



**Information Provided**  
The following information is provided to the Garrard Central Record from the Garrard County Court Clerk, Garrard County Circuit Clerk, the Garrard County Police Department, the Garrard County Sheriff's Office and the Lancaster Police Department.

- DEEDS**
- Lyubov Sokalskiy and Anatoliy Sokalskiy, wife and husband, 4067 Andedon Circle, Sacramento, CA to Mykola Silkovskiy and Iryna Silkovska, 800 Williams Road, Nicholasville, KY. Being all of Lot 64, of the Natures Tree Subdivision. \$55,000.
  - Quitclaim Deed: Joseph B. Harney, a single person, 132 Michelle Ann Court, Harrodsburg, KY to Maia L. Harney, a single person, 175 Sea Cadet Court, Lancaster, KY. Pursuant to the terms of their divorce and being all of Lot No. 6, of the Sea Cadet Subdivision, and designated as 183 Sea Cadet Court, aka 175 Sea Cadet Court, Lancaster, KY. The property has a fair market value of \$222,900.
  - Mark Wayne Brown and Leann Morrow Brown, husband and wife, 458 Old Danville Road, Lancaster, KY to Daddy's House, LLC, a Kentucky limited liability company, 458 Old Danville Road, Lancaster, KY. Whereas Mark Wayne Brown and Leann Morrow Brown are the owners of the property herein described and have organized as a Limited Liability Company for certain business interest and now desire to transfer said property unto a Limited Liability Company with the property located on Old Danville Road. Fair cash value of the property conveyed is \$80,000.
  - Floyd Joseph Schrock and Rachel Sue Schrock husband and wife, 306 J & V Lane, Stanford, KY to Ray Yoder and Kathryn Yoder, husband and wife, 625 East 1250th Avenue, Oblong, IL. Being Tract No. 3 of a division of property on KY Highway 39 (Crab Orchard Road) with exception. \$205,000.
  - Quitclaim Deed: Clinton Day and Margaret Day, husband and wife, 159 Vista Way, Lancaster, KY and Michelle Johnson and Timothy Johnson, wife and husband, 12060 Highway 30 W, Booneville, KY and Nichols Cody Correll, unmarried, 144 Vista Way, Lancaster, KY and Daniel Lee Correll Jr. and Cameron Olivia Correll, husband and wife, 139 W. Hickman Street, Winchester, KY to Daniel Lee Correll Jr. and Cameron Olivia Correll, husband and wife, 139 W. Hickman Street, Winchester, KY. Being Tract G of the "Day, Correll, Correll & Johnson" Minor Plat containing 1.483 acres. Also conveyed is an easement for Ingress/Egress for Tract G to Tuggle Road. There is no cash consideration but the fair market assessed value of this conveyance is \$15,000.
  - Barry W. Kincaid and Rebecca G. Kincaid, husband and wife, 105 Thomas Jefferson Drive, McDonough, GA to Keith Samuels, an unmarried man, 110 Ridgeway Drive, Lancaster, KY. Being Lots 7 and 8 and the south 7 feet of Lot 9 located on the west side of Ridgeway Drive. \$141,000.
  - General Warranty Deed: TLO

Properties, LLC, a Kentucky Limited Liability Company, 693 Swope Road, Lancaster, KY to Curtiss S. Scarritt, Trustee of The Curtiss S. Scarritt Family Trust, 5031 Deerwood Drive, Santa Rosa, California. Property is located on Perkins Lane and being all of Tract 3, containing 17.895 acres. \$565,000.

## Solar Project From Front

several years, but company officials said it is now at risk of cancellation due to the constraints of the county's current regulations.

Representatives from Clearway Energy, including Barry Matchett and Anna Rogers, provided a comprehensive presentation to the court and the public outlining the company's proposed solar farm and its projected benefits. They were joined by numerous local landowners who had entered into lease agreements with the company as early as 2019, with the expectation that the project would proceed unimpeded.

Clearway Energy, one of the nation's largest developers of renewable energy, with active projects in more than 30 states and development efforts in 40, has secured leases for approximately 2,500 acres in Garrard County. However, Rogers emphasized that a significant portion of that land has been rendered unusable for solar panel installation due to language in a December 2023 county ordinance. The ordinance prohibits solar development

## Elleman From Front

and transparency.

The June 2025 meeting included public comment from local landowners affiliated with a solar development project currently under contract. Clearway Energy Group was also present. In response to community concerns, Judge Elleman had stated publicly during the meeting that a special-called session would be scheduled specifically to address solar-related issues. However, the meeting took an unexpected turn.

During the "old business" portion of the session, a new ordinance — drafted by attorneys representing Clearway — calling for the repeal and replacement of the county's current solar regulations. The document had not been reviewed in advance by either Judge Elleman or County

on prime farmland and soils classified as having agricultural significance, effectively eliminating over 90 percent of the potential buildable land for the project.

Rogers provided a visual presentation showing the drastic reduction in usable land once the ordinance's limitations were applied. The result, she explained, would be a downscaling of the project from over 100 megawatts to fewer than 10 megawatts—making it economically infeasible. Matchett echoed this assessment, stating that while the ordinance did not explicitly ban solar development, it had the effect of creating a "de facto prohibition" on meaningful utility-scale solar deployment in the county.

To address this impasse, Clearway submitted a new version of the ordinance prepared by their own attorneys that would create a limited exemption allowing their project to proceed without overturning the ordinance's other regulatory safeguards. These include requirements for bonding to ensure full decommissioning of the project at the end of its life, setbacks from roads and neighboring properties, vegetative screening, and road-use agreements with the county.

The company also pledged to create a \$1 million Community Benefit Fund, which would be established at the start of construction and managed locally for public use. This fund would be in addition to an estimated \$354,000 in annual tax-related payments the county could expect over the life of the project. However, the structure of these payments became a focal point of the discussion.

Judge Executive Chris Elleman raised concerns over

how revenue from Industrial Revenue Bonds (IRBs) would be distributed. He pointed to previous IRB agreements, including one associated with a solar project on Highway 39, that yielded only \$4,200 annually for the county government itself, with larger portions diverted to other taxing entities. Elleman questioned whether the \$354,000 figure represented net revenue to the county or a total sum to be divided among multiple jurisdictions. Rogers responded that her understanding, based on tax counsel advice, was that the IRB would be executed with the county and that the full amount would go to the county government. Elleman, however, remained skeptical and asked for further documentation.

Several local residents and landowners, including Kenneth Yeakey and Joe Leavell, defended Clearway's project, arguing that many leaseholders had entered into agreements with the company based on verbal and informal assurances from previous and current county officials that the ordinance would not affect existing agreements. Yeakey, who claimed to be among the first to lease land to Clearway, emphasized the company's reliability and called on the court to honor what he characterized as a promise.

Leavell criticized what he described as mixed messaging from the Fiscal Court. He reminded court members that when the ordinance was passed in December 2023, they had been told the existing project would be "grandfathered in." He and others argued that failure to adjust the ordinance now would betray landowners who had committed to the project in good faith.

While some magistrates expressed concerns about the timing of Clearway's presentation and the lack of prior distribution of its proposed ordinance amendment, others acknowledged that the project had been under discussion for nearly two years. Magistrate Chris Butner ultimately made a motion to adopt the company's proposed changes, specifically easing the prohibition on development of prime farmland. Magistrate Bobby Preston seconded the motion.

The amended ordinance would still require compliance with all other provisions, including decommissioning bonds, which Matchett emphasized would be reevaluated and funded at set intervals (30, 25, 20, 15, 10, and 5 years) to ensure the project's end-of-life obligations are met. He noted that Clearway, as a publicly traded company, builds and operates its projects long-term and does not follow a business model based on short-term development and resale.

Magistrates engaged in lengthy discussion over the content and implications of the amendment, with particular attention to language regarding setbacks between adjacent leased parcels and development near state roadways. According to Rogers, Clearway voluntarily increased setback distances on the Highway 27 corridor from 100 feet to 300 feet, in excess of the ordinance's requirements.

Despite the judge executive's objections that the proposed amendment had not been thoroughly reviewed or included in the meeting agenda, the court proceeded with a roll call vote. The motion to amend the ordinance passed

by a majority of 4-2, with Magistrate Glendan Barker and Elleman voting against. Elleman's vote was particularly significant as the Judge Executive usually does not cast a vote in fiscal court matters and in the few cases they do it is usually to break a tied vote. Elleman's vote was more symbolic, seeing as it did not change the outcome of the vote.

The meeting also illuminated broader public frustrations with past failed economic development projects in Garrard County. Judge Elleman referenced prior ventures—including a distillery, restaurant, and commercial property agreements—that did not yield their promised returns, contributing to community skepticism. He emphasized that the court's current approach was rooted in ensuring transparency, accountability, and long-term protections for residents.

In a final comment, Clearway representatives reiterated their commitment to holding public town halls to engage directly with county residents. However, they expressed reluctance to initiate these forums until they had clarity on whether the ordinance would be amended to allow their project to move forward.

The court's vote initiates the first step in a two-reading process required to formally adopt ordinance changes. Further deliberations, including potential workshops and public hearings, are expected in the coming weeks. Until then, the future of Garrard County's most ambitious renewable energy project remains subject to ongoing legal, political, and public scrutiny.

Attorney Chris Whitworth.

The ordinance ultimately passed by a 4–2 margin, with Magistrates Butner, Preston, Day, and Davis voting in favor. Judge Elleman and Magistrate Barker voted against it. Elleman specifically requested his vote be called aloud to register his formal opposition.

"This was not on the agenda, and the community was not aware of this," he said. "This isn't how government business should be done."

Elleman indicated that the measure appeared to have been orchestrated outside official channels, raising questions about adherence to open meetings requirements.

"This was planned before the meeting," he stated. "I don't know if any laws were broken, but this was not a spontaneous action."

The existing solar ordinance, enacted in December 2023, was authored by for-

mer County Attorney Mark Metcalf and closely followed a state-recommended template. It included two local additions: enhanced setback requirements and protections for prime farmland. The newly introduced ordinance, written by Clearway's legal representatives, remains under review. Elleman confirmed that he had only seen the document the morning after the meeting and has since asked the county attorney to examine it. A copy is expected to be made public ahead of the scheduled second reading on June 30.

"This ordinance came from third-party attorneys who are not representatives of the court or this county," Elleman said, underscoring his frustration that it bypassed review by local officials. He also questioned whether other magistrates had reviewed the document prior to voting.

"That would be like me handing you a packet when

you walk into the meeting and asking you to vote immediately," he said.

Beyond procedural issues, Elleman pointed to a broader concern about how the county handles development projects. Citing past examples, including a distillery project and land giveaways for ventures that failed to deliver promised economic benefits, he urged caution when entering agreements that utilize taxpayer-supported resources.

"We've seen commitments made that never came to fruition. We owe it to the public to ensure those promises are kept."

Elleman emphasized that while the fiscal court has the authority to amend any ordinance, there should be a process involving public engagement and legal review.

"This should have been handled in a special-called meeting with full notice to the community. That was the

plan, and I intended to honor that."

He also noted that Magistrate Butner's statement during the meeting—that he had read the ordinance in full—suggested the document had been circulated to select members of the court in advance. Elleman, who said he was available at the courthouse the entire day prior, stated he was not contacted or informed about any proposed ordinance, nor was the county attorney.

A second reading of the new ordinance is scheduled for June 30. In the meantime, Elleman reiterated his commitment to transparency and accountability.

"My job is to represent the people of Garrard County openly and fairly. What happened at that meeting is not something I can stand behind."

## City / County Police Reports

Citations are provided by the Lancaster City Police Department and Garrard County Sheriff's Office.	
<b>Garrard County Sheriff's Department (GCSO)</b>	
<b>Citations</b>	
<b>June 3, 2025</b>	
• Brickett, Cheyenne M.....24..... 400 E West 5th St, Perryville (Mercer Co.)	
No registration plates; Failure to register transfer of motor vehicle; No registration receipt	
• Hooker, Leah.....61.....1060 Twelve Oaks Dr, Lawrenceburg	
No registration receipt; No registration plates; Failure of owner to maintain required insurance, 1st offense	
• Collins, Leslie M .....37.....118 Price Ct, Lancaster	
No registration receipt; No registration plates	
• Newby, Branden .....50.....462 Pike Ct, Lancaster	
No registration plates; No registration receipt; Rear license not illuminated; Operating on suspended or revoked operator license; Failure to wear seat belts; Failure of owner to maintain required insurance, 1st offense	
<b>June 4, 2025</b>	
• Harper, Johnny W.....73.....54 Mullins Station Rd, Mount Vernon	
Failure to produce insurance card	
<b>June 5, 2025</b>	
• Kyle, John W .....20.....115 Pleasant View, Lancaster	
Operating motor vehicle under influence of alcohol/substances	
• Houpp, Anthony W .....41.....1206 River Rd, Nicholasville	
Rear license not illuminated; Operating on suspended or revoked operator license; Failure to produce insurance card	
<b>Arrests</b>	
<b>May 30, 2025</b>	
• Peel, Nathan....43.....2755 Chrisman Mill Rd, Nicholasville	
Failure to appear	
<b>June 3, 2025</b>	
• Johnson, Hugh .....55.....8198 Lexington Rd, Lancaster	
Terroristic threatening, 3rd degree	
<b>June 4, 2025</b>	
• Masters, Samantha....42.....2005 Old Boonsboro Rd, Richmond	
Executed Jessamine County warrant for failure to appear;	
Executed Madison County warrant for failure to appear	

<b>June 6, 2025</b>	
• Dixon, Montrell .....36.....9421 Doral Ct Apt 1, Louisville	
Executed Madison County warrant for failure to appear	
<b>Criminal Summons</b>	
<b>May 1, 2025</b>	
• Beck, Chance L .....38.....104 Garden Park Dr, Nicholasville	
Violation of a Kentucky EPO/DVO	
<b>Lancaster City Police Department (LPD)</b>	
<b>Citations</b>	
<b>June 5, 2025</b>	
• Bell, Rhonda 57 654 Hamilton Springs Rd., Lancaster	
Harboring a Vicious Animal	
• Watkins, Robert J .....26.....20 Tommy Murphy Rd., Lancaster	
No Registration Receipt; No Registration Plates	
• Long, Larry W .....45.....6328 E KY 70, Liberty	
Speeding 10 mph Over Limit; Failure of Owner to Maintain Required Insurance, 1st Off; Failure to Produce Insurance Card	
• Caruso Saunders, Mary M.46.....8941 Buckeye Rd., Lancaster	
Failure of Non-Owner Operator to Maintain Req Ins/Sec, 1st Offense; Failure to Produce Insurance Card; Careless Driving	
<b>June 6, 2025</b>	
• Highley, Heather N.....41.....459 E Office St., Harrodsburg	
No Registration Plates; No Registration Receipt	
• Simpson, Leeanna M.....22.....88 White Oak Rd., Lancaster	
No Registration Plates; No Registration Receipt	
• Barker, Peggy M.....69.....8396 Nicholasville Rd., Lancaster	
No Registration Plates; No Registration Receipt	
• Madden, Stephen T.....31.....235 Ridgewood Dr., Nicholasville	
Disregarding Traffic Cont Dev-Traffic Light; Failure of Owner to Maintain Required Ins/Sec, 1st Off; Failure to Produce Insurance Card	
• Caldwell, William L .....36.....392 Gibson Lane Apt 2, Richmond	
No Registration Plates; No Registration Receipt; Failure to Produce Insurance Card	
• Delaney, Jonathan Isiah.....38.....127 Buckeye St., Lancaster	
Failure to Wear Seat Belts	
• Collier, Robert T .....27.....429 Woodcreek Dr Apt 2, Radcliff	
No Registration Receipt; No Registration Plates; Failure to Wear Seat Belts	
• Rodriguez Villar, Nabor ...25.....2911 N Luna Ave, Chicago, IL	
Disregarding Stop Sign; Failure to Wear Seat Belts; Rim or Frame Obscuring Lettering or Decal on Plate; No Registration	

Receipt; No Registration Plates; Improper Display of Registration Plates	
Huddleston, Krystal L.....42 .....	274 Daviston Rd., Midway
No Registration Receipt; No Registration Plates	
Hill, Justin D .....	37.....2050 Boneyville Rd., Stanford
Improper Display of Registration Plates; Failure to Wear Seat Belts; No Registration Receipt; No Registration Plates	
Isaccs, Jeffery .....	58.....2659 Gooch Pike, Paint Lick
Disregarding Stop Sign; Obstructed Vision and/or Windshield; License to Be in Possession; Failure to Wear Seat Belts	
Stathers, Randall L.....70.....	418 Crab Orchard St., Lancaster
Failure to Wear Seat Belts	
Townes, Colby D18	217 Foster Ln., Stanford
No Registration Receipt; No Registration Plates	
Baker, Charles M.....47.....	2943 Pendleton Rd., Pendleton
Speeding 22 MPH Over Limit; Failure of Owner to Maintain Required Insurance, 1st Off; Failure to Produce Insurance Card; No Registration Plates	
Wilson, Jeffery W	56 178 Rolling Meadow Dr., Lancaster
Speeding 5 MPH Over Limit	
Martin, Jenny L.....41 .....	222 Stanford St., Lancaster
Disregarding Stop Sign	
Cleote, Bevan R. ....38.....	510 Maple St., Georgetown
Speeding 5 MPH Over Limit	

<b>Arrests</b>	
<b>June 3, 2025</b>	
• Caruso Saunders, Mary M....46.....8941 Buckeye Rd., Lancaster	
Executed Mercer County warrant for Trafficking in a Cont Sub, 1st Degree, 2nd or > Offense (Methamphetamine);	
Drug Paraphernalia – Buy/Possess	

<b>June 4, 2025</b>	
• Baker, Daniel S.....38.....115 Arvin Dr., Lancaster	
Assault, 4th Degree (No Visible Injury); Kidnapping – Minor	

<b>June 8, 2025</b>	
• Goins, Gregory .....63.....232 Davis Ave., Lancaster	
Theft of Services; Poss Cont Sub, 1st Degree, 3rd or > Offense (Methamphetamine); Drug Paraphernalia – Buy/Possess;	
Non-Payment of Court Costs, Fees or Fines; Non-Payment of Court Costs, Fees or Fines (Attempt)	
• Perez-Salazar, V .....51.....303 Douglas Ct., Richmond	
Operating a Motor Vehicle under the influence of Alcohol 0.8 (189A.010(1A)) – 1st; No Operators-Moped License;	
Possession of Open Alcohol Beverage Container in Motor Vehicle Prohibited	