

# DEKALB COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

PLANNING • BUILDING • GIS

301 S. Union St., Auburn IN 46706

Planning: 260.925.1923 • Building: 260.925.3021 • GIS: 260.927.2356 • Fax: 260.927.4791

---

## AGENDA

### DeKalb County Plan Commission

Commissioners Court – 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor DeKalb County Court House

Wednesday, May 20, 2026

7:00 PM

To view the livestream, click here: <https://tinyurl.com/YouTubeDCPC>

1. Roll call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Prayer
4. Approval of Minutes: April 8, 2026
5. Consideration of Claims: April 2026

Payroll	\$29,131.39
Amazon	\$69.39
EagleView Imagery	\$56,407.50
HWC Consultant Fees	\$2,764.30
INAFSM Membership – Chris Gaumer	\$50.00
Kruse & Kruse 1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter Legal Fees	\$2,621.89
Lassus	\$279.64
Legal Ad – KPC Newspaper	\$28.00
Mileage – Cameron Rice	\$80.58
Newspaper Subscription	\$325.00
USPS – Postage Machine Refill	\$300.00
Verizon	\$83.46
WestWood Car Wash	\$10.00
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$92,151.15</b>

6. Old Business: None

7. New Business:

Petition #26-18 – During this hearing, the Plan Commission will consider a Text Amendment to establish Development Standards & Definitions for Animal Feeding Operations & Diversified, Small-Scale Agriculture. Various minor revisions may be necessary to make these amendments (IE: page numbers, section numbers, etc.)

8. Reports from Officers, Committees, Staff or Town/City Liaisons
9. Comments from Public in Attendance
10. Adjournment

Next Meeting: June 17, 2026

**If you cannot attend, please contact Meredith Reith**  
[mreith@co.dekalb.in.us](mailto:mreith@co.dekalb.in.us) | (260) 925-1923

**\*PLEASE ENTER THROUGH THE NORTH DOOR OF  
COURTHOUSE LOCATED ON SEVENTH STREET.**

**\*\*No cellphones, tablets, laptops, or weapons are permitted.**

**MINUTES**  
**DEKALB COUNTY PLAN COMMISSION**  
**Wednesday April 8, 2026**

The Regular Meeting of the DeKalb County Plan Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m. in the DeKalb County Commissioner's Courtroom by Plan Commission President, Jason Carnahan.

**ROLL CALL:**

**Members Present:** Jason Carnahan, William Van Wye, Kellen Dooley, Suzanne Davis, Angie Holt, Sandra Harrison, Jerry Yoder, Frank Pulver, and Elysia Rodgers.

**Members Absent:** Tyler Lanning

**Staff Present:** Plan Commission Attorney Andrew Kruse, Director/Zoning Administrator Chris Gaumer, and Secretary Meredith Reith

**Community Representatives Present:** Mike Makarewich

**Public in Attendance:** Chuck Knox, Jessica Harty, Sarah Delbecq, and Jared Malcolm.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

Jason Carnahan led The Pledge of Allegiance.

**PRAYER:**

Jerry Yoder led in prayer.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Motioned by Kellen Dooley to approve the February 18, 2026 meeting minutes. Seconded by Suzanne Davis. None opposed. Motion carried.

**CONSIDERATION OF CLAIMS:**

Jason Carnahan inquired about any comments, questions, or motions to approve February/March 2026 claims, totaling \$63,414.30.

Angie Holt motioned to approve claims seconded by Jason Carnahan. None opposed. Motion carried.

**OLD BUSINESS:** None

**NEW BUSINESS:**

Petition #26-11 – During this hearing, the Plan Commission will consider a Moratorium for Data Centers & the accessory facilities within the zoning jurisdiction of DeKalb County, Indiana. The purpose is for the Plan Commission & County Commissioners to gather facts & information regarding the planning & zoning, site development, potential environmental concerns and other items not yet known, as well as gather input from DeKalb County residents. After gathering information, the Plan Commission will write an Ordinance for Data Centers.

Chris Gaumer stated that in your packets you will find a copy of the ordinance that you will go to the County Commissioners because this would basically not permit data centers or their accessory facilities for a period of six months. This would be considered a zoning change, and this is why it's coming before the board today to get a recommendation to the County Commissioners. This is something that has been discussed by the Commissioners as well as the Ordinance Review Committee. This is simple and there's not much in there other than giving a recommendation to move forward. He asked Mr. Kruse if he had anything as a legal aspect that you want to add.

Andrew Kruse stated that if the county doesn't have a moratorium in place, then the committee, Commissioners, or Plan Commission works on an ordinance involving data centers and the appropriate regulations of data centers. During this if a data center would want to come in and apply while the ordinance is being written, it then would be grandfathered in with no standards in place. The only way to

prevent a data center from coming in with no specific regulations or safety, is to have a moratorium to stop development for a period. As Mr. Gaumer mentioned, it is a change to a zoning ordinance. So, even though you'd think maybe the County Commissioners could just vote on it. No, it must be brought forward and dealt with as a proposed change to the UDO. So, basically, it's a way to prevent people from filing applications and getting grandfathered in without any rules and regulations.

Mr. Carnahan added that we're proposing the moratorium for six months, so we can get this ordinance in place and all our data gathered.

Mr. Gaumer stated that Elysia and himself listened yesterday to what was sent. We attend a virtual data center webinar. It was based out of Penn State and the last 20 minutes, to a half an hour, were more Pennsylvania based laws and regulations, but the first half was very interesting. Tyler and himself will be going to a data center conference in Chicago and it's just Midwest focused for construction of and sighting of data centers and hope to gather information there as well.

Kellen Dooley asked if six months would be enough time to come up with something?

Mr. Gaumer stated that this is all that was discussed at the ordinance review committee that the committee really wanted to give as far as length of time. Obviously, it could be extended and would need to come back to the Plan Commission and the Commissioners again. This will put us at about October, and he's worked backwards with our time frame, and it would go to like the first October meeting of the Commissioners. You know a Plan Commission meeting before that and working out how we would gather public input for this as well. He believed it could be done but may be tight.

Mr. Kruse added that theoretically, you could make a request to extend it for three months more if you wanted to if needed.

Mr. Carnahan addressed the statement that as you know at the ordinance review committee, we're hoping to start writing a draft before that. He asked if there were any further questions or comments from the board.

Frank Pulver asked if there had been any discussions to have a data center come to DeKalb County.

Mr. Gaumer and Mr. Carnahan answered that they haven't.

Mr. Dooley stated that he hasn't been approached, but he just knows a lot of Commissioners that he's talked to throughout the state are being approached. This is why he wanted to get ahead of this before somebody does show up and it's not a whole solar situation again. It's just better to have something in place and see if DeKalb County is a possible place for one. He's not sure if someone may be looking at the county, but from what he understands, we're not low hanging fruit. Eventually they're going to start asking every county, to see if they can put something there. So having something in place when they come is much easier for us to just say, here's what the public says that we're okay with.

Elysia Rodgers addressed that yesterday on the webinar we watched from Penn State that according to the electrical grid and electrical usage, it was PJM. They listed northeast Indiana as one of the sections that was highlighted because of that potential for better electrical access, which is one of the four key things a data center is looking for. A quarter of what they're looking for is pinpointed here in Northeast Indiana.

Mr. Dooley added that because DeKalb's included in the PJM it kind of just carves out a little bit of Indiana and he believes that a lot of the other Indiana data centers are looking at the other power grid that's out of Chicago. But now that the Pennsylvania one's coming over, they're going to eventually ask us here. So having something in place ready to go ahead of time is way better and letting the public have an opinion on it first.

Mr. Carnahan added that we also have a good water supply which is another of the four.

Mr. Kruse stated that these buildings, as he understands it from the committee, are large buildings.

Mrs. Rodgers stated that there were about five different stages of what they call data centers. Everywhere from what they call Bitcoin, which is like the smallest that looks like someone's backyard shed, up to what they call the hyper scale, which are the 100,000 square foot plus 100 to 100,00 acres and with 10,000 plus servers. So, this is kind of the scale you have, and it could be smaller or larger.

Mr. Yoder asked, wouldn't the large one that's going south of New Haven take up a portion of southern DeKalb County.

Mr. Gaumer addressed that he wasn't aware and there will be different types of data centers. Like Microsoft, Amazon, and Google would all have their own. Obviously, he didn't know if anyone did. But one thing Commissioner Miller brought to us was that a professor can come and speak to the plan commission. The meetings that he's worked backwards in, and he's noted at he would like him to come and talk to the plan commission and allow the public to hear him to ask questions as well. Maybe not having it as let's present an ordinance but just have information that you all can ask that obviously we don't know the answer to. Writing an ordinance that you maybe don't want Amazon or Google or Microsoft size data centers, but we're okay with other smaller organizations that may need data centers. Like Elysia said, there were five different levels, based off size and energy capacity and or energy usage, water usage, and building size. There are various sizes we could include or even exclude. It's just too soon to have these discussions right now.

Mrs. Rodgers added that once she gets a link to the recording, she will send it out to everyone to review.

Suzanne Davis added that a lot of the downsides of data centers are well documented because they've been out there for a while now. So, people know what all the things they hate about them are. That would be a good starting point to see what the problems are.

Mr. Pulver asked so the one in New Haven, you say, is quite large.

Mr. Dooley answered that it's on the biggest ones and they purchased 1,200 acres. But not all data centers are that way is what we're trying to say. There's a wide range of data centers and they can include about 20 acres or all the way up to 1,200. The question is whether the committee is going to have to decide where we want to fall. There is a lot of Bitcoin, and the government is also spreading out their AI of drones and all the stuff that they use for warfare now. They will need data centers as they're trying to spread it across counties. For example, if you bomb one area you take out all their AI. The range is so different and when you think about them, don't always think about Goggle and it's just this massive 1,200 square foot one. You could have it all the way down to the size of Dollar General.

Mrs. Rodgers added that they also consider Parkview Health. She's sure they probably don't have all their servers within the same building as the main hospital. They probably have their own data center slightly offsite. This is what they call enterprise or regional type data centers.

Mr. Kruse asked if the water usage and electric usage scale with the size.

Mr. Gaumer stated that it does, and the smaller ones use little to no water. They will use more gel cooling racks. The others can use up to 150,000 gallons of water a day and it just depends.

Mr. Dooley addressed that this is why it's important to get this document together and this ordinance in place because there's a wide range of types of Data Centers. So, when people hear data centers, they always think of the massive, huge ones. We don't want that, but there's also smaller ones that are the size of Dollar General. As we go forward with more AI. He has followed the Ukraine war closely and they use AI for everything over there. This is how Warfare is going to go forward. They're going to need more data centers for AI. The question is what we want to see here in DeKalb County.

Mr. Carnahan asked if there was any more discussion from the board. Hearing none. He opened the public portion of the hearing up to any comments for or against this petition.

Jessica Harty approached the podium thanking the board for being proactive and taking time to review data centers. She addressed that she would have many things to say in the future when we start producing ordinances, but for right now that's really it. She asked everyone to make sure they get extremely educated on the situation and how data centers work. She thanked everyone again for being proactive in this and it makes her feel good.

Chuck Knox approached the podium and stated that he wanted to echo Ms. Harty's comments. He noted that there is a lot of valuable information being shared and emphasized that the size of data centers can vary significantly, explaining that not all facilities will be as large as Google's operations. Within the past month, he had the opportunity to tour a data center, which he found very enlightening. This facility did not use water for cooling instead; it relied on air-cooling systems to maintain appropriate temperatures within the building. He explained that the business model involves renting space for servers. These facilities receive electricity, convert it into a usable format, and provide it to clients who need data services. Examples included banking and gaming operations, as well as one tenant he could not access and assumed may have been military related. He stated that the economic benefit to a community from such facilities can be substantial and expressed that the community would be remiss not to explore opportunities that could bring similar value locally. He believed it is possible to pursue this type of development while still protecting residents and the water supply. He also commented that Indiana Michigan Power (I&M) is doing a good job implementing tariffs for large users. These tariffs help offset rising rates and ultimately benefit residents. He contrasted this with NIPSCO, stating that the company is currently facing significant challenges. He recently attended a regulatory commission meeting in New Haven that included NIPSCO union members, noting that the meeting was quite contentious unlike the current discussion, which he appreciated. He concluded by saying he looks forward to seeing what the board develops on this issue.

Mr. Carnahan asked if there were any further comments from the public. Hearing None. He closed the public portion of the hearing. He asked if the board had any more questions.

**IT IS, THEREFORE, THE DECISION OF THE PLAN COMMISSION THAT THIS MORATORIUM, PETITION #26-11 FOR DATA CENTERS, IS HERBY GRANTED A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS ON THIS 8<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF APRIL 2026.**

Motion made by: Suzanne Davis

Seconded by: Sandra Harrison

Vote tally: Yes: 8

No: 0

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jason Carnahan

\_\_\_\_\_  
William Van Wye

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kellen Dooley

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sandra Harrison

\_\_\_\_\_  
Suzanne Davis

\_\_\_\_\_  
Angie Holt

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jerry Yoder

\_\_\_\_\_  
Frank Pulver

**REPORTS FROM OFFICERS, COMMITTEES, STAFF OR TOWN/CITY LIANSONS:**

Mrs. Davis informed the board about a recent City of Auburn meeting that included two rezonings from residential to institutional. The first rezoning involved the Classic City Center. The current owner had purchased an adjacent property that was zoned residential and requested it be rezoned to institutional to match the existing Classic City Center zoning. She questioned why the county wasn't handling the request and learned that the property is located within the ETJ, giving the city jurisdiction. The second rezoning involved the property at 703 S. Main Street. The petitioner, Weber Law Group plans to purchase the residential property and convert it into a law office. A rezoning to institutional was requested, which was consistent with the surrounding uses, including the nearby community center and church. Both rezoning requests were approved.

Angie Holt informed the board about a City of Waterloo meeting held on March 16. Much of the discussion focused on the realization that NIPSCO has been installing new utility poles without seeking required approval. The town referenced a 2017 resolution stating that approval is required before installing poles. Waterloo is currently evaluating whether the work involved replacement of existing poles or the placement of new ones, as the town has made efforts to reduce the number of poles and move utilities underground to support beautification efforts. The town plans to get approvals through the plan commission and town council. She suggested reaching out to other towns or cities to understand how they manage similar situations, including whether to create a new ILP application specific to utilities or use an existing petition process through the plan commission. Additional discussion addressed pole ownership and maintenance. The utility located lowest on a pole typically owns it, while other utilities attach and relocate as needed, raising questions about maintenance responsibilities and compliance. The town is working to clarify these issues and ensure utilities such as NIPSCO and Frontier submit proper applications and obtain the necessary approvals for existing and future installations.

Mrs. Harrison informed the board that the Town of Hamilton had to cancel their meeting last month, because they couldn't get a quorum. There's supposed to be a meeting on Monday night. The City of Butler had to reschedule their meeting from last month and they're going to have a meeting at the end of the month. Mr. Gaumer stated that there should be one tomorrow and he will confirm to make sure this is true.

Mr. Yoder informed the board that he attended St. Joe's meeting, and they voted in five members on their board. They have yet to be able to find a Democrat or someone that will finish out their board. Basically, they're not getting anything done. They wanted to know if it would be possible for them to get around this if they can't find an independent or a Democrat within their boundaries.

Mr. Gaumer addressed that this is an Indiana Code and would have to take it up with the state.

Mr. Kruse added that he knows there's some of those codes that say you can reach out to your local Republican or Democratic chair and see if they'll wave the requirements. He added that these statutes don't. He believed that a park board could do that.

Mrs. Davis stated that we did this with the assessment appeals and Sheila Stonebraker always asked for a waiver. She will remind Lindsey, after you mentioned this the last time, Jerry, she mentioned it to the chair and she said she thought she might know someone, so she will remind her.

Mr. Yoder added that they pursued this, but they came up empty handed. He said that they do have five and will have a quorum. Is there something keeping them from starting to do business until they find someone.

Mr. Gaumer addressed that we can't give them legal advice and if they have quorum, they can do business. He said that they need to rely heavily on their attorney, for legal advice.

Mr. Kruse added that they need a legal opinion on whether they can operate without it.

Mr. Yoder stated that they have such a small population that they're trying to draw out from.

Mr. Kruse addressed that theoretically, you could have somebody that shows up a couple times a year.

Mr. Gaumer added they need to look at their rules of procedure as to what they require because ours requires people to meet and show up for a certain number of meetings.

Mrs. Davis stated that the other thing might be since they have that huge ETJ, you know, the Auburn Plan Commission has two people that must be residents. So maybe they can expand that a little.

Mr. Gaumer added that this is the same thing. So, they have to have the two members from the ETJ and are struggling to find the Democrat or Independent.

William Van Wye stated that he didn't hear anything from Ashley or Corunna.

Mr. Pulver stated that there was no meeting for the City of Garrett.

**COMMENTS/QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE:**

None

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Jason Carnahan adjourned the meeting at 7:31 p.m.

---

President – Jason Carnahan

---

Secretary – Meredith Reith

*This staff report is prepared by the DeKalb County Department of Development Services to provide information to the Plan Commission to assist them in making a decision on this Amendment to Ordinance Text to the Unified Development Ordinance – Article 9.05. It may also be useful to members of the public interested in this Amendment to Ordinance Text proposal.*

**PETITIONER:** DeKalb County Plan Commission

**ARTICLE SECTIONS:** Article 11: Definitions  
Article 2: Zoning Districts  
Article 5: Development Standards

**PROPOSED TEXT CHANGE:**

**Article 11: Definitions:**

**Animal Feeding Operation:** a facility where animals are kept and raised in confined situations for at least 45 days in any 12-month period, and the area used for the operation does not sustain crops or vegetation during the normal growing season. May include barns, feed storage structures, manure storage facilities, and other infrastructure designed for sustained production. May share the same parcel as a single-family residence and other uses, as permitted by the Unified Development Ordinance.

**Diversified, Small-Scale Agriculture:** The use of residential or limited agricultural land for a variety of small-scale agricultural activities conducted primarily for personal use, education (including programs such as 4-H), or household self-sufficiency, and not as a primary source of income. Such activities may include the raising of domestic farm animals, dairying, pasturage, apiculture, horticulture, floriculture, viticulture, and general livestock husbandry.

This use is considered accessory to the primary residential use of the property and may include the care and raising of animals and the cultivation of agricultural products. Limited handling of products may occur; however, large-scale processing, commercial storage, or distribution beyond what is allowed for a home-based vendor per Indiana Code 16-42-5.3 and enforced by local health department, is not permitted.

Diversified, small-scale agriculture shall not include:

1. Commercial animal feeding operations or those meeting or exceeding regulatory thresholds established by the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) for Confined Feeding Operations (CFOs);
2. Contract livestock growing operations;
3. Feedlots, stockyards, or the commercial feeding of garbage or offal to animals.

Such use shall comply with applicable zoning requirements, including setbacks and land-use limitations, and shall remain clearly secondary to residential use.

**Hobby Farming:** The use of land for purposes, including: dairying, pasturage, apiculture, agriculture, horticulture, floriculture, viticulture, and animal and poultry husbandry. Processing and storage of harvested produce or other end products shall not be allowed on site. The hobby farming use(s) shall not exceed 40% of the land area of the lot and shall abide by all setback regulations. Hobby farming cannot be the principal income source for the owner, operator or household on site. Hobby farming shall not include feed lots, stock yards, or the commercial feeding of garbage or offal to swine or other animals.

## Article 2: Zoning Districts:

Add to Permitted Uses in A1, A2, A3, A4:

- Animal Feeding Operation

Add to Permitted Uses in A1, A2, A3, A4 & RE:

- Diversified, Small-Scale Agriculture

Remove From Permitted Uses in A1, A2, A3, A4 & Special Exception RE:

- ~~Raising of Farm Animals~~ (to be combined with Hobby Farming & renamed Diversified, Small-Scale Agriculture)

## Development Standards (Article 5):

5.03 AFO-01: Animal Feeding Operations; General

This Animal Feeding Operation Standards section applies to the following zoning districts: A1, A2, A3 & A4

The following Animal Feeding Operation standards apply:

1. The animal thresholds shall be as follows:
  - a. 25 – 299 cattle & calves
  - b. 50 – 599 swine or small ruminants (sheep & goats)
  - c. 100 – 29,999 poultry (chickens, turkeys, or ducks, including broilers or laying hens)
  - d. 10 – 499 horses
2. All front; side and rear yard setbacks shall be a minimum of one hundred (100) feet from property lines
3. A minimum setback shall be a minimum of three hundred (300) feet from any adjacent residential zoning district in existence at the time of establishing the animal feeding operation.

## JUSTIFICATION:

Animal Feeding Operations are facilities and operations that fall below the threshold of the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) Confined Feeding Operation regulations. Within the DeKalb County Unified Development Ordinance (UDO), these operations are currently classified under the “Raising of Farm Animals” use and are permitted by right in the A1, A2, A3, and A4 zoning districts, and by Special Exception (Board of Zoning Appeals) in the RE district.

Although permitted by right, these operations are subject to review by the Technical Review Committee through the Improvement Location Permit (ILP) application process. As part of this process, the following departments review and approve applicable components of the project:

- Health Department: Reviews septic system connections when applicable. In many cases, this is not required due to the absence of restroom facilities.
- Highway Department: Reviews and approves new driveway access points to County Roads. For access onto State Roads, the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) provides review and permitting. The Highway Department does not regulate vehicle types or traffic using the roadway.
- County Surveyor/Drainage Board: Reviews and approves drainage plans and regulates off-site water flow.
- Soil and Water Conservation District: Reviews and inspects the Soil Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and ensures compliance with IDEM’s Construction Stormwater General Permit (CSGP) for erosion and sediment control.

Upon receipt of all required approvals, the ILP is issued. These departments operate under their own regulatory authority and are not governed by the Plan Commission or the UDO.

The Ordinance Review Committee was tasked with evaluating this use and developing enforceable standards for Animal Feeding Operations. The Committee considered several regulatory approaches, including minimum

acreage requirements with increased setbacks, minimum acreage with existing setbacks, and increased setbacks alone.

After review, the Committee determined that the most effective approach is to establish increased setbacks in conjunction with defined animal unit thresholds. In addition, the Committee is proposing new definitions for “Animal Feeding Operation” and “Diversified Small-Scale Agriculture.”

The Committee finds that these proposed standards will help minimize land use conflicts with neighboring properties while still allowing operators to reasonably utilize their land in compliance with the required setbacks.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Staff recommends that the proposed text amendment be certified by the Plan Commission with a favorable recommendation to the DeKalb County Commissioners.

**UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE REQUIREMENTS:**

When considering a Textual Amendment, the DeKalb County Plan Commission and the County Commissioners are obligated — under Section 9.05 G (2) of the DeKalb County Unified Development Ordinance — to pay reasonable regard to the following:

- a. The Comprehensive Plan;
- b. Current conditions and the character of current structures and uses in each district;
- c. The most desirable use for which the land in each district is adapted;
- d. The conservation of property values throughout the jurisdiction; and
- e. Responsible development and growth.

**JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS:**

- 1. The petitioner has complied with the rules and regulations of the Plan Commission in filing appropriate forms and reports.
  - a. Legal notice published in The Star on **May 8, 2026** and Publishers Affidavit given to staff.

**Commercial Ag Barns (under IDEM CFO #'s ONLY)**

<u>Date Issued</u>	<u>Property Owner</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Acreage</u>	<u>Building Size (sq. ft.)</u>	<u>Animal Type</u>	<u>Head Count</u>	<u>Nearest Residence Foundation (feet)</u>
6/26/2020	David Schwartz	5785 CR 64, Spencerville	30	5000	Calf	less than 300	approx 200
10/20/2020	Boger Farms	7170 CR 71, Spencerville	60	26880	Calf	less than 300	approx 1000
6/17/2022	Martin Graber	6986 CR 62, Spencerville	20	5936	Calf	less than 300	approx 100
10/17/2022	Country Road Farms	7953 CR 64, Spencerville	150	12000	Storage & Cattle	less than 300	approx 900
3/13/2024	Elmer Miller	7136 SR 101, Spencerville	16.6	32032	Chicken	27000	approx 1500
6/21/2024	Darrin Schmucker	4921 CR 52, Auburn	40	32032	Chicken	27000	approx 450
9/10/2024	James Zehr	4673 CR 46A, Auburn	26.95	34770	Chicken	27500	approx 800
12/5/2024	Brandon Zehr	5318 CR 45, Auburn	34.59	34730	Chicken	27500	apprx 700
3/24/2025	Jonas Graber	4677 CR 64, Auburn	28	36512	Chicken	27000	approx 450
7/3/2025	Michael Schmucker	7897 CR 26, Butler	40	15503	Cattle	298	approx 1400
10/7/2025	Leon Schwartz	5449 CR 52, St Joe	20	36256	Chicken	27500	approx 650
3/19/2026	Jon Brandenberger	3975 SR 8, Auburn	47.232	18600	Cattle	250	approx 450
4/7/2026	Harvey Graber	7134 CR 61, Spencerville	12.46	27440	Chicken	25000	approx 330

\*\*Gray rows are before "complaints"