

**TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES  
May 22, 2018**

Bryant Niehoff: Alright, we'll go ahead and get started and call to order the Tuesday, May 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the Technical Review committee. We have one item on the agenda today and that's the POET ethanol bio refinery and I believe we have a couple of representatives here today. If you guys don't mind stepping up to the podium just so we can catch you. We record all of these meetings and then we go through, type all them out. We'll give you a copy of those minutes. So.....

Robbie Stonebraker: Well it's electrified so if you touch it, we get the buzzer.

Niehoff: Yeah it is a booby trap, so yeah. If you could just state your name for the record, both of you.

Nathan Westhoff: POET.

Ron Steffen : Poet.

Niehoff: Thank you very much. Alright so the general procedure we follow today is basically we'll go down the line. You guys should have gotten written comments from those that we've gotten thus far. There may be a few that trail in a bit later and we'll make sure to get those to you as soon as you can if we get those. But generally we give the Technical Review Committee you know that two weeks period to reply to us with comments. If they don't have comments, you know they may come in later or you may touch base with them at a later date. So we'll start on the left end here with Mr. Byers.

Derrick Byers: Good morning. Derrick Byers, City of Shelbyville storm water utility. I had been in contact with David as far as what he needs to do to get that Rule 5 permit and I think he's good to go there. So a lot of my comments won't get in the way of that permit. Did you guys understand what I was saying about the watershed on that property?

(?): Inaudible comment.

Byers: The very first one under A7 or I guess third one down. Essentially that parcel split two watersheds. All the water eventually ends up in Big Blue, but the majority of your water's going into what you guys are calling the Hankins Ditch. That actually becomes the Ed Clark and goes to Brandywine. So the (?) would end in the 080 instead of 070. So since that's where you're (?) water's going, we'll use that on the permits and everything.

(?): Inaudible comment.

Byers: And then I also just asked for some detailed drawings of some of the erosion control BMPs like the vehicular tracking control, the concrete washout and the sediment ditch just so whoever the contractor is, we have something to look at on that for installation.

(?): And we can have those. My question is on the concrete washout if we decide to go with like a ( ? )?

Byers: Yeah.

( ? ): Then...(inaudible)...

Byers: That's fine. Yep, absolutely. And then somewhere on the ( ? ), it had said ( ? ) the details for the LF( ? )<sup>1</sup> and I did not see those on the plans.

( ? ): That's ( ? ). That's a reference to your the city standard.

Byers: Okay.

( ? ): ( ? ) should've modified that a little bit, but ...(inaudible)...

Byers: Okay, awesome. That's all I have right now. Thank you.

Niehoff: Thank you, sir. Alright Bryant Niehoff and Adam Rude, city of Shelbyville plan commission. We have a few comments. You all should have gotten those this morning. And we'll just go ahead and get started here, so starting off on the title sheet, just a very small clerical thing. It states Fairland, Indiana for the address. This is actually shown on the property card and we believe that there was an error when in prior transfers of this property. So that will um, you might wanna speak with your legal team about what the closing documents said when you guys bought that because there may have to be some changes there. We can talk with you at a later date. That's very small, very clerical, but something we'll need to address when we do our addressing, 911 addressing system. The next point here, so we have primary and accessory structure standards. The way our unified development ordinance bases standards off of our buildings, we classify them all buildings as primary and accessory. Yes, Ron?

Steffen: Inaudible comment.

Niehoff: Sure.

Steffen: Just so I understand.

Niehoff: Yeah?

Steffen: So the title sheet that we submitted indicated Fairland, IN for the address. You're saying we're, the city is saying now that that is an error with the county auditor's records. So what is the appropriate address that we would use to provide so we can I guess .....(inaudible)...

Niehoff: I believe it's the same.....

Steffen: Inaudible comment.

Niehoff: So it would be recorded on the deed. It would be mentioned there and I believe it's the same numeric address, just a different city name. So Shelbyville, IN rather than Fairland. So you may just wanna have your legal team take a look at the deed. If it does say Fairland, we can consult with them and our city attorney to see what measures need to be taken to get that switched. And do you have anything to add there, Adam?

Adam Rude: No, I was just gonna say yeah the actual street address there, the sorry I thought I had it on there. The street address you have shown is correct. At some point when that land was transferred, a deed was incorrectly written as Fairland, IN and that's how that mistake happened. We've already alerted the auditor's office. They've changed the our records our parcel information, but typically you can just your attorney will be able to pull together something that can be recorded just to correct the deed. It's not it's normally not normally it does not require re-recording all of the closing documents, but it is something that they're gonna want to look at. The your insurance company....(inaudible)....

Niehoff: Does that answer you guys' questions there for the most part?

(?): Yes.

Niehoff: Okay. So moving on into our primary and accessory structure standards, basically we had to classify. There's a lot of structures on this site, just quite a few. So we had to go through and classify which we would classify as primary structures and which is accessory and due to the nature and the way that our ordinance is written, we allow maximum, we provide maximum buildings on a property. So we have a maximum of five primary buildings, which you guys are meeting that standard which is good. We classified all buildings on this site that would be occupied as primary buildings. So the administrative office, the scale house, grains receiving, the warehouse and the processing facility. And the processing facility, we indicated those on sheet GSA02. The processing facility is you know a variety of buildings that you've indicated, but it's generally one structure in terms of a zoning sense. So you're meeting that requirement, however the structures we had to classify as accessory structures are, there's 22 accessory structures. So we allow a maximum of 5. You will need a variance in that regard, but and Ron, I sent that in an email to you yesterday trying to get ahead of the game there. But that is something we discovered in that regard. Should be a relatively simple process. I've already engaged our BZA president about a special meeting date if she would be open to that.

She is so we can talk off-site about that you know right after this meeting. And then also, and I don't know if it's mentioned here but in regard to the buildings, there we have a maximum height of 40' I believe for accessory structures and the grain bins are just far exceeding that. Unfortunately we don't have any exceptions for that in our Unified Development Ordinance, but while you're at the BZA for that first variance, we can easily tag that one on. It's something that our ordinance just hasn't caught up with yet. It's antiquated in that regard. So something also to keep in mind. Moving on to the entrance and drive standards. Well, I guess before I move on, are there any questions?

(?): I guess is that noted on here? The height?

Niehoff: The height? I actually don't know if it is and we can send a revision in that regard. We had talked about it, but I don't know if it made it on here. So I will, we will send a revision to that. Any other questions about the structures themselves?

(?): In terms of that specifically, can we ask for a variance for that....(inaudible)....is that for any structure or is it or is it any....(inaudible)....

Niehoff: Yes. Yeah basically anything that classifies as a structure so all of your silos I believe are over. I think one even goes up to 190, is that right? Or something like that.

Rude: Inaudible comment.

Niehoff: Oh that's a stack? Yeah.

(?): Inaudible comment.

Niehoff: A hundred? Okay.

(?): Yeah. Our highest structure would be....(inaudible)....

Niehoff: Okay.

(?): Inaudible comment.

Niehoff: Okay. I have here the RTO number 6.1160B?

(?): That may be an error.

Niehoff: That may be an error? Okay.

(?): Yeah.

Niehoff: Okay. Okay well honestly this information is perfect what you've provided on these plans. So I mean that can just be submitted along with the variance information. Just duplicate this. If there are any errors, we'll wanna make sure we correct for that, but this will be good. This will describe what you're applying for a variance for. Small hurdle, but shouldn't in any way, shape or form, if we get a special meeting set up, Adam and myself with work with you in getting that organized and I know your expected approval date, your hopeful approval date is the end of June. You're trying to hit the June Plan Commission meeting, correct?

(?): Correct.

Niehoff: Yeah. So we'll get you in to the BZA before then and we'll talk with you guys about scheduling that meeting. And then our entrance and drive standards – so again, this is something just where our ordinance hasn't quite caught up with the times and the maximum width of an entrance, of an approach off a road is 36'. I think that's something that we kind of talked about early on in the process that but you know, you're showing 140'. It will need a variance if you're wanting to keep that. Adam and I kind of got together and just threw out a few options, something to consider. We don't know how it works with your distribution and your receiving of trucks, but something you may just wanna take a look at, a few items I guess. So one would be, you know would it be possible to provide a smaller curb cut and then immediately expand it to 7 or plus lanes as shown on the plans or is there a way to provide a separate area for staging prior to the scale house?

(?): Those may be options.

Niehoff: Okay.

(?): It's all ....(inaudible)....We'd like to have ( ? ).

Niehoff: Sure.

(?): We don't want anybody backing up on the road is our main concern.

Niehoff: Absolutely.

(?): We want space for 39 trucks....

Niehoff: Yeah.

(?): ....(inaudible)....and currently we're going to have that.

Niehoff: Are you? Okay.

(?): So....(inaudible)....potential I guess for a ( ?).

Niehoff: Okay. Yeah just a few things to think about. You know we don't know if that would work into what you know, your guys' distribution processes are, but something to consider I guess. Alright, and just a note here as far as the variance goes for that. If you choose to maintain that 140' or anything over that 36' which we understand is likely, in previous requests for wider curb cuts, this is actually a pretty common one with our BZA. Again, we just need to update our ordinance in that regard. Our BZA has requested a raised curb median to separate the incoming and outgoing traffic. So this might be something you wanna consider if that fits into your plans. They've requested that on previous sections, previous requests. Also as far as the approach goes, we saw that there is a lane, and I believe it's to the west, the westernmost lane that essentially is a through lane, goes through to the administrative building. So you may wanna provide some sort of delineation or separation between the lanes that are leading to the scale house and that through lane. Have you guys thought about what that may be? Are you looking at signage? Are you looking at a separated curb?

(?): Inaudible comment.

Niehoff: What's that?

(?): The striping plan....

Niehoff: Striping? Okay, okay.

(?): Is that sufficient or do you guys typically look for something else?

Niehoff: Maybe some sort of signage. Our concern was maybe that a truck would come in and think that that was one of those lanes and then block. You know, if they're not able to get over into those easternmost lanes to the storage house, excuse me, the receiving house, then they may block that incoming and outgoing traffic in that area or I guess incoming traffic in that area.

(?): Typically, the way we handle it is striping with label all the lanes for farm trucks here.

Niehoff: Okay.

(?): ( ?) trucks here. Through lane here.

Niehoff: Sure. Just yeah I mean if that's sufficient and if that's worked in your other facilities, then I mean I'm sure that's fine with us. Just something we thought about as we were reviewing those plans and taking a look at that entrance. So fence standards, basically are you guys looking at any fencing on the site?

(?): Yep.

Niehoff: Okay.

(?): Currently, yep we were planning a fence along the whole frontage and along the ... (inaudible)...

Niehoff: Okay just make sure you take a look at UDO 5.20. That's our industrial fence standards and make sure that you are in compliance with those. Alright? Moving on to landscaping, we require yard plantings. So anywhere on the site, you need to provide a minimum of 10 yard plantings or annotate the preservation of trees in accordance with UDO 5.31E. And the non-residential lot planting standards are UDO 5.32. Each primary building, so those five buildings we discussed must have foundation plantings in accordance with UDO 5.32. And then all parking lots must provide parking lot perimeter landscaping in accordance with UDO 5.35. So those are all of our landscaping standards there. We saw that you provided that planting plan, but we'll need a more in-depth kind of look at that as far as what specific plant types you're looking at, locations, all of that, so something to consider. Oh and then a last note on the next page. If you could provide annotations and calculations showing that the adequate landscape buffer yard is being provided to separate this property from neighboring properties. And that's, those are our buffer yard landscaping standards, 5.36 of the UDO. Any questions there?

(?): You just....(inaudible)....setback for the buffer yard?

Niehoff: Yes and we require a minimum width and then there are certain types of plants that are required at certain intervals. If you could show that and then you have to provide, so it's based off square footage basically. So just show those calculations if you don't mind so we could verify those. And our light, oh go ahead. I'm sorry.

(?): Sorry. Bryant, are you suggesting then that our east and west fence line or property line along with the setbacks will need to have plantings?

Niehoff: They will, yes. Yeah and that's our those are our buffer yard standards.

(?): (?) apply for the (?)?

Niehoff: Yes. Yeah it's basically .....

(?): Inaudible comment.

Niehoff: Yeah so essentially any time there's a lower density zoning district, whether it's city or county and you have a higher density, excuse me, higher intensity development such as yourselves going in, you have to provide a buffer yard to kind of buffer your guys' more intense use as compared to the agricultural use. It's a residential uses around you. We can

take a look at that. If you don't think you're going to be able to meet that standard, you can apply that to your variance petition as well and we can go through that, so....And then our lighting standards; you guys did provide a lighting plan which we appreciate, but if you could provide a photometric plan to insure compliance with our lighting standards. Basically we wanna make sure that there's no bleed onto adjacent properties or that you're meeting the allowable bleed onto adjacent properties. And there's a few things on outdoor storage standards. If you're gonna have any of that, just make sure you're in compliance with UDO 5.46. As far as the parking standards go, just please provide your data that you used to calculate those minimum parking needs and that's in compliance with page 5-56 of the UDO. We describe what those the different uses are, what the requirements are. If you could just show what you were using to come up with that minimum, those parking standards. And then moving into like the setback standards and the floodplain that was mentioned in prior emails with Matt and with us. So our UDO requires that all structures be set back at least 25' from the edge of a floodplain. The plans that you're showing us show one of the silos within the floodplain, I believe and it's Zone A, so this is probably, I'm probably saying this information again redundant, but you know Zone A, basically we need to delineate what exactly where the floodway is and where the floodplain is. The state's already done that research to our understanding. When we have reached out to IDNR, they conducted, so yeah they conducted that study. You'll need to request a floodplain analysis regulatory assessment. So it sounds like you guys were already moving in that direction; great.

(?): Yes.

Niehoff: Yes? Awesome. Good deal. And then once the floodway and floodplain have been established, we can issue local permits in accordance with our flood hazard area standards for work in the floodplain only. The state still has full jurisdiction over the floodway. So if there's gonna be any cut, fill, structures, any of that in the floodway, that has to go through DNR.

(?): Current plans today, completely out of the floodway.

Niehoff: Awesome, awesome.

(?): Inaudible comment.

Niehoff: Good deal, good deal. And then....

(?): Inaudible comment.

Niehoff: What's that?

(?): That's handled through you?



Niehoff: Yes. Yeah we have a local ordinance that handles that. Basically all structures have to be elevated 2' above the established base flood area elevation, so....And then our sign standards; once you guys get to the point, we show that you are showing a sign near the entrance there. That's just handled through our permit application, so you guys will just do that when you're ready at that point. So sorry for the very lengthy list. That's all I have. I will be quiet now. Alright? Any questions?

(?): Inaudible comment.

Niehoff: Okay, alright. Thank you.

Mark Weidner: Mark Weidner with the police department. I think Mr. Niehoff's covered any possible question that I could've had and I just had some things in my mind about the perimeter fence, the traffic pattern, the parking, things like that, but I think we're good. I have no further right now.

Stonebraker: Robbie Stonebraker, Shelbyville fire. You'll see six items. I didn't see the vault on the plans showing where the vault was located for the check valve and that stuff on the plans (?) the empty(?) location was. And then confirming, I looked (?) the page for the water main stuff and you show about three different sizes. You showed a 12, an 8 and a 6 and our minimum is 8.

(?): Okay.

Stonebraker: So we'll need to confirm what that 'cause on the print, a lot of times they'll show along that water line what those main sizes were and yours your print didn't. It just showed the water. And then with that, hydrant (?) bollards protecting that type of thing by our standard. And then the one question I have, the cul-de-sac on the railroad spur where it goes back to connect with the it looks like you have a road running beside. I don't think that cul-de-sac is large enough. If we'd have a fire with a car sitting back there, I don't think it's large enough for us to turn around, so I've provided you that so you could put it in your AutoCad to confirm that.

(?): That's technically just a service road that serves that switches so is that something that we're going to be required to change?

Stonebraker: Well and again, if we have a fire back there, if you staged some cars back there and something does happen, how are we going to access that and then be able to get out? So if you're providing a road for that and then let's just say can we make the cul-de-sac large enough for us to be able to turn and get out if we do have an incident back there.

(?): You're asking us to provide a cul-de-sac large enough to turn your largest truck around?

Stonebraker: That's what the national standard is, yes.

(?): That's what the what standard is?

Stonebraker: National standard. I think we're only talking about 20', Ron. And then confirm that the hydrants have 5" Storz. I didn't see that on the plan as well.

(?): That'll be covered in our specs.

Stonebraker: Okay. That's all I've got.

(?): That (?) vault you're saying you prefer to.....

Stonebraker: I'm sorry?

(?): The (?)....(inaudible)....vault? Okay.....(inaudible)...

Stonebraker: Okay.

(?): ....(inaudible)....no parking sign (?)?

Stonebraker: Just meeting the city standards.

Inaudible mumbling.

Stonebraker: And then city standards, what that's talking about there's so many feet from a hydrant that you make no parking, that type of thing.

(?): Oh okay.

Travis Edington: Travis Edington, Indiana American Water. I just provided a couple of comments. We're still under engineering review of the site to see how it'd be best served and how to get the water main to you guys. There shouldn't be any issues meeting your timelines and your demands. Hope to have that plan finalized by the end of this week and I'll provide that to you so we can go over whatever agreements need to be come to terms. Also to give you guys a vault detail for the domestic water service. Attached it so you just might wanna make sure your vault detail matches our vault detail. And then I also supplied just our connection charges. That way you guys have our rate structure of the fees associated with the different sizes.

(?): Inaudible comment.

Edington: Yeah I seen you do have a vault detail on your plans. I just don't know if it matches 100% to ours so you might just wanna make sure that it....'cause the standard will be ours to use, so they're probably, they're very close. There's some details I don't think called out on yours that is on ours.

(?): Okay.

Edington: You might just try to match those up, please.

(?): Okay.

Edington: Thank you.

Niehoff: Anything else? Chris?

No audible reply.

Niehoff: Mr. House?

Matt House: Matt House, city engineer. I'll just go through my list here. Part of the city standards, we ask that you show the 811 Call Before you Dig symbol on the cover page or every other page. The you guys might've already talked about this, but the side ditch on the east side of the project looks like it's over the property line.

(?): Inaudible comment.

House: City standards state that ditches less than 1% have to have underdrains. Normally we don't sometimes in rural areas we don't require them, but they will your ditches over time will be wet and silt in, so.....Some of the work, okay yeah we already talked about the require construction in a floodway permit. We also talked about this, the widening of 300N will the side ditch will run into your bypass ditch, so I'd like to talk to you about that. This is all from the drainage report. You're talking about your TSS solids requirements being met by letting the water sit in the retention pond. Actually, would you mind explaining sort of how the whole thing runs real quick, like.....

(?): So after a rain event, we test all our water before we actually release (?) everything for whatever period of time.

House: And you guys do that anyways? Is that.....okay.

(?): Standard. Just in case you know we check for ethanol in the water.

House: Oh okay. That makes more sense. Okay.

(?): So start with the release....(inaudible)....

(?): Inaudible comment.

House: Okay.

(?): That's all manual.

House: And you do that other projects too? Alright. So that's not....okay. Do you have a detail of the pump anywhere?

(?): If we....(inaudible)....

House: Okay.

(?): We plan on using you guys' standard detail for your sanitary stations....(inaudible)...

House: Okay. The tile or the your outlet from your pump into the ditch, you may wanna consider adjusting the angle to where you're not pushing directly into the flow of the water. For the drainage report, please calculate the pre and post release rates for each outlet point. You've got 2, I think 2 outlet points. Number three, with the detention pond in the floodplain, please provide calculations showing the impact of a detention pond in a hundred year storm event.

(?): Inaudible comment.

House: Okay. The I'm gonna ask for more information on the time of concentrations in the sub-basin report. I think they're all the same and they should be different especially the links of them. And then the they used a maximum of 300' on all sheet flow, which if you look in TR55's instruction booklet, it's the maximum and a lot of people do do that, but it's probably not correct in all instances. And there's some, I know that some engineers believe it's too high. A lot of people are using a hundred so just explain why they're doing what they're doing. These are notes from Jerry. I've got a couple more. Okay oh the 12" fuel tile that flows under the 30" culvert there the east side of the property, it's currently flowing southwest. What's your, do you have a plan for replacing that? Or where does that go?

(?): ....(inaudible)...on the east property there?

House: Yeah where that there's a culvert crossing the road an there's just a 12" tile 8" below that.

(?): An existing tile?

House: Yep. So it'll be going through the pretty much through your drive and then.....Well actually I don't know how far the tile goes now, but I'm sure when they're digging, they'll find it. I guess if they well probably the answer he's looking for is at the end of the tile, make sure it's repaired and connected to whatever.....

(?): Inaudible comment.

House: Yeah.

(?): We addressed that in our purchase agreement....(inaudible)....

House: Okay.

(?): But we can better....(inaudible)...

House: Okay or just a note in the drainage report. Okay, alright, that's all I got. So those are my comments. And I also talked to Brad from the Waste Water Treatment Plant. He had a couple comments. All your sanitary lines, cleanouts should be 6" minimum. There's a couple, 406, 400 and there's a couple more in addition to that. And then he and actually I'm not sure about this one with the water. He's (?) already been done, but he suggested using separate water meters at the admin building and the other set of buildings with a bathroom.

(?): That's our plan.

House: Okay. So.....that's all I had.

(?): Awesome.

Niehoff: Thank you very much. We also had comments, really just a form from one other member of the committee, Vectren. They didn't have any issues, no comments, conditions, anything to add. So that's, you have a copy of that. And then the remaining members, we'll send out an email seeing if there are any outstanding comments, but I'm sure....so this is Rush/Shelby territory, correct, as far as the energy? So you guys have been in contact with them as far as what's going on there. Obviously that's a big one. But for the most part, these are the comments we have. The next step we have, basically if you could go through each of the sheets and submit written responses to where the revisions are made in the next set of plans that you'll submit to our office and submit that along with those revised plans, okay? We can talk with you about that filing deadline for the Plan Commission meeting in June, but that's quickly approaching, so you may just wanna get on top of this stuff pretty quick so that we can work with you guys in getting on that agenda. Do you guys have any outstanding questions for any member of the board here?

(?): I don't think so.....(inaudible)....

Niehoff: Okay, okay. Sure.

(?): So you're....the written responses with the new plans, do we need to provide an entire set or 11 sets of new plans or just revised sheets?

Niehoff: So typically the standard process is that we get a full new set, you know all 11 of these for the Plan Commission because the next step is to go to the Plan Commission for their approval. In some circumstances, as long as it's legible, we'll allow a smaller size because they're not reviewing them in the same detail that you know us that we are up there. They're insuring zoning compliance and that it's meeting the Technical Review Committee's comments. That's why we require the written responses in response to everyone's comments today. So if you guys, if it's legible at 11 x 17, you can provide those to us as well as the digital.

(?): We can provide whatever you would like. I was just curious.

Niehoff: Okay. Yeah.

(?): It gets to be a lot of sheets. If we're only revising 6 sheets, it's easier to send 6 sheets than 56.

Niehoff: Yeah, yeah, I understand that. Yeah we can work with you on that. I mean that shouldn't be a big issue if there are only 6 revisions. The only thing, so our Plan Commission requires hard copies. They like to sit up here and look at them. So if we have to go through and take out each of those copies, it may just be easier to print 11 x 17's revised copies of the plans if it's still legible, but we'll leave that up to you. And if you don't have any questions, we can talk afterwards about the next steps as far as the Plan Commission and BZA and if you wanna pull any of these guys aside for any questions that come up after the fact, I'm sure they'd be glad to answer 'em. So anything else?

(?): I...

Niehoff: Go ahead.

(?): I do have one more question.

Niehoff: Sure.

(?): Just because I just don't know what I don't know, right? So every sheet here, regardless of comments, essentially says approved with the exception of Indiana American Water?

Niehoff: Yes.

(?): ....(inaudible)...revise and resubmit? Which I understand where they're at in the process. However, the engineer review I'm not sure that that falls on us does it?

Edington: No other than we just wanna make sure we can serve you with what we have and work through our agreements, so I don't anticipate there being any issues at all.

(?): So from a city level, there's no this is not a hang up (?),....

Niehoff: Oh....

(?): ....when we go to the Planning Commission (?) they will one member....

Niehoff: Said revise and resubmit?

(?): Inaudible comment.

Niehoff: Yeah, no. So this is a new form that we you guys are actually the first ones to be reviewed under this form. Yeah you're our guinea pigs. You love to hear that, right? Yeah so I think there was just some confusion. I mean and correct me if I'm wrong, Travis.

Edington: I didn't mean to have anything (?) comments, so yeah.....

Niehoff: Yeah yeah so no, I don't think he needs a new set of plans.

(?): Inaudible comment.

Niehoff: Yeah, yeah.

(?): Inaudible comment.

Edington: No.

Niehoff: Yeah no and thank you for bringing that up. Yeah this is a new form that we're using so and there may be some mechanics with the fillable PDF that we just haven't covered yet. So no, I don't think there's anything. There's nothing to worry about in their regard. I'll let Travis answer that question, but....

Edington: Inaudible comment.

Niehoff: But yeah okay. So yeah if no other questions, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

(?): So moved.

Niehoff: Alright.

Byers: Second.

Niehoff: Thank you very much.

Meeting adjourned.