STATE OF ILLINOIS

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS

IN RE:

THE PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF

LIVESTOCK MANAGEMENT FACILITY

Public Informational Meeting held, on July 6, 2015, at the Ford County Sheriff's Office, Board Meeting Room, 235 North American, Paxton, Illinois, scheduled for the hour of 6:00 P.M.

I N D E X

A P P E A R A N C E S

FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE:

Mr. Scott Frank, Hearing Officer

Mr. Warren Goetsch, Bureau Chief

Mr. Brad A. Beaver, Manager

FOR THE FACILITY:

Mr. Colin Steidinger, Owner

Mr. Clint Steidinger, Owner

Mr. Nic Anderson, Illinois Livestock Development Group

Court Reporter:
Robin A. Enstrom, RPR, CSR
Illinois CSR #084-002046
Midwest Litigation Services
15 S. Old State Capitol Plaza
Springfield, Illinois 62701
217.522.2211
800.280.3376

(Meeting began at 6:00 P.M.)

HEARING OFFICER FRANK: We'll go ahead and get started.

Before we begin tonight, I would ask that everyone please turn your cell phones to silent. Thank you.

Good evening. On behalf of Philip Nelson, director of the Illinois Department of Agriculture, we thank you very much for the invitation to come to Ford County today. My name is Scott Frank. I'm with the Illinois Department of Agriculture, and I'll be serving as the hearing officer for tonight's public informational meeting.

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

This meeting is being conducted pursuant to Section 12 of the Livestock Management Facilities Act. The informational meeting is being held at the request of the Ford County Board and is to afford members of the

public an opportunity to ask questions and present oral and written testimony regarding the proposed construction of a 960-animal-unit expansion to an existing 960-animal-unit swine-finishing facility by Clint and Colin Steidinger.

My task this evening is to ensure that this meeting is conducted in an orderly fashion and to ensure that all comments and testimony received are entered into the record.

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

In order to ensure that we have an orderly process, I will quickly explain how the meeting will proceed this evening. Following my comments, Warren Goetsch will provide an overview of the provisions of the Livestock Management Facilities Act as it relates to this particular project, specifically outlining the current status of the protect and how the process will proceed following this meeting.

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

After their presentation, I will open the meeting to questions. Anyone wishing to ask questions of the facility representatives or the Department will be given an opportunity to do so. During the question-and-answer session, I will ask that you state your name and spell your last name. You then may ask your question. Depending upon the number of people who wish to testify in the oral testimony phase of the meeting which is right after the question phase, there may be a time limit placed on this questioning phase.

Following the question-and-answer phase, I will ask for written testimony. If anyone has written testimony that is not part of your oral testimony, I will accept it and enter it into the record for this proceeding. If you have written material that you will be using as part of your oral testimony, it can be entered

into the record following your oral testimony. Depending upon the amount of time that has elapsed at this point, we may take a short break.

Following the written testimony, I will ask for oral testimony from the public. Sign-in sheets were placed in the hall as you came in -- one sheet for attendance and a second sheet for testimony. People who wish to provide comments during this oral testimony phase are asked to sign the oral testimony sheet.

People providing oral comments will be sworn in and will be subject to questioning from the public. Each person will be given three minutes to provide his or her comments. Legal counsel speaking on behalf of multiple clients will be given a total of 15 minutes for all clients and will be asked to state the names of all the persons on whose behalf he or she is speaking.

Deferring time to other speakers will not be allowed. If you signed the oral testimony sheet, you may either speak or, if you have changed your mind, you may pass. You may not give your time to someone else. Also, please

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

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

So to quickly summarize the procedure tonight, we will have comments from the Department, comments from the facility, questions directed to the Department and the facility -- remember to state your name and spell your name -- written testimony accepted, oral testimony from the public, and closing comments.

Please keep in mind that we are not here this evening to discuss or debate the merits or perceived inadequacies of the existing regulations or laws. We are here tonight to receive information on this particular proposed livestock facility to assist with determining compliance with the existing regulations.

This is a public informational meeting, not a court proceeding. The purpose is

to share information and provide an opportunity for the Department, members of the County Board, and you the public to learn about this proposed facility.

Again, we very much appreciate your hospitality for inviting us here tonight to consider the proposed construction of the Clint and Colin Steidinger swine-finishing facility. Please remember to confine your comments and questions to that subject as we continue.

Before we move to the Department's remarks, the chairman of the County Board, Randy Berger, would like to say a couple words.

Mr. Berger.

MR. BERGER: I'd just like to thank all of you representatives for coming and all of you with the public.

Also, there are several County Board members here. Just put up your hand quickly. That way, if anybody in the -- thank you -- in the audience here would like to ask questions, you know who to find.

So thanks again, everybody, and please respect the rules.

HEARING OFFICER FRANK: Thank you, Mr. Berger.

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

MR. GOETSCH: Good evening. My name is Warren Goetsch. I currently serve as the bureau chief of Environmental Programs as well as the chief of staff of the Illinois Department of Agriculture.

One of our responsibilities at the Department is the administration of the various provisions of the Livestock Management Facilities Act. On behalf of the Department, let me welcome you to this public informational meeting.

Before we hear from the proposed facility's representatives, I'd like to say a few words regarding the applicable provisions of the Livestock Management Facilities Act and the current status of the proposed project.

The Livestock Management Facilities Act was originally passed and became law on May 21st of 1996. Since that time, the Act has been amended three times: first during the General

Assembly's 1997 fall veto session, second during the General Assembly's 1999 spring session, and most recently during the 2007 General Assembly's spring session.

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

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

The Livestock Management Facilities Act's provisions are quite complicated, and specific facility designs and situations certainly can differ. It is, however, the Department's intention to always fairly and equitably apply these requirements to the livestock industry in this state.

Now, regarding the current status of this project, the Department received a formal Notice of Intent to Construct application for the proposed expansion to an existing swine facility on April 21st of 2015. The proposed project expansion is to consist of the construction of one 101'10" x 196' swine-finishing building with an 8' underbuilding livestock waste-handling facility. The project is proposed to be located approximately 4.2 miles northwest of Gibson City, Illinois, in southwestern Ford County.

The application was submitted by Frank and West Environmental Engineers, on behalf of Colin and Clint Steidinger -- and I apologize if I didn't pronounce the name correctly -- of Gibson City, Illinois. The maximum design capacity of the proposed facility expansion is 960 animal units or 2,400 head of swine greater than 55 pounds, for an overall facility total of 1,920 animal units or 4,800 head greater than 55 pounds.

As I mentioned earlier, the Department received the Notice of Intent to Construct application on April 21st and reviewed

it for compliance with the applicable provisions of the Act. On May 27th, the Department determined that the Notice was complete and forwarded a copy to the -- of the completed application to the Ford County Board. Notice of that application was also published in the appropriate newspapers.

The design capacity of the proposed facility requires compliance with a residential setback distance of not less than 1,320 feet and a populated area setback distance of not less than 2,640 feet.

On June 23rd, the Department received official notice from the Ford County Board requesting that a public informational meeting be scheduled regarding the proposal. After further consultation with the County Board, the Department scheduled this meeting and caused notice of the meeting to be published in the appropriate newspapers.

An additional requirement of the Livestock Management Facilities Act deals with the design and construction plans of the livestock waste-handling facility. The

Department has received a formal submittal of detailed engineering design plans and specifications for the proposed project's underbuilding livestock waste-handling facility. The submittal is currently under review by the Department. As such, we are unable to comment on its compliance with the statutory provisions of the Act at this time.

We are here this evening to receive testimony regarding the proposed livestock management facility's compliance with the eight siting criteria as defined in Section 12, paragraph (d), of the Livestock Management Facilities Act. In general, information regarding the following would be appropriate for this evening's meeting: information regarding manure management planning, potential impact of the proposed facility on the surrounding area's character, whether the proposed facility is located within any floodplains or other sensitive areas, odor control plans of the facility, possible impact of the proposed facility on existing area traffic patterns, and possible impact of the proposed facility on community

growth, tourism and recreation, or economic development of the area.

Copies of the specific criteria were available on the table in the hallway with the sign-in sheets as you entered the room. If anyone would like to have a copy of the criteria but didn't pick one up, if you'd identify yourself, Brad can make sure that you've got a copy.

Finally, the process that will be followed after this evening's meeting is as follows: The County Board will have up to 30 business days from today's meeting to submit to the Department a non-binding recommendation relative to the proposed siting of this facility. Thus a recommendation from the Ford County Board is due at the Department on or before August 17, 2015.

After the close of the county's 30-business-day comment period, the Department will have 15 calendar days or until September 1, 2015, to review all the information submitted to date, including the Notice of Intent to Construct, construction plans, transcripts from

this evening's meeting, the County Board's recommendation, and any other additional information submitted by the owners at the request of the Department. Based on that review, the Department will determine whether the eight siting criteria have been meet.

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

Mr. Hearing Officer, at this time I would like to submit the -- a copy of the complete Notice of Intent to Construct application and its associated correspondence file for formal entry into the record as Exhibit 1, if I can find it. Here you go.

HEARING OFFICER FRANK: Entered into the record as Exhibit No. 1 is a completed Notice of Intent to Construct, including correspondence between the Department and the applicant, notices of this public informational meeting, and correspondence with Ford County officials.

MR. GOETSCH: And with that, that concludes my formal remarks. If -- I look --

again, I thank you for your attention, and I look forward to any comments or questions that you may have as we go through the meeting. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER FRANK: Thank you, Mr. Goetsch.

Entered into the record as Exhibit No. 2 is a copy of the Department's PowerPoint presentation.

At this time we will hear comments from the facility. Before you begin, for those who will be presenting information, please state your name and spell your last name, and I will then swear you in.

MR. COLIN STEIDINGER: My name is Colin Steidinger, S-t-e-i-d-i-n-g-e-r.

MR. ANDERSON: Nic Anderson, A-n-d-e-r-s-o-n.

MR. CLINT STEIDINGER: Clint Steidinger, S-t-e-i-d-i-n-g-e-r.

HEARING OFFICER FRANK: Please raise your right hand.

(Colin Steidinger, Nic Anderson, and Clint Steidinger were duly sworn or affirmed.)

HEARING OFFICER FRANK: You may proceed.

MR. COLIN STEIDINGER: My name is Colin Steidinger.

Along with my two brothers, we are sixth generation farmers. My twin brother, Clint, and I started farming full time out of high school in 2008. As a family farm, we have mainly been focused on a grain operation. This spring my youngest brother, Chad, graduated from high school. He too has plans to come back to the family farm.

Last spring we made the decision to diversify our family farm and begin raising hogs. This past January, we started raising pigs in our first wean-to-finish barn.

Hog production allows us the opportunity to grow equity, generate cash flow, and establish business assets while producing a product that will reduce our input costs in our grain operation, and in the end provide a safe, abundant, and affordable pork product to the consuming public.

We have tried our best to locate this

barn on a site that we could best utilize the manure, minimize the odor to the surrounding area. I also live on the site with my family.

While working closely with the Department of Ag to follow the Livestock Waste Management Facility Act, we will adhere to the best management practices in the pork production to minimize the impact on the surrounding areas. We have hired Frank and West Engineering to help us best design a building that will meet all eight siting criterias. Due to a scheduling conflict, our engineers, Frank and West, could not be here, but asked I've Nic Anderson to help our farm give an overview of the project and present how we will meet all eight siting requirements prepared by Frank and West Engineering.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, Colin.

Again, my name is Nic Anderson, and Colin and Clint did ask me to come and help fill in with the absence of Frank and West Engineering. I'm not an engineer. I've participated in these meetings over the years. Whether I'm the best qualified or not, I'll let

you be the judge of that. But our goal is to tell you how the farm is going to meet the eight siting criteria.

Some of the presentation tonight will overlap with what Ag already presented because it is part of the requirement, and what I'll tell you -- the sheets that you got in the hallway of the eight siting criteria and this pamphlet on how the farm responds to the Livestock Management Facilities Act is really an overview that I want to try to present so you can understand what they're going to try to do to fulfill that requirement under the review of the Department of Agriculture.

So anything that comes up tonight, whether it's questions for us or the farm or Department of Agriculture, we sure want to do our due diligence to make sure we fulfill the requirements of the Act and provide that to you so you understand what's going to happen out there.

So some of this will be overcrossing and some of the eight siting criteria overlap with responsibility. So I will try to explain

the process there. But we'll go ahead and get started.

The introduction, a site overview and layout, and conformance with the Livestock Management Facilities Act.

The light's not real great here, but you can see the outline of Ford County, and the arrow down into the general location of the farm.

This is its distance from Watseka, much like -- or from Gibson City, much like the Department of Agriculture stated.

And this is the actual farm site with the existing barn in blue and then, to the south of that, the proposed barn. So the barn that sits there today -- the new barn will be an identical footprint of that just on the other side of the property there.

That's a basic outline of measurements. Like Department of Ag said, 196 x 101.10. So both those barns will be identical.

This is an abbreviated portion of the eight siting criteria. I will go through each one of those, and as we get down to number eight, hopefully I can express to you how the farm is

going to meet that, and I think, since the farm has already gone through the procedure with the first building, there will be similar qualifications that they're really just going to duplicate and fulfill the LMFA.

As Ag mentioned, in Criteria 1, the certification requirement. These dates should match up with the Department on when the Notice was applied for, when it was deemed complete, much like they expressed.

According to the Livestock Management Facilities Act, a facility that exceeds 1,000 animal units but less than 5,000 shall prepare and maintain a waste management plan within 60 working days of commencement of operation.

So, those of you that aren't familiar with the Act, that thousand animal units -- it takes four pigs to equal one animal unit. So that 2,400 head in finisher comes up with 960 animal units. And we will talk about that later in the process when we talk about meeting the distance and location setbacks of the Act.

Since this farm is going to exceed that number, they will develop a comprehensive

nutrient management plan. That is prepared by their engineer by a technical service provider. For those of you that don't know what comprehensive nutrient management is, it's a much more detailed, much more record keeping process. It's -- I'll attribute it to precision farming where they'll go out and grid map farms in two-acre sections, collect the data, so they can more accurately plan their nutrient management with that manure out there in the fields that they're going to provide it to to grow the growing crops.

So much more detail and much more record keeping, and as farms get bigger, that requirement makes sense because we're dealing with more material, and it shows diligence that we are following a certain plan that can be reviewed by and looked at at the Department of Agriculture, and then more often, if there are issues out there, that we have a record of what took place, when it took place, and how we handled that. So, really, that's what the comprehensive nutrient management plan does. They will keep that on site. They will also

send -- provide that to the Department of Agriculture to do with -- to meet that requirement.

Outside of that, that plan becomes really the footprint for that farm when it talks about nutrients, and if there should be an issue outside of the Department's regulations, the Clean Water Act, the EPA all have access to that if needed. And, really, it's a resource for the farm to make sure they're managing those nutrients the right way, and they will learn from that plan and that plan may change in the future depending on their crop needs and what their management is of that farm. It's kind of a living document as that farm continues into the future.

So the goal of that plan is to utilize manure produced on the farm, put it out into the growing crop fields at an agronomic rate, and for those of you that don't know, what is an agronomic rate? University of Illinois, the agronomic handbook, talks about it takes so many units of nitrogen to grow a bushel of corn. It takes so much phosphorous and potassium. So

the manure is tested. We find out what the nutrient content is of that manure, and we provide that to our crop based on the agronomic rate. So, really, that's what that plan is -- know what we're growing, know what we have to put out there, and then manage it the right way.

The waste management plan, these are some of the goals: Total annual manure volume. So we want to know how much manure we produce. We want to know what our historical records of the crops that we're going to grow. More than likely, corn on corn is best suited for manure application. But in a corn-bean rotation or corn-corn-bean rotation, manure does have some benefits for other crops. Also wheat. So that would be dictated in that nutrient management plan.

The other thing is we need to take an analysis of that manure so we know how much N, P, and K are there. Not all hog farms are equal, but we have a pretty good idea what typical 55-pound finishing pigs and up produce, and some of it has to do with the diet they're fed or DDGs, other products that are out there, of what

the output is. But to ensure that, we're going to analyze that manure so we know what we're taking out so we can calculate what goes out into that agronomic rate as manure.

There are rules and regulations for land application and setbacks and to incorporate those protocols in the plan and then documentation of all phases of that process. So that will be included in that nutrient management plan.

Whether the design, location, and proposed operation will protect the environment by being consistent with the Livestock Management Facilities Act.

This will be picked up in some other criteria, but typically there are standards that the LMFA follows -- whether it's a construction standard, a nutrient management standard, a design standard -- that this farm has to meet, and the Department of Agriculture will review those building and design plans. The concrete consistency, the waterstop issues for cracks and crevices and joint junctures. So that is all provided in those plans for the Department to

make sure how it complies with the Act.

Midwest Plan Service is a standard that Ag uses for concrete manure storage handling handbook. So those data and those requirements are in that publication. That is the publication of land-grant schools that have designed standards that -- for concrete for manure holding. One of the issues that come up of cement thickness and porosity is 10-6. As a layman, I don't quite understand that completely, but 10-6 is the standard that the cement concrete needs to meet for porosity. And so water moves through that at a certain rate, and you have to meet that maximum standard to meet the requirements of the Act. You can go more, but you can't go less than that. So that standard is established in publications like Midwest Plan Service.

So concrete specification, reinforcement specifications, and waterstop requirements -- we'll address this a little later in some other criteria so we can show you kind of how they're going to implement that.

So, basically, the design proposed

will consist of construction plans for two finishing barns. One is already completed and met those requirements and went through the process. So, really, tonight is the addition of that 196 x 101.10 feet barn that we saw on one of the earlier slides.

This is typically what a finishing barn looks like. For those that might see them out in the countryside, this is a tunnel-ventilated barn where Ag is -- or air is pushed through that building through those large fans, and on the side there are portals for pit ventilation. So those pigs sit on top of slated floors in the above structure, and below structure is the waste-handling facility and the storage capacity that the farm and their engineers have designed.

This is typically what an inside of a barn looks like with the slated floor, a feeding type system throughout the whole barn. This barn has curtains on the side for natural air flow. So there are elements of those barns that combine mechanical and natural air flow through those barns.

Siting criteria is location. Location and setback distances have been met. The Department of Agriculture noted that in their compliance of the Notice of Intent to Construct back in May.

Also, another requirement is the manager of the farm will be a certified livestock manager. So that thousand-animal-unit threshold requires the farm to have an on-site livestock manager certified. Both Colin and Clint are going to process that. Today, as they stand with the animals they have, they are not required, but they will both go through that process and get the certification needed, and then also the livestock waste management plan that we've already spent some time on.

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

The proposed building is zoned in agriculture. The Department deemed that back in

May. And the farm is compatible with surrounding area in that it is agriculture area.

They also mentioned these numbers: 4,800 animal units greater than 55 pounds equals 1,920. The occupied residential setback is 1,320 feet, a quarter mile. A populated area is 2,640 feet, the half mile.

And on this slide you can see where the existing barn is, the distance between the barns, and the proposed barn. The darker gray area is the quarter mile. The farm where Colin lives is on -- in that setback, and he lives there with his family. So when you go out to that quarter mile, no one lives in that quarter-mile setback. In the populated area setback, there is Norman Ashley kind of to the north and east there a little bit. You can see a farmstead down in the corner -- right-hand corner there. That's just a barn location. There's no house there. It's tough to put all those on one slide, but if you go to Google or something like that, you can see that.

Outside that half mile, that doesn't fall into the setback requirements, there are

minimal houses. If you look due east, there's a house about a mile and a quarter across the way on the next section road. So if sections are in miles, right there at the Road 200 that's running north and south there in front of the farm, to the next road -- it's Road 300 -- that's a mile. And that lane back to their farm is about a quarter mile. There are some properties to the west outside that setback requirement, and if we had a bigger map, we could probably look into those a little closer.

But that's the requirement of the Act -- to meet those setbacks that are established there on this slide. Shows Gibson City as a place of business and Birkey's farm store and St. John's Lutheran Church off to the west.

Floodplain and aquifer is Criteria Number 4. Whether the farm is located in a 100-year floodplain and/or otherwise environmentally sensitive area, defined as karst -- a karst area with aquifer material within five feet of the planned bottom of the manure-holding facility, and whether the

construction standards set forth in the notice are consistent with the goal in protecting the safety of the area.

Long definition, and we'll try to go into that, but this is the floodplain map in Illinois that Department of Agriculture uses as a resource, and the next slide is a little tough to read, but when I go down into Ford County and zoom down, floodplain areas are denoted by blue streams when I go to my floodplain map on the Internet. And over on the side there you can see where the farm is located. There are no floodplain areas within proximity to this farm. I did -- I'll back up a couple slides here.

The nearest stream is 3,800 feet to the south of that. Actually, there's not a floodplain there. There is a stream. The nearest floodplain is over on Drummer Creek clear off to the east probably two miles, two-and-a-half miles or so. So they really have some decent distance from bodies of water or streams.

So this is the map that would be submitted to the Department to look at that

floodplain map, and they will do their own diligence on that.

A karst area. A karst area is defined of land surfaces containing sinkholes, large springs, disrupted land drainage, underground system associated with karstified carbonate bedrock, limestone or dolomite, and caves or a land surface without these features but containing a karstified bedrock unit generally overlain by 60 feet of unconsolidated materials.

Another long definition, but typically there are karst areas in the State of Illinois, and it's that unconsolidated type limestone system. It's very porous to water. So there is an I-8 map that is referenced in the LMFA that the farm's engineers will go look at and look at those karst areas and see if this farm is located in one of those. That would be a denote to say, "Hey, we need to look at this a little closer," and then, secondly, to make sure that there aren't features in that area that would have karst characteristics.

So the engineers go to the karst map.

So up in northern Illinois and kind of north central there south of Rockford, there is some karst areas. Down along the river, if you think about the river bluffs and cliffs and rock formations, there is some there. And in this area there aren't, but through the site investigation that the engineers do and submit to the Department, they look for those types of things in that investigation.

And then the other resource is the farm itself. You farm that ground. What can we learn from the farmer or other people in the area to make sure that those types of things don't exist and we can meet the requirements of the Act.

So a lot of investigation into that to make sure that we can meet that requirement, and Ag is there to verify that information that's provided to meet the requirement. So we not only rely on our engineers, but we rely on their due diligence to make sure that all those requirements in this criteria are met, as all of them.

Continuing in the Criteria Number 4,

the farm is not located in a karst area, indicated by the Department of Natural Resources, the State Geology with this map, and the bedrock map in Illinois as a potential karst area. So they -- they feel that they've met that requirement.

Another requirement is sandstone that's five feet or more thickness or fractured carbonate that is ten feet or more in thickness or sand, gravel, or sand and gravel such that there's at least two feet or more present with any five-foot section.

So, basically, they're going to go down and take a soil boring and find out what's under there. They have already done that on the existing barn and met the requirement. Their indication is this barn will also probably produce similar investigation. That has not been done yet, mostly because of the weather. So you got to dig a hole and get some equipment in. So if you follow the weather patterns here lately, that hasn't been real easy to do. But before they can go any further with the Department, they will provide that. So what -- it looks like the

weather's going to play a pretty big role that that can be done shortly and submitted to the Department so they can review that process. But that's yet to be done.

Hopefully, this diagram kind of explains what a soil boring does. You can see the -- an outline of the walls of the pit. That one -- it's just an example. It happens to be ten feet. But you can see that the grade -- that solid line is the grade, and when they go in to take a soil boring, they will have to go below the planned bottom of that location. This is just a diagram to show you that they have to go that deep to get that information and collect it and provide it to the Department, and they are anticipating that will come in the days to come.

Criteria Number 5: Minimize environmental impact. Whether the owner or operator has submitted plans for operation that minimize the likelihood of any environmental damage to the surrounding area from spills, runoff, or leaching.

The Department noted that they have submitted their building plans. That is one way

that the farm will meet that requirement to contain that manure as a nutrient so that they have enough storage. It gives them longer-term windows to work on manure management, and they're not day-to-day operations. So it is also designed for -- with waterstops and concrete reinforcement to avoid leaching and capacity challenges.

Proper sizing, adequate storage capacity. The LMFA requires 150 days of storage. This farm will have a year of storage, and why so much? We tend to farm in seasons in Illinois, and it's great to put our nutrients on in the fall. And they have the ability to put nutrients on this fall and retain manure until they're ready to put it on next fall. There might be a case that they do apply in the spring, but what it shows is they have the capacity to hold that nutrient so they can get around Mother Nature. They're not dependent on Mother Nature. They're dependent on their farming practices so they can utilize that at the right time, the right place, and the right amount.

So we call this a closed system that

they control, that there is no discharge from that. They are able to apply agronomically and meet crop demands at an agronomic rate. So that manure management becomes part of the Criteria 5 to how do we minimize issues, and through nutrient management, we can sure provide that.

Clean water diversion is a big part of it. Stormwater is free. So we don't always want stormwater. So we want to divert that through gutters and tiles that don't come access to manure. Once it becomes to access with manure, then we have to manage it. But stormwater is free. So they've implemented a stormwater system to redirect that stormwater away from the farm so it doesn't come in contact. And it's good water management.

Another segment is farm designed to prevent release of livestock. Solid concrete construction with reinforced grade 60 steel rebar. Waterstops in place in all construction and stoppage joints. All surfaces in contact with manure -- or concrete -- will be required permeability standard, and that's that 10-6. It's got to meet that permeability standard. It can

exceed it, but it can't be anything less than that.

So here's a slide that kind of breaks that down. Rigorous concrete construction is provided to the Department to review. Waterstops at all concrete joints. This farm will have a perimeter tile drain with a sampling port.

So when you put a concrete structure in the ground and the soil types -- unless the soil boring comes out different than the first building, water can move in the soil. So that sampling port -- we want to know what moves in and about down there at the bottom of those footings, not only for manure coming out of the system but water coming into the system. We don't want extra water in that system. So that sampling port is there that can be monitored and sent into the Department on a quarterly basis.

Colin has told me that their first quarterly process, they couldn't pull a sample. So there was no water in that perimeter tile drain. Oftentimes that's the case. But that's a way to monitor to see what moves there, and it's a requirement of the LMFA based on other data

that's says you need a perimeter tile drain in.

This is the reinforced wall enforcement. Hopefully, it describes -- it shows you that rebar that's in there and how that cement's going to conform. The big thing is waterstops, to understand that there's a waterstop, and cement will be poured over the top of that to make the seal. That's a requirement of the Act. In all those joints and wall connections, that needs to be provided.

The Department of Agriculture has a process to inspect that, not only from the contractor providing the right concentration of concrete and how many bags of cement are in a load -- they need to provide that type of information -- but through an inspection process throughout the process, not only documentation from the farm but from the Department, to go find those key spots and investigate that these are installed the right way and permeability is maintained throughout that whole system as a closed system.

This is just a another example of some pictures, if you're not familiar with it.

Cement floor -- concrete floor, walls, pillars that hold up the slats, and an installation process when those slats go on top before the structure comes on top of the building. So, really, that containment is what we're holding that year's worth of manure for so we can use it at the right place out in our cropping systems. Just one more example of that system.

Odor control in Criteria Number 6. Whether odor control plans are reasonable and incorporate reasonable or innovative odor reduction technologies given the current state of affairs.

There's several ways we can address that. Controlled land application, and we'll go into that a little bit later.

Routine maintenance, keeping things clean. This system is build as an all in/all out. So after each production cycle, they can clean and maintain. Fan management. Dust can be collected on fans. They can reduce a lot of odors. Dust is transferred by -- odor is transferred by dust. So anytime that they can minimize dust collection through maintenance,

cleaning, they can reduce those things.

Feed management is another way to address that, and we'll go into a couple other points there.

And location of setbacks, meaning the setbacks can reduce some of that odor issue that might come with the farm.

Steidingers have chosen to incorporate their manure. There's two ways. They'll take a look that, and we'll show some slides here. Really, through a knife injection system that takes manure down into the root zone, 6 to 12 inches. Eight is a pretty good average, but their goal is -- much like anhydrous ammonia that we do with regular farming, that we get that nutrient into the soil zone so we can maintain it and preserve it, and when we mix that, we can reduce some odors. And injection is a widely acceptable practice to reduce odor, and it can be very effective. We don't always get rid of all the odor, but that's the best practice we have at our tools to address that issue.

All manure will be supervised by the farm. They're still in the growth process here.

They will look at tankers, or they'll look at injection. So there are safety issues that come with manure application. It's always good to have a team of people there. So when you think about manure application with a tanker, that's a tractor with a big tank behind it with shovels behind it to put the manure in the ground. That's a simple PTO takeoff type of system that applies manure.

The dragline system -- and we have some photos of that. This is the tanker that all the controls are in the cab. They will go back to the farm and reload that at the farm out of the pit with a pump and proceed to go back out to the field in a rotational system, but that's an example. This is another example of incorporation through injection.

And then the dragline. The dragline is more economical. You can cover more ground. It's pretty efficient. Does have a little more added cost with equipment, but when it comes to that -- not that Steidinger's will own that equipment, but there are companies out there that will come in and custom apply under their

supervision under their nutrient management plan. So if they do choose this at some time in the future, there's a lot of benefits for it -- reduction of odor. A lot of things come with that, but it will all be under their -- their wing of the farm to make sure this is done, and that responsibility always comes back to them.

They have access to appropriate land base to encompass the nutrient management plan. So, in general -- and this will all be played out in the nutrient management plan -- utilizing the local yields that they have with soil types, it's anticipated that they'll need about 550 acres of a corn-corn rotation. When that plan finally gets together, that number could fluctuate, but of a farm of this size, that's a pretty good number to anticipate. But that will be submitted to the Department -- that they have an adequate nutrient management plan to address the animal units that they have on the farm. So, for today's example, that's where we -- where we stand. So that could change a little bit, but that's kind of the anticipation.

The farm will utilize regular

maintenance to reduce odors generated by the facility and manage dust from the buildings. That's probably the biggest key. All in/all out helps a lot because we -- they will power wash after every production cycle. That will be contained in the pit until they're ready to take that out to the field. But not only for the pigs' health benefit but also for odor and dust reduction that those buildings will be cleaned.

Regular maintenance, as I said earlier, is a big key -- to make sure manure is underneath the slats. That's done by a daily feed/chore/inspection process. Managing your feeders to make sure they're not open too much and feed wastage, but that's also a big part of dust and odor control inside the building and making sure the equipment's working properly.

We talked about pressure washing, making sure fans are dust free and operate efficiently, and barn maintenance.

The farm will incorporate an animal diet formulated to allow the most efficient utilization of proteins and nutrients. If you haven't been around pork production, phase

feeding is a terminology that the industry uses in hog farms around the country. So a 10-pound pig has a different diet than a 25-pound pig.

When I was a kid, we kind of feed the same diet until we got -- refilled the feeder. So by phase feeding and bringing pigs up to make sure they have the right energy, the right nutrients at the right time, we can better manage our input into animals. That also helps us manage the output as manure. So we're getting really good about efficiencies, and the numbers are reflected by performance.

And through their feed company that they work with locally, Zimmerman, they work on diets. Pig health is a big part of that too. They have a consulting veterinarian to address those issues. So health not only from the veterinarian side but from the feed side to make sure they're fed efficiently. That all returns back to the farm to make sure that we can do all the things we can to reduce odor. Feed's part of that, but also pig and animal health.

The farm complies and exceeds with farm -- all setback distances established by the

Livestock Management Facilities Act. The residential setback is exceeded by 680 feet. That farm we talked about being outside that quarter mile is to the north. The other populated area setback is the Lutheran Church and Birkey's seed store. So a lot of good setback on that farm. Great to see that. They've picked a great location to make sure that they can meet those requirements, and I think they've showed with their siting investigation that they can do that, and I think the barn that's already there is indicative that they can manage that system, and the new building will be an asset to that farm.

Comprehensive odor control, and this is just a combination of location, proper nutrition, injection of manure. Those are all great techniques. Sure, it has to be done with the best management practice and they have to implement it, but the plan that they've set in place is going to allow those three components to work together to make sure they address the issues that they need.

Also, to reiterate, the odor control

plan is Siting Criteria 6. Farm has diligently planned this. They're working with their engineer to do these things, and they're going to provide that information to the Department, and they feel that they can operate with minimal odor.

I have talked to Colin. When they built their first barn, we had a discussion about where that barn was going and what they're going to do, and as that barn's been up, he's there. He lives there. And he's portrayed it to me -- and we can sure ask him openly -- he doesn't have a lot of odors there. I think he's the first guy on the spot to know, if there's an odor issue, that he can address it and make sure that things are handled the right way because he and his family live there. So feel really comfortable with that odor control plan and how it exists and how it will meet the requirements of the Act.

Criteria Number 7: Traffic patterns. Whether traffic patterns minimize the effect on existing traffic flows.

So the earlier slide we showed of the farm, and there it is. We go down that quarter-

mile lane, and then we're going to take 200 south. That's about a mile or so down to the 800 road, and out to Route 47 on 800. That's about two-and-a-quarter miles. That is our best route. Even though 900 exists, it's not as good a road. There's less impact this direction, and Colin has worked in the past with his -- with his township road commissioner, and they've talked this over to address that issue with traffic.

Here are some traffic stats. So if you think about Route 47 -- I'm not sure. I thought I had a couple more pieces of data on here. Oh, there it is. This is Route 47 with daily and weekly averages. If I go down -- drill down on that a little bit, it does show Route 47, but 800 Road North, that's that east-west road there, 150 daily traffic average, over a thousand a week. Their farm anticipates on an average of four trucks a week. Now, knowing that, when we bring little pigs in or take big pigs out, there will be days that there are more trucks than four a week. But on average, that's the number. There will be some days and some weeks that there's very minimal traffic out there. They

will probably operate much like other agricultural areas do, but working with their road commissioner like they have on this first building, they think they can work through any issues that come up.

And, really, impact looks pretty minimal when you look at those numbers at the very bottom of less than 2/10ths of a percent from Route 47 and really less than 1% of the traffic on 800. And if you look at the daily traffic -- I didn't put 200 up there -- it is about half the traffic of 800. So really less than 2% of Road 200. So not a lot of impact there. We know that there's trucks there, but they live there, and they use the roads. It's important to them to address that, and working with their local road commissioner, they think they can address that. So mostly feed transportation. Animal transportation comes seasonally. Loading the building and unloading the building. And then feed is more on a weekly basis as those pigs grow.

This is their statement about working with the road commissioner. They've had a good

relationship, not only before this as this building -- new building got built, but before that also because they are grain farmers too. Like a lot of grain farmers, we use those township roads, and we need to respect them and make sure that they maintain because that's how we get our goods and services to market. It's important to us as farmers.

Criteria 8 is another long definition. I'm not going to beat the record on time on my presentation tonight.

But whether the construction of the new facility is consistent with existing community growth, tourism, recreation, economic development, or specific projects involving community growth or tourism or economic development that have been identified by local government or action or development within one year of compliance with the applicable zoning and setback requirements for populated areas as established by the LMFA.

Longwinded, but typically that area is zoned agriculture. We don't know that the county has denoted any other purpose for that or

zoned it differently or economic development has set forth any new planes. It is agriculture, and this farm fits nicely into that, and they can meet that criteria based on the Act. So the farm is consistent with any of that community development as it complies with zoning, and the farm will meet all the requirements of the Livestock Management Facilities Act.

This brings us to an end. Hopefully, we didn't go too fast through that, but this is a synopsis of what the farm is developing, providing to the Department for their review and approval.

Want to thank you for coming out tonight. We think agriculture and animal agriculture can be a big part of Ford County. There's a lot of benefits that go with it.

And from my standpoint -- and I don't say this lightly -- it's great to see an opportunity for young people to be able to come back to the farm and get involved in hog production. We know that land prices have gone. It's not an easy entry into agriculture these days, and my hats are off to them for stepping up

to the plate to participate. Apparently, their family has initiated that in them, and dad's here tonight and other relatives, but hopefully we can support them in this project and they can meet the requirements of the Act and really be an asset to not only that local area but this county as a whole.

So at that time I'd like to submit that to the Department for an exhibit, and I'll turn it back over to Mr. Frank.

HEARING OFFICER FRANK: Thank you very much.

Brad, you want to get the lights, please.

Do you have a printed copy?

MR. ANDERSON: Brad's got it on the computer.

HEARING OFFICER FRANK: Okay. All right.

MR. ANDERSON: I did not bring a hard copy. Sorry about that.

HEARING OFFICER FRANK: We will now open the meeting for any questions that you may have of the facility or the Department of

Agriculture.

If you have a question that you would like to ask, please raise your hand, and when called upon, please state your name and then spell your last name. Please indicate to whom you are addressing your question.

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

Are there any questions?

Yes, sir.

MR. BRUMLEVE: My name is Will Brumleve, B-r-u-m-l-e-v-e. My question is for Steidinger; is that right?

Okay. What's the address of the facility or the farm, I guess?

MR. COLIN STEIDINGER: 881 North 200 East Road.

HEARING OFFICER FRANK: Other questions?

Yes, sir.

MR. BERGER: Randy Berger, B-e-r-g-e-r, to the Steidingers.

I'm just curious. Are you going to, like, overlap? Have one group of hogs, say, you know, halfway to maturing and then start the next bunch, or are you going to run both facilities, like, you know, all the same? Bring all in --

MR. COLIN STEIDINGER: The facilities will be ran basically as one -- all in, all out, washed, sanitized, and then bring the next group in.

MR. BERGER: Okay.

HEARING OFFICER FRANK: Another question?

Yes, sir.

MR. VAN NESS: Yeah. My name is Phil Van Ness. I'm an attorney from Urbana. I'm actually --

COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry? I'm sorry?

HEARING OFFICER FRANK: Sir, could you repeat that please. Introduce yourself again and spell your last name.

MR. VAN NESS: Phillip Van Ness,

V-a-n N-e-s-s. And I'm representing Norman Ashley tonight who could not be here, unfortunately; so I'm here on his behalf.

I have a couple questions. I will direct them, I think, primarily to the Department, possibly also to Mr. Steidinger, either one.

First of all, I would like to request at some point that the engineering drawings be made available. Will those be available from the Department once they are submitted via FOIA or otherwise?

MR. GOETSCH: Yes.

MR. VAN NESS: Okay. Will those be routinely provided to the people who are signed on as attendees tonight, or should we request those plans through FOIA?

MR. GOETSCH: You need to request them through FOIA, and they will be available, yes.

MR. VAN NESS: All right. I'm going to ask the Steidingers now.

Is it your intention to continue to expand this way? You've built one unit. You're

about to -- propose to build another. Is it your intention to continue developing the farm this way?

MR. COLIN STEIDINGER: We don't have any plans at this point to expand the farm anymore.

MR. ANDERSON: If I could also, when you think about expansion and how farms sit, at some point manure application becomes costly. So a site of this size is going to fertilize the crops that they have there. It would make more sense, if they wanted to build more, is to go to a different location where there's more ground. So that's the general thinking of the industry.

MR. VAN NESS: As a general proposition, I would agree with you on that. Obviously, soil incorporation at agronomic rates factors into that, which brings me to my next question which I will, I guess, address to you.

The plan for waste storage once it's removed from the pit -- is it to be straight away taken out and land applicated? Is that the plan?

MR. CLINT STEIDINGER: Yes.

MR. VAN NESS: There's no storage

then involved post removal from the pit; is that correct?

MR. CLINT STEIDINGER: Yep.

MR. VAN NESS: And you indicated the waste storage capacity is going to be roughly one year capacity. And that is premised based on the current plan of 2,400 animals or something under a thousand animal units per barn. Is that also correct?

MR. ANDERSON: Typically, there's a calculation that hogs will produce so much volume if they each so much. So each barn will hold a year's storage. Each one of those barns will have similar capacity. So they can go for a whole season, typically. So eight feet by the dimensions that were on the site will hold that capacity for a year.

MR. VAN NESS: Okay. One last question.

You indicated this is going to be an all in/all out design, and I believe you answered one of the previous questions that you were planning on each of these buildings operating in tandem with the other so that it's going to be

all in/all out for both barns at the same time; is that correct?

MR. COLIN STEIDINGER: Correct.

MR. VAN NESS: Okay. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER FRANK: Question from someone else?

(No response.)

HEARING OFFICER FRANK: I see no more questions. That concludes the question-and-answer phase.

I will now accept written testimony. If you have written testimony that is not referred to in your oral testimony, I will accept it now and enter it into the record.

If you have written testimony that you will be referencing during your oral testimony, it can be entered into the record after your oral testimony.

Is there any written testimony to be offered at this time?

(No response.)

HEARING OFFICER FRANK: I see none.

I have the oral testimony sign-in sheet in front of me, and we have no names signed

up for the oral testimony. So this concludes the oral testimony phase.

Entered into the record as Exhibit No. 3 is the oral testimony sign-in sheet.

Also entered into the record as Exhibit No. 4 is the attendance sign-in sheet.

Are there any closing comments from the facility?

MR. COLIN STEIDINGER: Just like to thank everybody for coming out and showing your support and interest in our operation.

HEARING OFFICER FRANK: Thank you.

Are there closing comments from the Department?

MR. GOETSCH: I would just like to thank -- also thank everyone for coming this evening and wanted to assure you that the information that we received tonight will be reviewed carefully, along with all the other submittals, and we certainly look forward to the recommendation from the County Board. It will be very important to receive that as part of our overall evaluation of this proposal.

Again, thank you for coming and have

a safe trip home.

HEARING OFFICER FRANK: Thank you.

As I mentioned earlier, a copy of the transcript will be provided to the County Board. For others desiring a copy, you may contact the court reporter.

Thank you for your attendance here this evening. This public informational meeting is hereby closed.

(Meeting closed at 7:07 P.M.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) ss.
COUNTY OF SANGAMON)

I, ROBIN A. ENSTROM, a Registered Professional Reporter and Certified Shorthand Reporter within and for the State of Illinois, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings were taken by me to the best of my ability and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and further that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties thereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

_____

ROBIN A. ENSTROM

Illinois CSR No. 084-002046