

PROJECT TYPE <b>Solar</b>	STATUS <b>Complete</b>	MEGAWATTS <b>900</b>	DATE <b>April 17, 2026</b>
------------------------------	---------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------------

### Feasibility Assessment



Pulaski County is feasible for a 900 MW solar build, but it is a hard market, and the weighted score of -0.46 places it below neutral. The county is legally open to utility-scale solar under Ordinance No. 2025-03, which keeps commercial solar as a permitted use in A-1 and A-2 and as a permitted use in P-D, so this is not a moratorium jurisdiction. The limiting factor is not basic legality; it is the county’s mature opposition environment after Mammoth Solar and Moss Creek Solar. Pulaski is now a litigation-aware, process-heavy venue where every hearing record, drainage plan, and setback justification will be challenged.

The key positive is that the current ordinance framework is stronger and more predictable than the pre-2022 regime that produced Mammoth Solar a/k/a Starke Solar LLC v. Ehrlich and Moss Creek Solar, LLC v. Ehrlich. The 2022 solar amendments, now recodified in Ordinance No. 2025-03, give a clearer pathway, and the county still supports economic-development agreements through Indiana’s ERA deduction structure, subject to Ordinance 2024-03 and Economic Development Commission review. Grid position is also a real asset: Pulaski sits in NIPSCO territory and is framed by major 345 kV infrastructure, including the Reynolds Substation and the Olive-Reynolds corridor, which keeps transmission-led siting viable. The negatives are just as clear: organized resistance led by Pulaski County Against Solar figures such as Connie Ehrlich and Gail Lambert, cumulative-project fatigue, and meaningful land constraints from wetlands, shallow groundwater, and drainage-sensitive farmland.

The top risks are entitlement delay, record-based court challenge, and engineering conflict with wetlands and field drainage. The mitigations are specific. Site only in low-conflict areas of the unincorporated county outside the Francesville and Winamac extraterritorial jurisdictions; complete fatal-flaw screening for wetlands, tile systems, flood-prone soils, road access, and substation/collector routing before expanding land acquisition; and build a record that exceeds county minimums on vegetative screening, setbacks, drainage protection, decommissioning security, and road-use obligations. Do not lead with a single monolithic 900 MW entitlement package. In Pulaski County, phasing is a permitting strategy. A smaller first phase anchored to clean acreage and credible interconnection is the right way to defuse scale-based opposition and show the county a controlled project rather than another Mammoth-scale fight.

The development team should immediately lock the commercial pathway—utility-owned/rate-based versus independent power producer—because a public-utility project triggers the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission CPCN process under Ind. Code § 8-1-8.5-2, while an independent project remains primarily a county-plus-PJM exercise. In parallel, start pre-application work with planning staff, the Advisory Plan Commission, the Board of Commissioners, and the Pulaski County Economic Development Commission, and structure the tax package under Ordinance 2024-03 instead of assuming a standard solar PILOT exists. Expect 12-18 months for local approvals on a well-sited first phase and 36-60 months to first energization once PJM interconnection and any network upgrades are factored in. The likelihood of success is moderate for a phased, transmission-led project with disciplined outreach and a litigation-ready record, and poor for a single-shot 900 MW filing that treats Pulaski as a routine solar county

### Community Sentiment

#### Community Sentiment and Opposition History

Pulaski County remains open to utility-scale solar, but community sentiment is no longer well described as merely “divided.” It is organized, procedural, and increasingly shaped by cumulative-project fatigue. The conflict began with Mammoth Solar, whose original special-exception approval drew packed hearings in August 2020, and continued with Moss Creek Solar, which the Pulaski County Board of Zoning Appeals approved on September 27, 2021. Both approvals were then challenged in court. In *Mammoth Solar a/k/a Starke Solar LLC v. Ehrlich*, Court of Appeals Case No. 21A-PL-2060, the Indiana Court of Appeals

affirmed reversal of the original Mammoth approval. In *Moss Creek Solar, LLC v. Ehrlich*, Court of Appeals Case No. 22A-PL-2648, the court reversed the trial court on June 19, 2023 and reinstated the Moss Creek approval. That history matters because it established permit appeals and record-based challenges as a normal part of solar politics in Pulaski County. [wndu.com](http://wndu.com)

The substance of the opposition has remained remarkably consistent. Residents have repeatedly objected to conversion of productive farmland, loss of rural character, visual impacts, and property-value risk. Connie Ehrlich raised those concerns during the early Mammoth and Moss Creek fights. By July 28, 2025, the same themes were still driving local resistance, with Gail Lambert telling ABC57 that large-scale solar would erase the county's rural atmosphere and Ehrlich warning that land once available for cash rent was being committed to developers. Grist likewise reported that the "Pulaski County Against Solar Project" Facebook group had more than 500 members, confirming that the opposition is durable and organized rather than episodic. [wndu.com](http://wndu.com)

Support has also been durable, but it has come from a narrower coalition: participating landowners, renewable-energy advocates, and county economic-development officials. Hoosiers for Renewables spoke in favor of Mammoth at the 2020 hearing. Grist reported that some landowners viewed solar leases as a stabilizing alternative to volatile crop returns. County development leadership has stayed publicly supportive because the fiscal upside is material. In September 2024, Nathan Origer called solar "a great step forward in economic diversification." Community Development Commission minutes approved on February 11, 2025 reported that Pulaski County had already received \$500,400 in advance payments from Mammoth and Moss Creek. The county's 2026 comprehensive-plan R.F.P. materials now project \$105 million to \$126 million in solar-related economic-development payments over roughly 25 years from four developers and describe those payments as a cushion against the effects of Senate Enrolled Act 1 of 2025. [wndu.com](http://wndu.com)

### **2025–2026 Regulatory Tightening**

That combination of fiscal interest and persistent remonstrance produced a clear tightening of county policy in 2025. On March 3, 2025, the commissioners adopted Ordinance No. 2025-03, amending the Unified Development Ordinance. The amendment expanded pre-application notice by requiring certified mail to property owners within the defined area or up to 2,640 feet before a commercial solar filing; strengthened buffering in UDO § 7.14.B.3 by requiring landscaping along road frontage and toward habitable dwellings on non-participating properties within one-half mile; tightened setbacks in UDO Table 7.3 to 150 feet from any CSES component, including site fencing, to a non-participating property line or right-of-way; required reapplication for material layout changes and parcel swaps under UDO § 7.16.A; and added post-construction road-repair obligations in UDO § 7.20.A.1. The same day, the commissioners adopted Ordinance No. 2025-05, which raised the solar application fee to \$15,000 plus \$1,000 per MW, imposed a 10% surcharge on third-party compliance-monitoring costs, and added a one-time \$10,000 agreement-development fee. For a 900 MW project, the ordinance-level filing charge alone would therefore be \$915,000 before third-party review costs. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)

The county then moved from writing stricter rules to enforcing them. In January 2025, the county council created dedicated funds for solar payments and compliance-monitoring receipts after the county arranged for VS Engineering to oversee compliance on Mammoth, Moss Creek, Bottlebrush, and Mayapple and to receive public complaints. On April 14, 2025, the commissioners passed Ordinance No. 2025-08 regulating county-road use for commercial solar and renewable-energy construction, with fines of not less than \$1,000 per trip per mile and sheriff enforcement, effective May 2, 2025. At the June 2, 2025 commissioners meeting, the building department reported a stop-work order issued to Mammoth over setback questions involving fencing, and the board lifted that order on a 2-1 vote after the county attorney advised that the ordinance language was ambiguous. Public comment that night again came from Connie Ehrlich, Gail Lambert, Casey Lowry, and Jamie Murray, all focused on setbacks and whether the county was enforcing its own rules consistently. [wkvi.com](http://wkvi.com)

The summer of 2025 confirmed that Pulaski County's solar disputes had not burned out with construction. A public notice for BZA Docket No. 07282025-01 challenged the building inspector's refusal to revoke Building Permit No. 4242, issued February 25, 2025 for part of Mammoth South, and the refusal to issue a stop-work order. On July 28, 2025, the BZA denied that appeal after determining that the relevant decommissioning, road-use, and financial-assurance documents existed before the permit was granted. On the same date, ABC57 reported that Doral had already presented a new 945 MW proposal, "Mammoth Grazing Lands and Pastures," to the county council on July 14, 2025. The sequence is significant. Even after years of hearings, litigation, and active construction, additional acreage still triggered organized appeals and renewed calls for caps and limits. [pulaskijournal.com](http://pulaskijournal.com)

### **Current Outlook for a 900 MW Solar Proposal**

The most recent identified solar-specific action is the APC special meeting reported on March 20, 2026. At that meeting, county officials reviewed further UDO revisions that included stronger landscaping protections, road-damage repair requirements,

drainage and disaster-mitigation provisions, and an 8% cap concept. Residents packed the room and shifted the debate even further toward emergency-management issues, raising concerns about tornado debris, wind-resistance assumptions, and whether the county had the capacity to manage cleanup after a major storm event. Commenters also urged a moratorium on new solar development, and the APC planned additional discussion on April 8. The recent direction of travel is therefore clear even without a formal solar ban: Pulaski County is still considering how to narrow the conditions under which any additional utility-scale solar acreage should proceed. [pulaskionline.org](https://pulaskionline.org)

For a new 900 MW solar proposal, the practical reading of Pulaski County is mixed but cautionary. The county still values solar revenue, still maintains project-document portals for Mammoth, Moss Creek, Bottlebrush, Mayapple, and Mammoth Grazing Lands, and still relies on outside compliance monitoring rather than a countywide solar moratorium. But the county has also adopted materially stricter ordinance text, materially higher fees, and road-use penalties, all against the backdrop of repeat opponents who know how to litigate, appeal permits, and use public meetings to press for additional restrictions. The better inference from the 2025–2026 record is not that Pulaski County has closed to solar. It is that any 900 MW filing would enter a saturated political environment in which cumulative-acreage concerns, setbacks, buffering, road and drainage compliance, emergency-response planning, and visible community-benefit commitments will be central from the outset. [pulaskionline.org](https://pulaskionline.org)

## Economic Analysis

### Tax Treatment and PILOT Agreements

Pulaski County has not used a standardized solar PILOT schedule. It has used Indiana’s Economic Revitalization Area and assessed-value deduction framework under Ind. Code § 6-1.1-12.1, paired with negotiated economic-development agreements. County policy tightened in July 2024 through Ordinance 2024-03, which requires a completed application, a fee, and a recommendation from the Pulaski County Economic Development Commission for non-residential abatements outside municipal limits. On the tax side, Indiana treats utility-scale solar differently from ordinary farmland. House Enrolled Act 1348 added utility-grade solar to the public-utility assessment framework, capped the assessed value of land under and around the fixed solar equipment at the regional “solar land base rate,” and placed Pulaski County in the North District. The North District solar land base rate was \$13,000 per acre for the January 1, 2022 and January 1, 2023 assessment dates and \$13,700 per acre for the January 1, 2025 assessment date. Purdue’s Indiana property-tax guidance likewise explains that utility-scale solar equipment is assessed as depreciable personal property, subject to the statutory 30% floor, while the land value steps up sharply from agricultural assessment levels. [pulaskionline.org](https://pulaskionline.org)

The Pulaski precedents are now clear. In January 2022, Moss Creek Solar’s 200 MW project was approved with a ten-year, 100% abatement schedule and a separate economic-development agreement requiring \$6.0 million of payments to the County in eight \$750,000 installments, with the first payment due within 60 days after commercial operation. The County’s January 10, 2022 minutes state that roughly 95% of the project would be utility distributable property, that the land beneath the panels would be assessed at almost \$13,000 per acre and would not be abatable, and that Baker Tilly estimated \$17.2 million of taxes with the abatement versus \$27.6 million without it over twenty years. In June 2023, Bottlebrush Solar’s 200 MW project followed the same basic structure: a ten-year abatement and \$10.0 million of unrestricted economic-development payments in ten annual \$1.0 million installments after COD. Earlier, during the County’s December 13, 2021 joint session, the Mammoth Solar proposal for approximately 900 MW in Pulaski County was presented as seeking a twenty-year, 100% abatement with \$34,628,894 of economic-development payments over the same twenty-year term. The negotiating pattern is therefore not a flat \$/MW PILOT. It is a bespoke combination of abatement, non-abatable solar-land assessment, and front-end or post-COD cash payments to the County. [gov.pulaskionline.org](https://gov.pulaskionline.org)

### State Incentives

Indiana’s state-level solar incentive regime is comparatively thin. The state does not impose a mandatory renewable portfolio standard. Indiana instead adopted a voluntary clean energy standards program under Ind. Code § 8-1-37. The published targets were 4% for 2013-2018, 7% for 2019-2024, and 10% for 2025. Indiana’s own 2024 Priority Climate Action Plan states that the state had already exceeded the 2025 voluntary target by 2021. For a large merchant solar project in Pulaski County, that means state policy is supportive but not demand-forcing. The project cannot rely on a binding state RPS to create incremental REC or offtake value. [in.gov](https://in.gov)

The practical state incentives are tax classification rules and discretionary economic-development support. Indiana Department of Revenue Bulletin #51 provides sales-and-use-tax relief for qualifying “production plant” or “power production” expenditures by electric utilities or power subsidiaries, but that relief turns on taxpayer status and asset classification; it is not a universal solar exemption available to every project company. Local abatement remains the more dependable Indiana incentive for a utility-scale solar sponsor. Indiana has also shown a willingness to support very large Pulaski-area solar through project-specific

incentives. When the state announced Mammoth's next phase in northwest Indiana, the Indiana Economic Development Corporation committed up to \$300,000 in performance-based tax credits and up to \$1,225,000 from the Industrial Development Grant Fund for surrounding infrastructure in Starke and Pulaski counties. For a 900 MW Pulaski project, the state incentive story is therefore supplemental, not foundational. [in.gov](https://www.in.gov)

## Federal Incentives

For a new utility-scale solar project placed in service after December 31, 2024, the legacy § 48 investment tax credit has been replaced by the technology-neutral § 48E Clean Electricity Investment Credit. The IRS states that the base credit is 6% of qualified investment and increases to 30% if prevailing wage and registered apprenticeship requirements are satisfied. The IRS also confirms a 10-percentage-point adder for energy communities and, for projects meeting the domestic-content rules, a further increase. For a large project, the domestic-content adder is economically meaningful only if labor compliance is achieved, because IRS guidance states the adder is 10 percentage points when prevailing wage and apprenticeship requirements are met, but only 2 percentage points if they are not. The credit is transferable, and elective pay is available for applicable entities. [irs.gov](https://www.irs.gov)

Two federal limits matter immediately. First, the low-income communities bonus under § 48E(h) is not a realistic path for a single 900 MW facility. The IRS program is limited to facilities with maximum net output of less than 5 MW and provides only a 10% or 20% increase after allocation of annual program capacity. Second, federal timing risk is now material. IRS instructions published for the clean electricity production credit state that applicable solar facilities must begin construction on or before July 4, 2026, or be placed in service before 2028, and separate IRS guidance published in 2025 states that the § 48E clean electricity investment credit terminates for applicable solar facilities placed in service after December 31, 2027. That makes construction-start timing, safe-harboring, and procurement strategy central financing assumptions for any 900 MW Indiana solar deal now moving through development. [irs.gov](https://www.irs.gov)

## Landowner Economics

Landowner economics in northwest Indiana are strong enough to remain a durable source of local project support. Reuters reported that solar leases in Indiana and surrounding states were running about \$900 to \$1,500 per acre per year, typically with annual escalators. The Indiana Farm Bureau's solar-lease guidance uses annual escalation language of 2.5% as a model term, which is consistent with current market practice for long-term utility-scale leases. Pulaski County comparables align with that general picture. The County's combined Mammoth-plus-Moss economic-impact study projected \$5.3 million of annual land-rent payments to Pulaski County residents once those projects are operating, and Bottlebrush told the County Council that it expected to pay \$35 million to participating landowners over the life of its contract. For a 900 MW project, lease economics will be one of the most important local political variables because payments accrue directly to a concentrated group of Pulaski landowners over decades, not just during construction. [investing.com](https://www.investing.com)

## Community Benefits

Pulaski County's solar benefit model has developed in a practical sequence. The earliest emphasis was on impact containment. Moss Creek's package included not only the tax abatement and \$6 million economic-development agreement, but also reimbursement of County fees and studies up to \$105,000 and separate road-use and drainage-repair obligations referenced in the project documents and County minutes. Mammoth's 2021 joint-session record shows the same progression: shared-risk provisions, a road-use agreement with set payments for ditches and crossroads, and a decommissioning agreement were all discussed alongside the tax package. Bottlebrush then advanced through its own road-use agreement in September 2023. In Pulaski, "community benefits" have therefore meant protected roads, reimbursed public costs, decommissioning security, and unrestricted public revenue. [pulaskionline.org](https://www.pulaskionline.org)

The cash side of those benefits has also grown as the County's bargaining position matured. Moss Creek offered \$6 million of County payments. Bottlebrush offered \$10 million of unrestricted-use County payments. Mammoth was later described by the Indiana Economic Development Corporation as delivering \$40 million to Pulaski County over twenty years, while the state paired the project with infrastructure grant support for Starke and Pulaski counties. The current Pulaski template is therefore not a retail community-solar subscription model. It is a negotiated host-community package built around unrestricted County revenue, infrastructure protection, consultant-cost reimbursement, and compliance monitoring. A 900 MW project should expect Pulaski to negotiate on those terms. [gov.pulaskionline.org](https://www.gov.pulaskionline.org)

## Economic Impact

The closest Pulaski County benchmark for a 900 MW solar project is the County's own Mammoth-plus-Moss economic-impact study. That study evaluated the combined 900 MW Mammoth proposal and 200 MW Moss Creek project and projected a 36-

month development period with \$1.3 billion of total spending, \$141.6 million of local construction impact, 1,823 construction job-years, and \$107.5 million of construction-period earnings. Once operational, it projected 20 on-site workers earning an average of \$69,600 per year, 51 total permanent jobs in the County after multiplier effects, \$98.1 million of annual economic impact, and \$5.3 million of annual land-rent payments to residents. Because that comparator is 1,100 MW in the same county and under the same agricultural and labor-market conditions, a standalone 900 MW project belongs in the same order of magnitude but somewhat below those totals. The important point is structural: the construction phase is large, visible, and labor intensive; the operating phase is revenue rich but employment light. [gov.pulaskionline.org](http://gov.pulaskionline.org)

Moss Creek's separate 200 MW Purdue study confirms the same pattern from a different methodology. Purdue estimated \$216 million of capital investment, \$119.1 million of local construction-phase output, \$22.9 million of local labor income, and 467 local construction jobs, followed by 60 employment-years of local operations-and-maintenance activity over the project's 30-year life and \$52.2 million of long-run local output. County minutes for the same project described the direct permanent staffing expectation even more plainly: about two permanent jobs at roughly \$65,000 to \$70,000 per year. For diligence purposes, a 900 MW Pulaski project should therefore be underwritten as a major short-term construction employer and a major long-term tax-and-landowner cashflow asset, but not as a major permanent-job generator. [pcrd.purdue.edu](http://pcrd.purdue.edu)

## Environmental And Land Use

### Environmental Constraints

#### Wetlands

Wetlands are a first-order siting constraint in Pulaski County. Indiana's county-level National Wetlands Inventory summary identifies **11,725 acres of wetland habitat** and **867 acres of deepwater habitat** in Pulaski County, with **forested wetlands (7,241 acres)** as the dominant class, followed by **wet meadow (2,204 acres)** and **shallow marsh (1,383 acres)**. The county's own comprehensive plan ties that pattern to the local landscape: the **Tippecanoe River** and **Big Monon Creek** drain most of the county, and the western half is characterized by **sandy and loamy soils, shallow aquifers, and a water table near the surface in many places**, conditions the plan describes as highly susceptible to groundwater contamination. For a 900 MW solar layout, NWI mapping is only the first screen. Jurisdictional delineation, drainage compatibility, and construction-phase sediment control will drive usable acreage. [in.gov](http://in.gov)

Local solar permitting already treats wetlands and floodplains as mapped site features rather than downstream issues. The Pulaski County solar application requirements in the Unified Development Ordinance require permit submittals to show **existing wetlands and floodplains** on the site plan. That makes early delineation and avoidance work essential before a special-exception filing. [gov.pulaskionline.org](http://gov.pulaskionline.org)

#### Endangered Species

Pulaski County's biological risk profile is unusually strong for a row-crop county because the Tippecanoe corridor supports listed aquatic species and associated wetland habitat. The Indiana Natural Heritage county list for Pulaski includes federally listed mussels such as **northern riffleshell**, **round hickorynut**, **sheepnose**, **clubshell**, **rabbitsfoot**, and **rayed bean**; federally listed or candidate wildlife including **whooping crane**, **golden-winged warbler**, **eastern massasauga**, **Blanding's turtle**, and **spotted turtle**; and state-significant natural communities including **mesic floodplain forest**, **wet-mesic floodplain forest**, **wet sand prairie**, **shrub swamp**, and a **migratory bird concentration area**. For solar, that pushes the key impact pathways toward river and ditch crossings, sediment transport to aquatic habitat, impacts to wetland complexes, and loss of hedgerow or riparian tree cover. [in.gov](http://in.gov)

Federal bat review is also material. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Indiana Ecological Services office identifies the **Indiana bat** and **northern long-eared bat** as listed species under its jurisdiction in Indiana, and Pulaski County has already seen a solar project boundary change because of **bat habitat**: the county commissioners' **June 3, 2024** minutes state that the **Moss Creek Solar** project area was amended by swapping **70 acres** because of a bat habitat issue. That history is important. It shows that bat constraints in Pulaski are not abstract desktop flags; they can alter the approved project footprint late in the process. [fws.gov](http://fws.gov)

#### Cultural Resources

Cultural-resource review in Pulaski County follows the standard Indiana framework, but the county presents enough uncertainty that a large greenfield solar project should assume meaningful archaeological diligence. The Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology requires review materials for projects affecting historic properties, and where archaeological work is performed the report and any site forms must be entered into **SHAARD**. Indiana's federal review guidance also flags **tribal consultation/THPO** coordination as part of the Section 106 framework where a federal nexus exists. [in.gov](http://in.gov)

Pulaski is also specifically identified by DHPA as a **data-deficient county for stratified survey of unsurveyed landforms**. That does not mean every parcel is sensitive. It does mean the background record is incomplete, which increases the likelihood that a Phase I archaeological survey will be requested for large undisturbed acreage, especially where solar grading, access roads, laydown yards, or transmission features affect floodplain, terrace, or previously unsurveyed ground. If human remains are encountered, Indiana law requires DNR notice, and the state's preservation guidance provides that the agency must notify the **Indiana Native American Indian Affairs Commission** when Native American human remains are involved. [in.gov](https://www.in.gov)

Above-ground historic resources also exist in the county. Pulaski County is investing in rehabilitation of the **historic Pulaski County Courthouse** with support that included an **Indiana Landmarks**-funded study, which confirms that historic built resources remain active local concerns even outside formal federal review. [gov.pulaskionline.org](https://www.gov.pulaskionline.org)

## Floodplains

Floodplain risk is concentrated along the Tippecanoe River system and its tributaries. The county comprehensive plan identifies the Tippecanoe River floodplain as **FEMA Zone AE** with a **one percent annual chance of flooding**, notes repeated moderate to severe flood events, and states that **new residences are not allowed in the floodway**. The county's current floodplain permitting guidance goes further: development in a floodplain includes **utilities, walls and fences, roads, grading, excavation, drilling, and storage of materials**, and nonresidential projects in floodplain areas require a **floodplain determination, FARA report verifying base flood elevation, IDNR approval**, and a post-construction **elevation certificate or dry-floodproofing certificate**. [gov.pulaskionline.org](https://www.gov.pulaskionline.org)

For utility-scale solar, that means floodplain exposure is not limited to panel tables. Access roads, inverter pads, collection equipment, fencing, and drainage modifications can all trigger review. A 900 MW project should treat FEMA screening and IDNR floodway/floodway-fringe analysis as an early fatal-flaw item, not a late civil-design task. [pulaskionline.org](https://www.pulaskionline.org)

## Viewshed

Pulaski regulates visual effects through solar buffering and landscaping rather than through a separate scenic-overlay regime. The current Unified Development Ordinance requires landscaping for utility facilities and cross-references commercial solar to the dedicated solar chapter, while the county's solar ordinance revision history shows an explicit policy focus on perimeter screening, buffering of non-participating property, glare control, and immediate visual screening effectiveness. In practice, the visual receptors are dispersed rural residences and public open-space landscapes rather than dense suburban neighborhoods. [gov.pulaskionline.org](https://www.gov.pulaskionline.org)

That matters because Pulaski's opposition history has not been confined to pure land-value arguments. The county's first wave of solar permitting produced sustained remonstrance, and the **Moss Creek Solar** litigation reached the Indiana Court of Appeals in **Case No. 22A-PL-2648**. The appellate court ultimately reinstated the BZA approval on **June 19, 2023**, holding that the project's fire-safety submission satisfied the UDO, but the case shows how intensely local opponents scrutinize application completeness and mitigation details. Visual mitigation will be read in that same climate. [law.justia.com](https://www.law.justia.com)

## Land Use Context

### Comprehensive Plan

Pulaski County's adopted policy baseline is old and agricultural. The county's **2009 Comprehensive Plan** was written as a "Plan for Smart Growth" centered on protecting rural character, farm viability, and orderly development. In Chapter Four, the **Agriculture District** is expressly intended to protect substantial contiguous farmland, limit residential subdivision pressure, and require special-exception applicants to acknowledge right-to-farm protections. The same chapter contemplates **wind farms** within the county's **Exclusive Agriculture District** and discusses "Alternative Energy Resources" in the form of wind power. It does **not** speak to utility-scale solar in any modern sense. [pulaskionline.org](https://www.pulaskionline.org)

That gap is now obvious at the county level. Pulaski's **2026 comprehensive-plan RFP** states that solar projects consume substantial Building, Planning, and Zoning staff time and that the county expects **\$105 million to \$126 million** in economic-development payments over roughly **25 years** from **four solar developers**. The county is rewriting the comprehensive plan because the 2009 framework no longer matches present land-use conditions. For a new 900 MW application, the governing policy signal is therefore mixed: the legacy plan favors agricultural preservation, while the current county government is actively reorganizing around a multi-project solar buildout. [pulaskionline.org](https://www.pulaskionline.org)

## Agricultural Preservation

Agricultural preservation remains the county's strongest land-use theme. Pulaski's development materials state that **about 80 percent of county land is in farms**, and the county has adopted a separate **Right-to-Farm Ordinance** declaring agriculture vital to the county. The 2009 plan likewise frames the agriculture district as a tool to preserve the farming industry and the county economy. [development.pulaskionline.org](https://development.pulaskionline.org)

Prime farmland concerns therefore carry real local weight even though the county is approving large solar projects. NRCS defines prime and other important farmland at the soil-map-unit level, and Pulaski directs landowners to the **NRCS Web Soil Survey** for parcel-level soils review. County materials also show that drainage infrastructure exists largely to make farmland productive; the comprehensive plan says the county's stormwater drainage system was "born of necessity" because of soil characteristics, topography, and farmland enhancement. For solar siting, the implication is straightforward: loss of prime or well-drained tillable ground is a political issue, and interference with legal drains is an engineering issue. Both are central in Pulaski. [nrcs.usda.gov](https://nrcs.usda.gov)

### Surrounding Uses

The surrounding-use pattern in unincorporated Pulaski County is predominantly agricultural with scattered rural residences, drains, farmsteads, and conservation lands. Compatibility questions therefore turn less on urban adjacency and more on three recurring interfaces: non-participating homes, active farm operations, and the county drainage network. The UDO structure reflects that reality by routing commercial solar through special-exception review and by pairing land-use approval with project-specific **road-use**, **drainage**, and **decommissioning** agreements for major facilities such as Moss Creek, Bottlebrush, and Mayapple. [gov.pulaskionline.org](https://gov.pulaskionline.org)

### Agrivoltaic Potential

Pulaski's older planning documents do not recognize agrivoltaics as a land-use category. The 2009 comprehensive plan is silent on solar dual-use, and the county's solar ordinance framework historically focused on setbacks, fencing, screening, safety, and decommissioning rather than integrated farm production. During the county's solar-ordinance adjustment process, however, plan-commission draft language expressly discussed alternative fencing where a site was "incorporating agrivoltaics," showing that dual-use design had entered the policy conversation even if it was not yet the backbone of the ordinance. [gov.pulaskionline.org](https://gov.pulaskionline.org)

The current movement is practical rather than doctrinal. In **2025**, county-posted materials for **Mammoth Grazing Lands Solar** describe a **945 MWac** project in Pulaski County built around a "dual-use (agrivoltaic) installation," including livestock grazing, specialty crops, farming of setback areas, and a **200-acre Mammoth Agrivoltaic Research Center**. That does not mean Pulaski has adopted an agrivoltaic preference into the comprehensive plan. It does mean dual-use solar is now part of the county's active development narrative. For a 900 MW proposal, an agrivoltaic program would fit the county's current direction better than a pure land-withdrawal model. [pulaskionline.org](https://pulaskionline.org)

### Required Environmental Studies

At the local level, a utility-scale solar application in Pulaski County starts with the **special-exception** package required under the UDO. That package must map **existing wetlands and floodplains**, and the ordinance requires a **fire-protection and safety plan** for construction and operations. That fire-plan requirement is not theoretical. It was the central issue in the Moss Creek appeal, and the Indiana Court of Appeals held on **June 19, 2023** that Moss Creek's submittal satisfied **UDO § 2.3(R)(3)(e)**. A new filing should expect the same level of scrutiny on emergency access, responder coordination, and fire-response documentation. [gov.pulaskionline.org](https://gov.pulaskionline.org)

For environmental diligence, the minimum study set in this jurisdiction is broader than the ordinance text alone. A 900 MW project should expect: a **desktop wetland and waters review followed by field delineation**; a **floodplain/FEMA screening** and, where applicable, **FARA/BFE analysis with IDNR floodplain approvals**; a **threatened and endangered species review** focused on bats, riverine mussels, turtles, cranes, and wetland complexes; and **cultural-resources screening with DHPA**, including a **Phase I archaeological survey** where the site includes unsurveyed or sensitive landforms. Local practice also points to required or near-required companion documents and agreements on **drainage**, **road use**, and **decommissioning** before construction proceeds. [pulaskionline.org](https://pulaskionline.org)

No separate county viewshed or agrivoltaic study requirement was identified. Those issues are addressed indirectly through buffering, landscaping, fencing, and project design. In Pulaski County, the decisive environmental work is still the traditional package: wetlands, floodplain, drainage, listed species, cultural resources, and fire safety. [gov.pulaskionline.org](https://gov.pulaskionline.org)

## Infrastructure And Grid

### Substations and Transmission

Pulaski County sits in NIPSCO's electric service territory. NIPSCO's current service-territory map includes Pulaski County, and NIPSCO's economic-development materials list Pulaski among the counties it serves. [nipsco.e-smartonline.net](https://nipsco.e-smartonline.net)

The county's most consequential bulk-power facilities are not low-voltage local substations. They are the 345 kV nodes that frame the county's utility-scale development options. On the PJM side, AEP's Olive Substation near New Carlisle and NIPSCO's Reynolds Substation near Reynolds anchor the Olive-Reynolds 345 kV corridor. AEP announced on October 16, 2025 a rebuild of approximately 68 miles of that 345 kV line, plus upgrades at Olive Substation. AEP's fact sheet places the project area in Franklin, Monroe, Jefferson, and Beaver townships in Pulaski County, which confirms that this bulk corridor runs directly through the county. [aeptransmission.com](https://aeptransmission.com)

On the MISO side, NIPSCO's transmission plant records identify the Reynolds-Burr Oak-Hiple 345 kV transmission line as a major existing asset, and MISO interconnection studies have evaluated Pulaski-area generation at both the Reynolds 345 kV substation and the Reynolds-Burr Oak 345 kV line. MISO's DPP 2017 and DPP 2018 materials show a 200 MW request at Reynolds 345 kV and a 240 MW solar request at Reynolds-Burr Oak 345 kV, both in Jasper/Pulaski County geography. [nipsco.com](https://nipsco.com)

The practical transmission story is therefore a seam story. Large solar in Pulaski County has gravitated to the Olive-Reynolds 345 kV spine and its Reynolds-adjacent MISO interfaces, rather than to smaller local delivery infrastructure. PJM one-line and impact-study materials also show a series of new 345 kV ring-bus switching stations proposed on or adjacent to Olive-Reynolds #1 and #2, including the Moss Creek interconnection station, the Ora Ora station for Mammoth-related queues, and the Tatertown station for another queue position on the same corridor. [pjm.com](https://pjm.com)

### Grid Operator

For retail service and local transmission ownership, Pulaski County is a northern Indiana county in NIPSCO territory, and NIPSCO is a MISO transmission owner. [nipsco.e-smartonline.net](https://nipsco.e-smartonline.net)

For utility-scale generation, the county also functions as a PJM edge market because the AEP-owned Olive-Reynolds 345 kV corridor through Pulaski County has become the preferred interconnection path for several large solar projects. PJM study reports for Pulaski County facilities identify AEP Indiana Michigan Transmission as the transmission owner on the Olive-Reynolds interconnection points, while the remote Reynolds endpoint remains a NIPSCO facility. That is the defining grid fact for Pulaski County: local load service is NIPSCO/MISO, but recent utility-scale solar has targeted an adjacent AEP/PJM 345 kV export path. [pjm.com](https://pjm.com)

### Interconnection Queue

The queue history is already dense. Mammoth Solar established the corridor as the county's first large-scale precedent. In Cause No. 45518, Mammoth's March 10, 2021 testimony stated that Phase 1 would interconnect to AEP's Olive-Reynolds #2 345 kV circuit and that the project's queue positions were AF1-215 and AF2-134. PJM's later Phase III materials show AF1-215 listed as **In Service** and AF2-134 listed as **In Service**. [iurc.portal.in.gov](https://iurc.portal.in.gov)

Moss Creek followed on the same 345 kV spine. PJM's interim ISA identifies Moss Creek Solar Project as queue position **AF2-205**, a 200 MW solar facility in Pulaski County. PJM's impact study placed AF2-205 on Olive-Reynolds #2 345 kV and estimated **\$19.777 million** of physical interconnection work, plus additional NIPSCO costs still to be supplied. Moss Creek's interim ISA required **\$7.322 million** of posted security, including a **\$6.686 million** network-upgrades charge, and PJM's 2025 Phase III materials list AF2-205 in **Engineering & Procurement**. [pjm.com](https://pjm.com)

Mayapple added a second major Pulaski County claim on the same export path. Indiana Michigan Power's October 15, 2024 progress report in Cause No. 45868 describes Mayapple as an approximately **224 MWac** solar facility in Pulaski County that will interconnect to the PJM transmission system at the **Olive-Reynolds 345 kV** line. PJM's AG1-349 study is a **260 MW** solar interconnection in Pulaski County at that same Olive-Reynolds #2 345 kV line, with **\$19.777 million** of physical interconnection cost estimated on the AEP side and additional NIPSCO cost still outstanding; PJM's 2025 Phase III materials list **AG1-349** in **Engineering & Procurement**. That alignment indicates AG1-349 is the operative PJM queue position for the Mayapple interconnection. [iurc.portal.in.gov](https://iurc.portal.in.gov)

Pressure is not confined to Pulaski County parcels alone. PJM studies also show **AF2-078**, Honey Creek Energy in White County, as a **200 MW solar-plus-storage** project interconnecting at Reynolds-Olive #1 345 kV, and PJM Phase III materials

place AF2-078 in **Engineering & Procurement**. PJM also shows **AF2-133** and **AF2-132** on the Reynolds-Olive corridor in **Under Construction**, and AG1-436 and AG1-447 active at Olive-University Park 345 kV near the same Olive node. [pjm.com](http://pjm.com)

MISO has also tested Pulaski-area injections at Reynolds-side facilities. In DPP 2018, MISO studied **J1067**, a **240 MW** solar request in Jasper/Pulaski County at **Reynolds-Burr Oak 345 kV**. The Phase II report states that J1067 was fully deliverable at 240 MW and shows roughly **\$22.832 million** of transmission-owner network upgrades plus about **\$1.227 million** of direct-assigned facilities in the study cost table. [cdn.misoenergy.org](http://cdn.misoenergy.org)

## Grid Constraints

The principal constraint is not absence of 345 kV steel. It is queue saturation on the available 345 kV export paths and the operational complexity of the MISO-PJM seam. PJM's ISA for AF1-215/AF2-134 states that the project cannot come into service before NIPSCO completes a review of line-protection settings at the Reynolds 345 kV remote-end station, and that this work is outside the AEP facilities-study scope and must proceed under a separate agreement among NIPSCO, MISO, and the interconnection customer. That is a clear indicator that Reynolds-side work can become a separate gating item even for a PJM interconnection. [pjm.com](http://pjm.com)

PJM's AG1-349 study reaches the same conclusion from a different angle. The study assigns no PJM system-upgrade cost at that stage, but it expressly warns that cost responsibility can change as earlier-queued projects withdraw and that the project may still need system reinforcements completed to be deliverable; if it reaches commercial operation before those reinforcements are in service, an interim deliverability study would be required. This is a crowded queue environment with moving cost allocation. [pjm.com](http://pjm.com)

Constraint signals also appear at the Olive end of the corridor. PJM's Transition Cycle 1 Phase I summary lists a pending AEP upgrade, "**Rebuild Olive - AF2-359 345kV**," with a **30- to 36-month** schedule and an estimated **\$35 million** cost. Separate PJM transmission-planning materials also identify congestion on the **University Park North-Olive 345 kV** line and approve a **\$1.98 million** multi-driver reconfiguration near Green Acres with a required in-service date of **December 1, 2026**. Those upgrades are not inside Pulaski County, but they affect the same Olive export hub that Pulaski County solar is relying on. [pjm.com](http://pjm.com)

## Planned Upgrades

The dominant planned transmission investment is AEP's **Olive-Reynolds 345 kV Transmission Line Rebuild**. AEP describes it as a rebuild of approximately **68 miles** of 345 kV transmission between Olive and Reynolds, a relocation of about **2 miles** east of Monon, and equipment upgrades at Olive Substation. AEP's fact sheet places the line through four Pulaski County townships and sets the schedule as: project announcement in **Fall 2025**, right-of-way communications through **Fall 2026**, pre-construction activity from **Spring 2026** into **Early 2027**, construction from **Early 2027** through **Summer 2031**, and facilities placed in service in **Summer 2031**. AEP's public release values the investment at **\$266 million**. [aeptransmission.com](http://aeptransmission.com)

The second tier of upgrades is queue-driven and node-specific. PJM's TC1 materials identify the pending **Olive-AF2-359 345 kV** rebuild at **\$35 million**, and PJM/FERC planning materials identify the **Green Acres/Olive** tower-swap reconfiguration at **\$1.98 million** with a **December 1, 2026** in-service target to relieve congestion tied to the Olive export path. These are incremental compared with the AEP rebuild, but they matter because they target the same interface that Pulaski County projects are already using. [pjm.com](http://pjm.com)

## Interconnection Outlook

Pulaski County has a real transmission story. It is not a greenfield county with no high-voltage access. The Olive-Reynolds corridor already supports in-service Mammoth phases and continues to attract Moss Creek, Mayapple, Honey Creek, and other Reynolds/Olive node requests. That proves bankable utility-scale interconnection is possible in and around the county. [pjm.com](http://pjm.com)

The constraint is scale and concentration. By straightforward inference from the queue positions already in service, under construction, or in engineering and procurement on Olive-Reynolds #1, Olive-Reynolds #2, and related Reynolds-node facilities, more than **1 GW** of solar and storage is already competing for substantially the same export geography. The need for separate NIPSCO/MISO remote-end work at Reynolds, the pending Olive-node reinforcements, and the long-dated AEP rebuild schedule through **Summer 2031** support a conservative conclusion: a **900 MW** solar project in Pulaski County is unlikely to interconnect as a simple single-node, single-phase request without material upgrade exposure. A phased build, a multi-POI strategy, and a storage component would align more closely with the way this area is actually clearing the queue. [pjm.com](http://pjm.com)

## Opposition Intelligence

### Opposition and litigation history

Organized opposition in Pulaski County formed around the first Mammoth Solar entitlement fight in 2020. ABC57 reported that the effort began as a small local group in 2020, including Connie Ehrlich and Gail Lambert, using the name “Pulaski County Against Solar.” By February 26, 2021, the group had secured a donated office at 103 E. Pearl Street in Winamac. Its website states that the organization’s purpose is to protect agricultural land, preserve rural landscape, and oppose utility-scale solar conversion of county farmland. [abc57.com](http://abc57.com)

The first major case was Mammoth. Under the county UDO then in force, commercial solar required a special exception. Mammoth filed in June 2020 to build a commercial solar energy system on 4,511 acres in Pulaski County. The BZA approved the application after public hearings, and neighboring owners sought judicial review in Pulaski Superior Court Cause No. 66D01-2009-PL-10. On September 21, 2022, the Indiana Court of Appeals in *Mammoth Solar a/k/a Starke Solar LLC v. Connie Ehrlich, et al.*, 21A-PL-2060, affirmed the reversal of the BZA approval, holding that the application did not satisfy mandatory UDO requirements, including the required fire protection plan and other materials required by UDO §§ 2.3(R)(1) and 2.3(R)(3). [law.justia.com](http://law.justia.com)

Moss Creek followed the same path, but with a different outcome. Moss Creek filed on August 2, 2021 for a 1,620-acre solar farm in Beaver Township. The project also proceeded through BZA special-exception review, and remonstrators again sought judicial review in Pulaski Superior Court Cause No. 66D01-2110-PL-12. On June 19, 2023, the Court of Appeals in *Moss Creek Solar, LLC v. Connie Ehrlich, et al.*, 22A-PL-2648, reversed the trial court and reinstated the BZA approval, holding that the BZA could accept the supplemented landowner consents and the project-specific fire protection and safety plan. The opinion specifically discusses UDO § 2.3(B)(1)(a)(3), UDO § 2.3(R)(3)(e), and the application-revision language in UDO § 2.3(B)(7)(a). [law.justia.com](http://law.justia.com)

The opposition did not limit itself to zoning approvals. It also challenged the tax-abatement structure supporting both projects. Pulaski County’s project-document pages identify the relevant ERA resolutions: for Mammoth, Preliminary Resolution No. 2021-09 and Confirmatory Resolution No. 2021-15/2022-01; for Moss Creek, Preliminary Resolution No. 2021-11 and Confirmatory Resolution No. 2022-02. The January 10, 2022 council minutes reflect final action on Mammoth’s confirmatory resolution, and the Indiana Court of Appeals later upheld both ERA approvals on September 7, 2023 in Case Nos. 22A-PL-1738 and 22A-PL-1732. In the Moss Creek ERA opinion, the court expressly states that the Council adopted Resolution No. 2021-11 on October 11, 2021 and Resolution No. 2022-02 on January 10, 2022. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)

### Regulatory evolution

The opposition quickly expanded from project-specific remonstrance to ordinance politics. On February 22, 2022, the commissioners referred solar-related UDO amendments to the Advisory Plan Commission under Indiana Code § 36-7-4-607(a). The APC held a public hearing on March 16, 2022, continued it to April 1, and returned recommendations to the commissioners. At a special session on April 8, 2022, the commissioners considered amendments to Ordinance No. 2021-03, adopted the Chapter 7 solar revisions, and rejected the proposed Section 4 use-table change. The resulting ordinance was Ordinance No. 2022-05, effective May 23, 2022. Pulaski County Journal then reported that, on May 16, the APC deadlocked on a further commissioner-backed proposal to make commercial solar a permitted use in A-1 and A-2 districts. That sequence shows that local opposition did alter county process even when it could not stop solar altogether. [gov.pulaskionline.org](http://gov.pulaskionline.org)

The county’s current posture is materially different from the one that governed Mammoth and Moss Creek. The current UDO, Ordinance No. 2025-03, became effective March 3, 2025. Table 4.1 now lists “Commercial solar energy system” as a permitted use in A-1 and A-2 districts. County officials have nevertheless stated that Pulaski “does not have a Solar Ordinance” separate from the UDO and instead regulates solar through the UDO’s land-use framework. Chapter 7 still imposes project-specific controls. Table 7.3 requires a 150-foot setback from any CSES component, including site fencing, to a non-participating or non-included property line or any right-of-way. The county also amended its solar-related fee structure through Ordinance No. 2025-05, adopted March 3, 2025, which expressly authorizes use of third-party consultants in solar permitting and compliance review. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)

Pulaski also added construction-specific controls outside the UDO. In December 2024, the commissioners approved a compliance-monitoring service agreement with V.S. Engineering because four solar projects were expected to begin construction in 2025 and 2026. The county’s Mammoth Solar page now posts both the V.S. Engineering monitoring agreement and a separate Mammoth payment agreement for those services. In April 2025, the commissioners adopted Ordinance No. 2025-08 regulating the use of county roads for commercial solar and renewable-energy construction, citing Indiana Code § 9-

21-1-2 and tying enforcement to approved road-use routes. [pulaskijournal.com](http://pulaskijournal.com)

## Current flashpoints

The current fight has moved from entitlement to enforcement. At the June 2, 2025 commissioners' meeting, county staff reported that the Building Department had issued a stop-work order to Mammoth over setback issues. County counsel then advised that the ordinance wording was ambiguous and pointed to UDO § 5.6(C)(1)(D) on fences and walls. The commissioners voted 2-1 to remove the stop-work order, with Commissioner Jennifer Knebel dissenting after stating she wanted more time to review the setback issue. The same minutes record public comments from Connie Ehrlich, Casey Lowry, Gail Lambert, and Jamie Murray, all pressing setback questions. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)

The next step was an administrative appeal. A published notice set a July 28, 2025 BZA hearing on Docket No. 07282025-01, filed by Gail Lambert and Jaybird Farm Trust, appealing the building inspector's decision not to revoke Building Permit No. 4242, issued to Mammoth on February 25, 2025, and not to issue a stop-work order. ABC57 reported that the appeal challenged the sufficiency or completeness of decommissioning, road-use, and financial-assurance documents. Local reporting after the hearing states that the BZA rejected the appeal. The same pattern that marked the 2020-2023 litigation remains in place: opposition in Pulaski continues through the permit file, the construction file, and any document gap that can be framed as noncompliance. [pulaskijournal.com](http://pulaskijournal.com)

Regulatory pressure is still building. The March 20, 2026 APC special-session agenda listed proposed text amendments to UDO § 2.3(R) and Chapter 7, and separately listed "Solar Moratorium" as old business. ABC57 reported after that meeting that the proposals under discussion included stronger landscaping protections, road-repair obligations, drainage provisions, disaster-mitigation measures, and debate over an 8% countywide cap. The meeting archive shows the APC special session on March 20 and the commissioners' regular meeting on April 6, 2026, which is the same period in which ABC57 reported the moratorium issue would return for further discussion. Pulaski has therefore not stabilized around a settled solar framework. It is still actively revising it. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)

That instability is not limited to solar. In February 2026, the commissioners denied the APC's recommendation for an 18-month Battery Energy Storage System moratorium under Ordinance No. 2025-04, even while broader solar-text amendments remained under discussion. The county is using repeated ordinance reopeners, consultant oversight, and construction-phase enforcement to manage large energy projects. That matters for any project of scale because it means the governing standards can tighten while development is underway. [pulaskijournal.com](http://pulaskijournal.com)

## Implications for a 900 MW solar proposal

The principal opposition figures are identifiable and persistent. Connie Ehrlich is the lead name across the Mammoth zoning appeal, the Moss Creek zoning appeal, and the Moss Creek ERA appeal. Gail and Larry Lambert appear in the Mammoth appellate record and in the 2025 administrative appeal notice. Jason M. Kuchmay appears as counsel for remonstrators in the Mammoth appeal, and the 2025 appeal again names the Lambert interests as challengers. Pulaski County Against Solar remains the organizing vehicle. The Indiana Office of Energy Development's "Good Questions Project" separately listed "Pulaski County Against Solar Project" among anti-renewable groups active in Indiana, confirming that the group is not an isolated one-off formed for a single hearing. [law.justia.com](http://law.justia.com)

County leadership has never been monolithic. On April 8, 2022, Commissioner Charles Mellon stated on the record that he had initiated the UDO rewrite to streamline solar development, tying his support to farmer property rights, county revenue, and reduced litigation burden. But the June 2, 2025 stop-work vote showed a split board, not a unified one. The county's posture is therefore best understood as internally divided, pro-development on tax base and landowner-rights grounds, but increasingly willing to tighten standards and scrutinize compliance under sustained resident pressure. [gov.pulaskionline.org](http://gov.pulaskionline.org)

For a new 900 MW solar proposal, the threshold issue is no longer whether utility-scale solar is categorically allowed in Pulaski County. Under Ordinance No. 2025-03, it is allowed by right in A-1 and A-2 districts. The real risk lies elsewhere. Pulaski has an organized opposition group, a long record of remonstrance and appeal, a county government that has repeatedly reopened its solar rules, and an enforcement history focused on application completeness, fire-safety documentation, landowner consent, setbacks, road-use obligations, drainage, decommissioning instruments, and construction-phase paperwork. A developer can no longer treat Pulaski as a simple permitted-use county. It is a permitted-use county with a litigation-tested opposition network and a moving compliance target. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)

## Permitting And Project History

### Regulatory Framework and Current County Posture

Pulaski County's governing framework is no longer the same one that produced the Mammoth and Moss Creek appeals. On February 22, 2022, the Board of Commissioners referred solar amendments to the Advisory Plan Commission under Indiana Code § 36-7-4-607(a); after APC hearings on March 16 and April 1, 2022, the commissioners adopted those amendments on April 8, 2022, effective May 23, 2022, as Ordinance No. 2022-05. The county then recodified the Unified Development Ordinance as Ordinance No. 2025-03, adopted and effective March 3, 2025. Under the current Table 4.1, a "Commercial solar energy system" is a permitted use in the A-1 and A-2 districts, remains a special exception in L-I and H-I, and is also permitted in P-D; but Chapter 7 imposes project-specific controls that are more consequential than the use-table label. Section 7.17 requires a 75-foot setback from any internal ditch and a 150-foot setback from any non-participating property line or right-of-way, and expressly applies those distances to "any CSES component, including all CSES site fencing." Section 7.18 conditions any building permit on a decommissioning plan under § 7.4 and on county approval of a drainage agreement and road-use and maintenance agreement, with an Economic Development Agreement required if the developer seeks abatement. The UDO applies only in unincorporated Pulaski County outside Francesville and Winamac and their extraterritorial jurisdictions. [gov.pulaskionline.org](http://gov.pulaskionline.org)

The county has also moved beyond land-use text and into active construction management. On March 3, 2025, the commissioners adopted Ordinance No. 2025-05 updating the development fee schedule. In spring 2025, the county adopted Ordinance No. 2025-07 adding stop controls at intersections affected by solar construction traffic, and Ordinance No. 2025-08 regulating use of county roads for commercial-solar and renewable-energy construction, backed by a minimum \$1,000-per-trip, per-mile penalty for using unapproved routes. The Surveyor's Office publicly maintains signed drainage agreements for Mammoth, Moss Creek, Bottlebrush, and Mayapple, and the county's project pages route compliance complaints through V.S. Engineering; the Mayapple page separately posts road-use, drainage, decommissioning, and December 16, 2024 compliance-monitoring agreements. By June 2, 2025, county commissioners reported 9,722 acres for Mammoth/Doral, 1,708 acres for Moss Creek, 2,328 acres for Mayapple, and roughly 1,300 acres for Bottlebrush—15,058 acres in all—and local reporting in April 2026 still described county officials as working from an approximately 15,000-acre solar footprint. A new utility-scale entrant would therefore arrive in a county that is still permitting solar, but now treats it as an infrastructure-management problem as much as a zoning problem. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)

## Mammoth Solar

Mammoth established the modern Pulaski County solar precedent. In 2020, Mammoth Solar sought a special exception for a commercial solar farm on 4,511 acres in Pulaski County; after a public hearing, the BZA approved the application, and the approval was later vacated by the trial court before being reinstated by the Court of Appeals of Indiana in Opinion No. 21A-PL-2060 on September 21, 2022. While that litigation was pending, Mammoth expanded from a special-exception case into a county-scale fiscal package. During the December 13, 2021 joint session, the developer sought a 20-year, 100% abatement and described approximately \$34.6 million in economic-development payments over the same period. The council then adopted Resolution No. 2021-15/2022-01 on January 10, 2022, confirming an ERA covering approximately 9,205.33 acres, and the county later amended the EDA in 2024 because legal challenges had delayed the project through November 2023. Commissioners' minutes from September 16, 2024 show the amendment was still controversial, including questions about reimbursement of outside counsel and consultant fees. [public.courts.in.gov](http://public.courts.in.gov)

Mammoth is now the county's clearest example of how approval does not end local controversy. Doral Renewables currently describes Mammoth South as a 300 MW phase spread across roughly 3,500 acres in Pulaski County, part of the broader Mammoth portfolio. County oversight remained intense during construction. On November 3, 2022, commissioners considered and approved Mammoth road-use and decommissioning agreements. On June 2, 2025, commissioners received updates that road repairs were underway on the central and south projects, then voted 2-1 to lift a stop-work order issued because of a setback dispute over perimeter fencing. The minutes record the county attorney's position that Pulaski County "does not have a Solar Ordinance" apart from the UDO and that § 5.6.C.1.d ("Fences and Walls") allowed fencing within setbacks, while public commenters argued that fencing is functionally part of the solar project. That episode is the most concrete recent indicator of county posture: Pulaski will let large solar construction proceed, but it is prepared to stop work, revisit UDO text, and resolve disputes in public session while construction is underway. [doral-llc.com](http://doral-llc.com)

## Moss Creek Solar

Moss Creek remains the county's most important litigation precedent. NextEra's project entered under the pre-May 23, 2022 system, when CSES approvals in agricultural districts still went to the BZA as special exceptions. On August 2, 2021, Moss Creek filed its special-exception application for a 200 MW project on 1,620 acres in Beaver Township, and the BZA heard the matter on September 27, 2021. In parallel, the fiscal process moved quickly: the county council adopted preliminary Resolution No. 2021-11 on October 11, 2021; held its public hearing and adopted confirmatory Resolution No. 2022-02 on January 10, 2022; the commissioners adopted Resolution No. 2022-03 on January 18, 2022; and the EDA executed that same day

described a project of approximately 200 MW of nameplate capacity. The January 10, 2022 council minutes describe the abatement structure as a ten-year 100% abatement paired with \$6 million in county economic-development payments and reimbursement of county expenses up to \$105,000. [law.justia.com](http://law.justia.com)

Two appellate decisions followed. On October 7, 2022, the Pulaski Superior Court reversed the BZA approval, principally over the adequacy of the fire-protection and safety plan. The Court of Appeals reversed that judgment in Memorandum Decision No. 22A-PL-2648 on June 19, 2023, holding that the BZA had not acted arbitrarily or capriciously. A separate challenge to the ERA and abatement failed in Opinion No. 22A-PL-1732 on September 7, 2023. The county and developer then amended the EDA in August 2024 to address schedule slippage from the litigation, and September 16, 2024 commissioners' minutes show continuing public objections to the amendment and to payment mechanics. By June 2, 2025, county commissioners still listed Moss Creek at 1,708 acres. The practical lesson is direct: in Pulaski County, a solar developer can win locally, defend the win twice on appeal, and still spend years operating under active political scrutiny. [law.justia.com](http://law.justia.com)

### **Mayapple Solar**

Mayapple took a different path. When Lightsource bp presented the project to the commissioners on February 6, 2023, it described Mayapple as an early-stage 180 MW project west of Winamac, between County Roads 300 W and 600 W along County Road 100 N, with roughly 1,000 acres of panels and no request for county tax abatement. That choice mattered politically. It removed one of the most visible Pulaski flashpoints—the negotiated ERA and abatement package—even though it did not remove the project from county-level road, drainage, and decommissioning control. [pulaskijournal.com](http://pulaskijournal.com)

At the utility level, however, Mayapple is a larger project than the initial county presentation suggested. Indiana Michigan Power's April 3, 2024 semiannual report in IURC Cause No. 45868 states that I&M entered into a purchase and sale agreement for Mayapple on March 24, 2023 with Lightsource bp; describes Mayapple as an approximately 224 MWac solar facility in Pulaski County; places it on about 2,200 acres under long-term lease, plus two approximately 15-acre purchased parcels for the O&M building/substation and switchyard; and identifies the interconnection as the Olive-Reynolds 345 kV line. County records show the companion host agreements followed in June 2023: a drainage agreement dated June 19, 2023, road-use and decommissioning agreements dated June 20, 2023, and later compliance-monitoring documents executed December 16, 2024. Commissioners still counted Mayapple at 2,328 acres on June 2, 2025. Mayapple therefore shows that a project can avoid the headline abatement fight and still be drawn into the county's standardized agreement-and-compliance regime. [iurc.portal.in.gov](http://iurc.portal.in.gov)

### **Bottlebrush Solar**

Bottlebrush is the best example of fiscal approvals not necessarily translating into near-term construction. The county first entered an Economic Development Expense Reimbursement Agreement with Bottlebrush Solar Energy LLC at the joint session on February 13, 2023. The council adopted preliminary Resolution No. 2023-04 on May 8, 2023 and held the public hearing on June 12, 2023. The June 12 minutes identify Bottlebrush as an Invenergy-backed solar facility proposed in Beaver and Salem Townships, describe it as a \$290 million project with 200 MW over 1,500 fenced acres, and record a 4-2 vote—with one abstention—in favor of the ERA and abatement package. Those same minutes also preserve a siting risk that matters for any very large Pulaski project: opponents argued some parcels were outside county zoning jurisdiction and inside the two-mile planning area of Francesville, and Francesville's board president stated the town would not approve a zoning change for solar. [gov.pulaskionline.org](http://gov.pulaskionline.org)

The fiscal documents were nevertheless substantial. Resolution No. 2023-05 and the corresponding EDA tied the project to ten annual unrestricted economic-development payments of \$1 million each, for \$10 million total. On June 20, 2023, the commissioners adopted Resolution No. 2023-07 authorizing the EDA and described Bottlebrush as a project of approximately 200-250 MW of nameplate capacity. Yet by June 2, 2025, commissioners were still saying Invenergy/Bottlebrush was expected to cover around 1,300 acres and was supplying additional information. For siting analysis, Bottlebrush shows that Pulaski's agreements are necessary but not sufficient. A developer can obtain the abatement framework, the EDA, and county resolutions, and still remain behind the construction curve if local jurisdictional issues or county compliance requirements are not fully resolved. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)

### **Regional Context and Implications for a 900 MW Solar Project**

Pulaski is not an isolated market. Nearby counties have already hosted projects at comparable regional scale. The OUCC's NIPSCO renewable-case summary lists Crossroads Solar in White County as a 200 MW project approved in IURC Cause No. 45524 and lists the Dunns Bridge and Cavalry projects in Cause No. 45462 as 900 MW of solar and 135 MW of battery storage in Jasper and White Counties. NextEra's current Dunns Bridge Energy Center materials describe a 700 MW solar and 75 MW storage project in Jasper and Starke Counties, while Jasper County economic-development materials previously described Dunns Bridge Phase I alone as a 265 MW, \$300 million project. The regional transmission and market backdrop therefore

supports very large solar. What is distinctive about Pulaski is not regional infeasibility. It is the county's unusually dense record of permit fights, appellate litigation, road-management rules, and continuing public opposition. [in.gov](#)

For a new 900 MW solar proposal, the county's record points in one direction. That scale would be materially larger than Mayapple or Bottlebrush and roughly triple the size of Mammoth South. Using recent Pulaski and nearby Indiana projects as rough analogs, it would likely require several thousand acres and, as an inference, probably a multi-township assembly. It would also arrive in a county where officials have publicly reported approximately 15,000 acres already committed to the four main utility-scale projects, where the UDO excludes Francesville and Winamac and their extraterritorial jurisdictions, where building permits are conditioned on decommissioning, drainage, and road-use approvals, and where the county has shown a willingness to halt work over setback interpretation and to legislate traffic controls mid-construction. Opposition also remains active: local reporting from March 2, 2026 shows commissioners still fielding organized complaints about solar and debating how prior ordinance changes altered the county's leverage. The legal path is therefore open, but the practical path for a 900 MW solar-only project would require phased filings, early road and emergency-response planning, rigorous parcel screening around municipal jurisdictional edges, and host-agreement negotiations that should be treated as core permit work rather than post-approval cleanup. [doral-llc.com](#)

## Permitting Pathways

### State Permitting — Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission CPCN Process for Utility-Owned or Rate-Based Solar

- 1. Determine whether the project is in the IURC's CPCN lane.** Indiana does not have a general statewide solar siting board for independent utility-scale solar. The state-level siting trigger instead turns on utility status. Under Indiana Code § 8-1-8.5-2, a **public utility** may not begin construction, purchase, or lease a generation facility used to furnish public utility service without first obtaining a certificate that public convenience and necessity requires the project. The IURC's own electricity-industry materials describe these proceedings as "certificates of need for new power plants." For a 900 MW solar project, the CPCN pathway is therefore the relevant state process only if the sponsor is a jurisdictional utility, or if the project is being acquired for retail utility service with rate recovery. [law.justia.com](#)
- 2. Account for the statutory exemptions before filing.** Indiana Code chapter 8-1-8.5 contains exemptions. The current materials available from the IURC show a 2024 amendment that exempts certain REMC or cooperative projects of **10 MW or less** from the CPCN process, and prior Indiana materials describe a separate exemption for certain wind, solar, or organic-waste-biomass projects of **50,000 kW or less** when constructed through a competitively procured Indiana-taxpaying contractor. A 900 MW solar facility does not fit either of those small-project exemptions. [in.gov](#)
- 3. Prepare the petition, testimony, and any companion clean-energy approval requests.** Recent Indiana utility solar cases show that utilities typically file a verified petition supported by direct testimony, project-cost evidence, resource-planning support, and requests for any related approvals needed for acquisition, ownership, purchased-power structures, or cost recovery. Indiana Michigan Power's solar case, Cause No. 45868, sought CPCNs for two solar facilities and approval of additional solar acquisitions; CenterPoint's Posey County Solar filing likewise paired CPCN approval with acquisition and recovery approvals. [iurc.portal.in.gov](#)
- 4. Proceed through the contested IURC docket.** The CPCN case runs as an adjudicatory IURC proceeding. The OUCG participates as the statutory consumer advocate. Intervenors may appear. Testimony is filed, discovery is conducted, and the Commission holds an evidentiary hearing. Public comments are invited through the OUCG in generation cases, and separate public field hearings may be ordered in particular dockets, but they are not automatic in every solar case. [in.gov](#)
- 5. Expect a sub-year state timeline if the sponsor is a utility.** Recent Indiana precedent is relatively fast by national standards. CenterPoint filed its Posey County Solar CPCN on **February 23, 2021**, and the IURC approved it on **October 27, 2021**. Indiana Michigan Power's 749 MW solar portfolio case received a final order on **October 18, 2023**. A 900 MW utility case should still be modeled as a major contested proceeding, but Indiana precedent supports a working assumption of roughly **6 to 9 months** from filing to final order if the record is complete and the case does not materially slip. [iurc.portal.in.gov](#)
- 6. Recognize the local-zoning consequence of the state track.** Even where a utility pursues a CPCN, local land-use issues do not disappear unless a separate statutory preemption applies. The IURC's briefing in the Lone Oak litigation distinguished public utilities from independent power providers and noted that the developer there agreed it would comply with local zoning and land-use requirements. For Pulaski County, that means the local special-exception and construction-permit path remains central unless the project is in a narrow preempted category. [iurc.portal.in.gov](#)

### State Permitting — No Statewide Siting Certificate for Merchant Solar

1. **Confirm the absence of a general state siting permit.** For a non-utility developer building a merchant solar facility, Indiana does not impose a separate statewide solar siting certificate analogous to a state siting board approval. The CPCN statute applies to a **public utility** furnishing public utility service. The practical state workstream for a merchant 900 MW solar project is therefore environmental, drainage, floodplain, highway-access, and building-safety permitting, running in parallel with Pulaski County land-use approval. [law.justia.com](http://law.justia.com)

2. **Secure IDEM construction stormwater coverage before land disturbance.** Indiana's former Rule 5 program has been replaced by the **Construction Stormwater General Permit (CSGP)**. The CSGP applies to construction activity disturbing **one acre or more**, or smaller disturbances that are part of a larger common plan of development. Coverage is obtained through IDEM's online application or Notice of Intent process. Indiana materials still describe the NOI as needing to be submitted at least **48 hours before** land-disturbing activities begin, with a copy also sent to the local SWCD or MS4 reviewer. For a 900 MW solar facility, this permit is unavoidable. [in.gov](http://in.gov)

3. **Address DNR floodway and waterbody jurisdiction early.** If any array area, access road, collection line crossing, substation pad, or drainage work falls in a regulated floodway, Indiana's Flood Control Act requires prior approval from the DNR Division of Water for construction, fill, excavation, or other obstructions in the floodway of a stream with a drainage area greater than one square mile. DNR also makes clear that if an exemption does not apply, a **Construction in a Floodway** permit must be filed. [in.gov](http://in.gov)

4. **Coordinate any INDOT, health, and other agency approvals reflected in the county code.** Pulaski County's UDO expressly contemplates that solar applicants may need approvals from state agencies including IDEM, DNR, INDOT, and the Indiana State Department of Health, depending on the project's location and physical scope. Those approvals are not substitutes for county approval; they are companion approvals that must be folded into the final engineering package. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)

5. **Add the IDHS battery track only if storage is included.** Indiana separately regulates utility-scale battery energy storage. IDHS states that the statute applies in general to systems capable of storing and releasing more than **1 MW** for at least **one hour** using an AC inverter and DC storage. A solar-only project does not enter that lane, but any paired storage block does. [in.gov](http://in.gov)

## Local Permitting — Pulaski County Special Exception and Post-Approval Construction Process

Pulaski County Ordinance **2025-03** governs land use outside the incorporated towns of Francesville and Winamac and their extraterritorial jurisdictions. The ordinance took effect on **March 3, 2025**. The county's current UDO treats commercial solar as a use controlled through the use table and solar-specific standards in Article 7. In practice, Pulaski County's large solar projects have moved through the Board of Zoning Appeals as special exceptions, including Moss Creek Solar. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)

1. **File a complete BZA hearing application.** The county's APC/BZA hearing packet requires the petitioner to submit a complete application before the matter will be docketed. The packet requires, at minimum, the filing fee, a deed copy, a site plan showing the full layout and neighboring uses, and a statement of intent addressing the applicable findings and any written commitments. The 2025 fee schedule sets the BZA special-exception filing fee at **\$500 commercial**. [gov.pulaskionline.org](http://gov.pulaskionline.org)

2. **Complete statutory and county notice.** Pulaski County requires one newspaper publication no earlier than **30 days** and no later than **10 days** before the hearing. For all petitions, notice must run in the *Pulaski County Journal*; for properties west of County Road 800 West and south of State Road 14/Base Road, or at the administrator's discretion, notice must also run in the *Francesville Tribune*. The petitioner must also mail notice to all legal landowners within **660 feet** of any boundary of the subject property, using USPS Certificate of Mailing, no earlier than **30 days** and no later than **15 days** before the hearing. Posted notice on the property may also be required at the administrator's discretion. [gov.pulaskionline.org](http://gov.pulaskionline.org)

3. **Proceed to the BZA public hearing.** Pulaski County's BZA is the decision-maker for special exceptions. The BZA is a quasi-judicial board, and neither the Advisory Plan Commission nor the county executive reviews its final adjudicatory decisions. The BZA typically meets on the **fourth Monday of each odd-numbered month**, with additional public hearings scheduled in even-numbered months as needed. That meeting cadence matters to schedule risk on a 900 MW project because a missed docket cycle can add a month or more. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)

4. **Obtain the special exception decision and conditions.** The BZA may approve, approve with conditions or commitments, deny, or continue the application. The county's older UDO text, which matches the county's current special-exception practice reflected in the BZA materials, states that denied applicants are generally not eligible for reconsideration for **12 months**. Moss Creek Solar confirms the importance of a complete evidentiary record: the project's Pulaski County special exception was challenged in court over the adequacy of the fire-safety plan, and the Court of Appeals reinstated the BZA approval on **June 19, 2023**. [gov.pulaskionline.org](http://gov.pulaskionline.org)

5. **Move immediately into the county's post-approval permit lane.** Pulaski County's hearing packet directs the applicant to obtain an **Improvement Location Permit (ILP)** promptly after a favorable BZA decision. The packet states that the ILP expires if authorized work has not commenced within **six months** of issuance, subject to paid extensions, and that a special exception expires if the authorized use is not established within **12 months** of approval or if the use is discontinued for 12 months or longer. [gov.pulaskionline.org](http://gov.pulaskionline.org)

6. **Submit the pre-building-permit package required by Article 7.** Before issuance of any building permit for a commercial solar energy system, Section 7.18 requires submittal to, and review by, the Plan Administrator and/or a third-party engineering consultant. The package must include: a decommissioning plan under § 7.4; an **Economic Development Agreement (EDA)** if tax abatement is sought; a **Drainage Agreement (DA)** approved by the Drainage Board; a **Road Use and Maintenance Agreement (RUMA)** approved by the County Commissioners; any IDEM-required stormwater quality-management plan; and a copy of the site plan. Pulaski County places the cost of any third-party engineering review on the developer. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)

7. **Obtain commissioner-level approvals for the county agreements.** The RUMA must be developed with the County Highway Superintendent, the County Surveyor, and county counsel, and it must be signed and approved by the **Pulaski County Commissioners** before construction. If the project seeks property-tax abatement, the EDA must also be signed before any building permit is issued, and the County Council must notice and conduct the required public hearing on the abatement incentives before adopting the necessary resolutions. The DA must be signed by the **Pulaski County Drainage Board** before building permit issuance. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)

8. **Complete road, phasing, and baseline-condition submissions.** Section 7.18 separately requires the owner/operator to identify all state highways and local roads that will be used for construction and maintenance traffic, prepare a construction timeline and phasing plan, identify known road closures, and provide that information to local newspapers, law enforcement, emergency services, school corporations, the USPS, INDOT, and the County Highway and Building Departments. The owner/operator must also complete a pre-construction baseline road survey acceptable to the Highway Superintendent. The Highway Superintendent has **10 business days** to respond to the baseline survey. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)

9. **Build under county construction controls and inspections.** During construction, Section 7.19 requires reasonable dust-, noise-, and lighting-control measures as directed by the County Building Department and reasonable stormwater best-management practices as outlined by IDEM. The Building Department states that all building permits and inspections are handled by the department, and inspections are scheduled directly with staff. For temporary road closures longer than **20 minutes**, the UDO requires at least **24 hours'** notice to neighboring and affected property owners unless County Highway closes the road for the day. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)

10. **Close out occupied structures through ordinary building procedures.** Pulaski County's UDO requires as-built plans before issuance of a certificate of occupancy where that certificate is required, and the Building Department administers the ordinary building-code inspection process. The ordinance does not create a separate solar-field certificate-of-occupancy regime; the practical closeout issue is the O&M building, substation structures, and any other occupied or code-regulated improvements. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)

## Appeal Process

1. **BZA special-exception decisions are appealed to court, not to another county board.** Pulaski County states that BZA decisions may be disputed only through judicial review and that neither the APC nor the county executive has review authority over those adjudications. Indiana's zoning-judicial-review statute gives standing to a person aggrieved by the zoning decision who participated in the board hearing, as well as certain persons entitled to notice. A petition for judicial review is timely only if filed within **30 days** after the zoning decision. Administrative remedies within the board must be exhausted first. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)

2. **Rezoning decisions follow a different path.** If a project also needs a map amendment, the Advisory Plan Commission makes a recommendation and the Board of County Commissioners makes the legislative decision. Pulaski County's hearing packet states that rezoning decisions are legislative rather than adjudicatory and therefore are not reviewed through the same zoning judicial-review chapter that governs BZA special exceptions. That distinction matters if a solar sponsor tries to pair a rezoning with the solar petition. [gov.pulaskionline.org](http://gov.pulaskionline.org)

## Required Studies and Submittals

1. **Decommissioning plan.** Section 7.18(A)(1) makes the decommissioning plan mandatory before any building permit, and Article 7 separately states that the plan must bind the owner/operator and successors and give the county entry rights to enforce it. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)

2. **Stormwater management and erosion control.** Pulaski County requires any IDEM stormwater quality-management plan outlined by the Drainage Board before building permit issuance, and the state CSGP applies to construction disturbing one acre or more. For a 900 MW project, this is a core path item, not a secondary permit. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)
3. **Drainage study and drainage agreement.** Section 7.18 requires a Drainage Agreement addressing wells, crops, field tile, county-maintenance ditches and tiles, culvert damage, and stormwater-management practices during construction and operation. That agreement is developed with the Drainage Board, County Surveyor, County Highway, and county counsel. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)
4. **Road-use study package and baseline road survey.** The ordinance requires identification of haul roads, a timeline and phasing plan, road-closure planning, and a pre-construction baseline road survey with photo or video documentation. The RUMA and the survey together function as the county's transportation-impact control document. A separate traffic study is not automatic, but the UDO elsewhere authorizes special studies, including transportation impact studies, when the county needs more information to act. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)
5. **Site plan, statement of intent, and surrounding-use mapping.** The APC/BZA hearing packet requires a site plan showing the entire property layout and neighboring uses, together with a statement of intent addressing the relevant findings. Section 7.18(A)(5) separately requires a copy of the site plan before building permit issuance. [gov.pulaskionline.org](http://gov.pulaskionline.org)
6. **Landscape, screening, and ground-cover plan.** The UDO requires landscaping and screening in the development-plan content requirements and, for solar specifically, requires low-growing native perennial ground cover with pollinator emphasis, consultation with a horticulturalist or other approved expert, and compliance with USDA Farm Service Agency filter-strip guidance within the ditch setbacks. These are substantive design requirements, not aspirational landscaping notes. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)
7. **Noise and glare compliance package.** Pulaski County does not require a stand-alone acoustical or visual-impact study by name, but Section 7.15 imposes a **50 dBA** limit measured from the nearest property line, subject to waiver by adjoining owners in writing, and requires the facility to be designed or screened to avoid concentrated and prolonged glare onto abutting structures and roadways. In practice, a large project should expect to supply modeling or manufacturer-backed compliance evidence even though the UDO does not use the phrase "noise study" or "visual impact assessment." [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)
8. **Lighting and signage plans.** The development-plan provisions require a lighting plan and signage plan, and Article 7 separately restricts solar signage, including a **16-square-foot** maximum surface area and a maximum of **four** larger project signs on any one contiguous site. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)
9. **Archaeological and burial-ground review.** No standalone county archaeological-survey requirement was found for commercial solar. The UDO instead states that whenever development is contemplated within **100 feet** of a burial ground as defined by Indiana law, the development is subject to **IC 14-21-1-26.5**. That issue should therefore be screened early in title, ALTA, and constraints work even though the ordinance does not mandate a general Phase IA survey. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)
10. **State-agency approvals incorporated into the county file.** The development-plan section expressly contemplates that approvals from IDEM, DNR, INDOT, the Indiana State Department of Health, the County Drainage Board, utilities, and other agencies may need to be included on the appropriate forms and signed by the proper authority. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)

## Estimated Timeline

A Pulaski County merchant-solar path should be modeled in three overlapping phases. **Phase 1** is county land-use entitlement. Because the county requires newspaper notice **10 to 30 days** before hearing, mailed notice **15 to 30 days** before hearing, and the BZA typically hears matters on the fourth Monday of odd-numbered months with special hearings as needed in even-numbered months, a complete application usually needs **1 to 3 months** to reach a decision, longer if the matter is continued. [gov.pulaskionline.org](http://gov.pulaskionline.org)

**Phase 2** is post-approval engineering and agreement closeout. The decommissioning plan, stormwater package, drainage agreement, RUMA, any EDA, road survey, and third-party engineering review can run in parallel, but they must be complete before the county issues the building permit under § 7.18. For a project of this scale, that workstream should be budgeted at **2 to 6 months** after the BZA decision, with schedule risk driven by drainage, road negotiations, and tax-abatement documentation rather than by the ordinance's paper requirements alone. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)

**Phase 3** is state environmental permitting and, if applicable, utility regulation. IDEM stormwater coverage and any DNR floodway approvals typically fit within final engineering and can be pursued concurrently with county post-approval filings. If the project is instead sponsored by a jurisdictional utility and requires an IURC CPCN, the state docket adds a separate **6 to 9 month** approval track based on recent Indiana solar precedent. A realistic all-in entitlement window for a **merchant 900 MW**

Pulaski County solar project is therefore approximately **4 to 9 months** from complete county filing to notice-to-proceed on civil work; a **utility-owned/rate-based** version should be modeled closer to **9 to 15 months** because the IURC case becomes the critical path. [in.gov](https://www.in.gov)

## Political And Stakeholder Landscape

### Governing Framework

Pulaski County is not a greenfield solar jurisdiction. Utility-scale solar first moved there through the Board of Zoning Appeals (“B.Z.A.”) special-exception process. Mammoth Solar filed a special-exception application in June 2020 for a commercial solar energy system (“CSES”) on 4,511 acres in Pulaski County, and Moss Creek later likewise obtained a special exception for its Beaver Township facility. The county then rewrote its ordinance framework. On February 22, 2022, the Board of Commissioners referred solar-related amendments to the Advisory Plan Commission (“A.P.C.”) under Indiana Code § 36-7-4-607(a); the A.P.C. held a public hearing on March 16, 2022, continued that hearing to April 1, 2022, and the commissioners adopted the amended ordinance on April 8, 2022, effective May 23, 2022, as Pulaski County Ordinance No. 2022-05. The current county-wide land-use code is Pulaski County Ordinance No. 2025-03, the Unified Development Ordinance (“UDO”), which applies in unincorporated Pulaski County outside Francesville and Winamac and their extraterritorial jurisdictions. [public.courts.in.gov](https://public.courts.in.gov)

Pulaski County also regulates solar through a second layer of project-specific agreements. The county’s project pages for Moss Creek, Bottlebrush, Mayapple, and Mammoth Grazing Lands show the same recurring package: county-council economic revitalization area (“ERA”) and assessed-value-deduction resolutions, commissioner resolutions authorizing economic development agreements, road-use agreements, drainage agreements, decommissioning agreements, and separate compliance-monitoring arrangements. The county’s commissioners and surveyor pages direct complaints about solar road-use, drainage, signage, and compliance issues to V.S. Engineering, which confirms that Pulaski treats post-approval construction and operations as an ongoing county-managed compliance matter rather than a one-time zoning event. For a 900 MW project, that means entitlement risk does not end with ordinance compliance; roads, drainage, decommissioning security, and monitoring remain independent leverage points for county officials and remonstrators. [gov.pulaskionline.org](https://gov.pulaskionline.org)

### Elected Officials

The current Board of Commissioners is Donald “Don” Street, Jr. as president for District 2, John M. “Mike” McClure as vice-president for District 3, and Jennifer “Jenny” Knebel for District 1. Street and Knebel won four-year terms in the November 5, 2024 general election. The next commissioner seat back on the ballot is District 3 in the May 5, 2026 primary, which places McClure’s seat under near-term political pressure if a major solar filing requires visible county action in 2026.

The current board is divided on energy-infrastructure restrictions. In January 2025, Knebel pushed for moratoria on battery energy storage systems (“BESS”), carbon capture, data centers, and future industrial solar projects. On February 18, 2025, the commissioners voted 2-1 to deny an 18-month BESS moratorium that the A.P.C. had recommended. Street and McClure formed the majority; Knebel dissented. The same alignment reappeared on June 2, 2025, when Street and McClure voted 2-1 to remove a stop-work order affecting Mammoth after adopting the view that UDO § 5.6.C.1.D (“Fences and Walls”) allows fencing within setbacks. Knebel again voted no. A July 21, 2025 commissioner meeting then returned to questions about solar and battery-storage moratoria. The practical reading is straightforward. Knebel is the board’s principal restrictive voice. Street and McClure have recently operated as the working majority on solar-adjacent implementation disputes. [wkvi.com](https://wkvi.com)

### Planning and Zoning Bodies

The A.P.C. remains the county’s ordinance-writing and policy gatekeeper. The county’s current A.P.C. page lists Abby Shidler-Dickey as president, Tyler Gutwein as vice-president, Bob Keller as secretary, Megan Korous as a citizen-member, and Commissioner McClure and Councilman Ken Boswell among the ex officio members. The page identifies Indiana Code § 36-7-4-208(a) as the governing statute for A.P.C. composition and confirms that the commission is responsible for implementing land-use planning and revising the comprehensive plan and development code. That body matters for any future text amendment, setback revision, moratorium, or code interpretation that needs to be normalized before a project filing. [pulaskionline.org](https://pulaskionline.org)

The B.Z.A. remains the county’s quasi-judicial tribunal. The current B.Z.A. page lists Derrick Stalbaum as chair, Matt Kelsey as secretary, and Mark Eber, Bob Keller, and Abby Shidler-Dickey as the remaining members. The county expressly describes the B.Z.A. as quasi-judicial, states that its decisions are reviewable by judicial review, and cites Indiana Code § 36-7-4-920(g) for the rule that it is illegal to seek to influence a member regarding a pending matter. That separation is not academic. Mammoth and Moss Creek both produced appellate litigation out of B.Z.A. action. Any future Pulaski strategy therefore has to distinguish between legislative engagement on ordinance text and strictly record-based advocacy if a matter reaches the B.Z.A. on a

special exception, variance, or administrative appeal. [public.courts.in.gov](https://public.courts.in.gov)

## Solar Project History and Litigation

Mammoth was the county's first major stress test. In June 2020, Mammoth Solar filed a special-exception application to construct a CSES on 4,511 acres in Pulaski County. The filing described the Pulaski component as the first phase of a larger project projected to generate up to one gigawatt and ultimately require roughly 12,000 acres. The B.Z.A. approved the application, but the trial court vacated that approval. On September 21, 2022, the Court of Appeals affirmed in *Mammoth Solar, a/k/a Starke Solar LLC v. Ehrlich*, Court of Appeals Case No. 21A-PL-2060. That opinion made clear that Pulaski's solar approvals were legally vulnerable when the application record did not satisfy the county's own ordinance requirements. [public.courts.in.gov](https://public.courts.in.gov)

Moss Creek followed, and its litigation ran in the opposite direction. In *Moss Creek Solar, LLC v. Ehrlich*, Court of Appeals Case No. 22A-PL-2648, decided June 19, 2023, the Court of Appeals reversed the Pulaski Superior Court and held that the B.Z.A. had not acted arbitrarily or capriciously in accepting the application as complete and approving it, despite remonstrators' attacks on the application's authority and fire-protection showing. A separate challenge to the project's tax-abatement package also failed. In *Ehrlich v. Moss Creek Solar, LLC*, Court of Appeals Case No. 22A-PL-1732, decided September 7, 2023, the court affirmed the county council's ERA and assessed-value-deduction approval under Resolution No. 2022-02. That appeal arose from Pulaski Superior Court Cause No. 66-D01-2201-PL-2. Together, those two 2023 Moss Creek decisions show that Pulaski opposition is willing to litigate both zoning and tax-incentive approvals, but they also show that a complete record can survive appellate review. [public.courts.in.gov](https://public.courts.in.gov)

The county did not answer those cases by freezing solar. It kept processing projects while tightening conditions around them. On May 8, 2023, the county council adopted Preliminary Resolution No. 2023-04 for Bottlebrush Solar. On June 12, 2023, after public hearing, it adopted Confirmatory Resolution No. 2023-05. Local reporting described Bottlebrush as a proposed 200 MW project in Beaver and Salem Townships and reported that the council approved the economic-development agreement and tax abatement by a 4-2 vote with one abstention. Two months later, on August 21, 2023, the commissioners adopted Ordinance No. 2023-08 amending UDO No. 2022-05 to require perimeter landscaping along road frontage and facing non-participating habitable dwellings within one-half mile of a CSES, and to require a reasonable attempt to notify affected property owners 45-60 days before filing a WECS or CSES permit application. The chronology matters. Pulaski's response to controversy has been calibration, not prohibition. [pulaskionline.org](https://pulaskionline.org)

By 2025, the county was managing several solar files at once. January 2025 council reporting described four active large projects—Mammoth, Moss Creek, Bottlebrush, and Mayapple—and tied county budgeting to compliance oversight of economic-development, road-use, and drainage agreements. On June 2, 2025, the commissioners stated that Mammoth/Doral accounted for 9,722 acres in Pulaski County, Moss Creek 1,708 acres, Mayapple 2,328 acres, and Bottlebrush roughly 1,300 acres, or about 15,058 acres total, which the commissioners characterized as about 5.4% of county acreage. Meanwhile, the county council in February 2025 reviewed new Doral-related ERA requests, including Resolution No. 2025-06 for Mammoth Grazing Lands covering approximately 7,686.7844 acres across 137 parcels, and by September 2025 the county had posted Resolution No. 2025-16 and the associated economic-development agreement for Mammoth Grazing Lands. Pulaski therefore remains an active solar county, not a closed county. [wkvi.com](https://wkvi.com)

## Political Dynamics

Opposition in Pulaski County is durable, organized, and experienced. The same remonstrator names recur across the Mammoth and Moss Creek appellate captions, and public hearings on Bottlebrush and the 2025 BESS moratorium drew concentrated opposition focused on property values, agricultural land conversion, emergency response, environmental risk, and outside-developer tax abatements. That history means a 900 MW proposal would not be treated as a first encounter with utility-scale solar. It would be evaluated against a local political record already shaped by multiple court fights, repeated code amendments, and countywide anxiety over cumulative solar acreage. [public.courts.in.gov](https://public.courts.in.gov)

That does not make a 900 MW filing implausible. It does change what has to be solved in advance. Pulaski has already seen a Pulaski County phase of Mammoth described in court as up to one gigawatt, and the county has continued to process additional solar acreage and tax-incentive packages after that fight. The county's recurring pressure points are not abstract climate or grid questions. They are application completeness, fire and emergency-response planning, setbacks and screening, construction traffic, drainage, decommissioning security, and post-approval compliance monitoring. Those are the issues that generated the Mammoth reversal risk, the Moss Creek fire-plan dispute, the Bottlebrush hearing opposition, the 2023 landscaping amendment, and the 2025 setback fight. A developer that arrives with those items already reduced to enforceable documents will fit Pulaski's recent pattern much better than a developer that asks the county to solve them after the filing is made. [public.courts.in.gov](https://public.courts.in.gov)

## State Representation and Practical Implications

At the state level, Pulaski County is in Senate District 5, represented by Ed Charbonneau. The county is split between House District 16, represented by Kendell Culp, and House District 17, represented by Jack Jordan. Pulaski County's 2024 election guidance states that District 16 includes all county townships except Tippecanoe, Harrison, and Van Buren, while District 17 consists of those three townships. Those legislators matter on statewide tax, utility, and preemption issues. They do not control local siting. In Pulaski, the decisive venues remain local: the commissioners for ordinance direction and implementation disputes, the A.P.C. for text amendments and recommendations, the B.Z.A. for quasi-judicial review, and the county council for any ERA or assessed-value deduction under Indiana Code § 6-1.1-12.1. [indianasenaterepublicans.com](https://www.indianasenaterepublicans.com)

For a 900 MW project, the county's recent record supports a mixed conclusion. Pulaski has already entertained solar at or near that scale, and it continues to process solar-related incentives and agreements. But the local path is no longer politically light. The safest route is a front-loaded county strategy that treats Street and McClure as the likely votes needed for implementation issues, expects Knebel to press for more restrictive conditions, addresses the A.P.C. early on any ordinance-fit question, and reserves B.Z.A.-level advocacy for a tightly documented hearing record if a quasi-judicial approval is required. In Pulaski County, technical completeness is political strategy. [wkvi.com](https://www.wkvi.com)

## Regulatory Framework

### Pulaski County Solar Siting Posture

Pulaski County regulates utility-scale solar through its Unified Development Ordinance rather than through a separate standalone solar code. The county website identifies Ordinance No. 2025-03 as the current UDO, applicable in unincorporated Pulaski County outside the incorporated towns of Francesville and Winamac and their extraterritorial jurisdictions. The ordinance itself states that it amends Ordinance No. 2022-05, which the county adopted on April 8, 2022 and made effective on May 23, 2022, and that Ordinance No. 2025-03 was adopted and made effective on March 3, 2025. [pulaskionline.org](https://www.pulaskionline.org)

The county's modern solar framework was built in 2022. On February 22, 2022, the Board of Commissioners referred proposed solar amendments to the Advisory Plan Commission under Indiana Code § 36-7-4-607(a). The APC held a public hearing on March 16, 2022, continued the matter on April 1, 2022, and the Commissioners adopted the amendments on April 8, 2022. Those amendments created the current solar article structure, revised Chapters 2, 4, 7, and 8, and removed the former five-acre minimum from the definition of "Commercial Solar Energy System." Even after that rewrite, the county did not broadly convert farm-ground solar to a by-right use. On May 16, 2022, the APC deadlocked on the Commissioners' request to make commercial solar a permitted use in A-1 and A-2 districts, leaving the county's project practice on the special-exception track. [pulaskionline.org](https://www.pulaskionline.org)

That special-exception path has already produced appellate litigation. Moss Creek Solar filed its special-exception application on August 2, 2021, supplemented it before hearing under Docket No. 39272021-01, and obtained BZA approval after the September 27, 2021 hearing. Nearby landowners then sought judicial review in Trial Court Cause No. 66D01-2110-PL-000012. In *Moss Creek Solar, LLC v. Connie L. Ehrlich*, Court of Appeals Case No. 22A-PL-2648, decided June 19, 2023, the Court of Appeals reversed the trial court and held that the BZA had substantial evidence to find the landowner consents adequate and the fire-protection and safety plan sufficient under UDO § 2.3(R)(3)(e). The practical lesson is that Pulaski County will process solar, but every application item can become a litigation issue if the record is thin. [law.justia.com](https://www.law.justia.com)

The county tightened the solar rules again in 2025. Public notice for Ordinance No. 2025-03 shows amendments to § 2.3.R and Article 7, including certified-mail notice to owners within up to 2,640 feet, revised perimeter-landscaping language, a reapplication requirement for parcel swaps and other material layout changes, revised setback text in Table 7.3, and an express post-construction road-repair obligation under the road-use and maintenance agreement. The county then continued discussing further solar amendments in early 2026. A public notice dated January 29, 2026 set an APC special session for February 17, 2026 to consider additional amendments to § 2.3.R, Article 7, and Article 8. The county's posted governing ordinance remains Ordinance No. 2025-03. [pulaskijournal.com](https://www.pulaskijournal.com)

### Current Approval Path and Local Standards

For a utility-scale project, the operative county path is still the BZA special-exception route, not a routine administrative zoning clearance. The BZA is the county body that hears special-exception requests and administrative appeals, and its decisions are subject to judicial review. County practice confirms that large solar projects have been run through that channel. Moss Creek's 2021 filing was an "Application for Special Exception," and the later 2022 debate in Pulaski County expressly concerned whether commercial solar in A-1 and A-2 should remain special exception or become a permitted use. A 900 MW proposal

should therefore be modeled as a special-exception case with a full evidentiary record from the outset. [gov.pulaskionline.org](http://gov.pulaskionline.org)

The up-front county filing burden is substantial. Under § 7.1.C.1, as amended by Ordinance No. 2025-03, a CSES applicant must notify affected property owners by certified mail, using Form 3800, within the defined area up to 2,640 feet from the project, 45 to 60 days before filing. Before any building permit issues, § 7.18 requires submission of a decommissioning plan under § 7.4 and county-approved project agreements, including an Economic Development Agreement, Drainage Agreement, and Road Use and Maintenance Agreement. Section 7.18 also authorizes third-party engineering review at the developer's expense. County project pages show this is not theoretical. Moss Creek and Mayapple both have posted road-use, drainage, and decommissioning documents, and the Surveyor's Office separately maintains signed drainage agreements for Mammoth, Moss Creek, Bottlebrush, and Mayapple. [pulaskijournal.com](http://pulaskijournal.com)

Article 7 imposes the core siting standards. Section 7.17/Table 7.3 requires a 75-foot setback from any CSES component, including site fencing, to either side of an internal ditch; a 150-foot setback from any CSES component, including site fencing, to a non-participating or non-included property line or any right-of-way; and a setback from an inverter or converter to a communications tower equal to 1.1 times the tower's total height. Section 7.14.B.3 requires perimeter landscaping outside the fence line along road frontage and facing all habitable dwellings on non-participating properties within one-half mile. At the same time, the ordinance states that screening along non-participating agricultural properties is not required unless road frontage or dwellings independently trigger it. [pulaskijournal.com](http://pulaskijournal.com)

The operational standards are likewise detailed. Section 7.15 caps CSES noise at 50 dBA measured from the nearest property line, except during construction or short-term maintenance, and not between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Section 7.15 also requires the facility to be designed, oriented, or screened to avoid concentrated and prolonged glare into abutting structures and roadways. Section 7.14.C limits lighting to the maximum intensity reasonably required for safety, inspection, repair, maintenance, and operation, with shielding where necessary so direct light does not extend substantially beyond the facility. Section 7.14.H requires low-growing native perennials with an emphasis on pollinators, encourages compatible dual use such as grazing and apiaries, and requires plantings in ditch setbacks to follow USDA Farm Service Agency filter-strip guidance. Section 7.15.B further provides that AC feeder lines and collection cabling are to be installed underground to the extent practical and consistent with industry standards. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)

Pulaski County also treats later design drift as a new land-use event. Section 7.16.A now states that any material change in layout or major equipment, and any parcel swap, addition, or trade, requires reapplication. That matters for a 900 MW project because phasing, interconnection design, parcel assembly, and equipment substitutions often change over time. In Pulaski County, those changes cannot be assumed to fit within ordinary field-level revision practice. The county amended this provision in Ordinance No. 2025-03 precisely to make that point. [pulaskijournal.com](http://pulaskijournal.com)

### **Financial, Decommissioning, and Enforcement Risk**

The county's fee regime is unusually heavy for a utility-scale solar project. Ordinance No. 2025-05, adopted March 3, 2025 and effective not later than June 4, 2025, amended the development fee schedule to impose a commercial-solar application fee of \$15,000 plus \$1,000 per MW per project, plus compliance-monitoring costs, plus a 10% surcharge on third-party consultant costs, plus a one-time \$10,000 agreement-development fee. By arithmetic, that schedule creates a minimum county fee exposure of \$925,000 for a 900 MW project before pass-through consultant expenses and before separate building permits for Class 1 structures or industrialized building systems. The ordinance also states that a commercial solar building permit will remain open until all phases of construction are complete under the final submitted site plan. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)

The decommissioning and insurance provisions are similarly project-scale requirements. Under § 7.3, any grid-connected generation over 10 kW must carry liability insurance with minimum limits of \$2,000,000 per occurrence and \$5,000,000 aggregate, with a deductible not exceeding \$100,000, and the county may require additional-insured status. Under § 7.4, a signed and executed decommissioning plan must be submitted before construction begins or the building permit will be revoked. The plan must include contractor cost estimates, financial assurance at least equal to demolition and removal cost less estimated salvage value, a five-year update cycle, and county access and reimbursement rights if the county must complete the work. Section 7.4 also provides that a CSES is a discontinued use after one year without energy production unless a county-approved return-to-service plan is in place. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)

Pulaski County has shown that it will actively enforce, and actively dispute, those standards after approval. The county's project pages for Moss Creek, Mammoth, Bottlebrush, and Mayapple direct compliance concerns to V.S. Engineering, and the Moss Creek and Mayapple pages post executed compliance-monitoring agreements and payment agreements for that monitoring. On June 2, 2025, the Commissioners lifted a stop-work order on Mammoth after a dispute over whether fencing counted as a "CSES component" for setback purposes. The same meeting minutes record county officials stating that Pulaski County does

not have a standalone solar ordinance and instead regulates solar under the UDO. That episode shows that Article 7 language is being read in real time, under political pressure, against active construction. A new 900 MW sponsor should expect the same level of scrutiny on setbacks, fencing, drainage, traffic routes, and post-approval compliance. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)

### Agricultural Context, Incentives, and State Permits

The county’s broader land-use policy remains agriculture-protective, and that shapes solar risk even where Article 7 supplies the direct siting rules. UDO § 5.12 states that the county’s farmland compatibility standards are intended to promote development compatible with existing farms and agricultural uses and expressly references Indiana’s Right to Farm law, IC 32-30-6, and Pulaski County’s January 2016 Right-to-Farm Ordinance. Section 5.12 applies those standards to major subdivisions, planned developments, and improvement location permits on tracts of ten acres or more adjacent to bona fide farms, including a 50-foot Type C vegetated buffer. For a 900 MW solar project on active farm ground, that agricultural-compatibility policy will be part of the local narrative even where the solar-specific standards control the formal review. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)

If the sponsor seeks tax abatement, Pulaski County treats incentives as a separate approval lane. Moss Creek’s incentive package proceeded through County Council Resolution No. 2022-02 and Commissioners Resolution No. 2022-03, together with an Economic Development Agreement dated January 18, 2022 that cites Indiana Code chapter 6-1.1-12.1. Bottlebrush later followed the same pattern through Council Resolution Nos. 2023-04 and 2023-05. Section 7.18 of the current UDO makes an EDA mandatory before a building permit issues if the owner or operator seeks any form of tax abatement. A 900 MW developer should therefore assume two parallel county tracks: land-use approval before the BZA and a separate ERA/abatement and contract track before the Council and Commissioners if incentives are requested. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)

At the state level, the project will face the usual Indiana environmental and water-permitting stack, and those permits will be unavoidable at this scale. IDEM’s Construction Stormwater General Permit applies to construction activity disturbing one acre or more and requires permit coverage through an NOI or online application. If the project will fill or otherwise affect wetlands, streams, rivers, lakes, or other Waters of the United States, IDEM states that Section 401 Water Quality Certification is required and that the applicant must also obtain the federal Section 404 dredge-and-fill authorization from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Separately, the DNR Division of Water states that the Flood Control Act, IC 14-28-1, requires prior approval for construction, excavation, fill, or obstructions in a regulated floodway. And because Pulaski County’s own practice has been to require project-specific drainage agreements, any interaction with county-regulated drains or ditches should be addressed early with the Surveyor and Drainage Board, not deferred until construction. [in.gov](http://in.gov)

For a 900 MW solar project, Pulaski County is legally available but procedurally exacting. The county has a functioning approval pathway, a history of granting utility-scale solar approvals, and a current code that regulates rather than bans the use. But it also has a demonstrated record of project-specific agreements, third-party compliance monitoring, post-permit enforcement fights, and litigation over application completeness and fire-safety materials. In Pulaski County, success turns less on whether solar is categorically allowed and more on whether the applicant can assemble a record that is complete, conservative, and durable enough to survive both the BZA hearing and the court challenge that may follow. [pulaskionline.org](http://pulaskionline.org)

### Past Projects

Name	Location	Description	Outcomes
<b>Mammoth Solar Phase I (North)</b>	Starke and Pulaski counties, Indiana	Large-scale solar project near Pulaski County listed as a 400 MWAC operating solar farm in Starke and Pulaski counties, with an in-service year of 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reached operating status in 2024</li> <li>Added 400 MWAC of solar capacity in the Pulaski/Starke area</li> </ul>
<b>Mammoth South</b>	Pulaski County, Indiana	Ground-mounted single-axis PV solar project in Pulaski County covering about 3,500 acres and designed to produce 300 MW of clean energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project broke ground in Pulaski County</li> <li>Planned to generate renewable power for households in northwest Indiana and the greater Midwest</li> <li>Advanced the next phase of the broader Mammoth Solar development</li> </ul>
<b>Dunns Bridge I Solar</b>	Jasper County, Indiana	NIPSCO’s first utility-scale solar project in Jasper County, rated at 265 MW and serving as the first phase of the broader Dunns Bridge solar-plus-storage complex near Pulaski County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activated in 2023</li> <li>Became part of a larger 700 MW solar-plus-storage complex in Jasper and Starke counties</li> <li>Contributes to new tax revenue for Jasper and Starke counties</li> </ul>

Name	Location	Description	Outcomes
<b>Dunns Bridge Solar / Storage Phase II</b>	Jasper and Starke counties, Indiana	Second phase of the Dunns Bridge project near Pulaski County, featuring up to 435 MW of solar generation plus a 75 MW battery energy storage system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moved forward under construction</li> <li>Planned to create up to 300 construction jobs</li> <li>Expected to provide about \$59 million in additional revenue for Jasper and Starke counties</li> </ul>
<b>Indiana Crossroads Solar</b>	White County, Indiana	200 MW solar project in White County near Pulaski County, developed for NIPSCO as one of its first utility-scale solar facilities in Indiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activated in 2023</li> <li>Provides annual Economic Development Agreement funds to White County</li> <li>Expected to generate substantial property tax payments over the project's lifetime</li> </ul>
<b>Cavalry Energy Center</b>	White County, Indiana	Renewable energy project in White County near Pulaski County consisting of 200 MW of solar generation and 45 MW of battery storage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completed and added to NIPSCO's generating portfolio</li> <li>Expanded NIPSCO's operating renewable fleet in northwest Indiana</li> <li>Contributed to excess power and renewable energy credit sales returned to customers</li> </ul>
<b>Twin Lakes Solar</b>	White County, Indiana	150 MW solar project in White County near Pulaski County, operating since 2024 and serving the MISO market	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Entered operation in 2024</li> <li>Expected to power about 25,000 homes</li> <li>Projected to generate local tax revenue and create 250 to 300 jobs</li> </ul>
<b>Meadow Lake Wind Farm</b>	White and Benton counties, Indiana	Major wind project near Pulaski County consisting of six phases and 801 MW of installed capacity in northwestern Indiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Built out to 801 MW across six phases</li> <li>Generated significant payments to local governments and landowners</li> <li>Supported hundreds of construction jobs and dozens of permanent jobs</li> </ul>

## Key Stakeholders

Name	Organization	Role	Contact
<b>Government Decision-Makers</b> (24)			
<b>Donald "Don" Street, Jr</b>	Pulaski County Board of Commissioners, Pulaski County, Indiana	President, District 2 Commissioner	commissioner2@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574.946.3653
<b>John M. "Mike" McClure</b>	Pulaski County Board of Commissioners	Vice-President, District 3 Commissioner	commissioner3@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574-946-3653
<b>Jennifer "Jenny" Knebel</b>	Pulaski County Board of Commissioners	Pulaski County Commissioner, District 1	commissioner1@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574.946.3653
<b>Diana Day</b>	Pulaski County Tourism Advisory Council	President, Pulaski County Tourism Advisory Council; Market Manager, Pulaski County Farmers Market	pulaskicofarmersmarket@gmail.com 574-229-0277
<b>Mark Eber</b>	Pulaski County Board of Zoning Appeals	Member, Pulaski County Board of Zoning Appeals — County Council citizen-member appointee	buildinginspector@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574.946.7858
<b>Ken Boswell</b>	Pulaski County Council, Pulaski County, Indiana	County Councilman, District 3	countycouncil3@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574.946.3653 (Pulaski County Council office)

Name	Organization	Role	Contact
<b>Jeffery Richwine</b>	Pulaski County Council, Pulaski County, Indiana	County Council Member	countycouncil5@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574.946.3653
<b>Jerry Locke</b>	Pulaski County Council, Pulaski County, Indiana	Former Pulaski County Council District 3 member and former Pulaski County commissioner; farm owner and retired INDOT shop supervisor	auditorsoffice@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574-242-0770
<b>Lenora Hoover</b>	Van Buren Township, Pulaski County, Indiana	Van Buren Township Trustee	dlhoover@pwrtc.com 574.595.7836
<b>Jasmine Bolen</b>	White Post Township, Pulaski County, Indiana	White Post Township Trustee	whiteposttownship@gmail.com 219.204.9739
<b>Danyelle Weaver</b>	Winamac Town Council, Town of Winamac, Pulaski County, Indiana	Winamac Town Council Member; Winamac Plan Commission member	(574) 242-1441
<b>Alvin Parish</b>	Winamac Town Council	Winamac Town Council Vice President / Council Member	ermab7@pwrtc.com (574) 946-3064
<b>Sheila Hazemi</b>	Pulaski County Council, Pulaski County, Indiana	County Council President, at-large member	countycouncil7@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574.946.3653
<b>Brad Bonnell</b>	Pulaski County Council, Pulaski County, Indiana	County Council Member, District 1	countycouncil1@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574.946.3653
<b>Michael T. Tiede</b>	Pulaski County Council, Pulaski County, Indiana	Pulaski County Council Vice-President, District 4	countycouncil4@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574.946.3653
<b>Albert J. "A.J." Gutwein</b>	Pulaski County Council	County Council Member, At-Large; business owner	countycouncil6@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574-946-3653
<b>Tim A. Overmyer</b>	Pulaski County Council; United States Postal Service	County Council Member, At-Large; Rural Carrier	countycouncil2@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574.946.3653
<b>Steve Cotner</b>	Pulaski County Soil & Water Conservation District Board of Supervisors	Secretary, Pulaski County Soil & Water Conservation District Board of Supervisors; retired farmer	michelle.fox@in.nacdnet.net 574-946-3243 ext. 3079
<b>Kevin Podell</b>	Pulaski County Soil & Water Conservation District Board of Supervisors	Vice-President, Pulaski County Soil & Water Conservation District Board of Supervisors; farmer/landowner	podellfarm@gmail.com 574-595-0987
<b>Tom J. Murray</b>	Town of Winamac, Indiana	Town Council President; Winamac businessman	clerk@townofwinamac.com (574) 946-4809
<b>Niki Clemons</b>	Pulaski County Soil & Water Conservation District	President, Board of Supervisors	michelle.fox@in.nacdnet.net 574-946-3243 Ext. 3079
<b>Jake Tanner</b>	West Central School Corporation (Pulaski County, Indiana)	West Central School Corporation Board of Trustees member; board president in 2025	jtanner@wcsc.k12.in.us 219-567-9161
<b>Jonathan Gutwein</b>	West Central School Corporation Board of Trustees	West Central School Board trustee and board president	central_office@wcsc.k12.in.us 219-567-9161
<b>Pulaski County Drainage Board</b>	Pulaski County Drainage Board / Surveyor's Office	County drainage permitting authority (members: the three county commissioners; staff: Surveyor's Office)	surveyorsoffice@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574-946-3253

## Regulatory & Permitting (6)

Name	Organization	Role	Contact
<b>Karla Redweik</b>	Pulaski County Building Department, Pulaski County, Indiana	Building Inspector / Plan Administrator	buildinginspector@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574-946-7858
<b>Tina Dunn</b>	Pulaski County Building Department / Advisory Plan Commission, Pulaski County, Indiana	Planning and Zoning Coordinator / Administrative Secretary; Building Department Assistant	zoning@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574-946-7858
<b>Derrick Stalbaum</b>	Pulaski County Board of Zoning Appeals	Chairman, Pulaski County Board of Zoning Appeals; farmer; former teacher	buildinginspector@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574.946.7858
<b>Matt Kelsey</b>	Pulaski County Board of Zoning Appeals; DeFur Voran LLP	Pulaski County Board of Zoning Appeals secretary; attorney	mkelsey@defur.com 765-216-0181
<b>V.S. Engineering</b>	V.S. Engineering (contracted by Pulaski County)	County solar compliance monitor	pulaskisolarcompliance@vsengineering.com
<b>Andrew Fritz</b>	Pulaski County Advisory Plan Commission	Member, Pulaski County Advisory Plan Commission (documented in Feb. 6, 2025 APC minutes)	
<b>Economic Development</b> (6)			
<b>Doug Roth</b>	Pulaski County Advisory Commission on Industrial Development (ACID)	President, Pulaski County Advisory Commission on Industrial Development (ACID)	574.946.3869
<b>Amy Jo Hoover</b>	Pulaski County Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors	H&R Block franchise owner; Pulaski County Chamber of Commerce treasurer and community leader	amy.hoover@hrblock.com (574) 946-3832
<b>Angie Anspach</b>	Pulaski County Chamber of Commerce, Winamac, Indiana.	Executive Director, Pulaski County Chamber of Commerce.	chamber@pulaskionline.org 574-946-7600
<b>Amy Cantu</b>	Pulaski County Chamber of Commerce; H&R Block/Block Advisors (Winamac)	President/vice president of the Pulaski County Chamber of Commerce; Senior Tax Specialist at H&R Block/Block Advisors in Winamac	574-225-0549
<b>Aaron Paulsen</b>	Pulaski County Chamber of Commerce	Treasurer and board member, Pulaski County Chamber of Commerce	574-946-4233
<b>Al Breyfogle</b>	Pulaski County Economic Development Commission	President, Economic Development Commission	
<b>Opposition &amp; Advocacy Groups</b> (5)			
<b>Michelle Fox</b>	Pulaski County Soil & Water Conservation District	District Support Coordinator	michelle.fox@in.nacdnet.net 574-946-3243 ext. 3079
<b>Shelley Werner</b>	Pulaski County Soil & Water Conservation District	Education Coordinator / Office Assistant	shelley.werner@in.nacdnet.net 574-946-3243 ext. 3085

Name	Organization	Role	Contact
<b>Kerry Nielsen</b>	Pulaski County Soil & Water Conservation District / USDA NRCS	District Conservationist, USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service	kerry.nielsen@in.usda.gov 574-946-3243 ext. 3086
<b>Julie Morris</b>	Indiana State Department of Agriculture, Division of Soil Conservation (Pulaski County / Northwest Region)	Resource Specialist	jumorris@isda.in.gov 574-946-3243 ext. 3077
<b>Connie Ehrlich</b>	Pulaski County solar opposition group	Lead remonstrator / organized opposition to solar development	
<b>Community &amp; Business</b> (36)			
<b>Nathan P. Origer</b>	Pulaski County Department of Community Development / Pulaski County Community Development Commission	Executive Director	nporiger@pulaskionline.org 574.946.3869
<b>Brian Ledley</b>	Pulaski County Redevelopment Commission / Pulaski Memorial Hospital	Vice President of Communications and Patient Experience at Pulaski Memorial Hospital; President of the Pulaski County Redevelopment Commission	bledley@pmhnet.com 574-946-2148
<b>Abby Shidler-Dickey</b>	Pulaski County Advisory Plan Commission / Greenbridge Farm	President, Pulaski County Advisory Plan Commission; owner of Greenbridge Farm	greenbridgefarm@gmail.com 574-270-0307
<b>Bob Keller</b>	Pulaski County Advisory Plan Commission	Secretary, Pulaski County Advisory Plan Commission; agricultural business owner	zoning@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574-946-7858
<b>Todd Schmicker</b>	Pulaski County Advisory Plan Commission	Pulaski County Plan Commission board member and farmer	buildinginspector@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574-946-7858
<b>Breann Wilson</b>	Pulaski County Advisory Plan Commission / Pulaski County Surveyor's Office	Surveyor's designee; advisory/ex-officio member of the Pulaski County Advisory Plan Commission	surveyoroffice@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574-946-3253
<b>Clifford Robinson</b>	Pulaski County Advisory Plan Commission; The Law Office of Clifford Robinson, LLC	Attorney	cmrobinson@cmrobinsonlaw.com (219) 964-4288
<b>Chris Schramm</b>	Pulaski County Sheriff's Office, Pulaski County, Indiana	Sheriff	cschramm@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574.946.6655
<b>Kelly Gaumer</b>	Pulaski County Prosecutor's Office (59th Judicial Circuit), Pulaski County, Indiana	Prosecuting Attorney	prosecutor@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574-946-6858
<b>Holly VanDerAa</b>	Pulaski County Republican Party (formerly Pulaski County Assessor's Office).	Former Pulaski County Assessor; Pulaski County Republican Party secretary.	pulaskiassessor@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574-946-3845
<b>JoLynn Behny</b>	Pulaski County Clerk's Office	Clerk of Courts	clerksoffice@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574-946-3313

Name	Organization	Role	Contact
<b>Jenny Weaver</b>	Pulaski County Surveyor's Office, Pulaski County, Indiana	Pulaski County Surveyor	surveyoroffice@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574-946-3253 / 574-946-4968
<b>MacKenzie Ledley</b>	Pulaski County Public Library / Monroe Township, Pulaski County, Indiana	Executive Director, Pulaski County Public Library; Monroe Township Advisory Board member in Pulaski County, Indiana	mledley@pulaskicounty.lib.in.us 574-946-3432
<b>Cathy Elston</b>	Town of Francesville, Pulaski County, Indiana	Former Francesville Town Clerk-Treasurer	francesvillect@gmail.com 219-567-9521
<b>Teresa Bryant</b>	Pulaski County Auditor's Office, Pulaski County, Indiana	County Auditor	auditoroffice@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574.946.3653
<b>Laura Wheeler</b>	Pulaski County Treasurer's Office (Pulaski County, Indiana)	County Treasurer	treasurersoffice@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574-946-3632
<b>Gary Kruger</b>	Pulaski County Highway Department, Pulaski County, Indiana	County Highway Superintendent	countyhighway@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574.946.3942
<b>Tyler Gutwein</b>	Pulaski County Advisory Plan Commission; Gutwein Popcorn	Citizen member and vice president of the Pulaski County Advisory Plan Commission; plant manager at Gutwein Popcorn	buildinginspector@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574-946-7858
<b>Brad Zellers</b>	Town of Winamac, Pulaski County, Indiana	Town Manager	townmanager@townofwinamac.com (574) 946-3451
<b>Dara Chezem</b>	Eastern Pulaski Community School Corporation	Superintendent	dara.chezem@epulaski.k12.in.us 574-946-4010
<b>Maurice Loehmer</b>	Pulaski County Community Development Commission	Dairy farmer; Pulaski County public official	(574) 542-4680
<b>Chris Kline</b>	Doral Renewables / Mammoth Solar	Development Manager	contact@doral-llc.com (445) 447-2900
<b>Craig Stevenson</b>	Geswein Farm & Land Realty, LLC; Pulaski County Against Solar	Co-Owner & Managing Broker for Indiana; farm and land specialist	craig.matthew.stevenson@gmail.com (574) 870-4383
<b>Robert Simpson</b>	KOVA Ag Products, Inc. (Crop Fertility Specialists)	General Manager at KOVA Ag Products, Inc. / Crop Fertility Specialists	kovagreensburg@ekova.com 574-946-3147
<b>Cathy Rowe</b>	West Central School Corporation, Pulaski County, Indiana	Superintendent	crowe@wcsc.k12.in.us 219-567-9161 ext. 1602
<b>Sammy Jones</b>	Jones Robotic Dairy (Jones Dairy Farm)	Farm owner / agribusiness operator	+1 574-595-7887
<b>Pam Jones</b>	Jones Robotic Dairy (Jones Dairy Farm), Pulaski County, Indiana	Dairy farmer / farm owner / agribusiness operator	574-595-7887
<b>Ed Baptista</b>	Doral Renewables LLC	Vice President of Development and Agrivoltaics at Doral Renewables	legal@doral-llc.com (445) 447-2900
<b>Jason Kuchmay</b>	Snyder Morgan & Kuchmay LLP	Attorney; Partner	jmk@smk.law (260) 312-1233

Name	Organization	Role	Contact
Jeff Lowry	West Central School Corporation Board of Education	School board member	219-567-9811
Dennis Gutwein	West Central School Corporation Board of Education	West Central School Corporation Board member; owner/principal agent at Gutwein Insurance & Financial Services	dennis@gutweinagency.com 219-567-9177
Ray Franko	Pulaski County Advisory Plan Commission	Vice-President, Pulaski County Advisory Plan Commission (deceased 2026)	buildinginspector@pulaskicounty.in.gov 574-946-7858 (county APC/building-planning office contact)
Jacob Ahler	Pulaski County / Riley & Ahler, P.C	Pulaski County Attorney; Attorney at Riley & Ahler, P.C., Rensselaer, IN	219-964-4156 (Riley & Ahler, P.C.)
Megan Korous	Pulaski County Advisory Plan Commission (Pulaski County, Indiana)	Citizen-Member, Pulaski County Advisory Plan Commission	
Isaiah Tidwell	Monroe Township, Pulaski County, Indiana	Local government official	
Billy Bope	Mammoth Solar / Pulaski County agriculture community	Local farmer and vegetation management operator	

## Sources

### Community Sentiment Sources

- [Petition - Stop Commercial Solar in Pulaski County IN - United States - Change.org](#)
- [Solar farm approved in Pulaski County](#)
- [Public hearing for proposed solar farm in Pulaski Co](#)
- [077-25 - AN ORDINANCE REGULATING THE USE OF COUNTY ROADS FOR COMMERCIAL SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY CONSTRUCTION. | Pulaski County Journal](#)
- [Pulaski County weighs stricter solar rules amid resident concerns](#)
- [The country's biggest solar farm is coming to one of the coal-friendliest states | Grist](#)
- [061-25 - PULASKI COUNTY ORDINANCE 2025-03 | Pulaski County Journal](#)
- [Solar farm approved in Pulaski County](#)
- [Pulaski County, Indiana, Unified Development Ordinance](#)
- [Pulaski County Council Approves Resolution for Setting of Funds in the Budget for Solar Payments – WKVI Information Center](#)
- [NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING OF AN APPLICATION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL 118-25 - | Pulaski County Journal](#)
- [pulaskionline.org — Development Fee Schedule](#)
- [Pulaski County – It's the simple things](#)

### Opposition Intelligence Sources

- [NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING OF AN APPLICATION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL 118-25 - | Pulaski County Journal](#)
- [pulaskionline.org — CountyJDO2025](#)
- [Moss Creek Solar, LLC, et al. v. Connie Ehrlich, et al. :: 2023 :: Indiana Court of Appeals Decisions :: Indiana Case Law :: Indiana Law :: U.S. Law :: Justia](#)
- [pulaskionline.org — 2025 06 02 COMM SIGNED MIN](#)
- [2022 UDO Changes re: Solar Energy | Government | Pulaski Online](#)
- [Mammoth Solar proposes expansion as residents appeal project](#)
- [About — Pulaski County Against Solar](#)
- [gov.pulaskionline.org — Commissioners 04 08 2022 Special Meeting minutes](#)
- [Mammoth Solar a/k/a Starke Solar LLC v. Connie Ehrlich, et al. :: 2022 :: Indiana Court of Appeals Decisions :: Indiana Case Law :: Indiana Law :: U.S. Law :: Justia](#)
- [IUPUI Sitallite Phase 1a Final Report](#)
- [Commissioners Approve Moratorium on Solar and Wind Farms - Boone County, Indiana](#)
- [AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING](#)
- [Tippecanoe County Board of Commissioners](#)
- [Latest News — Pulaski County Against Solar](#)

15. Ehrlich et al. v. Moss Creek Solar, LLC, and the Pulaski County Council
16. Mammoth Solar proposes expansion as residents appeal project
17. Mammoth Solar – Pulaski County
18. Commissioners approve solar compliance monitoring service | Pulaski County Journal
19. NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING OF AN APPLICATION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL 118-25 - | Pulaski County Journal
20. Meeting Minutes
21. Commissioners deny Battery Energy Storage System moratorium recommendation | Pulaski County Journal

## Regulatory Framework Sources

---

1. 061-25 - PULASKI COUNTY ORDINANCE 2025-03 | Pulaski County Journal
2. Unified Development Ordinance – Pulaski County
3. 2022 UDO Changes re: Solar Energy – Pulaski County
4. pulaskionline.org — CountyUDO2025
5. Latest News — Pulaski County Against Solar
6. IDEM: Storm Water Permitting: Applicability of 327 IAC 15-5
7. DNR: Water: Permit Application Type
8. 2022 UDO Changes re: Solar Energy – Pulaski County
9. Moss Creek Solar, LLC, et al. v. Connie Ehrlich, et al. :: 2023 :: Indiana Court of Appeals Decisions :: Indiana Case Law :: Indiana Law :: U.S. Law :: Justia
10. 061-25 - PULASKI COUNTY ORDINANCE 2025-03 | Pulaski County Journal
11. Board of Zoning Appeals | Government | Pulaski Online
12. Development Fees – Pulaski County
13. Mammoth Solar – Pulaski County
14. Moss Creek Solar – Pulaski County
15. IDEM: Stormwater Permitting: Construction / Land Disturbance Permitting

## Permitting Pathways Sources

---

1. pulaskionline.org — CountyUDO2025
2. Indiana Code § 8-1-8.5-2. Necessity for Certification :: 2025 Indiana Code :: U.S. Codes and Statutes :: U.S. Law :: Justia
3. ANNUAL REPORT 2024
4. Docketed Case Details - IURC Online Services Portal
5. OUCC: I&M Generation Projects
6. FILED May 31, 2023 INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY
7. IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF INDIANA No. 24A-EX-
8. IDEM: Stormwater Permitting: Construction / Land Disturbance Permitting
9. DNR: Water: General Licenses and Exemptions
10. DHS: Utility Scale Battery Energy Storage Systems
11. gov.pulaskionline.org — APC BZA Hearing Application
12. Board of Zoning Appeals – Pulaski County
13. Pulaski County Indiana - Unified Development Ordinance

## Permitting And Project History Sources

---

1. pulaskionline.org — CountyUDO2025
2. Latest News — Pulaski County Against Solar
3. Moss Creek Solar, LLC, et al. v. Connie Ehrlich, et al. :: 2023 :: Indiana Court of Appeals Decisions :: Indiana Case Law :: Indiana Law :: U.S. Law :: Justia
4. Mammoth Solar – Pulaski County
5. Mammoth Solar breaks ground in Pulaski County for next phase of \$1.5B solar farm in Northwest Indiana
6. Moss Creek Solar, LLC, et al. v. Connie Ehrlich, et al. :: 2023 :: Indiana Court of Appeals Decisions :: Indiana Case Law :: Indiana Law :: U.S. Law :: Justia
7. PULASKI COUNTY RESOLUTION NO. 2021-11
8. Commissioners hear Mayapple solar presentation, county solar update | Pulaski County Journal
9. FILED April 3, 2024 INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY
10. pulaskionline.org — 2025 06 02 COMM SIGNED MIN
11. FEBRUARY 13, 2023
12. pulaskionline.org — Commissioners 06 20 2023 minutes
13. Jasper County Prepared for Transition Away from Schahfer Generating Station - Jasper County Economic Development Organization
14. OUCC: NIPSCO Solar & Wind Energy Cases
15. Docketed Case Details - IURC Online Services Portal
16. 2022 UDO Changes re: Solar Energy | Government | Pulaski Online
17. JUNE 12, 2023
18. Microsoft Word - NextEra - Moss Creek Solar - Economic Development Agreement (Pulaski County)(21664111.12)
19. <https://gov.pulaskionline.org/2022udochanges/>

20. <https://pulaskionline.org/development-fees/>
21. [https://public.courts.in.gov/Decisions/api/Document/Opinion?Id=TQ2hooiJkCa7qwVlg5P8bEV8PxJXEkAkWYXP3A8fh\\_3Fe7gY7WHXgYCV51-YWdsr0](https://public.courts.in.gov/Decisions/api/Document/Opinion?Id=TQ2hooiJkCa7qwVlg5P8bEV8PxJXEkAkWYXP3A8fh_3Fe7gY7WHXgYCV51-YWdsr0)
22. <https://doral-llc.com/projects/mammoth-south-solar-3/>
23. <https://www.pulaskijournal.com/news/commissioners-hear-mayapple-solar-presentation-county-solar-update>
24. [https://iurc.portal.in.gov/\\_entity/sharepointdocumentlocation/a1dc5ad1-f1f1-ee11-904c-001dd80b3d60/bb9c6bba-fd52-45ad-8e64-a444aef13c39?file=45868\\_IndMich\\_Submission+of+April+2024+Semi-Annual+Report\\_040324.pdf](https://iurc.portal.in.gov/_entity/sharepointdocumentlocation/a1dc5ad1-f1f1-ee11-904c-001dd80b3d60/bb9c6bba-fd52-45ad-8e64-a444aef13c39?file=45868_IndMich_Submission+of+April+2024+Semi-Annual+Report_040324.pdf)
25. <https://gov.pulaskionline.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2023/12/Joint-Session-02-13-2023-minutes.pdf>
26. <https://pulaskionline.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/pulaskionline-Pulaski-Co.-Resolution-2023-05-Bottlebrush-Solar-Confirmatory-Signed.pdf>
27. <https://www.in.gov/oucc/electric/key-cases-by-utility/nipsco-electric-rates/nipsco-solar-and-wind-energy-cases>

## Infrastructure And Grid Sources

---

1. NIPSCO Service Territory
2. Olive - Reynolds 345 kV Transmission Line Rebuild
3. [nipsco.com](https://www.nipsco.com) — 2020 attachment o forecast
4. [pjm.com](https://www.pjm.com) — af2 205 isa2
5. [pjm.com](https://www.pjm.com) — af2205 imp
6. [iurc.portal.in.gov](https://iurc.portal.in.gov) — bb9c6bba fd52 45ad 8e64 a444aef13c39
7. FILED October 15, 2024 INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY
8. AF2-078 System Impact Study Report
9. [cdn.misoenergy.org](https://cdn.misoenergy.org) — GI DPP 2018 APR Central SIS Phase II Report R05 10122021596538
10. [pjm.com](https://www.pjm.com) — af1 215 isa
11. [pjm.com](https://www.pjm.com) — ag1349 imp
12. Transition Cycle #1
13. AF1-161 Phase III Study Report

## Economic Analysis Sources

---

1. Tax Abatements – Pulaski County
2. AGREEMENT FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
3. OUCC: Voluntary Clean Energy Standards
4. Public Utilities
5. Clean Electricity Investment Credit | Internal Revenue Service
6. Clean Electricity Low-Income Communities Bonus Credit Amount Program | Internal Revenue Service
7. As solar capacity grows, some of America's most productive farmland is at risk By Reuters
8. [pulaskionline.org](https://pulaskionline.org) — other Council 01 10 2022 minutes
9. THE IMPACT OF THE MAMMOTH SOLAR & MOSS CREEK
10. [pcrd.purdue.edu](https://pcrd.purdue.edu) — executive summary 2023 pulaski county final

## Environmental And Land Use Sources

---

1. Moss Creek Solar, LLC, et al. v. Connie Ehrlich, et al. :: 2023 :: Indiana Court of Appeals Decisions :: Indiana Case Law :: Indiana Law :: U.S. Law :: Justia
2. Moss Creek Solar Incentive Documents, Agreements & Plans | Government | Pulaski Online
3. IDEM: Wetlands, Lakes & Streams: Wetland Acreage by County (1980-1987)
4. Pulaski County, Indiana, Unified Development Ordinance
5. Indiana County Endangered, Threatened and Rare Species List, County: Pulaski
6. Indiana Ecological Services Field Office | Species | U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
7. DNR: Historic Preservation & Archaeology: Environmental Review & Compliance
8. Indiana Department of Natural Resources
9. Courthouse & Justice Center Projects | Government | Pulaski Online
10. CHAPTER TWO
11. Development in a Floodplain in Pulaski County, IN
12. 4 Use Standards Contents 4.1 Permitted and Special
13. Comprehensive Plan – Pulaski County
14. 2026 Comprehensive-Plan R.F.P. Questions – Pulaski County
15. Agriculture | Economic Development | Pulaski Online
16. NRCS Prime and other Important Farmlands
17. CHAPTER FOUR
18. An Analysis of the Estimated Economic Impact

## Political And Stakeholder Landscape Sources

---

1. Pulaski County Council Approves Resolution for Setting of Funds in the Budget for Solar Payments – WKVI Information Center
2. Latest News — Pulaski County Against Solar
3. 2022 UDO Changes re: Solar Energy | Government | Pulaski Online

4. [https://public.courts.in.gov/Decisions/api/Document/Opinion?Id=TQ2hooiJkCa7qwVlg5P8bEV8PxJXEkAkWYXP3A8fh\\_3Fe7gY7WHXgYCV51-YWdsr0](https://public.courts.in.gov/Decisions/api/Document/Opinion?Id=TQ2hooiJkCa7qwVlg5P8bEV8PxJXEkAkWYXP3A8fh_3Fe7gY7WHXgYCV51-YWdsr0)
5. Board of Commissioners – Pulaski County
6. Pulaski County 2026 Election: What to expect | Pulaski County Journal
7. Advisory Plan Commission – Pulaski County
8. Board of Zoning Appeals – Pulaski County
9. Pulaski County Commissioners Deny Battery Energy Storage Systems Moratorium – WKVI Information Center
10. Pulaski Superior Court
11. 67 JUNE 2ND 2025 REGULAR SESSION PULASKI COUNTY
12. General Election 2024: County, State, and Federal – Pulaski County
13. Moss Creek Solar Incentive Documents, Agreements & Plans | Government | Pulaski Online
14. Pulaski County Commissioners Continue Discussions on Moratoriums – WKVI Information Center
15. Advisory Plan Commission – Pulaski County
16. MEMORANDUM DECISION FILED
17. PULASKI COUNTY RESOLUTION NO. 2023-05
18. Ed Charbonneau