

MINUTES
ELKHART COUNTY PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
HELD ON THE 12TH DAY OF AUGUST 2010 AT 9:00 A.M.
MEETING ROOM – DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICES BUILDING
4230 ELKHART ROAD, GOSHEN, INDIANA

1. The regular meeting of the Elkhart County Plan Commission was called to order by the Chairperson, Tom Holt, with the following members present: Steve Warner, Meg Wolgamood, Dennis Sharkey, Tom Lantz, Blake Doriot, Jeff Burbrink, Roger Miller, and Mike Yoder. Staff members present were: Robert Watkins, Plan Director; Duane Burrow, Senior Planner; Robert Nemeth, Planner; and James W. Kolbus, Attorney for the Board.

2. A motion was made and seconded (*Yoder/Wolgamood*) that the minutes of the regular meeting of the Elkhart County Plan Commission held on the 8th day of July 2010 be approved as submitted and the motion was carried unanimously.

3. A motion was made and seconded (*Warner/Sharkey*) that the legal advertisements, having been published on the 29th day of July 2010 in the Goshen News and the 2nd day of August 2010 in the Elkhart Truth, be approved as read. The motion was carried with a unanimous vote.

4. A motion was made and seconded (*Miller/Burbrink*) that the Elkhart County Zoning Ordinance and Elkhart County Subdivision Control Ordinance be accepted as evidence for today's hearings. With a unanimous vote, the motion was carried.

5. The application for Primary approval of a four lot major subdivision to be known as **THE FARM SECTION 3**, for Big M, Inc. represented by Marbach, Brady & Weaver, on property located on the East side of SR 13, 2,150 ft. North of CR 10 in York Township, zoned A-1, was presented at this time.

Mr. Nemeth presented the Staff Report/Staff Analysis, which is attached for review as *Case #FISHERS POND-100614-1*.

Chris Marbach of Marbach, Brady & Weaver, 3220 Southview Dr., Elkhart, was present on behalf of this request representing Big M Inc., Jeffrey Reynolds and Dustin & Amber Diller, owners of these particular parcels.

He explained that all of the parcels were split due to a court order, and that they are now coming back to comply with the ordinance so one home can be situated on each parcel. He stated that based on primary approval of this site, there would have been approximately 32 additional lots in those areas. He commented that he agrees with the staff's recommendation to keep the turnaround in place at the end of Shadow Hill.

Mr. Doriot asked if the entrance issue was worked out. Mr. Marbach answered no and further explained that the Highway Department has stated that they misread some previous memos and conveyed that they will allow the access point on Old Country Lane.

Mr. Sharkey asked if any of the lots are tillable. Mr. Marbach indicated that the middle of Lot 37 continuing south is wetlands; however, there has been alfalfa in the area to the north over the last several years.

Mr. Sharkey then asked if there would be farm equipment going through the subdivision and Mr. Burbrink said there is farm equipment out there now.

Present in opposition to this request was David Gay, 53955 SR 13, Middlebury, who resides directly across the street. He is concerned with an additional entrance to any of these lots off SR 13 in the future. He explained that generally there is a bypass lane accompanying an entrance into a subdivision and he is concerned it would put that in his front yard. He expressed his concern that an additional entrance and exit, and possible accompanying bypass lane, would magnify the vibrations he already feels from everything going past his home currently.

Mr. Sharkey asked if the Plan Commission has any jurisdiction on SR 13 and Mr. Kolbus said final approval would have to come by the State so they can override.

Mr. Marbach explained that they will provide a non-access easement on the recorded plat starting 25 feet from the southeast corner of lot 53 all the way along lots 10 and 53. He stated the only way the driveway could happen with the non-access easement is by approval from the Board and Highway Department. He went on to say that when the existing entrance was approved, part of the approval process was contingent on the fact that there would be no other entrances along the road.

A motion was made and seconded (*Doriot/Sharkey*) that the public hearing be closed and the motion was carried with a unanimous vote.

The Board examined said request and after due consideration and deliberation, a motion was made and seconded (*Doriot/Wolgamood*) that the Advisory Plan Commission approve this request for a four lot major subdivision as presented and in accordance with the Staff Analysis with the following condition imposed:

1. The easement for the cul-de-sac as recorded on The Farm Section 2 to be retained.

The motion was carried with a unanimous roll call vote.

6. The application for Primary approval of a Replat of the playground area of Harrison Ridge Subdivision to be known as **HARRISON RIDGE SUBDIVISION SECOND**, for Habitat for Humanity of Elkhart County represented by Brads-Ko Engineering & Surveying, on property located on the East side of Tippecanoe Drive, 180 ft. South of Tyler Lane in Harrison Township, zoned R-1, was presented at this time.

Mr. Nemeth presented the Staff Report/Staff Analysis, which is attached for review as *Case #0TIPPECANOE DRIVE-100709-1*.

Mr. Nemeth then asked Mr. Kolbus if every owner in the subdivision will need to sign-off to change the playground into a lot. He also asked and if there are any encumbrances on the use of this property by the other owners in the subdivision.

Mr. Kolbus advised that the Board has no control over whether or not the landowners have any private civil remedies based on what they purchased and what has been represented to them. He said the statutes allow that vacation of plats and re-plats can be applied for by the owner of the lot asking to be vacated from the plat or re-platted, and all that is required is that public notice be given in accordance with the Subdivision Control Ordinance. He said he could not find anything that requires them to sign-off. He did say, however, that there is a procedure which allows an entire plat to be vacated by agreement if everyone signs-off, but he pointed out that is not what is being requested. As long as they do the petition and the notice from the governmental standpoint, Mr. Kolbus said they can proceed with the hearing.

Barry Pharis of Brads-Ko Engineering & Surveying, 1009 S. 9th St., Goshen, was present representing Habitat for Humanity on behalf of this request. He noted that the executive director of Habitat, Tom McArthur, Executive Director, is also present.

Mr. Pharis explained that in 2000, Habitat subdivided Harrison Ridge, and in presentation of that subdivision it was stated by the developer's agent that the City of Goshen would take over the playground and maintain it as a playground. He stated that the playground is a non-taxable lot owned by Habitat as the city never took it over. According to Mr. Pharis, a copy of the title insurance was provided to the planning staff, which should assure the Board that the other owners have no legal interest in this land. He went on to say that he also supplied a letter from the homeowners association stating that they are in agreement with this decision.

Mr. Pharis said there were issues with a retention area located north of where they want to put this lot. He explained that the original area was constructed below the seasonal high water table and with fairly steep slopes. He noted that the area has remained wet over the last several years due to extremely high water levels. This has resulted in the area remaining wet, muddy and dangerous. Tom McArthur came to them and asked if they could come up with an idea for a retrofit for the retention area. That retrofit includes raising it above the seasonal high water table so that it is not always full of water. Secondly, the plan is to re-grade it with slopes of 4:1 so it can be maintained easier and be safer for the children of the neighborhood. Mr. Pharis indicated that the construction is underway, with seeding to occur this fall. He stated that they were left with an issue of about 9,000 square feet for the playground. He noted that after speaking with the City of Goshen, the Planning Department, and the Highway Department it was decided that it would be in the best interest of everyone to convert this area to a single family home lot that would go back on the tax roll.

Mr. Doriot asked if there would be a basement to which Mr. Pharis responded no.

Mr. Sharkey asked if they will still have plenty of space for surface water after they re-design the retention. Mr. Pharis explained that there would be more capacity than what was originally designed on the original plat.

Jeannie Sommers, 1630 Harrison Ridge Lane, Goshen, said this area is in her back yard. She stated that for aesthetic purposes she would like to have a sidewalk along the front to connect the two sidewalks where there is currently a gap.

Tom McArthur, executive director for Habitat for Humanity, 2526 Peddlers Village, Goshen, said they do intend to put in a sidewalk there. There are sidewalks in the subdivision so he thinks it was just an oversight on their part.

A motion was made and seconded (*Sharkey/Holt*) that the public hearing be closed and the motion was carried with a unanimous vote.

The Board examined said request and after due consideration and deliberation, a motion was made and seconded (*Wolgamood/Miller*) that this request be approved by the Advisory Plan Commission in accordance with the Staff Analysis and as presented with sidewalks and no basement. With a unanimous roll call vote, the motion was carried.

7. The application for a zone map change from a General Planned Unit Development-B-1/B-2/B-3 to a Detailed Planned Unit Development-B-1 to be known as ***THE WAKARUSA BUSINESS CENTER GRANDMA'S PANTRY DPUD***, for Paul Ivan & Anna Mae Martin represented by Brads-Ko Engineering & Surveying, on property located on the Northwest corner of Keystone Drive & Kemar Street, 350 ft. West of SR 19 in Olive Township, was presented at this time.

* (*It is noted that Blake Doriot stepped down from the Board for this public hearing due to a*

potential conflict of interest.)

Mr. Nemeth presented the Staff Report/Staff Analysis, which is attached for review as *Case #0KEYSTONEDr-100702-1*.

Present on behalf of this request was Barry Pharis of Brads-Ko Engineering & Surveying, 1009 S. 9th St., Goshen, representing Paul and Anna Mae Martin, owners of Grandma's Pantry, which is currently located on Waterford St. in Wakarusa.

Mr. Pharis explained that Grandma's Pantry is a bulk food grocery store that has grown over the years and the proposed new building will allow them to expand with fresh fruit and vegetables. They also plan to build a bakery within the building to serve the community. He noted that the Town of Wakarusa Technical Review Committee was very complimentary of this project, the size of this proposed new building and its expansion.

Mr. Pharis went on to state that the location is a blended PUD with B-1, B-2 and B-3 uses along the northerly portion as commercial uses, and 45 single family residential lots on the westerly portion. He noted that there are two homes under construction and the first nine lots are sold. He said that he has been asked to pursue the next 22 lots as there is interest from a developer/builder to purchase those lots.

Mr. Pharis stated that the Elkhart County ordinance would permit a sign 20 ft. in height, whereas, the Wakarusa ordinance and the PUD ordinance allows a sign 6ft. high at 5 ft. from the right-of-way. Additionally, every two feet from the right-of-way they are allowed to go up one-foot in height. The Technical Committee in Wakarusa was agreeable to issuing a letter stating that they were in agreement with the 80 ft. deviation from the 300 ft. requirement of a sign in the Elkhart County ordinance from a sign in the Town of Wakarusa. Mr. Pharis agrees that a 20 ft. high sign that is lighted should be 300 ft. from residences. However, Mr. & Mrs. Martin live and work in Wakarusa and the proposed sign will be 8-1/2 ft. tall and lighted only on the side that faces away from the residential community.

Mrs. Wolgamood asked if the Wakarusa Technical Committee recommendation was in the file. Mr. Pharis indicated that the letters should be in the file, but explained that they have to return to the Technical Committee with their final landscaping plan, the final sign plan and the elevations of the building, which he believes will occur within the next week or two.

When designing businesses with buggy parking, Mr. Yoder wondered if there is increased concern about MS4 regulations and run-off. He asked if this spot is filtered any before it gets to the existing sanitary connection and Mr. Pharis said it will be. He explained that the city of Goshen has come up with some pretty specific plans that they will be able to transfer to any place.

Mr. Sharkey asked if the lighting of the electronic message board is directed toward the intersection. Mr. Pharis pointed out the location of the sign and he explained that the lighting will be focused toward the commercial area and SR 19. He noted that their hours are 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 or 8:00 pm with the sign going off at night. He stated that the sign would only be on during business hours, with the front lighted and the back solid. Mr. Burbrink asked if there was room on the sign for other businesses and Mr. Pharis replied no.

There were no remonstrators present.

A motion was made and seconded (*Yoder/Burbrink*) that the public hearing be closed and the motion was carried with a unanimous vote.

The Board examined said request and after due consideration and deliberation, a motion was made and seconded (*Sharkey/Wolgamood*) the Advisory Plan Commission recommend to the Wakarusa Town Council that this request be approved as presented and in accordance with the

Staff Analysis with the following condition imposed:

1. Before a building permit is issued, the Wakarusa Technical Review Committee grant final approval for conformance with the development policies of Wakarusa (i.e. architecture, landscaping, etc.).

A roll call vote was taken and the motion was carried unanimously.

8. The application for Secondary approval of a Detailed Planned Unit Development known as **THE WAKARUSA BUSINESS CENTER GRANDMA'S PANTRY DPUD**, for Paul Ivan & Anna Mae Martin represented by Brads-Ko Engineering & Surveying, on property located on the Northwest corner of Keystone Drive & Kemar Street, 350 ft. West of SR 19 in Olive Township, zoned GPUD-B-1/B-2/B-3, was presented at this time.

Mr. Nemeth presented the Staff Report/Staff Analysis, which is attached for review as *Case #0KEYSTONEDr-100702-2*.

Mr. Pharis of Brads-Ko Engineering & Surveying, 1009 S. 9th St., Goshen, offered added no additional comments.

The Board examined said request and after due consideration and deliberation, a motion was made and seconded (*Wolgamood/Yoder*) that Secondary approval of this Detailed Planned Unit Development be granted by the Advisory Plan Commission in accordance with the Staff Analysis. The motion was carried with a unanimous roll call vote.

* (*It is noted that Mr. Doriot returned to the Board at this time.*)

9. The application for an amendment to the text of the Subdivision Control Ordinance, which proposal is summarized as follows: Amends the text of "Chapter 1 General Provisions 1.09 Saving Provision B. Approval under Prior Ordinances 2. Secondary Approval" to establish clarity on how to address a Primary Approval granted under the prior ordinance; and adds the subsection "Chapter 3 Major and Minor Subdivision Procedures 3.10 Effective Date of Primary Approval C. Extensions of Primary Approval" to establish a process for granting of extensions to Major and Minor Preliminary Plans by the Plan Commission, for the Elkhart County Advisory Plan Commission, for property located in the unincorporated areas of Elkhart County, including but not limited to the following townships: Cleveland, Osolo, Washington, York, Baugo, Concord, Jefferson, Middlebury, Olive, Harrison, Elkhart, Clinton, Locke, Union, Jackson, Benton, and the Town of Bristol, Town of Wakarusa, Town of Millersburg, and the Town of Middlebury, was presented at this time.

Mr. Kolbus explained that this proposed amendment gives the opportunity for an applicant to request an extension of primary approval for a period of up to five years, and they may request up to two extensions. The request is heard by the Plan Commission as a non-public hearing item, and it's within the Plan Commission's discretion to grant or deny the request. Also added in was Section 109.B.2. If you had primary approval prior to the effective date of the subdivision ordinance, Mr. Kolbus said you had two years to petition for an extension of time. One of the concerns was that some of these were approved prior to and had two year limitations that were expiring. He said they've added that language so as long as they come in prior to that date, they can request an additional extension of time. Mr. Kolbus believes these comments were consistent with what was discussed by the board members and the staff. He said the amendment is here for public comment today and then a recommendation will be forwarded to the County Commissioners to

amend the ordinance.

Mr. Miller stated it was his understanding the petitioners would not be notified that their time had expired and he asked if that needed to be noted in the ordinance. Mr. Kolbus did not feel that should be put in the ordinance, but he said the Board could direct the staff to notify petitioners.

Mrs. Wolgamood recalled that discussion as well, and after reviewing the minutes, she said the general consensus was that developers need to be notified.

Barry Pharis of Brads-Ko Engineering & Surveying, 1009 S. 9th St., Goshen, asked the Board if PUD's are covered by this ordinance, but Mr. Kolbus said a Planned Unit Development is a change to the ordinance itself.

Mr. Pharis then gave an example of a GPUD in place for B-1, B-2 and B-3 with detailed plans coming in one at a time. Mr. Pharis said that five years ago it would not have been an issue. However, things slowed down in 2009 and he is concerned that if everything is not yet platted, it would not be included. He sees subdivisions falling under the category of coming in and getting a two year primary approval. When a section was platted under the old ordinance, he said the two years started over again and it continued on that way. He now understands that he can get a five-year extension on a subdivision twice, which is good, but he does not feel it should apply to GPUD's or DPUD's. Mr. Kolbus then clarified that it only applies to subdivisions.

For further clarification, Mr. Burrow said General Planned Unit Developments are good for two years, but there is also a provision that does allow for the Plan Commission to extend them. He said planned unit developments have their own ordinance, which is a hybrid of the subdivision ordinance, and they follow that ordinance completely. In further discussion, Mr. Burrow said if a GPUD is not extended by the Plan Commission and things change, it would cause them to go back through a public hearing process.

There were no remonstrators present.

A motion was made and seconded (*Doriot/Miller*) that the public hearing be closed and the motion was carried with a unanimous vote.

The Board examined said request and after due consideration and deliberation, a motion was made and seconded (*Doriot/Miller*) that the Advisory Plan Commission forward this request to the Board of County Commissioners with a favorable recommendation. The motion was carried with a unanimous roll call vote.

10. The application for Primary approval of a one lot minor subdivision to be known as **RABER MINOR SUBDIVISION**, for Joni B. & Fannie Mae Raber represented by Brads-Ko Engineering & Surveying, on property located on the East side of CR 43, 2,000 ft. North of CR 10 in York Township, zoned A-1, was presented at this time.

It is noted that this item was transferred to the Advisory Plan Commission by the Plat Committee.

Mr. Nemeth presented a revised Staff Report/Staff Analysis, which is attached for review as *Case #54168CR 43-100702-1*. Mr. Nemeth said the debate and reason this was transferred to the Plan Commission is the statement on the Staff Report regarding the remaining 32 acres.

Mr. Kolbus asked if there is currently a single family residence on the remaining 32 acres and Mr. Nemeth said yes. Mr. Kolbus advised that it is a buildable lot based on the ordinance, which says the residual lot is a buildable tract if there is a building on it.

Mr. Nemeth said that clause is only under the Administrative Subdivision. Mr. Kolbus acknowledged that it is in the Administrative Subdivision Ordinance, but he said the definition of a

lot is a unit of land for development and the definition of development does not include the maintenance of existing buildings or structures. It is his interpretation that whether it is a minor subdivision or an administrative subdivision where you have a metes and bounds description and a parcel is split off, if the original metes and bounds description was a valid lot under the old ordinance and it has a building on it, that residual parcel remains a buildable lot.

Mr. Watkins agreed with Mr. Kolbus' interpretation. It was an existing buildable lot and he said they did nothing to change the status of that lot. Once you split a lot off, he said you modified the lot so the question is whether the conditions of the ordinance would then apply.

Present on behalf of this request was Barry Pharis of Brads-Ko Engineering & Surveying, 1009 S. 9th St., Goshen, representing Joni Raber, the owner and petitioner. He said they are trying to create a 5.5 acre parcel that can be transferred to his son and daughter-in-law to build a home. With the new subdivision ordinance, he said the grandfathered three-acre rule is gone so they are aware it is a minor subdivision requirement.

Mr. Pharis said he would like to get approval for this minor subdivision and not tie it to the big question of whether or not the residual parcel is legal. Through the minor subdivision, he feels they create a parcel that is legal and the balance is legal, but he doesn't want in the record that the 31+ acres needs to be a minor subdivision in the event they need a building permit for a septic field system, a pole barn, or they want to expand their farming capabilities.

Mr. Yoder asked if it would be appropriate for the Board to determine that they agree with the last point in the site description, but Mr. Doriot felt they should remove that comment and leave it for further discussion on how they are going to interpret the ordinance.

If they remove that comment, Mr. Burrow said it would allow the staff to put some information together for discussion and then bring back a policy statement for the Plan Commission to adopt. With ordinances, he said sometimes wording doesn't apply to what the Plan Commission intended so they would like the opportunity to go back and correct that to make it easier for the staff to interpret, and also to bring it into compliance with what the Plan Commission originally wanted.

Mr. Pharis said he had no objection to that as long as he and Mr. Marbach are notified of that hearing.

There were no remonstrators present.

A motion was made and seconded (*Doriot/Yoder*) that the Advisory Plan Commission approve this request for a one lot minor subdivision as presented and in accordance with the Staff Analysis excluding the following statement: *"In the future, the 32 acre remainder of this 38 acre parcel will need to undergo a subdivision before a building permit can be issued because the parcel will be created after March 1, 2009. However, no Board of Zoning Appeals variances will be needed for area, width, or 3:1 depth-to-width for a single family house."* The motion was carried with a unanimous roll call vote.

11. At this time, Mr. Pharis was asked for his comments on the administrative subdivision process. He explained that he did one administrative subdivision for a client who had a three-acre parcel. To comply with Health Department requirements of two soil borings per acre, he had to pay for six soil borings to get that approved. The requirements to comply with the Highway Department, short of dedicating right-of-way, were also expensive for his client. The bottom line, he said, is that his client has a three-acre parcel he doesn't see anything recorded anywhere that would be found by a title search that his parcel is legal and buildable in Elkhart County.

If doing a minor subdivision, Mr. Pharis pointed out that the ordinance requires two soil

borings and in return he has to dedicate right-of-way, which can be anywhere from 20 to 40 ft. However, at the end of the process there is a plat signed by the owner, Commissioners and the Plat Committee, and it's recorded in the Elkhart County Recorder's office so any title search in the future will find it. He then explained that he was going to bring in a subdivision he did earlier as a three-lot

minor subdivision, but he learned that he would be required to provide 42 soil borings on the 26 acre parcel. However, Mr. Doriot interjected that he has discussed that issue with Bill Hartsuff in the Health Department, and he indicated that Mr. Hartsuff said he would only require three soil borings in the primary location and three in the reserve area.

Mr. Doriot then suggested the wording "subject to administrative subdivision on file in the Planning & Zoning Office of Elkhart County" be included when recording the deed to address the concern about future title searches. However, Mr. Pharis pointed out that surveying and engineering firms are not permitted by state law to create a deed. He said he would prefer to be able to take a plat to the Records office to have it recorded and then he can send a copy to his client and every utility that is served by that district area. Recorded plats would then be in the Surveyor's office, one in the Planning Department, and the utility companies, as well as the copy recorded in the Courthouse. He did admit, however, that as time goes on and various issues are resolved, he may change his position, especially when it comes to not dedicating right-of-way.

Mr. Doriot felt they could fix the issues with the administrative subdivision if they streamlined the minor subdivision ordinance and Mr. Pharis agreed.

In further discussion, Mr. Holt asked if the requirements for soil borings was an ordinance and Mr. Burrow said the Health Department identifies it as a policy that was adopted by the Board of Health.

At the conclusion of this discussion, it was determined that the planning staff would present a policy statement on the residual issue for both minor and administrative subdivisions.

12. Mr. Watkins gave a brief update on the following items:

He submitted photos of the berms at VIM *[attached to file as Staff Exhibit #1]* as a follow-up to the report he was to give in July. He pointed out that the barriers are wider, taller and easier to drive on, and he said they maintained the access roads, which were all part of the fire marshal's original concerns. It is his opinion that they meet the Board's requirements with the exception of seeding.

The Board was then advised that the planning manager has returned on a part-time basis.

Mr. Watkins reported that discussion was held with Ground Rules with regard to the letter from Farm Bureau in response to the zoning ordinance rewrite. There were some things in the letter that had already been deleted, and they felt some things were a misunderstanding and were not applying to the situations. He also said there was one issue they felt they should leave to the steering committee for their recommendation. According to Mr. Watkins, some items still need to be discussed and the house size needs to be changed. The next step is for the steering committee to review the revisions and hopefully it will come to the Plan Commission if there are not too many changes; however, he said there is no timeline yet.

Mr. Watkins also reported that the building departments from Nappanee, Goshen, and Elkhart have been working on a uniform fee schedule for building permits. He said there are some steps the cities take that the county will not, and there will be a couple of fees in the ordinance that are not things the county could do given the size of the area within their jurisdiction. Mr. Watkins said they will be meeting with the mayors at the Department of Public Services on September 3rd at

9:00 a.m. to discuss a revised fee schedule that will be a uniform building fee and uniform language with regard to what you are applying for countywide.

Another issue being discussed is the Countywide Utility Study, which Mr. Watkins said will come back to the Plan Commission for disposition in September.

In a brief discussion regarding the budgets, Mr. Watkins advised the Board that three vacant positions have not been funded for 2011. He admitted that things are slower, but he said that doesn't mean business is slow. According to Mr. Watkins, the staff is seeing approximately 30 people a day at the counter, and the number of inspections is averaging six a day for each inspector and they are averaging 80 miles of travel a day. There has not been much done with unsafe housing in the past, but he said there are currently 40 in the process, which is time consuming. Building is slow, but Mr. Watkins said it is above last year with the exception of one month.

Mr. Sharkey said they feel all of the departments have worked hard and have done a great job cutting their budgets the last two years. However, he said revenues keep going down so they will not have the money to spend this year. He then indicated that next year could be even tougher.

The number of vacant homes in the county was then briefly discussed. Mr. Watkins explained that the code enforcement staff is now working with the Highway Department in cutting the grass. At some of these houses you find trash and debris on the property so he said they are working with the landfill through Tom Byers to figure out a way to clean this debris up. He's not sure if the landfill would even be willing to do that, but he said they would have to work out the process with Mr. Kolbus and this would eliminate the need to hire an outside contractor.

Mr. Doriot recalled an earlier discussion where the building inspectors were being cross-trained and Mr. Watkins said they still are. He also explained that St. Joe County is now having free monthly certified training courses, which the inspectors are taking advantage of.

13. A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mr. Doriot and seconded by Mr. Miller. With a unanimous vote, the meeting was adjourned at 10:23 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Teresa McLain, Transcriber

Kathleen L. Wilson, Recording Secretary

Tom Holt, Chairman

