

**MINUTES**  
**ELKHART COUNTY PLAN COMMISSION MEETING**  
**HELD ON THE 10<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JUNE 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 Secretary, Mike Yoder, with the following members present: Blake Doriot, Roger Miller, Steve Warner, Meg Wolgamood, Dennis Sharkey and Tom Lantz. Staff members present were: Duane Burrow, Senior Planner; Robert Nemeth, Planner; and James W. Kolbus, Attorney for the Board.
2. The minutes of the regular meeting of the Elkhart County Plan Commission held on the 13<sup>h</sup> day of May 2010 were not completed for approval at this time.
3. There were no legal advertisements published for this meeting.
4. A motion was made and seconded (*Doriot/Miller*) 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. Discussion on the proposed extension of Primary plats due to the economic slowdown was held at this time. Copies of suggested language for incorporation as an amendment to the Subdivision Ordinance was distributed to the Board by Mr. Burrow (*see attached*). This language reads as follows: “**3.10 C. Extensions** – *For good cause shown, the Plan Commission may grant one (1) extension of the original primary approval for a period of up to two (2) years.*” Mr. Burrow explained that this would be the suggested modification to the subdivision ordinance by allowing for one extension for up to two years. That would be a text amendment that would have to be adopted in the ordinance.

Mr. Miller clarified that the extension does not mean that it would have to be presented again, it's just a blanket on what was originally approved. Mr. Burrow confirmed that the extension would be for just one time for a period up to two years.

Mr. Sharkey asked about an existing extension. Mr. Burrow stated that there is no extension in the new ordinance. Mrs. Wolgamood asked if there was anything in the old ordinance that would allow the Plan Commission to grant an extension because they have granted extensions. Mr. Kolbus confirmed that there was nothing in the old ordinance that would allow the Plan Commission to grant extensions, but it was done anyway as a policy matter.

Mr. Burrow acknowledged that they have been doing it, but stated that it would be better to have it expressed in the ordinance. Mrs. Wolgamood agreed.

In response to Mr. Doriot's question about granting one extension for more time, Mr. Burrow responded that it would be going from two years to four years, further explaining that it has to be requested and is not automatic. Mrs. Wolgamood commented that the request would likely be done by the developer.

Mr. Miller stated that any rules or regulations that would impact the original drawings would not have to be taken into account. Mr. Burrow said they would just go with the original design standards. He explained that the lot area and lot width is what this would generally affect

and it would not require the Board of Zoning Appeals to review a plat or a property before a plat is approved.

Tim Miller of Fireside Homes was in the audience and Mr. Doriot asked how many subdivisions he has going right now that are not complete. Mr. Miller stated that he has six or seven that are not complete. In response to Mr. Doriot's question, Mr. Miller stated that the last time he platted was at least two and half years ago. Mr. Doriot then asked when Mr. Miller foresees platting another extension, to which Mr. Miller responded that perhaps when he sells another lot, as he has no foreseeable plans in the future to do another section.

Mr. Miller stated that one of his concerns was if they are required to keep track of where they are at with the extensions. He feels that two years is the minimum to do so.

Mr. Doriot had several questions for Mr. Miller regarding the six or seven subdivisions in development. Mr. Miller was asked if his overall primary plan was how he attempted to cash flow the subdivision. He was also asked if he could go forward with those sections if the lots had to be 1-1/2 acre lots, based upon the passing of a new ordinance. Mr. Miller said it would depend on which project they're talking about, but it would be a catastrophic change for them financially. They made all of their projections based on the number of lots that they requested in the primary plan. He suggested that any primary plats that are currently approved be grandfathered, regardless of the time frame.

Mr. Yoder said he is trying to make a connection between this and the zoning ordinance and he assumed they would be grandfathered. Mr. Miller stated that he believed the secondary plats are grandfathered, but not the primary.

Mr. Doriot gave an example of an existing development south U.S. 6 in Jackson Township, which is about half done. It was designed for 20,000 sq. ft. lots and the roads were laid out for 20,000 sq. ft. lots. More roads were paved than what was originally laid out in the first section so it would flow properly. Mr. Doriot stated in this case, there are areas where there are four lots surrounded by pavement and since it's been two years, the primary has basically expired. If this goes through and he seeks a secondary, he will be told that his primary is expired and it will have to be redesigned. Mr. Doriot said the process would then be to redesign a way out of primary, re-apply an amended erosion control plan, and go through the primary hearing prior to filing a secondary. He said he would have to comply with the standards at the time of the new primary so it's not grandfathered once the primary expires. Mr. Doirot expressed concern that if this went ahead it would involve thousands of dollars that people will have to absorb in a struggling economy.

Mr. Miller stated that it seems to make sense to grandfather primary plats that have been approved. Any primary that was planned indicates that the landowner/developer had a plan for that property, basically provided a primary idea of how the ground was going to be platted and it was approved. Due to the slowing of the economy development didn't transpire as quickly as anticipated. Mr. Miller suggests that grandfathering would cover primary and secondary plats.

Mr. Kolbus asked why secondary can't be approved and should be grandfathered. Mr. Miller explained that the problem is the primary may lapse before they plat their secondary plats. If that happened it could result in a reduction of lots, and therefore would make no sense financially to do so.

When Mr. Kolbus asked Mr. Miller if he is suggesting any sort of time limit on primary approvals, Mr. Miller recommends a time limit only on those that have already been approved. Mr. Kolbus suggested a time limit of two years for those already approved, as he believes there has to

be some limit. Mr. Kolbus stated that Mr. Kanney has indicated to him there are some sitting there that were platted 20 years ago. Mr. Miller said the only reason he recommends approval of the existing ones are because the requirements are changing dramatically with the new zoning ordinance. He went on to state that if there wasn't such a big change in the zoning ordinance it wouldn't create so much of an issue.

Mr. Sharkey stated that while he understands Mr. Miller's concern, he is concerned that there are some out there that were platted 20 years ago.

Mr. Miller, who said he is speaking for the Builder's Association, would be agreeable to some sort of a time limit. He stated that they need to know what it is, and feels that it needs to be longer than two years.

Mr. Doriot stated that the next option would be to bring in six or seven one lot extensions. In other words, pave 100 foot of pavement and bring in one lot, which would keep it active. Mr. Doriot suggested that doing one lot, which would extend the primary two years, might be a better option than redesigning 40 or 50 lots; however, Mr. Miller said it seems like there would be a better way.

Mr. Yoder asked Mr. Miller how long he would have projected to finish his ten phase development. Mr. Miller stated that Copperfield was a ten year development, while Timberstone was more like a 15 year development with 240 home sites.

Mr. Doriot wondered if the Primary could be viable for five years after the last section is platted with one extension granted of an additional five years and Mr. Miller felt that was reasonable.

For clarification, Mr. Yoder asked if they were proposing this for all current primaries and those going forward and Mr. Doriot said yes.

Mr. Miller wondered if a window of time could be given to all of those currently expired which would give them the opportunity to be approved, with the possibility of receiving the extension.

Mr. Burrow stated that based on the way the ordinance is currently written, the staff took the position that they have two years from March 1, 2009. Mr. Doriot clarified that they have until March 1, 2011, to bring in requests for extensions and Mr. Kolbus stated that they need to get this change done so that can be accomplished.

Mr. Sharkey asked how notification would occur when expiration is approaching. Mrs. Wolgamood stated that it is the developer's responsibility. Mr. Miller said he's been developing since 1985 and he had no idea they expired as it's never been an issue when they've come in with new sections.

Mr. Kolbus asked about the major cost on getting secondary when lots aren't selling. He questioned if bonding or putting in the improvements is the main burden of getting secondary, which he acknowledged is significant. He also asked what additional costs they are looking at, for instance professional fees. Mr. Miller stated that engineering fees present a barrier, construction for sure, as well as bonding.

Mr. Doriot asked if they are taxed as lots once they are platted, but Mr. Miller said they are taxed individually as farm land until they are sold.

Mr. Kolbus stated that an amendment would have to come back for a public hearing next month. Based on the discussions, he proposed changing the wording in section 3.10 A from primary approved for two years to five years. In 3.10 C, he suggested that the Plan Commission can grant an extension for up to five years from two years. Mr. Kolbus said it was up to the board if

they wanted to take out the good cause shown.

Mrs. Wolgamood stated that the only good cause right now is financial. Mr. Burrow added that residential has gone down 100%, and there is an economic incentive to grant relief on a temporary basis. Mr. Burrow stated that what is being asked is for the developer to explain why the development didn't occur.

Mr. Yoder expressed concern that everyone would come in and express economic problems, so he is leaning towards not doing the just cause clause.

Mr. Yoder stated that if there are subdivisions that are platted that are 20 years old, then he is inclined to believe they are way out of compliance with what the new regulations will be. He believes it may be in their best interest to look at it again and say you can't have  $\frac{3}{4}$  of an acre to build a house on.

Mr. Burrow clarified that what is being said is that after ten years new standards must be looked at. He believes it is a nice transition. The good cause is just an arbitrary statement.

Mr. Doriot felt the developer should come in and request an extension before the Board. Mr. Yoder questioned making the developers come before the board if the request was going to be granted anyway. Mr. Burrow stated that it should just be granted for ten years.

Mr. Burrow provided an example of when good cause might not be shown and the request would not be granted. For example, significant safety changes in street standards since allowing developer to strip off the road. In that instance, the developer really should come in and explain why they should still be allowed to occur even though there is a safety issue.

Mr. Kolbus explained that the reason the time limits are there is for changes that take place in the ordinance or the surrounding area. If there are no changes taking place it's a non-issue.

When Mr. Sharkey asked if it would be advantageous for developers to find more property and do primaries now before the new zoning ordinance, Mrs. Wolgamood said yes. Mr. Burrow responded that it has always been a concern.

Mr. Miller commented that it might be best for the developer to request secondary approval so the Board can review what was originally platted. This would afford the Board an opportunity to make sure they are still in line and there is not something in the area that would not make a subdivision a good neighbor. Mr. Burrow stated that something may not comply with the comprehensive plan, which is in keeping with the wording "may grant." Mr. Burrow pointed out that it does not state "shall grant", it reads "may grant".

Mr. Miller and Rob Letherman, who was also in audience, indicated that would be fine.

Mrs. Wolgamood sought clarification about whether the developers would come before a public hearing or the board. Mr. Burrow stated that the conversation would take place between the developer and the board. He said that the board can say no, and if the developer doesn't agree with that finding then they can come in and ask for a public hearing.

Mr. Sharkey asked when the five years would begin and Mr. Burrow explained that historically it has always been when it is adopted. He went on to say that Mr. Kolbus will need to write it starts from 2009 for existing ones, so that it is clear what has been done. Mr. Burrow relayed that a proposal will be submitted to the Board at a public hearing, at which time they can review it and make changes. That recommendation will then go to the County Commissioners who will consider the recommendation. The County Commissioners are the ones that ultimately approve the text amendment. Mr. Burrow recommended that the starting point of March 1, 2009 be used, to minimize confusion. To clarify, anything existing now has until March 1, 2014. Any

old ones are done unless they come in and ask for another extension, which may be granted. In response to Mrs. Wolgamood's question about how the March 1, 2009 date was determined, Mr. Burrow stated that the current ordinance was adopted on March 1, 2009.

The consensus of the Board was to make changes in the language for review by the Plan Commission in July and then set it for public hearing in August.

Mrs. Wolgamood suggested that Mr. Miller and Mr. Letherman at least call the office to find out what the final draft is, since they were involved in the discussion.

6. Based on the last discussion of the Zoning Ordinance, Mr. Yoder said he thought they talked about making changes to lot size to eliminate this problem. Mr. Doriot thought it was still in discussion phase, but no one has seen anything.

Tim Miller of Fireside Homes stated the discussion involved concerns about the acre and a half, general size requirements, and sewer. He shared that they were seeking flexibility when there is a matrix for the septic system and they could prove that they could do smaller lots in a given area.

They felt that the requirements in almost every zone were too large for the lot sizes. Mr. Miller stated that they shared what they recommended the new lot sizes should be rather than what was proposed. He also said that they did get some clarification on the fact that a residential development would have to be rezoned. If not, there would be very few residential subdivisions in an agricultural zone. The new approach would be to get it rezoned first and then go down that road in a residential zone.

Mr. Doriot asked if there's enough difference in what he heard last week and what they are doing right now to move the extensions along, as the existing developments will not fit into the new ordinance. Mr. Miller stated that there is no question that the existing developments will not fit into the new ordinance, as it will significantly change development in Elkhart County. He believes that the majority of change is due to the lot size.

Mrs. Wolgamood pointed out that the discussion was ongoing during the committee meeting and there was no decision made. Mr. Doriot stated that Farm Bureau wants to see the changes we've got right now so they can react to those changes with all the animal numbers due to the drastic changes.

Mr. Miller said that it all ties back into lot size again. Mr. Miller disagrees with the concept that this will not affect property value, both on the developed lots and on the farm ground. He went on to explain that retail lots will be more expensive in almost every zoning district, and referred to a handout developed by Jeff Chupp. He feels that the information may be a little aggressive but not too far out of line.

Mr. Miller believes that the farm properties in areas where residential growth would make sense will increase in value due to the density. Developers can buy less ground and put more homes on them. Therefore, the value of those farms is greater than property in a more rural setting.

The value of that property is going to decrease due to the fact that developers can't spend as much per acre to develop it. Developers will not be able to sell \$80,000 acre and half lots.

Mr. Yoder wondered if the Board's reasoning for encouraging increased property size for homes was due to septic concerns. While septic is a concern, he feels it's more of a density issue. They would like to push the higher densities towards the cities and toward sewer so that rural settings are less dense. Mr. Miller acknowledged that what is trying to be accomplished in the new ordinance makes sense, in keeping the growth closer to the municipality where there is shopping,

banking, churches, etc.

Roger Miller commented that it's nice to have those amenities but what he is more concerned with is the fire department, the ambulance, all the things that people out in the country convey to him they want but don't get, even though they desire to live out in the middle of nowhere.

Mr. Sharkey expressed concern that when it comes to zoning ordinances, schools are never discussed. He believes that schools rank very high in determining where people want to live. Mr. Doriot questioned why a Fairfield educated child can be educated for \$2500 less than an Elkhart Memorial child. Tim Miller agreed that schools are a driving force in the marketplace.

Mr. Sharkey stated that families are moving out of school systems to move to other school systems, and those school systems happen to be in rural areas. Mr. Miller pointed out that the Middlebury School system has been the school system of choice for the last ten years. Although it's not necessarily because people want to be in a rural setting, it's because they like the quality of education they've heard happens in the Middlebury Schools. So, they are migrating towards Middlebury Schools. However, now the Middlebury Schools are getting too overpopulated and the families are moving somewhere else. The demographics in that area are going down. Family size is decreasing so there are fewer families with children in school, meaning the school systems become less important for the majority of the buying people in that area. As time goes on and the baby boomers are moving on through the process and their kids are out of school, the school systems are not going to be as big a deal. They're looking at property taxes and quality of life, more so than the schools. He then indicated that he has been in empty-nester housing for the last ten years because it's a trend that is coming and it's going to continue.

Mr. Yoder felt they had a good discussion on land value at the workshop. He stated that there is a difference of opinion, but his opinion is that he is not going to decide on the zoning ordinance based on some proposed changes in land value because that can't be determined. However, they can make a decision concerning the placement of a high density subdivision in an agricultural area with active farms. To do so would create a conflict of use. It's a problem to move equipment up and down the road if there are a lot of people driving by. It's a problem for the people driving and it's a problem for the farmer trying to move equipment. With a livestock operation there is the potential for other conflicts to take place. Generally speaking, he likes the direction the ordinance is going as it creates larger lots and less density out in the country and lowers those incidents of conflicts of use, which is what he thought zoning is all about. It protects everybody's right to use their property.

In a scenario involving Jefferson Township, Mr. Yoder said they could arguably say that we want that all residential, so with agriculture, you're going to need a lower use in that area because it's already primarily residential anyway. A decision may be made to say that it's all residential or whatever is appropriate to make it. Tim Miller agreed pointing out that Jefferson Township is very popular; however, there are no city utilities. That results in a conflict due to the lot size requirements. There's no sewer, but in Jefferson Township a lot of it is sandy soil and it's possible to get by with much smaller lots than required in the ordinance.

Mr. Yoder stated that he understands the issue, and acknowledged that it needs to be resolved. Mr. Yoder also stated that there is a water quality issue. Some will say that no additional systems can be put in that watershed. Tim Miller stated that he would like to see this assumption proven due to the fact that there are not wells in residential areas, since there are nitrates that are not safe for drinking.

Rob Letherman was asked to address his concerns. Mr. Letherman stated that Elkhart East is not opposed to changing the zoning ordinance. Rather, they are in support of the change as it levels the playing field. Mr. Letherman relays that Elkhart East, a 1200 acre development, spent a lot of time and effort working with the county and neighbors to get a master plan in place and he would like assurance that the master plan is applied as fairly as possible.

Mr. Yoder asked Mr. Letherman his thoughts about the five year extension. Mr. Letherman stated that he believes five years is more than fair and he thinks the developer should be responsible for coming to the County to request an extension; although, he cautioned the need to keep an eye on conflict.

Mr. Letherman shared that he was on the committee for the City of Elkhart when they revised their zoning ordinance. Additionally, he has been on the Plan Commission for the City of Elkhart since 2002. He offers one word of caution, relaying that when Elkhart revamped the whole zoning ordinance nobody had a good enough grasp on it when it was finally adopted. This resulted in basically shutting down development for about 18 months. Mr. Letherman then went on to reference the Meijer “fiasco” that happened on Cassopolis Street and stated that Elkhart went from being extremely business friendly to raising the bar too high, which resulted in a loss of interest in the City of Elkhart. He relayed that the Plan Commission went to the staff and told them that they needed to streamline the process and make significant changes. There was a two to three year period when a lot of projects didn’t happen in the City of Elkhart.

Mr. Letherman suggested to Mr. Watkins that a viable draft be developed. He recommended having several contractors run a mock project through the process, using the draft, to see how it proceeds. Mr. Letherman explained that the City of Elkhart wanted to raise the bar, so they revamped the whole zoning ordinance. However, when they got done, the conclusion was that they raised the bar too high when it came to standards and the process.

Mrs. Wolgamood asked how long the ordinance has been in effect. Mr. Letherman explained that they revised the ordinance in 1998, but they revamped it due to the problems they saw in 2004-2005. Then it was really streamlined around 2005-2006 that spelled out exactly what the developers needed to have to get a project through the process. Mr. Letherman shared that in hindsight, had they done some mock project, it would have saved probably a year, maybe more, in getting the process streamlined.

Mr. Yoder said they would like to make sure that the new zoning designations that are being created will transfer right on top of existing and won’t change any uses that are currently in existence. In others words, it will be possible to find a designation that fits.

Mr. Letherman explained that right now there is a GPUD on a thousand acres. For some reason the map does not show that GPUD on that property. Mr. Letherman stated that he knows how to read maps and he knows how the public interprets maps. He would like to see indicated the designated future uses that have been agreed to on the map, as it’s been ten years.

Tim Miller stated that what he expected to find in the zoning mapping was, in essence, a guide map for what they wanted to see. What he saw was “this is what is existing” and then a key that said “these are the 14 or 15 different zones that are available.” He went on to state that what he didn’t see was the Board’s vision for the County. He had hoped to see where the Board would like to see the growth happen.

Mrs. Wolgamood felt he was talking about two types of maps. One of those maps would be an actual zoning map which is what they were attempting to create. If the Commissioners adopt the actual zoning map, it will be possible to look at the actual map and see that an area is “A-G”. It

won't reflect current zoning, it will reflect zoning once the new zone map is adopted. It would take the existing zones today and convert A-1 to A-G, in most cases. If it was a residential area then it would be R-R or whatever designation is closest to its current use.

Mrs. Wolgamood then went on to address the second map Tim Miller was discussing, which was the Comprehensive Plan map. She shared that when the last Comprehensive Plan went through; they chose not to do a map. The Comprehensive Plan is just a number of statements.

Mr. Doriot explained that in the past some older plans were referenced in meetings which resulted in confusion.

Mrs. Wolgamood believes that often when people looked at the old comprehensive map they interpreted it as law, when in fact it was a policy.

Tim Miller said that what is being proposed will result in the developer needing to convince the Board that it makes sense to make changes to zoning, which he was agreeable to.

Mr. Yoder stated that the current A-1 areas may present some challenges. There has been some discussion about affording leniency to land owners if the current use fits within three or four zones. This would allow the land owner to indicate how they wish to be zoned. For example, someone with an intensive livestock operation is not going to agree to make the property R-R. However, a cornfield in A-1 has numerous possibilities. Although there is some question about the farmer's right to say he wants property designated R-R so that everyone will know that he intends to make a subdivision or residential area on that property.

It was agreed that there will be a number of things that need to be worked through as a new zoning map is created.

Tim Miller believes that residential housing developments can live in harmony with the farming communities. For the last ten years he has put in the non-remonstration agreement with the deed restriction for his developments. He expressed interest in knowing if there have been remonstration issues with those developments that have that clause in the covenants of their development. Mr. Miller stated that he is unaware of any of his communities that are complaining against farming activities. He feels that it may be a non-issue, because the farm was there when they moved in.

Mr. Yoder asked if there was any further discussion or questions on this subject that would move it forward.

Mr. Letherman stated that he has read through half, as the residential portion does not pertain to him, and he questions some things in the ordinance. He realizes from past experience that consultants will present a utopian community plan, but in this case there are things in the ordinances that won't apply in Elkhart. For example, one of the commercial standards refers to keeping all parking in the rear of the building. Mr. Letherman is confident that Lowe's is not going to be in agreement with that, as they want cars out in front. Lowe's wants people to see the cars in their parking lot when they drive by because it draws other people to their store. Mr. Letherman feels there are things that can be looked at and discussed.

Mr. Yoder encouraged Mr. Letherman to present his concerns, as the Board is moving from the utopia to reality. Mr. Letherman stated that he sent his concerns to the consultant. Mr. Yoder indicated that Mr. Letherman should review the new draft when it becomes available. Mr. Doriot asked Mr. Letherman if he was sending copies of his concerns to the staff. Mr. Letherman indicated that he had been doing so.

Mr. Kolbus shared that at the Builder's Association workshop last week they spent some



time discussing a very detailed list. They had picked out all of their sections and reviewed their comments at the workshop, which was very helpful. He said he has not seen any of Mr. Letherman's comments and suggested that he distribute those comments to the Plan Commission members as well.

Mr. Letherman then asked if there had been any discussion on how the changes will effect existing covenants and restrictions. He explained that with Elkhart East they have covenants and restrictions, development standards, and the compact agreement. He wondered if it would be necessary to change all of those documents, due to the changes in zoning designations. He realizes that the process of making those changes is part of being a developer. However, he questions the need to do so for existing property owners as they have read and agreed to the covenants and restrictions that applied in 2001.

Mr. Sharkey felt they should be grandfathered. Mr. Letherman asked for clarification about how grandfathering would be applied. When Mr. Sharkey asked Mr. Letherman if he was talking about landscaping and building design, Mr. Letherman explained what takes place when an individual buys a lot in Elkhart East. The individual is required to read a copy of the covenants and restrictions, development standards and compact agreement all of which reference the zoning ordinance. Mr. Letherman expressed concern now that he is ten years into this development and has sold to 20 or 40 different property owners. He asked if he would have to go back and change all of those documents, and fears it will be a nightmare to do so.

Mr. Burrow stated that it depends on how those documents were written, and recommended that Mr. Letherman consult his attorney.

Alex Thwait's, board member of Farm Bureau, expressed some concern regarding the animal numbers and land values with the new zoning ordinance. He stated that property value could be inflated or deflated depending on a change in zoning.

Roger Miller asked Mr. Thwait's how Farm Bureau resolves an issue between neighboring farmers who aren't in agreement with changing the land use. Mr. Thwait's stated that Farm Bureau might not resolve that issue, as each land owner owns their land, and therefore has the right to do what they want to do as long as it meets with the current standards. When standards are changed it dictates to the landowner what they can and can't do and might change their future plans.

Mr. Thwait's felt that the animal numbers needed substantial work, and indicated that he would be interested to see what changes are proposed. The Board indicated there would be more discussion concerning that.

Mr. Thwait's stated that he was advised that in addition to receiving emails about changes, updates would be posted on county website. Farm Bureau would like to see what those changes are going to be before going through everything only to discover that it was all discarded and there are now new changes.

Mrs. Wolgamood asked Mr. Thwait's if he was involved with the letter from Farm Bureau addressed to Ground Rules, which they all received and Mr. Thwait's said he was. He went on to explain that Farm Bureau wanted to show their concern and are interested in seeing what the changes are going to be.

7. A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mr. Doriot and seconded by Mr. Sharkey. With a unanimous vote, the meeting was adjourned at 10:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Teresa McLain, Transcriber

---

Kathleen L. Wilson, Recording Secretary

---

Mike Yoder, Secretary