

PLAINFIELD PLAN COMMISSION

June 13, 2022

6:30 p.m.

Mr. Bahr: Good evening. I'd like to call to order the June 13th Plainfield Plan Commission meeting.

ROLL CALL/DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Mr. Bahr: Andrew, if you would please, take roll.

Mr. Klinger:

Mr. Philip – here

Ms. Andres – here

Mr. McPhail – here

Mr. Kirchoff – here

Mr. Brandgard – here

Ms. Giesting – here

Mr. Bahr – here

Everyone is present and accounted for.

Mr. Bahr: Thank you very much.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Bahr: If you would all please stand with me and join me in the Pledge.

GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mr. Bahr: Public hearings. Public Hearings are designed to allow public input regarding the subject matter. Guidelines:

1. The proceedings are recorded for public record purposes; please come to the podium, located in the front of the room, give your name and address and make your presentation.
2. Please make presentations as concise as possible; try to limit your comments to no more than five minutes and please try to avoid items that have already been presented. Each speaker will be allowed to speak only once.
3. Following your presentation, please print your name and address on the speakers' sheet provided by the Plan Commission Secretary.

OATH OF TESTIMONY

Mr. Bahr: Mr. Daniel, if you would, please administer the Oath.

Mr. Daniel: Anyone expecting present evidence to this Commission, please stand and raise your right hand.

(Mr. Daniel administers the Oath of Testimony)

Mr. Daniel: Thank you

Mr. Bahr: Thanks Mel.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mr. Bahr: First item on the agenda is docket CP-22-047 – Plainfield Park Impact Fee discussion.

Mr. Bangel: Good evening and thanks for meeting with me this evening on Park Impact Fees and Master Plan process. Most of you are not fully aware of what the Park Impact Fee is, so I'm going to give just a brief synopsis in just a minute here, of what the Park Impact Fees are. Kind of the need and the purpose of the Park Impact Fee are – what this is, is an extra fee, or permit, that is pulled by builders or developers or individuals when they construct a new house in the incorporated Town of Plainfield. And that fee structure is utilized for new improvement or capacity improvements to the approved park master plans and the zone improvement plans that are put together in this 5-year study that we complete. Park impact fees are also negotiated

sometimes with developers and trade outs for different services. They put a trail through a system, through a development (inaudible), it's a negotiation tool we use sometimes there. As I mentioned before, the Park Impact Fee, it's a 5-year process. So, we're in the renewal process of this right now. We completed the first Park Impact Fee study in 2012. We renewed and updated it in 2017, and now we're back in 2022, updating to implement it in 2023. As I mentioned before, the Park Impact Fees are not used for any maintenance on current existing amenities or items in inventory; they are for new construction that qualifies in the Zone Improvement Plan that is put together the same time as this Park Impact Fee. In 2017 we adopted the Ordinance No. 09-2017, it was adopted on June 26, 2017, and implemented on December 26, 2017. The fee structure at that time for single-family homes was \$1,151, and for multi-family home units it was \$890. Currently up to this date, from 2018 to now, we've collected \$1,491,679 in Park Impact Fees that have been utilized for park projects and expanding capacity. The process for 2022 – this is the first time that I've gone through the Park Impact Fee study, leading this. So, I've learned a lot in the last six months. The process, we started in January of this year, which was a little behind schedule, but we've done a good job putting together a very strategic plan with this process and working with Baker Tilly and with Pros Consultants on this. With the Zone Improvement Plan, that is completed at the same time. Actually, it's completed before the Park Impact Fee is established because we use all of the information from the Zone Improvement Plan, and that's conducted by getting information from the Town of Plainfield Development Services, Parks Department, Clerk Treasurer's Office, as well as looking at national averages when it comes to the size of communities with their park amenities and the acreage that they have, as well as getting feedback from the community on what their needs and levels of service are that they would desire in Plainfield, and to continue to do that. That is how the Park Impact Fee is established, off of those findings that Pros Consultants and Baker Tilly have collected for us. We also have conducted three meetings with a Park Impact Fee advisory board, and they reviewed the Zone Improvement Plan as well as the Park Impact Fees, to give input with this. And now we're here this evening presenting to the Plan Commission, and we will have three Readings of the ordinance for Town Council approval. Hopefully the first meeting this evening, and then Readings two and three on the June 27th Town Council meeting. So, the proposed fee structure that we're showing for 2022, which would be implemented December 27, 2022, for single-family homes would be \$2,533 and for multi-family units \$1,723. Like I said, this would – the final approval would be on June 27th with the current schedule, and it would be implemented on December 27th for anybody pulling permits at that date.

Ms. Giesting: So, for the multi-family, that number is per unit or...?

Mr. Bangel: Yes, that is per unit, like if an apartment complex is built, that is the cost per unit.

Ms. Giesting: Got it.

Mr. Kirchoff: (microphone not on) Can you help me (inaudible) my head. It looks like the single-family went up about 60%, but the multi-family one went up 100%.

Mr. Bangel: They actually went up more than that. The single-family was \$1,100 – the next graph I have...

Mr. Kirchoff: (microphone not on) (inaudible)

Mr. Bangel: What's that?

Mr. Kirchoff: (microphone not on) (inaudible)

Mr. Bangel: No, the old numbers– right here we currently have – the old number was \$1,151, the existing, and the proposed going to \$2,533. So, it is a substantial increase but based off of what we had with inflation, as well as the expansion of the Town of Plainfield, if we want to continue to have the level of service we have in the community, we have to increase our Park Impact Fees to justify that. And you see other communities with similar amenities doing the same thing. Any other questions with any of this?

Ms. Geisting: Not yet.

Mr. Bangel: Okay. My kind of closing statement ties into what Bill was asking. Plainfield Parks is a pillar in the community and the best parks department in the county. To continue to achieve this, resources must be added and maintained at the same level as the community grows. Increasing the Park Impact Fee is one of the best tools to achieve this. I'm open for any questions you might have.

Ms. Giesting: So, we talked about this earlier, but this is for only new construction?

Mr. Bangel: Correct.

Ms. Giesting: So, existing homes, existing families and folks who live here, how do they support the current – like, how do they support parks?

Mr. Bangel: Their current tax rate, that is divided up between the town and that is used for our general operating expenses every year, and that's typically what's paid for maintenance. So, what the Park Impact Fee is specifically designed for is anything that we've identified in our Zone Improvement Plan – which I can use an example from five years ago, the need for pickle ball courts was addressed with this because we've built pickle ball courts with Park Impact Fees for the last five years. So, that would be the same thing continuing here. The Zone Improvement Plan here shows trail additions, it shows some athletic field needs, it shows off leash dog areas, shelter areas; it identifies all of that in the Zone Improvement Plan, that we will then take all of this information and put master plans together for Parks. That will be completed by the end of this fall. We did switch things up a little bit this year with the master plan process and the Park Impact Fees because typically the Master Plan is completed before the Park Impact Fees. What we're able to do by doing it this way is we can see what those needs are and actually put them into our

master plans and have those funding sources already allocated for. So, it actually might be a better process, doing it that way.

Mr. Klinger: (microphone not on) The Parks operations are actually funded from property taxes, and then also gate receipts, so at Splash Island (inaudible) that. In terms of the capital improvements, it is largely funded through both a combination of Park Impact Fees and the food and beverage tax dollars.

Ms. Giesting: Ah, okay.

Mr. Klinger: So, locals who are dining at local restaurants are contributing to food and beverage taxes, but we're also capturing dollars from visitors who are coming and maybe staying at the hotels out there by the airport.

Ms. Giesting: Sure, okay.

Mr. Klinger: But food and beverage and Park Impact Fees are the primary sources or capital improvements.

Ms. Giesting: Got it, thank you.

Mr. Bangel: Any other questions?

Ms. Andres: Brent, when I looked at the map that you attached, you had kind of the outline of the current footprint, so as we grow as a town over the next five years, do you amend that map, are they excluded from the – how does that process work?

Mr. Bangel: I'm going to refer that to Sam Shafer with Baker Tilly. I believe it expands with it but...

Mr. Shafer: Yeah, it would expand with anything within the town, so anything annexed would then be included.

Ms.: Andres: Within that map, okay.

Mr. Bangel: Thank you. Any other questions?

Mr. Klinger: But again, only new development, right.

Ms. Andres: Right, that's right.

Mr. Klinger: Yeah

Mr. Bahr: Thank you

Mr. Bangel: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Bahr: Thank you very much.

Mr. Klinger: This is for public hearing, so...

(Brief pause)

Mr. Bangel: Thank you.

Mr. Bahr: Thank you. This is for public hearing and at this time I'd like to open the public hearing and ask anyone that would like to speak of the fees to the Commission, please approach the podium.

(Brief pause)

Ms. Giesting: I don't see anyone.

Mr. Bahr: Being that no one is approaching, we will close the public hearing and open up for discussion amongst the Commission, if any.

Ms. Giesting: No discussion. Thank you for that presentation.

Mr. Philip: So, Mr. President, I have a motion. I move the Plan Commission approve Resolution No. 2022-01 to adopt the 2022 Zone Improvement Plan as an official part of the Comprehensive Plan of the Town of Plainfield and certify said amendment with a favorable recommendation to the Town Council.

Ms. Andres: Second

Mr. Bahr: I have a motion, and a second by Jennifer. Andrew, if you would.

Mr. Klinger:	Mr. Philip – yes
	Ms. Andres – yes
	Mr. McPhail – yes
	Mr. Kirchoff – yes
	Mr. Brandgard – yes
	Ms. Giesting – yes
	Mr. Bahr – yes

Resolution No. 2022-01 is approved.

Mr. Bahr: Thank you

Mr. Philip: Mr. President, I move the Plan Commission certify the 2022 Park Impact Fee Ordinance with a favorable recommendation to the Town Council.

Ms. Giesting: And I'll second that.

Mr. Bahr: I have a motion and a second. Andrew, if you would, take call.

Mr. Klinger:

Mr. Philip – yes

Ms. Andres – yes

Mr. McPhail – yes

Mr. Kirchoff – yes

Mr. Brandgard – yes

Ms. Giesting – yes

Mr. Bahr – yes

Recommendation is approved to be forwarded to the Council.

Mr. Bahr: Very good.

PLAN COMMISSION ACTION ITEMS

Mr. Bahr: And the on the Plan Commission action items, (inaudible) execute the documents?

Mr. Singleton: (not at microphone) (inaudible) The other item that we have on the agenda is (inaudible). Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to present this evening. I'm here to give you guys an update – and we've got two other councilmembers in the room, so they can hear it as well. So, this was kind of a good opportunity. It's really prepared for the Council but because of the special meeting you guys had, we thought it was a great opportunity to give you guys an update as well. And so, this is something that we've been working on for quite some time already, but it is starting to come to a head, as far as kind of wrapping up. So, I'll try and get through this relatively quick, and give a little background but not too much, to keep things moving. I do have

Ken Olson with American Structurepoint here. They are leading this part of the study. We're working very closely with Butler Fairman and Siefert as well, as we look at this entire broader area. But lots of plans that you guys are familiar with from past history. This really drives out of the interlocal agreement that the town entered into with the state of Indiana, to accept Quaker Boulevard and Avon Avenue into our jurisdiction. Back in 2001 is when that agreement was executed. As part of that agreement – this is an excerpt from that – there was a commitment that we would do this study. It started this year, and it really kind of anticipated us doing two projects that were out of our Thoroughfare Plan. Going back to 2019 when we approved the Thoroughfare Plan, there were two projects in there that we felt were good candidates. But the alignment scoping study was really intended to narrow off of those two projects, onto a collection of other potential projects. And so, that's what we've been looking at. So, the project goals and the approach here – really, this is Structurepoint's approach to six steps: to kind of gather data, get out with the community, identify all these different projects that we were considering, evaluate and prioritize those projects, and then obviously deliver the plan. And that would be the goal of the plan. So, that plan is due in approximately one month, the next Town Council meeting, up for review and approval by then so that we can get this to INDOT. More on that later. So, the goal of course, like I said, is to evaluate (inaudible). (inaudible) work through the bottom there and do the analysis and really to prioritize some of these based on some costs. So, we are still in draft mode so we're kind of (inaudible). If you look at the timeline of the study, we started in spring, early June about a week and a half ago we had a public meeting. We produced a draft actually just before that public meeting. So, staff is reviewing that draft and the Council has some portions of that study. But then like I said, we have to finalize by July. The reason we have to finalize by July is because INDOT is preparing to look at the interchange Quaker Boulevard and I-70, and they want to start posting documents by as early as August. And so, they do not want kind of overlapping of studies happening at that time. It's a long process so it's going to be a number of years before things really kind of shake out, with INDOT looking at that, but that's when their process will start, here in August. So, part of the public feedback – we don't have a ton of time to get through all of these details of course, but we are recording their feedback and kind of weighing those in against these different projects. So, that will become part of the study. And of course a big part of the public process is to keep people informed, which is why we're here tonight as well; so that this information can get out to the public and we can (inaudible) that feedback. You know, we're going to get some feedback from the study but we're also going to get feedback over the years as we develop these projects. And so, we're not looking for granular feedback at this point, but we try to keep that eye level, and again, keep people informed on what we're doing, that's part of (inaudible). So, we did have about 55-60 people show up; haven't had a lot of written comments after the meeting, but what we did get we have up here and (inaudible) will continue (inaudible) final report. Going back to those projects that we're looking at, we really looked at – because you know, there were six projects, two that were already in the Thoroughfare Plan. Project 1, which is the big Quaker – so, here's I-70 running east/west through here, and you've got Quaker Boulevard and the interchange right here. So, this is Camby Road, which is the new intersection project we're just kind of getting wrapped up right now, since we took that over from the state. And then from my arrow (inaudible), that is Project 1 and the intent

of that is to take Quaker Boulevard due south from where it kind of 90's at County Road 750, and get that over to S.R. 67. So, that's been a project on different plans for at least 20 years – at least 18 years for sure because it was on the 2004 Comp Plans. The other project, Project 2 is to actually take the east/west portion of Old S.R. 267 that runs through the residential area and extend that across I-70 for improved access, allowing some of that growth development to come up from the south to the interchange (inaudible). So, that's a nice project to do because it offers a fair amount of traffic congestion relief. The challenge is it's very hard to construct because of the rock quarries, you've got I-70, and it's not in town. It's pretty far outside of town in fact. So, a good project to keep in the future but probably perhaps not one that we're quite ready for at this time. Project 3, those represent just different alternatives at the actual intersection of Hadley and Quaker, things that we can do to increase capacity. Project 4 is what we consider a Collector/Distributor that is - (inaudible) point is for our western growth. We see it as the intersection at Quaker and Hadley, and so different methods or locations where we can redirect that traffic that won't go through that intersection are why some of these are considered options that we're looking at. Project 4 is an example of that. So, what that would do would be to keep people on the interstate through the intersection, and then have them exit off and go directly to Center Street. So, we call that a Collector/Distributor. And that is just for westbound travel only, so that proposal was just to address the afternoon rush hour for people who are exiting to go north, needing to cross over those two lanes of travel, get in a northbound left turn lane to go down Hadley Road. This would allow them to kind of bypass that whole area, get over to Center. And as many of you know, our Thoroughfare Plan has a road called Hackamore Road that runs east/west over in that undeveloped area, as part of our planning, and so, the idea would be to get to that east/west roadway. Again, balancing out the growth of traffic that's expected to go on the Hadley Corridor over time. I'll just jump ahead to Project 6 because it does something very similar. And it's called the underpass but when you look at Andrew's mouse going back and forth, the blue and the green kind of run parallel to each other. So, those have similar benefits. And we'll get a little bit more into detail of Project 6 – so, it's a local road that connects Cambridge and Gateway on either side of Quaker Boulevard, it would connect those two roads, and then also seek to give better access to Quaker Boulevard. But I'll talk about the in a minute. So, I mean Project 5, very traditional widening of Hadley Road – it's been in the Thoroughfare Plan for multiple versions, as an arterial roadway, and will continue to be an expected improvement. But the longer we can delay that is something that we desire to do because you know, there's a lot of houses on there and it has direct access to drives. So, making that a little bit easier for them for as long as we can is (inaudible). So, I probably shouldn't have gone into that level detail because I've got slides for all of these to show these in more detail. Again, this is Project 1 and you can see where it really – this does not offer as much of a traffic benefit as it does a desire to route traffic around the planning for the park, the Sodalis Nature Park down there. So, those areas in red generally represent the areas that are restricted access. And so, you can see the road is strategically laid out to try and avoid those areas; that is part of the consideration. This is Project 2; this is you know, again, (inaudible) project to construct, we're not spending a lot of time on this right now but we're going to kind of keep this as a potential future investment project and plan around it as we move forward out there. So, looking at the intersection of Quaker and

Hadley, like I said we did a number of reviews here. So, this is (inaudible) access and we go through an analysis period. If we did this (inaudible) Cambridge and Gateway, you know, what does that do? What if we add U-turns up at the high school stoplight there at Red Pride Drive? We looked at roundabouts, assigning those to the intersection and how do those perform with intersection improvements. We looked at a unique design of a "T" type intersection where westbound travel would be free-flowing along Hadley at Gateway, but other movements got restricted and so – just bringing this up to show the multitude of options that we analyze before we make this decision (inaudible) town.

Mr. Klinger: (inaudible)

Mr. Singleton: So, we have started to home in on some specific improvements, this is one of them. This would be a free-flowing right from eastbound Hadley Road to southbound Quaker. This kind of exists, in a weird way, today but it doesn't function as it should, but we've done this at Stafford and Reagan with success, where we keep that traffic moving through the intersection. Same locations, this is an introduction of the alternative section design where you are displacing certain lanes, moving them out of their traditional sequence. So, this is called displaced (inaudible), some people call them (inaudible) flow intersection. But over here on the right side – so, north is to the left; on the right side of the screen, you can see where cross traffic is actually intersecting and crossing each other. So, you'd have a traffic signal right there. So, that northbound left movement, that gives us some trouble; that would get at a traffic light and then it would have to stop; you have a green light it would cross over southbound traffic would come through that intersection. And now you've got your left turn on the opposite side, but if you look at that intersection, those left turn movements can now happen when both through movements are happening for the north/south movement, and that left turn can go. Right now, they have to wait. And so, that's an efficiency gain from a traffic engineering standpoint, that we can take advantage of but it's a little bit – it's definitely non-customary. I think the state is in the process of building two of these in the state and have not completed one yet. So, this would be a new, and kind of departure, if we were to pursue this. I know despite its benefits, it does have some concerns about whether this is a good place for this type of intersection, but it does work from a traffic standpoint.

Mr. Klinger: (microphone not on) (inaudible) at 39.

Ms. Giesting: Yeah

Mr. Singleton: Yeah, so when you're crossing over and going against the opposite direction.

Ms. Giesting: Yeah

Mr. Singleton: Right. You know, we want to look at all available options. This is a great one as far as a performance standpoint, but it is an expensive one. This is a grade separated roundabout bridge. So, if you've been up on Keystone Parkway, going into Carmel- and Fishers has several of these, I believe. You know, these do a good job of moving traffic. We did have some concerns

about our truck traffic needing to navigate off of Perry through there. But it does help the truck traffic that would be going north/south because they're not having to slow down and stop at an intersection. So, definitely some good safety benefits here, but you know, this one comes with a price tag in excess of \$40 million; our relinquishment money is \$20 million, so it would be a pretty good supplement and it would not be able to support some of these other projects that we feel are important too.

Ms. Giesting: Scott, what is relinquishment money?

Mr. Singleton: Sorry, I skipped over that part. So, when we signed the agreement with INDOT we basically bought that burden of having that roadway in perpetuity; they gave the town \$20.5 million...

Ms. Giesting: Okay

Mr. Singleton: ...to invest in – it's kind of based on maintaining that road forever but we have to spend that money in 5-7 years. And I apologize; that is really the point of this study, to say, in the context of these issues we're challenged with, where's the best place to put that money in that next 5-7 year window.

Ms. Giesting: I understand.

Mr. Singleton: I skipped over that part, thinking I'm speaking to the Council, so I apologize. So yeah, this is something that would be hard to construct. I know we've had some expressed concerns about visibility and having to dive down into like a tunnel kind of thing and missing some of the hospitality area.

Mr. Klinger: (microphone not on) I think it's important to note, it's not cash. It's (inaudible) projects, which is part of why we're going through this process (inaudible).

Ms. Giesting: Okay

Mr. Bahr: Are they involved in the decision making of the project?

Mr. Singleton: We are collaborating with them, yes. And I'll get a little bit more into that as we kind of wrap things up.

Ms. Giesting: Okay

Me Singleton: So, I did talk about the Collector/Distributor; this kind of shows that, it's pretty straight forward. Hadley Road widening, again pretty straight forward. This can be kind of an eluded slide because we're trying to show projects (inaudible), so I'm not going to spend a lot of time on it. This is what we showed in the public meetings. We did not want to get into too much detail because we do have better (inaudible) detail. I'm going to show you guys that. But when

you talk about INDOT and the collaboration that we have to do, this is a big one. This uses a lot of the state right-of-way that was purchased for the interchange, and obviously also for Quaker and that tise in. So, the permanence of their ramps on an interchange and access points really gets into a lot of detail discussion. And so, this is a model to show the concept of what we're trying to say. So, when we talk about an underpass of Quaker, what we're trying to do is to connect Cambridge on the east and crossover to Gateway. So, going back to where we talked about maybe putting some restrictions in up at Hadley Road, this is a way to alleviate some of the impacts of those restrictions to the local businesses, and actually improve connectivity through this area. Without the northern portion – and I don't have a file to view those – but without that northern portion, this still has value in terms of creating that connection. But INDOT has to approve that because we're cutting across the right-of-way. And there's a whole discussion that I know I don't have time to get into, about limited access right-of-way. When INDOT puts in a major road like this, they buy the rights for access into the corridor. So, they own those rights; they cannot give them to us, and they did not transfer them as part of the relinquishment agreement. So, we have to go back and get their permission – even though we own the road – in order to break any points in that limited access. Here in particular, they obviously want to protect the performance of the interchange with I-70. And so, they do have some concerns. And right now, where this is laid out – not exactly, but pretty close – this is laid out to avoid any kind of full takes of property. That would have to go up for discussion as we get into speeds, radiuses and all those things. But this is an option that we certainly would look at. Where this interfaces with their future interchange, which is not designed yet obviously, is a huge question. We have to draw something so that we can model it and we can see how the traffic performs, which was the purpose of this document here. So, now we can kind of talk about it and see how it affects the interchange. So, in all that context, in all those different projects, the things that we're using to evaluate, we're looking at the crash, we're looking at the traffic benefits, looking at the cost and these different factors, environmental. We've got these laid out in a matrix so you can see if we add up all these projects down at the bottom, you know, we're almost at \$200 million. So, we're talking about spending \$20 million, we're looking at \$200 million worth of improvements. Obviously, a lot of what you saw is not happening any time soon and those projects are off down the road. We're trying to prioritize this next 5-7 years. So, to prioritize them, you know, we've got them up with our own kind of scoring – and the point is not to actually be able to read this today because obviously you can't – but just to show how we are listing out all those different projects, all those different improvements, and then breaking them down across those categories up at the top. If you zoom in at the top, you see crash mitigation, traffic, development connectivity, and then project cost and support. Support being the one as far as the council giving them the ability to weigh in on priorities and how we need to direct these fundings. So, you really move across there from what's an objective measure in your crash mitigations, your traffic... That's what Structurepoint is helping us out with tremendously; they're also helping us out with this process. But then as you move across this scoring, you get into more subjective measures. And so, we have been working with two councilmembers, we're obviously updating the council tonight, in order to try to siphon through and sift through all of these different variables and see what comes to the top as far as priorities. So, I am out of time. Just perfectly to wrap up, the

approximate recommendations of priorities that I am interpreting from the status of the report now – Structurepoint will offer theirs to the council as part of the council meeting this evening – again, they're not taking into account that council feedback – we had some earlier feedback to guide but we still need some feedback before any of these become final and they all have dollars associated with them. So, that's the process ahead of us over the next month, is to really kind of home in on those types of details, but we wanted to let everybody know where we're at currently.

Ms. Giesting: Scott, so in one month you will have your projects prioritized?

Mr. Singleton: What we're going to have is a recommendation on how to spend that \$20 million.

Ms. Giesting: It doesn't look like you're going to have any trouble doing it.

Mr. Singleton: There is no problem, but it is harder than you think to actually make a recommendation because there are so many choices. There are some very good projects that should happen but with all the other factors, how do you say, but this is the one we should do now. It is a challenge still. Easy to spend, but hard to prioritize. So, that is Structurepoint's recommendation. And then the last thing, I know I'm out if time – we will close the gap where we can close the gap with some gateway improvements that we'll look forward to with the new interchange. This was a plan that the town approved a long time ago, and this will come back into play as (inaudible) interchange. That's all I have, sorry for going over.

Mr. Bahr: Thank you

Mr. Kirchoff: Thanks Scott.

Mr. Bahr: Very good, very informative.


ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Brandgard: With that, I would move to adjourn.

Mr. Philip: Second

Mr. Bahr: We are adjourned.

Mr. Steve Bahr, President

DocuSigned by:

965ABE261770450...
Mr. Andrew Klinger, Secretary