Marshall County Zoning Commission

Renewable Energy Ordinance Work Session – Meeting Minutes

Date: 10/20/2026 **Location:** Marshall County Courthouse **Prepared from:** Audio transcript of meeting

Attendees

- Bill Hobson, Zoning Commission Chair
- Pat VonAhnen, Zoning Commission
- William Wears, Zoning Commission
- Tyler Kelley, Zoning Administrator
- Roger Lutes, Local Farmer

A Board of Supervisors member (addressed as "Christian") also took part in part of the session and left before the end.

Note on attribution: The transcript does not identify speakers. Statements are attributed by name only where the speaker identified themselves or the role is clear (Mr. Kelley presented the draft ordinance and the comments received on it; Mr. Lutes spoke as a local farmer). All other remarks are recorded as commission discussion.

Purpose

The commission and Zoning Administrator reviewed the draft renewable energy ordinance (wind and solar) section by section, alongside written comments received from outside reviewers, to decide what to revise before the draft goes to the Board of Supervisors. This was a working session without the public comment format of the earlier meeting, so members could discuss freely.

Discussion and Outcomes

1. Definition of "solar energy system"

- A reviewer (David Vollmer, Invenergy) recommended expanding the definition to include related supporting facilities, such as inverters, collection lines, operations and maintenance buildings, substations, switchyards, and similar facilities.
- Mr. Kelley noted the current wording came from Dallas County, and that Linn County's definition is more detailed. The approach mirrors the data center definition, which was made detailed to avoid being too vague.
- **Outcome:** Members saw no issue with the suggestion. The language will be added to the existing definition as an edit ("may include...").

2. Small wind definition and acronyms

- The definition of the small/non-commercial wind system is inconsistent across the document because it was drawn from other county ordinances. It needs to be cleaned up.

- A reviewer asked that the term also be defined in Article 4. Members agreed an acronym should be defined only once in the document, and it is already in the definitions section.
- **Outcome:** Clean up the definition; do not repeat it in Article 4.

3. Abandonment language

- Mr. Kelley explained the abandonment language was intentionally kept similar across utility-scale and non-utility (residential) wind and solar.
- No changes were requested.

4. Residential (non-commercial) wind: setbacks, lot size, and permitting

- Mr. Kelley estimated there may be about ten residential wind towers in the county.
- **Setbacks:** Utility-scale wind and telecommunications towers require a setback of 1.1 times total height. No equivalent exists for backyard wind, and the draft only addressed guy wire anchors (10 feet). The draft is missing a setback for the tower itself from adjoining parcels and from the owner's own residence.
- **Noise:** Residential wind will adhere to the same 55-decibel limit as utility-scale wind.
- **Location and lot size:** Residential wind is allowed only in A-1 zoned areas. A landowner with a house on a large farm parcel would need to split off the residence to qualify. Members discussed adding a minimum lot area and tying it to the 1.1 setback, which is the practical limiting factor. Current minimums are 35 acres for a farm parcel and 25 acres for a residence, with exemptions (homestead exemption, land unsuitable for agriculture) and the variance process through the Board of Adjustment.
- **Permitting:** These systems require a building permit with an engineering analysis, a document showing compliance with the Iowa building code, and submission by a certified engineer. They are currently reviewed only by the Zoning Administrator as part of the building permit. Members saw no need to add another review body for small residential systems, but agreed that large utility-scale projects need public comment.
- **Outcome:** Add a setback requirement of 1.1 times height from the property line and from the home; add or confirm a minimum lot size.

5. Guy wire and anchor setback

- Members found the setback wording unclear. Part A (guy wire anchors) and Part B (main structure) should be switched so the most important requirement comes first. "Including" should be changed to "such as," and each item should state exactly what it covers.
- Setback discussions concerning distance were held regarding 10 or 15 feet, members felt 10 feet was not enough and favored 15 feet, to match the setback for a building such as a garage.
- **Outcome:** Mr. Kelley will revise the section and look for examples from other counties. The consensus leaned toward 15 feet.

6. Community outreach and notification of neighbors

- A reviewer asked whether the county should require a "community outreach plan." Mr. Kelley clarified that the draft only asks applicants to inform adjacent property owners and stakeholders, and that his intent was timely notification of neighbors, not a county-run outreach plan.

- Members agreed the burden belongs on the developer and that the county should not prepare or be responsible for the plan.
- **Timing:** Mr. Kelley said developers typically begin knocking on doors about 18 months before putting up meteorological (MET) towers. Members suggested notification should come either when developers begin seeking landowner participation or before MET tower installation. A member noted that people near a project sometimes learn about it only from neighbors.
- **Who is notified:** Mr. Lutes said that, in his experience, only owners of adjacent land need to be notified, and that no notice was required for a MET tower. Notice was required when applying for the wind farm permit. Others suggested including county officials as stakeholders and possibly people within a set radius.
- Mr. Lutes also described his permitted 15 MW wind project south of Ferguson near Greencastle Park, which did not proceed because he could not fund a roughly $3 million interconnection.
- **Outcome:** The notification point in the project timeline and the meaning of "interested stakeholders" still need to be defined. Mr. Kelley will ask developers when they currently notify neighbors and whom else they notify.

7. Road use agreement and conditional use permit submittal list

- A reviewer asked why road use conditions are listed in the conditional use permit (CUP) submittal requirements when a road use agreement is already required.
- Mr. Kelley explained that the county has no standard road use agreement. Agreements have varied between developers, and problems have arisen with culvert damage and drainage tile damage in neighboring fields that were not covered by the agreement or the landowner agreements.
- On the advice of the county attorney, anything affecting the county must be spelled out in the ordinance, not left to development plans, because developers have changed commitments after review by their lawyers, and the county has less standing without defined requirements.
- **Outcome:** Keep the requirements in the submittal list so applicants see everything required in one place.

8. Grading plan and agricultural impact mitigation plan

- Mr. Kelley said these items were added from other counties, mainly to protect landowners and to provide baseline information for emergencies and decommissioning. Landowner agreements provide little of this information.
- **Outcome:** Mr. Kelley will contact David (SES), Scout Energy, NextEra, and others to learn what a grading plan should contain and what is already in their development plans.

9. Viewshed analysis

- The analysis is intended to address shadow flicker at non-participating residences during planning. Dallas County Conservation Board uses near campgrounds and parks.
- Mr. Kelley found a prior county form assigning the analysis to the conservation director, the zoning administrator, and the county road engineer, but found no completed example in prior approvals.
- **Outcome:** Keep it in the draft for now, since the document is still in progress. Mr. Kelley will define it more clearly.

10. Wildlife monitoring and mitigation plan and project boundary

- The Iowa DNR formerly provided wildlife studies for major projects but no longer does. Studies are now submitted to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The draft defines what must be submitted to the county as part of the CUP, which developers largely already do.
- The draft requires a baseline avian and bat study within the project boundary and within a two-mile perimeter outside it. The two-mile figure came from Linn and Jcounties.
- A member asked why the county should require more than the federal and state requirements. Mr. Kelley said the ordinance should recognize federal and state regulatory bodies, and that the larger question was the definition of "project boundary."
- Developers could not give Mr. Kelley a firm answer on how they define the project boundary. Project footprints have shifted significantly, as much as ten miles in a year for one project (about five miles in each direction). Without a renewable energy zoning district, the commission cannot require projects to stay in a general area, but it can ask applicants to identify the maximum area they might move into.
- **Outcome:** "Project boundary" needs to be defined in the ordinance. Mr. Kelley will seek clarification from developers.

11. Setbacks from conservation areas and the scoring matrix

- The county attorney and the county conservation director (Emily) concluded the county needs a defining characteristic or scientific data to justify any reduction in setbacks near county conservation areas. The attorney suggested a matrix assigning a numeric score to each park, wildlife area, and trail.
- Mr. Kelley was also asked to develop a similar matrix for the Board of Adjustment so that decisions on approvals and waivers can be justified consistently and fairly to developers and landowners. He has not started that matrix.
- The Conservation Board is developing its matrix. No timeline has been given. Both matrices should be required as part of the CUP submittal materials.
- Factors discussed: size alone is not an adequate measure (a small timber stand may hold several endangered bat species); the amount of county money invested in the area; and the importance of the habitat to threatened or endangered species.
- Mr. Kelley noted that a comparable comprehensive inventory took two years in Story County, so completing one in six months is a concern.
- A member stated the ordinance cannot move forward without the matrix.
- **Outcome:** The commission wants to see the matrix before the next meeting and needs to decide where it fits in the planning process.

12. Floodplain

- Mr. Kelley expects floodplain to be the largest constraint. The floodplain extends at least a mile and a half from the Iowa River and about a mile or less along tributaries.
- He does not see how wind and solar structures can avoid being classified as "maximum damage structures" in the floodplain.
- Mr. Kelley anticipates public outcry, but noted that many parcels near rivers would already be excluded by floodplain rules, separately from avian and bat concerns.

13. Timing of submittals during project development

- CUP applications are usually submitted about two years before groundbreaking, and avian and bat studies are done on the same timeline as MET studies, roughly one and a half to two years after the first conversations with landowners. The county needs this information much earlier.
- Mr. Kelley proposed requiring a small set of preliminary submittals (for example, five documents) within a set period after a developer starts work in the county, with early meetings with his office and Conservation. Members agreed that studies should be completed before a project is considered.
- Mr. Kelley said developers were told at first contact that regulations were being developed and could differ from current rules, and that developers have participated at all stages of the development of the draft, it has been reviewed by the three developers three times. He does not want to write regulations around specific current projects, since the ordinance is for the whole county. Not just this current moment in time.

14. Public comment from Mr. Lutes: conservation buffer

- Mr. Lutes objected to a two- or three-mile radius around parks. Using Greencastle Park as an example, he said farmers near the park were required to build terraces after the county acquired it (around 1975–76), partly with NRCS funding, lost cropland, suffered crop damage from geese, and were never compensated. He said terraces near the park were required to remain permanently, even if the land changes, unlike typical terraces. He argued that a large buffer would also remove a possible source of turbine income.
- Mr. Kelley responded that the radius has not been set and that these concerns have been under discussion. He asked about the year and any language in the terrace agreement; Mr. Lutes said much of it went through the NRCS.
- Mr. Lutes stated that a two-mile radius around the conservation areas would mean no wind towers in the county, which he estimated at hundreds of millions of dollars to the county over 25 years. Another participant asked what that figure was based on. No answer was recorded.

Decisions and Consensus

- Add supporting facilities language to the solar energy system definition.
- Define acronyms once, in the definitions section.
- Add 1.1-times-height setbacks from property lines and the residence for residential wind, with a minimum lot area.
- Reorder the setback paragraphs and revise guy wire anchor setback; consensus leaned toward 15 feet.
- Responsibility for community outreach and neighbor notification rests with the developer, not the county.
- Keep road use, grading, agricultural impact, and viewshed items in the draft for now.
- Residential wind and solar permits remain with the Zoning Administrator; large projects require public comment.

Action Items

Owner	Action
Tyler Kelley	Revise the solar definition and the small wind definition; revise residential wind setbacks, guy wire anchor setback, and paragraph order
Tyler Kelley	Research setback examples from other counties
Tyler Kelley	Ask developers when they notify neighbors and whom else they notify; define "interested stakeholders" and the notification timing
Tyler Kelley	Contact SES, Scout Energy, NextEra, and others on what a grading plan contains
Tyler Kelley	Better define the viewshed analysis and "project boundary"
Tyler Kelley	Email Emily (Conservation) for the matrix timeline and forward it to the commission once confirmed
Tyler Kelley	Begin the Board of Adjustment matrix
Tyler Kelley	Post notice of the next work session
Commission	Review the Conservation matrix before the next meeting

Open Questions

- Where the scoring matrices and early submittals fit into the planning timeline.
- How "project boundary" and "interested stakeholders" will be defined.
- Whether the two-mile (or larger) buffer around conservation areas will be adopted and how the economic impact claim is supported.

Next Meeting

A follow-up work session was scheduled for **Friday, October 30, 10:00 a.m. to 9:00 am** (members discussed one and a half hours, then agreed on two). Agenda: review the matrix if available, and continue reviewing reviewer comments against the draft. Some members will be unavailable November 5–12, and election office duties limit availability as the election approaches.

Minutes Submitted by Tyler Kelley 11/3/2026

Marshall County Zoning Commission Meeting 10/30/2026 Minutes

Meeting type: Conditional Use Permit request and Renewable Energy Ordinance work session
Date: Friday, October 30, 2026
Location: Meeting Room 1, Marshall County Courthouse, also streamed online
Prepared from: Video transcript of meeting

Attendees

- Bill Hobson, Zoning Commission Chair
- Pat VonAhnen, Zoning Commission
- William Wears, Zoning Commission
- Tyler Kelley, Zoning Administrator
- Bill Delo, applicant representative (appeared online on behalf of Lumen, referred to as "L3" in the recording)
- Emily Herring, Conservation Director (joined partway through the work session)
- A Board of Supervisors member (addressed as "Christian")
- Roger Lutes, Local Farmer
- Neighboring property owners and other members of the public

Note on attribution: The transcript does not label speakers. Statements are attributed by name only where the speaker identified themselves or the role is clear (Mr. Kelley as Zoning Administrator, Mr. Delo as applicant, Ms. Herring as Conservation Director). All other remarks are recorded as commission or public discussion.

1. Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:00 am. The Chair read the standard public notice on public comment procedure.

2. Approval of Agenda

- **Motion:** Approve the agenda. Moved and seconded.
- **Vote:** Voice vote, all in favor. Motion carried.

3. Approval of Minutes

- **Motion:** Approve the October 20, 2026 meeting minutes as written. Moved and seconded.
- **Vote:** Voice vote, all in favor. Motion carried.

4. Conditional Use Permit Request 2026-CUP-6039

Applicant: Bill Delo, on behalf of the legal owners of the property **Parcel:** 8318-16-200-004 (A1 Agricultural, accessed from Iowa Avenue) **Request:** Conditional use permit in an A1 zone for an unmanned telecommunications facility of six modular fiber huts with backup generators.

Staff Report (Zoning Administrator)

- The item was tabled from the October 20, 2026 meeting. Since then, the applicant submitted a revised site plan and comments, which were forwarded to the commission.
- The use is a special permitted use in an A1 zone, similar to an electric utility. It would not be allowed in R1 or R2 zones.

Applicant Presentation (revised site plan)

- A tree screen would be planted along the western property line, between the site and the adjacent residence, for visual and noise screening. No tree removal is proposed.
- Both huts previously proposed for the northwest corner were moved to the east side of the site. The southeast huts were reorganized so the generators sit in the far southeast corner, as far from residences to the west as possible.
- Fencing would enclose the huts and generators, covering about 60% of the width of the parcel. The remaining area inside the fence would be gravel. The land outside the fence would likely be put in prairie grass.
- Site selection: Lumen and its property consultant reviewed more than 20 properties. This site was chosen for its proximity to the fiber line along Iowa Avenue and a willing owner able to carve out a suitably sized parcel (typically 2 to 3 acres).
- Noise: with all six generators running, about 59 dB at roughly 200 ft (about the western property line), comparable to normal conversation. The air conditioning units are about 43 dB at the western property line.
- Generator testing: about 10 to 15 minutes per month during weekday business hours, plus about 10 to 15 minutes annually for additional maintenance. The estimated total is 135 to 195 minutes (about 2 to 3 hours) per year.
- All improvements would be within the 2.12-acre parcel, served by one driveway off Iowa Avenue. The huts are prefabricated modular units set on concrete pads.
- A finished-grade or grading plan is not available at this stage. Lumen typically produces one at the construction drawing stage.
- Purpose: the facility maintains data and internet signal speed along the fiber cable.

Commission and Public Discussion

- **Notification:** Some neighbors said they received a letter late or not at all. Staff explained that letters go to owners within 1,000 ft of the project property line, and that two letters were sent (for the October 20 and October 30 meetings). After comparing locations on a map, staff indicated the notice radius explained why some had not received letters.
- **Topography and drainage:** Commissioners and neighbors noted the site slopes substantially from west to east, with a waterway or ravine near the proposed southeast generators. They expected considerable dirt work and asked for a finished-grade plan. A downstream neighbor to the north raised concerns about erosion and runoff through a culvert and said he would involve the Iowa DNR.
- **Staff response on grading:** The county ordinance does not require a grading plan for ZC recommendation for a utility site as this project is described. Erosion and soil loss are regulated through Iowa DNR including permits and complaints, and through NRCS if the land is in a conservation program. Road culverts fall under the county engineer.

- **Future expansion:** Any new parcel split would need to meet the 25-acre minimum or obtain a variance. The existing parcel appears to be an established parcel from before 1997. Once the applicant owns the parcel, additional units within it would be at the owner's discretion.
- **Alternative location:** A commissioner and a neighbor suggested moving the site farther east, onto a flatter commercial area near US 30. The applicant was not familiar with that property.
- **Public concerns:** The facility provides little economic benefit or employment, and the trees would take 15 or more years to provide effective sound screening. Speakers asked that the applicant locate elsewhere.
- **Commissioner views:** One member felt the applicant had addressed last month's questions. Another still had concerns about the dirt work and waterway. The Chair noted that a unanimous vote sends a message, but the commission chose to express its concerns in the motion.

Action

- **Motion:** Recommend approval to the Board of Adjustment, with reservations about the dirt work. Moved and seconded.
- **Vote:** Voice vote, 2 in favor, Hobson and VonAhnen, 1 opposed Wears. Motion carried.
- **Next steps:** The item goes to the Board of Adjustment and then the Board of Supervisors, each with a public comment opportunity. No Board of Adjustment date is set yet. Owners within 1,000 ft will be notified by mail, and agendas will be posted on the county website (Agenda Center) and in the Times Republican. A zoning commission member also asked for confirmation that the new tree planting would be placed outside the existing trees.

5. Renewable Energy Ordinance Work Session

The Chair stated no public comment would be sought during this session, and that listening sessions would be held at later meetings. The commission and Zoning Administrator reviewed the draft ordinance page by page against comments received.

Discussion and Outcomes

1. Setbacks from non-participating landowners and other properties (page 12)

- The draft proposes 2.2 times total turbine height for non-participating landowners, public parks and public buildings. The county attorney suggested identifying an acceptable range (1.1 to 2.2). Mr. Kelley noted other counties generally use 1.5 or above. Members were comfortable with 2.2.
- Measurement point (property line versus inhabitable structure) was discussed. Members leaned toward property lines as cleaner, with concerns about large landowners.
- Outcome: Mr. Kelley will create a setback table covering setbacks from the property lines of non-participating landowners, public parks and city limit lines. The two-mile river setback will be separated from the 2.2-times-height language.

2. Setbacks from county conservation areas and the scoring matrix

- The two-mile setback figure has not been decided. The Conservation Director is developing a matrix to score the county's 38 conservation areas (endangered species, recreational value, income, investment) so waivers can be justified consistently. Her board must review it, and no

timeline was given. She has contacted about 20 other directors and is working with an engineering firm. Story County's similar effort took two years.

- Several members said two miles from parks is too far and raised property rights concerns. One member suggested one mile. A map showing 2-mile buffers around conservation areas, towns and the floodplain showed a large share of the county affected.
- Outcome: No decision. The matrix is needed before the setback can be set. Conservation's role will be a recommendation, not an approval (see item 4).

3. Setbacks from cities

- One mile from incorporated areas was described as standard. Members did not support reducing it. The county attorney was unsure whether the county could reduce a city's setback by agreement with a municipality.
- Outcome: Keep one mile. Mr. Kelley will ask the county attorney whether a variance or agreement with a city is possible.

4. Conservation Board role

- Only the Board of Adjustment and Board of Supervisors have approval authority under Iowa code. The Conservation Board's role will be changed to recommendation.
- Outcome: Revise wording to "recommendation."

5. Floodplain, river corridor and eagles

- The draft combines a floodplain exclusion and a separate two-mile setback from the Iowa River bottom, intended to protect eagle nests. Iowa DNR previously published guidance of two to five miles from active eagle nests but has removed it. Current practice relies on federal minimums.
- GIS staff said "Iowa River bottom" cannot be mapped. The FEMA Special Flood Hazard Area can.
- Outcome: Define floodplain using the FEMA Special Flood Hazard Area and keep eagle protection separate, tied to required wildlife studies.

6. Wildlife and bat issues (page 22)

- Kelley will spell out U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service requirements and Iowa DNR recommendations. Baseline avian and bat studies within the project boundary and a two-mile perimeter will remain. Post-construction monitoring of three years was seen across ordinances.
- Ms. Herring reported that mitigation properties must be held 30 years. Marshall County has two (an approximately 480-acre conservation easement and an approximately 200-acre privately held site), and mitigation space is running low. Conservation completed acoustic bat surveys in about six parks, with calls being certified by a biologist and a public presentation planned for January.
- Bat deterrence technology and curtailment were discussed, with reported mortality reductions around 60%. A member wants it required. Others raised cost concerns. Ms. Herring will share information from Iowa State and an industry council.

7. Grading plan (page 12)

- The county has no standard form. Mr. Kelley will draft a standard grading plan form using common developer requirements, with a preconstruction and post construction comparison.

8. Signal interference (13J)

- Keep a complaint process without detailing FCC or FAA rules. The developer must work with the FCC or FAA to resolve interference and report the repair to the Zoning Administrator.

9. Aircraft detection lighting

- The county cannot require what the FAA must approve. Outcome: "required if applicable," with prior FAA approval. Members noted it is cheaper to install at initial construction than to retrofit.

10. Road use agreement (page 14)

- Prepare a standard form agreement with the County Engineer. The 130% cost assumption is outdated. A third-party engineer will estimate costs, paid for by the developer, and costs will be tied to a cost-of-living index. Temporary corner extensions may be kept as county improvements if the county engineer agrees.

11. Decommissioning and financial security (pages 17-18)

- Cost estimates by an independent third party, re-estimated every 10 years with an annual index adjustment (draft had 5 years).
- "Timely manner" for funding is replaced with specific dates. Consensus: 25% before ground disturbance and 100% by the five-year mark. Security remains in place if the project is sold.
- Transfer of ownership: notify the county within 60 days after transfer.

12. Debris, best practices and emergency response (pages 19-23)

- Add "contamination" to the minimum soil disturbance practices. The emergency response plan will be developed with Marshall County Emergency Management and local first responders, and debris cleanup funds will follow the decommissioning security. Developers have been known to provide funds and training to volunteer fire departments to satisfy emergency response concerns.

13. Agricultural impact and baseline soil survey (pages 19-21)

- Invenergy objected to the soil survey as burdensome. Members and a farmer considered the draft protocol excessive.
- Outcome: Require submission of the most recent soil survey for the property (farmers commonly grid sample) at the time of the conditional use permit. The decommissioning survey would repeat the same data points through a certified soil lab.

14. Met towers and utility-scale solar

- Not reached. Scheduled for the next work session.

Decisions and Consensus

- Keep 2.2 times turbine height for non-participating landowners and create a setback table.
- Keep a one-mile city setback; the conservation setback remains undecided.
- Define floodplain by the FEMA Special Flood Hazard Area and separate eagle protection.
- Change the Conservation Board and Zoning Commission role to recommendation.

- Require aircraft detection lighting if applicable.
- Use a standard road use agreement with third-party cost estimates tied to an index.
- Decommissioning: 10-year re-estimate with annual index adjustment, 25% security up front and 100% by year five, 60-day notice of transfer.
- Replace the detailed soil protocol with submission of the latest soil survey.

Action Items

Owner	Action
Tyler Kelley	Revise the draft for the items above (setback table, floodplain definition, recommendation language, lighting, road use, decommissioning, soil survey, emergency response, 60-day transfer notice)
Tyler Kelley	Spell out U.S. Fish and Wildlife requirements and Iowa DNR recommendations; draft standard grading plan and road use forms
Tyler Kelley	Ask the county attorney about waivers or agreements for city setbacks; follow up with the county engineer on road cost estimates
Tyler Kelley	Begin the Board of Adjustment scoring matrix; send updated draft pages to the commission before the next meeting
Emily Herring	Complete the Conservation matrix; share information on bat deterrence technology
Zoning Administrator	Schedule the Board of Adjustment hearing for 2026-CUP-6039 and mail notices to owners within 1,000 ft
Commission	Review updated draft pages before the next work session

Open Questions

- Whether and at what distance a buffer around conservation areas will be adopted, and when the matrix will be ready.
- Whether a county variance or agreement can reduce a city's setback.
- How project boundaries will be defined and where early submittals fit in the timeline.

Next Meeting

A follow-up renewable energy work session is scheduled for Friday, November 13, 2026, at 10:00 a.m. (expected to run until about noon). Topics include meteorological towers and utility-scale solar, with an update from the Zoning Administrator. Per the 10/20 minutes, data center ordinance work session meeting is scheduled for November 30th, 2026 at 9:00 am.

Adjournment

- **Motion:** Adjourn. Moved and seconded.
- **Vote:** Voice vote, all in favor. Meeting adjourned.

Minutes submitted by: Tyler Kelley 11/3/2026 **Approved:** _____