

APC MINUTES

July 15, 2026

Members present: John Reece, Tom Kerns, Don Calhoun, Coy Applegate, Jim Hufford, Abby Journay, Amy Alka, Terry Alfrey, Todd Holaday

Members absent: Will Greer, Steve Hernly, Adrian Moulton, Jason Brewer

Legal Representation: Jason Welch

Staff present: Debra Johnting, Area Planning Director and Kristi Halloran, Recording Secretary

Others present: Roxanna Lewis, Brad Dilger, Troy Prescott, Dan Freer, Barbara Keesling, Deb Smiley, Scott and Rachel Mull, Kaela and Chester Ragon, Shawndra Pailey, Gary Price, Marion Dailey, Neda Lester, Missy Williams, Clyde Shaffer, Jason Allen, Jim Martin, Blake Clevenger, Scott Schwieterman, Andy Fahl, Jon Peacock

President Calhoun: The clock says its 7:00 o'clock so we will go ahead with the Area Planning Meeting. First on the agenda is the minutes from the June 17th meeting. All members have a copy of the minutes? Had a chance to read them?

J. Hufford: I make a motion that we accept the minutes as presented.

Vice President Applegate: I'll second.

President Calhoun: It's been moved and seconded we accept the minutes from the June 17th meeting. All those in favor say aye.

All: Aye.

President Calhoun: Okay. Tonight, petitioners will have 15 minutes to present their petition. During this time there will be no interruptions or questions. After the presentation the board may ask questions. Anyone wanting to speak for or against will have three minutes each and then the petitioner will have an additional five minutes to respond to their comments. Section 7, subsection 6 states the maximum time period for any meeting shall be 90 minutes. Therefore in the event that the meeting has been convened for 90 minutes and all business has not been completed, all unfinished business shall be continued to the next regular meeting of the Area Planning Commission subject to the following: upon the expiration of the 90-minute time limit, upon affirmative vote of a majority of the members present at the meeting, the board may suspend the rules and extend the meeting beyond the 90-minute time limit. First on the agenda is APC2026-15-Z, Chester and Kaela Ragon. If you want to come up and state your name and your address. You're requesting to rezone from R-1 to C-2 commercial. So go ahead and tell us what you want to do.

C. Ragon: My name is Chester Ragon. The address of the business is 535 North East (Rear lot) in Winchester. Good evening and thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak today. My name is Chester Ragon and I'm here to request approval to rezone our property to commercial so we can continue to operate Family First Auto, a small auto repair shop. This isn't a request to go to a large industrial facility or bring in a business that will disrupt the neighborhood. Our goal is to operate a clean professional auto repair shop to serve our local communities while respecting the surrounding properties. The prior one owner had operated a car repair shop about 30 years in this building. Our town has a need for reliable, honest, and affordable auto repair. Many people currently have to travel out of town for certain repairs or wait days or weeks to get into a shop. Family First Auto will give local residents another trusted option close to home. This business is about more than repairing vehicles. It's about investing in our community. We want to keep the money local, create jobs, and provide a service that every family depends on. Reliable transportation is essential for people to get to work, school, doctor appointments, and take care of their families. I'd like to address the concerns that may come with the auto repair shop. First is appearance. We're committed to maintaining a clean and professional property and keep the grounds well maintained, properly store parts and fluids, and make sure the business reflects productivity in the area. This will not become a junkyard or place with abandoned vehicles. We do have plans to make necessary repairs and updates to the current building. Second is noise. Most of our work takes place inside the building. We operate during normal business hours—not late at night or early in the morning. We want to be respectful to the neighbors. Third is traffic. An auto repair shop generally creates customer visits rather than constant traffic. Customers drop off the vehicles and many return later to pick them up. We do not expect traffic levels that will negatively impact nearby roads. Four is environmental responsibility. We will properly dispose of used oil, antifreeze, batteries, and all other automotive waste through licensed recycling disposal companies. We understand these responsibilities and will comply with all state and local environmental regulations. Family First Auto is built on honesty, integrity, and treating customers fairly. Our reputation will be our greatest asset. We understand that maintaining a positive relationship with our neighbors is just as important as serving our customers. Approving this rezoning would allow this property to have positive impact instead of becoming underutilized. We can continue to be a small business that contributes to the local economy through taxes, purchases from local suppliers, and employment opportunities. We understand that rezoning decisions should not be made lightly. We appreciate the responsibility you have to balance private property rights with interest to the community. We respectfully ask you to consider the positive impact this business will have. We are committed to being good neighbors, maintaining professional property, following all the correct regulations, and providing an important service to people in this community. Thank you for your time, your consideration, and your service to our town. I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have.

President Calhoun: Okay. You made it through. That's the main thing. Does any of the board members have any questions?

T. Kerns: This type of business has been run out of that building for quite a few years?

C. Ragon: Yes.

President Calhoun: I see on the map you've got two different places where there could be parking?

C. Ragon: Yes.

President Calhoun: How many cars do you, would you have at one time?

C. Ragon: I try to have like maybe three or four a day. I usually keep them all in the shop until people come pick them up. They don't set out overnight or anything.

President Calhoun: Anybody else on the board have any questions? Is there anybody out in the audience that has a comment for or against?

J. Allen: My name is Jason Allen. I own Champion Drains here in town and also just have a lot of vehicles that we take care. Chester and his family have been able to service some of our service vehicles that we have at our company as well as personal vehicles that we've been able to go to at that business. So as far as you know him taking care of stuff, making sure stuff gets turned in in a timely manner. There's quick turn around on their response time on getting that stuff done. So there's not like, the trucks aren't sitting outside for a long period of time. My opinion is if we're trying to get a business to grow here in the community and continue to have people succeed in this community and they're going to continue to buy products from this area and stuff that's going to support all the other local businesses as well then it's a good thing because he surely helps support my business when we have service breakdowns on our trucks. So I'm all in favor for this since the fact that the building has already serviced as a facility for the past 30 years just not properly zoned correctly from the previous guy who owned it. So I say it's a good thing to have.

President Calhoun: Thank you. Is there anybody else that would like to talk forward or against?

J. Martin: Hello my name is Jim Martin, Martin's Lawn Mower Repair. I stood before you back in 2012. I'm in the same neighborhood that Chester and his wife were at. I lived in that neighborhood and knew about the auto repair shop that was there. I'm excited for Chester and Keala to be there and clean it up and that whole neighborhood will really benefit from their ownership and the business they will be running out of it. Thank you.

President Calhoun: Thank you. Anybody else? I'd entertain a motion for favorable recommendation.

Vice President Applegate: So moved.

President Calhoun: It's been moved, is there a second for a roll call?

T. Alfrey: Second.

K. Halloran: Okay. Tom Kerns, yes. Jim Hufford, yes. Jason Brewer is absent. Coy Applegate, yes. Terry Alfrey, yes. Amy Alka, yes. Adrian Moulton is absent. Will Greer is absent. Steve Hernly is absent. John Reece, yes. Abby Jounay, yes. Todd Holaday, yes. And Don Calhoun, yes.

President Calhoun: Now that would be a favorable recommendation so now it will go to Winchester City Council and they will have the final say. Their meeting will be when?

K. Halloran: Their meeting is Monday, July 20th. City Council is at 6 pm and they already have all of your paperwork or will have.

C. Ragon: Thank you.

President Calhoun: Thank you. Okay next on the agenda is APC2026-18-Z, Scott Schwieterman. If you'd like to come up and say what you're wanting to do.

S. Schwieterman: Hello my name is Scott Schwieterman. I live at 4265 West State Road 28 in Ridgeville, Indiana. Part of my property is zoned commercial. One of the previous owners used to have a car lot there back in the 90s. My wife and I are planning on building a home and we wanted to have it rezoned to agricultural limited just to match the rest of the property. I do farm and I will be farming the property as well. Short and sweet. That's all I have.

President Calhoun: Okay. Any of the board members have any questions? Anybody in the audience like to talk for or against? Okay, seeing none I'd entertain a motion for a favorable recommendation.

J. Hufford: I'll second.

President Calhoun: Have a roll call vote.

K. Halloran: Jim Hufford, yes. Jason Brewer is absent. Coy Applegate, yes. Terry Alfrey, yes. Amy Alka, yes. Adrian Moulton is absent. Will Greer is absent. Steve Hernly is absent. John Reece, yes. Abby Jounay, yes. Todd Holaday, yes. Don Calhoun, yes. And Tom Kerns, yes.

President Calhoun: That will be a favorable recommendation and that will go in front of the county commissioners at their next meeting.

K. Halloran: Yes, Monday, July 20th at 9:00 am. And they'll have all your papers as well.

S. Schwieterman: Thank you very much.

President Calhoun: Thank you. Next on the agenda is the amendments to Article XIX Commercial Solar Energy System Siting regulations presented by the solar committee. There's four different ones that we'll look at. The first one is the notifications and the hearings. Basically we've got on that one we're changing to 60 days which it was 45 days, right?

D. Johnting: Yes.

President Calhoun: And then the second section would be the method and way the people are notified. We're adding "the applicant shall provide written notice of time, date, and location of the public hearing by certified mail or other trackable mailing method to all property owners within 1,000 feet of proposed commercial solar site at least 30 days prior to the hearing." Those are the two we need to vote on?

D. Johnting: There's one more "45 days".

President Calhoun: Okay. The third part of it would be "The Randolph County Board of Commissioners shall provide the Director of Area Planning Commission with written notice of a decision within 45 days of the public hearing or within the next two commissioner's meetings." Do any of the board members have any discussion on this? Is there anybody in the audience that would like to comment for or against this? Seeing none I'd entertain a motion to have a vote for a favorable recommendation to these three changes.

Vice President Applegate: So moved.

J. Hufford: I'll second it.

President Calhoun: Okay, roll call vote.

K. Halloran: Coy Applegate, yes, Terry Alfrey, yes. Amy Alka, yes. Adrian Moulton is absent. Will is absent. Steve is absent. John Reece, yes. Abby Journay, yes. Todd Holaday, yes. Don Calhoun, yes. Tom Kerns, abstain. And Jim Hufford, yes.

President Calhoun: So that will be a favorable recommendation. So that will go to the commissioners on the 20th also?

D. Johnting: Yes.

President Calhoun: The next part of the amendments is limits on solar in the county. What the subcommittee decided on was "Commercial Solar Energy Systems in Randolph County shall not exceed 15,000 assessed acres within the fence. Assessed acres of commercial solar energy will

be provided by the Randolph County Assessor's Office per written request. A variance request to exceed 15,000 assessed acres may be brought before the Board of Zoning Appeals." And then the Section 2 on that "Assessed Acres of Commercial Solar: Assessed acres of the total commercial solar energy systems in Randolph County shall be calculated as any part of a solar project located within the fence. This will be provided by the Randolph County Assessor's Office per written request." That would be the two that we are voting on, right? Any one on the board members have any comments?

A. Journey: I have a question. How many acres are currently behind the fence that are in panels?

President Calhoun: Do you remember that?

D. Johning: I didn't bring my folder.

President Calhoun: I didn't bring my folder either. You want to come up Dan?

D. Freer: Oh yes I happen to have the paper with me.

President Calhoun: Okay, so it would be the 2,195.

D. Freer: I believe that's right.

President Calhoun: So there's 2,195 acres within the fence as of now. Any other questions from the board? Seeing none.

T. Kerns: I don't have a question I'd like to make a statement. I've been a little vocal about I'm not a big one in favor of percentages or caps. And I don't think we'll ever reach 15,000 acres in Randolph County but I can say that and who knows what happens in the future. But I just questioned the legality of treating acre 15,000 and 15,001 different and I think we all got paperwork from the county attorney and from our legal counsel here that says there was a lot of questions involved with that. That's the only thing I wanted to point out. You know just because somebody filed earlier than somebody else they get treated different. That was the only question that I want to bring that up. I think everybody got paperwork on that.

President Calhoun: Yes.

T. Kerns: All right.

A. Journey: I've got a question. How is 15,000 determined by the committee? I'm not a big one for caps myself. I guess I was just wondering why 15,000. Why that number?

President Calhoun: That is basically the amount of acres that if the electrical lines, the main lines will handle. Am I right on that?

D. Freer: I don't think we're wired to handle that currently.

J. Welch: Don I also want to go on record that I did do significant research on this and it looks to me like there may be some significant constitutional risks to setting an arbitrary cap at a percentage or an amount of acreage based on several constitutional provisions without going into all that now. I think there may be some risks. It's not well settled now. No one knows exactly what a court would do with it. I think there probably are some significant risks to setting an arbitrary cap. Any zoning has to have a rational relationship to a legitimate governing interest. So basically that means that people should be able to use their property how they would like unless there's a government interest in limiting that for some reason like erosion, soil control, nuisance, unsightly to the neighbors, it affects the use of someone else's property. So setting an arbitrary number might treat two exactly identical pieces of property differently just because of when they file to have their solar farm. So I think there may be with a per say cap unless there is a rational basis for it, I think there's a chance it may not hold up.

President Calhoun: I know in our Unified Ordinance for the county it talks about prime farmland. Would that be considered something that would be?

J. Welch: Well the system that we have now is set up that each specific site has to be approved by the commissioners at a public hearing. So that has a rational basis. Then the commissioners are considering a specific site and determining whether or not that's prime farm ground...I don't think we should put that there or if there's a reason that they don't want to put it there, that's particular site. If we're saying it's a cap then we're not saying which acres are appropriate for it. There's 15,000 acres of parking lots and the next ones a parking lot. There's no rational basis to set an arbitrary cap number. I think the system that you have now that points to a specific property is probably going to be more well taken but like I said I don't know if that will hold it or not. I can't say 100% either way but I think there may be some concerns with it.

President Calhoun: Anybody else from the audience like to speak for or against this? Troy.

T. Prescott: Troy Prescott, 4131 N 100 E. I just don't understand why some of these guys feel like there's a need for a cap. It's up to each individual landowner if they want to participate or whatever they don't. It's like you say with the power lines. The capacity will cap itself out on its own with financial reasons or whatever. If there is future power lines coming through people that could have a project five to ten years down the road don't even know it yet. And so they're not here to speak tonight for themselves to say hey I want that opportunity if it was presented to me. I've always been about being fair to the landowner. Also being fair to the homeowner. I've talked about EDP and I've talked to some of the homeowners up our way. If they end up after this all shakes out with the screening and things, it frees up money for them maybe they pay lump sum payments instead of slow good neighbor agreements over a period of 30 years that they pay a big chunk up front. I threw out a number, I'm not going to throw it out now, but I've talked to EDP

about it. I've talked to some of those homeowners and they're all saying like hey that's a great deal for me. I'm glad it's going to be next door to me. They don't make noise. They don't smell. I just can't understand how a few guys think they're high up authority enough that they can say this is enough for our county. To me it's up to each individual landowner. Let me make that financial decision for myself. I know Tom talked to a guy at the last meeting that talked about how he could really use this money to cover his medical expenses at his age and in the future going to the nursing home. You know why these guys think they have the authority to take that right away from them I don't understand it. They keep referring to trying to protect our farm ground. Our farm ground is titled in me and my wife's name. So is the mortgage and so is the property taxes. It's nobody else's it's ours to make that decision. But like I say I truly want to be good to my neighbors that's one reason we signed with EDP. They do good neighbor agreements. Not every company does that so we felt like we were trying to be good to our neighbors and let them participate also to start with. We could have got more money per acre with some other companies offers that we had and didn't have any experience with the EDP had already worked with friends of ours in the southern part of the county. I realize this ordinance is a solar ordinance that affects every company not just EDP. It's in any company that built renewable projects. Another question I did have. You haven't gotten to the screening yet but if you go to 500 and 700 feet setbacks, do they still have to plant screening? To me there's no reason I mean that ground would be far enough if you're at 500 to 700 feet. Now where the fences are 40 feet and they plant trees that doesn't hurt anything. Some of these screening requirements and stuff I think the committee didn't talk. This committee's sole purpose was worried about getting a cap put in place. That's all it was. The group that was on the last committee was three farmers that were totally against wind and solar. This one was loaded up again with people that were totally opposed to it. Not open just trying to progress and take it forward to be helpful to the homeowners, landowners, the county, and working with the developers. So anyway I'd either like to see another committee or something different but I thought this was kind of a sham deal. Thank you.

D. Freer: Dan Freer, 6831 South 1200 West, Losantville. In my opinion the way this particular section is written it's not really a cap currently. All it's doing at that point is providing an extra layer of public discord because many counties currently already require special exceptions for approval projects. At the 5% level of the county, which is a fairly significant amount of development and that would really even include a large number of acres and what was just suggested because of the ancillary effects of the projects. It just adds another layer for those who are opposed to the project. And we feel that that is acceptable from the standpoint of the Comprehensive Plan suggests protecting farmland for agricultural use and also there's another section in the Comprehensive Plan that suggests that homeowners moving in to the area should know what that property is going to be used for or the most common use which in the past has

always been farm ground. And not knowing what projects maybe you know coming down the line. Those are the couple of things that I think are important. We're not trying, the way this is written it doesn't even limit the number of acres that can be developed in the county. It just requires a zoning change at 15,000 acres. Thank you.

President Calhoun: Thank you. Anybody else like to talk for or against?

B. Dilger: Brad Dilger, EDP Renewables. A couple of the items have already been addressed. I was curious how the 15,000 acres came up like how was that number calculated. Sounds like it was more of just a recommendation on what a number might be. And regarding process like it was also touched on earlier regarding timing of projects. Like if a project was under construction and that property that fenced property had not been assessed yet will then affect another project that could be going through the system and because of the way Randolph County permits these projects there are several steps or stage case that a project has to go through. One of them is the initial public hearing and then the county agreements that have to be negotiated and then on to the permit that eventually have to be obtained to build the project. So there are many steps to go through and a project could get stuck in that system with the County Assessor's number and where things lie. I see that as problematic. As far as a variance being allowed like as I understand it and Jason you can probably correct me if it's incorrect but if the variance is required that states that it is not allowed at this time. You have to go and get let's say a variance to you know have a garage, a mechanics business you know in the in the back of the parcel because it's not a permitted use it's not allowed. So to say that yes a project could come in and get a variance. Yes it's possible but if the county is still wanting to attract future business of renewables generally seeing that as a step that has to be obtained if the 15,000 acre cap is met it's just not really showing an openness to future development. So it's just. I guess it's what does the county want. And what does the committee want? What do the people want? Some land owners do want to participate. Troy just sort of voiced his opinion on you know his participation what he sees the value. There was the landowner that you know that Tom was able to talk to you last time. There is a lot of value for certain land owners. I understand that the change in what people are used to but this is a permitted use at the moment. And yes it could be used for agricultural use it could be used for other uses as well. So I just ask you to keep that in mind as you decide how to proceed with this amendment. Thank you.

President Calhoun: Thank you anybody else that went to talk for or against? Board members have any other questions?

T. Kerns: Since it was brought up a couple of times about the landowner to talk to me I will mention that a smaller landowner in the county came and talked to me. They're seniors now and he said they plan on their land going on to their children in the future. He said where they're

at financially they're fine but if something would happen to them for long term care to take care of their you know themselves they would potentially have to sell land to pay their medical bills. Where if they participated in the solar project that would make a difference in the money where they would not have to sell their family farm. So that's kind of the other side of the story but that's what was said since it was brought up, I wanted to share that.

J. Peacock: Jon Peacock, 3761 E Greenville Pike, Winchester. I want you to know a couple of things. I don't hate solar. I don't like how some of these things have been, how things have been handled in our county in the past dealing with notification and things that have been corrected to a large extent. The idea of limits is not something that we initiated. There's lots of counties in our state that have some level of limits in place. They have not been challenged yet but there are lots of counties with limits. The idea isn't to limit certain people from projects at all. It's to me looking long term how much do we want in our county. Are we Okay if a huge new line comes through our county that could have room on that line for wherever it goes for lots more projects and I'm sure there's people in the room that could tell me how many projects could be added on that new line without even considering what we already have taking power out of our area. To think that we shouldn't think about how much maximum or how much would we like to have before there's more levels of discussion? We aren't trying to put a moratorium on today as much as a few people or some people would like. It's continued growth that our county needs the money for with long term a plan for how much of this we want to have in our neighborhoods and taking prime agricultural ground. So the thought process is not to limit, it's to allow for a moderate expansion and then just have more layers of discussion. Where if I'm a county official at that time and if I can't sell the BZA on the idea that this is best for our county despite a moderate level of protest then I'm not sure we should be doing it anyway it's just another level of discussion and projects could continue. With the big line that's being proposed I had another farmer tell me today they got a letter. The big line is being considered coming through our area. We need to think about how many projects could be on that line. What we're proposing with 15,000 and I thought it was permitted acres that we were talking about not within the fences but that limit was more than double what is currently approved without any additional standards other than possibly the green and maybe some setbacks depending on how you guys propose it to the commissioners, then how they would vote. We tried to put this as a moderate growth yet having some level of what's this top end of this because otherwise this could be a very different looking county in a few years. Thank you.

President Calhoun: Anybody else?

C. Shaffer: Clyde Shaffer, 7963 N Delaware County Line Road. I was on the subcommittee. We got this letter from the County Attorney from Meeks. He had talked with Jason and in it it very clearly says caps/restrictions are most likely unconstitutional. Period. For the issue you got to

vote on or make a decision on the one we're doing right now. Once they tell you it's unconstitutional I'm not sure why you'd want to push the county into doing something that's just going to result in a lawsuit. It's just not good business for us so anyway. That's all I want to do just make sure and Jason referred to it and stuff but you know both attorneys have said it's not going to pass the constitutional muster. That's my two cents, thank you.

President Calhoun: Thank you Clyde. Anybody else? Seeing none I would consider the recommendation for a favorable vote. With the roll call vote. I think I can do that if we don't.

J. Welch: You have to have a second.

President Calhoun: Okay, I need a second.

T. Alfrey: Second.

President Calhoun: It's been moved and seconded roll call vote for a favorable recommendation.

K. Halloran: Terry Alfrey, yes. Amy Alka, yes. John Reece, yes. Abby Journay, no. Todd Holaday, no. Don Calhoun, yes. Tom Kerns, abstain. Jim Hufford, no. Jason is absent. Coy Applegate, yes.

J. Welch: It's not enough for a favorable. So you have to next vote on an unfavorable and if that doesn't get at least seven then it would just go with no recommendation from the board.

President Calhoun: Ok so now we'll vote for an unfavorable recommendation from the board.

J. Hufford: Second.

J. Welch: Yes means no.

K. Halloran: Amy Alka.

A. Alka: Okay.

D. Johnting: Yes mean no.

J. Welch: A vote yes means unfavorable. So a vote yes would be against because this is for an unfavorable recommendation.

A. Alka: I've been "fairing" all week. I'm still not tracking you. Because let me think about this for a second and you go and you come back.

K. Halloran: John Reece.

J. Reece: I'm still thinking myself.

J. Welch: We voted to have a favorable recommendation to the county.

A. Alka: How is this going to be different than before?

J. Welch: You have to get at least seven. So well it's an affirmative unfavorable. So favorable, yes we do want it. Unfavorable, no we do not want it. If neither one of those pass then it goes with no recommendation from the board. And that really only matters if the county does nothing. So it just basically telling the county you know what the board thinks about it. The favorable has to have at least seven to pass. The unfavorable would have to have at least seven to pass. If neither one of those passes then it's going to go with no recommendation to the county.

A. Alka: I'm just starting to get this all straight in my head.

K. Halloran: Abby Journey, yes to an unfavorable recommendation. Todd Holaday, yes. Don Calhoun, no. Tom Kerns, abstain. Jim Hufford, yes. Coy Applegate, no. Terry Alfrey, no. Amy Alka, no. John Reece, no. So you have three yeses.

J. Welch: Since neither passed it's going to go with no recommendation to the county. So the county will still consider it and there will not be a recommendation either way from the Area Planning Commission.

President Calhoun: Next would be setbacks. So we would be changing it where residential use, public uses, platted building sites, parks, etc. 3rd and 4th sides of residence would be solar farm buffer with 680 feet with a 20 foot visual which ends up being 700 feet. That would be on the 3rd and 4th sides of a residence. All the rest of the setbacks would stay the same. Is there anybody on the board that has any questions or comments? Is there anybody from the audience still like to comment for or against the minimum setbacks. Brad.

B. Dilger: Brad Dilger, EDP Renewables. I have just again a process question here because last year we went through this process again and discussed setbacks at length and we arrived to 500 foot current distance within the ordinance. How do we know that that doesn't work because a project has not been allowed to progress through that point of actually using the 500 foot set back. I think there were some questions during the ordinance revision committee process and folks did go out and try to get a sense for that distance. So I'm just curious like is 200 feet like? If we haven't seen it in use how do we know that is the number? Like right now the projects that have been built in Randolph County, yes EDP Renewals has built those projects, but the renewal projects have used greater than the minimum setback so far. And those have been working for years and there was the opportunity to use 500 feet and we didn't have the opportunity to try that. So I'm just again I ask the committee members here like what are we trying to achieve with this ordinance revision? Any of these revisions? Like is the county wanting further development or not because it seems like we're just increasing the rules of something that has been used and has worked for years and now we're just creating more hurdles for developers to come in—EDP or

anybody to come in. So again just if there's a specific reason why you landed at 700 feet or the 680 with the visual barrier which again that that is getting into what the landowner who has opted to participate what they can potentially see from that development on their property you know within an allowable use. So creating pockets where you can't really farm it and you know it's just going to be grassy area with some trees you know so many feet away from the house. I'm just trying to figure out the reason why. So if anybody could answer that question I'd love to understand that.

President Calhoun: Basically it was so that that person out in the middle of the solar farm gets a little bit of more relief. If he's got solar panels all the way around him.

B. Dilger: Sure.

President Calhoun: I don't know that there's very many places that that has happened and that goes back to how you set up or the diagram was how you set the farm up.

B. Dilger: Sure.

President Calhoun: But no that was the biggest reason why was to give that person that he's got two acres out just a little bit more relief.

B. Dilger: Yeah and again like going back to my statement earlier about the stage gates that a project has to go through like the initial concept has to be approved. All of the general design components need to be approved by the county. It has to go through the permitting process. All of those things have to be fulfilled successfully before anything can be built. To add this other layer of you know this 700 feet. Again, it just doesn't make a lot of sense I guess. If there was a specific reasoning behind it other than the general comfort I guess I would see that but I'm just I'm just struggling. I don't think we're going to find a specific answer because it seems like it's an an objective stance to what a neighbor will feel comfortable with and we haven't talked to any neighbors or no neighbors have spoken up in that regard. Some neighbors love it! We've had a couple of neighbors move in next to our solar facilities that want to live there. They're like yeah we know the neighbors are going to be quiet. We know that you know there isn't going to be any farming interruptions, you know to like any spraying or harvesting, the kind of creates dust. They looked for that and there are other properties that are on the market that we're also going to see sell. We don't see an impact there. So to say that the neighbors want this I think is a stretch. Thank you.

President Calhoun: Thank you. Anybody? Troy.

T. Prescott: The question I had and I tried to talk about this in the committee is and I was going to draw a map and excuse me for not doing that. I forgot about it. But if the landowner sits across the road for the homeowners it's across the road from the solar farm. If you go out 500 feet into

that field or whatever you just cut it's caused a divot. Like if the road separates it you would think I would think you just want the road, the fence to go straight and not have just a straight thing where you're going to have a little section of ground. I talked about one of the people I've already ours is under the old rule so it doesn't matter but he said why don't you go by those new rules and I said okay if they go out there and take out some would say it'd be like 300 feet you got 150 feet from his house to the road and you got the road right away so you got 300 feet you got there. So EDP squares it out it'd be like a 300 by 300 foot section. And I said what do you want me to do with that and he said well you'd farm it. And I said you're not going to get into this little 300 by 300. And you could I guess, it'd be a couple acres. I'd say no I sell it to somebody to build a house. Well I don't want a neighbor across from me either. Well it's not his ground. I mean he could buy it at that point but it's like there's no looking at how's this affect the landowners in these conversations. It's like I think 200 feet is plenty. I think most the panels on ours are at least 200 almost 350 feet back from people's houses. EDP didn't get too close to people. I think that I guess I've haven't been past every one of them down there. It's like they're always getting punished for breaking rules that they've never broken. Like say building on three and four sides of the house they've never that I know surrounded a house completely. Our farm had houses that could have three or four sides and they've stayed Deb like you looked at about 800 feet was the one that we looked up to the Northside of one of our properties. I think you and me looked at it that day it was like 800 feet, so it's still done within the 700 feet but I mean they've done a good job for me as far as staying back in people's houses and doing things. I'd say I still ask about once you go back 500 and 700 feet you still have to plant trees. I mean to me that makes no sense because those are big enough tracks of land to get in and farm. But if you're in a 40 foot one it's not. I don't have problems putting trees in front of that. But those are outside the fence and then you got to mow around them and stuff like that. It just creates a headache and then it's hard to keep the trees alive and we've had all that discussion about different kinds of trees and anything else. So anyway thank you.

President Calhoun: Thank you. Anybody else?

N. Lester: I'm Neda Lester, 5804 South 1100 West, Modoc. I am a landowner and I'm very concerned about the exterior and the setbacks because I don't want it close to my home and I don't want to look out and really don't even want to look out and see the trees but that would certainly be better than fences or the solar system. Granted it's their property. They can do with it what they want but if that is the case I also want to make it very clear that I would like to see it groomed. Whether it's 200, 400, 500, 700—I don't care how many feet it is but there is property next to some of our property that hasn't been groomed properly. I also know that there are family members that was looking to move to Randolph County and now have chosen to not. So long term I agree. What do you all really want our Randolph County to represent? Do you want to

become a solar county? Or are we going to stay with our roots and develop more agriculture? Just my concerns very much so, very much so.

President Calhoun: Thank you. Anybody else? Clyde.

C. Shaffer: Clyde Shaffer. Brad referred to this from EDP but a year ago you guys increased from 40 feet to 500 feet. Huge increase. Boom it was approved. Commissioners went with it but as he said we've not built one solar project to even see what 500 foot setbacks look like and you like we said we were at 40. And now we're at 500. And that is what you guys did a year ago. And where I struggle is we're just right back in here asking to increase again. And again I was on the committee. I was minority owned or participant but at the end of the day we looked at or I looked at settings from other states. Pennsylvania has a study done in 2026, standard setbacks 135 to 235 feet. Indiana, the last study that any of us could find was 2022, average setbacks in Indiana is 250 feet. If those statistics are still true, the one was done in 2026 and the other was done by Purdue University in 2022. You know then Randolph County is sitting with at least double the setbacks for homes and we want to protect our homeowners but at what point do you do your job of protecting homeowners and at what point are you doing a job that is to shut down opportunities for people like me and my family to have solar or wind on our properties. So you know I would say take a breath. Don't extend it any farther let's see what 500 looks like. Give it a chance before we go just adding more on on something that we've already extended way out. I just you know I don't think you guys aren't doing your job. You did your job. You did it a year ago. Now we need to wait and let it transpire out unless the goal is to just shut solar down. You can ask any county official, we shut that down county cannot pay their bills period. We went over that before so we don't need to reiterate it. But it is huge economic benefit not just to the farmers, not just the county government, but to tons of businesses in this county that benefit from this expansion of solar. Thank you.

President Calhoun: Thank you Clyde. Dan.

D. Freer: Dan Freer. 6031 South 1200 West, Losantville, Indiana. The purpose of this, where it began in the most recent project that was presented just a few months ago there were land owners, residences that were going to be completely surrounded with panels. We realize that the panels are going to be near houses. You know what the real goal was especially was at very most on three sides. Well you have to put a limit on the fourth side or you can go on forever. If that's a big amount on the fourth side but you know we were trying to discourage someone being completely surrounded. And we actually have people in the room that were part of that group that was going to be surround. So we were just trying to give the homeowners a little more voice in the process. Thank you.

President Calhoun: Anybody else?

T. Prescott: Did I use all my three minutes? Well the point is I think that what he's talking about the map that was presented that day was not a panel layout. It was just signed acres. That's the reason I wanted to be a part of the committee. I could show you how our farms were all signed up. There are houses surrounded by four sides. There's no panels placed on it. Deb has seen the maps. It's true. I mean EDP does a responsible job about doing what they're like say it's like the already with 500 foot setbacks. Let us see how it works out and see how they propose the next panel layout. With the map that these guys are going off of is not a panel layout map. It was just a preliminary map of acres that are signed up. And it's not even if I'm correct, Brad, it wasn't even the final farms that are chosen.

B. Dilger: No. So again that was a new step and because site is not clearly specified within the ordinance like what I can't remember the specific language of. Where is it with the... So the proposed CES site. There's not like a specific definition of what a proposes site means so. What was shown and what was presented at that public hearing was just what Troy said. It was a general layout of where we have land signed at that time because of the development process we understand or we expect that land to change because we are still going through all the studies, we have to figure out where we can or cannot build based on setbacks, based on wetlands, based on wildlife studies. Like there's so much that has to go into it that we don't have a panel layout at the time of this preliminary hearing. So for the statements to be made of the layout or this was going to be all around the house in every inch of what was shown is just. There wasn't an opportunity or at least there was a not a chance other than the three minutes that we had to explain the projects. That it was just simply land leased or land optioned to be leased for the project. So there's a lot of information that I know we're going to have to address you know at a future date when we bring a project through. I think it's just an incorrect statement of everything that was shown is going to be filled with panels because that's just not the reality of how any of these projects get realized. That was just my comment there how it's being defined I suppose.

President Calhoun: Okay, thank you.

T. Kerns: I will say that we talked about wanting less acres in the county but the larger the setback is the farther we spread these out. So if the setback goes farther they're going to move it to another acre somewhere else. I wasn't 100% on the 500 acres last year I was at 300 acres but I was—feet, yes I mean feet—but the 500 was a compromise between 300 and 700 was 500 last year because of the efficiency of what we were using land wise. You know when you start to moving them out moving and there's a lot of acres to ground that can't be developed so then it moves the neighbors farm and the neighboring farm. The farther that we push these out eventually we'll get the point where like you said that you can't even develop. If you put 700 feet around every property you can't develop in Randolph County. At 700 feet on all four sides and 700 feet. So what you're saying we don't, we're not going to develop anymore. We stopped at

that. 700 feet on two sides gets really close to that and it also makes it just more inefficient where we have farm ground that's not being utilized anymore. That's one other way to look at it.

President Calhoun: Anybody else.

T. Holaday: I just wanted to clarify so this there's not a number that is showing being replaced in the first column on the line where it says residential use and public use (platted building sites) third and fourth side of residence. That is currently is 480 feet, correct.

President Calhoun: Yes.

T. Holaday: That 480 feet is not showing on my paper but that's what it currently is. So we're talking about changing it from 480 to 680?

President Calhoun: Yes.

T. Holaday: When we talked about this number last year and we went to 480 and that was a large jump. I remember going through those conversations and I don't believe we've had any new farms use these setbacks yet to even know what the maps look like. The, I'm going to say Building Commissioner, was...who gave us the maps last time a year ago?

D. Johnting: Randy Abel.

T. Holaday: Randy, thank you. Randy had the maps of all the existing wind farms and he had circles on them at 300 and 500 feet and we looked at the implications of those—all of us did. That's how we came up with the 480 feet or 500 feet at the time so it was pretty it was thought through pretty carefully last year in my opinion.

President Calhoun: Okay. Anybody else?

D. Johnting: If that would have been voted down or whatever. If it reverted back, it would have been 480. It was 480. I should have marked that out. The 500 is marked out.

T. Holaday: It looks like that's what it should be. I just wanted to make sure.

D. Johnting: I had lots of changes.

President Calhoun: I would entertain a motion for a positive recommendation. Is there a second? Motion fails. Make a recommendation for an unfavorable recommendation. Is there a second? Ok. That'd be seconded. Roll Call vote.

K. Halloran: Todd Holaday, yes. Don Calhoun, no. Tom Kerns, abstain. Jim Hufford, yes. Coy Applegate, yes. Terry Alfrey, yes. Amy Alka, no. John Reece, yes. Abby Jounay, yes. That is six yeses.

D. Jhnting: That does not pass.

J. Welch: No recommendation.

President Calhoun: That'd be no recommendation. So the last will be screening. On this as you can see in our amendment that number 3 was completely struck and then we added a new number 3a "The landscape buffer shall be at density of vegetation training consisting of at least three native evergreen species installed in a two-row staggered arrangement to provide effective year round visual buffering of the solar facility. No single species shall comprise more than 40% of the total trees installed. Deer resistant trees are encouraged whenever possible. Species selection shall be appropriate to the local climate and soil conditions to ensure long term survival and screening effectiveness. Trees around new installations are to be planted during appropriate planting season (spring or fall) and planting must be completed by the end of construction. All dead trees are to be replaced during the following appropriate planting seasons (spring or fall). The screening plan should be presented to the Area Planning Director for approval prior to the permitting process. The Area Planning Director will consult with the County Ag Educator or colleague for approval if desired and alternative landscape plan may be submitted to the Board of Zoning Appeals." And then it would be number 7 we would add "Following notification of a tree needing replacement, the commercial solar system owner must complete the replacement by November 1 of the same calendar year or be fined \$1,000 per tree by the commissioners." And then down in Article XIX, Section 19-10 definitions of amendment to the following Visual Barrier it was all struck and replaced with "Visual Barrier – As used in Article 19 it is a density of landscaping which initial planting size and density is expected to obtain a height of seven feet in three years under normal growing conditions. The intent is to completely exclude visual contact with solar panels and equipment." So that's what we would be looking at changing under screening. Any questions? Anybody from the board? Anybody from the audience would like to comment towards.

B. Dilger: Brad Dilger, EDP Renewables. Yeah again this comes back down to process. We are more aware of this process. Deb probably have a pretty good idea of process on this as well. On Section 3a, well actually this is 3b, so all dead trees are to be replaced during the following appropriate planting season. Who determines if they're dead? I know we all generally understand when a tree's dead, it looks dead, like pretty dead. But it kind of ties back into the following page of Section 7 so it kind of goes to determination of whether the plant is unhealthy shall be at the discretion of the Director of the Area Planning Commission. I guess Deb, I mean this is your role at the moment. I mean there will be another Director of the Area Planning Commission in the future at some point and I see that "or recognized landscape professional" was struck. Is that an error or are you a landscape professional?

D. Johnting: We struck “certified landscape plan”.

B. Dilger: I mean the copy that I have it shows the part that struck says “or a recognized landscape professional.”

D. Johnting: Well I guess it was more about the “recognized” part. I mean I'm fine to leave it in. You have someone that you hire to do your planting and they say no this isn't dead. Trust me it will be alive next spring. I'm not going to argue with that. I am not.

B. Dilger: You as the Area Planning Director yes I totally understand that but we don't know who's going to come in the future. Just as we've talked before about EDP is not the only developer out here. You're not going to be only Area Planning Director to come through. So who knows.

D. Johnting: So what's the suggestion then. Just leave it with 4-H, Ag, or...

B. Dilger: A recognized landscape professional.

D. Johnting: Okay, who hires the recognized landscape professional?

J. Welch: Who has the final say? If you have a recognized professional and she has a recognized professional and you disagree. That's why we have the Area Planning Director as the final say.

T. Kerns: By implementing fines we are creating a whole level of questions. Just like you're saying you know I mean I guess we're directly down to the director so the director is going to give out fines.

J. Welch: She would send a letter and say that these to be replaced and then if they don't replace it and they got fined then they would have an opportunity to I guess to go to court if they didn't think it was unhealthy. I guess that the judge would have to sort that out.

B. Dilger: Again process like there are thousands and thousands of trees out there. Is it a notice?

J. Welch: There are a lot of dead ones right now.

B. Dilger: Sure. Is it a notice per tree? I'm just trying to figure out the process.

J. Welch: This this was a very important thing I think for the committee, to make sure that the screening be done properly. So I think that was the biggest error in the first ordinance. So this is very important that this be done. Somebody has to have the final say and the committee is determined that Debra needs to make the final say. If she wants to send a letter and say it's unhealthy, I'm sure her or any director would listen to you but if she implements the fine you have to go to court and convince the judge it was healthy. It's what it's going to be.

B. Dilger: The other part again process. It says “replace by November 1 of the same calendar year”. I could get a notice on October 30th. And does that mean I have one day to replace that tree?

J. Welch: Says the next appropriate planting season so.

B. Dilger: It says calendar year.

J. Welch: There would be discretion I guess.

B. Dilger: It says November 1st of the same calendar year.

J. Welch: So that's what it would mean then. I didn't write.

B. Dilger: So you're just setting somebody up to fail.

J. Welch: I'm not sending you a letter on October 31st.

B. Dilger: I'm not saying you or Deb would, I'm just saying it could happen.

J. Welch: You can argue that to the judge.

B. Dilger: So again like is this the signal that the county is wanting to send out. It's like we could potentially receive a letter on October 30th. We have a day to plant a tree or get fined \$1,000 per tree so. It's just again process. Like is that what the county is wanting to do is set up that system to dissuade people from coming out because if I plant 200,000 trees let's say all 200,000 die. I'm not going to be able to...

J. Welch: I guess you could you could insert the language “or within 30 days of receipt of the notice”. Whichever is earlier.

T. Kerns: Here's the question with as vague as it is. If they get fined a \$1,000. There's no continuing problem with that. Does that mean they don't have to plant that tree again?

J. Welch: They're going to get another notice.

T. Kerns: None of that is in here. None of that is defined. How that has to be maintained and stuff. It's so vague.

J. Welch: The idea is to keep the trees planted and alive.

B. Dilger: I totally understand that. I understand the screening. I understand like the health of the trees and it was like, the trees have been that whole process has been trouble from the get go and we have been following that to the detriment of healthy trees. We've created a monoculture out there which is not beneficial. We have replanted trees and again whether they are they are tasty to the animals that come through and the younger trees are obviously the ones that get planted

and those are the tastiest ones. So if we keep planting deer food out there like it just doesn't make a lot of sense that we're going to get a notice for 200 trees or 2,000 trees or something on October 30th. And have to pay the fine and then plant the tree. So again it's just. It's not that I'm disagreeing with.

J. Welch: I can write something up better for next month if you would prefer me to do that.

B. Dilger: Yes I'd love to see that.

D. Johnting: You know my process was we had one tree in the first ordinance. One type of tree and you fought it and I finally said the neighbors can call me and scream at me. Don't waste any more trees. It's not worth it. We need to do better on this.

B. Dilger: And I don't disagree with that.

D. Johnting: One tree is not appropriate. The rest of it was I think a backlash from the effect of the original problem which was the one type of tree, the only type of tree that was allowed planted in one way it was pigeonholed in such a way that you could not have succeeded. And we talked about that.

B. Dilger: Again I totally, right and we've worked on, I presented a possible plan last week. It's not, we are showing effort to try to correct this. And then again like to throw the fine in here like after we.

J. Welch: It has not been corrected without the fine so there has to be some kind of a stick.

T. Kerns: Are we fineing in any other ordinances within the county? If somebody doesn't follow the sign ordinance?

J. Welch: There's fines for all the ordinances. Anybody who gets prosecuted either has a fine or they go to court and they get it dealt with? They can fight it. It goes to the judge.

T. Kerns: Right but I just, I've never remember a case when we've done that. That's why I was asking.

J. Welch: I wasn't on the committee I didn't...

T. Kerns: I know, I know...

J. Welch: I'm just saying there has to be a stick somewhere. It's not going to get replaced. It's not getting replaced now.

J. Hufford: Sheriff's Department enforces all the county ordinances.

B. Dilger: So the future development wants to be pursued you've got to go through those permitting steps just like we talked about before. You got to go through the general hearing. You've got to go through all the agreements. You've got to go through permitting. The APC Director has that ability to deny a future permit. Correct?

J. Welch: Based on, it depends. If it's not followed if you don't follow the rules you'd get denied.

B. Dilger: Is the cash? Is that what is going to be pursued truly? Like \$1,000...

J. Welch: The intent of this is that the trees get replaced. I don't think they want to take your money. I think they want you to replace the trees.

B. Dilger: I get that. I totally understand that. So yeah just. The timeline if there's the same calendar year. If it could be 365 days just so you have 365 days to do it. That would make more sense.

J. Welch: Or within 30 days of notice.

A. Journey: Can I ask a question? What's the current policy? What do you do right now? What's your time frame now?

B. Dilger: Our operations department you know they identify the trees that—and again this is our approach it wouldn't be everybody's approach—they identify which trees have been killed by you know a number of ways. It could be weather. It could be deer. It could be errant spraying. So trying to figure out why they were killed and some of the trees have just been mowed over as well by sometimes I think in error you know by the farmer who's come through he is mowing what he thinks is supposed to be mowed and they mow over the trees.

A. Journey: Once they identify those trees are dead, how quickly do they actually get replaced?

B. Dilger: Just again because of purchasing processes like we have to contract that out. We don't plant trees ourselves so we have to find a contractor to do it.

A. Journey: So you don't have someone on to maintain that?

B. Dilger: No, it's just. I think any larger company is going to contract that workout they're not going to have an arborist you know on site or just a landscaper.

A. Journey: Maybe the people that you would contact maybe as part of the contract that they would be replacing those. I didn't know how that worked.

B. Dilger: No I knew. It could be something we pursue with vegetation management contractors that we use but generally we go with you know paid landscaper that specializes in tree.

A. Journey: So right now there isn't really a like a policy saying you've got 200 trees and 50 of them die. It's just assessed, evaluated, and replaced...

B. Dilger: Yes, operations you know identify those specific locations that say 50 trees contractor can you please give me a quote and time to complete planting of 50 trees. And it goes through the process.

A. Journey: Actually this is different right this part in here about the \$1,000 fine. That wasn't in there last month, correct?

President Calhoun: That was something the subcommittee talked about considerably.

T. Kerns: Do you know how many trees you replace in a year?

B. Dilger: I don't. I could find out from the operations folks but I don't track that.

President Calhoun: The idea of the subcommittee was to make sure that you had a variety of trees that you can plant.

B. Dilger: Totally support that.

President Calhoun: And they would be spaced due two row zones that way. You know your coverage is going to be a little quicker.

B. Dilger: I totally support all of that.

President Calhoun: And there was a couple in the committee that thought that the dead trees there needed to be a fine if they're not replaced within a certain time frame. If that makes it so that you get them replaced quicker then so be it. That was the intent to be able to get them replaced. If whoever is doing your landscaping if they've got a contract with you maybe they should be out there checking to make sure these trees are alive.

B. Dilger: Yeah and it's going to change process but again like "November 1st of the same calendar year" if I get a notice for 200 trees that could be potential.

J. Welch: If you checked every month, you would know those were dead before October 30th.

President Calhoun: Seemed like we had briefly discussed that on the committee.

B. Dilger: This is rife with issues like the timing of the same calendar year.

J. Welch: We can make it ironclad if he wants to go that far. That's not a problem.

B. Dilger: Okay, thank you.

President Calhoun: So are we wanting to table this?

J. Welch: It's not up to me.

T. Holaday: So the Section 3b says all the trees are to be replaced during the following appropriate plantings seasons spring or fall. Doesn't really coincide with the trees must be replaced by November 1st of the same calendar.

J. Welch: I think if you were going to do this you would almost have to have on there when they were required to expect on April 1st and September 1st and all of our dead trees should be replaced by 30 days after that if not they get a notice. Does that make sense?

President Calhoun: Would that work?

T. Kerns: I would say about 30 days the following planting season because if there's quite a few trees it's actually hard to source a lot of these trees if you're getting multiple trees and weather. With all these projects going on it is sometimes hard to source. So if you say you're going to have an April inspection then they need planted by the fall planting season. By fall inspection they need to be planted by the spring planting season to leave a buffer in there.

T. Holaday: And that would work with the language in 3b I think.

T. Kerns: Does that make more sense Brad?

B. Dilger: I think I heard what you said I mean it's just if you could explain it.

T. Kerns: If we're going to talk about doing inspections like you know required to their inspected twice a year you know say April and September/October so one and then within that inspection whatever the finding is that inspection they would have to be replaced by the April by the fall planting season and inspected in the fall by the spring planting season.

B. Dilger: Who's inspecting?

T. Kerns: That's the question. So as the county will send that out somebody's inspect and make that list each time.

J. Welch: Or the company.

T. Kerns: So if it's not on the company's lists and something gets missed then.

J. Welch: Then it can be turned in I suppose. If there was a dead one that was missed.

T. Prescott: Troy Prescott. This is where I wanted to talk to the committee about is and I don't know what the construction budget is as far as planting trees but like if it's \$1,000,000 or \$2,000,000 or whatever. That's where I said if that negotiation and Tom we talked about this that it gives the homeowners some room to negotiate. I said if you take that say \$1,000,000 divided by 20 homes is \$50,000 right there. So EDP goes the homeowner says we'll write you a check

for \$50,000 if you'll let us build closer and forget the trees. You can take that money and plant trees if you want or do whatever? It gives them some freedom to work but if you're requiring them to set back 500 feet plus still plant trees. They are having to spend the money. I don't know how many trees is in a project but \$1000 of trees could get pretty expensive pretty fast. I mean I think \$100 fine would be a lot better than \$1000 fine or more but the point is if you take the screening out that frees up money for the company to divide that up and give it to the homeowners and then the homeowners get to decide if they want to plant trees or they don't want to plant trees. Most of them if you tell them here's \$10,000. Go plant all the trees you want. Most of them aren't going to and tell them they don't have to the planted trees they're not going to plant trees. They're going to put \$10,000 in their pocket and do what else with it. I think there needs to be I don't know if it's written in the ordinance that they got the right to negotiate that with the homeowner to get that out. I think that frees up a lot of this I mean especially if it's 500 feet from somebody 's house I think they'd care less whether there is a tree out there or not. Anyway.

President Calhoun: Do we want to table this and have Jason come up with something better? Table it to the next meeting.

J. Hufford: Have the language changed a little.

President Calhoun: Do you want to make a motion?

J. Hufford: I'll make a motion we'll table to the next meeting.

Vice President Applegate: I'll second it.

President Calhoun: We'll table about the screening until the next meeting. Is there any old business that needs to be brought up at this time? Is there any new business? We will have a meeting next month. Appreciate everybody in the game, all the comments. Thank you board for working through this. I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

J. Hufford: Second.

President Calhoun: Thank you.

President, Don Calhoun

Vice President, Coy Applegate

Recording Secretary, Kristina Halloran