

COMMISSIONERS' MEETING

October 17, 2022

The Bartholomew County Commissioners met on October 17, 2022, in the Commissioners Chambers of the Governmental Office Building, 440 Third Street, Columbus, Indiana. Commissioners Larry S. Kleinhenz, Carl H. Lienhoop and Tony London, County Administrator Tina Douglas and Attorney Grant Tucker were in attendance. Auditor Chief Deputy Dalene Pattingill attended via Zoom.

Commissioner Lienhoop opened the meeting.

Commissioner Lienhoop gave the invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

The first item was the Approval of Minutes of October 3 and October 6, 2022. **Commissioner London motioned to Approve the Minutes as presented. Commissioner Kleinhenz seconded the motion which passed unanimously.**

The next item was the Approval of Payroll. **Commissioner Kleinhenz motioned to Approve the Payroll as presented. Commissioner London seconded the motion which passed unanimously.**

The next items were the Weekly Permits Report as read by Commissioner Lienhoop:

| <i>Time frame</i> | <i>New permits</i> | <i>Fees</i> | <i>Value</i> |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| <i>10/03/22 to 10/07/22</i> | <i>34</i> | <i>\$4,846.00</i> | <i>\$2,294,438</i> |
| <i>10/10/22 to 10/14/22</i> | <i>28</i> | <i>\$4,281.00</i> | <i>\$2,979,924</i> |

*Of note: A few single family dwellings
\$1,100,000 new commercial building*

The next item was the Weekly Crew Report for County Highway as presented by County Engineer Danny Hollander (via Zoom) for the last 2 weeks as follows: placed stone along Marr Road & 700 E; fixed pipe in West Pointe Additions; placed grass seed over pipes; ditched on 300 E, 100 E, 300 W, 250 N, & 500 S; dura-patched potholes; pipe on 250 N for field entrance; put up signs; mowed in Wayne Township; and Milestone paved 700 E, 700 N & Lutheran Lake Road.

The next item was a Decision on Untreated De-icing Salt for the Highway as presented by Engineer Hollander. After review, Engineer Hollander recommended awarding the bid to the quote with Morton Salt, Inc. of Chicago as follows:

- *FOB Plant* \$93.00/ton
- *County Storage* \$93.06/ton

Commissioner London motioned to Award to the low bid, Morton Salt, Inc. of Chicago as presented. Commissioner Kleinhenz seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

The next item was Proposals for the Striping of 525 E as presented by Engineer Hollander as follows:

- *AAA Striping Company (Columbus, IN)*
 - \$7,013.40
- *Indiana Sign & Barricade, Inc. (Indianapolis, IN)*
 - \$9,295.00

Commissioner Kleinhenz motioned to Approve the low bid, AAA Striping Company, in the amount of \$7,013.40 as presented. Commissioner London seconded the motion which passed unanimously. Commissioner Kleinhenz had driven 525 E and had spoken to Superintendent Smith about widening the rest of the road to SR 7. Superintendent Smith stated that they needed to do shoulder work before they could make that happen, but hope to do it next year.

The next item was the Ratification of Expenditure for the Highway Department as presented by Engineer Hollander as follows:

- *Ratification of Expenditure for Milestone Contractors*
- *For overages on overlay of 525 E widening*
- *Original Cost awarded 8/29/2022:* \$148,150.00
- *Total Due after completion:* \$150,936.06
 - ***Overage Amount:*** **\$ 2,786.06**

Engineer Hollander stated that they needed 35 ton more in asphalt. **Commissioner Kleinhenz motioned to Ratify the Overage Expenditure with Milestone Contractors in the amount of \$2,786.06 for a total of \$150,936.06. Commissioner London seconded the motion which passed unanimously.**

The next item was the Consideration of an Annual Maintenance Renewal for Information Technology Department as presented by IT Director Scott Mayes as follows:

- *CityForce (formerly Franklin Information Systems)*
- *For Code Enforcement Office Records Management*
- *IT Budget*
- *Annual License & Maintenance Agreement*
- *\$4,338.20*

Commissioner London motioned to Approve the Annual Maintenance Renewal with CityForce in the amount of \$4,338.20 as presented. Commissioner Kleinhenz seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

The next item was the Consideration on First Reading of an Ordinance Amending the Columbus & Bartholomew County Zoning Ordinance for the Jurisdiction of Bartholomew County as presented by Plan Director Jeff Bergman as follows:

- *Plan Commission Passed Resolution No. 2022-01*
- *Approving Amending the Ordinance Regulating Solar Farms*
- *Intent: The purpose of the Commercial Solar Energy System Standards is to establish reasonable requirements for the development, operation, and decommissioning of commercial solar energy systems and to minimize conflict between these developments and surrounding land uses*
- *Bartholomew County Zoning Ordinance Revisions for Commercial Solar Energy Systems (CSES's) Exhibit "A" List Details:*
 - *Zoning Ordinance Section 3.5(B): Agriculture: Preferred (AP)*
 - *Zoning Ordinance Section 3.6(B): Agriculture: General Rural (AG)*
 - *Zoning Ordinance Article 3: Zoning Districts*

- *Zoning Ordinance Chapter 6.10: Commercial Solar Energy Systems*
- *Zoning Ordinance Chapter 12.9: Improvement Location Permits*
- *Zoning Ordinance Chapter 14.2: Definitions*

Plan Director Jeff Bergman stated that the proposed Ordinance deals with Commercial Solar Facilities, not the small scale homeowner/business items. Currently, these Commercial Facilities would be allowed with the in-place Ordinances. They would not have any restrictions regarding set-backs and de-commissioning as this Ordinance does address. The Plan Commission only looked at land use, not a judgement on Solar Energy. There are a couple of facilities being planned within the County. The Ordinance is not aimed at these, but rather establishing the rules for which they will be allowed. The staff had over 8 hours of public testimony (25 members of the public). The vote from the Commission was 7-1 in favor of the Ordinance. Emilie Pinkston gave a brief overview of the Ordinance as follows:

- *Commercial Solar is conditional use – public meeting*
- *Separation distances*
- *Lighting, vegetation*
- *De-commissioning & site restoration plan – approved by County Commissioners*
 - *Would come into effective if not producing for 12 consecutive months*
 - *Reevaluated every 5 years*
 - *Specific list of materials*

Commissioner Kleinhenz stated that in the last 3 years they have had frequent calls from Solar Companies. They did not feel it was appropriate to meet with these groups. They did meet with several citizen groups concerning this, however. They did read all the memos and contacts that they have received. Attorney Tucker explained that this is not a referendum on whether or not solar farms will be allowed in Bartholomew County; the market will determine that. This is to establish the rules that they must follow if a solar project does come in to the County. Commissioner Lienhoop stated that they are reviewing this Ordinance on First Reading. To pass, it will have to pass a Second Reading. They can also make changes, and if they do, then it would have to go back to the Plan Commission for Approval. Director Bergman believes if the Ordinance passes on both readings with changes, then it goes to the Plan Commission. If the Plan Commission has no issues, then the process is completed.

Commissioner Lienhoop stated that for the Public Hearing, each person will have 3 minutes to state their case. He encourages everyone to be civil. The 3 minutes was set as the Plan Commission has already had 8 hours of Public Hearings. They will go in order of the sign-in list. Zoom participants will get 3 minutes but they will go last. The Public Hearing was opened.

Comments from those in Physical Attendance

- ***Ed Curtin*** – passed
- ***Ray Ziegler*** – 5th generation in Bartholomew County. He stated the study of 20 years ago is still relative, especially the farmland. It adds to the quality of life to its citizens. If they have solar farms, they hope the set back would be 500'. Many visitors come to Columbus for the architecture and would be distracting to drive down the roads and see these farms.
- ***Timberly Ross*** – passed
- ***Chris King*** – passed
- ***Josh Chavez*** – with Revon – project manager – decommissioning and salvage values – returning the land to previous condition is already a part of their plan – the bond should just be considered an insurance project – in the scenario that the bond would be needed would only be if the project gets abandoned – they already have an obligation to return the land to pre-use – the salvage value of 5% does make sense and they feel it should be contemplated as part of the decommissioning process – they do feel the 250' setback is appropriate but the 500' setback could endanger the project – for them it would be loss of revenue of \$40,000,000 to the project – Commissioner Kleinhenz questioned in communities where they have had a larger setbacks, have they approached the adjoining landowners for a waiver of the setback – Mr. Chavez stated that it depends on the financial feasibility of the project and they will approach for the waivers though most neighboring owners are not willing to waive the setback.
- ***Jayne Gelman*** – passed
- ***Carol Kelleghan*** – married to Lynn Finkel – husband loves the dirt as much as their children – when he received the letter regarding solar – they discovered 15 contiguous land owners had signed – took their proposed contract to attorney – they were advised, at great expense, that it was a very sound legal document that would support them

greatly for their endeavor – the company offered same offer to their adjoin land owners – found out that it only requires 1% land of the Ag land in the County for it to happen – they could minimize the number of neighbors that would have to sign on – adds to the community – we cannot just rely on coal & gas

- **Peter Gray** – passed
- **Lynn Finkel** – they have 15 land owners that want the land back afterwards – contract states land back to the original contour – that is a strenuous restraint – should be up to the land owner if they are okay with it – Ordinance is one of the most restrictive of any of the County Ordinances – setbacks are his concern – we have them on hospitals and homes – believes they are adequate as presented – appreciates the work the Plan Commission has done
- **Jeff Hilycord** – real estate broker with 25 years in Bartholomew County – disemminity – land fill is one of these – resale values will go down – solar farms due decline property values – the companies that wish to build in the county are very large – Tenaska is very large and very profitable – the recently passed inflation reduction act has had their 30% tax credit increased to 40% - requires the landowners to waive the setbacks – recommends that the setbacks be set to 500' as was first determined by the Plan Commission
- **Jeni Smith** – There has been much discussion regarding the 250' setback – she stated that the Ordinance that stated 250' and 30' behind and beside – they could potentially have a solar farm within 30' – they have 200 acres that could be surrounded by solar farms – if they approve this with the proposed setbacks – they will lose future farmers – they want a 500' for all property owners – this allows the solar companies use their good neighborhood policy by compensating neighbors for less setbacks
- **Tim McNealy** – 4 items – Sept 23 – Letter to the editor – Jeff Bergman and Emily spent 2 years researching and recommended 500' setback – Bartholomew County has industrial farming for CAFO at 500' setback – Texas has study showing property value losses even a mile away – the good neighbor agreement to all property owners so that if they want it closer than 500' they can have a say in that – a 250' setback has no incentive for a good neighbor agreement – feasibility of Solar restrictions – only casinos are more profitable – predator prey relationship

- **Lois Bonnell** gave her time to **Greg Daily** – 2 concerns – setbacks & decommissioning – family farmed for 6 generations – larger setbacks than heavy industry – current zoning for heavy industry – should not be more stringent than heavy industry – neighbors with solar panels not regulated – why is he being discriminated against with the 250' setback – a one acre residential lot takes 8 acres of his farm ground out of use – 92 acres are inefficiently wasted – he recommends 45' setbacks – decommissioning has been worked out with the individuals and the companies – Commissioner Kleinhenz stated that he had figured out his question
- **Phillip Werchman** – stewardship of the land – needs to be minimum setback of 500' – reasons – not just for large land owners but for those smaller land owners – adjacent landowners will have to change what is next to that field – more area for absorption of water which would eliminate toxic runoff – do not give away productive farm land in the county – they have no connection to Bartholomew County – we are not economically distressed – they have offered large sums of money to the land owners – not sour grapes – had opportunity to sign lease – keep our farmland – make the setbacks larger
- **Connie Werchman** – passed
- **Shawn McNealy** – neighbor to proposed facility – the people directly next to it – to minimize solar companies and neighboring non-participating land owners – 500' setbacks would minimize issues and help during fires and other natural disasters – residential zoning districts in Ag zoning districts is 250' from the dwelling then the panels would only have to be 30' from his land line – change to 500' from all property lines
- **Stephanie Wells** – With Hoosiers for Renewables – opportunities it provides – preserve and protect farmland – current proposal has reasonable setbacks – average setback for non-participating residents is 250' – Purdue recommendation is 200' and IU recommendation is 150' – Ordinance is high but reasonable
- **Reed Davis** – Indiana Land & Liberty Coalition – believe in private property rights – farm on land or farm the sun on land should be able to without intrusion – last 2 years had been doing this – the setbacks should be from the solar panel to the dwelling, not the property line – 250' is reasonable – too large setbacks greatly increases the

footprints 10 fold and increases the neighboring landowners – minimum ground clearance will only increase the height of the panels will only increase the number of months for the landscaping to cover the project

- **Allen Eiler** – passed
- **Kurt Burbrink** – talked a lot about setbacks – for the last 35 years has served on the REMC Board – reason we are here is because this country needs power – have to go to an all of the above approach to get energy – 65% from fossil fuels – can't get away from that – it is not that people that are against solar but how it comes about – has signed an agreement – Ordinance is okay with the 250' setback – supports as is – strikes balance between supporters and owners want – lastly does believe the County stands to benefit from Solar Farms through economic development and taxes
- **Dan Schroer** – setbacks are okay – preserve existing tile in the existing farm ground – strike the “locating by best available” – decommissioning plans – is unaware of recycling of panels – no guidelines to handle – protect them from going to the landfill – 15 or 30 year life of the panels – 1,500 to 2,000 panels per acre – North Carolina has proposals to handle them – state we want them recycled in the Ordinance
- **Taffy Schroer** – setbacks – not in numbers – protecting our Gateways into Columbus – most of land lies in 2-mile Jurisdiction – page 8, City of Columbus Comprehensive Plan – development inside and outside the land affects all of the community – currently allows along east 25th Street – CCCP states maintain and protect the entrances to the city – most suited for industrial areas – not along our Gateways – add deny CSES facilities along Gateways
- **Sally Fiesbeck** – had left the meeting
- **Richard Dickey** – on 25th Street – 100% on the 500' setback – has worked in nuclear and oil business – a 30 year contract in current economy is a hail mary – expect a bankruptcy that will go into litigation
- **David & Marlene Dow** – family have been part of the community for past 32 years – property rights should not be less because they own a smaller amount – Republic article with statement by signer of a contract that seems like people just don't want to look at solar panels – she does not – if she was purchasing and one was near she would not purchase – in favor as awnings over parking lots – better places than Ag land and

taking down forests – 20 – 30 years of unknown as we do not know as it is not in the past – run off from – TIME UP – recommended 500’ and put time in to make that determination

- **Matt Carothers** – *lives in a farmhouse been in the family for many years – turned down lease agreement – agrees with the 500’ setback as originally recommended – 90% that voted for the setbacks wanted the larger setbacks – interesting that Plan Commission told that Bartholomew County was pursuing solar projects – those that spoke out against 500’ were from out of county and solar attorneys – large project in Pulaski County – 500’ or better to protect home values – Cummins did 14 acres all surrounded by standing woods – use the original recommendation of 500’ from the property line*
- **Chris Kimerling** – *passed*
- **Cheryl Carothers** – *people move to the country for the view – looking for property was to watch the sunrise or set – found both – watch the changing of the crops – solar panels will destroy the views – 30 year would be a long time to view these – solar panels 20’ tall would be taller than her attic window in her 1800’s farmhouse – use the 500’ setback and allow neighbors to negotiate a closer setback – use parking lots to place panels – valuable farmland would not be destroyed – parking lot panels produce shade and cover from the weather – lots of places to be installed – inventive solutions (left pictures)*
- **Tim & Jane Cooney** – *Jeff Hilycord has already discussed property value issues – it will erode property values and taxes*
- **Jarrold Pitts** – *Director of Development for Tanaska – commended the Plan Commission for their work – reasonable setbacks that are included in the Ordinance as presented – balances the rights of land owners to use their property as they wish and works for the neighbors – benefits – will create 350 jobs during instruction – will have 5 direct jobs over 30 year – increase property tax revenue by over \$40,000,000 – quiet – no increased traffic – project website – Swallow Tail – land use – owned by private landowners who have agreed to lease – drought resistant commodity – not a decision the owners made lightly – Commissioner Kleinhenz – quoted \$40,000,000 in tax revenue – will they not request a tax abatement – Mr. Pitts – not determined yet whether they will seek one – would not ask for 100% long term abatements*

- **Adam Wade** – lifetime resident – lots have changed in his lifetime – landfill was last issue to divide the community – ability to produce clean energy – not experienced a utility scale project – a 500' setback would make certain more of the land would be easily returned to Ag – not his right to tell his neighbor what to do – would like to see 500' setback with good neighbor ability to negotiate smaller
- **Mary Solada** – Attorney from Indianapolis – represents Tenaska – memo dates September 7 – support as written – may need to examine some things in future – 1' instead of 3' above ground – ability to use the roads during daylight not at night – Commissioner Kleinhenz stated at first thought 3' over 1' was a good idea – why did Plan Commission go to 3' over the 1' – Mr. Bergman – allow for greater diversity of vegetation under – Commissioner Kleinhenz stated taller would require greater foundation – Ms. Solada – impact of 500' from home – 500' from property line is devastating for developer – would impact far more non-participants – Babcock ? survived hurricane
- **Brian Bush** – setbacks – too far – should be less – greater than heavy industrial – cuts into his learning potential – over 15% of his property would not be available for earnings – Decatur County would be minimal of ag land – property rights limiting his rights and income – utility company would be exempt from the setbacks – plans for kids to farm after the lease – most impacted by this – due respect to neighbors and their concerns – he is confident with the lease – challenged – would you move into the middle of a solar farm – yes – wouldn't want to move into a subdivision and wouldn't want to live in heavy industrial – could sell and create a subdivision
- **Mike Macett** – 53 year resident – 2 options to move elsewhere – declined – impressed by Plan Commission work – retired attorney – member of board of Energy Matters – looked closely at this – his grandparents were farmers – think the recommendation is reasonable – provides an opportunity for community to welcome community scale solar – a lawyer's point – in concurrent jurisdiction joined by Federal and – shall meet any and all Federal & State Regulations – not including approvals or updated approvals for the permitting

End of Sign-in Sheet – Anyone else in attendance wishing to speak

- **Bennett Fusion** – oversees Community Relations for EDP Renewals – gratitude to Plan Commission and staff – well done with the research – community investments – RiverStart – over \$25,000,000 over life of project – did receive tax abatement – setbacks proposed are in excess of General Assembly should be from dwelling not property line – height restriction – adding clearance adds cost and modifies view scape – see conversations on those 2 pieces
- **Skip Taylor** – moving a setback to 500’ – allows them to pump the brakes a little bit – few people take exception that solar is part of the solution – only works for 12 hours – what are other counties doing – heard that counties are less than 500’ – what is our county benchmark – Decatur or one around Indianapolis – should look at before moving forward with specific setback – if they are at “X”, why are they at that – if you set it to 500’, you can always comeback to 250’ but if you set it to 250’, it is very hard to move to 500’
- **Heidi Dickey** – read letter – needs to be a moratorium on large scale commercial solar – need 500’ setback or more with proper structural fencing – need good neighbor Ordinance – herself – wrote letter to Commissioners – 8/31/2022 – addressed letter to them and did not receive any response – was taken aback – was looking forward to some sort of response – voice was overlooked – Commissioner London called – left a message and called back again – left messages and responded to her recent e-mail – she went to Bartholomew County Fair and received 156 signatures to have a moratorium – didn’t get any reply
- **Lois Bonnell** – local rep for Tenaska – speaking as landowner of 100 acres – as a land-lease option – offset the cost of the rising cost of farming with a portion in solar – 200’ setbacks are very reasonable – will make it a larger footprint – will set idle – 250’ is reasonable though she would like to see it lower

BREAK

Comments from ZOOM Participants

- Commissioner Lienhoop feels they need to make a decision today because if they do not, then it will become effective in November due to no action by the Commissioners within the 90 day limit. Government moves awful slow sometimes – though there are

sometimes good reasons for that. Scott Mayes has a list of those on Zoom. He only shows one person that has requested to speak.

- **Grace Hasler** – working for BASF – loss of farmland is a huge impact – does not have specific numbers – as a recent graduate from Purdue, she wants to be a voice for the future agriculturalists – the 30’ rule was her greatest issue – would be a problem for future neighbors – she is a younger voice if needed

Closed comments from Zoom

Closed the Public Hearing comment portion of the meeting

Commissioner Kleinhenz had some bullet points - 3’ ground clearance & setbacks - reasonable – he would rather not see solar farms in the County but is a firm believer in property rights - Commissioner London stated that the Plan Commission spent a lot of time hashing these items out – came down to reasonableness – balance rights with responsibilities to the neighbors – Commissioner London went to Randolph County and looked at the RiverStart Project – this is a solar project but they also have a wind farm – was amazed that he didn’t hear a thing from the solar – found out they had not turned it on yet – saw lady mowing grass directly across from the solar farm – asked how she felt about it – the fence wasn’t more than 50’ from road and panels were 50’ inside of the fence – she stated not as bad as she thought it would be – surrounding people for “being a good neighbor” get \$3,000 a year from the company for being a “good neighbors” – it looked pretty good – she said it hadn’t been there long but they were getting used to it – he has concerns over decommissioning – Commissioner Kleinhenz has good friend who is very concerned about taking good farmland out of production – Commissioner Kleinhenz has several farms around him that have not been farmed in the last several years – taking acreage out of production drives up the prices of the remaining farmland – growing up, a family near him grew tobacco and were criticized – it all goes back to the property rights – farming tobacco at that time was a cash cow – you do what you need to so that you can keep the farm – if he owns the land he should be able to raise what he needs to in order to keep his land – Commissioner London stated the property values is what he believes is most critical – the Commissioners are not “courting” anything, including solar farms – it is not a comment on solar being good or bad – it is the safety issues – he tends to support the Ordinance as brought before them – one item brought up was including the scrap value to be included in the decommissioning but he is against that as the person/company buying the equipment should get the money back from it – Commissioner Kleinhenz stated that they want them to

clean it up, the County does not want the scrap left behind – he asked if company “X” goes bankrupt in 5 years and it has been 2 years since the landowner has received a payment, what happens – Lynn stated that they would go after the bond – County is not first in line – owner would be – the Bond protects the land owner – they have the right to leave the improvements to the land (not the structures, but land improvements) if the owner wants to – Commissioner Kleinhenz is concerned that it could be 5 years before they could farm the ground again if the company went into bankruptcy – Robert stated that he would probably be pulling panels up – someone in the audience stated that the landowner does not own the panels so that would be theft – it was stated that pulling panels would happen only after default by the company – Commissioner Lienhoop stated that 2 gentlemen that helped create the Comprehensive Plan are still alive but not in the meeting today, would not be in favor of solar but they would be in favor of property owner rights – he has 2 CAFO’s near him and the wind has been out of the North and he has smelled those farms recently – this is not much different than what they are facing here today – this is a very emotional County and family issue that has even split some families – he appreciated Mr. Taylor’s comments that eluded to the fact that we are a good sized community with around 80,000 residents and yet Randolph County probably doesn’t have 12,000 residents – a CAFO in Rush or Randolph does not affect as many residents – appreciates him subtly pointing that out – personally he is not in favor of solar farms – 30 years is a long time – there are a lot of marriages that can’t last that long – they don’t know what they are going to see in 30 years – he told Commissioner Kleinhenz that he hates some of the confusing language in the Ordinance – he wishes that they would just pick one number for setbacks and go with it – he likes the 500’ and make the company negotiate with the neighbors – Commissioner Kleinhenz stated that he liked the comments by Mr. Hilycord – when you set rules for 5 acres or less or even 10 acres or less, the land you saved for a kid to put a home on is affected – you could have solar farms 30’ from the property line – no matter what number you pick, there is always going to be something just past that line – 30’ from the property line would be offensive to him – the Ordinance requirement of 3’ of ground clearance makes the panels more intrusive as they are now 2’ taller – Commissioner London stated that part of that is because the panels rotate – Commissioner Kleinhenz asked if they are making the situation worse by extending the height – another issue was requiring 12 types of plantings – seems trivial but can make it more difficult for everybody – that is why feedback is very important – he received something regarding the vegetation issue just this morning - Commissioner Lienhoop – as a final point, they didn’t want the State Legislatures making the laws – Commissioner London stated that 2 years ago, a bill passed in the

Senate and failed in the House – Matt, in the audience stated that Senate Bill 411 did pass for Counties if they wanted to adopt the rules within it – the rules have been laid out – Commissioner London stated they had tried to pass a bill 2 years ago that would have taken away control from the Counties and given it to the State – **Commissioner London motioned to adopt the Ordinance on First Reading as presented.** Commissioner Kleinhenz will not second that as he is uncomfortable with the extra 2’ of height requirement and the setback – he does not know if 250’ from a residence and 200’ from a property line if it is 5 acres or less is sufficient – he would like that to be 10 acres or less – if those changes were made, he would vote for it today, he would vote for it if they can tweak it. Commissioner Lienhoop stated that the height issue shouldn’t be an issue getting it changed – a member of the audience stated that increasing heights also increases wind-load upon the panels – they drive steel pylons into the ground – if they go taller they have to go deeper – agrees there would be an impact to the view scape - **Commissioner Kleinhenz seconded the motion.** Adam stated the Ordinance states 20’ of height and a minimum ground clearance of 3’ – a change to 1’ clearance would change the height to 18’. **Commissioner Lienhoop called for the vote of the First Reading of the Ordinance before them. The vote was 2-1 with Commissioner Lienhoop as the dissenting vote.** The Second Reading will be next Monday. Mark Webber asked if they would have another Public Hearing. Commissioner Lienhoop stated they have to have another Public Hearing for an Ordinance. There will be other items on the Agenda for next week, so the Second Reading will be the last item.

The next Commissioner’s Meeting will be Monday, October 24, 2022.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:08 p.m.

BARTHOLOMEW COUNTY
COMMISSIONERS

CARL H. LIENHOOP, CHAIRMAN

LARRY S. KLEINHENZ, MEMBER

TONY LONDON, MEMBER

ATTEST:

PIA O'CONNOR