

APC MINUTES
JANUARY 22, 2020

Members present: Adrian Moulton, Steve Hernly, John Reece, Andy Fahl, Gary Girton, Jim Hufford, Bob Lahey, Bryn Albertson, Terry Alfrey

Members absent: Amy Alka, Aaron Stephens, Tom Kerns, Don Calhoun

Legal Representation: Jason Welch

Staff Present: Randy Abel, Executive Director, Debra Johnting, Recording Secretary

Others present: Ed Thornburg

V. President Fahl: It's 7 o'clock and I will call this meeting of the Area Planning Commission to order. Welcome, glad to see everybody, it's been a long time since we've convened. So we will get started, Don's not here tonight. And my name is Andy Fahl, I'm the Vice President. I am the Randolph County Council Representative. I live down at Lynn. We have new members here tonight, so we're going to start right there in the corner and just introduce yourself.

Steve Hernley from Farmland, John Reece from Lynn, Deb Johnting from Area Planning, Jason Welch Board Attorney, Randy Abel, Area Planning Director, Terry Alfrey from Winchester, Jim Hufford Citizen Representative from Union City, Gary Girton Commissioner representative, Bob Lahey Union City City Council, Bryn Albertson from Winchester, Adrian Moulton School Superintendent from Monroe Central and I'm from Farmland.

V. President Fahl: We will start with approval of the minutes from April of 2019. Hope everybody has had a chance to look them over? Anybody have any comments, suggestions or corrections?

J. Hufford: From what I remember of that meeting these look pretty good.

V. President Fahl: Do I have a motion to accept? And a motion to second? Then so moved and seconded, all those in favor? Opposed the same? Motion passes. We'll go right down the list here and click these off, election of officers for 2020. Don's not here tonight but he has expressed interest to retain being President, and I would be definitely interested in retaining Vice President. Anybody have any comments or nominations?

J. Hufford: I make a motion that the nominations be closed.

V. President Fahl: It has been properly moved and seconded that they remain the same, all those in favor, opposed the same. Motion passes. So, now we're going to go to the Area Planning Commission's appointment of a municipal citizen to the BZA. We have three members eligible, Bryn Albertson, Jim Hufford and John Reece, and I am under the understanding that all three of you are definitely interested in this position, correct? I think the best way to handle this, is just to have a ballot vote. But, first, we'll let ladies go first, is there anything you want to say?

B. Albertson: When Deb asked me I said I would stay on there if I was needed.

D. Johnting: Bryn has done it for a year, she finished up a four year term that had had several people in it. That position changes every four years, not necessarily the same person stays in it, but to keep everyone from going off at the same time we have staggered 4 year terms.

J. Reece: I attended the last Lynn Town Board meeting, and they gave me permission to accept it if that's what you want me to do.

J. Hufford: The main reason I want to be on the Board of Zoning Appeals, I have set on it before, is that as of now, we have no representation for two thirds of the county. There are five members of that board that all come from Winchester. One from Modoc, and one from Parker. The entire eastern half of the county is not represented on the board at all. And it has presented some problems. Some things that have come before it that we didn't know about, no way for anybody on the board to come to us and translate what was going on, and then things get passed and the city just sits there and looks stupid because we were never notified that these things were even happening. That's the main reason that I would like to see that happen, and also I might as well bring that up right now, I have talked to our commissioners, and also I have talked to the state representatives, and the state senator and tried to get the law revised that's written now, the way it is. And try to get it where rural counties who don't have major population in a big city, or two big cities who have over 20,000 of population so they will actually split the county, and have somebody represent a district in each part of the county. Have the three people who come from the main city, like here in Winchester, you've got your three, and then you've got four people who are being appointed out here be appointed from the four corners of the county. Because I know that if there is someone on there from Parker City, and there is something about Union City, or Lynn, doesn't want to drive way over there to check it out and then come to our council meeting and explain to us what's going on. So that's all I have to say.

D. Johnting: State statute does say three from the largest municipality, two from the APC and two from the county. It didn't seem right so I checked this out for sure when you asked me. And that's unless the other largest town has over 20,000 and then they would share with the largest town.

J. Hufford: Yes, yes, that is the state statute at this time, right, and the three from Winchester is fine, but the other four should represent the rest of the county.

V. President Fahl: Ok, I will pass these out, and we will be voting for one person, Bryn Albertson, John Reece and Jim Hufford. Ok, Adrian would you mind collecting them, if you read them off I will tally them. Ok, what we're going to do here is we're going to have you vote again, and you'll be voting for one person. And it will be either Jim Hufford or Bryn Albertson. Thank you for your help, Adrian, I appreciate it. The Area Planning Commission's representative to the BZA will be Jim Hufford. And that's for four years, right Deb?

D. Johnting: It is.

V. President Fahl: The next thing is our attorney contract.

J. Welch: It's the same exact contract as last year, as far as the terms go. And there is also an annual conflict of interest disclosure there because I represent Farmland, Losantville and Ridgeville also, besides Area Planning so I file this at the court house every year.

V. President Fahl: So, we just need a motion on this? Discussion and a motion? Any comments, concerns? It has been properly moved and seconded to retain Mr. Welch again, all those in favor? Opposed the same, motion passes, thank you. Now we're going to move on and deal with APC2020-1-Z, Randy or Deb you want to give background on this?

D. Johnting: He made his application and we put it in the newspaper and he missed the deadline to mail the letters and asked if there was any way at all that he could continue the process to next month. There is no one here tonight who would have seen it in the paper, if they were they would know that it is being continued. So, he can mail his letters out and they will know the new date, and he won't have to start the process over.

J. Hufford: He's a hard man to get hold of. I tried and the mayor tried, but by that time it was too late. You were trying to get hold of him as well?

D. Johnting: Yes, and he wouldn't respond, but he is now. I have my ways. He doesn't want to have this hearing in June.

V. President Fahl: So he has sent us a letter, dated January 7, 2020.

January 7, 2020

Randolph County Area Planning Commission
325 S Oak Street
Winchester, IN 47394

RE: APC2020-1-Z, Petition for Backstay Lofts, LLC, Request for rezoning

(To be read at the Area Plan Commission Meeting on January 22, 2020)

To The Area Planning Commission of Randolph County,

Due to unavoidable circumstances, the Due Notice letters for my docket #APC2020-1-Z were not sent out in a timely manner and landowners within 250' of the project were not notified. The legal notice was published in the local newspaper; therefore, I am requesting that my petition be continued to your next hearing on February 19, 2020.

I am looking forward to making this exciting presentation for the Backstay Lofts in Union City and regret that I am unable to do so tonight. Please accept my deepest apologies for any inconvenience and I hope you will vote to grant a continuance for this petition to rezone.

Thank you,

Jonathan R. Anderson, Esq.
AP Backstay Lofts LLC
1828 N Illinois St.
Indianapolis, IN 46202
(317) 822-4905

V. President Fahl: Any discussion, comments, concerns.

J. Hufford: Is there any problem moving it to next month? There's nothing in the by-laws that says he can't refile for next month?

D. Johnting: Well, since it's been in the paper, anybody who would be interested would have been here tonight, so, announcing it at this meeting would keep him from having to put it in the paper and start over with the petition. He will send out the letters by the deadline and they'll have those for February. But, I really hate to start his petition over, we've come this far.

J. Hufford: Yes, he's got a lot involved and a lot invested. Do we need a motion to continue it to the next meeting?

D. Johnting: Yes.

J. Hufford: Then I will make a motion to continue this until the next meeting, February 19th I believe?

V. President Fahl: It has been properly moved and seconded to grant a continuance on this petition APC2020-1-Z. All those in favor, say aye, all those opposed, motion passes. The next thing we have is old business. Anybody have anything? Seeing none, we'll move on to new business.

J. Hufford: I'd like to say that I got a copy of this from you on the solar? And I would like to say it is well written and really covers it very well. I think you did a very good job.

R. Abel: I want to make a few comments on this, did everybody get a copy of this? Really, really would like for you to read through it, and I know it's a long read. I have gotten a lot of complaints about it being long but if you look at our wind ordinance it's long too. And the purpose of this is, that once you meet these developmental standards you can just do it. You don't have to have a hearing every single time a solar farm, either solar non-commercial or solar commercial comes in. And so what we tried to do in this was to kind of take a middle ground here, we want to encourage solar development, but we also want to protect the health safety and welfare of the people in the county. One of the biggest things, and I think Andy probably said it best, he said, the meat and potatoes of this is really that portion that addresses the buffers and the landscapes and the setbacks. Because that's what's going to protect the property values of the people. And so, what I have tried to tell everybody on our committee, imagine this as going around your house. So, that's what you have to keep in your head. We're trying to find a middle ground here, I think we want to be friendly to the solar companies but we don't want to hand them everything on a platter either. And I know there's a lot of things that they are saying, oh we can't afford that, and you know I have looked at some of the figures, and they're making a lot of money off of this in a year. I mean we're talking somewhere between \$21 and \$42 million dollars is what my estimate is. And that depends on what they are getting per kilowatt, if they're getting .04 cents or are they getting .08 cents. Nobody knows but the power companies. But I can tell you individuals who have homeowner systems are getting around .03 or .04 cents a kilowatt for the excess they produce. So you know darn well that EDPR is going to get more than that, is my guess.

J. Hufford: Yes, if you're commercial you can sell it on the open market. The individual is not allowed to do that.

R. Abel: Yes.

J. Hufford: The individual is not allowed to sell it to the local power. That makes a big difference.

R. Abel: Yes, that makes a big difference. So, when you read through this kind of keep those things in mind. Another big concern the committee had was, and I have contacted the State Fire Marshall who put me in touch with a couple other fire chiefs around that have these things in their counties and I have also talked to the Fire Chief here in Winchester, and he took it to, I guess there is an Association of Fire Chiefs here in Randolph County, he took it to them. Their big concern is that we really don't know what access they're going to need, or what emergencies may occur within a solar field. So, you know of course they're big concern was if you have an accident in there can they get to it? They said you don't need to get down every little lane, but they are really pushing for a perimeter lane. But the solar companies are really pushing back that they don't want it. So, the last solar committee meeting Andy came up with the suggestion that maybe just along the right of ways of the roads that they would have an access lane that was gravel. And I thought that was a good compromise, they're going to come back and we'll see what they say about that. I don't know, even the fire departments don't really know for sure what they are going to get into here. The people that I talked to—the ones who have it in their county said they've made two or three trips in it already, and they have a lane around. But they didn't have eighteen hundred acres either. So that makes a big difference. And the one down at New Castle, came off the interstate, it flew across a ditch, through the fence, and into the solar field. And we were told it took two hours to get that shut off to allow the firemen or first responders to go down the ditch, up the other side of the ditch, and then respond to the emergency. They had no immediate access.

J. Hufford: No emergency cutoff?

R. Abel: No. Well, they didn't know where it was. There was an emergency cutoff but they couldn't open the gate. And there wasn't anybody to shut it off. They had to wait. So, we want to make sure that doesn't happen in Randolph County. So, we want emergency training, and we also want ready access for the fire departments for the gate. Other things that we came across, it really concerned us was, what's in the panels, and what happens during the decommissioning phase. I talked to several counties about this, one of the things that we can expect at the end of this, there's going to be 600,000 panels. They estimate there will be over 700 tons to get rid of. Not all in panels, but 700 tons. So, the recycling company that I contacted in Cincinnati, and I thought it would be higher than this, but they said it would cost now, today, \$16 per panel. If it was monocrystalline and did not contain any hazardous materials. So I said what happens if it has cadmium in it? He said it goes to over \$100 per panel. Well, if you multiply 600,000 x \$100 and it's not feasible to put those kind of panels in. So, there's a portion in here where I said no cadmium panels. We may want to further that into other heavy metals and stuff. I talked to Danny down at the landfill, there's a leach test they have to go through. So, when they are ready to decommission these they send a couple panels off and do a leach test. Right now there's very, very few that won't pass that leach test. So, they are all going to be considered non-hazardous. But Danny said that even if they are considered non-hazardous, they have a report in there that tells them what materials are in that. So he said, that even if it's considered non-hazardous by the state, if it comes to our dump and has these materials in it—we will not take it. It will have to go to a hazardous waste site. So there goes your cost again.

J. Hufford: Right, we probably should deal with the solid waste managements on stuff like that, handling hazardous waste like that.

R. Abel: Well, when you read this, there is a section in there, and I am sure they're not going to like it, it's a waste management plan.

J. Hufford: Right, I see that.

R. Abel: And in that waste management plan I asked them to identify the panels they are using, the hazardous materials within those panels, and what would be the estimated cost of recycling if they did. And, the issue that potentially could happen, depending on the timing of things, in 2012 Europe decided they had to do something about these panels and the waste and hazardous waste that it was causing in the countries. They mandated recycling. Indiana mandates recycling of circuitry, isn't that how the term goes I think? So, if you have electronics that have circuitry in them, you have to recycle them. And right now today, even though there's circuitry in these panels, they do not define them as circuitry. So they are not considered to be in the group that is forced to be recycled like your televisions and computers and all that. All it would take is a little change in the definition by somebody who wants to push this and now you're looking at a \$600,000 straight to the dump cost versus \$9.6 million to recycle. At today's prices. That's a big difference. I just want to make sure that in their applications we are made aware of what is in these panels, what kind of panels they are, what the potential is to recycle. That information will be passed on to the commissioners or to whoever is doing this decommissioning agreement. I think it's very important that we cover our butt here, so to speak.

J. Hufford: Now, if you want to see about getting the law changed on that, where they would be classified, meet me up at there at Randolph County on Friday at noon, the representatives are going to be there, and we're going to be talking about law changes.

R. Abel: Well, I don't know that I want it changed, but I'm just saying that sometime it's going to, it's going to have to.

J. Hufford: Right, it's going to have to. Otherwise we're going to get stuck with people out here filing bankruptcy, we're going to get stuck with the bill. We need to get that put in the state law that they are responsible.

R. Abel: So, in Europe, what they basically did was do an upfront cost. So, say the panels are going to cost \$300, you automatically tacked on that extra \$16 for recycling, and then it's upfront cost. And that was put into a reserve somewhere. If you looked at the end of the life and say I've got to come up with \$9.6 million, that seems like a lot of money. But if you say I'm going to take your \$300 panel and up it \$16 in cost it doesn't seem quite as an aggressive a move. But, so that's just another one of our concerns and we weren't sure how to address it, and we haven't gotten a lot of feedback from the companies.

J. Hufford: And the county probably can't address it as much as you would need to do at a state level?

R. Abel: Yes, exactly, but we need to protect ourselves. From the end of life I'm really worried that, and what we've learned from other counties is that these states that have had these solar fields in for twenty years now, are telling us they are on their third or fourth owner. EDP came in here and we had

a sit down discussion, and they almost acted insulted sometimes because of what we were suggesting, and we kept saying—this is not directed at you, this is all companies and we are trying to even the playing field. And this decommissioning is probably not going to be you, it's going to be the third or fourth company down the road.

J. Hufford: And we can't stop them from coming in but we can regulate them coming in.

R. Abel: Yes, so I think we need to be careful how we approach it, that we're not out to get EDPR, we want their investment here, it's a \$254 million dollar investment. That's obviously something that's going to be good for the county as far as tax-wise and everything else. So, it's not that we want to discourage development, but we certainly want to make sure that the county is not at risk in doing so. So, read through this, and I would appreciate any and all feedback that you have. We do have a solar committee meeting tomorrow, and we'll probably know a little more because we're meeting with Envenegy on a phone call tomorrow, so we'll see what their feedback is on this. And I know another push back is probably going to be the cost of any landscaping. But they seem pretty open to the fact that they would landscape against a residential area. And if you read, I put in there, not only a residential house, but also land that has been parceled off for residential use. So somebody that has parceled two or three acres off, or five acres off who was going to put a house there that's not there yet, they're still going to be required to bumper that area. And they said, well, if you go up to five acres how long? So, we're trying to figure out the dimensions. We don't want them to have to a thousand feet with the buffer. That would be kind of unreasonable. So, we're trying to figure out a good size. A five acre lot is basically 720 feet x 300 feet. If you take a rectangle. A square would obviously be something a little different than that. So, we need to try to decide what's reasonable to require a maximum length for them to buffer against residential. So, is there anything else in there that concerned you?

J. Hufford: That should be written with the buffer, probably on a case by case basis, where it's going to have to be determined because you just don't have any idea, you know.

R. Abel: That's why we're trying to make it so, another thing we are doing in here to soften the blow a little bit, so to speak, is to allow them to go to the adjoining landowners and get waivers. So, if your setback is two hundred feet to this landowner that's got a house, you can go to him and say, how about letting me go down to fifty feet. And I'll put two rows of trees in, or go down to fifty feet and do the row of trees, for a certain distance, so they can go to that adjoining land owner and get waivers for those requirements without having to come to the BZA. And they were pretty receptive to that idea, about that. Another thing we did away with was any kind of a buffer between two ag limited. So, if you've got a farm field, we basically said you can put your fence on the property line, put your 20 foot setback and start your panels.

J. Hufford: Now, are these panels that they are putting in the ones that track the sun? Or are they stationary?

R. Abel: I think they are going to track the sun.

J. Hufford: I know an area where there was a hill about a mile away in the solar field, and the sun just about blinded everyone with the glare on the panels and they were made to put non-reflective glass on there.

R. Abel: Well, we have a section in there about mitigating adverse effects. That was in there to cover that, but you can't of course cover everything.

J. Hufford: So, well, they need glass in there that will not reflect the sun.

R. Abel: They also wanted, and we kind of put our foot down on this, they wanted to have it, so it's only permitted in Ag Intensive. They obviously wanted it permitted in Ag Limited. But, in my way of thinking when you start talking about Ag Limited, Manufacturing and Commercial, those are areas used for expansion for businesses. And for subdivisions and things like that, areas around the city. So, I prefer to have it out in Ag Intensive. And by doing that they can have a hearing for Ag Limited and that kind of encourages them to keep it out of those areas. I'm not saying that there are not Ag Limited areas that would not be appropriate, because there are some that I think would be appropriate for those, and I think you'd have a hearing that wouldn't have much push back. But I think those need to be a hearing for those areas for commercial. And for non-commercial, and non-commercial basically is defined as meeting the needs of business or the homeowner, and so those can go in under the rules in the non-commercial sections of this. And that really encourages homeowners to put them on the roofs. Obviously if you're out in the country you're going to put them on the ground. That's acceptable also. Just look through the definitions also, and I know Jason and I went over this after they struck out some words, so we put in "affected" instead of some other words. The words "adjoining" and "affected" were an issue, so look these over.

V. President Fahl: I think as a committee, we spent a lot of time on this, a lot of discussion, a lot of viewpoints, everyone speaks. We understand that this is a new industry coming in to the county, it's a lot of money, Randy just said that, and we're trying to keep them happy and protect the residents of Randolph County. I would add that so far we have met with two different companies, and this is my opinion, even though they are both in renewable business, they are doing things a little different. We get different answers to the same questions. And we are going to meet again tomorrow. I think we have made huge progress, we have moved forward a long ways so we are on the right track but there's a lot to it—there just is a lot.

R. Abel: An interesting comment was made, when we all think of solar panels as a "green" industry, and we think of them being favorable to nature and that sort of thing, but they said we're not here to be green, we're here to be profitable. So they are not really that interested in the green end of this, they're in to sell it to the power company as cheaply as possible. And that's what they're in it for, and of course you would expect that with anybody.

V. President Fahl: Did everyone understand the waiver part that he described, I don't know if you mentioned that or not, if they can't come to an agreement on the waiver, then they can opt to have a hearing here in front of us to settle it.

R. Abel: Or they can just stay with the standards that are there. Which is probably in most cases what's going to happen. Also, I don't know if I mentioned this. So, the University of Texas did a study on

property values and I talked to a gentleman in Madison County who is working with solar also in his county and their setbacks to residences were actually 500 feet. Which we thought was a little excessive. So that's up in the air. But he said that the study they had from University of Texas basically said that the proximity, so the closer you were it hurt your property values, the bigger obviously the field is, it's going to hurt your property value, and the landscaping affected it, how well it was done and what it looked like. And they said the other thing that affected it is, what was there before? Which, I never thought of this, but they said that if you went in where somebody cleaned up a junk yard and put a solar farm in, everybody was really, really happy, because you got rid of the junk yard.

J. Hufford: If you put this in an agricultural intensive area, it's really not going to create much problem on the value of the farm next door, it's going to sell for the same thing because it's still tillable.

R. Abel: I think we put in here that it needs to have natural ground cover. Because that's a permeable surface and then with that being permeable you don't have as many erosion and water problems.

V. President Fahl: And back to land values, in the last sixty to ninety days, as we have been working on this there have been two properties, one in Jay County and one in Randolph, that had wind turbines on it and we paid attention to what that did to land values, and it did not hurt them at all. If anything at least one of them it increased the price.

R. Abel: Now, the guy in Madison County told me that where these solar panels are going that the individuals found out, tried to sell their properties and had a lot of difficulty getting a bid on the property. So you can take that for what it's worth. It depends on where it is, how it's organized and so on. Every situation is going to be unique. It's pretty hard to say how it's going to affect property values until you get to the unique property.

G. Girton: You say you're selling a farm or selling a residence?

R. Abel: No, a house, it was a residential lot. And it had the solar going around it. And the individual said, no I don't want that around me, I'm going to sell and get out. So the realtor came in to the solar hearing and told the Building Commission they couldn't even get a bid on it. I don't know if they have gotten a bid on it yet. But, even if you reduce the bids to half the people not wanting it that's going to reduce your price.

J. Hufford: It's the same thing we went through on property values and things when we passed the CAFO Ordinance. One of the biggest concerns there was—we addressed that by actually letting people know that if they're going to be building in this area that they're going to have that problem.

V. President Fahl: As far as the blinds go, in our discussions we have used the landfill at Modoc as an example. If you drive past there you know the landfill is there but yet you really can't see what's going on. And I think possibly if we can obtain something similar with the solar I think everybody would be happy. The land fill did that on their own. It takes time, it's expensive. But they are trying to keep everybody happy.

R. Abel: I called Brown's nursery and it's going to cost, with labor and trees and everything about \$2,000 a hundred foot. And that's a lot of money if you've got very far to go. So if you were just

requiring them to put it down along the right of ways and along people's houses, that's going to be a major investment for a solar company. And I forget what, Ed's probably got a better idea of what it costs to put a gravel lane in, driveway.

E. Thornburg: When I was still building driveways, it was running about \$1 a square foot. Now, that was a driveway that would be for much heavier access than what they would want to do around them. They're going to spend \$.75 a square foot on driveways.

R. Abel: And I think we're only going to require a 12' lane. And another idea I had when I was talking to the fire chiefs is that maybe something could just be put in the ordinance access to the approval of the Fire Association of Randolph County. Because I don't know what their needs are, and I don't think they know what potential access they're going to really need to these without talking to the solar companies first. I do like the idea of putting them along the right of ways of roads though. Because that's going to be the major place you're ever going to have an accident. So, hopefully we get in the middle of the road here. Because there's always going to be people who love this, and people who say "not in my back yard". So I am hoping we can come to a center ground here somewhere so we don't end up with the CAFO wars where we were in here for several years. So, I'd rather see some kind of middle ground that we could go down here that's going to be agreeable to everyone.

J. Hufford: Right, head it off before it happens.

V. President Fahl: Anybody have anything else? It's not on here but how about the UDO with Debbie Luzier?

R. Abel: That's been mostly, I have to apologize that's been our problem. She sent us several documents to check over and we have finally got through the one but haven't sent it back to her yet. She's been busy, we've been busy, right now she is heavily, heavily involved with legislature going on at the state. So that's going on right now. So I told her we're trying to get through this. Deb and I need to go through and compare our notes.

D. Johnting: We took all the uses and combined them with ours and hers and what should stay and what should go. There were some items we're not really on the same page, but we're trying to combine it all in a manageable format and streamline our process, take out the uses that are redundant or we just don't need any more and add new things we do need like agri-tourism, everybody wants a party and wedding venue, that kind of thing. But there are hundreds of entries to go over.

R. Abel: Now this may be a flawed way of thinking, but some of the problems we've had in the past is people wanting to spot zone. We're trying to get away from spot zoning. So, we've had people say hey I want this business out in the country. So instead of spot zoning it and making it like manufacturing or commercial, and then when they go out of business, technically the farmer can't farm it because it's commercial or manufacturing, or somebody says I'm going to stick a junk yard in there, because it's now zoned for a junk yard. So what we're thinking instead is to make some of these uses a special exception, so we will have a hearing at the BZA so you can sell it as is, leave the business the same and sell it. But once that business is done it goes back to ag. And that way we'll save ourselves having to rezone back to ag and we'll get rid of that potential problem where something could go in there that we don't want and it gives us more oversight to what goes in places.

J. Hufford: We've got a couple of block area, near the factory, the bank won't loan money on the homes because it's zoned manufacturing, so they can't even sell their houses.

R. Abel: And we've got that problem in Winchester, there are so many things miss-zoned it's not even funny. So we are trying to tweak this to accommodate some of those.

D. Johnting: Many of the rezoning requests we have had in the last couple of years have been to satisfy the banks so they can refinance or so something else. They wouldn't do it if they didn't have to. And they didn't request that zoning in the first place.

R. Abel: So, we plan on getting on to that UDO as soon as the solar is done, we hope to. It's been awhile, hasn't it? But I told her in my last email, I'd rather get it done right, than to hurry through it and have to do it all over again. Because after some of the things we found in this ordinance we don't want to go through that again. We want to make sure it's right and make sure it fits our county. The trouble is a lot of these ordinances are really made for bigger cities or different areas.

J. Hufford: And we have a lot of that is outdated.

V. President Fahl: Unless anybody has anything else, I will entertain a motion for adjournment. It has been moved and seconded to adjourn. All those in favor, all those opposed? Thank you all for coming.

President, Don Calhoun

Vice President, Andy Fahl

Recording Secretary, Debra Johnting