

**LAKE COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**  
**July 12, 2006**

**Meeting Minutes**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** John Fleming, Bob Kormann, Lisa Dumontier, Jerry Winkley, Clarence Brazil, Steve Hughes, Fred Mueller, Jack Meuli

**STAFF PRESENT:** Sue Shannon, Alex Hogle, Joel Nelson, Lita Fonda

John Fleming called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

**Motion by Lisa Dumontier and seconded by Bob Kormann to accept the minutes as presented.**

John overviewed the meeting procedures.

**JOCKO FLATS MINOR**

John explained that the Board makes a recommendation for the County Commissioners, who will meet on July 26 at 10:30 am on this proposal.

Alex Hogle presented the staff report.

Responding to Fred Mueller's question, the farm easement is removed through the process of subdivision review.

John inquired about tail-water. Alex explained that tail-water is involved with tract 3, which has the option for flood-irrigation. The tail-water is what happens to the remainder of that water. A requirement is that prior to final approval, there'll have to be a revised irrigation plan. This may need to be clarified in the conditions. Steve Hughes expressed concern about the Board or the County Commissioners getting involved with tail-water. Sue pointed out the need to keep it out of drain fields. Flood irrigation can continue if the parcel is greater than 20 acres. Lisa said that the parcel is fairly flat, and has been dry for years. Steve added that given spotted knapweed, there would be no water.

Weeds were discussed. Alex explained that the weeds here presented a unique situation, with a very high degree of weeds. In the case of this subdivision, weed treatment was required prior to further subdivision review. Steve thought that this needed to be consistent for subdivisions reviewed, with spraying or not, and bonding or not. Jack Meuli thought subdivisions sprayed or bonded prior to final approval/final plat. Sue noted that this was so. For this one, they had to spray before they submitted it, because it was so bad. The weed district supervisor talked with Paddy Trusler about this one. They are getting tougher about the weeds. If concerns are noticed, call the weed district with concerns. Fred asked about the next one. John pointed out that some people have already subdivided, which is a difference. Bob said that uniformity is needed. Lisa said the owner had only 10 days to spray and it was a hardship. Alex explained that the decision was to have decent stewardship. Bob pointed out that with rain, spray can't be applied. What if

it doesn't work out? Sue clarified that some is timing, and that they'd probably work with them, and there'd be a condition to spray next year. John said that's not a condition here. He thought a good point was made that the commissioners should be careful. Lisa said that the concept is great, but that it needs to be across the board. Alex invited the dialog to continue outside of the discussion of the subdivision at hand.

Jack Duffey commented on behalf of the applicant. He has no intent to flood irrigate lot 3. There was talk of fencing, but Jack didn't see it in the conditions. John said that to be consistent, the Board has asked for legal exterior fencing, but it's not in the conditions of approval. Jack also agreed with Steve's comment on the weeds. He felt this was a strong-arm tactic to put a timeline on spraying in order to receive the application, although he did understand what the commissioner was trying to do.

*Public comment opened:*

None offered.

*Public comment closed.*

**Motion by Steve Hughes to recommend for approval of the subdivision per the staff recommendations, with the additional recommendation for a legal fence at the perimeter. Seconded by Fred Mueller. Motion carried, Bob Kormann, Jerry Winkley, Clarence Brazil, Steve Hughes, Fred Mueller, Jack Meuli and John Fleming voting in favor, and Lisa Dumontier abstaining.**

### **AIRPORT ACRES MAJOR**

John F noted that the Commissioners will review this on August 1 at 10:00 a.m.

Joel Nelson presented the staff report. He added that the applicant just requested a variance to the County standards for road width, and provided the Board with a copy of the variance request. John F asked about the map. Sparky Court was clarified. Joel updated the Board on other recent events. The 2004 & 2005 evidence of weed control was received. For 2006, it has not been done; it's not worthwhile to spray after 6/15. Today the Cultural Site Review was received from the Tribal Preservation Office, and Joel shared the response. He reiterated that the Findings of Facts in the staff report could not take the variance request into account, as it was just recently received.

Fred M checked about which roads are chip sealed, which would be Sparky Drive, and that no weed spraying was done this year. There was some done in 2004 and 2005. Board members questioned that the amount and type shown would be effective. Fred questioned if the Board should hear this prior to them getting signed off on the weed problem. John checked for other questions. His question was, that given this was subdivided in 2001, a buyer would have an expectation on the lot sizes. Was there indication in the previous subdivision that this could be subdivided again? Joel said that there was a mention of the possibility of future subdivision.

Lynn Speckert spoke on behalf of the applicants. In terms of the weeds, the 2004 and 2005 information was submitted. The applicant is working with Tom Benson to try to control the weeds. It was too late to schedule after June 15, so he has already scheduled for next spring. The road variance requested is on Sparky Court. The subdivision was approved before with 18' driving surface on Sparky Court and they are adding 2 additional lots, which would not increase the traffic significantly. The developer hopes to avoid obtaining another special use permit to go over the Flathead Irrigation Project ditches. In terms of the irrigation easements, she understands that the neighbors are concerned about the access of irrigation. They've added easements to ensure that the surrounding irrigation neighbors have access to irrigation ditches. The covenants have been updated per Joel's requests. They've received cultural clearance from the Tribe. Joel had requested that lot 1B and 5A access on Patrick Drive. She felt that lot 5A should have the option to access from Sparky Drive or Patrick Drive. There's over 300' on Sparky Drive.

John asked if 4A accesses to Sparky Drive. Lynn confirmed.

Lisa asked about Tom Benson, who is the director of weed control. Marc Carstens explained that the weed control plan was initiated under a different director, and that Tom began this spring. Should the subdivision go forward, it seems that the next plan will be more stringent. Steve touched again on the ineffectiveness of the prior plan. Jack thought that the Board will see decisive changes in the new weed management.

Steve asked for more information on the desire of the applicants to avoid a special permit for the canal. Marc identified the canal as at the end of the road, at the hammerhead on Sparky Court. It would require another special permit from Flathead Irrigation Project (FIP) to cross it. There's a culvert there now.

John inquired if a longer culvert was needed if the road is wider. Steve clarified that for a special permit, you go in with your request. Sometimes they approve it right there. They just approve the size of the culvert. Marc explained that this is a concern of the owner, so they are stepping forward with his concerns. Steve responded that if a culvert is needed and a special permit is required for a FIP ditch, then they'd better do it. Marc's understanding was that the special permit was applied for, for the current culvert that's in place and the road is in compliance with the issued permit. Steve felt it was an easy thing, and not a hardship.

*Public comment opened:*

Leann Espinoza: She owns lot 2, and had the expectation that that would remain about 5 acres. When she asked about subdivision she was told it would be contingent on water and sewer from St. Ignatius. She's very concerned about the water table, the ground water, the wells and septic tanks even though the language says that it's approved for 2 acres size. It doesn't make sense, looking at the property, that she'll have a safe well. There are lots of issues. In spring, when people start irrigating and pulling water from the well, and also the liability that's starting to occur with people who accept the project, who approve them, the buyers, the developers, on water safety, under case law. She's waiting for Reno case law pertaining to sewer and contamination.

Marc Carstens: He spoke in support of the subdivision procedure. This is only one element of the review. After this portion, DEQ review looks at water and sewer issues much harder. It has to pass both reviews before it can become a subdivision. He thought there was recent legislation that allows written comment to be attached to the sanitation review sheet, should the public feel motivated to make the concerns known to the reviewing agency.

John Fleming: He reiterated to be aware that DEQ accepts comments from the public, so to be sure to do that. They have to make a decision on this too, if it proceeds here.

Sue Shannon: If she could submit that in writing before the commissioners hearing on Aug 1, it would become part of the record and be forwarded to DEQ as part of the record.

Leann Espinoza: She was out of town last month. She has quite a bit of documentation.

*Public comment closed:*

In response to John's question, the Board discussed the variance first.

Fred felt the culvert should be fixed, and the road should be 24', with no hardship. There was no further discussion offered at this point on the variance.

Clarence pointed out that the 18" driving surface has a typo; this is meant to be 18'.

**Motion by Jack M to recommend approval of the subdivision with the staff recommendations, seconded by Jerry Winkley.**

It was clarified that the staff recommendations do not include the variance, so the variance would not be included. Sue recommended voting on the variance as a separate item. John hoped it was quite clear to the people who already own there that this could have been resubdivided. It didn't seem fair to him to buy 5 acres and expect that around you, and then find out there's going to be 8 people around you instead of 4. His other concern is the water and the sewer in the area. A subdivision on the other side of town put together a sewer project, but this one doesn't have it; it has individual. He does know that those are issues that will go to DEQ, and he's hoping that they'll take care of those.

**Vote on the motion: 4 in favor (Jerry Winkley, Clarence Brazil, Bob Kormann, Jack Meuli) and 4 opposed (Steve Hughes, Lisa Dumontier, Fred Mueller, John Fleming)**

**Motion by Steve Hughes to deny the requested variance, seconded by Jerry Winkley.  
Motion carried to deny the variance, all in favor.**

Jack M explained that the vote would be presented to the Commissioners as a tie vote.

#### **DAYTON HARBOR COTTAGES PUD**

John highlighted that the Commissioners will hold a hearing on this item on July 26 at 10:30 a.m.

Joel presented the staff report. He noted that with conditions #16 and #19 (around pg. 25) that this is actually a case of 'either/or'. He would rather see #16. He pointed out a correction of a typo, for a 2-way road and 90 degree parking, and letters received.

Responding to Jerry's question, condition #8 was discussed, regarding Title 70, Property, Chapt 23, Unit Ownership Act—Condominiums. Sue said that it deals with filing as one lot with unit ownership. Jerry mentioned International Building Code specification. Joel understood, based on correspondence with the State, that because of the proximity of the units, it required 5/8" sheet rock. Sprinklers would not be required for this, in response to Bob's question. If they're going to use them for short-term leasing, they need the proper building permits from the State. Harbor House is going to need State licensing.

Jerry asked if there was room for 7 RV spots. On condition #32, is there room for 6' there? Answer was [inaudible]. Joel said the sidewalk is 5'. Jerry asked about #27 to pave C Street. Joel replied that C Street is already paved. He explained that the one block of C Street will be used heavily by the development and probably tear it up, in response to Jack's question.

Sue responded that 'short-term' is 30 days or less per state law, in response to Fred.

Bob asked questions about the location, 90 degree parking and length of stay for RV's, and how water and pumping will be addressed. Joel has been expecting the DEQ to require seasonal RV requirements. Bob pointed out the RV's could increase the density during the peak time. Joel showed the RV location and redesign for traffic for one way. He is suggesting the road be 2-way. John suggested leaving the RV's off entirely. Bob said if they wanted a septic holding tank for the RV's to dump into, DEQ would have to approve that. Sue noted that an RV subdivision would need review. Someone potentially could park there if it was self-contained with water and they took it elsewhere to dump. This should be addressed some way. Joel's intention to require RV parking was based more on people passing through, when renting a cabin, for instance.

John asked about the wording on #31. Joel said that this has been suggested before.

Conditions #16 and #19 received discussion. The hydrant would satisfy the condition. #19 could be lumped with #16, as an alternative.

Dave DeGrandpre spoke on behalf of the applicant. He asked for the comments tonight to focus specifically on the project. He showed a list of permits that James LeKander has received put together in 2002 by Lakeshore Protection at the Tribe. Regarding RV spaces, he explained these were included since they thought the Board would want them. It might make sense for someone with a winter house in Arizona, for parking. The prevention for long-term RV use would be the 13 other owners. He'll leave the call on this up to the Board. The idea behind the short-term rentals is that the idea behind this project was to provide a place for people who rent boat slips to be able to stay. They feel this is targeted more towards a sailboat set. He felt the Homeowners Association should be able to decide, since they'd have the most at stake. He addressed concerns with 6 conditions. #3: they aren't proposing impervious surfaces for boat storage. #4: if there

is a rule against parking on the replacement drain field, then they shouldn't, otherwise it should be allowed. This area is currently being used as a boat storage area. #16 and #19: a wet hydrant seemed like the most important thing to Siggurd Jenson. He showed some other fire department-related features on the map. Another condition: with regard to signs, he felt 12 was a large number to require. He felt this number of signs would look more out of character than needed for traffic safety. #30: They propose to have the parking area grassy rather than paved, to keep it somewhat low key. #31: He felt that the 5 spaces for the marina and office store were another case of overbuilding. They provided 83 spaces per the traffic consultant's recommendation. He may or may not have taken the marine and office into account. The only people using it are those who are sailing from the facility. #33: He felt a sidewalk is set up to benefit the whole public rather than the residents of this subdivision. He showed where he thought the sidewalk should end and requested the removal of the condition.

Bob clarified that Dave's request on #31 is to eliminate the 5 spaces for the marina/store.

On the landscape plan of condition #12, John asked about the trees. Tiny trees in a vegetative buffer will take 10 years to be effective. What can be done about that? Dave thought the landscape plan would be an appropriate place to address that. Clarence suggested purchasing bigger trees. James LeKander(?) said that there are 3 interests there in the community. He's hoping all 3 can come up with something that [inaudible] the growth and storm water runoff, and beauty as well.

Bob brought up #22 and #23 and the 12 signs. The signs would need to comply with regulations and go with the standard signs. Jerry said that with the rearrangement of parking on C Street eliminates the one-way signs since it'd be a two-way street. Dave said it does require another stop sign. It's not a huge issue; they'd just like to provide a certain look.

*Public comment opened:*

Marvin Tabor: He's president of the Park Board. A big concern is the 100' of swim park. #16 places a dry hydrant in that area. He thought it'd be better on the west side with the kayakers, away from the kids in the park. With the harbor house, would this replace the grey one, where the showers and port-a-potties are dumped here. He is concerned about the sewer being able to handle these plus the port-a-potties plus showers.

John: He thought the hydrant could be easily fixed.

Marvin: He felt the parking areas were needed. They want more full-time use of facilities. He pointed out a place where a yield sign would be useful, rather than a stop sign. When asked by Bob for his opinion about eliminating the sidewalk, his personal opinion was he didn't see sense for it, although he hasn't discussed it with the Park Board for their opinion. He repeated his worry about the fire trucks filling up where kids are playing, plus they'd have to dig across the swimming park. He explained how this would be a problem.

Ken Clizbe: He referred to the Sunday Missoulian which outlined problems in Lakeside from this type of development. He passed the article around. These types of projects have been

pushed through in Flathead County in the Somers area with no oversight. There's a lack of knowledge on the International Building Codes. There's no structure in Dayton for inspections or to enforce the issues that are being talked about. Who will make sure the covenants are enforced? Once this happens, we can't do back, so he wants to make sure it's done right the first time. He finds the use of public property for private use is unacceptable. Parking is still shown in the extension of 4<sup>th</sup> Street that goes down towards the proposed kayak ramp. The developer has plenty of property to provide parking without using public right-of-way. The plan has changed significantly since the beginning, and it looks a lot better. He thinks it still needs some work. The developer wants a lot of relief from what the Board or staff proposes, but they fail to give something back in return. He wants to see some give and take. The traffic study was done on a Wednesday, he thought. Given the dust, there are traffic problems. The streets do need to be paved, or at minimum, chip-sealed. He would include 3<sup>rd</sup> Street in this. It's the highest traffic area in Dayton. The proposed signs are within the development. The representative states that they're trying to keep a rural setting, but the density doesn't look rural to him. The developers applied for 11 permits from Lakeshore Protection and the Tribe. In the 1982 condition of approval it states in item #22 that a permit is required from the County Commissioners to do something different, in addition to lakeshore development. He's opposed. He thinks it's a lot better than when they started. He doesn't like public property taken for private use.

John: That's exactly what we're doing in this process. We're trying to make something good [inaudible].

Donna Heffner: She showed pictures from April 2006 of 3<sup>rd</sup> Street and the next area over where the sewer will be built up. This 'lake' happens because of sewer system and the lack of appropriate drainage because the water table is so high. This happens with thaws or heavy rains. The mound system on B Street will be county-engineered behind Hill's place. She gestured for it's height but it's almost underwater in the spring, and has contaminated the neighboring wells. The topography is such that the water just flows down there. Anything in the septic system in the drain fields is going to straight to that same section. She explained more about various locations. She gave a letter to be passed on to DEQ. The water runs along the clay soils and doesn't sink in. When it stands there, it has the opportunity to contaminate the wells close to that area. Most are shallow wells on that end of town. It's outside of the project area but that septic system will definitely affect a number of neighbors there, possibly adversely. She can only put a septic system on 3 lots; she can't do so for 2 lots. The last cost \$18,000. The septic system for 14 units would need to be a lot larger. They're too close, too compact, too many in one spot. He wants to propose a business there with a [inaudible] building and he'd have to have 3 lots per household. She thought that should be the maximum that should be allowed.

Wes Schultz: On 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, there's no proposal for chip-seal. It gets as much traffic as C Street. He has a well across the street from this. Any time this sewer fails, and it will fail eventually, it'll come down the ditch, end up in the little pond in the picture. If the water could be drained, that would be fine, but the only place to drain it is in Flathead Lake. When the pond gets a little deeper, that's where it goes. As far as Dave trying to make this a country setting, this is almost double the density of a city block. If you maintain one house per 50' x 150' lot, you could get more into a country setting. We can solve problems now or deal with them down the road.

Karen House: She built a house in Dayton 2 years ago. She was required to have 2 City lots and an engineered septic system. The engineered septic system takes care of drainage.

John: DEQ will be assessing this plan so any comments about sewers should be added to that record.

Charlie Becker: He lives in Big Arm. His kids go to school in Dayton. He thinks the proposal would be an asset to the community. He's a local plumber. He's put in septic systems. The DEQ oversees that. The septic laws in Lake County are very stringent. It's an evaporative mound system of level 2, which has a filter system to take out nitrates, pumps out a dose into the field which evaporates the liquids in the mounds. The water around it is designed to go into the mound and up. What people say about the septic leaching over to them and ruining their wells are all stringent standards addressed by DEQ and Environmental Health. They're the same rules that have been updated and watched and we all have to follow them for any building. He thinks the project would be a great attribute for the community and for the [inaudible] on Flathead Lake which need a place to go and get into the lake. There's not a lot of access and it is private. He thinks it would do wonders for Dayton and the area.

*Public comment closed.*

Fred thought Dave had a good point on #4, and suggested deleting 'and replacement areas'.

Bob inquired as to what happens when the original drain field fails. Can the parking be transferred to the old drain field?

Fred asked how a type 2 is monitored. Dave responded that when you buy one of these systems, a packaged treatment system comes along with it. The company that provides it enters into a service contract. They come out and test it. He wasn't exactly sure but he thought they had to submit results to DEQ on a regular basis. When the system is shown to be effective over time, the frequency is reduced.

John suggested that the Board go through each condition, and if someone has a comment or question on that condition, it can be discussed. He thought they could get through it, and then get a motion at that time.

***Changes to conditions, as discussed by the Board:***

*#4: delete 'and replacement areas'.*

*#3: delete 'The proposed stormwater management plan shall include the impervious surface area for storage of boat and recreational vehicles on the site.'*

*#12: add 'for an effective landscape buffer' after the first phrase (after "The developer shall submit a detailed landscape plan'.)*

*#14: Include clean up of present debris.*

The clean up of the area, would include what's stored there now, so both prior to and during construction.

*#16: put #16 and #19 together; scratch #19; and move the hydrant to the southwest corner.* Joel pointed out that the fire representative had wanted the SE corner. Sue suggested they contact the fire representative and discuss it. They might not be able to put the water line below the frost line [inaudible]. John thought this is a valid concern. You don't want that torn up, and you don't want engines coming down to refill when it's being used. Clarence said that it has to be buried deep enough to avoid freeze, so it shouldn't [inaudible] the boats.

*#19: scratched.*

*#21, #22 and #23: let the staff figure out the details on the appropriate signage.*

The discussion: #22 may not be needed with the 2-way road. A yield sign for the intersection of C and 3rd was touched upon. Sue offered various suggestions. The Board wants the appropriate signs. John suggested that the staff figure those out, and the Board agreed.

*#24: Leave #24 'as is'.*

The discussion: Dave pointed out that it's a 20' wide one-way paved street. There are competing interests. The fire department wants to be able to have 2 vehicles be able to pass each other. Parking seems okay to him. Sue reminded that there is visitor parking for visitors. Subdivision regulations require extra space on the side of the road if there's going to be on-street parking. Somewhere along the road, something needs to tell people not to park. When asked, Marvin explained that with fire trucks, the tanker truck needs to go around the fire truck to get water. Jerry thought 3 signs saying 'no parking' with one on the east end and two signs equally spaced on the lakeside, and one properly placed one-way/do not enter sign would do it. Alex suggested that 20 years down the road, how different is this going to be from downtown Bigfork? Sue recommended putting one sign in front of unit #8. Nobody is going to park in front of the garages.

*#30: remove 'The development shall include 7 RV parking spaces.'*

The discussion: Bob favored eliminating the RV parking, particularly since the developer didn't see this as a need. Clarence saw the RV parking as a need. Living on Findley Point, friends come to visit him in RV's and they park in the yard. (They sleep in the house.) They have to find a place to park. John thought RV's will arrive there, but he agreed with Bob that if the developer isn't concerned, he didn't know that the Board should be, except that Clarence is looking ahead to try to avoid a problem. Sue mentioned information from the subdivision regulations. She thought that they should have some parking for RV's but maybe prohibit on-site storage of RV's and [inaudible]. John asked if the condominium could control it and have some input, where people might need to check ahead and get permission from the Homeowners. Bob outlined 2 issues he saw with RV parking. First the developer doesn't see a need and isn't pushing for it. The Board is trying to say he's not thinking far enough ahead. He's looking at it from the standpoint that if he's driving down there and sees the way they're planning these, to keep them kind of 'countrified', and he sees 7 motor homes with accessories and painting, it doesn't fit. Perhaps there's a need, but does putting that in there, helping people, or taking away from the overall impact of the subdivision. Jack asked if it's in the covenants that the only RV parking can be guests of the people that live there, can't that be controlled? He could see 2 sided. Bob mentioned that covenants don't work. John thought #30 could be revisited at the time that a motion is made, so the group could move along.

*#31: remove '5 spaces for the marina office/store'.*

*#33: remove the second sentence.*

The discussion: Lisa favored the removal of the sidewalk on the east side. Joel disagreed for reasons of circulation. Lisa felt the public benefited much more than the subdivision residents, who would have interior sidewalks. Jack mentioned the effect of a curb [inaudible]. Lisa felt a nice foot trail would be more attractive and in keeping with the setting. Bob suggested a stone or crushed gravel walkway. Sue said that right now, people aren't dealing with a lot of traffic on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street and are able to walk down to the lake. Now there will be traffic. They'll have to walk within the road to get down there. Bob thought the sidewalk might not be a bad idea, but perhaps a different construction. Lisa didn't know that it should be up to the developer to pay for a sidewalk that the public is going to use. Sue clarified that in a city, the developer pays. The sidewalk in question is the one on the east side of the property, not the internal ones. Sue felt it was needed, at least along the northern portion due to the increased traffic, so people can walk somewhere off of the street. Dave said that there are no constraints in this flat, grassy area. There's room for it. Marvin asked if something would obstruct the walking if there were not a sidewalk. Sue said the trees will go 15' out from the property, and the driving surface will be constructed in the middle of the right-of-way. There will probably still be a grass area between the trees. Marvin said that currently they walk down on the grass. Once the logs are where they belong onto [LeKander's] property, they'll have room to hike. The Park Board already has shrubs planted 10' off his property line. They can walk on the grass behind the shrubs right now without any problem. There's already heavy traffic up there on. If the logs get off, and don't develop this where you can't walk on it, he didn't see a problem. A woman reported that there's very little traffic in the area. She indicated where she's seen people parking.

Additional comments:

Jerry asked if the parking would be grass, turf block or what? Joel referred to the choices given in #31. Turf block was briefly discussed.

The Board returned to condition #30, and asked the developer to speak on this. James LeKander explained that currently when someone comes down from Calgary and wants to store a trailer and pickup while sailing, they usually charge to dry-store it in the boat parking, which is boats in the winter, and empty trailer and pickup parking in the summer. He thought they could approach RV parking in the same way. He discusses the parking surfaces. Gravel was specified in 1982 approval. Grass grew up. It drains well. He showed places on the map where it may work. He affirmed that the area could handle 7 RV's, and that people could not stay in the RV's, in response to Bob's inquiry. Original conditions specified no camping and no tents. He noted that the 23 original conditions would still stand, in response to Bob's question about how this was enforced and if it was in the covenants. It's a management thing and would probably be up to a joint decision of the slip holders association and the condo owners association. He's trying to build a marriage of these for long term. He was sure they'd be back for an amendment if the decision was contrary to anything that's decided here. He was in favor of whatever would work the longest for the most people.

**Motion by Jerry Winkley, and seconded by Fred Mueller, to recommend approval of the project with the staff recommendations as modified by these changes (*listed above*). Motion carried, all in favor.**

John reiterated to those with concerns on drain field and so forth, to get comments to DEQ via Sue.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Jerry asked what happened at the Commissioners' meeting for the zoning review, which occurred earlier in the day. Joel responded that they had for Sue, who was unable to attend, about the specifics of certain changes, and they wanted to change a few things in the language. Jerry asked if there was discussion on permitted use and sizes of guesthouses. Joel explained that they ran out of time for some discussion. They've set another date of Thurs August 10, 2006 at 10:00 a.m.

John Fleming adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:30 p.m.