

**OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE
RICE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Commissioner's Room / Government Services Building
Thursday, December 4, 2025 at 6:00 PM**

I. Call to Order

A. Roll Call

The meeting was called to order both in-person and electronically by Chair Garrett Johnson at 6:01p.m.

Members present were: Garrett Johnson, Julia Hogan, Matt Purfeerst

Members absent were: Kenneth Engen, Jim Cihak

Staff present were: Zoning Administrator Trent McCorkell, Senior Planner Jeremy Edwards,
Administrative Coordinator Anna Aguilar, Office Support Specialist MacKenzie Klett.

Commissioners present: Charlie Peters

Others present: see Sign-in Sheet and Registrant List.

B. Motion by Matt Purfeerst, seconded by Julia Hogan, Reading of the Notice

RESULT: Approved, AYES: Julia Hogan, Garrett Johnson, Matt Purfeerst, NAYS: None

C. Motion by Julia Hogan, seconded by Matt Purfeerst, Approval of the Agenda

RESULT: Approved, AYES: Julia Hogan, Garrett Johnson, Matt Purfeerst, NAYS: None

D. Motion by Matt Purfeerst, seconded by Julia Hogan, to approve the minutes of November 6, 2025.

RESULT: Approved, AYES: Julia Hogan, Garrett Johnson, Matt Purfeerst, NAYS: None

E. Motion by Julia Hogan, seconded by Matt Purfeerst, to approve the corrective minutes from October 2, 2025.

RESULT: Approved, AYES: Julia Hogan, Garrett Johnson, Matt Purfeerst, NAYS: None

II. New Business

1. Preliminary and Final Plat/Brumm - Section 9, Wheatland Township

Bruce Brumm has applied for a preliminary and final plat to enlarge an existing single-family residential lot. The property is currently described as: Lot 3 of Block 1 of Novak's 1st Addition in the SE1/4 of the SE1/4, Section 9, Wheatland Township, Rice County, Minnesota. PID# 01.09.4.76.001. Property address is: 4920 Jackson Ave, Webster, MN 55088. The property is Zoned VMU, Village Mixed-Use.

Motion by Matt Purfeerst, seconded by Julia Hogan, to recommend approval of the Preliminary and Final Plat with the following conditions and findings for Bruce Brumm. The property is located in Section 9 of Wheatland Township.

RESULT: Approved, AYES: Julia Hogan, Garrett Johnson, Matt Purfeerst, NAYS: None

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL – Brumm – Preliminary and Final Plat (Pre & Final Plat)

1. Final plat shall be recorded with the Rice County Recorder's office within 90-days of the County Board of Commissioners approval.
2. Any adjustments required by the County Surveyor or Recorder shall be made prior to recording of the plat.
3. A deed conveying the land to be platted under a single ownership shall be recorded prior to recording of the plat.
4. Any new construction is to adhere to all Rice County codes and ordinances.
5. The resulting lot shall not be further subdivided or combined with other land(s) unless approved under the Rice County subdivision regulations.

Hearing Minutes:

Senior Planner Jeremy Edwards (JE) presented the request to the Planning Commission (PC).

The PC asked the applicant, Bruce Brumm (BB), to come forward to add comments or answer questions regarding the request.

BB - When I moved in, I needed a septic installed, and I asked the neighbor, and he let me do it. He drew up a lease that we had and subject to that, it would go onto my property if it was platted. I was going to do it a few years ago, but then I found out the cost, it was like \$8,000 for a surveyor. So, I had to save up money and then recently I got a different surveyor and got it done. I believe I have everything that is needed.

GJ - Are you aware of the 5 conditions?

BB - Yes.

Chair Johnson opened the public testimony portion of the item to the public and no one spoke.

Chair Johnson closed the public testimony portion of the item to the public.

Discussion:

JH - Pretty standard, it makes sense why you would want your septic on your own property.

GH - I like it. Seems like it worked out well with the lease and getting it done, now it's ready to be platted and finished.

MP - It looks good to me. I motion to approve with the 5 conditions.

JH - I second.

Motion to recommend approval with stated conditions and findings made by MP, seconded by JH, and approved unanimously.

2. **Conditional Use Permit/Bath - Section 25, Walcott Township**

Mike Bath has applied for a Conditional Use Permit to allow for a riding and boarding stable. The property is described as: Part of the W1/2 of the SW1/4, Section 25, Walcott Township, Rice County, Minnesota. PID# 15.25.3.50.001. Property address is: 25739 Falk Ave, Faribault, MN 55021. The property is Zoned A, Agricultural.

Motion by Matt Purfeerst, seconded by Julia Hogan, to recommend approval of the Conditional Use Permit with the following conditions and findings for Mike Bath. The property is located in Section 25 of Walcott Township.

RESULT: Approved, AYES: Julia Hogan, Garrett Johnson, Matt Purfeerst, NAYS: None

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL – Bath – Conditional Use Permit (CUP)

1. The Conditional Use Permit is for a Horse Riding and Boarding facility consisting of riding/boarding for up to five (5) full size horses and three (3) miniature horses. Facility is to be operated as shown on the site plan. Changes to the business are not permitted without approval of a new/amended permit.
2. The landowner shall comply with all applicable federal, state and local rules, regulations, requirements or standards.
3. Applicant shall provide onsite bathroom facilities for all guests and employees. This can be done through portable facilities.
4. Adequate fencing shall be maintained to contain all horses.
5. The operator shall maintain liability insurance and shall provide proof of such to Rice County upon request.
6. The site shall not be used to host riding events.
7. Failure to comply with conditions may result in revocation of the Conditional Use Permit.

Hearing Minutes:

Zoning Administrator Trent McCorkell (TM) presented the request to the Planning Commission (PC).

JH - Was this site previously used for a riding and boarding stable? It looks like there's some existing facilities already on the property.

TM - Yes, the applicant stated they had been doing this but were unaware they needed a permit. Since they came in, we went through those details.

JH - Okay, so it's kind of an after-the-fact permit.

TM - Yes.

The PC asked the applicant, Mike Bath (MB), to come forward to add comments or answer questions regarding the request.

MB - We technically don't do boarding. Since 2019, we've been providing what's called equine-assisted learning. Our focus is on moving from fear to faith. It's a ministry, and we are a 501c3, and we hold sessions for individuals and family units. Our ministry is based on moving a person from fear to faith. And horses are how we do that. Currently, we have 8 horses that are our teachers, if you will. We help people who have maybe suffered from trauma. We have a grandmother and a granddaughter that come out as a pair for sessions. We have an EMT that comes out with his autistic son. We have kind of a range. We have families who do homeschooling, and this is almost part of their curriculum. We are at a point where we're continuing to grow and what I mean by grow is we currently do about 12 sessions a week. And winter is always a tough time, so I came to TM to talk about putting in an indoor riding arena. That's when we found out that before we could do that, we needed to get this permit. So that is about us and what we do, that is the Refuge Ranch.

GJ - Are you aware of the 7 conditions associated with this?

MB - Yes.

CP - There was a letter from the SWCD, did you contact them or talk to them?

MB - Yeah, early on. So, we bought the property in 2017. We had property that was in CRP at that point in time. We were doing the planning, and I had an individual come out and point out the grasses, you can't touch that grass, you know? And so we do have trails, but it's all within his instructions about where we could put them.

JH - It does look like there is some wetland on the property where the new proposed building is going, correct?

MB - No.

Chair Johnson opened the public testimony portion of the item to the public and no one spoke.

Chair Johnson closed the public testimony portion of the item to the public.

Discussion:

GJ - It doesn't look like there is going to be a big change.

MP - There is nothing around there that would be obstructed by the new shed. It is on a quieter road too so it's a good spot to have it.

JH - Yeah, I think it looks pretty good. And a condition of approval is that the landowner has to comply with all applicable federal, state and local rules, so if there's any issues with wetlands, obviously it has to be addressed prior to any construction so it would come up at the time of the building permit.

MP - I motion to approve with the 7 conditions, and the adjusted first condition to include the new building.

JH - I second.

Motion to recommend approval with stated conditions and findings made by MP, seconded by JH, and approved unanimously.

3. Interim Use Permit/Romani - Section 15, Wells Township

Julia Romani has applied for an Interim Use Permit to allow for a short-term rental in an existing

dwelling. The property is described as: Part of Government Lot 3 in the SE1/4, Section 15, Wells Township, Rice County, Minnesota. PID# 10.15.4.50.016. Property address is: 17943 Roberds Lake Blvd, Faribault, MN 55021. The property is Zoned GDS, General Development Shoreland.

Motion by Julia Hogan, seconded by Matt Purfeerst, to recommend approval of the Interim Use Permit with the following conditions and findings for Julia Romani. The property is located in Section 15 of Wells Township.

RESULT: Approved, AYES: Julia Hogan, Garrett Johnson, Matt Purfeerst, NAYS: None

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL – Romani – Interim Use Permit (IUP)

1. The Interim Use Permit is for a short-term rental consisting of three (3) bedrooms. The short-term rental is to be operated within the existing onsite single-family dwelling. Changes to the short-term rental are not permitted without approval of a new or amended permit.
2. No garages, detached structures, or temporary sleeping accommodations outside the dwelling unit shall be used as sleeping areas. There shall be no onsite camping.
3. The owner shall maintain an accurate guest register, containing the number of guests and dates of stay. Register shall be made available to Rice County upon request.
4. Guest stays shall be limited to less than thirty (30) days per stay.
5. No more than eight (8) guests shall be allowed in the short-term rental.
6. No more than five (5) vehicles may be parked outside on the property.
7. Indoor and outdoor music shall not be allowed before 8 am and not later than 10 pm.
8. The owner shall designate a property manager who shall respond to complaints and be available on-site within one (1) hour of being contacted.
9. Prior to operation, the owner shall provide in writing the property manager name and contact information, maximum occupancy of the short-term rental, and a site plan accurately depicting all property lines to Rice County, all guests, and neighboring property owners. Any future changes to this information shall be provided in writing to the same parties.
10. The owner shall maintain appropriate liability insurance with a minimum coverage of \$2,000,000 and shall provide proof of such to Rice County upon request.
11. The operator shall maintain compliance with applicable state health regulations and shall provide proof of such compliance to Rice County upon request.
12. The dwelling shall be maintained in habitable condition and in compliance with Minnesota State Building Codes.
13. The short-term rental shall comply with all applicable County, State, and Federal regulations.
14. This Interim Use Permit shall be null and void upon change in ownership of the property or two (2) years from the date of approval, whichever occurs first. Operations shall not continue after this date if a new Interim Use Permit is not approved.
15. Failure to comply with conditions may result in revocation of the Interim Use Permit.

Hearing Minutes:

Zoning Administrator Trent McCorkell (TM) presented the request to the Planning Commission (PC).

MP - As far as you know, have there been any issues with this site in the past being on Vrbo or Airbnb?

TM - I have not been aware of any complaints that it's been operated prior to the permitting or anything like that.

The PC asked the applicant, Julia Romani (JR), to come forward to add comments or answer questions regarding the request.

JR - I am looking to do some rental through Vrbo during some of the weeks that I am not using the lake

home.

GJ - Do you have any idea how often you will be renting it out?

JR - I know some people that are interested are looking at long weekends. And then in the summer several weeks, but we have looked at blocking out at least 2 weeks a month for us to use it as well. I am not sure if this is a hot spot for renting anything yet. But I am thinking probably in the first year if we get 12 rentals that is a good projection. That would be good for me.

CP - Will you be the caretaker of the property? The one that people call if there's an issue.

JR - I live in Iowa, and so does my partner Richard (RB). We are about an hour and a half away from the lake house. But I do have family in the area that are close by. A brother in Medford that I've spoken with, and he is close to the property. And I also have a sister who lives in Farmington. So, I do have family in the area that we could contact. And a lot of things we figure would be via phone, like if there was a plumbing issue, we would probably just call the plumber to go look at it. I have 3 brothers that are plumbers, so I think I'm set with that. Right now, I think it would be myself and Richard that would be the property managers, but we have family next in line. Like I said, my sister and her boyfriend are in Farmington, and my brother Dan lives in Medford.

CP - Is there lake access with that parcel?

JR - Yes, there is. You do have to cross the street to access the lake and dock.

GJ - Are you aware of the 15 conditions?

JR - Yes, and I was wondering how it was worded, if some of them are up for discussion, or things we could talk about. I noticed one was the need to be within an hour of the property.

GJ - Yeah, I guess it wouldn't have to be you, but you would have to designate a property manager that could be there, if there was a problem, within an hour of the rental.

RB - Is that one-hour hard set? Or is that something that could be negotiated?

TM - The one hour is within ordinance for the use, so we do have to have somebody named that within an hour they could get to the site.

RB - I was looking through some of the ordinances and I wasn't sure. I didn't see anything with that, but I am not sure what ordinance I should have been looking at. I think the one other question that JR had was the parking. We can accommodate more than 3 vehicles on that property. And if it's being rented out for up to 8 people, that could be 4 couples, and I wouldn't want a couple to have to park and carpool just to get to the site. On the bottom where the pictures were taken, there's a parking spot there, and up by the garage, there's two maybe even three, because of the way the property's been cleared. So, I didn't know if that was anything that could be negotiable, too.

TM - The maximum of 3 vehicles can change, it's not set for that. That is just 3 outdoor, so if they do have an indoor parking garage area that could work.

RB - We can accommodate more outdoor than just 3, just based on the layout.

GJ - We can discuss that at a later point. Anything else you wanted to point out with the conditions?

JR - I did connect with Vrbo about the insurance piece. I think it says \$2 million coverage and they said that people that rent through Vrbo go through proper insurance and that is usually \$1 million coverage. So, I didn't know if that was in ordinance too, or if that is something that we could discuss.

TM - That has been the amount that's been applied to all of the short-term rental facilities in the county as they've come forward.

GJ - I think some of the past ones have used that million dollars from Vrbo and then added another million dollars. Because it's a \$2 million cumulative insurance coverage.

TM - And that is spelled out within the ordinance requirements, so it isn't one that we are able to lessen.

RB - What ordinance number is that? I was looking at the applicable ones, and I wasn't quite seeing all of those numbers, so I was just curious if there was one to look at.

JH - Specifically under short-term rentals within the zoning code, because this was something that was updated when the county was going through its zoning ordinance update.

TM - It's Chapter 507.09, Subpart E, within the zoning ordinance.

RB - Yeah, I read that, and I didn't see any specific dollars, but maybe I was just not referencing something.

TM - It's subpart 6 under E.

Chair Johnson opened the public testimony portion of the item to the public and no one spoke.

Chair Johnson closed the public testimony portion of the item to the public.

Discussion:

JH - I think that it is reasonable to increase the number of vehicles in condition 6. They do have a larger driveway on the property, which is understandable that they'd want more than 3 vehicles. I am not opposed to upping that by a couple vehicles.

GJ - I tend to agree. I think it's obviously a bigger place that accommodates 8 people, and obviously the lot also allows for more room and area so you aren't getting into other people's properties or anything. I guess I would be okay with going to 4 or 5 vehicles.

JH - I think I'd be okay with 5.

MP - I think the purpose of it was just to make sure that if they have a fire there, they can get in, but like they said, I think 2 inside, 3 to 4 outside. Yeah, I think 5 would be fine. The ask on number 10, with the less insurance, I think you have to keep that at \$2 million. I don't know if that was under negotiation or not, but I was going to say keep it at \$2 million.

GJ - That was discussed pretty well during our work sessions.

JH - And like what you said, they can have the \$1 million with Vrbo and then an additional million. That's pretty standard for ones we've approved so far. And it sounds like they would have somebody available within an hour. They just have to make sure that they'd be reachable, either party, Medford or Farmington.

GJ - It sounds like that should work.

MP - Other than that, it looks pretty good.

JH - It's understandable it has lake access and people want to rent lake properties. I motion to approve with the 15 conditions with the change to condition 6 to have 5 vehicles.

MP - I second.

Motion to recommend approval with stated conditions and findings made by JH, seconded by MP, and approved unanimously.

4. **Interim Use Permit/New Energy Equity (Hubers) - Section 18, Northfield Township**

Jesse Dimond of New Energy Equity, on behalf of landowners David and Jacquelyn Hubers, has applied for an Interim Use Permit to allow for a 3.80-MW(AC) solar energy production facility. The property is described as: Part of the E1/2 of the NE1/4, Section 18, Northfield Township, Rice County, Minnesota. PID# 08.18.1.75.002. The property is Zoned A, Agricultural.

Motion by Matt Purfeerst, seconded by Julia Hogan, to recommend approval of the Interim Use Permit with the following conditions and findings for Jesse Dimond of New Energy Equity, on behalf of landowners David and Jacquelyn Hubers. The property is located in Section 18 of Northfield Township.

RESULT: Approved, AYES: Julia Hogan, Garrett Johnson, Matt Purfeerst, NAYS: None

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL – New Energy Equity (Hubers) – Interim Use Permit (IUP)

1. The landowner and operators shall comply with all rules, regulations, requirements, or standards of the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, Army Corps of Engineers, and other applicable federal, state or local agencies.
2. The Interim Use Permit (IUP) is for a 3.808-MW (AC) solar energy production site as shown on the application site plan, dated 8/6/2025, subject to meeting all setback and access requirements.
3. Security fence shall consist of fencing meeting state and federal electrical code requirements.
4. All required permits shall be obtained prior to onsite construction.
5. As soon as onsite construction is completed all areas of the site, excluding the access roads and electrical equipment pads, are to be established and maintained in Agricultural crop production or a pollinator friendly perennial vegetative cover.
6. All electrical lines internal to the site and to the location of the interconnection point with the power utility shall be buried underground, except that those lines within the fenced area may be above ground as long as they are lower than the solar panel heights and meeting electrical codes.

7. A stormwater plan and proof of compliance with state/federal stormwater regulations shall be submitted to Rice County Environmental Services with the application for building permits.
8. The applicant or operator shall furnish Rice County with a \$200,000 bond or other approved financial surety to ensure proper site decommissioning/restoration and to ensure road repair or repair for other off-site damages caused by construction or operation of the facility. Financial surety shall be reviewed and approved by the Rice County Attorney's office prior to any work on-site.
9. Screening shall be established and maintained as shown on the submitted site plan.
10. No roadway or developed lane shall be maintained along the underground power transmission route from the solar site to the point of interconnection poles near 115th St E.
11. The entire site shall be restored to a condition suitable for agricultural crop production prior to expiration of the Interim Use Permit (IUP) unless a new IUP has been approved for continued solar use.
12. Failure to comply with conditions may result in revocation of the Interim Use Permit.
13. This Interim Use Permit (IUP) shall expire by the earlier of one (1) year from the County Board approval if no construction has begun, eighteen (18) months after electrical production has ceased, or twenty-five (25) years from the commercial production start date. Site restoration/reclamation must be completed prior to the expiration if no renewal has been approved. The applicant/operator of the IUP must notify Rice County Environmental Services of the commercial production start date.
14. No more than four overhead utility poles shall be used near the point of interconnection.
15. Solar-related construction shall only be allowed between the hours of 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Hearing Minutes:

Zoning Administrator Trent McCorkell (TM) presented the request to the Planning Commission (PC).

MP - Can you pull up the conditions? I was wondering if there was a condition for drain tile.

TM - It has come up in the past when there was a need for it. That is not a standard condition, but it can be added if needed. That will certainly be a discussion item.

The PC asked the applicant, Jesse Diamond (JD), to come forward to add comments or answer questions regarding the request.

JD - Good evening, my name is Jesse Diamond. I'm an employee of New Energy Equity. We are based out of Roseville, Minnesota. I'm out of Stillwater. This project is just under 27 acres for the permitted area. It's a 3.808 megawatts AC, and the DCOM amounts about \$160,000 - \$162,000. My hope is to answer any questions from you the board and anybody from the community about how this might impact your community. From my standpoint, this is a cool project, because normally farm fields are generally pretty flat and you can see them for a while. But this one happens to be up on a bluff, so there are some community members that may have a view of it, but the general community and from the roads, it will not be seen. So, it actually is pretty unique in that very few will be affected by this one.

GJ - Are you aware of the conditions?

JD - I apologize, I did not get a chance to look at them, but I will take a look at them. Is it alright if I address them to staff, or do I need to address them now?

MP - You should probably do it now, because if we approve it, it's with these in there. So, you're probably going to want to look through them.

JH - These are standard conditions for solar projects that we have approved in the past.

JD - Yeah, I'll take a quick look here. I've done quite a few of these, so give me just one minute. Okay, so for condition 8, our bonding was approximately \$161,000. Is this saying that it has to be a minimum of \$200,000?

GJ - Yes.

JD - I'll get that documentation updated and resubmitted.

GJ - Can you please scroll to the last few, JE?

JD - Okay, I'm good.

Chair Johnson opened the public testimony portion of the item to the public and the following spoke:

Allyn Kuennen - *115th St E* - Just a couple questions, really clarifications, and then I have some general comments for you guys. TM if you can bring up the site plan with the interconnection. I know TM mentioned that there were 2 poles but the plan shows 3. I can get with the company and find out exactly what that design looks like because I am a little concerned if we are going to end up with a tree farm of utility poles there. I'm a little uncomfortable with that design. I just want to know what that looks like before I comment any more on that. And the main thing is I've been working with Xcel Energy for 10 years, trying to get them to move the utility poles to the other side of the gravel road. On our side, there are lots of trees, there's lots of stuff in the way, and they're constantly coming out with Asplundh and wiping out our trees. I have made a little bit of headway with them this past year and they are moving one of the poles a little bit, so I don't want anything to happen down at this corner that's going to make my efforts harder in the future. I know on Condition 10, it mentioned no roadway or development lane shall be maintained along the underground power transmission route. I'm wondering if we can get that revised to say no roadway or development lane shall be constructed or maintained from the solar site to 115th Street. The reason why I want that clarification is that there's already a field driveway there. So, what this condition says is that you just don't want them to build a new road where they are burying their utility lines, but that doesn't keep them from building a road right next to it. So, I am just looking for some clarification on that condition. And then also, I'm wondering if we can add a condition for no construction access off of 115th Street. All construction access should be coming from 110th Street through the property owner's access. It would be nice just to have that clarified so there's no confusion in the future. There is a letter of comments from the Rice County Soil and Water about wetland delineation. That whole area floods in the spring regularly with heavy rains, so that's a concern of mine, because that backs up already onto my property. And anything they do there to cross that creek, if they don't improve that, it's going to be worse. That is a concern. And can we get clarification of how long the full build out will be? When they built the solar farm across the street from us, we put up with lots of pounding, lots of backup alarms, day and night for 2 years. I'm just wondering how long, if this goes through, we're going to have to put up with that again. Because the sound carries right down through the valley, down to the rest of our homes. And then I was also wondering, does Rice County have hours of construction? Is it 7 a.m.?

Joel Pumper - *115th St E* - A portion of our property butts up to this proposed solar. A statement that the developer said that this solar farm is on the bluff. Well, I'm on the bluff with it. So, my concern is, first of all, I don't want it there. I don't want an industrial solar farm in my backyard, and if it would get approved, I have multiple concerns: erosion, runoff, because a lot of that runoff there goes across my property. The ravine goes down where AK was just talking about, so I have concerns because I have to look at it every day. Nobody else here knows what that's like because you don't have to look at it. The other thing is that when I look out to the south of our property there is another solar farm across the road. How many of these solar farms are we going to have in a given area? I don't know what the zoning is for these or how many can be in an area but it might just go on and on. My concern is that I've been there a long time, for 40 years, agricultural land is starting to change, and I'm aware of the changes. I'm not sure that's the right change, people can come right in and develop land and put industrial solar panels in and then I have to look at it. Thank you

Matt Garlie - *180th St E* - I represent the Garlie Trust, which is the land that actually borders the proposed solar farm. We have had the land in our family for almost 70 years. Can you please put the overhead photo of the land back up? What concerns me is that this is a big deal. You can't see the land elevations but this whole elevation slides towards the Garlie farm. All you will see is panoramic solar panels. And it's 400 feet from our deck. I didn't plan on speaking tonight, but Garlie Estate, my brother and my mother live there. We are a hard 'No'. We do not want it. I mean, the history of the place is agricultural land. It's currently agricultural land. The future of it should be agricultural land. There is a reason that Mr. Fritz's whole area behind there is put into a set-aside farm because it is supposed to be farmland. It is literally pinned on our property line, and without seeing the elevation of where it's tucked in. The comment about "nobody is going to see it," I guess we are nobody then. That is all we are going to see. It's not pushed towards the Hubers, it is not closer to his housing development, it's

there for the Garlie's to see. So, I am just here for that. This needs serious consideration. Thank you.

Chair Johnson closed the public testimony portion of the item to the public.

Discussion:

JH - I have a question for staff about the wetland comment from SWCD. Was a wetland delineation not submitted in their application?

TM - Not sure if there is one within that. Typically, it's not been a requirement with those, since solar is allowed in wetland areas.

JH - Yeah, submitted with their application they have over 300 pages of different soil and other identification information.

MP - We have allowed solar panels in wetlands, but we haven't allowed roads to go through wetlands have we?

TM - So, roads during the construction permitting process are reviewed by the Soil and Water District in detail at that point. Roads have some different standards than panels do, certainly. This area is entirely within the field area for the portion that they were referencing, other than potentially right down by the roadway that was mentioned for the point of interconnection at the right-of-way.

MP - I guess I would like to have the applicant come back up and answer some of these questions as well. What their plan is with the road. If they can talk on power lines, and then construction access from 115th.

JH - Also runoff, since it sounds like there is an issue with flooding in the spring and other stuff.

GJ called applicant up to the speaker stand, TM pulled up applicant site plan.

JD - Okay, what question would you like me to address first?

GJ - Yeah, so one of the conditions is no roads are to be built over the trenched electrical to the point of interconnection, but in the site plan as well, there's no road that's being proposed from the solar panel field to the point of interconnection.

JD - Correct.

GJ - That's not something that would be part of the project?

JD - Correct, the only road that is being proposed off of 115th Street is just to provide access to the utility company, which they need so they can do maintenance on the poles. So, just that short length along with the turnaround is the only road that's proposed off of 115th. In an original design, which was not presented and is not in play, we did originally have that, and we changed it, mainly because of an easement that's kind of a shaded area that you can see on the property. We're not allowed to put a road there. So even if we had wanted to, we were not allowed.

GJ - Perfect, that answers that question. All of the construction would have to come through the building site on the proposed road from the north.

JD - Absolutely. One of the things I want to stress is that I really like what I do. I reached out to the Garlie's because I knew that there would be an impact. Whether this project gets approved or not is the board's decision. I believe that we follow the rules and regulations, and the landowner deals in trees. And I have offered to the Garlie's to work directly not only on creating a vegetative buffer on the south side of the property to mitigate some of their view, but also to offer a fund for them to plant trees. There is going to be an impact. I am a very real person, there will be an impact but I am also trying to be a good neighbor and just generally do good development. I don't think it should have much weight but I just want everyone to know that I am very willing to work on how to mitigate this as much as possible, to do what I can to limit the impact. You know, if that's adding another row of trees, whatever it may be, I'm willing to work with the neighbors. One of the other comments that was made was about how many poles. If we want to make a condition that the maximum poles allowed beyond the point of interconnection is 4, that's pretty common. That would allow for 3 utility poles and 1 customer/riser pole. And then everything else would either have to be ground-mounted, or something like that. I just worked in Scandia, and one of their biggest concerns in Scandia when you drive into town, original designs for community solar was exactly what was pointed out, just a ton of poles. There's literally, I think it's 16 poles and it's ugly. Setting a limit to 4 poles, we'd certainly be willing to do that if we put it as a condition, then it's set in stone. 4 poles is hopefully reasonable, 3 are required by the utility company, so we can't go less than that. How many solar farms? I heard that come up. Community solar fills gaps. The projects are small enough that we don't have the funding behind them to upgrade substations, and so if there's a gap, for example, there is literally 7.808 megawatts left on this substation and this feeder. Once that's filled, I don't see any more community solar coming to this particular area

to fill that substation and transformer. Yes, there is some coming, whether it's these projects or others. We're trying to fill gaps. Utility-scale projects that are hundreds and thousands of acres, they're worth millions of dollars and can absorb \$5-\$10 million substation feeder upgrades. We just can't, our projects generally aren't even valued as much as what a substation upgrade would cost, so we're only filling gaps. You'll basically only see 7.808 in this community for this substation. And once that's filled, you'll stop seeing community solar for that.

GJ - Perfect.

JD - Were there any other questions?

JH - I think one question was build-out, I know it's hard to know for sure.

JD - I live right near Afton, and we built three 1MW projects, I helped develop them and I walked it with the city. They were bringing in equipment and doing pile driving, which creates the most disruption for about 6-weeks. Beyond that you're talking about electricians and whatnot, that is significantly less interruption. I don't recall if I saw a condition about timeframes that we can work. That would also be a fine condition to add. I do believe that it was part of my application that we generally only work from 8a-5p, Monday through Friday. We don't work weekends as far as making noise. Now, obviously emergency is 24/7. Everybody needs it for safety, but generally for installing it is not before 8am and doesn't go past 5pm. And generally, not on the weekends, so I'm not sure what other people have done, but that has been a standard for what we're communicating and then having to follow, because obviously we can't skew from what we're putting into our paperwork as our application. The final thing I'll say is that, one of the neighbors here did have more stuff. I will wait afterwards and happily take down any notes of any additional comments and questions, give them my contact information, and get those answers to them. Thank you.

Applicant left speaker stand

GJ - I do think that answers a lot of the concerns. Can you please pull up the conditions? I wouldn't be opposed to adding a condition for the working time during installation of the solar field.

JH - And poles.

GJ - If there is community concerns from the past projects and the bulk of the disturbance comes from the installation, to have a condition limiting work hours to 8a-5p you at least know there won't be post driving down poles late at night.

MP - Yeah, I'd like that in the conditions, and as well as the max four poles at the interconnection.

JH - And I do understand somewhat of a disdain towards having solar come in on agricultural land, and it being somewhat of an eyesore and such, but technically, within the Rice County Zoning Ordinance, solar is an allowed interim use on agricultural land. So, it's not like this isn't an allowed use that we have never seen. It has come forward on many agricultural properties throughout the whole county.

GJ - I know that there is the problem with the looks of them, but hopefully, with the conditions for vegetation and everything else, it helps mitigate a lot of concerns. There are a lot of them throughout the county already.

JH - It does sound like the applicant is willing to have vegetative buffer and trying to be a good neighbor.

MP - That is a question I forgot to ask. Can you pull up the site plan? Is there a vegetative buffer along that south edge?

CP - Yes, there was.

MP - And he mentioned setting up a trust or account of some sort for the tree planting in a future use. I think that is something they can work out amongst themselves.

GJ - We have our condition for vegetative buffer so that puts the burden on the applicant. And I think the easements that are there are probably from the plat and that takes care of any issues or concerns with having a road or construction done in that area because it's not possible. Like I said before, the ordinances allow it and there are quite a few in the county. Short-term there may be some impacts, but with the establishment of a vegetative buffer.

JH - And with the criteria for conditional and interim use permits, I feel that this project adheres to what is required, standard wise.

GJ - Jumping back to the interconnection off of 115th street, there shouldn't be any impact there with the wetlands, but also part of the conditions state that they have to adhere to all state and local rules and regulations.

JH - They will have to work with SWCD.

GJ - I guess the only other thing is that there was some concern about erosion. I do think that can be a problem in some instances, but I think there is a massive difference between established grass under solar panels and conventionally tilled farmland as far as erosion goes. I would expect it to be a lot better

actually once the solar panels are out there.

CP - You basically covered it. We have had some extensive conversation and work sessions about good cropland going to solar. You can't tell a farmer that has good cropland that he can't have wind or solar and cash in on an opportunity. You pretty much answered every question I had. I think we should make conditions about the 4 poles and work hours. And that vegetation should be planted and maintained. I don't know if we can put that on the condition, so that it's maintained also.

JH - So it doesn't die after a year.

GJ - I agree with that as well. So there would be two additional conditions, along with the amendment to the vegetative buffer that it will be established and maintained.

TM - Condition 9 is that the screening be established and maintained.

JH - So we really just need to add conditions for the poles.

GJ - Yeah, we'll add a condition limiting the number of poles at the point of interconnection to 4.

JH - And then, do we want to include work hours?

GJ - I think we should.

CP - Might as well.

GJ - Just so there is no confusion.

JH - Sounded like the applicant was fine with an 8a to 5p, Monday through Friday.

GJ invited Applicant up to the speaker stand

JD - The only caveat is to also put something in there about emergency hours, 24/7, just so that Xcel and the fire department, anybody can get in there any time for emergencies. But for general work hours for the maintenance of it to make sure you don't have people coming in at night to mow. While we are construction 8a to 5p but having emergency hours be 24/7. That is generally what's worked and we've been able to keep to that.

CP - To include construction?

JD - Yes. The one other thing is that we did include some stormwater stuff. It's not required, but we did include it because it was brought up as a concern. And yes, it's 300 pages, stormwater plans are like 100 pages. And I don't expect you to have read it, to be honest I can't even understand 90% of it, but it was conclusive that the existing drainage patterns are going to stay pretty consistent and will generally flow into the same area. So, if there are any questions specific to that, we do have the paperwork to show that generally, it should be pretty minimal if any impact on what's editing to what will become.

Applicant left speaker stand

JH - I saw that was submitted with the application.

GJ - So we will be adding a 14th condition for the number of poles and a 15th condition for general construction and maintenance working hours from 8a to 5p, Monday through Friday with an exception for emergencies.

TM - I do have some wording for the conditions that you're discussing, and then I'd just comment on the one there. The one condition would say, "no more than four overhead utility poles shall be used near the point of interconnection." Then the next one would say, "solar-related construction shall only be allowed between the hours of 8 a.m. and 5 p.m, Monday through Friday." When you're using the term emergency, that gets very complicated to deal with in a condition. I think this is saying that the construction is within those hours and times. If there's something other than construction that becomes an emergency, that wouldn't be covered by this. And it'd be hard to say that the construction would be on an emergency basis, so I think this says it's Monday through Friday, 8a to 5p.

GJ - Would you put general maintenance along with construction on that?

TM - We have not had to get into maintenance hours on any of the other sites that we've had. With this condition, if it was some maintenance that required construction, we could certainly enforce those hours and days at that point. You know, if there was something where they had to swap out a bunch of panels that required a permit that would apply. If it was mowing or minor repair that would typically not fall under that.

JH - That makes sense.

GJ - Is everyone okay with the way those conditions are worded?

MP - Yes.

JH - Yes.

MP - I motion to approve with the 13 current conditions and the addition of conditions 14 and 15 relating to number of utility poles at the interconnection and work hours.

JH - I second.

Motion to recommend approval with stated conditions and findings made by MP, seconded by JH, and approved unanimously.

5. **Interim Use Permit/New Energy Equity (Hubers) - Section 17, Northfield Township**

Jesse Dimond of New Energy Equity, on behalf of landowners David and Jacquelyn Hubers, has applied for an Interim Use Permit to allow for a 4.00-MW(AC) solar energy production facility. The property is described as: The SW1/4 of the NW1/4, Section 17, Northfield Township, Rice County, Minnesota. PID# 08.17.2.50.001. The property is Zoned A, Agricultural.

Motion by Garrett Johnson, seconded by Matt Purfeerst, to recommend approval of the Interim Use Permit with the following conditions and findings for Jesse Dimond of New Energy Equity, on behalf of landowners David and Jacquelyn Hubers. The property is located in Section 17 of Northfield Township.

RESULT: Approved, AYES: Julia Hogan, Garrett Johnson, Matt Purfeerst, NAYS: None

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL – New Energy Equity (Hubers) – Interim Use Permit (IUP)

1. The landowner and operators shall comply with all rules, regulations, requirements, or standards of the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, Army Corps of Engineers, and other applicable federal, state or local agencies.
2. The Interim Use Permit (IUP) is for a 4.0-MW (AC) solar energy production site as shown on the application site plan, dated 9/30/2025, subject to meeting all setback and access requirements.
3. Security fence shall consist of fencing meeting state and federal electrical code requirements.
4. All required permits shall be obtained prior to onsite construction.
5. As soon as onsite construction is completed all areas of the site, excluding the access roads and electrical equipment pads, are to be established and maintained in Agricultural crop production or a pollinator friendly perennial vegetative cover.
6. All electrical lines internal to the site and to the location of the interconnection point with the power utility shall be buried underground, except that those lines within the fenced area may be above ground as long as they are lower than the solar panel heights and meeting electrical codes.
7. A stormwater plan and proof of compliance with state/federal stormwater regulations shall be submitted to Rice County Environmental Services with the application for building permits.
8. The applicant or operator shall furnish Rice County with a \$200,000 bond or other approved financial surety to ensure proper site decommissioning/restoration and to ensure road repair or repair for other off-site damages caused by construction or operation of the facility. Financial surety shall be reviewed and approved by the Rice County Attorney's office prior to any work on-site.
9. Screening shall be established and maintained as shown on the submitted site plan.
10. No roadway or developed lane shall be maintained along the underground power transmission route from the solar site to the point of interconnection poles near 115th St E.
11. The entire site shall be restored to a condition suitable for agricultural crop production prior to expiration of the Interim Use Permit (IUP) unless a new IUP has been approved for continued solar use.
12. Failure to comply with conditions may result in revocation of the Interim Use Permit.
13. This Interim Use Permit (IUP) shall expire by the earlier of one (1) year from the County Board approval if no construction has begun, eighteen (18) months after electrical production has ceased, or twenty-five (25) years from the commercial production start date. Site restoration/reclamation must be completed prior to the expiration if no renewal has been approved. The applicant/operator of the IUP must notify Rice County Environmental Services of the commercial production start date.

14. No more than four overhead utility poles shall be used near the point of interconnection.
15. Solar-related construction shall only be allowed between the hours of 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Hearing Minutes:

Zoning Administrator Trent McCorkell (TM) presented the request to the Planning Commission (PC).

The PC asked the applicant, Jesse Diamond (JD), to come forward to add comments or answer questions regarding the request.

JD - Similar to the other one, this is just a little bit larger. Instead of 27 acres, it's about 31.5 acres of permitted area. This one, instead of a 3.808, is a 4.0 AC. The decommissioning was lower on our end. We will update that to a minimum of \$200,000 and resubmit that. And then, again, here to answer any questions. I do know that one of the questions about the two is there trees for both? And there are. So, if we look at the site plan for this one, you will see that the trees continue, all the way across.

MP - Roughly, how many trees, or how many rows of trees?

JD - I believe two rows of trees, I would have to double check the exact count but they are 15 feet on center. Dave is a tree guy, he knows.

CP - I did notice going to the south, I can see the one concern about heavy rain and the water going down through that. Is there any mitigation or berm to hold back water? I know you stated there was minimal, but I can see his concern.

JD - Under the current SWIPP there is not a call-out for any mitigation pools, stormwater management facilities, whatever the direct verbiage we want to use. In this particular one we had removed some panels from going down the hill on an area you couldn't really see from the photos. But basically, the northwest corner of this one Dave has done some really great drain tile to collect and mitigate it going down the hill. We had proposed some panels there and removed that knowing it would probably cause some issues. If you look kind of where you see the PID landowners zoning agricultural. We had proposed it up in that area, but when we walked the site, we noticed that it was going to be an issue, and it was going to be removing facilities that were definitely intended. You can kind of see a little green blurb there, kind of where the arrows from this potential stormwater right there, that's where it's collecting, mitigating, and then there's a few of those down the way, and so we have put some thought into it. If we were to do stormwater facilities, we would do them on the north side and on the south side to collect. I'm not an expert in this. I think that, to your point earlier, what the county department, what our stormwater management plan all comes up with is what should be doing the best job of mitigating it. Obviously, during the construction year putting up short-term mitigation, but as far as long-term mitigation and any stormwater facilities, I always leave that up to the experts.

CP - So, with this panel layout, you have the two potential ones to the south there. That would be my concern. You still have room to do that, though, right?

JD - Yes, and that's why our permitted area, our fence layout is that way, we're leaving room for those if we need them. If we don't end up needing those, and everybody agrees, then they could be removed. And that's why we're just calling them potential, because we're at a 30% design, we don't have all the information, we don't have all the feedback that we need to make those decisions. But we did leave that space in case they are needed. That one in the southwest is the most likely to happen. You can see that's where the water collects and goes.

CP - Through that waterway right there.

JD - Yeah, so that is the most likely one that would be needed. And so, what you would likely do is send both drainage patterns towards that point. Do something that can collect the majority of the heavy rainfall to mitigate any extra runoff. But again, I will leave that up to the experts.

Chair Johnson opened the public testimony portion of the item to the public and the following spoke:

Allyn Kuennen - 115th St E - One of the items I wanted to talk about on the previous was the stormwater. One thing we don't know is the design of those stormwater basins, and where the outlets are going to be, or how that flow is going to be controlled if they do have to build them there. So, the concern is on this site, there's a slough there where that water can go. But you have to design those so that if they fill up with water, that it's a controlled release, otherwise you're going to have a mess. He's

also showing those same potential stormwater basins in the other design. He's only at 30% design, but you have to look at that closely, because if you don't do that right, we already have water that comes down through our property. Again, it comes down our back property line, hits that area where they want to put the connections at 115th Street, and that floods. And so, if they get it wrong upstream, it's going to get worse downstream than what it already is. So that's the last few things I wanted to talk about the last time, just kind of keep that in mind as he moves forward with design and decides if he's going to do that or not. That's it. Thank you.

Chair Johnson closed the public testimony portion of the item to the public.

Discussion:

GJ - This might be more for staff, but that would be a discussion with SWCD and at that point they would decide that it would need to have those stormwater management areas?

TM - That would be more addressed through their stormwater permitting that they have to do with the state, actually.

GJ - I was wondering if it was something, you know, if their studies, and then all of a sudden they decide they need it or not, but if it's part of a permit to where it got to a point where it was needed, that it would at least have it or be required to have it.

JH - Are we wanting to include hours of operation for this as well?

GJ - Yeah, I would assume we'll do the same conditions on this one as we added to the last one. I am happy with the 2 rows of trees at 15 feet for vegetative buffer. That has to be the most aggressive one that I've seen in the county. Most of them are a tree every 30 feet and they are 6 feet tall when they go in and it takes a long time for them to grow. The vegetative buffer for this one would be quite a bit better than what's normal. Other than that, I think we covered a lot of it in the last one. I motion to approve with the 13 current conditions plus the two additional conditions for the number of poles and hours of construction from 8a to 5p.

MP - I second.

Motion to recommend approval with stated conditions and findings made by GJ, seconded by MP, and approved unanimously.

6. **Interim Use Permit/US Solar (DeGrood) - Section 11, Warsaw Township**

David Watts of US Solar, on behalf of landowners Joseph and Constance DeGrood Revocable Trusts, has applied for an Interim Use Permit to allow for a 3.25-MW(AC) solar energy production facility. The property is described as: Part of the N1/2 of the NW1/4, Section 11, Warsaw Township, Rice County, Minnesota. PID#s 14.11.2.25.004 & 14.11.2.00.001. The property is Zoned URI, Urban Reserve Industrial.

Motion by Matt Purfeerst, seconded by Julia Hogan, to recommend approval of the Interim Use Permit with the following conditions and findings for David Watts of US Solar, on behalf of landowners Joseph and Constance DeGrood Revocable Trusts. The property is located in Section 11 of Warsaw Township.

RESULT: Approved, AYES: Julia Hogan, Garrett Johnson, Matt Purfeerst, NAYS: None

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL – US Solar (DeGrood) – Interim Use Permit (IUP)

1. The landowner and operators shall comply with all rules, regulations, requirements, or standards of the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, Army Corps of Engineers, and other applicable federal, state or local agencies.
2. The Interim Use Permit (IUP) is for a 3.25-MW (AC) solar energy production site as shown on the application site plan, dated 11/22/2024, subject to meeting all setback and access requirements.
3. Security fence shall consist of fencing meeting state and federal electrical code requirements.
4. All required permits shall be obtained prior to onsite construction.

5. As soon as onsite construction is completed all areas of the site, excluding the access roads and electrical equipment pads, are to be established and maintained in Agricultural crop production or a pollinator friendly perennial vegetative cover.
6. All electrical lines internal to the site and to the location of the interconnection point with the power utility shall be buried underground, except that those lines within the fenced area may be above ground as long as they are lower than the panel heights and meeting electrical codes.
7. A stormwater plan and proof of compliance with state/federal stormwater regulations shall be submitted to Rice County Environmental Services with the application for building permits.
8. The applicant or operator shall furnish Rice County with a \$150,000 bond or other approved financial surety to ensure proper site decommissioning/restoration and to ensure road repair or repair for other off-site damages caused by construction or operation of the facility. Financial surety shall be reviewed and approved by the Rice County Attorney's office prior to any work on-site.
9. The entire site shall be restored to a condition suitable for agricultural crop production prior to expiration of the Interim Use Permit (IUP) unless a new IUP has been approved for continued solar use.
10. Failure to comply with conditions may result in revocation of the Interim Use Permit.
11. This Interim Use Permit (IUP) shall expire by the earlier of one (1) year from the County Board approval if no construction has begun, eighteen (18) months after electrical production has ceased, or Twenty-five (25) years from the commercial production start date. Site restoration/reclamation must be completed prior to the expiration if no renewal has been approved. The applicant/operator of the IUP must notify Rice County Environmental Services of the commercial production start date.

Hearing Minutes:

Zoning Administrator Trent McCorkell (TM) presented the request to the Planning Commission (PC).

The PC asked the applicant, Nikki Miller (NM), to come forward to add comments or answer questions regarding the request.

NM - I work with U.S. Solar. I'm here on behalf of David Watts and Connie and Joe DeGrood, here to share and ask the board for the approval of an Interim Use Permit for a 3.25-megawatt community solar facility, as TM mentioned, in Warsaw Township. The solar array will cover about 20-ish acres, within a fenced-in area, and that's a small portion of the larger parcel. We have recently had a zoning amendment approved by Rice County to allow for solar use in the Urban Reserve Industrial district. So we believe that this is a well-suited site for this project and welcome questions, I am happy to answer.

GJ - Are you aware of the conditions?

NM - Yes.

Chair Johnson opened the public testimony portion of the item to the public and no one spoke.

Chair Johnson closed the public testimony portion of the item to the public.

Discussion:

MP - This one seems a little simpler.

JH - Yeah, and we did have that discussion back when this came forward with the zoning amendment at least with identifying if this use should be allowed in the Urban Reserve Industrial.

GJ - It is set pretty far back too.

JH - Yeah, it doesn't look like it really impedes into other surrounding uses.

MP - TM I have a question on the bond amount? This one is \$150,000, is this just a smaller site? Why did we change it from \$200,000?

TM - Our bond amounts have been approximately \$50,000 per megawatt. Some rounding on both ends of that with different ones, but that's why this one's \$150,000.

JH - I think the conditions kind of hit all that need to be hit with getting permits needed from state and federal level. And obviously maintenance of the site.

MP - I motion to approve with the 11 conditions.

JH - I second.

Motion to recommend approval with stated conditions and findings made by MP, seconded by JH, and approved unanimously.

7. Conditional Use Permit Discussion

TM - Okay, so a brief discussion item, at least that I had. So again, tonight I left with you the conditional interim use permit criteria that applicants fill out. Those are right from the ordinance dealing with what's needed for the approval, or a denial on a conditional or interim use permit. I know we kind of skipped over this for a while, so it was kind of new stuff when we threw that at you a little bit more a few weeks ago but just wanted to bring it up again with that. Our tentative plan is to do some more involved training, hopefully next year like we did a couple of years ago. To kind of go through those in specific details, but I just wanted to get you a little more familiar, again, with that sheet. Do you want me to keep that available, it's not a checklist, nearly, like the Board of Adjustment one is, but do you want it handed out or available?

JH - It does have information that we can reference.

MP - When we deny, that is when we have to actually have specific details about why we are denying it?

TM - What I was going to stress was generally on approvals you don't need to go through those individually. You should be stating that it is meeting all the criteria for approval, you did that on an item tonight. Where it can be a little more important on an approval is if there are some conditions that aren't necessarily what the applicant might be looking for, something like we had to add this screening even though the applicant doesn't want it, we need it to meet the criteria. Stating that is certainly important. Where it is very important to go through the specifics is on a denial. So, if you get a denial, you really want to say, here are the criteria that we're looking at. We can't add conditions to make it okay, it's just not possible to do that, and then some of the reasons for that. The only other things, briefly, I was going to mention again, conditions if they're controversial at all, just saying that they're needed to mitigate any impacts of the project, or to define the project, or make it fit with that. One of the other things that came up is public testimony. That's certainly something your job is, is to weigh that testimony. You know, there may be 10 people that say one thing that may be really valid, or may not be, and you need to take that into account. So, the overall statement of that is the number of testimonies may not be the key to that, there may be one testimony that you feel is much more substantial than what 10 other people said. So just keep that in mind, that it is your job to interpret that and deal with it that way. But that's really all I wanted to just quickly update you on those things. Again, our plan will be to do some more involved training with it but just keep those in mind. I'll try to keep those sheets up there as well, so that you have those at least each time.

GJ - How specific do you have to be when you're having your discussion? Say we don't think it meets the Comprehensive Plan and that's why we should deny it, and then you put forth a motion. Is that enough? Or should it be part of the motion or can it just be in the discussion before the motion is made?

TM - So you do want to be specific, if it's the Comprehensive Plan, at that point, you're going to want to cite a section of the Comprehensive Plan that it's not meeting this section for that.

MP - But that would be after the motion. That would be between the motion and the vote.

TM - It certainly could be before the motion as well, as part of your discussion. I mean, that's kind of varied in how this kind of functioned, at least with that. As long as it's on record of why you're putting forth. Now, if it is a discussion before the motion, the motion maker should say, yes, with our discussed criteria involved there. Also helpful, just repeating that twice isn't going to hurt anything, and similar, I'd say, to when you're the Board of Adjustment on the criteria and findings there, you know, these aren't really made to be yes/no's. They're to be why's. So, kind of keep that in mind with them. Not that you need to go through every one.

MP - You said we don't have to read that whole list?

TM - With the Board of Adjustment, you should, yes.

JH - You could be a little more descriptive on those findings, too.

MP - Could we change the wording on the last one? That is a real tongue twister.

JH - Those are what's shown in the zoning code, so you can't really change that.

TM - The answer to it is to get why you're doing something, like, why it's a yes or a no, essentially.

JH - Especially with some of those more controversial ones.

TM - It certainly gets tricky, also remember that if you do get to a point where it's something that you want more information on because you aren't ready to make a decision, items can be tabled as well. It doesn't have to be tabled at the beginning; they certainly can be later on.

MP - Legally we can't table an item unless we are waiting for more information, right?

GJ - We can table whenever we want.

JH - Staff can send a 60-day extension letter.

TM - You'll want to state the reasons for tabling an item. It just needs to be, we need more time to consider this new information that was given to us. It can be something like that.

JH - We just need to be a little more descriptive with some of our explanations.

TM - Yeah, I'd say more, especially on the denials, if you do have those. That's where it really needs to be a little more detail. And if there's one that you get questions for us, we can certainly help fill in some of those details or at least make suggestions for that.

III. Adjournment

Hearing no other items before the PC, a motion was made by MP, second by JH, to adjourn the meeting at 7:42 pm. Motion carried 3-0.

Respectfully Submitted

Planning Commission



MacKenzie Klett
Office Support Specialist



Garrett Johnson, Chair