



GRANT COUNTY SOUTH DAKOTA
PLANNING AND ZONING OFFICE
210 East 5th Avenue
Milbank, SD 57252-2499
Phone: 605-432-7580
Fax: 605-432-7515

Minutes for the meeting of Grant County Planning and Zoning/Board of Adjustment.

Members present: Nancy Johnson Mike Mach Bob Spartz Richard Hansen Tom Adler Tom Pillatzki

Alternates present: Dave Kruger Don Weber

Members absent: Gary Lindeman

Others present: Brett Koenecke Wade Falk Warren Falk Kristi Mogen Michael Binder Tim Waldner Barry Fladeboe David Kruger Todd Boyd Bryan Roth Mark Mauersberger Wayne Owen Roger Hansen Steph Hansen David Lau Albert Jongewaard Yvonne Pauli Kevin Owen Joanne Schmig Dave Gonzenbach Melissa Schmit Jay Hesse Marilyn Stemsrud Patrick Adams Keith Welberg Vince Meyer Dillon Dwyer Timothy Gapp John Boots Mark Granquist Ted Gramm Richard Fish Kevin Schnaser Charles Wollschlager Bill Street Wendy Storm Steven Storm

Agenda for the meeting of Grant County Planning and Zoning/Board of Adjustment.

Meeting Date: Monday, March 13, 2017

Meeting Time: 4:00 P.M.

1. Call Meeting to Order at 4:05 pm by Chair Johnson
2. Acknowledgement of Grant County Board of Adjustment Procedural and Rules of Conduct available at the sign in desk.
3. Approval of Minutes: Motion by Adler second by Mach carries 7-0.
Minutes of March 7, 2017 Joint Hearing to be approved at April meeting
4. Plat Approvals
Both plats were printed incorrectly and unable to move through the process as actual owners signatures on the corrected copies were unattainable do to family vacations.
5. Conditional Use/Variance Requests/Rezoning
 - a. The request, if granted, would, allow a Hutterite Colony and agribusiness. Permit No. VAR01172017, Blue Sky Colony by Tim Waldner, Applicant Lot 1 Roggenbucks Addn in SW1/4 Section 19 of Township 119, Range 47 and SE1/4 Section 24 of Township 119, Range 48 of the 5th Principal Meridian, Grant County, South Dakota. (Vernon Township)
 - i. Information for classification of land as agricultural
 - ii. Information from Department of Ed for Hutterian School

Johnson opened the hearing announcing the correction of the township number in the notice to the newspaper only. Johnson began the hearing by stating the hearing had all ready been conducted but if there was new information or information that had not been considered previously that anyone wished to bring it would be open for those in opposition to speak first. Johnson called the opposition 3 times with no one rising to speak. Johnson then called those in favor to speak three times with no one rising to be considered. Johnson closed the meeting to public comment and opened the board discussion. Kruger handed out pages of the ordinance he wished to have considered and read aloud Section 229 for the definition of the Conditional Use and stated he gets the feeling they always have to grant them and he shouldn't be the judge and jury on that. This is an institutional farm, and he felt the operation of the Hutterite Colony would not go along with the items in the list in the definitions and highlighted inflated land values and Johnson pointed out the property was offered on the open market and available for everyone to purchase. Kruger also pointed out that the Board would not have to approve all CUP applications as he feels they are led to believe. They may be permitted but not when they are not appropriate generally without restrictions. They may also deny when not in harmony with the purpose and intent of this regulation or in general compatibility with adjacent poverties and other property. Adler added it isn't different from having the trailers set up around the county for housing of groups as rentals and the safety considerations they make when placing them. Atyeo-Gortmaker states what they do for you they are going to be an institutional farm and that is what you make and base your decision on. Johnson

inquired that it also says agribusiness and asks for clarification Atyeo-Gortmaker states that it is their home extended occupation and it wouldn't be an agribusiness because they live there. Kruger states that is the only thing for the findings as to why this approves public health, etc in the list. This is why we have a hearing and you ask Waldner to address the board for questions: Public Welfare is addressed and they offer immunizations for their people through the county health nurse. Kruger asked for Tim to come forward and address each of the things in that list. Board is wishing for you to address each of these items- what do you do as a current community so as to not take Grant County backwards by being there. We take care of whatever we need to, back home they get flu shots at county nurse, and they have a safety committee on site and have met twice all ready to address concerns of the Hutterite colony, safe vehicles. Johnson asks if Tim feels they downgrade the neighborhood in any way and he states no. How are they controlling the numbers states Kruger and asks if they increase the prosperity of the county by being there. Waldner answers that he doesn't think there is any farm in Grant County that would be treated differently and they pay the full amount of taxes on their property like everyone. Asking these questions have now set a precedent and all applicants will now be asked these questions and Atyeo-Gortmaker asks if there are any more things the board wishes to know. Pillatzki asked about the schools memo they received in their packets. For clarifications it was asked how many children are on site Waldner states none and they have a building that is a multi purpose building. At some point they could use it as a school but they are not currently operating outside the CUP at this time. Atyeo-Gortmaker reads aloud the information: Department of Education, Director Susan Woodmansey: Attendance to the Hutterian School-

1. The School can choose to Home School the children who live there. If this is done a letter is written to the home district to exempt these children from attendance at the Public School. \$0 public aid is expended by the state to either the home school OR the home district.
2. Private School- Tuition is paid by parents of attendees to "fund" the school and they receive \$0 state aid and the home district receives \$0 aid as well.
3. An agreement is made between the Public School District and the Hutterite Colony to enroll and serve the students at the colony with a teacher and supplies from the Public District they are within. This would be an attendance center of Grant-Deuel School District and associated and operated by the District who would then receive state aid for each student in attendance at the Hutterite School facility. A student outside the district could open enroll to the district but the district would have to choose to place them at the Hutterite Colony school for attendance in order to be a student associated with that attendance facility. Also- they would need to meet conditions for that assignment to be considered at the district level.

Kruger states he received different information from another advisor he had inquired of and he says they would have to observe the setbacks for a cafo if they were to become an attendance center. This CUP cannot be denied or granted upon school information because there isn't a school there. Johnson states the number 8 in the ordinance is the citation for the Institutional Farm conditional use and there are not more requirements in which they need to meet.

Kruger's main question is whether granting this CUP will not adversely affect the public in Grant County. And in my mind that the public is raising that it is a public nuisance. Mach states that is the purpose of the hearing and when the public got to ask their questions were they satisfied and did they answer all the concerns? Kruger has received phone calls at home but no one else on the board had. Johnson states what needs to be decided is: if a CUP and the purpose of that for this land use would be ok. They have not applied for a business at this but a welding shop or something like that would be a home extended occupation or they could expand their ag land use. At this time they are not using the property in a different manner than what it had been in the past. Atyeo-Gortmaker clarifies that asking questions about running a CAFO or agribusiness would be asked at a later date but at this time they are asking you if they can be an institutional farm: yes or no. Kruger states that anyone who purchased that property could be using it and he wants to know if they have evidence to show

they are an institutional farm. Atyeo-Gortmaker points out that in ordinance there are no requirements of burden of proof required like in the CAFO section and the Wind Energy as we are about to hear next. They operate in this manner until we find there is something to be egregious. Kruger states the CUP needs to ask those questions but it is pointed out that those things would be an inherent part of the applications but would have to be written in as requirements to look behind that curtain.

Kruger feels we don't have to grant it because they haven't proven they are going to meet the list of items in the definition and he feels it is our job to make sure they are going to do these things and if they do these things or verify they are going to do these things and if they don't we can't grant it. He states he doesn't need more information we just need to think about these things and if everyone here feels they have verified it then they can grant it. Atyeo-Gortmaker points out the list in Ordinance 1211 wind energy where there is a list they need to prove to you they have completed but all they need to say is that they are becoming an institutional farm. It would take a whole different ordinance of requirements to be added the farm would present that information. At this time you can't look behind the curtain. Johnson points out that to be a sanitary landfill they have things that must be present in the permit presentation. Atyeo-Gortmaker states the hardest part of my job is that I have to prepare the permittee to give you all the information that you can consider and I go by what is black and white and you govern for that not the what-ifs or you are pulling the rug out from under the applicant. Kruger asks what are the other findings they would be required to get and as a clarification, at this time they have asked to be considered an institutional or religious farm, a school and multiple houses on the site and you know they will look different than my farm or yours and that is why we require them to get permission.

Pillatzki is states we are not just dealing with another colony for buying power and competition for land. Spartz states that isn't different than a farmer from Minnesota that does the same thing. Johnson states they will buy land in other locations too. Atyeo-Gortmaker states that if they are discussing that only on the basis that they place a colony here that there are other colonies that own land in this county already. They have a right to do that. They can do that whether they have a colony here or not and it really shouldn't be a discussion. Are they an institutional farm or not.

Kruger states they automatically do because they are meeting the regulations and there are no conditions. Johnson makes comment as long as they do what they are saying they are doing and not running a biker bar they get a CUP. Johnson calls for a motion. Motion was made by Hansen to approve the CUP for Blue Sky with a second from Spartz. A roll call vote shows unanimously yes in approval of the motion to grant the CUP.

- b. The Conditional Use request, if granted, would permit the applicant to construct and use a transmission facility including poles, conductors (wires), on-site substation and necessary parts applicant to build and operate a wind farm in Osceola, Mazeppa, Twin Brooks and Stockholm Townships. Permit No. CUP02082017A & CUP02082017B, Nathan Franzen on behalf of Cattle Ridge Wind Farm, LLC, 7650 Edinborough Way Suite 725, Edina MN 55435, Applicant in Osceola, Mazeppa, Twin Brooks & Stockholm Townships of the 5th Principal Meridian, Grant County, South Dakota. (See proposed facility in maps as published and publicly available in the P&Z Office)

An introduction to the CUP for Geronimo brought forth a recusal from Hansen, as he is a party to the project. At this time, Atyeo-Gortmaker announced the seating of Don Weber as alternate to the Board of Adjustment in Hansen's place.

Johnson called for the permit to be presented to the board by Geronimo representatives and asks for the Ordinance number 1211 and cites they did a really good job at laying it out according to the ordinance requirements. Hesse, Schmitt, Fladeboe, Binder and Koenecke began the presentation. Mogen stated to Schmitt that the Board was not convened correctly and the presentation was stopped to clarify that she had missed the statement and seating of Weber to the Board of Adjustment. Hesse carried on presenting the plan. This will be a \$2.5 billion dollar

investment with a capacity of 200 to 400 mw and 127 turbines as shown on the map, at this scale 40-60,000 homes could be powered. \$1.1 million dollar per year payout to landowners over 20 years brings out 23 million in payouts. In that 20 years 800,000 dollars are given to the community through a board of landowners. There will be 200 people here during construction with a 300 to 350 million dollar impact to the local community.

Schmitt, Senior Permitting Specialist presented the environmental review and the answers for common questions she has had in other projects and an overview of the ongoing and completed items provided for other entities to receive approvals. State PUC will have meetings in Milbank area and Pierre for the environmental assessment. Fish and Wildlife grassland easements is investigating trade in kind for parcel per parcel land swaps. They comply with all standards of Grant County ordinance and have given the preliminary layout that will evolve and be submitted in the final layout within 60 days of building.

Setback designs meets and exceeds the setback distances and she lists the information from the permit for distances they observe in excess of these needs. Noise and flicker were addressed by giving the requirements and stating they have done the tests to find they are well below the standards necessary for Cattle Ridge. They have taken into consideration roads, pipelines and microwave beams as she refers to enlarged maps present for the public and Board.

Studies that guide the design are wildlife and consultation for the application with a noted low impact and limited threat to nests and bats in particular. Common wildlife effects are not anticipated with little impact and reports of no altered enjoyment of lands in prior projects. Noise levels required are 50 dba for Grant County and in the preliminary layouts they will average 36-40 dba they have tested 4 turbine models with given nameplate ranges and in the table of noise comparison it would be like an idling car that you were standing beside and present a 36-40 dba to any receptor or home location. The flicker requirement not listed in Grant County ordinance is required by the state and federal permit is set less than 30 hours per year. The results of the study shown are below that for houses in the system and information is also included that there is no correlation of decreased value to homes within 10 miles and that review was included in the packet.

They presented the EMP to give no interference to tv and radio for collection lines and turbines at 500 feet setback but a 3rd party EMF study is to be conducted prior to the state permit. Also a report presented that show zero correlation to health and safety from a world health study of 2007. Schmitt completes her presentation by stating all requirements of the Grant County ordinance have been presented and she urges an approval vote of the project.

Johnson opens the discussion for the board to ask questions to the presenters and requests the written letters to be presented. At this time a letter from the Gary Meyer family was read at the table by each member for consideration. She asks if the turbines 4 models with the smallest being 2 mw and largest being 4 mw have an impact on the final number of turbines. Yes and that is why it varies for the 200-400 mw system depending on the size of the turbines they can use in locations and how many they can place. Pillatzki asked for the definition of a leak survey and it was clarified that it was a grassland binder and used in the flatlands to identify animals for the project impact. Weber asked how long temporary jobs would be created and it was stated that during construction for as long as it lasts in the fall for roads and foundations and again in the spring to the fall of the year for 12 to 16 months. Mach asked how the turbines would be managed and how many jobs that would create and Hesse states it is Geronimo that intends to own and operate the turbines with 10-15 jobs. Adler inquires about life of the farm and it is answered the industry standards and purchase power agreements are made for 20 years but the turbine technology could increase that from 20 to 30 years depending on the turbine selected. Johnson asked if the life span is from the time it is operational and that was correct and Weber asked if the permits they needed yet to secure would add to the time of development and it was answered some of these permits would be simultaneous with the state being 6 months and the federal being 12 to 18 months. They are ongoing with the SD fish and wildlife. Kruger asks of the Valuation and is informed the SD tax code calls it capacity of the system and the state formula for generation is used. Kruger states there are 3 townships involved that will receive a large revenue if it were to be allocated to them. Johnson asks if there is a need to build a substation to gain access to the CapX lines- yes they will apply for a building permit as that becomes reality and it is noted in the map layout for the placement of such. Kruger asked for stray voltage and the precautions offered for the concerns of neighbors. Hesse answers that this

is a closed loop 3 phase system and if there are imbalances the system safeguards shut it down. He also wonders if there is confusion between stray voltage and magnetic field which is handled in the ordinance already and he points out as well that full study is submitted to the state. Spartz asks if there would be a bin site construction of a nonparticipant of the project if that would affect the turbines and the wind patterns and Hesse states as long as the setbacks are observed they don't foresee problems. Mach points out the maps that show Cattle Ridge observes larger than required setbacks and notes Hesse comment that it shouldn't cause problems.

5:30 pm Johnson calls those in opposition to the CUP to make testimony.

Kevin Owen states he is not against the project but they own or rent 2500 acres and they are not in the project and notes the L shape on the map for the land they own. He states a majority of the people in the project don't have kids that live there anymore but they do and they are concerned for the family to ranch and farm and take over in the future. Thanks to Jay for answering his questions but he feels special mention needs to be made for the Eagles he knows to nest in the area as he has counted about 10 at this time and they are there year round. He also mentions that is the largest concentration of deer population as recognized by the game fish and parks in South Dakota. Transmission lines are handled at the Commissioner level for work within the ROW and setbacks are handled by them and they can run above/below or interexchange agreement. Hesse answered the electricity currently has no buyer but the MISO system is potential and there is current interest in that purchase. Schmitt answered they are in ongoing studies and endangered species go first in those studies but she is aware of a nest outside the 10 mile line of the project and other states have open hunting seasons and welcome hunters throughout the year.

Wayne Owen concerns were that he didn't want it in his territory because it is within 500 feet of where he is going to try to make a living. He has talked to a lot of people and some like and some don't and points out that the eagles are there and asks for the road impacts to be discussed.

Todd Boyd, Attorney for ITC states he was in Clark last week and he is not a yes or no on the project but wants a proposed resolution adopted to protect ITC services. This resolutions was adopted all ready by Brookings and Deuel county and he would like them to enter the agreement. Copies being handed out and we don't know if there are going to be any interference but if there is going to be this would allow for the wind farm to be turned off and a remedy made immediately. If this is acceptable and they have agreed on March 7th for the 4 townships and could work on making it more specific once it is adopted and signed today. He states that the wind energy will interfere with the copper lines and will make the landline unusable which means 911 will not work either. The adoption of this resolution would remedy the problem they saw in Lake Benton.

Atyeo-Gortmaker points out is given to the wrong board and it was his understanding that this board makes the recommendation to the Commissioners. Atyeo-Gortmaker points out this is more an agreement between the companies resolution. His understanding was that this board makes the recommendation to put this in place and when they make that recommendation to commissioners. It is clarified that this board is the quasi-judicial board and makes the decision for the permit and that is final. He states he can change the resolution and he will make a recommendation to the commissioners that they attach this when they receive the recommendations. Adler points out that isn't the way this board works. Mach states this as well. He states the procedure followed in the other counties that he has appeared in before apply this resolution to the permit as a requirement for the company to follow. Atyeo-Gortmaker points out that to ask this board to enter a company to company agreement as a condition this isn't the procedure to follow. Boyd asks if the ordinance addresses this and Atyeo-Gortmaker points out there is a complaint system in which the days and documentation are compiled with an investigation so it would already be addressed in the ordinance for mitigation measures. He asks how long that takes and in answer a certified letter is sent and investigation done within 7 days of written complaint with 30 days to resolution. However, that may not be something this board governs in the first place- if you contend the ITC customer cannot make a 911 call there are remedies with the 911 system that follow different rules. He wants to talk about any services they provide. To clarify a tower blinking that stops making the dusk change has a time limit to correct that issue and the condition can be mirrored for you but it is done in that manner not to enter an agreement. It is his experience that takes 2 years and they want remedy and they want the system shut off. Johnson states it should be in the form of a complaint that is covered

already- if violated there is a procedure that is followed and Pillatzki states there is a condition that can be worded to give more safeguards and the complaint procedure was ready aloud. This board cannot bind the company into your agreement but we can place measurable or other used standards to put conditions upon the CUP permit that can dictate more clearly a plan of action and that can apply to every system that may come in. What is important here so a condition and he wants any “unreasonable interference” to shut down the wind farm? When asked what that meant in laymen’s terms he couldn’t explain to the board and stated it is their engineering standards. Atyeo-Gortmaker asked him again what he was asking for and Spartz requested a measurable item for what he means and Boyd says that is what is in the agreement are their industry standards but was not able to elaborate upon those measures. If those standards are met they would be able to provide landline, internet, and local services for their cooperative and he was asked to what standard they are able to verify they are operating at now. They have not measured that and cannot provide a threshold to make a measurable comparison that could be caused by the windfarm. They don’t show that measurement because they don’t have any problems and he states they have zero problems now and hereafter when the system is energized they would be caused by the windfarm. If you will be requesting a shutdown of the system what is measured to make that determination to the board and he points out the standards of IEEE in the resolution again. He was asked to prove they would be above the 4.1.2 Acceptable standard or 4.1.3 conditionally acceptable standard at this time and he felt that would not be their burden to prove the threshold to measure from and provide that threshold.

Example, Clark County didn’t notify them so they didn’t measure until after that wind farm was installed and that was the point- will ITC be measuring that prior to this windfarm being built? No he presents there will be a lot of problems potentially. A condition can be discussed and can be tabled to a later meeting to do the research for how this could affect the ordinance and governance as a whole. Geronimo representation was asked if they use IEEE standards in what they do. Koenecke answered they would do what they needed to do to preserve the CUP permit but ITC shouldn’t really be authorizing this board to his client in this way. They will sign the resolution between companies and Atyeo-Gortmaker points out that would be the way this could be handled and you are asking for assistance to this complaint process. No- that is not what he wants, he wants the permission granted that they could have the wind farm shut down immediately because through the complaint process it could take 2 years or more. Mach says so you have a problem you are going to shut them off and Boyd answers exactly. Adler states he would get along without tv and telephone long before he gets along without electricity. Mach Pillatzki and Spartz conference at the table that this agreement with them and then we don’t have to touch this at all. Atyeo-Gortmaker states that they can acknowledge the agreement and do nothing more with it. Boyd stands on his ground that they need the resolution to control the wind system if they have a problem and again with the agreement between the companies on file the P&Z Officer and Board can assist in finding a timely solution. Johnson states that it is already a condition of the complaint system and Atyeo-Gortmaker states yes and the agreement between the companies can be placed as a condition that they get a remedy within 24 hours. Is 24 hours what was agreed upon? You can have a condition that they come to an agreement and you the IEEE is outside the scope of the Board. Boyd disagrees and feels the control is here at the permit process and that it gets adopted now to stop any issues if they should arise and it was explained that the hearing process has not allowed for Geronimo to answer the acceptance of such a resolution.

Adler asked about issues that create problems and earlier experiences. ITC getting phone calls from people and they have had this used in other counties and he didn’t realize Grant County didn’t do things in the same way with the commissioners. The hearing process to adopt a resolution or standards was explained for Boyd and he asked if a man has a heart attack and can’t dial 911- how does that happen and how does that really happen. How did that happen in Lake Benton? He states he doesn’t have the statistics and he plays a scenario of an oncall nurse without a cell phone can’t get called in because her land line doesn’t work. If she is on copper and works for the hospital- can they be identified? How many of those individuals do you have and Boyd stated that shouldn’t be for them to prove. Right now they have no problems the problem gets created when the system gets energized and it was pointed out that they file the complaint and it gets investigated.

Johnson asks again for those opposed to present now. Mogen requests the board to place a condition for a road agreement for townships and Johnson points out that that is already handled administratively required with entities of concern.

Johnson calls for those in favor of the windfarm to present testimony.

David Lau he grew up here and was a business owner as he continued to live here and is 4th generation. He has had 2 small business and recognizes the need to plan for the future but without new industry that would not work. When commodity prices are high it brings industry to town and a strong economy. With the way things are now we need a plan for the future and how do we do that without new industry and we just have to work harder to pay taxes or we build a strong economy. In his trucking business diesel fuel was the highest cost and he worked hard to stay ahead and work stronger and cheaper and without change to stay ahead in our community with the way things go increases and taxes and expenses are all that will appreciate. Bring them in because they have been kind and respectful to our landowners.

JoAnn Schmig lives under proposed line and is pledging pasture for the tower and supports renewables even though others may be saying not in my back yard it is a great resource and the increase use of our resources will help the townships county and the state. There are downsides to everything but this has more good than bad.

Marilyn Stemsrud is in favor and her kids who are going to inherit the land are in favor.

Yvonne Pauli doesn't live here anymore but cattle and homes are on the land and they are interested and involved.

Tim Gapp- Summit has been involved for 10 years and would like to see this opportunity taken advantage of for Grant County. There is transmission now to get the power out of here and it will be good economics for the taxes and schools. They have contracts for maintenance of roads which in some cases would make improvements and give more than adequate funding for maintenance and also a community fund.

Richard Fish and his dad have seen the wind around and they have been good to work with. They have signed leases and gone online to find opinions and found nothing negative.

Wade Falk is here with his neighbors today and he lives on his great grandfathers farm in the rural community farming where the income is concerning. The wind project would trickle down to mainstreet and regenerate the ag economy. It is the landowners decision and we want it and it is coming. They are honoring the 1000 foot setback to others and I would let them make it lower on my property. As for ITC saying they have no problems now come and watch Netflix at my house and stop by when the Sherriff was trying to fix his phone from randomly calling 911 and they wouldn't fix it. There is no system that doesn't have problems- it doesn't exist- but don't shut down green energy because you think it isn't your problem.

Steph Hansen lives in the area and is happy they are coming. They have been pleasant to work with and have talked to them several times and they have always been able to get answers from the company.

Johnson called 3 times for any more testimony in favor of the wind energy conditional use permit and closed the public hearing at 6:20 pm
Spartz began the questions and clarifications with asking if everything would be coming from China to which the answer was there really isn't a way to pick. There are more sources available now but the various locations to choose a Ford or a Chevy are limited. There are more manufacturers both in South Dakota and in the United States. There is a percentage of the things they can buy locally and a percentage that has to be sourced internationally. Weber follows up with his request to keep it local with plant layoffs within the area and things that could come from GE or a local contractor such as the blades.

Johnson read the letter received from the Meyer family accrossed the road with their concerns about EMF and the field of dissipation but she referenced the ordinance about electrical codes that South Dakota would enforce. Hesse states this is a 3 phase system that has a safety process for the times it could become unbalanced. If there is a break or an error that the turbines monitor at all times is shut down remotely until fixed.

Mach pointed out the avian surveys and the point counts. Schmitt gave an overview of the process by stating there are 8-9 points that are manually counted for an hour to count birds flying and perched or present. Flight paths such as Round Lake through game fish and parks is done in coordination and analyzed for mortality and it has shown no eagles in the project area. If there were they would become part of the bird and bat plan for conservation.

Motion by Pillatzki to approve the Conditional Use permit A as presented with the condition that Geronimo will agree to work with ITC and report back to the Planning & Zoning Officer within 60 days as to whether an agreement was reached. P&Z Officer will report the satisfaction of the condition or why an agreement has not been reached to the Planning & Zoning Board of Adjustment. Second by Mach motion carries by roll call unanimously.

Motion by Mach to approve the Conditional Use permit B as presented with the condition that Geronimo will agree to work with ITC and report back to the Planning & Zoning Officer within 60 days as to whether an agreement was reached. P&Z Officer will report the satisfaction of the condition or why an agreement has not been reached to the Planning & Zoning Board of Adjustment. Second by Weber motion carries by roll call unanimously.

6. New Business Planning & Zoning course from First District scheduled for April 3, 2017 at 4 pm.
7. Old Business
 - a. Joint Hearing for Agribusiness/ Light Industrial ordinance March 7, 2017
8. Next meetings:
 - a. Regular meeting: April 10, 2017 at 4 PM
9. Adjournment Motion by Mach second by Hansen carries 8-0.

Krista Atyeo-Gortmaker
Planning and Zoning Officer
Grant County