



**Grissom Air Reserve Base Joint Land Use Study
Public Meeting #3
Meeting Summary
April 9, 2018, 5:30 p.m.**

Consultant Team Members Present:

Tyson Smith, White & Smith, LLC Planning and Law Group

Vagn Hansen, Benchmark Planning

Brooke Thomas, American Structurepoint

Mr. Smith welcomed everyone, introduced Mr. Hansen and Ms. Thomas, and reviewed the meeting agenda. The consultant team presented the final JLUS report, recommendations, and implementation strategies. The following summarizes the "Question & Answer" portion of the meeting.

Q: MOU - who would initiate that?

A: That would be part of a separate process. It is up to the larger community to prepare them and get them in place.

Q: The public survey in June? What was that used for?

A: To find out if our findings were somehow different than that of the general public, and to determine if we needed to make adjustments in what we were preparing and to tailor our public outreach process for the local community?

Q: Did it raise a red flag (the low response rate) that this wasn't advertised enough?

A: The response rate for the survey is typical for this type of project.

Q: What is the overlay? What does it do?

A: An overlay imposes additional regulations on top of the minimum standards that would normally be allowed by the base zoning district.

Q: So Cass Co. is more restricted?

A: Yes, since 2016. The properties at the end of the runway have additional land use and development regulations associated with it.

Q: Have you brought Ft. Wayne in? They fly here a lot. How does that group react with Grissom?

A: The study looked at Grissom, but we are aware of Ft. Wayne's use of the airspace. That's why they are included as a party in the recommendation for a memorandum of understanding.

Col. Russell (Commander, 434th Mission Support Group, Grissom Air Reserve Base):
As far as the wind turbines themselves, we are neutral on it. We go by what FAA says, and they review wind farm proposals for their conformance with FAA regulations governing tall structures. We are most concerned about the affects on radar interference. The pentagon is doing a study now. If it is determined, by the pentagon, there could be an impact, Grissom will look at ways to mitigate those impacts and could ultimately request that all or part of the project be denied. If it is determined by the pentagon that there aren't likely to be any adverse impacts to radar, we would not take issue with the project(s).

Q: Was this project advertised?

A: Yes. We sent legal notices in the Tribune and Herald, on social media, on the project website and elsewhere.

Q: Is it possible to do something more intentional to make sure that every person gets the information?

A: We will continue to advertise opportunities to participate in planning processes and studies across advertising mediums.

Q: Why can't we just adopt a policy that limits the height of each turbine?

A: The height of the turbine is just one consideration. The distance from the airfield and the topography of the area where the tower is being located have to be factored in as well. A blanket height restriction wouldn't necessarily ensure that the airspace wouldn't be impacted