

JOHNSON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Johnson County Administration Building

111 South Cherry Street, Olathe, Kansas

Board of County Commissioners Hearing Room, 3rd Floor

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

December 14, 2021

5:45 p.m.

A. CALL TO ORDER

A meeting of the Planning Commission of Johnson County, Kansas, was convened at 5:45 p.m. on Tuesday, December 14, 2021, and was called to order by Jim Neese, Chairman, pro tempore, with the following members present and participating; to-wit: Michael Levin, Mark Huggins, Roger Mason, George Lund, Kelley Rast, Dave Johns, Lindsey Grise and Randall Downing. Randy Hutchins and Chris Iliff were absent. Also present were Jay Leipzig, Leslie Davis, Karen Miller, Diane Wicklund, and Sean Pendley, Johnson County Planning Department.

Chairman Neese: Good evening. I am the Chairman pro tem of the Johnson County Planning Commission. I'd like to call it to order, December 14, 2021. Before we get started, I would like to have the information statement read for those that may be online or are not here or are on the phone, if you would do that for us, please, Leslie.

Ms. Davis: Yes sir.

*This meeting is now being recorded. Please silence all electronic devices. Please note, to reduce the spread of COVID-19, physical distancing will be observed in the hearing room, with limited seating. Some Board members will not be physically present in the Board meeting room and will be joining through Zoom. If you are using Zoom, you may participate in the meeting using your computer, phone or electronic device. Zoom participants' chat will be disabled once the meeting begins. If you have trouble with Zoom, please call 913-715-1700. If you would like to speak but did not register beforehand, please use the "raise hand" function, or *9 if connecting via telephone. I will call your name when it is your turn to speak. Registered speakers using Zoom will be called upon in the order in which they signed up, alternating with in-person speakers. Speakers who have registered or signed up for in-person public comment by 5:45 p.m. will be called on in the order in which they signed up. The Chairman may modify these procedures as needed to conduct an orderly and efficient meeting. All speakers will be limited to two minutes, unless the Chair designates a different time period in order to accommodate all speakers desiring to speak. When your name is called by the moderator, your microphone will be unmuted. Please state your name and address for the record, followed by your comments. If you share concerns, comments or points made by others, please refrain from repeating those comments and instead note for the record that you agree with the previous individual's comments. There will be a "10-second remaining" warning sound. Board members and presenters, please state your name every time you begin talking so the notes can be transcribed for the record. This is a public hearing. We are presenting live and recording the meeting. Thank you.*

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chairman Neese: At this time, the Chair would ask for approval of the agenda, and it was modified. I think everybody has a copy of that. Could I have a motion to approve the agenda, or make additions to the agenda?

Motion by Commissioner Downing, seconded by Commissioner Lund, to approve the agenda.

The motion passed unanimously.

C. CONSIDER MINUTES OF PREVIOUS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Chairman Neese: Any additions or deletions to that? And I would like to make a correction to the last minutes. Apparently, Mr. Petersen's name was misspelled in a minutes presentation. I believe his last name is spelled with -sen rather than -son. Is that correct?

Mr. Leipzig: That's correct.

Chairman Neese: Okay, any other corrections, deletions or additions?

Mr. Leipzig: Yes, Mr. Chair. I do have one correction to the meeting minutes. On page 23, I was asked a question by Commissioner Levin about Douglas County, asked, did they originally cap the size of the solar facility at 1,000 acres? I had replied that it was originally capped at 1,000 acres, but they removed that cap. That statement was incorrect, so I wanted to be clear on that. Douglas County, the current regulations that they are proposing does still have a 1,000-acre cap.

Chairman Neese: Okay, so made. Any other deletions or additions? Hearing none, a motion to approve the minutes of the last meeting.

Motion by Commissioner Downing, seconded by Commissioner Levin to approve the minutes of the November 16, 2021, Planning Commission meeting as amended.

The motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Neese: At this time, before we go into one item, I'd like to make a statement here. Just a reminder to the public. For the proposed solar regulations, the public hearing was closed on November 16th. We will therefore not be taking public comments tonight regarding the draft solar regulations since the public hearing was closed at the last meeting. As listed on the agenda, there will be a general public comment period at the end of this meeting. However, this will be after the Planning Commission votes and makes any recommendations, if they do make any recommendations, on the proposed solar regulations. Comments will be limited to matters that are not on the agenda. So, basically, it is a public comment. Please be aware, there will be an opportunity for the public to speak at the Board of County Commissioners meetings when they consider proposed solar regulations. I want to repeat that. The public will have another opportunity to speak in front of the BOCC if and when we pass these recommendations on to the County Commissioners. Having said that, I would like staff to continue with the proposals, the changes and the proposals that you suggest that we look at for the adoption to send to the County Commissioners.

D. UPDATE THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS TO REGULATE UTILITY-SCALE SOLAR FACILITIES

Mr. Leipzig: Mr. Chairman, good evening. Just a couple of logistical details, similar to what we've done in our previous meetings. I wanted to go through the list of those comments that were included in your agenda packet, and then those that were emailed afterwards. On 12/7 and 12/8,

we included comments from Larry Campbell, also comments forwarded from Carrie Brandon. Joyce Whitter submitted three sets of comments. Steven Clark and Carroll Hosch, and also comments that were emailed on December 13th included those from Anna Gepson, Deborah Nash, Jenny Cox, Tammy Dohr, Alan Anglyn, Ryan Swart, Byron Wiley, Jill O'Connor, Gail Tucker. Stan Knoche submitted three sets of comments. Steven Clark submitted three sets of comments. Mary Coffman, Ryan Metcalf, Ryan Mathes, Jenalea Myers, Brandon Stewart, Kelley Stewart, Jane Knoche and Joyce Whittier. Those were the comments that were mailed out yesterday, 12/13.

Chairman Neese: Thank you, Jay.

Motion by Chair Neese to recess the Planning Commission open meeting and convene in Executive Session at this time, for a total of 15 minutes, for the purpose of receiving advice of Counsel and to preserve the attorney-client privilege and to reconvene in open session in this room at approximately 15 after the hour, or as soon thereafter as the Executive Session may end. Seconded by Commissioner Lund, the motion passed unanimously.

The Commission recessed to Executive Session.

Chairman Neese reconvened the Open Meeting.

Chairman Neese: Thanks for being patient with us on that. I'd like to resume the update on the Comprehensive Plan to regulate utility-scale solar facilities. I don't know if you're going to do it, Sean. Whoever is going to go over the last changes and recommendations and the amendments or conditions that we talked about last time that need to be answered. I think there are a couple of those.

Mr. Pendley: Thank you, Chairman. I think Jay Leipzig was going to make a couple of opening comments, and then I'll give a presentation with the update. Thank you.

Mr. Leipzig: Actually, Mr. Chairman, my comment is going to be very brief. As I said, I went through the details with what was included in the packet. In your agenda packet was a memo from staff dated December 7, 2021, and with that, I'm going to turn it over to Sean Pendley, who has a PowerPoint to summarize that information, as well as Darren Coffey, our planning consultant is on Zoom and will be able to answer any additional questions you might have. But I believe this is the direction that you provided to us at our previous meeting when we met on November 16th.

Mr. Pendley: Thank you, Jay. As indicated, as Jay mentioned, at the last meeting of the Planning Commission on November 16th, that was the public hearing. As you recall, there were some recommendations and some changes to the draft regulations, so staff has prepared that, and that is included in the memo and the draft regulations that were included in the packet and are posted on the County's website. First I just want to give an overview again of the schedule of where we are with the draft regulations and the process so far for the meetings. Just to mention, we had the previous study sessions in September and October with the Planning Commission regarding these amendments. Then there was the public hearing, as we mentioned, at the last meeting on November 16th, and tonight we have the follow-up Planning Commission meeting with the suggested changes to the draft regulations.

The next steps, the Planning Commission recommends approval of the draft regulations that would proceed to the Board of County Commissioners. We anticipate the study session to be with the Board of County Commissioners on January 20th. The meeting location has not yet been finalized, but it will be in this building. It will be in the Administration Building here. And then, following the study session, the item will be scheduled for our regular meeting with the Board of

County Commissioners on February 3, 2022. That is the planned schedule moving forward with the draft regulations. That would be a separate public meeting at which time the public would have an opportunity to speak as well.

Chairman Neese: Excuse me. The meeting in January has been changed to the County Commissioners?

Mr. Pendley: There will be two meetings. There will be a study session on January 20th. There will be a study session for the Board of County Commissioners, and then a regular action meeting for the Board of County Commissioners.

I want to highlight the changes since the last meeting. If you recall, the Planning Commission had recommendations for three primary changes to the draft regulations, so that's what we'll focus on, and then they asked staff and the consultant to assist with researching and recommending an additional requirement for properties that may be surrounded by a solar facility. I'll go through each one of these and highlight them. First, if you recall, the previous recommendation for the term of the Conditional Use Permit for the utility-scale solar facility was 25 years, as recommended in the previous draft. That was recommended for a change by the Planning Commission to 20 years, so the draft regulations have been updated to highlight that change.

Another primary change was for the maximum project area. Previously that was recommended up to 2,000 acres, the project area. That was revised to 1,000 acres at the request of the Planning Commission. The regulations have been revised accordingly. Another change was the distance from cities. That was revised from a minimum of 1.5 miles to 2.0 miles from any city limit.

All of those changes that were requested by the Planning Commission have been made to the draft regulations, so the draft you have before you this evening in this packet does reflect those changes. We wanted to go over a couple of those changes and how that will impact the regulations and any applications moving forward for utility-scale solar facilities.

This was the previous buffer that we had provided as part of the draft regulations. This showed a 1.5-mile buffer from city limits. We had an updated map that showed a two-mile buffer from city limits. I will note another major change with this is a recent annexation – two annexations, actually – in the City of De Soto. Those are highlighted on the south end of De Soto, that's on the south and west portion of De Soto. There was a very large annexation as part of the former Sunflower Army Ammunition Plant and another parcel, a large area of 356 acres to the north of the Sunflower property. That recent annexation that was approved on November 18th has a substantial change to the city of De Soto, as you can see. They essentially doubled the size of the city, so that will have an impact on potential utility-scale solar, where it may be located. This buffer map reflects that, so that's taking into consideration both the annexation and a two-mile buffer. The areas that are showing up in bright green, basically those are the areas left that would be eligible for utility-scale solar. As you see on the far west end of the county there is a pocket in between De Soto and Gardner and then there are some small areas on the very south end.

[technical issue with Zoom]

Mr. Leipzig: Good evening, everybody. Just so you all heard that, there were some technical issues with Zoom, so we are pausing the meeting just for a few moments while we get that corrected.

[meeting paused]

Mr. Pendley: Sorry for that. I'll go back here. I'll go back, just in case anybody missed this on the Zoom Webinar. Again, the highlighted changes were the change in the CUP term from 25 years to 20 years, revising the maximum project area from 2,000 acres to 1,000 acres, and then the distance from cities from 1.5 miles to 2.0 for a minimum distance from cities. The change, the buffer map, we wanted to make this clear and highlight this. This was the previous buffer map that was proposed, and this shows in bright green the areas with the 1.5-mile buffer around the cities. This was the area that would have been eligible for utility-scale solar facilities. With the new two-mile buffer that has changed substantially. That buffer is shown as the pink, light salmon color, and then the bright green is the area that would be eligible for utility-scale solar facilities. The other primary change, of course, is the annexations for De Soto. That has a tremendous impact on the area that would be allowed for a utility-scale solar. With these maps, we wanted to highlight that. They're included in the packet. We'd be happy to go through any details with that as well.

Commissioner Levin: I'm sorry. I have a question. Could you go back to the map for a minute? Pretty drastic change. You, by chance, don't have a 1.5-mile outside the cities with that new annexation?

Mr. Pendley: We do. We do have that, and I'll show that at the end. That's a good question. We prepared those additional maps, figuring there may be questions on that. We had our wonderful AIMS staff help us with the maps, and they provided buffers for 1 mile, 1.5 miles, two (2) miles and three (3) miles. We'll go through those options.

Again, to highlight these, annexation for the City of De Soto with a majority of the former Sunflower Army Ammunition plant, that's over 6,000 acres. In addition, 365 acres for another parcel. With that 2-mile distance from the cities, that does have an impact on where the utility-scale solar would be allowed in the county. As proposed, the remaining land area that would be eligible for solar would be 10,391 acres from the current city limits, with the new De Soto annexations. Of course, there is still the waiver option that would be allowed for distance from cities. We would take into consideration, what the City's comments may be, whether they would be in favor of that or opposed to that, so those are the things that could be eligible or possible. We'll discuss that as well.

The other changes, or some of the items that were discussed at the last meeting that we wanted to highlight. There was a question about the maximum project extent, if you recall. That's another map that we prepared and we'll show you in a minute, that in addition to the project area, 1,000 acres, there is a project extent area, which is basically another geographic metric that we use to accommodate where a solar facility would be allowed within a certain area or geographic region. That is so that we don't have any one particular CUP, one particular solar project, extending too far, to proliferate in a larger area than what would be expected, so that area was recommended for four (4) square miles or 2,560 acres. Staff recommends keeping that. The reasons for that are that when we actually put this on a map and we looked at where a 1,000-acre solar facility could be and then we put a project area around it, it really didn't change much. It stayed about a four-square-mile area, and I'll show you that in a minute.

There is a waiver option as well, as we mentioned at the last meeting. For that waiver, if an applicant were to request a waiver from this requirement, they would have to demonstrate that it does not conflict with planned uses in the area, that the distances of any non-abutting tracts are no more than one-half mile apart and that the deviation does not create any adverse impacts to surrounding properties. That's just kind of a high-level.

What I wanted to show was this map. This is also included in your packet. These are graphic representations. These are not actual parcels or any particular township in the county. This is just showing a theoretical parcel map of a particular area. We have revised this. In the previous version of the regulations we had a 2,000-acre project area. That's the area, again, highlighted in this light red color. The properties are in green. The black bold lines would be section lines. In the previous example, we had a 2,000-acre project. Now we've reduced this to a 1,000-acre simulated solar facility. The project extent is this other map that shows the yellow boundary. Again, what that is doing, it's not necessarily the boundary of a solar project. That's just another metric that we use to make sure that a solar project is within a certain area. The way we measure that is it's going to be measured by the farthest extent of any one parcel within a solar project, and it just creates a square. This square, as an example, shows you a four-square-mile area with a 1,000-acre solar project.

I know that may be confusing. There may be questions about that, but when we looked at a couple of different options, if you reduced it like what I think some of the suggestions were, that maybe we reduce this in half. If we reduced the project area from 2,000 acres to 1,000 acres, if you reduced the project extent to two (2) square miles, you would have certain parcels outside of that. We don't think that that was the intent, so we recommend keeping that requirement as it's drafted. If there's any questions on that I'd be happy to answer those. We had the consultant look at that as well, and they agreed that that made sense, keeping that area. We can come back to any of these, too, if there are any questions.

The other item that the Commission requested, if you recall, was the situation where there may be properties surrounded by a solar facility. These would be like non-participating parcels, properties that are not within a project area, if they were surrounded on 2 or more sides by a utility-scale solar facilities. In researching this, we had the consultants with the Berkley Group help us with this as well when we looked at it. The recommendation we suggest is rather than prohibiting a solar facility from locating on two or more sides of a property, what we recommended is if that situation were to happen that it would require an additional setback and additional screening for any situation where you had a solar project that surrounded a property on two or more sides.

The way the draft regulations reads, "If a project area abuts a non-participating parcel on 2 or more sides or more than 50% of the exterior property line, then the setbacks shall be increased an additional 50 feet along the shared property line according to the minimum setback requirements." So that's in addition to the required minimum. So for example, if a minimum setback would have been 50 feet, now it would be at least 100 feet. In addition, additional screening may be required in addition to the minimum screening requirement. There's also going to be screening requirements around the perimeter. If it's adjacent to a property where you have more than two sides, they may need additional landscaping if they don't have any existing trees or other screening provided.

Ms. Davis: Sean, Mark Huggins has a question. He's raising his hand

Mr. Pendley: Okay, Commissioner?

Commissioner Huggins: Sean, my question would be on the project extent boundary, are we trying to determine anything about the actual configuration of that boundary? I assume it doesn't have to be square. Has there been any considered about...can it be four (4) miles long and one mile wide? Or, L-shaped? Is that even an important issue? I don't know that that is an important

issue. I just think it needs to be defined a little better if there are considerations associated with the layout.

Ms. Davis: Sean, Karen is raising her hand.

Mr. Pendley: Karen Miller with our Planning staff is also available for questions. I would gladly have Karen try to answer that, and I have some thoughts, too, but Karen, if you have thoughts, that would be great.

Ms. Miller: Sure. If you remember, the first draft that the Planning Commission saw, I had a little bit different definition of the project extent, and it was not clear enough, so I changed the definition, the project extent, to be the smallest rectangle possible around the entire project area. So, it doesn't have to be a square. It has to be a rectangle, and to answer your questions, no, there's no minimums or maximums on the actual dimensions, like one (1) mile by four (4) miles, or two (2) miles by two (2) miles, or such. That was another reason why it somewhat makes sense to keep the project extent at 4 square miles instead of cutting in two, because with that change of definition, it kind of changes the dynamics of how that project extent works. That's just my two cent's worth, so Sean, if you have some other things.

Mr. Pendley: No, thanks, Karen. That's great. That does help answer that, and I think the only other thing I was going to add to that to Commissioner Huggins' questions, also, if for whatever reason, any one parcel maybe sticks out just beyond that four square miles, again, there is a waiver option if an applicant had one particular parcel that didn't fit in perfectly within that four (4) square miles as it was defined, there is that waiver option if they could demonstrate that it doesn't create any adverse impacts. That's all I was going to suggest.

Back to the requirement for any properties that may be surrounded on two or more sides by a solar facility, there are draft regulations incorporated into your packet, into the new regulations. This, again, would be additional setbacks and additional screening. This would be applied to only those properties where it's adjacent to or abutting a non-participating parcel, so if there are interior setbacks within two participating parcels, this setback does not apply. It's only when it's adjacent to properties that are non-participating. For the purposes of the requirement, non-participating parcel means a property that's not located within the project area.

That was really the slides I wanted to go through. Since there was a question about the differences between the buffer maps, I will go through that. I'll just show, I'll scroll through all of these. What we've changed here now is we're going to go through all of the options of one (1) mile through three (3) miles. The changes we've made here is incorporating the recently-approved annexations for De Soto. So, if we just considered a one-mile buffer, here is what the resulting area would be. It would be over 36,000 acres that would be available for utility-scale solar. With a one-and-a-half-mile buffer, the resulting area is just over 20,000 acres. With a two-mile buffer, the remaining area is just over 10,000 acres, and then finally a three-mile buffer would result in just under 3,000 acres eligible for utility-scale solar. So a wide range. You can see again. I'll go back through these, one-mile, one-and-a-half, two miles as proposed, and then –

Chairman Neese: Sean, I have a question. I just learned about the De Soto annexation which moved down pretty far south. They took a pretty good chunk there. How long does it take, or is there a rule for annexation? If somebody wants to go into a city limits, how long does that take? Can you do that in 30 days, 60 days? Maybe it's something you don't know, but I just –

Mr. Pendley: I know a little bit from my time as a city planner. I do know that annexations generally can be approved by city councils. They don't need to go through a planning commission. The

public hearing is held at the city council, so you essentially could short-circuit it by one meeting. Usually, there is a public hearing, and usually you need a minimum 20-day notice. It's usually at least a month from a time, a best case, from when an applicant were to submit it, a voluntary annexation application, it would have to go through that process to get approved by the city. It just is a function of the respective cities, as to how fast a property can be annexed. That's really at the discretion of the cities.

Mr. Leipzig: Mr. Chairman, if you would like, Rick Lind could answer that question as well, if that would be helpful. I just don't want to cause additional confusion.

Mr. Lind: My understanding was this was a 520 annexation. That stands for KSA 12-520, which means this was a unilateral annexation by the City, which means they did this on their own and did not need Board of County Commissioners review or approval. That process generally takes about 60 days. Remember, it's with landowner consent. So, most of the time it can be extended if this is not without landowner consent, but this was with landowner consent.

Chairman Neese: Okay. It kind of begs the question, then. Whatever boundaries we set here as the distance...Let's say I'm a landowner and I look at the area outside of Spring Hill, for example, or outside of Edgerton, and I'm concerned about this type of development near my property, and I own 100 acres. My neighbor owns 100 acres. The guy next to him owns 100 acres. If they petition to be annexed by the city, and that was done within 50 or 60 days, my question would be if they request to go into the city, and a CUP was being requested, what is the legal ramifications there? In other words, who is first, or is there a first? Because if some of these folks decide tomorrow, "Hey, I'd rather be in the city than have this happen." They petition the city, and 50 or 60 days they could become part of the city, and that could move the boundaries out quite a bit, regardless of what we end up recommending to the County Commissioners, what they do. If they could do that in 60 days, that's pretty quick. So, would that be...? How does that affect - ?

Mr. Lind: This reminds me of the law school exams that we had, the question you just asked. It does become, it may become, a race as to what transpires, but as long as it's in the county at the time they file the application, we would process it, but you raise a question that I'm not prepared to answer, which is what happens before the Board of County Commissioners were to act and there was an annexation? Also remember, on the 520 annexation, this has to abut the main body of the city, so if it's an island annexation, that's a 520c annexation, which requires Board of County Commissioners approval. Once again, it's about a 60-day process, but the Board of County Commissioners has to review it and approve it.

Chairman Neese: Okay. I understand the island annexation, how that works. Okay. I'm just thinking of timing here, or whatever.

Mr. Pendley: Commissioner, I'll just add to that, too. Also in our regulations you'll note that we do not include islands that are below 80 acres in that distance from cities. That's why you see that other little parcel example south of De Soto that is in De Soto that's an island. The buffer doesn't apply to that. It's only the main parts of the city that are contiguous or anything over 80 acres. Those are good questions. I think for the effective date of when the annexation would apply and how that would interact with a pending CUP application, as Rick said, that's a good question and something we would need to research to have a definitive answer on.

Chairman Neese: I have one other question. There was some discussion about the Sunflower, requesting that they add additional property to the south down to 143rd. If that's the case it would even move that southern line further. Have you had any contact with De Soto? Are they in the process of doing that?

Mr. Pendley: We have not had direct discussion with the City of De Soto about further annexation. We do know that that's a possibility. It's also a possibility, we do know, that they have an annexation agreement with the City of Gardner. That's in question as to who would potentially annex that additional land south of 127th. I don't think that's been decided. I think that's a discussion between the cities, so we don't know yet. But you do raise another good question about this change. This is a drastic change in terms of looking at the city land area and this requirement for the distance from cities. We had noted that it may be worth, the Commission may want to consider any other options for this, but this change to a 1,000-acre maximum, two-mile separation from cities, if there are any proposals in the area of the former Sunflower Army Ammunition Plant that's still in the County, maybe that's still a viable area. Maybe that should be an area that would be allowed for a utility-scale. So that would be a great example of where a waiver would probably be warranted. You probably would have the support, I imagine, from the cities. They wouldn't have any conflict with that. That's something that the Planning Commission may want to consider as a result of this annexation and remaining area for utility-scale solar.

Mr. Leipzig: Mr. Neese, I just wanted to add on something that Sean had just said. We actually had a meeting with the City Manager today, of the City of De Soto and talked about next year starting some coordination meetings with our Comprehensive Plan update around that Sunflower area. We're starting that process. We actually talked with him a couple times today, and we're going to be meeting very regularly, I anticipate at least once a month with them, to talk about how we can update, ensure that our Comp Plan is consistent with what they are proposing and vice versa. It was a very good meeting, very positive. We're going to continue those discussions with them.

Mr. Pendley: Commission, the last items I will note here for our presentation, there is one section that staff is recommending removal of, and that's the requirements for post construction erosion control and sediment control requirements. This is in Article 23, Section 6(B) 14(g), page 25 of the draft regulations. Public Works staff is recommending removing that specific subsection iv, because that's already required under building permit and code requirements, so it's already covered in other regulations, and it would be covered at the time of permit. So we would just recommend striking that specific section. We can note that in the recommended motion tonight for approval.

So, that's the one area we would remove. We would remove that section for the post-construction erosion control and sediment regulations. It's in Article 23, Section 6, on page 25 of the draft regulations. There may be other changes, one being moving this new requirement if the Commission supports this change for the non-participating parcels surrounded by a solar facility. We would recommend moving that to the setback section and it be an item 3 on page 32. It's a new item, nine (9), that we listed, but for numbering and formatting purposes, it works better if it's under item three (3), so we would not recommend changing the content of that. We would just recommend moving the location. That's just really a formatting issue. That concludes our presentation on the draft regulations changes. I'd be happy to answer any questions and be available for staff comments as well. Thank you.

Commissioner Mason: I have a question, Sean. Regarding waivers, we've had quite a little discussion about them over time. Which items still have waivers attached to them, the possibility of getting a waiver?

Mr. Pendley: The requirements that have waivers – and I'll be happy to have Karen Miller add in anything I miss – requirements that will have waivers will include the distance from cities, and I

believe it's the requirement for the project extent, and the setback requirements. Karen, did I miss anything else?

Ms. Miller: I'm looking.

Mr. Leipzig: I believe that is correct, Sean.

Commissioner Mason: There is no waiver attached to the size of the project area?

Mr. Pendley: There is no waiver in the current draft regulations for the maximum project area. That's one that was discussed at the last two meetings. If you recall, there was a previous motion at the meeting in October and then also in the meeting in November, and the majority of the Commissioners supported no waiver for project extent, both I think when it was the 2,000 acres and when it was revised to the 1,000 acres, it remained with no waiver option. That's what the last Commission recommendations were for.

Commissioner Mason: Thank you.

Commissioner Levin: I had a question. It may already be answered, so I apologize. A lot of paperwork to read here. I know there's going to be maintenance roads and other types of byways to get vehicles back to obviously maintain the panels. Are there specifics, like if we had to get emergency vehicles back to an area, are there specifics back to an area, are there specifics on how wide, the grade, how they're maintained, et cetera? Is that already in there, or I just missed it?

Mr. Leipzig: Yes, Commissioner, I'll take one stab at it, and Sean, jump in, too. We are mandated to follow the International Fire Code, and there are requirements in the Fire Code in terms of the weight those roads supporting the fire truck apparatus, turning ratio, that type of thing, on the interior of the solar farms.

Mr. Pendley: That's correct. Thanks, Jay. I note, as Jay mentioned, they are subject to building code requirements, fire code requirements. We do have provisions in for access to all areas for installation of panels, equipment for operation and maintenance. In addition, with any application for utility-scale solar facility an applicant would have to provide an access plan, road maintenance access plan, as part of the application. So there would be details provided, and that would be for review by the Public Works Department and Fire Department for that review of where access would be provided and required.

Commissioner Levin: Okay, thank you. One more quick question. I just want to make sure, at this point in time, there still is no application from any company or entity requesting a utility solar facility, correct?

Mr. Pendley: That is correct. There is no application pending.

Chairman Neese: I've got a question. Rick, one thing I'm concerned about – and I know that you know the answer to this, but I don't, so I'm asking – I'm concerned that these things, whether they're 100 acres, 50 acres or 1,000 acres, they're going to be there for a long time. I would like for you to explain to me the assurances that when it's time to decommission these particular places, that there's sufficient funding to do so and that as these things are handed off, whether they're sold or whoever owns it 40 years from now, that there is a chain of succession of how these things can be decommissioned. I would like to know how that's assured, if it's a bond fund, bond exchange, letters of credit are better than that.

Mr. Lind: There's going to be a development agreement of some type. Obviously, we don't have one drafted at this point in time, but should you go there, we will develop a development agreement that will have how the decommissioning will occur. There are a number of surety vehicles that we're familiar with. However, because of the length of these CUPs and also the amount of money, we intend to reach out to third party experts to also get their opinion, to weigh in. We want to make sure that if we go letter of credit or if we go bonds, which direction will give us the best opportunity to ensure that 20 years down the road, 40 years down the road, the money is there. So we're going to explore all those options in more detail, just waiting to see which direction you go.

Chairman Neese: I hate to bore you, but I'm going to ask you another question. Could you explain to me the tax ramifications? I know there's been statements that this is going to bring so much – maybe you're not the person to ask – so much to the County in taxation and I did a little research on this. The first few years they're going to get \$65 to \$70 million worth of tax credits, and so on and so forth. Could you tell me what income and how its derived from this – from any, not just this one, I'm not just talking about just this one, any of them – in the future?

Mr. Lind: I really don't have that information. I don't know if the Planning staff does.

Mr. Leipzig: Commissioner Neese, I do not have that information, either, except to say that these facilities are taxed at a commercial rate.

Chairman Neese: And that's fine, but when we have our – I've asked for this before because it's important, okay? Because there are certain statements by potential applicants of so much money over so long a period of time, and I would like to know what that so much money is. And the County Commissioners need to be able to have that. So I don't know. Who in the County is the one for finding that out?

Mr. Leipzig: Mr. Neese, that is one of the issues that will be discussed, I'm sure, by the Board of County Commissioners.

Chairman Neese: I mean, I think that that should have been discussed during a meeting prior to that, but you know, it's what it is. If you would have that, that would be great.

Mr. Leipzig: I'd be happy to help with that. I was going to check to see if Karen Miller, here on Zoom, Karen, if you would have anything you could add on that.

Ms. Miller: The only thing I would have to add would be that there is a certain period that is a tax exemption and that, I believe, applies to just the equipment and not the land. Does that sound correct?

Mr. Leipzig: Yes, for ten years?

Ms. Miller: Yes, that's my memory. So that would be something I could check.

Chairman Neese: All I'm requesting is that we know exactly what it is, okay?

Mr. Pendley: I will note, Commissioner Neese, Planning staff did have a meeting with the Appraiser's Office and we asked this question. And I think there's still some research that needed to be provided to confirm this, but as Karen Miller had mentioned, there is a tax abatement for equipment for ten years that the State offers. After that, from what we understand, the equipment would be taxed at a commercial rate, and the land for the area in which the solar equipment is installed. So for that area, that land would be taxed at a commercial rate following the abatement,

but we need to confirm and get additional details on what this is, what the rate would be. We would be happy to research that further.

Commissioner Rast: I believe they can actually then start also depreciating the equipment, land and all that. Like once they get through the abatement, then it turns around to be a depreciation thing. But I don't understand why it's difficult to just do a mockup, come up with a fake project, come up with the land, come up with the numbers, so it's very clear.

Mr. Leipzig: We anticipate the question coming up with the Board of County Commissioners. I guess our thought with the Planning Commission focusing on the land use aspect of it, but I'm sure that question is going to come up. To your point, we'll have an answer.

Commissioner Rast: I think taxes and money to a county is a huge point with land issue of how it affects and stuff. I do have another question, though, going back to the decommissioning. Does the landowner bear any responsibility before taxpayers? Like, if things do go south, does the landowner who's been collecting the lease money over the time, do they bear any responsibility, or do the taxpayers who maybe have not gained anything? Are they going to be the ones on the hook?

Mr. Lind: What we're going to try to ensure is that the County doesn't pick up this bill. We're not concerned with the landowners. When they enter into their lease, they need to take whatever precautions, whatever legal advice that they seek out, but what we're trying to ensure is that the Johnson County taxpayers, not those particular landowners who are on the hook, so we want to make sure that we have surety that will be there if and when it's needed so that if they don't do it, there's money there to ensure that it will get cleaned up.

Commissioner Rast: Okay, thank you.

Chairman Neese: Okay, does staff have anything else that they want to add to that, or does anybody have any other questions of staff?

Mr. Pendley: I will note one last thing. Before you tonight included in your packet is the Planning Commission Resolution for recommendation for this amendments to the Zoning Regulations. We would just note, we also need to include in that that this will include the Johnson County Rural Comprehensive Plan, so before this is signed by the Chair and moves on to the Board of County Commissioners, we'll make a change to include that this also includes the Rural Comprehensive Plan. It's not just the Zoning Regulations being amended. It's also the Comprehensive Plan. That's just something we wanted to note for you so that once the Planning Commission does recommend approval of this, that document will be updated and be signed. There will be a separate resolution for the Board of County Commissioners when these amendments go before the BOCC, but this is the resolution for the Planning Commission. I just wanted to note that for the record.

Chairman Neese: Is there any discussion amongst the Commissioners regarding the presentation made by staff and the adoptions and changes that they made to the plan? The Chair would entertain a motion to move this on to the County Commissioners if someone would so do that. If not, I'd be glad to -

Commissioner Downing: I make the motion.

Chairman Neese: Okay. I'm going to elaborate on your motion if I may take the liberty.

Commissioner Downing: Please do.

~~Motion by Chairman Neese, Motion by Commissioner Downing and restated by Chairman Neese~~ seconded by Commissioner Rast, to adopt Resolution No. PC-210-2101 recommending to the Board of County Commissioners amendments to the Johnson County Rural Comprehensive Plan and Johnson County Zoning and Subdivision Regulations as drafted by the County Planning staff regarding utility-scale solar facilities as recommended by County Planning staff and to authorize the Chairman to sign the Resolution with the attached amendments for submittal to the Board of County Commissioners for its consideration and adoption.

Chairman Neese: I assume that was your motion, sir.

[inaudible]

Chairman Neese: Excellent. You're a brilliant person. Do I have a second?

Commissioner Rast: I second.

Chairman Neese: We have a motion and a second. Do we have any discussion on the motion?

Commissioner Mason: I, unfortunately, was not able to be at the last meeting, and I would like to see this moved on to the County Commission. However, with the changes that were made at the last meeting, the reductions of several things, I will not be voting for moving this forward.

Chairman Neese: Okay. So, if that's the case, I'm going to call for a vote on the proposal before us. All in favor say aye. I think we have a roll call. We have a roll call.

Ms. Davis: Seven yes and one no.

Chairman Neese: And one abstaining.

The motion passed, 7-1-1.

Chairman Neese: We will send that recommendation to the County Commissioners. We're going to have a planning session on – it was moved from the 6th to the 20th. Is that right?

Mr. Pendley: Yes, the study session with the Board of County Commissioners will be scheduled for January 20th 2022, at 2:00 in the afternoon, in this building, the Johnson County Administration Building, the meeting room to be provided in detail, and then the regular action for the proposed amendments will be scheduled February 3, 2022. Details, I believe, would be 9:30 a.m., Board of County Commissioners meeting, or another time as may be determined. That's one question we're looking at as far as a specific meeting location on that, but the meeting date is February 3, 2022.

Mr. Leipzig: Mr. Chair, I wanted to give some clarification from our legal team very quickly on that vote.

Mr. Lind: 7-1-1.

Mr. Leipzig: Okay, for pass.

Mr. Lind: For pass. Mr. Chairman, one thing I wanted to clarify with Sean. Sean, you correctly pointed out that on January 20th at 2:00 there would be a study session with the Board of County Commissioners here in this building. You also said that that would be one on February 3rd at 9:30 in the morning here in this building, and if that changes, Sean, where is it that they can look to see if there happens to be a change?

Mr. Pendley: Thank you, Rick. If there is a change to that meeting time or the meeting room location, that will be on the Board of County Commissioners page on the County's website, at jocogov.org under the meetings schedule, or Board of County Commissioners.

Chairman Neese: Thank you. At this time, having proceeded through that, we're going to have public comments, having to do with something other than what we've just discussed. It's just in general, and I think the predecessor, the Chairman before, said a couple minutes, so if anybody has any comments other than on the agenda which we just discussed, the Chair is open for comments. If you do have a comment, give us your name and address before you make a statement.

Ms. Davis: Our first speaker is on Zoom, and that is Steven Clark.

Steven Clark, 3422 Kensington Court, El Dorado Hills, California, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Clark: Given the restrictions placed on topics, I will not be speaking tonight.

Chairman Neese: Anyone else want to make some general comments? Hearing none, is there any other business?

[inaudible]

Ms. Davis: I'm not sure what the topic is they are all signed up for, but the next person to speak is Cindy Freund. And the following speaker would be Rob McCollum.

Cindy Freund, 37250 West 176th Terrace, Edgerton, Kansas, 66021, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Ms. Freund: I'm not used to doing something like this, and I'm not sure what you mean by general comments. Is it things you've already talked about?

Chairman Neese: I'll clarify that for you. It's anything other than what was on the agenda this evening.

Ms. Freund: Okay –

Chairman Neese: If it's on the agenda –

Ms. Freund: If I say something I'm not supposed to, please let me know.

Chairman Neese: I will.

Ms. Freund: I am just finding out about this, which is very disturbing.

Chairman Neese: I'm going to let you know.

Ms. Freund: I'm sorry. I didn't understand you.

Chairman Neese: If you're talking about you're just finding out about this, are you talking about what was on the agenda this evening?

Ms. Freund: No, I'm just finding out about this solar company wanting to come in, the whole thing. I had heard talk of it but I was led to believe it's going to be way further away, and when I saw the map and it was like bam, almost like right where I live. I recently found out it was only like a half a mile away.

Chairman Neese: Excuse me interrupting you, but that was on our agenda this evening.

Ms. Freund: Okay. .

Chairman Neese: We're not going to be talking about that in general comments.

Ms. Freund: Okay. I'm sorry. I didn't hear that, so okay. I'm just going to stick to general things. Okay. When I found out about how big this was, and I don't really like to go by hearsay and what's on Google, and things like that.

Chairman Neese: Excuse me. That was on our agenda, so that's not part of the comments that are going to be allowed.

Ms. Freund: Okay, I feel like I'm really being limited in what I can say. Okay, see if I can say this. I talked to a Commissioner in Sedwick County. Can I talk about that?

Chairman Neese: Okay.

Ms. Freund: Okay. And I had heard that what I thought was a solar farm was turned away. So I wanted to ask what their experience was, and why, so –

Chairman Neese: I'm going to interrupt you.

Ms. Freund: I'm sorry, what?

Chairman Neese: I'm being rude, but I'm going to interrupt you.

Ms. Freund: Okay. Why?

Chairman Neese: Everything about the solar farm was on the agenda, so if you want to talk about something other than the solar farm –

Ms. Freund: Can I talk about wind farms? That wasn't on the agenda.

Chairman Neese: Okay.

Ms. Freund: Okay, thank you. He corrected me and said it wasn't a – I won't say it – it was a wind turbine farm, a big one that was wanting to come to Sedgwick County. And like our part of the county, they have a large part of their county that is farm community that is very precious to them. That's what he told me, and I feel...I grew up in Olathe. The farming community was new to me. I had to get used to it. It's a whole mindset. It's a whole culture in and of itself, and the countryside is beautiful. The wildlife is gorgeous, and that is why so many people move out that way. I am afraid that a lot of people have – maybe not a lot – some have moved away because of this impending thing coming, that I won't say is coming to our area. Sedgwick County said they –

Chairman Neese: Excuse me.

Ms. Freund: Yes, sir.

Chairman Neese: Your time is up.

Ms. Freund: Oh, wow. Okay. I had a lot more to say. It's just breaking our hearts. It's absolutely breaking our hearts out there. We love our area out there. It's a shame.

Chairman Neese: Thank you very much.

Ms. Freund: My husband died four years ago. He would be devastated. We love it out there, and we just hate to see it go.

Chairman Neese: Thank you.

Ms. Freund: It's just not fair. The people that want it aren't living near it. And we understand –

Chairman Neese: Thank you, ma'am.

[continued off-mic comments]

Ms. Davis: Next speaker, Rob McCollum, please. The following speaker will be Sharma McCollum.

Sharma McCollum, 15215, Edgerton Road, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Ms. McCollum: I came here tonight. You guys all know me. I came here to talk about you-know-what, but I can't talk about you-know-what, and you guys know how we feel about it.

Chairman Neese: Ms. McCollum, I'm going to ask –

Ms. McCollum: We've said it over and over, but I just had signed up to speak, and I don't want to waste this opportunity to once again let you know as a resident of rural Johnson County how we feel about this.

Chairman Neese: I don't want to be rude, ma'am, but this is not just appropriate at this time. Thank you.

Ms. McCollum: Okay, well I just came up here to say...Whatever, so anyway...Have a great night as you [off mic]

Chairman Neese: Thank you.

Ms. Davis: That was Sharma, so I'm assuming Rob is not speaking, because he was before her, so the next speaker is Byron Wiley. Following Byron is John Anderson. I don't see anybody walking in, so the next speaker, John Anderson. All right, then Alan Anglyn, and then next will be Carrie Brandon.

Alan Anglyn, 17090 Evening Star Road, Edgerton, Kansas, 66021, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Anglyn: I came here to hear the discussion tonight. I had hoped to have an opportunity to comment. Given I cannot comment, I will give the rest of my time back. Thank you.

Ms. Davis: Our next speaker, Carrie Brandon, and after Carrie Brandon, we will have Travis Hardy.

Carrie Brandon, 450 E. 2300 Road, Eudora, Kansas, 66025, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Ms. Brandon: Good evening, okay. I just want to ask a question. I emailed over four days ago a request for permission from Leslie Davis, who is no longer in the Administrative Assistant role for the Planning Commission about republishing and sharing with the public, who has no visibility to these specific recorded public County Commission meetings, and I never got a response back from Leslie. She told me then to direct my questions to Jay and to...Who's the other guy?

[Off-mic]

Ms. Brandon: Sean Pendley, yes, thank you. And I did not get a response back from either of you, either. So, I would like to have an answer to why. Why is the public not getting a response from its Planning Commission on really critical important issues around making transparency available to the entire citizens, registered voters in Johnson County?

Chairman Neese: Thank you.

Ms. Brandon: And I don't want to use the rest of my two minutes for them to answer, so if you could –

[inaudible, crosstalk]

Chairman Neese: What I'm going to do is I'm going to ask staff to answer that in writing to you.

Ms. Brandon: Well, I haven't gotten that. I've tried that several times.

Chairman Neese: I'm asking them to do that, and I'm sure that they will.

Ms. Brandon: Can I they at least –

Chairman Neese: They're not going to give it to you right now, so what they're going to do is I'll ask them to send you that in writing, so you'll have that and have an answer to your question. How's that?

Ms. Brandon: Well, Kansas Open Records Act says if we don't get a response in three days that you guys have failed in your role. So I'm going to go ahead and publish the videos to the public, because I think they need visibility to what's going on here.

Chairman Neese: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Brandon: Thank you, Jim. I'm not out of time yet. The other thing is you guys will be receiving invitations to property tours this Sunday. I hope you'll all come out and see firsthand why we're so fiercely wanting to protect our quality of life.

Chairman Neese: Thank you.

Ms. Davis: Our next speaker was Travis Hardy and then following Travis will be Alan Anderson.

Travis Hardy, 421 East 2400th Road, Edgerton, Kansas, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Hardy [off-mic]: I don't have anything to say.

Chairman Neese: Thank you, sir.

Alan Anderson, Polsinelli Law Firm, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Anderson: I will not tread onto the agenda tonight. All I will say is that, even though disappointed obviously in the result, I want to thank the Commission for its time and certainly the professional staff, for your time that was put into this. It's not an easy topic, so just wanted to make that thank you and not get into the topic. It obviously is not our desired result as we look forward to the future of working with the Planning Commission, the County Commission going forward.

Chairman Neese: Thank you.

Ms. Davis: Our next speaker will be Jane Knoche, followed by Carleen Thompson. Okay, Jane is passing. Carleen Thompson. All right. Mike Young, followed by Mike Kelly.

Mike Young, 17035 County Line Road, Edgerton, Kansas 66021, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Young: I've been in and spoke many times on this. This is on all four sides of me of, what's leased right now.

Chairman Neese: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Young: [inaudible] brought up the –

Chairman Neese: That's not part of our comments at this time. Thank you very much.

Mr. Young: My point is that if this was a mile-and-a-half or two miles from Olathe, we wouldn't even be discussing this right now, but instead it's a m-and-a-half or two miles from Edgerton.

Chairman Neese: With all due respect sir, we'd appreciate that –

Mr. Young: Well, you gave me another 50 feet from my house, so I've got a100 feet of panels around my house on all four sides. Thank you very much.

Ms. Davis: Our next speaker is Mike Kelly, and then following Mike Kelly, we have Richard Gall.

Mike Kelly, Mayor, Roeland Park, Kansas, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Kelly: Thank you very much members of the Commission. Thank you very much for your discernment on the topics and on the myriad topics that come before the Commission. I won't speak on the topic this evening, other than to say thank you to the staff and thank you for your work as Commissioners, being guided by the data, being guided by your discernment, as well as the professional that the taxpayers pay for. Thank you for basing your decisions on those good opportunities that are afforded you. With that, I'll thank you very much for your continued work on behalf of the County, and wish you a good night.

Chairman Neese: Thank you.

Ms. Davis: Now we have Richard Gall, followed by Mike Henley.

Richard Gall, 38400 West 183 Street, Edgerton, Kansas, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Gall: I don't know if this old lineman will get anything right here. All I really know how to do is climb poles. Done that for 35 years, providing electricity to customers of Kansas City Power and Light. In Johnson, Wyandotte, Douglas, Miami and Linn Counties in Kansas and Jackson County in Missouri, and I'm proud to have done that, and I would be very proud to be able to tell people when they ask me where I live and I could tell them Johnson County, and they would be able to say, "Oh, you're where that big solar project is that produces electricity that people can use." That would really, really be great for me to be able to say. Thank you. And whatever happens, you're not going to stop me from going outside to go to the bathroom.

Chairman Neese: I'm not going to thank you for that. I'm going to be the one chairman to not thank you for being up there and saying that.

Ms. Davis: Our next speaker is Mike Henley followed by Dan Barton.

Mike Henley, 2327 North 300 Road, Edgerton, Kansas, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Henley: Believe it or not I'm a landowner that's very close to this. We just found out about it, and I was in total shock, and I wish we would have had more of a voice in the decision to let these people in.

Chairman Neese: Thanks –

Mr. Henley: I think our whole country is kind of in a problem with this, and I think what you guys are doing right now is very important.

Chairman Neese: Thank you for your comments, sir. We appreciate it.

Mr. Henley: Thank you, sir.

Chairman Neese: Thank you.

Ms. Davis: Our next speaker is Dan Barton, and then we actually have a last minute sign-up on Zoom, Kim Lacey.

Daniel Barton, 1147 East Sheridan Bridge Lane, Olathe, Kansas, appeared before the Planning Commission and made the following comments:

Mr. Barton: I want to begin by thinking a little bit about the people of Johnson County. I think we all agree that the important thing is the people in the community in and around Johnson County, the unquestionable fact here is that continued coal burning is detrimental to the people of this area. Communities near coal plants experience elevated rates of –

Chairman Neese: Excuse me, sir.

Mr. Barton: Yes, sir.

Chairman Neese: Excuse me. With all due respect, that's not appropriate at this time. I

Mr. Barton: I'd like to talk more about generic principles if that's okay, about future regulations about opening it up and –

Chairman Neese: It's just not appropriate.

Mr. Barton: Okay. I'd just like to note my support of that for the future, but thank you very much for you time. I appreciate it.

Chairman Neese: Thank you. Thank you very much.

Ms. Davis: Our final speaker will be Kim Lacey on Zoom.

Kim Lacey, 2235 North 400 Road, Eudora, appeared before the Planning Commission via Zoom and made the following comments:

Ms. Lacey: I am a half-mile from the proposed site. I am just curious why, if any of these people, any of the public has been notified before this meeting that we would be unable to speak.

Chairman Neese: Excuse me.

Ms. Lacey: About the issue at hand. Could you tell me that, please? Did you notify the public that we would be unable to speak?

Chairman Neese: With all due respect, ma'am, it's not appropriate at this time. We're just taking general comments about things –

Ms. Lacey: No, I have a question for you. You have all this public here. You have been talking about your agenda. When else should we talk about this? Everybody is here right now. Nobody was notified that we wouldn't be able to speak tonight, and I don't think that's fair.

Chairman Neese: With all due respect, I don't want to have them cut your mic off. We appreciate your concern –

Ms. Lacey: I really think you're doing the public a disservice.

Chairman Neese: Okay. Leslie, is that it?

Ms. Davis: That was our last speaker, sir. Thank you very much. Do we have any old business? New business?

E. UPDATES/OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Leipzig: Mr. Chair, I'll just reiterate the dates that Sean had mentioned previously. We have a study session before the Board of County Commissioners on January 20th. The time for that meeting is at 2:00 p.m., and then the regulations that you are recommending will be before the Board of County Commissioners on February 3rd at the Board of County Commissioners meeting at 9:30 a.m. in this building on February 3rd.

The other thing that I wanted to mention just very briefly is that our next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, January 25th at 5:45. During that meeting, some key things we'd like to accomplish are the election of the officers for next year. Also, to get an update on our Subdivision Regulations audit. It's something we had started last year. We want to make a presentation to you on the status of that project as we go into our Comprehensive Plan update. We'll be coming forward during that meeting, and also we have our Comprehensive Plan annual review scheduled for January 25, 2022. That's all the additional items that I have.

F. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Neese: Hearing no other business before us, the Chair would entertain a motion to adjourn.

Motion to adjourn by Commissioner Lund, seconded by, Commissioner Levin.

The motion passed unanimously.

Thereupon, with no further business to come before the Johnson County Planning Commission, Acting Chairman Neese, at 7:27 p.m. declared the meeting to be *Adjourned*.