Planned Unit Development (P.U.D.) Review Committee Meeting
Meeting Minutes
October 14, 2026, 2:00 PM
460 S. Illinois St., Coal City, IL

Call to order and roll call
Vice Chair Terry Halliday called the meeting to order in the absence of the regular chair, Ed Boik. Roll call was taken, and a quorum was established.

Present: Bob Koerner (Claypool Drainage District, Chairman), Chris Spencer (Coal City School District Superintendent); Darrell Olson (Village of Coal City Director of Public Works); Walt Mahaffay (Village of Coal City Planning and Zoning Board); Matt Fritz (Village of Coal City Administrator); Mike Imhof (Coal City Chief of Police); Kyle Watson (Coal City Building Official); Gary Grunauer (Resident); Terry Halliday (Resident); Ryan Hansen (Chamlin & Associates, Village Engineer); Alec Macdonald (Grundy County Economic Development Director); Bill Stahler (Maine Township Drainage District); Nick Doerfler (Coal City Fire District). Mark Heinle was not present at roll call but arrived and participated in the meeting by 2:15 PM.

Absent: Ed Boik and Doug Boresi.

Approval of the Minutes
September 1, 2026 Meeting

There were no comments or corrections.

> *Motion to approve the September 1, 2026 meeting minutes was made by Member Chris Spencer and seconded by Chief Imhof. The motion carried by roll call vote, 13-0.*

September 9, 2026 Meeting

Vice Chair Halliday asked that the spelling of his last name be corrected on the last page, where the motion was recorded as seconded by him. Staff agreed to make the correction. There were no other comments.

> *Motion to approve the September 9, 2026 meeting minutes with the correction to the spelling of Vice Chair Halliday's name was made by Walt Mahaffay and seconded by Chief Imhof. The motion carried by roll call vote, 12-0, with Member Alec Macdonald abstaining because he was absent from the September 9th meeting.*

General/Admin. Business: Submittal of 9/18/26 Meeting Summary
Matt Fritz explained that the summary documents the September 18 subcommittee meeting between the applicant and staff. The meeting was held to help the petitioner work through the more than 200 review questions. He said it was helpful and that several changes in today's presentation came out of it, along with some developments since then. The summary was submitted for the record so that all committee members and the public have it. No vote was required.

Applicant presentation: Changes to Building Layout/Design
The applicant's representatives said they had addressed most of the review comments with a revised design. They reported that:

- The applicant is under contract on the two remaining adjacent residential properties and has incorporated them into the site plan.
- The revised layout gave more flexibility for building orientation and stormwater management.
- No mechanical or electrical yards now face public rights-of-way, because the buildings were separated and the chiller equipment was moved to the rooftops.
- Remaining generator yards will be screened by buildings or short screen walls along Carbon Hill and Reed Road.
- Proposed PUD bulk standards. The applicant presented a PUD zoning table built from the Village's I-1 light industrial standards, with these changes:
    - Building height: A flat 40 feet across most of the property. A southeast area is reserved for a possible two-story data haul building of up to about 75 feet. The applicant stated its intent is single-story throughout but wishes to retain flexibility for different clients.
    - Typical building height: Typical single-story buildings are about 36.6 feet to the top of the parapet. Rooftop thermal energy storage (TES) tanks will be hidden behind a louvered screen wall set back from the parapet, adding roughly 10 to 13 feet.
    - Floor area ratio: Reduced from 3 to 1.
    - Open space: Held at 20 percent.
    - Lot width and area: Unchanged from I-1.
    - Reed Road front setback: Over 300 feet, with the cross-section showing about 360 feet to the building.
    - Carbon Hill corner side yard: Increased from the required 40 to 200 feet, with about 220 feet actual.
    - East side yard: Increased from the code's required 10 to 125 feet.
    - South rear yard: Increased upwards from the required15 to 500 feet.
    - Parking: The only remaining bulk deviation, for Lots 1 and 2. The applicant stated it will construct enough stalls for every employee on site at once, although operations run in shifts.

Fritz asked the applicant to calculate and document the additional uncovered and permeable area resulting from the reduced parking. The applicant agreed.

Landscaping and berm. The 6-foot berm will remain, with added trees and shrubs to provide continuous screening along public roadways and additional trees adjacent to buildings. Trees will be at least 2.5-inch caliper and 8 feet tall at planting. Mass grading, including berm construction and landscaping, will occur first, allowing time for growth during phased building.

In terms of stormwater, the applicant stated the design continues to meet the Will County stormwater ordinance. Detention basins will be dry-bottom and about 7 feet deep with roughly a foot of freeboard. Retaining walls are currently planned, and the applicant is working toward sloped sides. A North Ditch relocation hydrology study and off-site improvement plans were submitted to the Village and drainage district the previous week and are under review.

The Architectural. Renderings showed a charcoal "coal-colored" rain screen and setbacks inspired by downtown Coal City, with articulation along Reed Road. They also showed gradient

gray panels that distinguish the data hall modules and building numbers for emergency wayfinding. Roof access will be provided by an exterior stair tower.

Technical updates. The applicant reported:

- Environmental: The environmental constraints report was refreshed using IPaC data, and the previously listed orchid was removed.
- Traffic: The traffic impact analysis received only administrative edits. The applicant now proposes a temporary signal at Broadway and Reed Road during construction instead of flipping stop signs.
- Sound: A sound study is being updated for the new layout. The applicant withdrew its variance request for emergency-use and generator testing sound and committed to on-site sound monitoring.
- Water: The utility use memo was clarified to distinguish average day demand from peak demand, which is used for sizing fire protection. All water use is conservatively treated as wastewater. A fill-and-flush procedure was described at about 100,000 gallons per closed-loop system across 33 systems over the 5.5-year build-out. The applicant said it is flexible on trucking in water or purchasing it from Coal City, and the updated procedure will be provided after the meeting.

Application Review discussion: Response to Review Comments
Vice Chair Halliday suggested that, rather than going through all 258 review comments, members raise the items they wished to pursue.

Phasing (Comment 75). In response to Vice Chair Halliday, the applicant said construction phasing was reversed to run south to north. Operations will use the Carbon Hill entrance while construction traffic uses Reed Road, so the two types of traffic do not cross. An updated phasing and logistics sequence will be provided.

Floodplain (Comment 80). The applicant explained that an isolated floodplain on Lot 2 will be filled with compensatory depressional storage provided on site, about 1.5 acre-feet within the stormwater basin. Upsizing the culverts under Reed Road and Carbon Hill is expected to lower the North Ditch base flood elevation by several feet and remove the isolated floodplain from the mapping. The process requires review by Coal City's civil engineer, the Illinois DNR, and FEMA.

Flush chemical odor and sampling (Comment 132). Kyle Watson asked whether the PCT 6009 flush solution would produce odors in the sanitary system, given the zoning code's odor performance standard. The applicant said it could not document the odor, that pH balancing could occur before discharge, and that it could truck the waste off site if problems arose. Ryan Hansen asked for a sanitary sewer waste stream sampling plan so the treatment plant can anticipate issues. The applicant agreed and said such documentation would accompany any permit request. Mr. Hansen asked that the requirement be recorded for the PUD, and it was agreed that a "bolt-on" sampling document would be provided and included in the PUD.

Fire and emergency access. In response to a fire safety question from Nick Doerfler, the applicant confirmed an exterior stair tower will provide roof access for each building footprint. The updated fire truck turning radii and hydrant locations will be shown on individual civil engineering sets for each building, which will be submitted separately.

Temporary power generation (Comments 77 and 109). The applicant clarified that it is retaining a permitted use for temporary on-site natural gas generation. It would be limited to a maximum of 12 months, used only if ComEd energization is delayed, and held to all PUD performance

standards. No plans are currently prepared. The applicant said it will do everything possible to avoid it, has not used such a solution at other sites, and no additional variances would be needed.

Landscaping. In response to a member's question, the applicant said IDOT seed mixes and soil preparation specifications would be used, native stormwater seed mixes would be planted in the basins, and installers would provide a one- or two-year watering and survival period. Ongoing landscape maintenance contracts will be held.

Site grading ahead of approval. Mark Heinle asked about possible early site grading to keep pace with ComEd's build-out. The applicant said it was in discussions with the seller about seller-performed work, which would be separate from the PUD approval. The member recommended the applicant and Village prepare public messaging if such work begins, so the community does not assume the process has concluded. The applicant agreed and said it had planned to prepare materials.

Public comment
Fritz noted that a letter from Donna Petty had been included in the members' packets and would become part of the record (Attachment A). Donald Vilt was the only person who signed up to speak and speakers were reminded of rules surrounding public comment.

Mr. Vilt expressed opposition to the proposed data center, saying he spoke on behalf of area residents. He questioned why a home value analysis cited by the applicant was conducted in the northern suburbs rather than locally. He also raised concerns about noise, pollution, possible health effects reported in other states, and the adequacy of the local water supply and aquifer. He said a neighbor was selling her home because of the project. He also questioned how a member who also serves on the Village Board could give an impartial opinion, and stated his belief that the Village Board had already decided.

Vice Chair Halliday reminded Mr. Vilt that the committee has no voting authority over the application. The committee only offers comments and recommended changes, and the application proceeds to the Planning and Zoning Board and the Village Board regardless. No other members of the public wished to speak.

Committee action, if any (motions, votes, direction to consultants)
No formal action was taken.

Process overview. Mark Heinle outlined the committee's remaining work. The committee is charged by the Village Code with delivering a report to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA), the advisory body to the Village Board. The report will identify deficiencies that would cause the plan to fall short of PUD approval criteria and may recommend changes to overcome them. The ZBA is not bound by it, and the applicant may revise its submittal or proceed as filed. After at least one more round of discussion once all materials are received, Chair Boik will prepare a draft report for the committee to revise. A majority vote will adopt it. Dissenting members may submit written dissents. The vote will be on the report only and will not authorize permits or approvals. Mr. Heinle offered his view that the applicant's changes show the process is working, but that the outstanding data on sound and impacts remains to be seen. He declined to estimate a timeline.

Remaining submittals. Fritz asked what materials were still expected. The applicant listed an updated sound study for the new configuration, an updated economic and tax benefits report (reflecting an expected increase in project cost), and the full PUD narrative incorporating the bulk zoning table. The updated fill-and-flush procedure and the sanitary sampling document are also expected. The applicant's target for delivering documents was October 16.

Members, including Vice Chair Halliday and Bill Stahler, stated that at least one week is needed between the posting of documents and the next meeting to allow adequate review. Mr. Stahler noted that he relies on the committee's engineer for technical guidance.

Tentative scheduling for the next meeting

Based on members' preference for a week of review time, Matt suggested October 27 in place of the previously considered October 20. Vice Chair Halliday called for a motion, and the meeting time was confirmed as 2:00 p.m. Ryan Hansen and Mike Imhof noted they would be out of town and would submit comments in advance.

Motion to set the next meeting for Tuesday, October 27, 2026 at 2:00 p.m. was made by Member Ryan Hansen and seconded by Nick Doerfler. The motion carried by roll call vote, 14-0.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn was made by Hansen and seconded by Doerfler. The motion carried by voice vote with no opposition, and the meeting was adjourned.

Matt Fritz, Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENT A

From: Donna Petty <donna09@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 13, 2026 3:01 PM
To: Kayla Melvin <kmelvin@coalcity-il.gov>; edward.boik@hrgreen.com; Matt Fritz <mfritz@coalcity-il.gov>
Subject: Public Comment for PUD Meeting

Please submit my letter for Public Comment for the Oct. 14, 2026 PUD Committee Meeting to all PUD Committee Members. Thank You!

October 14, 2026

Coal City PUD Committee

Dear Committee Members,

I am writing to formally state my strong opposition to the proposed Aligned Data Centers development and to object to the procedural, engineering, and fiscal deficiencies currently surrounding this project.

Public participation is fundamental to responsible local planning, yet the current Planned Unit Development (PUD) review process creates barriers that exclude the community:

Holding public hearings at 2:00 PM on weekdays blocks working residents, parents, and community members from voicing critical perspectives on decisions that directly impact them.

Sporadic scheduling paired with short-notice postings—requiring residents to manually check the Village website every 48 hours fails to provide meaningful public notice.

The lag in approving and publishing meeting minutes (with only August 18, 2026 currently available) undermines public oversight, transparency, and trust in these proceedings.

In addition, I have questions regarding the Agenda item: Submittal of Meeting Summary 9/18/2026. Was a meeting regarding Aligned Data Center held without public knowledge?

Secondly, a direct comparison between Aligned's initial Utility documentation and the updated Combined Site Plan reveals an alarming expansion in the project.

The initial engineering utility memo evaluated a layout totaling 3,223,500 square feet.

The updated site plan balloons that footprint to 3,792,900 square feet—an un-modeled increase of 569,400 square feet of industrial build-out.

This massive expansion has not been properly evaluated for municipal water supply security, structural safety or adequate water pressure in case of fire.

Third, Aligned's Utility documents fundamentally misrepresent true water consumption across the 11 proposed buildings:

The submittal completely omits the massive volume of water required to initially flood, pressurize, and safety-test industrial pipelines, and heat-rejection infrastructure.

Aligned's claims of minimal water use are entirely disproven by real-world precedent. For example, their SLC 04 facility in Utah consumed 80 million gallons of water in a single year—on a site that is only a fraction of the proposed Coal City development.

Despite foundational efficiencies and errors being formally exposed during the review process, Aligned Data Centers has failed to provide a formal addendum, corrected data sets, or a properly retitled Magnum Economic & Fiscal Report. Attempting to rush through PUD approvals while leaving these glaring discrepancies uncorrected violates basic standards of accountability.

A project that relies on exclusionary meeting schedules, unverified square-footage expansions, omitted water infrastructure demands, and uncorrected fiscal data cannot be approved. I urge the committee to halt this process and reject the proposal in its current form.

Sincerely,

Donna Petty