

Public Comment - None

Review Draft Board Agenda – Vice Chair Gilmour asked the committee to review the draft, and asked that the three items from the Facilities Management Committee be included on the Board agenda for October 15, 2013.

Action Items for the County Board

➢ From Admin HR Committee:
  - Approval of Health Coverage Plans with Blue Cross Blue Shield of Illinois
  - Approval of Dental Coverage Plan with MetLife

➢ From Facilities Management Committee:
  - Approve contract with Commercial Mechanical, Inc. for County Office Building Roof and Systems Upgrades in an amount not to exceed $825,000.00 including contingencies
  - Approve Wold Architects and Engineers for future Architectural and Engineering Services using the State’s Attorney’s Office approved Master Agreement
  - Authorization to submit a grant application to DCEO for Public Sector Energy Efficiency Funding in the approximate amount of $7000.00

Executive Session – None Needed

Adjournment - Member Flowers moved to adjourn the Committee of the Whole meeting and the motion was seconded by Member Gryder. There being no objection, the Committee of the Whole, at 5:33p.m. adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Valarie A. McClain
Administrative Assistant
November 12, 2013

Mr. Francis Klaas  
Kendall County  
6780 Route 47  
Yorkville, Illinois 60560

Re: Document Review and Investigation Activities  
Highway Department Property  
6780 Route 47, Yorkville, IL  
Proposal No. U13-008

Dear Mr. Klaas:

Huff & Huff, Inc. (Consultant) is prepared to offer Professional Engineering Services for conducting additional soil and groundwater sampling activities for the leaking underground storage tank (LUST) incident at the property at 6780 Route 47 in Yorkville, Illinois. LUST Incident No. 952150 is associated with three USTs (two diesel fuel and one gasoline).

Consultant previously collected soil and groundwater samples to assess current site conditions and submitted the 45 day report to the Illinois EPA. Based on previous findings, additional investigation is necessary and submission of the Site Investigation Completion Report (SICR) followed by a Corrective Action Plan (CAP), remediation, then Corrective Action Completion Report (CACR). Should analytical results indicate achievement of Remedial Objectives preparation of a CAP will not be necessary, and a CACR will be completed, requesting closure of the LUST incident.

Based on available information, groundwater impacts are present at the site above the Class 1 Groundwater Standards. The soil concentrations also exceed the Tier 1 Remedial Objectives for the soil migration to groundwater exposure pathway. In order to secure closure of the site, addressing groundwater impacts is required. Installation of monitoring wells is important to determine if soil excavation can be reduced or eliminated.

As the previous groundwater sample achieved the remedial objective for the vapor intrusion exposure pathway, soil gas sampling is not anticipated and is not included in this proposal. Should the IEPA require soil gas testing, the estimated scope and costs will be provided in a supplement.
1. PROJECT SCOPE

Specifically, the following tasks will be completed:

Task 1: Conduct additional soil delineation activities. Previous sampling at the site identified constituents of concern with concentrations above the Tier 1 Remedial Objectives. Based on the results, additional sampling is necessary to the southeast, west, and north of the former underground storage tanks to complete the delineation. Based on recent IEPA correspondence it will also be necessary to collect additional samples from within the source area near to the former USTs. Soil borings are planned for advancement at up to 10 locations with up to 40 soil samples being collected for benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes (BTEX) and polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PNAs). Soil sampling is anticipated to be completed within a one day period with boring termination planned at depths of approximately 15 feet below ground surface (bgs). Boring locations will be recorded with a GPS.

The soil samples will be collected from depth interval of ground surface to 3 feet, 3 feet to 5 feet, 5 feet to 10 feet, and 10 feet to 15 feet. The samples will be screened with a photo ionization detector to identify the discrete portion of each interval from which the analytical sample will be collected. The soils will be logged for inclusion in the SICR.

Task 2: Groundwater monitoring well installation. Based on the groundwater analytical results, installation of five permanent monitoring wells is proposed. Per Illinois EPA regulations, one of the wells will be placed within the area of highest impact (former UST basin area) with the remaining wells placed 200 feet from the former UST basin. Based on previous depth to groundwater information, the wells will be installed to depths of approximately 22 feet bgs. The wells will be completed with flush mount covers to avoid impacting daily site activities. Well locations will be recorded with a GPS.

Consultant will measure the elevations of the ground surface and top of PVC riser to the nearest 0.01 foot to determine groundwater flow. An arbitrary benchmark will be referenced as part of the elevation survey.

Soil samples will be collected during well installation for the indicator contaminants (per Illinois EPA requirements) noted in Task 1. Consultant will coordinate with the Highway Department for placement of soil and groundwater drums resulting from well installation. Proper disposal of the drums is assumed to be completed by the Highway Department.

The soil samples will be collected from depth interval of ground surface to 3 feet, 3 feet to 5 feet, 5 feet to 10 feet, and 10 feet to 15 feet. The samples will be screened with a photo ionization detector to identify the discrete portion of each interval from which the analytical sample will be collected. The soils will be logged and well
construction information recorded for inclusion in the SICR.

Task 3: Groundwater monitoring development/sampling/slug testing. The groundwater monitoring wells will be developed to ensure collection of a representative groundwater sample. Development will be conducted at least 48 hours after setting the wells to avoid damage to the well. The development will aid in removal of fine particles which will also allow for a better determination of aquifer characteristics during the slug test phase. Purge water generated during development will be stored in appropriately labeled drums onsite, pending future off site disposal by the Highway Department.

The wells will be sampled for BTEX and PNAs using low flow pumping techniques. Low flow pumping creates less turbidity than standard bailer methods, resulting in less suspended solids to influence the analytical results. Parameters including pH, conductivity, dissolved oxygen, and temperature will be recorded during low flow purging. Prior to sampling the wells will be opened and allowed to equilibrate, after which depth to water level measurements will be recorded. The depth to water level measurements will be measured from top of PVC on the north side of the wells to the nearest 0.01 foot. Purge water generated during sampling will be stored in appropriately labeled drums onsite, pending future off site disposal by the Highway Department.

The well located in the down gradient location will be slug tested to determine hydraulic conductivity. The conductivity will be used for determining the appropriate groundwater classification for the site.

Task 4: Preparation of SICR for submission to the Illinois EPA will be completed after collection of the first round of groundwater sampling. Task includes Tier 2 modeling for the groundwater and soil migration to groundwater remedial objectives. Task also includes conducting a formal water well survey to confirm well locations as discussed in the 45-Day Report. Consultant assumes the Highway Department will provide necessary information on the nearby well to the north to meet the requirement of the recent IEPA correspondence.

Task 5: Preparation of Corrective Action Plan or Corrective Action Completion Report.

Depending upon the results from the above tasks, the extent of remediation will be proposed.
2. PROJECT COST

The estimated cost for completion of the site investigation is listed below, and excludes costs for preparing reimbursement applications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1: Soil Delineation</td>
<td>$11,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2: Well Installation</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3: GW Sampling / Development / Slug Testing</td>
<td>$7,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4: Site Investigation Completion Report</td>
<td>$4,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5: Corrective Action Plan or CACR</td>
<td>$5,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6: Project Management and IEPA Coordination</td>
<td>$725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$42,625</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultant proposes to complete this project on a Time and Materials Basis using the fee schedule attached and will guarantee the costs will not exceed $42,625. This cost assumes that the Highway Department will locate private utilities prior to drilling activities. Should active remediation be necessary, a separate proposal to cover the oversight and CACR will be prepared.

The Illinois EPA recently established remedial objectives for the vapor intrusion pathway. The previous findings indicated achievement of the remedial objectives based on groundwater results; however, soil gas samples were not collected. The Illinois EPA may require collection of soil gas samples which have not been incorporated into the above tasks. Should collection of soil gas be required, collection and assessment of the results can be completed for an additional $4,200 and includes collection of up to two soil gas samples.

3. CONTRACT CONDITIONS

1. CONSULTANT'S SERVICES: The Consultant's (Huff & Huff, Inc.) services shall consist of those tasks described in Section 2.

2. SCHEDULE: The Consultant's work under this Agreement shall begin upon receipt of written notice to proceed or a signed copy of this Agreement, and 75 days will be required to complete this project.

3. COMPENSATION: The fee basis for the scope of work, as outlined in Section 2, pertains to the specific scope work.

4. DIRECTION: For work performed under this Agreement, Consultant shall take direction from the Client.

5. CHANGES: This Agreement may only be changed by written amendment which specifies the terms being revised and which has been signed by both parties hereto.

6. PROJECT DATA: The Consultant, in coordination with the Client, shall obtain from the appropriate sources all data and information necessary for the proper and complete execution of
the Consultant's services. Consultant shall be entitled to rely on materials and information provided by the Client.

7. INDEPENDENT CONSULTANT: The Consultant shall be deemed to be an independent contractor in all its operations and activities hereunder. The employees furnished by Consultant to perform the work shall be deemed to be Consultant employees exclusively, and said employees shall be paid by Consultant for all services in this connection. The Consultant shall be responsible for all obligations and reports covering Social Security, Unemployment Insurance, Worker's Compensation, Income Tax, and other reports and deductions required by an applicable state or Federal law.

8. RIGHTS OF WORK PRODUCT: Client shall have unlimited rights in all drawings, designs, specifications, notes, and other work developed in the performance of this contract, including the right to use same on any other work without additional cost to the Client. The Consultant shall not be liable for any use or reuse of the drawings, designs, specifications, notes and other work for use other than intended under the terms of this Agreement.

9. INDEMNIFICATION: The Consultant hereby agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the Client and any proper owners whose property it is necessary to access in the performance of this work, against any and all liability, loss, damages, demands, or actions or causes of action, which may result from any damages or injuries sustained by a person or entity in connection with or on account of any negligent act or omission of the Consultant or its employees relating to its obligations pursuant to this Agreement.

10. TERMINATION: Client may terminate this Agreement at any time upon ten (10) days written notice for whatsoever reason, provided Client shall pay the Consultant a reasonable fee for work satisfactorily performed prior to the effective date of termination. In no case, however, shall the total amount paid to Consultant exceed the amount set out above.

11. INSURANCE: The Consultant shall maintain insurance as set forth in the prime contract, if attached, or as set forth below.
   a. Worker's Compensation and Employer's Liability Insurance: Worker's Compensation in compliance with applicable State and Federal laws.
   b. Comprehensive General Liability Insurance for Bodily Injury and Property Damage to a combined single limit of $2,000,000 per occurrence/claim or an umbrella of $3,000,000.
   c. Comprehensive Automobile Liability Insurance, including owned, hired, and non-owned automobiles, for Bodily Injury and Property Damage to a combined single limit of $1,000,000 per occurrence.
   d. Professional liability insurance $2,000,000 on a claims made basis.

12. STANDARD OF CARE: Services performed by the Consultant under this Agreement will be conducted in a manner consistent with the level of care and skill ordinarily exercised by members of the profession currently practicing in the same locality under similar conditions.

13. RETENTION OF RECORDS: Consultant shall maintain complete records of all hours billed and direct costs incurred under this Agreement so as to accurately reflect the services performed and basis for compensation and reimbursement under this Agreement. All relevant project and accounting files relating to this project shall be maintained for a period of seven (7) years from
the date of termination or completion.

14. **LEGAL:** This Agreement shall be construed and interpreted solely in accordance with the laws of the State of Illinois.

**BOTH PARTIES HERETO WARRANT AND REPRESENT** that they have full right, power, and authority to execute this Contract.

**IN WITNESS THEREOF,** the parties hereto have executed this Agreement as of the day and year first specified above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSULTANT</th>
<th>CLIENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HUFF &amp; HUFF, INC.</td>
<td>KENDALL COUNTY HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By: James E. Huff, P.E.  
Typed Name:  
Senior Vice President:  
Officer’s Title:  
November 12, 2013  
Date:  
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HUFF & HUFF, INC.

2013 FEE SCHEDULE

This statement is being furnished to you in the interest of enhancing your understanding of our billing policies and procedures. Each employee is assigned an hourly rate and records his or her time for each project. Each invoice identifies each person that charged time to the project, hours spent and total cost for each individual. All time spent traveling on client business is included in the time charged to a project.

The Project Manager responsible for preparation of your statement reviews the time records before rendering a bill for adjustments in the statement where appropriate in the judgment of the Project Manager. For example: time may be adjusted downward for duplication of effort, for training time beyond the normal adjustments for technical experience already factored into our hourly rates, or in other situations where it would not be fair to charge you for the full time spent on your project.

Listed below is our 2013 Fee Schedule. These rates are adjusted annually, effective January 1 of each year, to reflect changes in salaries, overhead, and the experience of individuals. Overtime is charged at the same hourly rates listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Services</th>
<th>$/Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>$175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Staff (Engineers/Scientist)</td>
<td>$93.00 - 170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Engineers/Scientist</td>
<td>$60.00 - 106.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designer/Senior CAD</td>
<td>$107.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians/CAD</td>
<td>$56.00 - 80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>$50.00 - 96.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate vehicles</td>
<td>$0.555/mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal vehicles</td>
<td>$0.555/mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other travel</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reproduction</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black &amp; White</td>
<td>$0.11/copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color-8-1/2” x 11”</td>
<td>$0.50/copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color-11” x 17”</td>
<td>$1.00/copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plotter-24” x 36”</td>
<td>$6.00/copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding accessories</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>Cost + 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost + 10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Fax Sent                            | $1.00/each   |
| Fax Received                        | No Charge    |
**Field Work**  
$30.00/day/person  
(Includes minor supplies, equipment, work clothes, cleaning, etc.)  
Includes company Cellular phone use – field work & travel days  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bailers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>$8.50/each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydra-Sleeve, 1.6”</td>
<td>$19.00/each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydra-Sleeve, 2.0”</td>
<td>$26.75/each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORC Socks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2”</td>
<td>$54.50/each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4”</td>
<td>$67.25/each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10.00/lb.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5035 Method Sets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$13.20/set</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analytical**  
Cost + 10%  

**Outside Services**  
Cost + 10%  
Subcontractors  
Supplies (Significant)  
Postage  

**Equipment Rental**  
Cost + 10%  
In-house:  
PID Meter: $75/day or $225/week  
Jerome Meter: $100/day or $300/week  
Noise Meter: $40/day or $120/week  
D.O. Meter: $25/day or $75/week  
G.P.S. Unit: $75/day or $225/week  
Peristaltic Pump: $50/day or $150/week
David C. Miller  
14770 W. William Koepsel Drive  
Gurnee, IL 60031

Present Position — Deputy Treasurer & Asst. GM for the North Shore Sanitary District.

Length of Service — Chief financial and administrative officer for past 11 years; 18 years total with this employer.

Duties — Direct all financial and administrative functions for the second largest district in Illinois.

Other Pertinent Information — The IMRF is a pension program that works, with both employers and employees honoring their respective funding obligations. This has enabled an effective recovery from the great recession and a funding status of 85%, far above the national average. On the other hand, the State of Illinois’ pension plans are broken and only 40% funded.

My primary objective as Trustee will be to protect the significant investments made in IMRF by local governments, participants and taxpayers by ensuring that those investments are not compromised during ongoing negotiations in Springfield to address the failure of the State’s pension system after many years of mismanagement and funding abuse.

BBA (Finance, Investment & Banking) and MBA (Risk Management) from the University of Wisconsin.

Sue Stanish  
320 W. Jackson Ave.  
Naperville, IL 60540

Present Position — Director of Finance for the Naperville Park District.

Length of Service — I have been with the Park District for 3 years and previously served as the Director of Finance with the Village of Willowbrook for 13 years and the Accounting Manager for the City of Naperville for 5 years.

Duties — Responsible for financial operations including investments, accounts payable, payroll, budgeting, forecasting, debt management, policy development and financial analysis.

Other Pertinent Information — Degree in accounting from DePaul University; Certified Public Accountant, Past President of the Illinois Governmental Finance Officers Association (IGFOA), Past Chairman of the IGOA Career Development Committee, Past Board Member of the Illinois Metropolitan Investment Fund and member of PDRMA’s Finance Committee. The experience I have gained from both the Municipal and Park District perspectives combined with my strong leadership will be a positive addition to the IMRF Board. The issues facing Illinois Public Pension Funds continue to be an ongoing challenge that needs to be carefully managed. As an IMRF Board Member, I would be committed to ensure that the Fund remains fiscally sound and viable for members and taxpayers.
Balloting instructions

The ballot envelope indicates who has the authority to cast a ballot in IMRF's Executive Trustee election.

If your governing body has retained exclusive authority to cast a ballot

This ballot packet is addressed to the governing body instead of to the Authorized Agent.

The Clerk or Secretary of the Board must certify the ballot resolution and return it to IMRF. The signature certifies that the ballot resolutions were voted properly.

If the ballot resolution is not certified, it will not be counted as a valid ballot.

If your governing body wishes to grant its Authorized Agent the authority to cast a ballot

The only Authorized Agents eligible to vote are those whose Notice of Appointment (IMRF Form 2.20) on file with IMRF indicates they have been given such power.

To grant voting authority to its Authorized Agent, the governing body would complete a new IMRF Form 2.20.

Casting a vote

- On the ballot resolution, mark the box in front of the name of the candidate the governing body wishes to vote for.

- A governing body may vote for a participating employee who is not shown if the employee has or will have at least eight years of IMRF service credit by December 31, 2013, and is employed as a chief executive officer, chief finance officer, or other officer, executive or department head. Print his or her name in the space provided and place an “X” in the box in front of that line.

- The Clerk or Secretary of the Board would certify the completed ballot resolution. For the vote to count, the certification on the ballot resolution must be completed.

- Insert the certified ballot resolution into the ballot envelope. Then insert the sealed ballot envelope into the self-addressed return envelope.

- The self-addressed return envelope must be received by IMRF no later than 4:30 p.m., Thursday, December 12, 2013. Envelopes received after that time and date will not be opened and the enclosed ballot resolution will not be counted.
Kendall County

**IMRF Employer Ids:** 03024  
**Authorized Agent:** Jill Ferko  
**Hourly Standard:** 600 Hours

**User Name:** RONDA Ti  
**Secure M**  
**Wage Req.**

**Wages and Contributions**
- Report Wages
- Report Wage Adjustments
- Display Wage Report History
- Display Wage Adjustment History
- Display Contribution Rates

**Payments**
- Pay Online
- Display Payment History
- Display Account Balance

**Members**
- Enroll Member
- Change Member Information
- Terminate Member
- Report Disability/Return to Work

**Documents**
- Display Document Archive
- Display Adopted Resolutions
- Download Forms
- Display Authorized Agents Manual
- Display Web Transaction History

**Web Account**
- Change Web Profile

**Contact Us**
- Connect with IMRF
- Find a Workshop

---

www.imrf.org/employeraccessv2/EAHome.do  
11/14/2013
SITE INFORMATION

PETITIONERS  Alan & Mary Maly

ADDRESS  16895 Lisbon Center Road

LOCATION  On the north side of Lisbon Center Road about 0.32 miles east of Fennel Road

TOWNSHIP  Big Grove

PARCEL #  07-08-100-011

SIZE  27 Acres of a 124.77 total acres

EXISTING LAND USE  Agricultural/Farming

ZONING  A-1 Agricultural

LRMP  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>County: Agricultural; Village of Newark: ?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Lisbon Center Road is a Big Grove Township Roadway and is designated as a local rural road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>There are no trails shown for this area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>There are no wetlands or floodplain on this property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REQUESTED ACTION  The petitioner is requesting approval of an A-1 Special Use Permit to operate a Small Poultry & Small animal Processing Plant.

APPLICABLE  Pet. 13-16 (Text amendment to allow this as a special use in the A-1 district)
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Prepared by Angela L. Zubko, Senior Planner
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### REGULATIONS

§ 11.00 Off-street Parking and Loading  
§ 13.08 of the Zoning Ordinance (Special Uses)

### SURROUNDING LAND USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Adjacent Land Use</th>
<th>Adjacent Zoning</th>
<th>LRMP</th>
<th>Zoning within ½ Mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Agricultural/Farming</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>Newark &amp; A-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Agricultural/Farming</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>A-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Agricultural/Farming</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>A-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Agricultural/Farming</td>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>A-1; LaSalle County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PHYSICAL DATA

#### ENDANGERED SPECIES REPORT

The Illinois Natural Heritage Database contains no record of State-listed threatened or endangered species, Illinois Natural Area Inventory sites, dedicated Illinois Nature Preserves, or registered Land and Water Reserves in the vicinity of the project location.

#### NATURAL RESOURCES INVENTORY

The NRI indicates that 67.4% of the soils on this site are soils that are classified as being prime farmland and the most agronomically productive. 100% of the soils are very limited for local roads and streets; and 15.9% are very limited for shallow excavation. The site is located within the Fox River Watershed and Rooods Creek Subwatershed. A drainage tile survey is recommended to be completed on the parcel.

- Land Evaluation: 90
- Site Assessment: 113
- TOTAL: 203
- Level of Protection: Medium

### ACTION SUMMARY

#### TOWNSHIP  
(Big Grove)

It was discussed at the July 16, 2013 Big Grove Township Board and received an unanimous recommendation in favor of the petition.

#### MUNICIPAL  
(Village of Newark)

Received a letter dated August 5, 2013 stating the Village of Newark Trustees reviewed the information and support the endeavor.

#### ZPAC (7.1.13)

At the time of ZPAC there were a lot of open ended questions but they still made a favorable recommendation.

#### RPC (8.28.13)

The Plan Commission made a favorable recommendation and added a condition that within 5 years, 50’ of the driveway must be a minimum of tar and chipped and modified the condition to not allow retail sales on site instead of the previous wording. The main concerns brought up at this meeting were: the notification process, public hearing sign size, traffic, noise, the property hearing in the area, lighting, possible protests, landscaping, driveway construction, commercial retail on the site, possible water contamination, appearance, signage and waste.

#### SUHO (9.3.13)

Bill Ford made a favorable recommendation to approve the special use. Also Mr. Ford felt the 5 year time limit to pave 50’ is too long of a timeline. The main concerns brought up at this meeting once again was the notification process and feels all residents of Newark should be notified, traffic, noise, smell, disease
prevention, the well, septic, retention ponds on site, fire prevention, hazardous spills, rats, entrance appearance, landscaping, roadway conditions and lighting.

SUHO (10.15.13) Due to hearing back from the SAO about notification staff felt another public hearing should be held notifying the residents within 500' of the OVERALL parcels. Mr. Ford made another favorable recommendation to approve the special use stated no new evidence was submitted, they were all the same concerns as last meeting.

REQUESTED ACTION

GENERAL The petitioner is requesting approval of an A-1 Special Use Permit to operate a small Poultry & Small animal Processing Plant.

The petitioner has stated that all processing will take place in enclosed buildings. They are projecting to process a maximum of 3,000 chickens per day. They also will have a maximum of 30-35 employees.

SETBACKS From the proposed site plan all setbacks will be met for the building and parking lot.

STORMWATER DETENTION Staff has requested to start discussions with our consulting engineer with regards to their 2 proposed detention areas.

ACCESS/ROADWAY This road will be the jurisdiction of Big Grove Township Road Commissioner who I have spoken to and he did not feel this would be an issue. Most people will be bringing chickens in small trailers. For parking they would request tar and chip or pavers instead of asphalt. They do not anticipate a retail outlet or anything.

TRANSPORTATION In an average transport you can fit about 8-10 chickens per coop. The transport below can hold about 200 chickens.
The petitioner proposes to be open from 5:30am to 6pm Monday thru Friday except additional Saturdays in October and November to process Turkeys. The petitioners have stated that typically January to April are the slowest times of the year. Also typically the chickens will be dropped off in the morning, slaughtering typically takes place between 6-10am, then the customer picks up their processed chickens between 2-4pm. If the customer wants the chickens frozen they would typically pick them up the next day.

The petitioner has stated they plan to have waste removed on a regular basis and have already been contacted by a rendering company in Joliet that will deal with the waste. Also it will be kept in sealed containers and picked up within 48 hours.

The EPA and USDA will be in charge of the wastewater for animal products and the Health Department will be in charge of domestic waste and water. The IDPH will also regulate the well used for processing. Also staff is concerned about the waterway that runs on this property and if that could be contaminated in the future from this operation but that will be looked at more carefully while reviewing the engineering drawings.

No sign is proposed at this time, if a sign is installed at a later date it must comply with the sign regulations in Section 12 and requires a building permit.

There will be security lighting on the building that will be shielded.

The parking will mainly be used for employees as typically people will drop off their live chickens and pick up the processed chickens later that day. The Zoning Administrator may grant an exception in the agricultural (A-1) from the provision of having a hard surfaced parking lot where such uses generate low traffic volume. Handicapped parking stalls within the A-1 district shall be improved with a permanent, concrete, unit paver or asphalt surface and shall also provide a hard surface to the entrance of the structure a minimum of 6 feet wide. The petitioners request the parking lot be gravel instead of asphalt and staff is in support.

The building inspector has not provided comments on this petition yet. We are waiting to see if the Department of Agricultural will be inspecting the buildings and do not know if the petitioner will be requesting inspections or going to apply as Agriculturally exempt.

§ 13.08.J of the Zoning Ordinance outlines findings that the Hearing Officer must make in order to grant a special use. Bill Ford made the following findings of fact...
at both hearings:

That the establishment, maintenance, or operation of the special use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort, or general welfare. If the conditions are adhered to the establishment, maintenance, and operation of the special use shall not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare. The testimony has shown that the process as outlined by the petitioners will be a state of the art operation, there will be a USDA employee on site during the operations and ensure the public health and safety and monitoring of the employees and premises.

That the special use will not be substantially injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood. The Zoning classification of property within the general area of the property in question shall be considered in determining consistency with this standard. The proposed use shall make adequate provisions for appropriate buffers, landscaping, fencing, lighting, building materials, open space and other improvements necessary to insure that the proposed use does not adversely impact adjacent uses and is compatible with the surrounding area and/or the County as a whole. The entire operation will take place within a building and the unloading area must be at least 400' from any principle structure on an adjoining lot. The zoning in the general area is agricultural which this process fits in with that classification.

That adequate utilities, access roads and points of ingress and egress, drainage, and/or other necessary facilities have been or are being provided. The special use will be utilizing the existing driveway and drainage will be closely evaluated when the engineering drawings are assessed.

That the special use shall in all other respects conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located, except as such regulations may in each instance be modified by the County Board pursuant to the recommendation of the Hearing Officer. The EPA, Illinois Department of Health, Kendall County Health Department and the Kendall County Building Department all have jurisdiction over different aspects of the special use and the regulations must be followed and adhered to.

That the special use is consistent with the purpose and objectives of the Land Resource Management Plan and other adopted County or municipal plans and policies. The review and action to be taken on the special use petition will coincide with a proposed text amendment (Petition 13-16) that will permit a small Poultry & Small animal Processing Plant as a special use in the A-1 District. The special use proposal will comply with all proposed conditions attached to the proposed text amendment.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff is comfortable with this request and recommends approval. If approved, Staff recommends the following conditions be placed on the controlling ordinance approving the A-1 Special Use:

1. A maximum of 21,000 units a week.
2. Facilities (the unloading area) must be located at least 400' from any principle structure.
3. No rendering may take place on the site.
4. Live animals may be held on the site for no more than twenty-four (24)
hours.
5. All slaughtering/processing permitted only in an enclosed building.
6. The hours of operation are to be 6:30am to 6pm Monday thru Friday except additional Saturdays in October and November to process turkeys.
7. In no event can poultry produced be sold for retail or wholesale by the processor on the processing site.
8. All Applicable Federal, State and County rules and regulations shall apply.
9. Waste, by-products or any decomposable residue which results from the slaughtering of animals must be kept in a sealed container and picked up within 48 hours.
10. All signage shall comply with the provisions of Section 12 of the Kendall County Zoning Ordinance (Sign Regulations)
11. Shall satisfy all requirements of the Kendall County Health Department and Building Department prior to the issuance of occupancy permits.
12. Performance Standards. All activities shall conform to the performance standards set forth in section 10.01.G.
13. Engineering drawings including stormwater must be approved before a building permit can be released.
14. Within 5 years, 50' of the driveway must be a minimum of tar and chipped.
15. Kendall County staff will have access to the log books kept in house to verify the limits are being maintained with regards to how many animals are processed weekly.
16. A certificate of a certificate of occupancy will be required and copies of the EPA, IDPH and USDA permits supplied at the time of application for the building permit.
17. On the north side of the parking lot a 3-4 foot in height berm with landscape to 100% opacity to shield the car head lights.

Attachments:
1. ZPAC Meeting minutes on 7.1.13
2. RPC Meeting minutes on 8.28.13
3. Special Use Hearing Officer minutes on 9.3.13
4. Special Use Hearing Officer minutes on 10.15.13
5. PBZ Meeting minutes on 11.12.13
6. Email from Jody & Beth Osmund
7. Letter from the Illinois Stewardship Alliance
8. Letter from Richard Durbin
9. Letter from Alice Marks with her concerns
10. Email from Tom & Renee Geistler
11. Email from Garrett & Gwendolyn Carlyle
12. Email from Cliff Thrall & Family
13. Email from Brent & Sheila Urton
14. Email from Mark Oldenburg
15. Email from Pam & Bill Kunke
16. Email from Cliff Thrall dated November 12, 2013
17. Email from Mark Oldenburg dated November 10, 2013 to Mr. Scott Gryder
18. Map made by Mathew Marks showing what's in the area
19. Brower World Class Processing Equipment brochure
20. Draft Ordinance
21. Site Plan
22. Preliminary Concept Elevations
ZONING, PLATTING & ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ZPAC)
July 1, 2013 – Meeting Minutes

Planner Angela Zubko called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.

Present:
Megan Andrews – Soil & Water Conservation District
Aaron Rybski – Health Department
Fran Klaas - County Highway Department
Phil Smith – Sheriff’s Office
Amy Cesich – PBZ Member
Angela Zubko – PBZ Senior Planner

Absent:
Greg Chismark – Wills Burke Kelsey
Jason Petit – Forest Preserve

Also present:
Attorney Daniel Kramer
Alan & Mary Maly (Petitioners)
Darrell Poundstone (Renwick and Associates, in Ottawa)

AGENDA

A motion was made by Amy Cesich to approve the agenda, Fran Klaas seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion carried.

MINUTES

Aaron Rybski made a motion, seconded by Fran Klaas, to approve the June 3, 2013 meeting minutes. All were in favor and the motion carried.

PETITIONS

#13-16 Poultry processing plant and slaughtering
Planner Zubko stated this is the text amendment to allow a poultry processing plant as a special use in the A-1 district and check the language of slaughtering in other sections. This text amendment directly relates to Petition 13-17. Planner Zubko stated she thought about changing the language of slaughter houses as that is not commonly used anymore but decided to keep it as that’s the language the state still uses. The text will be talked about more at Ad-hoc at the end of the month but they wanted it to go to ZPAC to get their comments and also hear from the Health Department. Planner Zubko read through the conditions and the following suggestions were made:
Condition h might be too imiting especially for small shops like in Lisbon
Condition m might also be too hard for some people to adhere to.

To help aid in the discussion on the text Planner Zubko went through Petition 13-17 at this time:

#13-17 Maly Poultry Processing Plant
Planner Zubko stated the petitioners; Alan & Mary Maly are requesting approval of an A-1 special use to operate a poultry and small animal processing plant. The property is located at 16895 Lisbon Center Road on the north side of Lisbon Center road about 0.3 miles east of Fennel Road. The petitioners own about 125 acres of land and are requesting 27 acres of it for the special use. The petitioners have stated that all processing will take place in enclosed buildings and projecting to process a maximum of 3,000 chickens a day. They will also employ about 30-35 employees. Once again staff has many questions the petitioners will be answering at ad-hoc or before ad-hoc to help aid in a decision to recommend
approval of the special use. Some of the questions were about wastewater, who has authority, unloading of the chickens, how garbage will be handled, deliveries and inspections.

Attorney Daniel Kramer introduced himself and the owners/future operators of the property. Mr. Kramer wanted to talk a little about the text. He thought 20 acres might be a hindrance for small processing like Lisbon. Mr. Kramer asked if it’s 200’ from the property line or from where the processing will take place? These don’t effect this special use but possible others that exist. Mr. Kramer stated near Thanksgiving or Christmas they might do more than 3,000 but on an average day probably will do way less than 3,000 chickens. Holiday hours might vary and quantities. As long as there is some flexibility they do not see an issue with putting the amount of chickens in the Special use. With regards to regulations it is the IL Department of Agriculture and the USDA, they only oversee the processing and machinery, not building. Building and water is all under local authorities.

Mr. Kramer briefly discussed about the Village of Newark concern about annexing the property and having to take ownership of the roadways. They will be going to the Village of Newark’s meeting on July 10th but does not think there will be any issues. They have also notified the township and talked to the road commission and no issues have been brought up to date.

Most people will be bringing chickens in small trailers. For parking they would request tar and chip or pavers instead of asphalt. They do not anticipate a retail outlet or anything.

Alan & Mary Maly came up to the podium to help aid with questions. Mrs. Mary Maly stated with regards to waste, it really depends on volume but definitely pick up on a regular basis. If they have a large quantity of chickens it could be on a daily basis. It would be in a covered trash cans stored inside the building. Blood, feathers and bones are separated and disposed of. Due to the location of the site they will not be using anything on their fields but it’s possible to compost everything and spread onto fields.

Darrell Poundstone with Renwick and Associates (consulting engineer out of Ottawa) stated with regards to the BOD’s (biochemical oxygen demand), the expected BOD’s to come through the waste water system is about 1/3 of what you’d see coming out of a small restaurant. The petitioners will be using a standard underground septic system that will be to the northeast of the property. The exact location will not be determined until the soil borings are competed.

Mr. Rybski asked if it was going to be a combined system with regards to bathrooms and the washout/clean up from the operation. The reason he asked is because EPA has rules and restrictions with regards to slaughtering operations. Domestic waste is permitted by the health department but not the other waste. The petitioners said ideally they would like to combine them but whatever the regulations are they will follow. There is a 6” well on site and they are already talking to a well contractor. On the concept plan the engineer is showing detention on the downstream sides of the property. The USDA does have standards for the building. State inspected facilities can sell only within state and the USDA permits interstate. USDA facilities have inspector at all times. There was talk about deliveries and the petitioner stated that a semi truck holds 30,000 chickens. They expect to have people with flatbeds/hay wagons or car haulers that hold about 1,000 chickens. In an average transport you can fit about 8-10 chickens per coop. The petitioners will bring in an example to ad-hoc to help educate. With regards to operations they might want to look at 5:30am due to heat, typically you slaughter from 6-10am. The petitioners stated that typically January to April are the slowest times of years. Typically pick up is from about 2-4pm. If they want the chickens frozen they would typically pick up the next day.

Planner Zubko stated it seems like conditions a, b, c, h, j and m need to be looked at further. Mr. Klaas suggested maybe making a weekly average so there is some give and take in the regulations.

ZPAC Meeting Minutes 7.1.13
Petition 13-16
With no further discussion Megan Andrews made a motion, seconded by Aaron Rybski to forward the petition with the suggestion changes and recommend approval to the Plan Commission. All were in favor.

Petition 13-17
With no further discussion Phil Smith made a motion, seconded by Amy Cesich to forward the petition and recommend approval to the Plan Commission. All were in favor.

REVIEW OF PETITIONS THAT WENT TO COUNTY BOARD
13-08 ZPAC Definition- changes are shown in the packet, approved on June 18th
13-13 Steven & Lori Seeler- approved as is on June 18th

Going to Board on July 16th:
12-03 Land Cash Ordinance
13-11 Any text related to guns or target practice
13-15 Subdivision Control Ordinance

PUBLIC COMMENT- There were no audience members to comment.

OLD BUSINESS- None

NEW BUSINESS- None

AJOURNMENT- Next meeting on August 5, 2013
With no further business to discuss Fran Klaas made a motion, seconded by Aaron Rybski to adjourn the meeting at 9:53 a.m. The motion carried.

Submitted by,
Angela L. Zubko
Senior Planner
KENDALL COUNTY
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Kendall County Office Building
Rooms 209 & 210
111 W. Fox Street, Yorkville, Illinois

Meeting Minutes of August 28, 2013
(Unofficial until Approved)

Chairman Bill Ashton called the meeting to order at 7:04 pm.

ROLL CALL
Members Present: Chair Bill Ashton, Tom Casey, Bill Lavine, Vern Poppen, Tim Sidles, Claire Wilson, Walter Werderich, Budd Wormley and 1 vacancy (Big Grove)
Others present: Senior Planner Angela Zubko
Members Absent: Larry Nelson
In the Audience: Mary & Alan Maly, Desiree Edwards, Jody Osmund, Alice marks, Tina Suomi, Mathew Marks, Darrell Poundstone, Attorney Kelly Helland & Randy Mohr.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Claire Wilson made a motion to approve the agenda as written. Budd Wormley seconded the motion. All were in favor and the agenda was approved

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Claire Wilson made a motion to approve the minutes from June 26, 2013, Bill Lavine seconded the motion. All were in favor and the minutes were approved.

SPECIAL RECOGNITION
Chairman Bill Ashton wanted to present Randy Mohr with a recognition award for 21 years on the Plan Commission and thanked him for his time. Randy is now on the Zoning Board of Appeals. The audience applauded.

PETITIONS
#13-16 Poultry processing plant and slaughtering
Planner Zubko stated this is the text amendment to allow a small poultry and small animal processing plant as a special use in the A-1 district. Planner Zubko went through the memo and stated we are looking to add a definition of a small poultry and small animal processing plant and rendering. Planner Zubko went through all 14 conditions proposed. She stated the process to process chickens is at the end of the memo. She also stated she visiting a poultry processing plant and thought it was quite efficient, they had about 25 employees and about 2,500 chickens a day.

To help aid in the discussion on the text Planner Zubko went through Petition 13-17 at this time and stated all the same conditions are placed on the special use.
#13-17 Maly Poultry Processing Plant
Planner Zubko stated the petitioners; Alan & Mary Maly are requesting approval of an A-1 special use to operate a small poultry and small animal processing plant. The property is located at 16895 Lisbon Center Road on the north side of Lisbon Center road about 0.3 miles east of Fennel Road. The petitioners own about 125 acres of land and are requesting 27 acres of it for the special use. The Big Grove Township board made a unanimous recommendation in favor of the petition. Planner Zubko has received a letter from the Village of Newark Trustees saying they reviewed the information and support the endeavor. The petitioners have stated that all processing will take place in enclosed buildings and projecting to process a maximum of 3,000 chickens a day. They will also employ about 30-35 employees. They do meet all the setback requirements. Staff has requested to start discussions with our consulting engineer with regards to their 2 proposed detention areas. There is an existing driveway the petitioner proposes to use. This road will be the jurisdiction of Big Grove Township Road Commissioner who I have spoken to and he did not feel this would be an issue. Most people will be bringing chickens in small trailers. For parking they would request tar and chip or pavers instead of asphalt. They do not anticipate a retail outlet or anything. In an average transport you can fit about 8-10 chickens per coop. The picture in the report can hold about 200 chickens. The petitioner proposes to be open from 5:30am to 6pm Monday thru Friday except additional Saturdays in October and November to process Turkeys. The petitioners have stated that typically January to April are the slowest times of the year. Also typically the chickens will be dropped off in the morning, slaughtering typically takes place between 6-10am, then the customer picks up their processed chickens between 2-4pm. If the customer wants the chickens frozen they would typically pick them up the next day. The petitioner has stated they plan to have waste removed on a regular basis and have already been contacted by a rendering company in Joliet that will deal with the waste. Also it will be kept in sealed containers and picked up within 48 hours. For the well and septic there will be a combined effort. The IL EPA and the US Department of Agriculture are in charge of the water and waste from the animal by-products. Our Health department is in charge of the waste from the toilets and hand washing instead. The IDPH (IL Department of Public Health) will regulate the well used for the processing plant. No sign is proposed at this time, if a sign is installed at a later date it must comply with the sign regulations in Section 12 and requires a building permit. Parking lot lighting will be needed unless a variance is requested. The parking lot will mainly be used by employees. The Zoning Administrator may grant an exception to agricultural (A-1) zoned properties with low traffic volume to not asphalt the parking lot. The petitioners request the parking lot be gravel instead of asphalt and staff is in support. The building inspector has not provided comments on this petition yet. We are waiting to see if the Department of Agricultural
will be inspecting the buildings and do not know if the petitioner will be requesting inspections or going to apply as Agriculturally exempt. This property will be a USDA facility so a USDA employee will be on site when the operation is open. In the packet is an email from Jody and Beth Osmund in support of this proposed facility. There is another letter of support from the Illinois Stewardship Alliance. Also in the packet is a site plan and elevations of the proposed building. Staff is comfortable with this request and recommends approval with the 15 listed conditions.

Ms. Wilson asked why this use would be limited to not allow retail or wholesale to restaurants or middlemen. Planner Zubko stated that was something from ad-hoc and they wanted it to be more local and not allow retail on site.

Bill Lavine wanted to clarify the process and retail condition. The Commission might need to clarify this condition or take it out so we are protecting them to make sure they are not in violation.

Jody Osmund wanted to clarify the condition as well to state the petitions will not engage in retail sale as he's a farmer and does distribute his chickens to sell and will be using this facility.

Desiree Edwards asked if the special use follows the land or owners. Mr. Ashton stated it would only be for this parcel.

Mr. Ashton asked if the number they process recorded by the USDA? Mr. Maly stated they have to keep something called total records in the books for the USDA. Every chicken that comes in has to be recorded into the books including daily tallies. There was discussion if year logs need to be given to Planner Zubko? Planner Zubko stated she thought if there was a question she could ask for the logs or tell them to prove how many chickens a week or year they are producing. The petitioners were fine with whatever condition was placed on the ordinance.

Tom Marks asked what facility Planner Zubko visited. Planner Zubko stated she visited Central Illinois Poultry Processing in Arthur which is also a USDA site. There was discussion that the Undesser’s is not a USDA site.

Mathew Marks owns property around this property. He stated he has talked to many neighbors and this is the first time he’s heard about this. He asked the legal way to notify the neighbors. Mr. Ashton stated it’s the adjacent land owners (from the special use), in the paper and a public hearing sign. Mr. Marks stated the public hearing sign is quite small to read. Mr. Marks passed out a map showing surrounding homes and wanted to know what this special use will mean for the area. Mr. Ashton stated anything in the town of Newark, Kendall County does not have any control over. Anything in Big Grove Township on the comprehensive plan shows the area will remain agricultural. This is a special use in the A-1 Agricultural district. Planner Zubko stated
this will look like an agricultural operation. Mr. Marks also had concerns about lighting on site. Mr. Marks asked what would happen if there were protests on site. He also asked about landscaping and the driveway. Mr. Ashton stated the Sheriff's office would have to deal with protestors if needed. Mr. Marks also stated a lot of the neighbor's have concrete driveways and would like to keep aesthetics of the neighborhood. He was also concerned about having commercial on the site or setting precedence. His last questions was about the environment and impacts. Mr. Lavine stated the soils were tested with the Natural resource inventory and the IL database was access to see if there were any endangered species (which there are none.)

Mr. Marks asked what the Plan Commission's obligations are here, Mr. Lavine stated it is to weigh both sides of the issue and take a vote to recommend approval or recommend denial to the County Board. Mr. Ashton stated he understands what he's saying and whether it's a poultry processing plant verse any other farm operation.

Mr. Randy Mohr stated if we want to put condition 'g' it should only be only on the special use and not the text. He also stated there's been a turkey processing plant for over 35 years and there has never been a protest.

Jody Osmund wanted to discuss the appropriateness of the scale and its community. It will help preserve farms on a less industrial scale. His farm has produced about 3,000 birds and travels to Arthur for processing. Their farm will be more viable with a close processing plant. He supports this small-scale type of production and their endeavors.

Alice Marks who owns the property right next door has a couple concerns and passed out a paper listing her concerns. Some concerns were how it would affect her property values? She feels maybe we’re underestimating the traffic to this property due to employees and farmers dropping off their chickens. She asked if maybe the customers can use Fennel Road instead of Townhouse Road. She’s concerned about the possibility of contamination to her well. She also is worried what is will look like as it would be right out her window. Lighting at night is a concern and signage. Mr. Ashton stated the lighting could not spill over onto the next property and the sign could only be a maximum of 32 square feet.

Matt Marks stated he has a 6-horse trailer that cannot make a turn from Fennel onto Lisbon Center Road. He just wanted to mention that could be an issue. Mr. Ashton stated that would be up to the road commissioner.

Desiree Edwards asked a question about annexation with regards to the sewers. Attorney Kramer stated there is no discussion about annexation and does not believe the sewers could even accommodate this site.

Ms. Kramer wanted to state with this being a special use another land owner could not use this petition as precedence if it is approved. It's very specific to this property. Also the 30 employees is in the future, 5-15 is ideal at this time. She also stated there is a lot
of traffic on Townhouse Road. She also feels because this is a USDA site there are a lot more regulations than typically on a barn or other type of facility.

Mr. Casey asked about waste, Ms. Kramer stated it would be kept inside until picked up.

Mr. Sidles asked if there was any discussion on the parking lot or screening. Ms. Kramer stated currently they do not have a fence or anything proposed but she can discuss it with her clients.

Mr. Sidles asked planner Zubko about noise. Planner Zubko stated the only noise would be chickens that are waiting to be slaughtered.

Ms. Wilson is encouraged about the possible employment and helping the surrounding farmers. She thinks this fits in and will be un-obtrusive to the neighbors.

Petition 13-16 recommendation
Ms. Wilson recommended approval of the text amendment with the deletion of condition 'g'. Mr. Werderich seconded the motion. With a roll call vote all were in favor of the text amendment as modified.

Mr. Ashton asked how many cars a day do the petitioners propose. Mr. Maly stated in 5 years they could be at maximum capacity with 30 employees. There could be 6-8 customers a day. Probably a maximum of 80 trips total a day including supplies, customers and employees. Mr. Ashton is asking due to possibly paving the apron of the driveway. Ms. Wilson does not see the need for pavement at the end of the driveway. She does recommend in the interest of being a good neighbor to possibly put something into the plans for asphalt between the parking lot and neighbors. Mr. Maly thought about berming around some of the property. Mr. Sidles would like something in writing for something to be done but keep it pretty open. There was talk about adding a condition about asphalt at the end of the driveway within 5 years. Ms. Kramer stated her clients have not discussed it at length but it is not something her petitioners would like to do. Lisbon Center Road is a tar and chip roadway and the majority of the traffic is going to be cars except the rendering truck most likely. Ms. Osmond has been to the Arthur plant and has not seen it being an issue. Tom Marks stated if the petitioners will work with them they can be very good neighbors.

Petition 13-17 recommendation
Claire Wilson made a motion to approve petition 13-17 subject to the modified conditions with are the modification of number 7 to state in no event can poultry produced be sold for retail or wholesale by the processor on the processing site and add a condition that within 5 years, 50' of the driveway must be minimum tar and chipped. Tom Casey made a second. With a roll call vote all were in favor.

**REVIEW OF PETITIONS THAT WENT TO COUNTY BOARD**
Chairman Ford swore in all members of the audience that wished to talk about the petition including the special use for a small poultry and small animal processing plant.

PETITIONS
#13-17 Maly Poultry Processing Plant
Planner Zubko stated the petitioners; Alan & Mary Maly are requesting approval of an A-1 special use to operate a small poultry and small animal processing plant. The property is located at 15895 Lisbon Center Road on the north side of Lisbon Center Road about 0.3 miles east of Fennel Road. The petitioners own about 125 acres of land and are requesting 27 acres of it for the special use. The Big Grove Township board made a unanimous recommendation in favor of the petition. Planner Zubko has received a letter from the Village of Newark Trustees saying they reviewed the information and support the endeavor. The petitioners have stated that all processing will take place in enclosed building and projecting to process a maximum of 3,000 chickens a day. They will also employ about 30-35 employees probably in about 5 years. They do meet all the setback requirements. Staff has requested to start discussions with our consulting engineer with regards to their 2 proposed detention areas. There is an existing driveway the petitioner proposes to use. This road will be the jurisdiction of Big Grove Township Road Commissioner who I have spoken to and he did not feel this would be an issue. Most people will be bringing chickens in small trailers. For parking they would request tar and chip or pavers instead of asphalt. They do not anticipate a retail outlet or anything. In an average transport you can fit about 8-10 chickens per coop. The picture in the report can hold about 200 chickens. The petitioner proposes to be open from 5:30am to 6pm Monday thru Friday except additional Saturdays in October and November to process Turkeys. The petitioners have stated that typically January to April are the slowest times of the year. Also typically the chickens will be dropped off in the morning, slaughtering typically takes place between 6-10am, then the customer picks up their processed chickens between 2-4pm. If the customer wants the chickens frozen they would typically pick them up the next day. The petitioner has stated they plan to have waste removed on a regular basis and have already been contacted by a rendering company in Joliet that will deal with the waste. Also it will be kept in sealed containers and picked up within 48 hours. For the well and septic there will be a combined effort. The IL EPA and the US Department of Agriculture are in charge of the water and waste from the animal by-products. Our Health department is in charge of the waste from the toilets and hand washing inside. The IDPH (IL Department of Public Health) will regulate the well used for the processing plant. No sign is proposed at this time, if a sign is installed at a later date it must comply with the sign regulations in Section 12 and requires a building permit. Parking lot lighting will be needed unless a variance is requested. The parking lot will mainly be used by employees. The Zoning Administrator may grant an exception to agricultural (A-1) zoned properties with low traffic volume to not asphalt the parking lot. The petitioners request the parking lot be gravel instead of asphalt and staff is in support. We are waiting to see if the Department of Agricultural will be inspecting the buildings and do not know if the petitioner will be requesting inspections or going to apply as Agriculturally exempt. This property will be a USDA facility so a USDA employee will be on site when the operation is open and must be built to USDA standards. In the packet is an email from Jody and Beth Osmund in support of this proposed facility. There is another letter of support from the Illinois Stewardship Alliance and I just received and passed out a letter from Richard Durbin from the United States Senate in support and urging to give this application serious consideration. Also in the packet is a site plan and elevations of the proposed building. Staff is comfortable with this request and recommends approval with the 16 listed conditions. Also near the back of the packet is a list of concerns from Alice Marks and a map showing some homes in the area. As mentioned earlier some concerns that were brought up at the Plan Commission meeting where: traffic, noise, the property values in the area, lighting, possible protests, landscaping, driveway construction, commercial retail on the site, possible water...
contamination, appearance, signage and waste. At the Plan Commission condition 16 was added that states that within 5 years, 50’ of the driveway must be a minimum of tar and chipped. Staff agrees with this condition. There was also discussion from the Plan Commission of a fence on the east side of the property or some type of landscaping but they did not want to put it as a condition at this time.

Attorney Kelly Helland stated the USDA employee/inspector will be onsite whenever the operation is open and every bird will be logged that comes through the site so the staff could inspect the 21,000 average per week is being abided for. Also the petitioners would be amendable to putting up some landscaping and screening along the parking lot and other locations that might be visible to the neighbors. The elevation of the building being proposed is an agricultural façade and fits in with the surrounding area and agricultural area. They do not feel the plant will have detrimental effect to the neighbors as the operation will be completely enclosed. Just to reiterate the petitioners are not looking to seek any retail on site. They are requesting a positive recommendation.

Chairman Ford asked what the function of the USDA function is. Attorney Helland stated he inspects the cleanliness and oversee any bacterial infections. Mary Maly stated they inspect every bird to make sure they are not diseased and also look at the trailers they are brought in to makes sure they’re hygienic and makes sure the site is clean. Mr. Ford asked about the process and how the waste products will be contained. Ms. Maly stated the birds are unloaded and kept in the unloading area until processing, in a shaded area to be less stressful on the birds. Once they are removed from the transport coup they are shackled, stunned, and conveyed over a trough to bleed out (which is collected and disposed of properly). The birds are then put into a scaldor to loosen their feathers, then into a tumbler to remove the feathers. The birds are then hung on a separate conveyor system where the organs are removed and various stages and the bird is washed out. Then the birds are put in a chilled tank for a few hours. Once that is completed then they are packaged and put into refrigerator storage or freezer space. The organs are either saved to be packaged or in another barrel to be removed for waste products. Mr. Ford asked what will be different with this facility verse the Arthur facility. Alan Maly stated the Arthur plant was built over 15 years ago and they are Amish so they do a lot of things that need to conform to their religion. So this plant will be more up to date, will have lighting in their facility, use less water and have a little more modern machinery in this facility. Mr. Ford asked about the drain system. Mr. Maly stated there will be a main drain system and a separate drain for the wash down that contains harsh chemicals. Darren Poundstone stated the IL EPA will be regulating the process and permitted it. The Illinois Department of Agricultural is deciding if they also want to have a say but the minimum will be the IL EPA. There is a permit for construction and a permit for operation with the EPA. Mr. Ford asked about the water creek on site and Mr. Poundstone stated there is a swale on the property that is dry most of the time on the property. Mr. Ford asked about the well and the petitioner stated there is an existing well on site they plan to use. The EPA also requires sampling, quarterly he believed. Mr. Ford asked if there are any problems with smell. Attorney Helland stated she did not think this would be a problem since everything is done indoors. Planner Zubko stated the only area that smelled in Arthur was the unloading area which is why there is a condition it must be 400’ from a principle residence. Mr. Ford asked about the rendering company and asked if they pull into the building or how that works. Ms. Maly stated in Arthur they pick it up outside, at this facility they are not sure if it will be done inside or outside but it will only be in sealed containers.

At this time Mr. Ford opened up the public hearing with the following testimony heard:
Bill Regan is a resident of Newark and feels all residents of Newark should have been notified and is concerned about traffic. Ms. Helland said the majority of the traffic will be employee traffic and the chickens typically come from small farmers at about 200-1000 at a time. The Maly’s stated it would most likely be scattered like 1,000 chickens from 1 farmer, 500 from another and 200 from a couple more. All the chickens are scheduled; you cannot just show up and expect your chickens to be processed. They are also looking into organic processing which that would take a different day or time of the day vs. regular chickens vs. rabbits. Ms. Maly stated they are expecting around 40 trips a day, more employee traffic than farmers.

Peter Renz is also a Newark resident and has a couple questions. He asked about the odor and asked about the vented ridge roof, the well on site and concerns about the septic and retention, truck traffic and if they are going to sit there during the process, traffic overall, customers and how many, what if there is no USDA approval, disease prevention, fire prevention and is the building going to be sprinkled, when did rabbits come in? The parking lot and regards to spills and what they are going to do. He also stated why not expand the Undessors’ site as that’s poultry processing? Mr. Ford stated that is a totally separate location and up to the petitioners.

Attorney Helland stated with regards to the fire department they have not decided if it will be sprinkled yet or not. The onsite well might need to be dug deeper but that will be looked at. There will be no discharge into a sewer system. As far as the roadway goes the road is tar and chipped and does not foresee any more traffic than the current grain trucks. Some farmers may sit on site and some may wait. Planner Zubko wanted to clarify the text amendment was for the small poultry and small animal processing plant and the Maly’s are going above and beyond to have a USDA facility so they can still run without being a USDA facility.

Carol Henderson stated the road was graveled when she moved there and tar and chipped it recently, she is concerned about truck traffic. She is against this special use, she’s about a ¼ mile from this property on Fennel. She’s also concerned about the smell and worried about rats.

Matthew Marks stated he owns numerous properties around this facility. His concerns are traffic, noise, odors and this being more commercial then other types of farm. One question is are any overnight stays permitted? On the open venting have they done circulation numbers yet? He stated semi trucks will not be able to make the turn from Fennel to Lisbon Center Road. Fennel Road is done 2-3 times per season so this will affect the road conditions. He had some questions about the lighted cupola, is it decorate? With regards to outdoor lighting are shields going to be used so it is shining downwards. He brought up landscaping and asked if there is a landscaping plan? He asked about the existing trees along the drive and if they will stay? He stated all the adjacent properties have decorative landscaping and nice entranceway. Mr. Marks asked if an entrance light will be put it so people do not drive by and miss the site. He thought garbage should be removed daily and understood that would increase the traffic. Mr. Ford stated he understood a USDA employee will be on site at all time and the process will be regulated on a day to day process. Attorney Helland stated no overnight guests will be permitted. No calculations have been done yet with regards to the open venting. With regards to the existing trees they will stay and no formal landscape plan has been drawn yet. The lighting in the cupola will be decorative and will have shields on their lights and there is no proposed parking lot lighting. With regards to waste the petitioners plan to remove it every day, the text amendment states within 48 hours for a day buffer in case it is not picked up or if there is a holiday. The petitioners do not have plans to light any signs at the driveway at this time.
Don Hartman stated a lot of the existing neighbors did not know this is going on and feels more notification needs to take place. Another concern is the traffic.

Tom Marks lives next to this property and would like to see a landscape plan approved. He is of the opinion the paved drive needs to be sooner than five years.

Planner Zubko asked Attorney Kramer if they went to any Village of Newark meetings or if the talks were internally with staff. Attorney Kramer said no formal meetings were held, they only talked to staff, no hearing was held at the Village of Newark.

Matthew Marks started hearing rumors about this plant about a year ago and did not receive information from the Village of Newark. Planner Zubko stated for the record the County received this application May 28, 2013 so we were not aware of this for a year.

Alice Marks’ letter was put on the record.

Attorney Kelly Helland wanted to submit in evidence the mechanical systems. She also stated she feels this will have very little impact compared to some other agricultural business permitted by right and not going to store ammonia on site. This will also add about 30 jobs in the next 5-10 years and also provide a service to local farmers and businesses.

With no further testimony Bill Ford closed the public hearing.

Special Use Hearing Officer Ford reviewed the Findings of Fact for a special use as follows:

§ 13.08.J of the Zoning Ordinance outlines findings that the Hearing Officer must make in order to grant a special use. Staff has answered as follows:

That the establishment, maintenance, or operation of the special use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort, or general welfare. If the conditions are adhered to the establishment, maintenance, and operation of the special use shall not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare. The testimony has shown that the process as outlined by the petitioners will be a state of the art operation, there will be a USDA employee on site during the operations and ensure the public health and safety and monitoring of the employees and premises.

That the special use will not be substantially injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood. The Zoning classification of property within the general area of the property in question shall be considered in determining consistency with this standard. The proposed use shall make adequate provisions for appropriate buffers, landscaping, fencing, lighting, building materials, open space and other improvements necessary to insure that the proposed use does not adversely impact adjacent uses and is compatible with the surrounding area and/or the County as a whole. The entire operation will take place within a building and the unloading area must be at least 400' from any principle structure on an adjoining lot. The zoning in the general area is agricultural which this process fits in with that classification.
That adequate utilities, access roads and points of ingress and egress, drainage, and/or other necessary facilities have been or are being provided. The special use will be utilizing the existing driveway and drainage will be closely evaluated when the engineering drawings are assessed.

That the special use shall in all other respects conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located, except as such regulations may in each instance be modified by the County Board pursuant to the recommendation of the Hearing Officer. The EPA, Illinois Department of Health, Kendall County Health Department and the Kendall County Building Department all have jurisdiction over different aspects of the special use and the regulations must be followed and adhered to.

That the special use is consistent with the purpose and objectives of the Land Resource Management Plan and other adopted County or municipal plans and policies. The review and action to be taken on the special use petition will coincide with a proposed text amendment (Petition 13-16) that will permit a small Poultry & Small animal Processing Plant as a special use in the A-1 District. The special use proposal will comply with all proposed conditions attached to the proposed text amendment.

Bill Ford made a favorable recommendation with this petition, with the above modified findings of fact and the 16 conditions specified on the special use. Mr. Ford wanted to state he is of the opinion 5 years is too long of a time.

ADJOURNMENT
Chairman Bill Ford adjourned the Special Use Hearing Officer meeting at 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Angela L. Zubko
Senior Planner & Recording Secretary
CALL TO ORDER- SPECIAL USE HEARING OFFICER
At 7:04 p.m., Chairman Bill Ford called the Special Use Hearing Officer meeting to order.

ROLL CALL
Members present: Bill Ford
Also present: Planner Angela Zubko, Walter Werderich (future hearing officer) Jeff Nieland, Mark & Jill Oldenburg, Kim Ahnert, Darrell Poundstone, Cliff & Kate Thrall, Gwen Carlyle, Tom & Renee Geistler, Larry & Carol Henderson, Cheryl Harvey, Pam & Bill Kunke, The Hartmans, Scott & Claudia Paquet, Mark Croeger, Pamela Patterson, Brent & Cindy Harney, Cheryl Harvey, Steven Whitlock, Mary Maly & Attorney Kelly Kramer

MINUTES
Bill Ford motioned to approve the September 3, 2013 Special Use Hearing Officer Meeting minutes as written.

Chairman Ford stated that the record of these proceedings shall include all testimony, comments, evidence, or documents previously submitted at a prior hearing on September 3rd, 2013. A copy of the audio recording of the hearing on September 3rd, 2013 is hereby made a part of these proceedings and a copy of the findings of fact that took into account prior testimony used for the September 3rd, 2013 meeting is also hereby made a part of these proceedings.

Chairman Ford swore in all members of the audience that wished to talk about the petition for the special use for a small poultry and small animal processing plant.

PETITIONS
#13-17 Maly Poultry Processing Plant
Planner Zubko stated the petitioners; Alan & Mary Maly are requesting approval of an A-1 special use to operate a small poultry and small animal processing plant. The property is located at 15895 Lisbon Center Road on the north side of Lisbon Center road about 0.3 miles east of Fennel Road. The petitioners own about 125 acres of land and are requesting 27 acres of it for the special use. The Big Grove Township board made a unanimous recommendation in favor of the petition. Planner Zubko has received a letter from the Village of Newark Trustees saying they reviewed the information and support the endeavor. The petitioners have stated that all processing will take place in enclosed building and projecting to process a maximum of 3,000 chickens a day. They will also employ about 30-35 employees probably in about 5 years. They do meet all the setback requirements. Staff has requested to start discussions with our consulting engineer with regards to their 2 proposed detention areas which they are currently doing. There is an existing driveway the petitioner proposes to use. This road will be the jurisdiction of Big Grove Township Road Commissioner who I have spoken to and he did not feel this would be an issue and did not request any conditions to be place on the special use ordinance. Most people will be bringing chickens in small trailers. For parking they would request tar and chip or pavers instead of asphalt. They do not anticipate a retail outlet or anything. In an average transport you can fit about 8-10 chickens per coop. The picture in the report can hold about 200 chickens.
The petitioner proposes to be open from 5:30am to 6pm Monday thru Friday except additional Saturdays in October and November to process Turkeys. The petitioners have stated that typically January to April are the slowest times of the year. Also typically the chickens will be dropped off in the morning, slaughtering typically takes place between 6-10am, then the customer picks up their processed chickens between 2-4pm. If the customer wants the chickens frozen they would typically pick them up the next day. The petitioner has stated they plan to have waste removed on a regular basis and have already been contacted by a rendering company in Joliet that will deal with the waste. Also it will be kept in sealed containers and picked up within 48 hours, the petitioner’s goal is within 24 hours. For the well and septic there will be a combined effort. The IL EPA and the US Department of Agriculture are in charge of the water and waste from the animal by-products. Our Health department is in charge of the waste from the toilets and hand washing inside. The IDPH (IL Department of Public Health) will regulate the well used for the processing plant. No sign is proposed at this time, if a sign is installed at a later date it must comply with the sign regulations in Section 12 and requires a building permit. No parking lot lighting is requested. The parking lot will mainly be used by employees. The Zoning Administrator may grant an exception to agricultural (A-1) zoned properties with low traffic volume to not asphalt the parking lot. The petitioners request the parking lot be gravel instead of asphalt and staff is in support. This property will be a USDA facility so a USDA employee will be on site when the operation is open and must be built to USDA standards. In the packet is an email from Jody and Beth Osmund in support of this proposed facility. There is another letter of support from the Illinois Stewardship Alliance, also in the packet is a letter from Richard Durbin from the United States Senate in support and urging to give this application serious consideration. Also in the packet is a site plan and elevations of the proposed building. Staff is comfortable with this request and recommends approval with the 17 listed conditions. Also near the back of the packet is a list of concerns from Alice Marks and a map showing some homes in the area. Some of the concerns that were brought up at the Plan Commission and prior hearing meeting where: traffic, noise, the property values in the area, lighting, possible protests, landscaping, driveway construction, commercial retail on the site, possible water contamination, appearance, signage and waste. At the Plan Commission condition 16 was added that states that within 5 years, 50’ of the driveway must be a minimum of tar and chipped. Staff agrees with this condition. There was also discussion from the Plan Commission of a fence on the east side of the property or some type of landscaping but the Plan Commission did not want to put it as a condition at this time. It was suggested to bring this up at the Planning, Building and Zoning meeting as they have the authority to add conditions. Planner Zubko read through all the conditions:

1. A maximum of 21,000 units a week.
2. Facilities (the unloading area) must be located at least 400’ from any principle structure.
3. No rendering may take place on the site.
4. Live animals may be held on the site for no more than twenty-four (24) hours.
5. All slaughtering/processing permitted only in an enclosed building.
6. The hours of operation are to be 5:30am to 6pm Monday thru Friday except additional Saturdays in October and November to process turkeys.
7. In no event can poultry produced be sold for retail or wholesale by the processor on the processing site.
8. Parking shall be in accordance with Section 11 of the Zoning Ordinance including lighting.
9. All Applicable Federal, State and County rules and regulations shall apply.
10. Other such conditions as approved by the County Board.
11. Waste, by-products or any decomposable residue which results from the slaughtering of animals must be kept in a sealed container and picked up within 48 hours.
12. All signage shall comply with the provisions of Section 12 of the Kendall County Zoning Ordinance (Sign...
Regulations)
13. Shall satisfy all requirements of the Kendall County Health Department and Building Department prior to the issuance of occupancy permits.
14. Performance Standards. All activities shall conform to the performance standards set forth in section 10.01.G.
15. Engineering drawings including stormwater must be approved before a building permit can be released.
16. Within 5 years, 50' of the driveway must be a minimum of tar and chipped.
17. Kendall County staff will have access to the log books kept in house to verify the limits are being maintained with regards to how many animals are processed weekly.

Planner Zubko mentioned she has received letters from the following people and that the letters have also been read by the hearing officer and will be information given to the County Board as well:
- Tom & Renee Geistler
- Garrett & Gwendolyn Carlyle
- Cliff Thrall & Family
- Brent & Sheila Urton
- Mark Oldenburg
- Jody & Beth Osmund
- Illinois Stewardship Alliance
- United States Senator Richard J. Durbin
- Alice Marks

Attorney Kelly Kramer wanted to stress there will be a well and septic and there will be no hook-up to Newark’s sewer and water system.

At this time Mr. Ford opened up the public hearing with the following testimony heard:

Tom Geistler had a few questions: why did Newark vote down the process? Planner Zubko stated the Village did not take a formal vote, they took no stance but the project is in the County and they support the endeavor. How much water will be used for the plant? What kind of chemicals will the plant use and disposing of the chemicals? How many shifts a day will take place? Where will waste water go, will there be a lagoon? Why isn’t there a location set aside where light industry can go instead of a rural setting?

Attorney Kelly Kramer stated the well depth and water consumption have had preliminary discussions with J & W and they believe the depth will be about 400‘-600‘ and it should not stress the existing aquifer. The existing well onsite is about 400‘ into the ground. The waste product will be picked up on a daily basis, the waste water will be determined by the USDA and public health department. There have been preliminary discussion on waste water and well and septic. No further in depth discussion have happened as the petitioners are awaiting to see what happens with this special use petition. Mary Maly stated that in Arthur they have a septic field existing and if there was a new facility it would need something along the lines of a treatment facility. Darrel Poundstone (Engineer) stated this is pursuit to the IL EPA and IL Department of Agriculture. The design will be approved and monitored though those agencies. Kelly Kramer stated the chemicals are regulated by the USDA, but the petitioners stated that chlorine will be used to clean. Mary Maly stated that
she talked to J & W and in comparison the water usage described to them would be less than irrigating the former nursery nearby.

Cliff Thrall stated that 9.3 gallons will be used and about 5 times that for turkeys. It comes close to 195,000 in a five day work week. He is worried about what will get to Newark’s water table and how much it will affect the water table. His biggest concern is if the facility starts using that amount of water and the system fails the Village of Newark might need to re-do their treatment system and are close to capacity right now. He believes there is ample vacant light industrial locations in the county and suggested the vacant Lowe’s in Oswego for this type of operation. He has read a lot about the EPA standards and is not sure the EPA would allow a gravel driveway and parking area. He also had the guidelines if anyone would like to see them from the EPA.

Bill Kunke stated he raises chickens and have met the Maly’s once. He wanted to discuss possible traffic and stated in Arthur they average about 2,500 chickens a day and they do use pick-up trucks, horse trailers or livestock trailers. There’s a time schedule so no one is backed up and waiting. He is of the opinion the dust is null and void as you’re moving slowly through the parking lot. There are no semi-trucks coming in and out except maybe for the dumpster. He stated the smell is minimal. He also briefly discussed the water and rain ratios. He stated if there was no sign in Arthur you would not know it existed. He stated there are a lot worse neighbors you can have. There is a need for it and it’s not as bad as people are thinking in their mind. He supports this endeavor and will use the facility when it opens. He also mentioned it brings local business while the farmers are waiting for the chickens to be processed.

Pamela Patterson wanted to state she has a 10 acre farmette and a half a dozen chickens and supports this rural endeavor. There is a definite need for this type of facility. She also stated there are a lot of chemicals that farmers use on their crops currently and feels that’s the least of people’s concerns. She will also use it as well, not every year but every couple of years. It’s been said before the city has moved around her.

Mark Goldenberg stated Arthur is 2 miles from every residential area. Mr. Goldenberg submitted a picture from his daughter’s window. The silo is where the facility will be located. His concern is the smell on a calm, hot day. His feels a lot more needs to go into this before a decision is made.

Gwen Carlyle lives north of the site. She feels this is a kill plant and not an agricultural operation. She does not believe it belongs there and feels it is a manufacturing facility. They are not opposed to livestock but opposed to a slaughtering facility. She feels it changes the landscape of the neighbors that exist there. She’s worried about quality of life and smell. She feels there needs to be a lot more planning and critical review before it goes into her backyard. She talks about the southerly winds and stated she is worried it will smell. Chlorine is harmful to the public and a known cancer causing agent. She does not feel it will bring Newark extra money but just extra people and not enough police force. She also discussed her concerns for their property values. She talked a little about possible expansion and what would be done at that time, who would police all the people.

Brent Harney lives about 400 yards west of this property. He is worried about water runoff and his well is not 400’ deep but 80’ deep. He is worried about the smells and stated it will smell. He stated he’s been trying to get the township road commissioner to fix the culvert by his house and the township road commissioner stated there is no money. He is worried about possible expansion and needs more studying.
Cheryl Harvey owns property adjacent to this facility and would use the facility. She thinks people are more concerned and ahead of themselves. She raises about 100 chickens a year. She also stated there are many chemicals used on farms. She owns 100 acres at Fennel and Lisbon Center Road.

Peggy Hartman lives on Fennel Road and stated this property runs towards them, their property is lower. She stated this petition concerns her, she’s worried about property values and water. She stated when she bought her property this property was a dairy farm and is just concerned.

Tom Geistler requested the County get information from the Village of Newark and their concerns with regards to wastewater. Ms. Zubko read the letter from the Village of Newark dated August 5, 2013. Kelly Kramer stated the petition was never filed officially with the Village of Newark. The owners made the decision to NOT annex into the Village of Newark. Newark was never given that opportunity to vote. The sludge trucks were mentioned and Ms. Kramer stated they wished the renderings to be picked up every day. He stated he hopes the business is successful and wonders why it would not go into an industrial area of the county. Ms. Kramer stated the term special use and non permitted use are being used simultaneously. The special use is used more for the Board to attach conditions to the special use that are appropriate for that area. Mr. Geistler stated he is worried about groundwater and water run-off. He is concerned about the Village of Newark.

Gwen Carlyle wanted to know why she was not notified and if the Village of Newark has discussed water issues. Ms. Kramer stated that is up to who they elect and if they are informed. She is also concerned about the police force.

Mark Goldenberg wants to know what type of mechanisms will be put in place if something becomes an issue. Ms. Kramer stated he can contact the Planning, Building and Zoning Committee, a group can sue them. Based on intentions he feels this is a bad idea.

Kim Ahnert stated his property looks out at this property. Everyone has a lot of concerns about this petition and thinks there is a better property to suit this special use.

Renee Geistler feels the EPA needs to be involved now instead of later. She stated she lived by a chicken farm and it smelled. She asked if we would like it in our backyard? She feels a lot more needs to be studied.

Mr. Ford asked Mr. Kunke about the smell at Arthur. He stated in the morning it does not smell but in the afternoon it might smell. He stated there is not no smell but when you go by the dumpster it smells a little.

Ms. Kramer wanted to ask Mr. Kunke a few questions: the dumpsters are outside at Arthur, correct? Mr. Kunke stated that is correct. Ms. Kramer asked if he was aware the waste on this property would be kept inside? Mr. Kunke stated he was not aware but now aware. Ms. Kramer ask if Mr. Kunke notices on approaching the Arthur plant any odor if his window’s are down in the spring? Mr. Kunke stated he never has. She asked if the odor ever noticed is from the dumpsters or the processing itself? Mr. Kunke stated if he had to pick one it would be the dumpster. Ms. Kramer asked if he’s been to the plant in the summer and if the odor increases? Mr. Kunke stated he’s been to the plant in the summer and the smell is the same in the summer and in November. Ms. Kramer asked how many chickens he raises? Mr. Kunke stated about 400-500 chickens. Ms. Kramer asked when cleaning out the chicken coops do they smell? Mr. Kunke stated yes. Ms.
Kramer also asked about hogs & cattle? Mr. Kunke stated they all smell. Mr. Kunke stated personally the worst smell to him is the Grain Co F.S. fertilizer plant near Minooka.

Cliff Thrall is wondering where on the property the trash will be contained? He also brought up parking lot lighting and if the parking lot will or will not having lights? He also stated the waste will be picked up after hours and asked if the USDA requires the septic to be pumped? He also is wondering about the weight of the rendering vehicle. He is also worried about the safety of kids walking on the roadways.

Gwen Carlyle stated she is worried about vermin and attracting major rodents and vultures.

Ms. Kramer stated everything is done inside the structure. The waste will not be stored outside.

Ms. Kramer wanted to verify the previous testimony will be included in this hearing. Planner Zubko stated yes the September 3rd audio will

Special Use Hearing Officer Ford closed the public testimony and reviewed the Findings of Fact for a special use as follows:

§ 13.08.J of the Zoning Ordinance outlines findings that the Hearing Officer must make in order to grant a special use. Staff has answered as follows:

That the establishment, maintenance, or operation of the special use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort, or general welfare. If the conditions are adhered to the establishment, maintenance, and operation of the special use shall not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare. The testimony has shown that the process as outlined by the petitioners will be a state of the art operation, there will be a USDA employee on site during the operations and ensure the public health and safety and monitoring of the employees and premises.

That the special use will not be substantially injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood. The Zoning classification of property within the general area of the property in question shall be considered in determining consistency with this standard. The proposed use shall make adequate provisions for appropriate buffers, landscaping, fencing, lighting, building materials, open space and other improvements necessary to insure that the proposed use does not adversely impact adjacent uses and is compatible with the surrounding area and/or the County as a whole. The entire operation will take place within a building and the unloading area must be at least 400′ from any principle structure on an adjoining lot. The zoning in the general area is agricultural which this process fits in with that classification.

That adequate utilities, access roads and points of ingress and egress, drainage, and/or other necessary facilities have been or are being provided. The special use will be utilizing the existing driveway and drainage will be closely evaluated when the engineering drawings are assessed.

That the special use shall in all other respects conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located, except as such regulations may in each instance be modified by the County Board pursuant to the
recommendation of the Hearing Officer. The EPA, Illinois Department of Health, Kendall County Health Department and the Kendall County Building Department all have jurisdiction over different aspects of the special use and the regulations must be followed and adhered to.

That the special use is consistent with the purpose and objectives of the Land Resource Management Plan and other adopted County or municipal plans and policies. The review and action to be taken on the special use petition will coincide with a proposed text amendment (Petition 13-16) that will permit a small Poultry & Small animal Processing Plant as a special use in the A-1 District. The special use proposal will comply with all proposed conditions attached to the proposed text amendment.

Bill Ford stated he did not hear any new testimony and will keep the same findings of fact and made a favorable recommendation with this petition, with the above modified findings of fact and the 17 conditions specified on the special use.

The PBZ Committee will be November 12th at 6:30pm.

ADJOURNMENT
Chairman Bill Ford adjourned the Special Use Hearing Officer meeting at 8:38 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Angela L. Zubko
Senior Planner & Recording Secretary
CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order by Chairman Scott Gryder at 6:32 p.m.

ROLL CALL
Present: Chairman Scott Gryder, Amy Cesich, Lynn Cullick, Vice-Chair Judy Gilmour and Jeff Wehrli
Absent: None
Also present: Senior Planner Angela Zubko, Alan & Mary Maly, Attorney Daniel Kramer, Gwen Carlyle, Cliff & Kate Thrall, Thomas & Renee Geistler and Jill Oldenburg

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Amy Cesish made a motion to approve the agenda as written, Lynn Cullick seconded the motion. All agreed and the motion was approved.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Lynn Cullick made a motion to approve the minutes from October 7, 2013. Amy Cesich seconded the motion. All agreed and the minutes were approved.

EXPENDITURE REPORT (handed out at meeting)
Jeff Wehrli made a motion to approve the expenditure report in the amount of $21,137.04 and forward it onto the Finance Committee, Lynn Cullick seconded the motion. All agreed and the motion was approved.

PETITIONS-
#13-17 Maly Poultry Processing Plant
Planner Zubko stated the petitioners: Alan & Mary Maly are requesting approval of an A-1 special use to operate a small poultry and small animal processing plant. The property is located at 16895 Lisbon Center Road on the north side of Lisbon Center road about 0.3 miles east of Fennel Road. The petitioners own about 125 acres of land and are requesting 27 acres of it for the special use. The Endangered Species Report contained no record of state listed threatened or endangered species, Illinois Natural Area inventory sites, dedicated Illinois Nature preserves or registered land and water reserves in the vicinity of the project location. The Natural Resources Inventory indicated that 67.4% of the soils on site are classified as being prime farmland and most agronomically productive and the level of protection for the LESA score is medium. At the July 16th Big Grove Township board meeting they made a unanimous recommendation in favor of the petition. Also Planner Zubko has received a letter from the Village of Newark Trustees dated August 5, 2013 stating that the Village of Newark Trustees reviewed the information and support the endeavor. Just to clarify the project will NOT be in the Village of Newark and NOT be connected to their sewer system, it will be on well and septic. This was never a formal petition to the Village of Newark.

The ZPAC Committee made a favorable recommendation, the Plan Commission also made a favorable recommendation and added a condition that within 5 years, 50' of the driveway must be a minimum of tar and chipped and modified the condition to not allow retail sales on site. There were 2 public hearings on this
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petition due to information received from the SAO related to notification procedures and the hearing officer Bill Ford made a favorable recommendation at both hearings. This will be a USDA (United States Department of Agricultural) certified plant which means they have to follow the Counties rules and also the stricter rules of the EPA Department of Agricultural and the Illinois Department of Public Health.

All processing will take place in enclosed building and projecting to process a maximum of 3,000 chickens a day. They will also employ about 30-35 employees probably in about 5 years but start off with about 10 employees. They do meet all the required setbacks. There is an existing driveway the petitioner proposes to use and 2 existing buildings on the property that will be maintained. Lisbon Center road is the jurisdiction of the Big Grove Township Road Commissioner, who I have spoken to, and he did not feel this use would be an issue and did not request any conditions to be placed on the special use ordinance regarding the roadway. Most people will be bringing chickens in small trailers. There will be NO retail on site and that is one of the conditions. In an average transport you can fit about 8-10 chickens per coop. The picture in the report can hold about 200 chickens. The petitioner proposes to be open from 5:30am to 6pm Monday thru Friday except additional Saturdays in October and November to process Turkeys. The petitioners have stated that typically January to April are the slowest times of the year. Also typically the chickens will be dropped off in the morning, slaughtering typically takes place between 6-10am, then the customer picks up their processed chickens between 2-4pm. If the customer wants the chickens frozen they would typically pick them up the next day. The petitioner has stated they plan to have waste removed on a regular basis and have already been contacted by a rendering company in Joliet that will deal with the waste. All waste will be kept in sealed containers inside a building and picked up within 48 hours, the petitioner’s goal is within 24 hours.

For the well and septic there will be a combined effort. The IL EPA and the US Department of Agriculture are in charge of the water and waste from the animal by-products. Our Health department is in charge of the waste from the toilets and hand washing inside. The IDPH (IL Department of Public Health) will regulate the well used for the processing plant. No sign is proposed at this time, if a sign is installed at a later date it must comply with the sign regulations in Section 12 of the Zoning Ordinance and requires a building permit. The parking lot will mainly be used by employees and no parking lot lighting is requested. The petitioners request the parking lot be gravel instead of asphalt and staff is in support. This property will be a USDA facility so a USDA employee will be on site at all times when the operation is open and the facility must be built to USDA standards.

Some of the concerns that were brought up at the previous meetings where: the public feels this is a manufacturing use and not agricultural, amount of traffic on and off site, noise, the property values in the area, lighting, possible protests, landscaping, driveway construction, possible water contamination, type of chemicals the plant will be using and disposing of, appearance, signage, how many shifts a day, waste and wastewater, amount of water used and effect on the aquifer and water runoff, smells, attracting other rodents and vultures, Newark’s police force policing more people, and safety of children walking along the roadways. There was also discussion from the Plan Commission of a fence on the east side of the property or some type of landscaping but the Plan Commission did not want to put it as a condition at this time. It was suggested to bring this up at the Planning, Building and Zoning meeting as they have the authority to add conditions.

In the packet is a site plan and elevations of the proposed building. The site plan will be an exhibit to the ordinance, therefore; if the petitioners want to add onto the site they would need to go through the special use process again unless the changes would be considered a minor amendment. Staff is comfortable with this request and recommends approval with the 15 listed conditions, eliminating condition 8 as they meet the
requirements and 10 as those would be added today or at the County Board meeting. Planner Zubko read through all the conditions:

1. A maximum of 21,000 units a week.
2. Facilities (the unloading area) must be located at least 400’ from any principle structure.
3. No rendering may take place on the site.
4. Live animals may be held on the site for no more than twenty-four (24) hours.
5. All slaughtering/processing permitted only in an enclosed building.
6. The hours of operation are to be 5:30am to 6pm Monday thru Friday except additional Saturdays in October and November to process turkeys.
7. In no event can poultry produced be sold for retail or wholesale by the processor on the processing site.
8. All Applicable Federal, State and County rules and regulations shall apply.
9. Waste, by-products or any decomposable residue which results from the slaughtering of animals must be kept in a sealed container and picked up within 48 hours.
10. All signage shall comply with the provisions of Section 12 of the Kendall County Zoning Ordinance (Sign Regulations)
11. Shall satisfy all requirements of the Kendall County Health Department and Building Department prior to the issuance of occupancy permits.
12. Performance Standards. All activities shall conform to the performance standards set forth in section 10.01.G.
13. Engineering drawings, including stormwater, must be approved before a building permit can be released.
14. Within 5 years, 50’ of the driveway must be a minimum of tar and chipped.
15. Kendall County staff will have access to the log books kept in house to verify the limits are being maintained with regards to how many animals are processed weekly.

Planner Zubko mentioned she has received letters from the following people and that the letters been given to the PBZ Committee members including 3 letters she received today from Cliff Thrall, Mark Oldenburg & Pam & Bill Kunke and passed out to the members at the beginning of the meeting. The other letters in the packet include letters from:

Jody & Beth Osmund
Illinois Stewardship Alliance
United States Senator Richard J. Durbin
Alice Marks
Tom & Renee Geistler
Garrett & Gwendolyn Carlyle
Cliff Thrall & Family
Brent & Sheila Urton
Mark Oldenburg
Map made by Mathew Marks showing what’s in the area

Mr. Gryder stated they do not take additional testimony but wanted to make sure Planner Zubko stated all the items and comments in her report. No audience members wanted to talk at this moment. Ms. Cesich had a few comments: a few County Board members were at the last hearing and there were a few items brought up from the residents that concerned her: the EPA requirements and the water table and aquifer. She wanted to clarify we are granting zoning and the EPA has not looked at this yet. Planner Zubko stated yes the EPA typically will not look at a project until the zoning is approved on that land and then go through their process
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and asked Mr. Kramer just to verify. Ms. Cesich feels we might be putting the cart before the horse and giving zoning for something we don't know all the part for. She has some concerns. Planner Zubko also mentioned the condition about engineering and stormwater must be approved.

Attorney Kramer stated there are two ways to look at the project, the EPA would like them to get the zoning first. The petitioner's engineer has to supply water and wastewater plans to the EPA and those plans can get costly. The EPA will not approve the project until those plans are provided. It would be a hardship for the petitioners to go through that type of expense if the land use will not be approved. If zoning is approved there are so many days to submit their plans for approval. With regards to the water table, Mr. Kramer stated they will be using water, there is no question of that, but this particular well on site was for a cattle operation that was run there years ago with a 6" casing which is huge compared what a normal home in the County might have. The purpose of the casing is so it can pump incredible amounts of water for agricultural use like irrigation which would not require County approval. Mr. Kramer talked a little about the process and conditions added to make sure all conditions are adhered to.

Mr. Wehrli stated we need to remember is that we're voting or recommending on the zoning use/special use. As far as the specifics of the operation itself the petitioners have agreed to the limitations that have been set in this special use and they also have to abide by the limitations that the other governmental agencies will give them including the possibility that they might review it say it is just not going to work. Mr. Wehrli stated that in another time when the County went against another governmental agency because the County Board did not feel they would do the right thing or monitor it properly, that is the quickest way to get your case booted. We have to assume they will do their jobs properly and monitor it properly. He's looking if it fits into the agricultural use and if the conditions are acceptable. The other agencies will run most of it and we have to trust in them.

Mr. Gryder asked if the hearing officer has viewed all the testimony and findings of fact and have recommended approval and the County Board denied the special use would that open the County Board up to liability. Mr. Kramer volunteered to chime in since he was the City of Yorkville’s attorney for 22 years so he can give it to us in regards to both sides. Mr. Kramer stated in Illinois on zoning there is a famous case called the LaSalle case and it gives 6 factors on zoning and then there was the Sinclair pipeline case granted two other elements on that the land use and zoning follow religiously. It asks if the governmental entity have a plan, an advisory body and do we follow that plan? In terms of liability no one can sue the CB saying they’re liable but it can go to court if we do not follow our own plan and if we don’t follow our fact finding body (the hearing office). If you follow your fact finding body the courts will agree.

Ms. Gilmour stated the neighbors have some legitimate concerns one concern are property values running a slaughter facility so closely to their homes. Another thing is the issue with the water and not sure if the township and Village understand the intensity of this operation. There was some discussion on the type of septic system to be used.

Cliff Thrall stated he is a licensed in Ill. for waste water systems and has contacted the EPA about septic requirements with regards to what will be done. He is concerned that if the horse does get put before the buggy things might get overlooked and they could operate without the proper approvals and channels being met. He also discussed the 6 inch well and his concerns. He stated if this septic system goes in this would be the largest sub-surface system in the County. He is of the opinion this is not the proper place for this facility and worried about water supply. Mr. Wehrli asked Mr. Thrall if he’s comfortable with the EPA and IDPH to properly certify and size the appropriate type of system for that use? Mr. Thrall stated he would have to
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assume they are professionals and would do their job due diligently like all us do at our jobs but sometimes when things are done out of order accidents can happen. He thinks they will look at site conditions and maybe not surrounding conditions. Mr. Thrall thought it would be the Bureau of Water that would possibly handle water table issues and things of that nature. There was discussion that the County Board has authority to pull the special use at anytime so if something went wrong or conditions were not met.

Mr. Kramer brought up that some slaughter facilities are located in town like in Earlville, Lisbon and meat packing plant in Elburn and no issues. He stated if the petitioners do not meet all the criteria in design per the EPA and Federal Department of Agricultural then the plant will not get built. They have a lot of items that need to be met.

There was discussion about how we can make sure they get approval from the EPA and USDA?

Gwen Carlye asked if Newark and the township have written and recommended the project. She has started a petition consisting of 82 names currently and would like the petition to go on record. She is worried the Village of Newark did not ask the resident’s their thoughts and that’s why she has started the petition. She is worried there are so many concerns the residents have about this going into their backyard. Gwen also discussed her concerns with the notification process. Planner Zubko stated they followed all stated laws and went above and beyond holding 2 public hearings. Planner Zubko also read the letter from the Village of Newark supporting the endeavor.

The PBZ would like to add a condition to the special use that a certificate of occupancy will be required and copies of the EPA, IDPH and USDA permits supplied while applying for the building permit.

Ms. Gilmour has lots of concerns and asked about the waterway in the front of the property. Planner Zubko stated it would be addressed during engineering so is not concerned.

Mr. Wehrli asked if a small berm can be located on the north side of the parking lot, about 2-3 feet in height to block headlights? Mr. Kramer said they would do a low lever berm about 3-4 feet and landscape to 100% opacity to shield lights. They could do some large evergreens.

There was discussion on moving this to the Committee of the Whole (COW) so the full board can weigh in.

With no further suggestions or changes Lynn Cullick made a motion, seconded by Amy Cesich to forward the petition onto the Committee of the Whole meeting on Thursday. All were in favor.

**#13-29 Historic Preservation Ordinance Amendment**

Planner Zubko stated in your packet are two items: the benefits of becoming a certified local government and the proposed changes to the text in order to become eligible to have the CLG status. The proposed changes to the Historic Preservation ordinance would be to eliminate the language for owner’s consent and change the percentage for a historic district from 100% to 51% (pages 7, 10, 11, 12 & 13). Planner Zubko just wanted to clarify that ALL decisions would still come through the County Board and a recommendation from the Historic Preservation Commission would be forwarded to the board. The Commission would assume if the owner did not consent then the County Board will not pass the landmark or district. The Commission was formed in 2006 and consists of 9 members including Jeff Wehrli as the County Board representative. According to the Ordinance on the commission we must have 1 attorney, 1 historian or architectural historian, 1 architect/engineer and 1 real estate professional knowledgeable in historic preservation, all other members
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Jody and Beth Osmund
Cedar Valley Sustainable Farm CSA
1985 N. 3609th Road
Ottawa, IL 61350

July 31, 2013
Angela Zubko
Senior Planner
Kendall County Regional Planning Commission
111 West Fox Street
Room 203
Yorkville, IL 60560-1098

Dear Ms Zubko:

We write to you today in support of the poultry processing plant special use permit application of Al and Mary Maly of Ferndell Farm in Newark, IL.

Cedar Valley Sustainable Farm is a community supported agriculture enterprise that delivers locally raised beef, chicken, pork, and eggs to approximately 200 families a month. Currently, all of our poultry (approximately 2000 birds) are processed by Central Illinois Processing in Arthur Illinois (a 3 ½ hour one-way drive from our Ottawa, IL farm) as it is the only USDA inspected facility in the state that accepts birds from independent producers.

The extreme distance to the processor and limits to the Arthur facility’s capacity makes expansion of poultry operations in northern Illinois very challenging despite ever increasing demand for locally grown poultry. We know of farms near the Wisconsin border that make a five hour one-way trip to Arthur for processing.

The Maly’s plant would be a good first step in addressing the poultry processing bottleneck in Illinois. With the Newark plant, Cedar Valley Sustainable Farm’s distance to processing would be one tenth of what it is now. Given the close proximity to processing, we will expand production numbers and processing frequency, and we are confident that existing poultry operations in this part of the state will do the same. Also, it is likely that other producers will emerge as the time/distance challenge is removed.

Obviously, a new poultry processing plant will benefit local producers. It will be a boon to Newark and the Kendall county as well—20+ new jobs and a number of ancillary economic multipliers. On average, five to twelve poultry producers will travel to the plant each day. While their birds are processed, they will refuel trucks at local stations, eat at local restaurants, and purchase goods at local businesses. I know that Cedar Valley Sustainable farm spends $100 plus in Arthur with each processing trip. Surely, $2500 - $6000 per week in spending would help the local economy.

Lastly, we would like to point out the appropriateness of the scale the Maly’s project (3,000 birds per day). Rather than a mega-plant processing 200,000 birds a day and straining water, power, road, and community resources, this plant will be humane to employees, animals, the community, and the environment. It will, also, make small poultry operations like ours more sustainable and foster rural businesses in northern Illinois.
Sincerely,

Jody & Beth Osmund

Farmers

Jody & Beth Osmund
Cedar Valley Sustainable Farm CSA
1985 N. 3609th Road
Ottawa, IL 61350
815-431-9544
815-993-3387 (cell)
cedrvalleysfarm@gmail.com
www.cedrvalleysustainable.com
Angela Zubko  
Senior Planner  
Kendall County Regional Planning Commission  
111 West Fox Street  
Room 203  
Yorkville, IL 60560-1098

Dear Ms Zubko:

I am writing you today in support of the poultry processing plant special use permit application of Al and Mary Maly of Ferndell Farm in Newark, IL. The Malys' proposed processing plant would mean significant economic development for the community and region, both directly and indirectly.

Illinois Stewardship Alliance (ISA) is a state-wide non-profit organization that promotes the growth of local food systems and sustainable agriculture. As an organization interested in the development of community-based food systems, we strongly support the creation and expansion of the infrastructure, such as a poultry processing plant, that is necessary for local food systems to grow. Demand for locally produced food, including poultry, is growing.

Currently, Central Illinois Processing in Arthur, Illinois is the only United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) inspected facility in the state that processes poultry from independent producers. The lack of poultry processing facilities in the state creates a bottleneck and significant barrier to meeting the demand for local food. Farms all across northern Illinois are currently driving six to ten hours round-trip to Arthur to have their birds processed, cutting into already slim profit margins and consuming limited time and resources that could otherwise be reinvested in expanding production to meet the ever increasing demand. In addition to the direct impact on those poultry producers travelling to Arthur, a poultry processing plant in Newark would create new jobs associated with its construction and operation. Additionally, the poultry producers that travel to Newark to take advantage of the plant with likely be spending additional money at local businesses.

Large processing plants that are processing an average of 200,000 birds a day have significant impacts on local infrastructure, straining water, power, sewer, waste disposal and road systems in the community. At an average of 3,000 birds per day, the Malys' proposed poultry processing plant is of a scale that is appropriate and consistent with the values of local community-based food systems and will not have the kind of significant negative impacts on local resources and infrastructure associated with large facilities.

For the reasons enumerated above I urge the Kendall County Planning Commission to support the poultry processing plant special use permit application of Al and Mary Maly of Ferndell Farm in Newark, IL.

Sincerely,

Wes King  
Interim Executive Director
August 29, 2013

Ms. Angela Zubko
Kendall County Regional Planning Commission
111 West Fox Street
Room 203
Yorkville, Illinois 60560

Dear Ms. Zubko:

I am writing in support of the poultry processing plant special use permit application of Al and Mary Maly of Ferndell Farm in Newark, Illinois.

Currently, Central Illinois Processing in Arthur, Illinois is the only poultry processing plant in the state approved by the United States Department of Agriculture that accepts birds from independent producers. Even though the demand for locally grown poultry is increasing, farmers in northern Illinois experience cuts in their resources and profit margins because they must drive up to ten hours to have their birds processed. A poultry processing plant in northern Illinois would allow operations in the region to expand production and processing frequency by reducing travel time and cost.

A processing plant in Newark would bring other economic benefits to the community and the region. The plant would create new construction and operations jobs in Newark. Local businesses would see an increase in customers due to the five to twelve poultry producers expected to visit each day. Compared to larger plants that processes 20,000 birds a day, the Malys’ intent to process 3,000 birds a day is of a scale that is appropriate for the region and will not strain community resources.

I urge you to give Al and Mary Maly’s application the most serious consideration. Please contact my Springfield office at 217-492-4062 if you have any questions. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Richard J. Durbin
United States Senator
Concerns regarding the proposed chicken processing facility on Lisbon Center Rd, Newark, IL

I am the property owner directly to the east of the proposed chicken plant. I have several concerns listed in order of importance to me.

1---How will this affect my future property value? I am concerned that rezoning will set a precedent for future rezoning and eventually the surrounding property will lose its country flavor.

2---What is the possibility of contamination to my well?

3---Increased traffic on a lightly traveled road. Right now during the day there may be 3-5 cars per hour and most of it is local farmers. I read there will be 30 employees and about 5-6 farmers visiting the site daily to drop off and pick up chickens. If entrance to the facility is 1 car and exit is counted as a second car trip that would be at least 50 more cars driving on Lisbon Center Rd. per day. I am assuming not every employee will be working each day and that they will not be leaving the property to find lunch or to run an errand to Walgreens, etc. I understand the farmers will come early in the morning and return in the afternoon. That would be 4 car passes per farmer or 20/day. Total extra cars driving on Lisbon Center Rd. would be 70 extra cars per day on that small road. I also understand that there will be daily dumpster pick up. Perhaps employees and farmers could be encouraged to approach the property from Fennel Rd instead of Townhouse Rd in order to avoid as many residential areas as possible.

4---What will I be looking at from my kitchen window and back yard deck? The picture I saw on line of the proposed structure would be similar to a large barn. I am fine with that but could not determine where the parking area will be. I would hope it would be on the west side of the building so it is not facing my home. Will the parking area be screened with evergreens? If my large tree line remains healthy I probably would not see the facility during the summer months but in the winter when the trees are barren of leaves I would have full view from the back of my house.

5---What will the parking lot lighting be like? How bright?

6---Will signage to the property be low profile?

Thank you for considering my concerns with this proposed project. I hope to have a good working relationship with the owners of the property to resolve any problems that may present themselves in the future with regard to this property and project.

Alice Marks

16675 Lisbon Center Road, Newark, IL

Cell  1-530-738-2370  Land line  1-630-323-2370
Dear Sirs and Madams,

Thank you for your time and attention relating to the construction of a slaughterhouse at 16895 Lisbon Center Road. We are contacting the board because such a plant we feel does not belong in a quiet farming community. We feel this will have a negative effect on the residents of the county and the Village of Newark, some of which have homes not far from the proposed site.

This parcel of land is not just another farm, but a manufacturing facility. If this were just another type of farming facility, then why is there a need for a special permit to be issued for its construction as stated in the minutes from the April 8, 2013 meeting. A processing plant would bring in an industrial operation which would definitely effect those living in the community and especially those homes surrounding that area.

There should also be concern for the smell that this type of manufacturing would incur. There is no way that the odor wouldn't cause a distraction to outdoor activities during the warmer months when families would want to be outside and enjoying the warmer weather.

People have worked hard to afford homes on Rennesoy Drive and surrounding areas. Why should their property values drop because of this type of construction. The lighting from the parking lot will change the night sky. Those living in a city might not care, but people who chose to live in the country would be greatly effected.

We would hope the board would listen to the home owners of Newark and the county and not allow this processing plant be constructed in the quiet farming community that values the people who live near and around where this proposed construction would be in the future.

Thank you for your time as board members to heard the feelings and concerns for the citizens of the Village of Newark and the surrounding areas.

Respectfully,
Tom and Renee Geistler
15697 Lisbon Center Rd.
Newark, IL 60541
Scott R. Gryder
Kendall County Board Member
Forest Preserve Commissioner

111 W. Fox St.
Yorkville, IL 60560
630-699-8814
sgryder@co.kendall.il.us

From: Gwendolyn Carlyle [gwen.carlyle@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 7:07 AM
To: Amy L. Ceslich; Lynn Cullick; Elizabeth Flowers; Judy Gilmour; Scott R. Gryder; Dan Koukol; Matthew G. Prochaska; John Purcell; jshaw@co.kendall.il.us; Jeff Wehrli
Subject: Poultry Slaughterhouse at 16895 Lisbon Center Road, Newark

Dear Sirs and Madams,

Thank you for your time and attention in regards to my concerns with the proposed poultry slaughterhouse at 16895 Lisbon Center Road. I am a resident of Newark and find my home exactly one half mile directly north of the proposed site. I do not feel this plant belongs in a farming community and feel there are strong reasons why this would negatively affect the residents of the county and the Village of Newark whose homes are in the area.

First, this is not another farm, or farming operation, it is a manufacturing facility, a manufacturing facility that would be located in an agricultural area. I understand that poultry and agriculture go hand in hand, however, the simple fact that a special use permit is required testifies to the argument that this facility is an exception to, not an addition of an agricultural community. Looking at the Planning, Building and Zoning minutes from April 8, 2013 the Village of Newark was thinking of "re zoning this to manufacturing." The reply from the facility's attorney, Mr. Kramer, was to say "the special use makes more sense in the County especially since no other manufacturing is in the area." Considering those opinions I become confused when I look at the Poultry Processing Plant petition 13-17 which makes two exceptions by granting first, a Limited Manufacturing District for poultry and rabbit slaughtering and second, a Heavy Industrial District for a Special Use Slaughter House. The opinion of the Village of Newark seemed to be that this facility is by nature a manufacturing operation. Mr. Kramer then pointed out that in fact there is no manufacturing in the area. Why then would it be considered beneficial to grant a special use permit for manufacturing when a community has flourished for so long without it?

Secondly, my concern as a resident is how this facility would affect the quality of our daily life and ultimately the property value of our homes. I do not feel it would be honest to say that a slaughterhouse would not cause an offensive odor. I know the general thinking seems to say offensive odor would be minimal, but for myself and many other nearby residents who would deal with the odor day in and day out, I believe that constant would be a more accurate description than minimal. The facility said its peak months of operation would be the warmer months of the year and also stated that they typically perform the slaughtering between six and ten a.m. because of the heat. Am I to understand that 3,000 units a day would be processed in four hours? The permit request an extension of slaughtering times during holiday periods, which I interpret to mean slaughtering would take place all day. This throws up a flag. In my opinion, that the smell of facility will most definitely be noticed especially during the warmer months of the year. The months that most people have their windows open and are outside enjoying the weather. Also I feel it should be noted that during summer months the prevailing winds would push the smell and noise from the plant towards the village not away from it. The special permit
also looks to include a lighted parking lot for the facility. Living in both the city and now the country I know how light pollution changes from one place to the next. Being only a half a mile away from the proposed site, I'm sure the light from the parking lot would reach the homes along the south side of Rennesoy Drive, removing the quiet landscape that motivates a person to want to live in the country in the first place.

I believe that the constant light along with my previously mentioned concerns about the offensive odor and the sudden existence of a manufacturing facility would be certain have negative effects on property values for myself and my neighbors. One could not say in good conscious that granting a special manufacturing permit to construct a poultry slaughterhouse one half mile from a residential subdivision would have no effects on property values. I also know that it takes every effort for me and my family afford and maintain our small home. It's one we are proud of and enjoy very much but financially it is a drop in the bucket compared to the cost of the farms located the nearby area. To us to have one more reason for property values to fall is something that no one wants, can afford or wishes to tolerate. I've been told by those whose personal lives will not be affected by the facility that it will pop up and after a few years be shut down just like everything else. If this view is correct, then why are we are voting on a bad investment and assisting the creation of more empty foreclosed property. If this view is incorrect, and the facility is successful and expands to the additional sites they have listed on their building plans for future growth then the "minimal" effects from processing animals grows into a much larger one and an area which was once said to have no manufacturing is now one with multiple manufacturing facilities. Either way I do not feel it is consistent with the traditions or wishes of the community and feel it would be harmful to the general well being of those who have gone through the hard work and effort to plant their roots in the area.

I again thank you very much for your time and attention. I also thank you for all the hard work and concern you have had and continue to have for Kendall County.

Respectfully,

Garrett and Gwendolyn Carlyle
for the record

From: Cliff Thrall [explor224@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 28, 2013 7:45 PM
To: Scott R. Gryder
Subject: Dear Kendall co. Board members,

Dear Kendall co. Board members,

Just recently I became aware of a proposed slaughterhouse here in Newark. This is very concerning since no notice was given to the only residential subdivision near this project. No one will ever buy our homes that back up to a slaughterhouse, hence lowering our already depreciated home values. Beyond the obvious concerns (lighting, smells, dust, dander, noise exceeding 55db, increased traffic in a village with little to no sidewalks) the fact that Newarks public works said no means no guarantee to waste water pollution. I’m a licensed septic installer here in Illinois, knowing the facts about wastewater treatment is my job. This plant does not meet the requirements of the kchd or idph it will fall under the EPA. Industry standards are 5-10 gal. Per bird, this equals 15000-30000 gallons of water per day. The only ways to treat this wastewater is 1. A lagoon 2. Aerobic treatment and spray irrigation 3. Large holding tanks. None of which have a positive impact on our quality of life. I believe that this is not the proper location this facility. It must be connected to city sewer, and a water supply of sufficient size within city limits in a commercial zoned area. As stewards of Kendall county I pray that you( members of the board) take much more into consideration than the Special provisions. Please vote no!

With gravitas,

Cliff Thrall and Family

Sent from my iPad
From: Brent Urton [holysmokerpitmaster@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 28, 2013 2:41 PM
To: Amy L. Cesich; Dan Koukol; Elizabeth Flowers; Jeff Wehrli; Judy Gilmour; Lynn Cullick; Matthew G. Prochaska; Scott R. Gryder
Subject: Proposed chicken processing facility

Dear Kendall County Board member,

As you know, there is a proposed chicken processing facility currently under consideration, intended to be constructed on Lisbon Center Road, just west of Townhouse Road, in Big Grove Township, referenced parcel #07-08-100-011.

Our understanding is that the petitioner is requesting approval of an A-1 Special Use Permit, in order to construct the above referenced facility and begin operations.

We are against the granting of this Special Use Permit and/or the necessary rezoning of this land that would allow this operation to commence.

The reasons we oppose the granting of the Special Use Permit and/or the necessary rezoning are:

1. **Wastewater handling**: As Kendall County has already informed the owners, no septic system will be allowed. Therefore, the generated wastewater will have to be either trucked out on a daily basis, or used in some manner of sprayed irrigation on adjacent fields. Holding tanks have the potential of cracking and leaking, thereby eventually polluting the water table.

2. **Air Pollution**: The odors from such an operation will most certainly permeate into our homes, as we are located less than a mile to the north of this proposed site. Personally, our family utilizes an outdoor clothesline three seasons of the year for 95% of our laundry. That allows us much savings on our natural gas bill. The odors from such an operation would most certainly force us to discontinue use of the clothesline.

3. **After Hours Operations**: The waste pickup and pumping of any holding tanks will not be able to be accomplished during normal daytime operating hours. Furthermore, we suspect that the cleaning and sanitation of such a facility will also need to be done on a schedule after the advertised 6:00pm closing time.

4. **Non-Conforming Zoning**: There is empty commercial property all over Kendall County. We built our home at the location where it is simply because of the surroundings! If we had wanted to live in a commercially developed area, we would have made our home elsewhere. The existence of such a facility in close proximity to our homes will most certainly cause ours, as well as our neighbors’ property values to drop. I know that if I had the choice of buying a home in a subdivision so close to such a facility, I would have chosen to live elsewhere.

We, as voters, are urging you to vote against the granting of the Special Use Permit and/or the rezoning of the parcel of land that would allow the operation of this proposed facility. Please feel free to phone us at our residence to discuss this matter further.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Brent and Sheila Urton
410 E. Rennesoy Dr.

P.S. 815-695-5547

Newark, IL 60541
See Below.

Scott R. Gryder
Kendall County Board Member
Forest Preserve Commissioner

111 W. Fox St.
Yorkville, IL 60560
630-699-8814
sgryder@co.kendall.il.us

I have several comments about the proposed poultry processing plant located at 16895 Lisbon Center Road. Please keep in mind also, I understand the Malys have been doing some due diligence. I also understand the “feeling” that there is a need for an operation like this in northern Illinois. Overwhelmingly one must consider also, only one other operation like this exists in our state and I think it has to do with the unpopularity of this industry close to residential areas.

All comparisons are made with a poultry processing plant located in Arthur, IL. What is not mentioned is that plant is located a bit over 2 miles south of Arthur on a County road. Much farther away from any residential areas and positioned right off a road improved for frequent truck traffic.

In contrast, the processing plant proposed near Newark is ½ mile south of town, at most, 3000 feet away from my doorstep. It will be located on a Big Grove Township roadway at best designed for occasional truck traffic during spring planting and fall harvest. The surrounding roads certainly were not designed for day to day deliveries, finished product pick-ups, hauling poultry by-products or decomposable residue, not to mention other significant waste removal. In fact, the proposal is a small industrial operation situated in a rural area introducing several undesirable activities and their inherent problems.

More truck traffic will add noise to a delightfully quiet location, not to mention the commotion of the plant itself. When I walk outside can I now expect to hear chickens too, day in day out? There is the possibility of water contamination from any waste products leaching into the aquifer. I have to believe a significant amount of water goes into processing 3000 birds a day. Where will that water come from? If winds are out of the South what smells might I experience on any given day but particularly what will that be like on say a 95 degree day? What about feathers or dander lost by birds during transport or off-loading? Will that become an issue in my neighborhood? Has any thought been given to disease or sickness a contaminated bird or birds might introduce into the area I live? After all one of your conditions is 21,000 birds a week’s over 1,000,000 birds a year. In addition to this activity to look forward to just a few thousand feet away, the lighting that will undoubtedly be on the property will be an additional nuisance.
If the plant is built and there is a problem whose jurisdiction will it fall under? Once you make the approval does Kendall County have mechanisms in place to address this (in other words the expertise?) or would it fall to the cash strapped State of Illinois? Or, worse yet, if the plant is USDA approved would any problem be handled at the federal level?

What about expansion? Surely, once built why would the owners not think they could expand? After all, an agreeable county board granted the initial variance. If the business is somehow threatened by not expanding what is to prevent that?

Moving beyond the obvious concerns; invariably at some point it will be determined improvements need to be made to the streets and roads supporting this industrial operation. Will these costs be undertaken by the plant owner as part of the granted variance? Or, will the more likely outcome be an increase of taxes where everyone in the county pays for this special interest?

And, speaking of taxes, no mention is made (that I can find) as to what tax rate will be applied to this new industry. If the variance is applied to a piece of property currently zoned agricultural do they continue to pay taxes at the very low agricultural rate or will that portion be taxed at a higher commercial or industrial rate?

I strongly believe the residents of Yorkville, Plano and Oswego could care less what happens in the Southwest corner of the county. And, it would seem, those communities take seriously their city planning. I realize we are talking about an unincorporated portion of the county but would this commercial enterprise be considered near one of those communities? Perhaps there is a location closer to one of those towns, zoned properly and already improved, which would raise less concern and be an ideal fit?

At the very least an engineering impact study should be done based on full capacity and real operations observed over several days. A better estimate as to how the area will be affected would be achieved this way. All comparisons to the Arthur, IL location appear to be based on nothing more than a field trip.

Unintended consequences has become a catch phrase of late when governments; including Federal, State or Local, pass laws or change zoning to favor the petitioner at the expense of the rest of the tax-payers.

Will our property taxes continue to rise even though our quality of life has been upset? What about when we go to sell our houses and find the value dropped due to the undesirability of the location, particularly those of us closest to the operation?

Lastly, if this industrial operation is put in place and residents of Newark feel there is a quality of life, quality of health, nuisance or other unforeseen issue what recourse do we really have?

Mark Oldenburg

309 E. Rennesoy Dr.

Newark, Il 60541

815-695-5448
Planning, Building and Zoning Committee,

We are writing in support of the poultry processing plant that Alan and Mary Maly would like to build. We live north of Minooka in Kendall Co and raise organic meat chickens as well as lamb, pigs, vegetables, eggs and Alpacas.

We currently use Central IL Poultry Processing in Arthur, IL and can see a definite need for another inspected poultry processing facility. People from IL and surrounding states only have 1 option for inspected processing and because they are so busy, it limits the options for getting or changing an appointment as well as processing options for people who want their poultry processed organically. We have talked to several people just in the past month who have said they heard about the proposed processing plant in Newark and would be interested in using it. Having a local processing option would encourage local farmers to raise small flocks of poultry.

Several or the people at the Oct. public hearing commented that we were in favor of the project because we don't want to drive to Arthur. Other than getting up @ 2 am, we actually enjoy our trips to Arthur. We spend the day visiting the shops. However, because of the distance, we don't raise as many chickens as we would if we had a closer option. Last year we raised 200 chickens. This year we planned on raising 300 but added 100 more because of demand. We have aprox. 30 chickens left to sell from the added group and will not have chickens available again until the end of May. There is definitely a demand!

The outside of the building in Arthur looks like any other pole building. If they didn't have a sign outside, you wouldn't know what their business was.

We visited Mary and Al's farm last year to see how their portable chicken structures were built. They have a clean and neat property. They both seem to be very conscientious. Their hens are Animal Welfare Approved which tells me that they are concerned with the humane treatment of the animals they will be processing.

While we can understand people having concerns, most of the comments we heard at the Oct. public hearing had no rational basis. There were many comparisons to Tyson and Perdue and comments about buzzards and scrap piles. Also comments about the small Newark police force. This will be a small plant with small farmers bringing in small groups of chickens and turkeys. There will be no outside disposal and I believe the Kendall Co sheriff would be called for any problems - not the Newark police.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of our comments,
-Pam & Bill Kunke

Creekside Natural Farm - Minooka, IL
http://www.creeksidenaturalfarm.com/
Scott R. Gryder
Kendall County Board Member
Forest Preserve Commissioner
111 W. Fox St.
Yorkville, IL 60560
630-699-8814
sgryder@co.kendall.il.us

From: Cliff Thrall [explor224@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, November 08, 2013 6:01 PM
To: Scott R. Gryder
Subject: Scott Gryder

Scott Gryder
Kendall County Board

Re: proposed poultry processing plant

The proposed poultry processing (slaughter) house in unincorporated Kendall county A-1 zoning is in violation of the current code. There is language in M-1 of the Kendall co. Zoning code that covers these facilities. After reading the A-1 code, it mentions special use permits for other uses, all of which would have the same impacts on our county. But special care is given to these other Use Permits, one being "the facility must have direct access to a road designated as a major collector (or higher) on the County Resource Management Plan." This facility is not on a major collector, in fact it's on a no stripe tar and chip road that gets posted for weight.

Also as far as the Limited Demolition language that has been completely ignored with this special use permit. Section 7.00 Chapter B sub 5 of A-1 states that "Limited Demolition of existing farmhouse, barn, or accessory structures may be permitted upon submission of a site plan and architectural drawings for approval by the county as part of any special use for office uses provided that such demolition shall not exceed more than 15% of the combined square footage of all the existing structures on the premises". (This sounds like special interest not special use)

I would like to know why these very important laws we have to protect our agricultural landscape have been forgotten? With complete tear down of the entire site and adding a parking lot for 30 cars, and large rendering shipping containers been picked up every day or two. How can this be considered? Our Zoning Codes have kept Kendall Co. beautiful and desirable. Every business owner in the county should be up in arms, if they ever had to purchase properly zoned land, or were forced to rezone their land.

Poultry plants are known as large consumers of water. This plant is estimated to use 5-8 millions gallons a year. There may be a well large enough, but disposing of this much waste has potential for major pollution. Water from scalding tanks contain fatty tissue and other elements, blood from wash out, not collection has a very high B.O.D.( biochemical oxygen demand) which will not break down well in this type of septic system. Industrial waste water is completely different from domestic waste, being that no bacteria is present. The EPA has clear rules for operating said septic systems, they call them Class Five Injection Wells. Having this less then a 1/4 mile away from Newark's village limits, in total site of a
residential subdivision and near the only sports park in Newark. I don’t believe this would protect the public health and welfare of the citizens of Kendall Co.

Lastly the A-1 district was established to protect lands that are well suited for agricultural production of food and fiber be retained for such production unimpeded by the establishment of incompatible uses. Separating food growth and food processing is essential to protect the agricultural landscape. That’s why processing of poultry is part of M-1. Special using a permit to get a M-1 use into an A-1 district not only is wrong but is against everything the Zoning Code is here to protect. I ask that you weigh this very heavily before voting on Nov. 12th. For where would will we all be if it wasn’t for strict enforcement of the laws, rules, and codes we have. I also ask consideration be made to repeal the amendment made on 9-13-2013 to the A-1 district due to redundancies with the M-1.

Thank you,

Cliff Thrall Ref. mat.

1. Kendall co. Zoning ordinance
2. EPA 40cfr432 Section 6 artical 2.1

Sent from my iPad
Scott R. Gryder
Kendall County Board Member
Forest Preserve Commissioner

111 W. Fox St.
Yorkville, IL 60560
630-699-8814
sgryder@co.kendall.il.us

Scott,  

I am unable to attend the November 12, 2013 board meeting regarding the poultry processing plant due to board obligations of my own. It is my hope you will take the following into consideration.

At the October 15th meeting when I asked William Ford; what recourse do we have if any of the potential problems discussed that evening come to fruition, he replied we could file a lawsuit. I find his reply so arrogant and lacking in concern with your constituent’s unease and worries over this proposal. Why would you consider voting yes for something that concerns so many residents, with unknown effects to their local environment that might result in a lawsuit?

A couple of folks spoke up in favor of this plan and indeed expressed their desire to be customers. But, when viewed in context, these people have an economic interest. They do not want to drive farther than they have to; and time is money. Well, when these steps are taken for the few with an unknown result for the many, I start to think “special interest”.

The petitioners indicated their many intentions to operate this poultry plant according to the provisions set forth, which is nothing more than shoe-horning an industrial site into an agricultural area. During the October 15th meeting the petitioners never said what they would or will do. In particular with regard to plans to ensure a safe environment or what their stance was if the results of their operation created an undesirable condition for their closest neighbors. And, changing the zoning as suggested may be legal but it certainly is questionable ethically, again considering the 100-125 people living so close by. If the board is leaning in the affirmative, this proposal should be tabled. The petitioner should be required to provide more detail (More detail than one drawing locating buildings.) about the operation itself and the true safeguards planned. Everything discussed was said in generalities with no true specifics. This should raise great concern and be remedied. And, if you vote to place an
industry in the middle of farm land, the next operation looking for such a variance should have no trouble. You should be concerned about the precedent you set.

Once elected or appointed you were given “ownership” of the county. The population centers of the county are to the North. But, please do not short change the residents in the South part of the county just because population is a bit sparse. Would this be on the table if circumstances were similar but the location Yorkville or Oswego? I tend to think not. Remember please, this is about 2000 ft. from families. I would hope you use your stewardship wisely, fairly and evenly across the county.

Lastly, think of a landmark or intersection 3 or 4 blocks away from your house. Imagine that messy and admittedly smelly industry right there. If the idea of a poultry processing plant in operation, at that location near your house bothers you, I think the obligation is to vote no.

Thank you,

Mark Oldenburg

309 E. Rennesoy Dr.

Newark, IL 60541

815-695-5448
WORLD CLASS PROCESSING EQUIPMENT

Turnkey Equipment and Supplies for Processing Poultry in Small and Medium Sized Plants

Telephone: 319-469-4141
Fax: 319-469-4402
E-mail: broweriowa@aol.com
Web site: www.browerequip.com

Highway 16 West * P.O. Box 2000
Houghton, Iowa 52631 * USA
To Our Customers:

Brower specializes in serving the small- and medium- sized poultry producer and has successfully served this market for nearly eight decades. We are proud to have added this quality line of processing equipment. When you buy Brower, you get-

1. State-of-the-art designs for the markets we serve.
2. A commitment to service from our family business to your family business.
3. The resources of a Top Gun manufacturing and engineering group, a modern 200,000 square foot facility and the latest CNC fabricating equipment.
4. The best workmanship at competitive prices.

Be sure to write and ask for our production catalog — top quality small flock equipment as well as equipment for livestock, pets and wildlife.

Please let us know how we can serve you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Thomas W. Wenstrand
President

A DIVISION OF HAWKEYE STEEL PRODUCTS INC.
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CATALOG NO. PROC21

PROCESSING PLANS

We have Processing Plans which include complete lists of equipment, floor plans, manning suggestions, and operating tips for three sizes of processing plants — up to 400 broilers per hour (BPH), up to 600 broilers per hour and up to 1000/1200 broilers per hour. These plans are free by writing or calling us. The basic units in these plans are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>400 BPH</th>
<th>600 BPH</th>
<th>1000 TO 1200 BPH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KILL</td>
<td>MODEL NO.</td>
<td>KILL 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCALD</td>
<td>MODEL NO.</td>
<td>BM60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICK</td>
<td>MODEL NO.</td>
<td>BP30SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVISCERATE</td>
<td>MODEL NO.</td>
<td>SS40ET OR SE10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These units can be interchanged to fit your needs.

WARNING! Gas and electrical hookups required to connect utilities to all killing lines, scalders, pickers, eviscerating lines, gizzard peelers, bagging machines, any other accessories and any other products sold by Brower must be made by qualified gas and electrical technicians. All line sizes and other specifications must meet or exceed local and national codes. There must be proper electrical grounding at all times.

All dimensions and capacities are approximate. Dimensions shown are those when unit is set up, not shipping dimensions.

CAPACITIES ARE NOT GUARANTEED.
The ability to achieve capacities indicated depends on many factors including, but not limited to, labor force experience, plant layout and availability of constant supply of birds.

All Rights Reserved

PROC21
Printed in USA
KILLING LINE CONVEYORS
Conveyors are built for USDA approval. Units can be used with killing tunnels. Reversible, vari-speed drive. Corrosion-resistant aluminum gearbox, drive and take-up. Stainless steel track and trolleys. Our bolt together design allows quick assembly and also permits easy expansion. 3/4 horsepower motor, 115V, 60HZ. Order shackles separately. See page 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KILL 16</td>
<td>16 foot (4.9 meters) long conveyor, 28&quot; wide (65 cm), 33 shackles spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KILL 22</td>
<td>22 foot (6.7 meters) long conveyor, 28&quot; wide (65 cm), 44 shackles spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONVEKT</td>
<td>Extends overall conveyor length 5 feet (1.5 meters) - adds 10 linear feet (3.0 meters) and 10 shackles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STAINLESS STEEL KILLING TUNNEL
Two models are available to work with either KILL16 or KILL22 killing line conveyors. Birds are killed as they enter the tunnel on shackles. The tunnel base is tapered with a drain hole. Both sides have wash nozzles with trigger valves and hose to keep tunnel washed down at intervals. On KLDT1, KLDT1W, KLDT2 and/or KLDT2W, you can add a 48" (121.9 cm) extension. Order KLDTTEXT for standard 30" (76.2 cm) width; order KLDTWEXT for 48" (121.9 cm) wide tunnels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KLDT1</td>
<td>Stainless Steel Killing Tunnel, 30&quot; wide x 54&quot; long x 79&quot; high, (76 cm wide x 239 cm long x 201 cm high). Use with KILL16 or KILL22. Model KLDT1W has the same dimensions as KLDT1 but is 48&quot; wide (121.9 cm).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLDT2</td>
<td>Stainless Steel Killing Tunnel, 30&quot; wide x 142&quot; long x 79&quot; high, (76 cm wide x 361 cm long x 201 cm high). Recommended for use with KILL16. Model KLDT2W has the same dimensions as KLDT2 but is 48&quot; wide (121.9 cm).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STUNNING KNIFE
Stunned birds are easier to handle and they bleed more quickly and thoroughly. Stunned birds have fewer bruises and broken wings. You speed up your processing operation. You can control voltage to various ages and sizes of birds or for changing environmental conditions. Virtually the only way to kill turkey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SK200</td>
<td>Electronic Stunning Knife, 110V, 60 HZ, or 60 HZ, single phase. Variable power setting. Includes power cabinet, safety knife and rubber glove. Unit features easy reset overload and ground fault interruptor for operator safety. Available with 220V, 50HZ - 60HZ. Order Model SK200220.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADJUSTABLE BLEED RACK FOR KILLING CONES
Designed to hold these cones (see page 4): 6-54K; 8-53K (recommended for pastured poultry); 8 to 10-52K; 8-51K. Order cones separately and you must order a QRBT1A Bracket for each cone. Rack features four leveling feet, easy rack height adjustment up to 60" (152 cm) high. 304 stainless steel construction. Can be disassembled and stored flat. Designed to set over a 2"W x 4"L x 1"H stock tank (order separately) for blood collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BR48</td>
<td>Adjustable Bleed Rack, 24&quot; wide x 48&quot; long x 60&quot; high (61 cm wide x 122 cm long x 152 cm high)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STAINLESS STEEL BLEEDING TROUGH
Keep Your Processing Area Clean and Sanitary. When a fully automatic system is not needed, use our killing cones and stainless bleeding trough. Blood flows down back panel and into sloped trough. Position any receptacle under the drain hole on one end.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BT86</td>
<td>Stainless Steel Bleeding Trough and Back Panel 86&quot; long x 40&quot; high (218 cm long x 102 cm high). Trough is 5&quot; (13 cm) wide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT134</td>
<td>Stainless Steel Bleeding Trough and Back Panel 134&quot; long x 40&quot; high (340 cm long x 102 cm high). Trough is 5&quot; (13 cm) wide.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other sizes manufactured upon request
KILLING CONES

Four sizes are available, all constructed of 20 gauge stainless steel. Hemmed edges and lockformed seams assure no snags. For slot mounting, order model QRBT1A bracket (shown right). For wall mounting or for use with BT86 and BT134 bleeding troughs (see page 3), order Q781 Cone Rail (shown right). Q781 is 5” wide x 56” long x 1” deep. Holds up to 4-54k cones.

SCALDING EQUIPMENT

SCALDERS
OUR SUPERSCALD ROTARY SCALDERS WILL SCALD MORE BIRDS PER HOUR THAN DUNK SCALDERS AND NO AIR COMPRESSOR IS REQUIRED.

Scalding requires a broiler to be immersed in 145°F (63°C) water for about 60 seconds — regardless of the type of scalding used. Our Superscald Rotary Scalders have at least three times the capacity of competitive dunk-type scalers. Also, you do not have to attach the birds to shackles.

SUPERSCALD
* All Stainless Steel
* Maximum Production in Limited Space
* Minimum Labor

We offer two models of Superscald. Both feature, as standard, an accurate 0-5 minute timer with second graduations, sensitive thermostat, digital thermometer (registers in °F and °C), and work table. Birds tumble freely, assuring a thorough scald. You'll get more production with less labor than any other competing scalers. Setup for LP gas is standard. Natural gas orifices included for easy conversion.

Both units are 220/110V, 60HZ. Contact us about your specific electrical requirements.

WARNING!
Scalding requires 145°F (63°C) water which can severely burn operator. Exercise caution at all times.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIT36-48</td>
<td>Spare Parts Kit for either SS36SS or SS48SS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>Approximate Per Hour Capacities</th>
<th>Tank Dimensions</th>
<th>Overall Dimensions</th>
<th>Motor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS36SS</td>
<td>500-750 Broilers 500-750 Pheasants 100-120 Turkey Hens 80 Turkey Toms 500-700 Ducks 1000 Quail</td>
<td>W (76 cm) L (91 cm) H (69 cm)</td>
<td>W (84 cm) L (170 cm) H (107 cm)</td>
<td>1/2 HP 220 / 110V 60 HZ 250,000 BTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS48SS</td>
<td>1000-1200 Broilers 1000-1200 Pheasants 250-350 Turkey Hens 125 Turkey Toms 1000-1200 Ducks 1800 Quail</td>
<td>W (76 cm) L (135 cm) H (71 cm)</td>
<td>W (84 cm) L (216 cm) H (107 cm)</td>
<td>1/2 HP 220 / 110V 60 HZ 375,000 BTU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Economy Gas Scalders**

Our manual gas scalers can be used with either LP or Natural Gas. Tanks are hot dipped galvanized after fabrication. Easily accessible pilot light. Requires vent tube. **Standard drain table adds 26" (66 cm) of length.** Automatic water level and heat controls. 115V, 50/60 Hz.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BM38</td>
<td>Holds about 38 gallons. Ideal scalders for pastured poultry operations. 23&quot; wide x 28&quot; long x 36&quot; high (58 cm x 71 cm x 91 cm). Tank dimensions. 20&quot; wide x 22&quot; long x 23&quot; deep (50.8 cm x 50.8 cm x 58.4 cm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM60</td>
<td>Holds about 60 gallons. 28&quot; wide x 42&quot; long x 37&quot; high (71 cm x 107 cm x 94 cm). Tank dimensions 27&quot; wide x 32&quot; long x 23&quot; deep (69 cm x 81 cm x 58 cm high).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our commercial pickers have one superior design advantage—a conical-shaped centrifuge. The cone shape permits birds to freely rotate for a clean pick. By contrast, flat centrifuges result in birds piling up in the center. The result is a poor pick, having to run the picker longer (at risk to skin breakage) or having to hand pick birds. All centrifuges are made of heavy duty aluminum. Choose between 2 models of SUPERPIK, our BATCHPIK, our new Utility Picker or our Junior BATCHPIK. Regardless of which model you choose—EVEN WHEN THEY’RE EMPTY, THEY’RE LOADED.

**SUPERPIK**
Stainless Steel, Automatic Pickers

Features (all standard)

* Automatic unloading door is self closing; latch is operated by a start button which simultaneously starts the timer and opens the automatic water valve. Set 0-5 minute timer for 30 second pick or as required.

* Feather exhaust.

* Shipped fully assembled and ready to use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>Capacity Birds per Hour</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Loading Height</th>
<th>Cylinder Diameter</th>
<th>Motor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP30SS</td>
<td>400-700 Broilers</td>
<td>35&quot;</td>
<td>76&quot;</td>
<td>47.5&quot;</td>
<td>43&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400-700 Pheasants</td>
<td>89 cm</td>
<td>193 cm</td>
<td>120 cm</td>
<td>109 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100-120 Turkey Hens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69-80 Turkey Tomts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400-700 Ducks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000 Quail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Length includes bird catch table which is 34&quot; (86 cm) long.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP38SS</td>
<td>800-1000 Broilers</td>
<td>54&quot;</td>
<td>90&quot;</td>
<td>63&quot;</td>
<td>43&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>800-1000 Pheasants</td>
<td>120 cm</td>
<td>229 cm</td>
<td>160 cm</td>
<td>109 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250-300 Turkey Hens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>125 Turkey Tomts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>800-1000 Ducks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1800 Quail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Length includes bird catch table which is 34&quot; (86 cm) long.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**BatchPik**

All Stainless Steel

Features (all standard)

* Built-in feather exhaust
* 0-5 minute timer with second graduations
* Shipped fully assembled and ready to use

This unit is perfect for small poultry retail stores where customers want live birds processed on the spot. It also works great for hunting preserves where game birds are brought in from fields to be picked in batches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>Capacity Birds per Hour</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Loading Height</th>
<th>Cylinder Diameter</th>
<th>Motor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP30SS</td>
<td></td>
<td>W L H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-400 Broilers  300-400 Pheasants 75 Turkey Hens 50 Turkey Toms 350 Ducks 800 Quail</td>
<td>35&quot; 43&quot; 43&quot;</td>
<td>89 cm 109 cm 109 cm</td>
<td>30&quot; 109 cm</td>
<td>2HP, 220V 76 cm</td>
<td>60 HZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Utility Picker**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>Capacity Birds per Hour</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Loading Height</th>
<th>Cylinder Diameter</th>
<th>Motor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP25SS</td>
<td></td>
<td>W L H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6 Birds in 25-45 seconds</td>
<td>22&quot; 24&quot; 37&quot;</td>
<td>56 cm 61 cm 71 cm</td>
<td>37&quot; 71 cm</td>
<td>25&quot; 64 cm</td>
<td>1 1/2HP, 115/220V, 60 HZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Junior BatchPik**

Especially Designed for Quail

Features (all standard)

* Feather exhaust
* Work shelf
* 0-5 minute manual timer
* Aluminum centrifuge, galvanized steel frame
* Shipped fully assembled and ready to use

This picker is designed for quail but is also a nifty economy unit for any requirement — broilers, pigeons, or pheasant. Compared to our other pickers, the fingers are more densely placed on the centrifuge and cylinder.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>Capacity Birds per Hour</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Loading Height</th>
<th>Cylinder Diameter</th>
<th>Motor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QBP23</td>
<td></td>
<td>W L H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 Quail 100 Broilers 100 Pheasants 100 Ducks</td>
<td>26 42&quot; 43&quot;</td>
<td>67 cm 107 cm 109 cm</td>
<td>43&quot; 109 cm</td>
<td>25&quot; 56 cm</td>
<td>1.5HP, 220V 60 HZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Whisper Fingers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Used in all picker centrifuges and feather exhausts. Total length — 3 1/2 inches (8.9 cm); fits a 3/4 inch (1.9 cm) hole.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Virtually any other type of finger available upon request.

**Spare Parts Kit for SuperPik**

Recommended for all export shipments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIT30</td>
<td>Spare Parts Kit for SP30SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIT35</td>
<td>Spare Parts Kit for SP35SS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eviscerating Line Conveyor System
The conveyor is the same equipment used for our killing line conveyor shown on page 3. We add components shown below to make an eviscerating system. Hardware for ceiling suspension is not included. Vari-speed drive allows you to adjust line speed. Reversible.
Components included with each system are:

- Water Flushed Trough — Stainless steel, 31" width standard (79 cm width), 43" available upon request. EV16 has 10' (3 meters) trough 12" (30 cm) deep; EV22 has 15' (4.6 meters) trough 12" (30 cm) deep.
- Inside wash nozzle with trigger valve and hose.
- 2 gooseneck wash nozzles on 10' (3m) trough for EV16; 4 nozzles on 15' (4.6m) trough for EV22.
- Splash shield mounts where birds are washed.
- Stainless steel giblet station, 20" wide, 33" long, 37 1/2" tall (51 cm wide x 84 cm long x 95 cm high).
- Shackles — EV16 has 33 shackle spaces; EV22 has 44 shackle spaces; spaced at about 1" intervals. Order shackles separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EV16</td>
<td>Eviscerating Line Conveyor System, 26 1/2&quot; wide (67 cm), 16' long (4.9 meters) complete with all above listed accessories. Recommended for 600 birds per hour operations. 115 volt, 60HZ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV22</td>
<td>Eviscerating Line Conveyor System, 26 1/2&quot; wide (67 cm), 22' long (6.7 meters) complete with all above listed accessories. Recommended for 1200 birds per hour operations. 115 volt, 60HZ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As your operation grows, you can expand EV16 and EV22 by adding trough and conveyor sections. Order CONVEKT to extend conveyor (see page 3). Order EVEXT or EVEXT to extend the trough. Extension adds about 48" (122 cm) of Length.

Shackles For Kill and Evisceration Conveyors
Brite finish, 5/16" (.79 cm) round bar material, 3/8" (.95 cm) suspension rod. Order 33 shackles for 16' (4.9 m) conveyor; 44 for 22' (6.7 m) conveyor; 10 for CONVEKT Stainless steel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBW4</td>
<td>3 Foot Bird Washer 25 1/2' wide x 36&quot; long x 56&quot; high (65 cm wide x 91 cm long x 142 cm high).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In-Line Bird Washer
Designed to be installed with our EV22 eviscerating line. All stainless steel construction. A top performing commercial unit at a reasonable cost. 18 spray jets. Washes birds on outside only. Recommended for our 1000-1200 bird per hour system.

Offal Cart
This offal cart is a handy accessory for use with eviscerating lines, tables or stationary eviscerating units. Use it to catch inedible offal. The perforated insert collects solids while liquids remain at the bottom. Completely portable with four (4) casters and handle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFFAL</td>
<td>Offal Cart with insert and 4 Casters. 23&quot; wide x 34 1/2&quot; long x 32&quot; high (58 cm wide x 88 cm long x 81 cm high).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28BG</td>
<td>Perforated Insert. Having an extra insert for each cart is highly recommended. You will not have to slow down your eviscerating operation because you can quickly change inserts when one is full.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAINLESS STEEL

EVISCERATING TABLES - TWO OPTIONS

All stainless-steel model SS40ET (shown right) is designed for cleanliness, long wear and economy. The top is one piece and seamless, has 1 1/2" (3.8 cm) lip. Unit comes complete with two (2) four inch eviscerating tubes and a center drain, two (2) gooseneck wash valves, and two (2) trigger valves with hose. The table accommodates up to 4 operators. Use for fish and small game as well.

Model No. Description
---
SS40ET Stainless Steel Four Operator Eviscerating Table 43" wide x 55" long x 36" high (overall height is 58 1/2".
(109 cm wide x 140 cm long x 91 cm high).

ETSB Optional adjustable shackle bar for SS40ET to use for shackle evisceration. Shown attached to model ET below left (ETSB fits both SS40ET and ET). Total height of SS40ET with shackle bar is 78" (198 cm). Order shackles separately. See page 8.

Eviscerating Table

An economical table for pastured poultry processing.
One piece top with 1" (2.54 cm) lip; 1.75" (4.4 cm) center drain.
Unit comes with two (2) gooseneck wash valves and two (2) trigger valves with hose. Stainless Steel.

Model No. Description
---
ET Eviscerating table 29" wide x 54" long x 37" tall. Overall height is 55"

ETSB Optional, Adjustable Shackle Bar to use for shackle evisceration. Total height of ET with shackle bar is 79" (201 cm). Shown attached to ET in photo to the left. ETSB is an option and the shackles also must be ordered separately. See page 8.

TEN FOOT STATIONARY EVISCERATING UNIT

The 10 foot (3 meter) stationary eviscerating unit fills the need between a processor who needs more capacity than our eviscerating table, but who does not require a automatic line. The stainless steel trough (30 inches wide, 12 inches deep (76 cm wide, 30 cm deep)) is the same as the trough section on our EV16 line. There are four gooseneck wash spigots and 4 trigger valves and hose for four operators. Place our offal cart at the end of the trough as you would with our automatic lines.

Model No. Description
---
SE10 10 Foot (3 meter) Stationary Eviscerating Unit 30 1/2" wide x 10" long x 86" high (77 cm wide x 3 meters long x 2.2 meters high). Includes 10 ESSS Eviscerating Shackles.

STAINLESS STEEL

GIZZARD PEELER

The hardened, spiral cut rolls are direct driven. The drive cannot slip as with a belt driven machine. A 1/3 horse-power motor with gear reducer turns the peeler rolls at 288 RPM. A double pole switch allows you to reverse the rolls in the event anything becomes entrapped in the rolls.

Model No. Description
---
SSAK4 Gizzard Peeler complete with floor stand and motor 110V, 60HZ, single phase (as pictured) 19" wide x 33" long x 40 1/2" high (48 cm wide x 84 cm long x 103 cm high).

SSAK450 Gizzard Peeler complete with floor stand and motor 220V 50HZ, 3 phase 19" wide x 33" long x 40 1/2" high (48 cm wide x 84 cm long x 103 cm high).

HAK4 Gizzard Peeler Head.

RAK4 Peeler Rolls only.

Model No. Description
---
12504 Perforated Stainless Giblet Pan 20 3/4" x 12 3/4" x 4" (53 cm x 32 cm x 10 cm).

12524 Perforated Stainless Giblet Pan 12 3/4" x 10 1/2" x 4" (32 cm x 27 cm x 10 cm).

12003 Solid Stainless Giblet Pan 20 3/4" x 12 3/4" x 2 1/2" (53 cm x 32 cm x 6 cm).

GIABLET PANS
COMMERCIAL ICE SYSTEMS--WALK IN COOLERS, FREEZERS AND ICE STORAGE BINS
We will work with you on your specific requirements. All purpose ice machines available. Single phase and three phases. 208/230V, 50HZ and 60HZ. We also have sourced walk-in coolers and freezers for large installations. Let us know your needs.

CHILL TANK AGITATOR PUMP
(Shown attached to PP430 Chilling Tank in photo to right)
Agitator pump maintains constant water temperature assuring a uniform chill. The pump can be moved so you need only one pump for several tanks. The standard unit fits over the PP430 or PP412 chilling tanks. However, the standard unit can be easily modified to fit other tanks. Advise us of your tank dimensions and the type of material (metal, fiberglass, etc.) and we will quote.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTAP50</td>
<td>Chill Tank Agitator Pump, 220V, 50HZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTAP60</td>
<td>Chill Tank Agitator Pump, 115V, 60HZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LARGE CAPACITY CHILLING TANKS
These popular chilling tanks are replacing all other types in the field. Each unit comes standard with a heavy duty metal frame, heavy duty casters and a drain. Choose from three (3) sizes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PP430</td>
<td>Jumbo Polyethylene Chilling Tank 32&quot; wide x 44 1/2&quot; long x 37 1/4&quot; high (81 cm wide x 113 cm long x 95 cm high). Holds 160 gallons (600 liters).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP412</td>
<td>Large Polyethylene Chilling Tank 18&quot; wide x 29&quot; long x 27&quot; high (46 cm wide x 74 cm long x 69 cm high). Holds 48 gallons (180 liters).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP433</td>
<td>Small Polyethylene Chilling Tank 23&quot; wide x 24 1/2&quot; long x 19&quot; high (58 cm wide x 62 cm long x 48 cm high). Holds 20 gallons (76 liters). (This tank is popular for giblets in larger plants.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12 BAGGING EQUIPMENT

AUTOMATIC BAGGING AND CLOSING EQUIPMENT
Bagger blows open bags. Vacuum removes air from bag before sealing. Includes twist tie sealer — vinyl coated wire is pulled off of a reel, is cut to size and then twisted around neck of bag. A very fast and efficient system. Great value for small and medium sized operator. Capacity of up to 10 packages per minute.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BVS40</td>
<td>Complete bagging unit includes vacuum and electric tie. 28&quot; wide x 48&quot; long x 60&quot; high, 115V, 50/60Hz (65 cm wide x 122 cm long x 152 cm high)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAG35</td>
<td>Special Wicketed Plastic Bags for use with BVS40. 8&quot; x 2&quot; x 14&quot; (20.3 cm x 5.1 cm x 35.6 cm). The length is 15 1/2&quot; (39.4 cm) including a 1-1/2&quot; (3.8 cm) wicket lip.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>2000 ft. spool of vinyl-coated wire. Yields 6400 lbs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YOUR LOGO CAN BE IMPRINTED AT EXTRA COST. ASK FOR QUOTATION AND MINIMUM ORDER REQUIREMENT.

POULTRY BAGS
Smartly display your dressed fowl with our polyethylene, gusseted bags. There is no center seam and these bags are made of the clearest material on the market. Designed for easy loading. All bags are .0015 material except 12 x 8 x 30 which is .002. All bags packed either 100 or 1000 quantities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 x 3 x 15</td>
<td>6&quot; x 3&quot; x 15&quot;</td>
<td>Broilers, Fryers, Small Roasters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15 cm x 7.6 cm x 38 cm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 x 3 x 18</td>
<td>9&quot; x 3&quot; x 18&quot;</td>
<td>Large Rosters, Capons, Small Hens Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(23 cm x 7.6 cm x 46 cm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 x 6 x 24</td>
<td>12&quot; x 6&quot; x 24&quot;</td>
<td>Turkeys, Large Ducks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30 cm x 15 cm x 61 cm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 x 8 x 30</td>
<td>12&quot; x 8&quot; x 30&quot;</td>
<td>Large Turkeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30 cm x 20 cm x 76 cm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIE</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Vinyl Coated Wire Tying Strips tie any of the above (5&quot; long)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DRESSED POULTRY TRAY
Ideal for storing and/or chilling dressed poultry. Size is an easy one for one person to handle. Tray will stack when full or nest when empty. Constructed to withstand freezer conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28BG</td>
<td>Plastic Tray for Dressed Poultry 16&quot; wide x 23 3/4&quot; long x 7 3/8&quot; high (41 cm wide x 60.3 cm long x 18.7 cm high)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GIBLETS CARTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>LS311</th>
<th>LS2000</th>
<th>LS459</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelf Size</td>
<td>15 1/2 x 24&quot; (39.4 x 61 cm)</td>
<td>15 1/2 x 24&quot; (39.4 x 61 cm)</td>
<td>20 1/2 x 47&quot; (52.1 x 119.4 cm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Size</td>
<td>16 1/4&quot; x 27 1/2&quot; x 32&quot; (41.3 x 68.9 x 81.3 cm)</td>
<td>17 1/8&quot; x 32 1/2&quot; x 34 1/4&quot; (43.5 x 82.6 x 86.5 cm)</td>
<td>22 3/4&quot; x 54 1/8&quot; x 37 1/4&quot; (57.8 x 137.5 x 94.6 cm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Between Shelves</td>
<td>11 3/4&quot; (29.8 cm)</td>
<td>12 1/8&quot; (30.8 cm)</td>
<td>13 1/8&quot; (33.3 cm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diameter of Casters</td>
<td>3 1/2&quot; (8.9 cm) Swivel</td>
<td>4&quot; (10.2 cm) Swivel</td>
<td>2-5&quot; (12.7 cm) Swivel. 2-5&quot; Fixed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>200 lbs. (90.9 kg)</td>
<td>200 lbs. (90.9 kg)</td>
<td>400 lbs. (181.8 kg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Stainless Steel</td>
<td>Legs - ABS Plastic Shelves Polypropolene</td>
<td>Stainless Steel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CART PRICES SUBJECT TO CHANGE.
ACCESSORIES FOR KILLING AND EVISCERATING
Select from our complete line of knives for killing, boring and pinning; lung removers; and trimming shears.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-S128</td>
<td>Poultry Killing Knife, Stainless Steel Blade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-S130</td>
<td>Pinning Knife, Stainless Steel Blade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-726</td>
<td>Boning Knife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-475</td>
<td>Economy Shears — Straight Trimmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-1328KBR</td>
<td>Heart and Liver Shears - Blade is curved right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-4268BP</td>
<td>Gizzard and Venting Shears - back point prevents damage to viscera.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-1010</td>
<td>10” (25 cm) Sharpening Steel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-CLUNG</td>
<td>Chicken Lung Remover, 11” long (28 cm).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-TLUNG</td>
<td>Turkey Lung Remover, 16” long (41 cm).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-41820</td>
<td>9” Victorinox Giant point venting knife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(great for killing, venting and neck work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-41822</td>
<td>4” Victorinox Boning knife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(great for heads, necks and legs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-WCFLUNG</td>
<td>Water Flushed Lung Remover. 6’ (1.8 meter) hose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with brass swivel both ends. Standard garden hose hookup. Simple hand trigger water valve. 12” (30 cm) indexable lung scraper wand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APRONS

Heavy Duty Plastic Aprons
* .015 gauge vinyl
* semi-transparent
* withstands abrasion, acids, and alkalies
* 29” x 35” (74 cm x 89 cm) or 29” x 45” (74 cm x 14 cm).

Low Cost Disposable Aprons
* light and comfortable
* use and discard
* withstands abrasion, acids, and alkalies
* 28” x 46” (71 cm x 117 cm)

POULTRY SCALE
Obtain fast, accurate weights on individual birds with our dial scale. Included are top and bottom hooks and easy to read dials. Twenty pound capacity with one ounce graduations. One year warranty. Cone not included. Order cones shown on page 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DA2648</td>
<td>Disposable White-Coated Tyvek Apron.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLASTIC COATED SCALDING BASKETS
These baskets are a big asset in speeding up your manual scalding operation. Heavy wire is coated with tough vinyl plastic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7842</td>
<td>Dial Scale with Capacities Marked in Ounces and Pounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Plastic Coated Scalding Basket, 14-1/2” diameter, (36.8 cm) top, 10” (25.4 cm) bottom, 9” (22.9 cm) high, Packed 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Home Picking Options**

**Home Picker Table Top**
Model HPTT has 28 fingers on a 10 inch drum. Galvanized steel construction. 1/4 HP, 110V, 60 Hz. 15" wide x 22" long x 12" high.

**Leg Mounted Home Picker**
Model HPJR has 54 fingers on a 12 inch drum. Galvanized steel construction. Can be washed without disassembly. 1/3 HP, 110V, 60 Hz. 17" wide x 28" long x 50" high.

**Transport Coop**

**Coops Stacked**

**Coops with Extension**

**Transport Coops**
Designed for optimum air flow. Interlock for transport and stacking. Easily washed and sanitized. High density polyethylene with stainless steel hinges and fasteners. 12 1/2" x 16 1/2" (31.8 cm x 41.9 cm) door. Optional 2" (5 cm) extension for use with medium sized turkeys, show birds, and the like. Assembly required (takes about 10 minutes).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COOP 9</td>
<td>Poultry Transport Coop; 10 broiler capacity (approx.) 24 1/2&quot; wide x 36 1/2&quot; long x 8&quot; high (62.2 cm wide x 92.7 cm long x 20.3 cm high).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOP9EXT</td>
<td>2&quot; (5 cm) bolt in extension spacer with fasteners; 6 turkey capacity (approx.) Comes in 4 poly strips that bolt together. Shown above on the right.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IOWA USA
DESCRIPTION OF PARENT TRACT

Sub Lot No. Two of Section No. Seven and Sub Lot No. Four of Section No. Eight as in Township Number 35 North, Range No. 4 East of the Third Principal Meridian and further described by courses and distances as follows: South 29.10 chains thence East 43.37 chains thence North 28.88 chains thence West 23.42 chains to the Beginning, in Kendall County, Illinois.

KEEPING the East 350.00 feet of the South 246.64 feet of Sub Lot No. Four of Section No. Eight as in Township No. Thirty Five North, Range No. 6 East of the Third Principal Meridian, in Kendall County, Illinois.