

LAKE COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
August 8, 2007
Meeting Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT: Fred Mueller, John Fleming, Jack Meuli, Clarence Brazil, Ken Miller, Brad Trosper, Bob Kormann, Joyce Funda, Steve Hughes

STAFF PRESENT: Sue Shannon, Joel Nelson, LaDana Hintz, Lita Fonda

John Fleming called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Motion by Ken Miller and seconded by Fred Mueller to approve the July 11, 2007 meeting minutes. Motion carried, all in favor.

John explained that the Board will ask the staff questions regarding the staff report. Then the applicant/agent shall comment and stand for questions. Public comment will follow. When public comment is closed, the Board will take action.

STONEHORSE BUSINESS PARK MAJOR SUBDIVISION

The Commissioners are scheduled to hear the proposal on 8/23/07 at 10:00 am.

Joel Nelson responded to Board questions on the staff report.

Fred Mueller asked about a requirement to pave Tower Road. What's wrong with the chip seal? Joel noted that the road supervisor requested it be paved because of the commercial traffic. Fred disagreed. He thought the road might be too narrow. Joel said it was 24' rather than 26'.

John asked about the location of the 4 remaining units on page 3. Joel said it was taken care of in the recommended conditions of approval, and Sue Shannon highlighted condition #21. John asked if they would assign those rights at that time. Sue said with the final plat, the recorded document states either that he'll retain them to utilize on property he owns within the zoning district or he can assign them to lots that are created within the business park.

John asked if the conditions of approval included something about the left-turn lane from Hwy 93 to Tower Road. Joel noted that condition #14 would cover that, and read the condition.

Diana Luke spoke on behalf of the applicant. She expressed concern with staff recommendation #12, regarding paving from Glacier Creek Drive to Hwy 93. They would rather waive the right of protest of future RID, as needed.

Joel asked how they felt about condition #11. Diana said [inaudible] asphalt, versus the 2 double shot chip seal. That was what was proposed for Glacier Creek Drive. Bob Kormann asked why they felt the double-chip seal was as good as the asphalt. Fred said that there are no specifications on the asphalt. The asphalt roads would be nice, but 2 inches of asphalt is the same as chip-seal. It was just chip-sealed last year. Bob asked if it could be widened to 26' and the asphalt eliminated. Joel said it wouldn't be required to be widened. Sue explained that

Glacier Creek Drive is not currently developed. When they develop it, they will have to. Joel said that he asked the road supervisor about the asphalt thickness. The minimum is 4 inches, but preferably 6 inches. The road supervisor estimated costs between \$140,000 and \$200,000. John asked what a double-chip seal costs. The answer was not known.

Public comment opened: None offered. *Public comment closed.*

Fred thought condition #12 should be taken out entirely. Bob asked how this would hold up to the Vergeront trucks from the pit, compared to 4 inches of asphalt. Fred said the Vergeront trucks had been on the road for 10 or 15 years.

Motion by Fred Mueller, and seconded by Jack Meuli, to recommend approval of the subdivision with the staff recommendations except to leave condition #12 out.

Joyce Funda asked about pg. 6 and the enforceability of the covenant for maintaining the roads. She was curious how the developer responded to staff concerns. Joel referred to conditions #8 and #20. She asked if the developer was in line with this. Diana had no comment.

Joel checked about condition #11 and the asphalt driving surface for Glacier Creek Drive. Fred thought #11 should be double chip-seal instead of asphalt.

Fred revised his motion, to add a change in condition #11 from specifying asphalt to specifying double chip-seal, and Jack accepted the revision for his second.

Motion carried, all in favor.

STONEHORSE PHASE IV MAJOR SUBDIVISION

The Commissioners are scheduled to hear the proposal on 8/23/07 at 10:00 am.

Joel Nelson responded to Board questions on the staff report.

Ken Miller asked for elaboration on pg. 4 on the 8.71-acre parkland set-aside that is part of a 10.5-acre area previously deed restricted. Joel showed the area on the map. It was already part of a no-build easement on the previous deed. Sue clarified that the purpose of the deed restriction was to avoid development on the hilltop. They wanted open space there.

Joyce asked if more information had been received regarding the boldfaced concerns in the report. Joel said that no additional information beyond that in the report had been received. He affirmed that those concerns have been included in the conditions of approval.

Diana spoke on behalf of the applicants. She had two concerns. One was with condition #3. She handed out the overall site plan they've developed. This was developed as a PUD, which is conceptual. The lot numbers have been changed since then. They plan on following the newer lot numbers throughout, with some minor changes. She asked for #3 to be nixed.

John explained this is a cluster development concept within the zoned district. They're putting it together a piece at a time. Diana confirmed for Jack that these were the same number of lots with different numbers. There have been other changes. The Business Park was not originally within the PUD. They've downsized the numbers from the conceptual plan. It's always a work in progress.

Diana said condition #17 was a compromise between the developer and staff. They would like to utilize some walkways that have already been built, that were not a requirement, as part of the 10.5% of the lineal footage of walkways. Right now it says these trails shall connect to the existing walkway. The walkways are in the parkland referred to in the no-build zone earlier. John asked where the walkways exist. Diana explained that this trail was built to enhance the future parkland.

Diana confirmed for Joyce that the site brochure she handed out was from 2007. She clarified for Jack that the change she requested in condition #17 was to eliminate the second sentence.

Diana explained the developer doesn't want to put a definite location on the walkways, in case he has a homeowner who comes in and wants it moved. They don't want to have to tear up and move walkways. She could see the Planning staff concern to have the walkways shown and installed.

Joyce referred to the concern at the introductory meeting that it was presented as a discretionary item, which could potentially disappear. Diana explained that the Planning staff wording currently requires that they will put in 10.5% of what was originally shown on the PUD approval. The locations may be variable. The staff is recommending that they connect to [inaudible] facilities and that they're in a useful location. Her concern is to be able to utilize existing walkways towards that percentage that's required for this.

Sue addressed the objective that Planning staff have with the walkways. The walkway and parkland that are proposed are outside the original PUD. The access to these would be via road right-of-way. Staff recommendation is that they connect along the roadway, that they build some sort of walkway to connect these walks to access those walking paths. Also, 10.5 % of the lineal footage of trails that were shown on the approved PUD be developed. Ken asked where the 10.5% came from. Sue replied that this is 10.5% percent of the lots that were in the PUD. John summarized that if the project stopped right now, the lots being created tonight wouldn't be connected to a walk system. Sue affirmed. They'd have to walk down the road to get there.

Public comment opened: None offered. Public comment closed.

Joyce asked if the staff would be satisfied with the walkways the way they are, if the project stopped now. Sue thought that the message at the end of the introductory meeting with the Planning Board was that the lots should be able to access the proposed parkland. If they don't know where they're going to put the walkway, they can at least develop a sidewalk in the road right-of-way so people can be off the road and access the parkland.

Ken agreed with staff recommendation on #17, that the 10.5 % is needed, and that they should connect, precisely for the reason to make sure it's put in place.

Motion by Ken Miller, and seconded by Brad Trosper, to recommend approval of the subdivision with staff recommendations with the exception of condition #3. Motion carried, all in favor.

JOHNSON SINGLE LOT SUBDIVISION

The Commissioners are scheduled to hear the proposal on 8/23/07 at 10:00 am.

Sue Shannon responded to Board questions on the staff report. She noted that it's a standard subdivision. They aren't maximizing on the allowed density so a condition has been recommended to address the additional units along with the final plat. There is a home currently being constructed on proposed lot 1. Environmental Health Department is waiting to process the drainfield application until it goes for DEQ review because of the requirement to submit public comment along with their application. The staff recommendations address this as well.

Ken asked about pg. 3, letter f, first point that no lot shall be further subdivided or used for residential & agricultural purposes. John noted it conflicted with the two additional development rights. Sue clarified and corrected the statement. It can only be used for single-family residential purposes, and minor agricultural purposes. Joyce said that with the water supply and sewage disposal on pgs. 2-3, the staff proposes indemnification language and disclosure language. In the event future lot owners find themselves in the position where they can't [inaudible] use the water, what are the options for water use? Is sewage a companion issue? Sue replied that it would only be water, and would probably be determined by the Supreme Court decision. Joyce asked if they would potentially use the water illegally until there was a Court decision. Sue explained that it's not an illegal use. They file notices of drilling wells with the DNRC. The DNRC is not allowed to issue permits on the Reservation. This just puts them on notification regarding that situation.

Sue confirmed for Ken that the home on lot 1 is modular, and on a permanent foundation.

Chris Balstad offered to answer questions on behalf of the applicant.

Public comment opened: None offered. Public comment closed.

Motion by Jack Meuli, and seconded by Fred Mueller, to recommend approval of the subdivision with staff recommendations as written. Motion carried, all in favor.

NORTH COTTONWOOD MINOR SUBDIVISION

The Commissioners are scheduled to hear the proposal on 8/23/07 at 10:00 am.

Joel Nelson was ready to respond to Board questions on the staff report. Craig Crockett, the applicant, was available for questions. Steve asked what kind of easement would be put on the property, and who would be utilized to put on the easement. Craig said they'd go with the staff recommendation. Joel explained it would be deed-restricted with language regarding the

maintenance of lots. Sue said they've been following the policy that whenever approval is granted of a conservation development, where they've obtained bonus lots, the set-aside will be restricted for development in perpetuity for the subdivision. It's a separate deed restriction. Steve said that it's not going to be through an organization but through the deed. He asked about the language of the restriction, which was a concern and referred to a previous conservation easement at Big Arm. Sue spoke about the Norman Reum subdivision, which utilized the conservation development bonus where the language for the deed restriction was worked out to say that there will be no further subdivision of that tract in perpetuity. It was also in the Reum conditions of approval. Joyce mentioned condition #26. Sue added that the County Commissioners would have to approve that language. Steve summarized that someone would review the language before the project is done, which was his concern.

Joyce asked Craig if an attorney would be used for the closing or any portion of this. He thought he'd probably need to. She just suggested that someone check the language to be used, because of the use of 'in perpetuity'. She thought it would be important in order to get the right language to get the intent to stick. Craig thought it would be similar to drawing up a contract. Steve pointed out the difference is with a contract, it can be changed by the partners; this can't be changed by anyone. Ken thought it should go through the County attorney before it goes to the Commissioners. John F thought the intent of the Board, staff and property owner were pretty clear.

Public comment opened: None offered. Public comment closed.

Motion by Clarence Brazil, and seconded by Jack Meuli, to recommend approval of the subdivision with staff recommendations as written. Motion carried, all in favor.

John commented that this subdivision has wetlands. They did a good job of avoiding the wetlands. Craig thanked Joel Nelson and Sue Ball for their suggestions and help.

LONG SINGLE LOT SUBDIVISION

The Commissioners are scheduled to hear the proposal on 8/23/07 at 10:00 am.

Sue Shannon summarized and clarified from the staff report, and responded to Board questions. Ken asked how the non-contiguous parcel was created. Sue explained that this was allowed to be done through a past boundary line adjustment; currently boundary line adjustments are not allowed unless they are adjacent. Homes exist on the portion between the two parts. She didn't have information on the acreage of the parcels with the homes. John asked about the Board of Adjustment basis for the variance to the density map. Sue explained the density regulations state that a variance may be requested if there are existing units that were developed prior to the density regulations. John thought the division was already made. This just formalizes them. Joyce asked about the covenants on pg. 5. She checked her assumption that the animal nuisance covenant referred to the domestic animals specified in the covenants.

Ken asked about condition #9 requiring a building notification permit, and the final statement on the recommendations, which states the lots are currently developed. Could there be further

development? Sue pointed out that something like a barn or storage shed could be put up without changing the use of the property. Setback, buffers and height would be checked.

Diana Luke was present on behalf of the applicant. Ken asked if the current buildings met the height restriction of 30'. Diana said the hayshed had been removed. There's also the commercial storage building.

Public comment opened: None offered. Public comment closed.

Motion by Jack Meuli, and seconded by Fred Mueller, to recommend approval of the subdivision with staff recommendations as written. Motion carried, all in favor.

ARROWHEAD ON THE BAY MAJOR INTRODUCTORY

This is an informational meeting. The public hearing will be at the September meeting.

Joel Nelson presented the staff report. He handed out a letter received from CSKT Council after the report was processed. They are opposed. He summarized some highlights of their concerns.

Fred noted that the lots as proposed are already advertised in RV magazine as for sale. Bob asked if some of the units were already built on site. Joel said that 3 have been installed. Bob asked for clarification on pg. 3 about the lack of compliance with Lake County subdivision regulations. Joel explained that the application was determined to be sufficient for review. Additional items can be revealed during the subdivision review. The more it was reviewed, the more it appeared that they are trying to create lots, and that can't be done in a condominium subdivision. They've requested that the developers and agents meet with staff to work through this. Joyce affirmed with Joel this is an application for a condominium subdivision, and asked what are Park Model RV sites. Joel replied that they would be buying the Park Model itself, and an interest in the development. They should not be buying a piece of land. Sue detailed this would allow them to park this unit in a specific area. Joyce asked about the stick structures. Sue explained that they are building stick-built attachments onto the RV's. Board members requested further clarification. Sue explained that Park Models are built to RV construction standards. They do require a special moving permit. Jack added that they aren't what we picture as an RV. Joel explained that it's Park Models only for this subdivision. Sue said the difference between these and a mobile or modular home is all within the building code standards. John affirmed with staff that the Board has to consider these RVs. Joyce asked about the definition of an RV, since these look like houses. Sue thought the definition included details on the square footage and electrical and plumbing standards.

Ken affirmed with Joel that the density is 1.5-acre. The reference in the letter of comment to 2.5-acre density was mistaken. Joyce asked if a purchaser could have a motor home visitor as well. Joel said the proposed covenants weren't clear on that. The plan is to make sure that the intent is clear. The intent appears to be to allow nothing except a Park Model. Sue said that staff also had concerns about additional RV's being parked. Hookups have only been proposed for the Park Model RV units, but that wouldn't prohibit someone from parking there. Joyce asked about pg. 4, #2. In the staff opinion, is 35' x 70' a sufficient area for the parking proposed there?

Where do they park if it isn't? Joel responded that this is the only parking area beyond the on-site parking.

Ken asked regarding the property line along Flathead Lake, if the area between the high water mark and the northern property line were counted in the 4.71 acres. Joel affirmed. Ken also asked about the number of units described on pg. 1, and what approval had been obtained for the additional 22 units. Joel explained that some were existing units on the tax rolls. Sue said that they existed prior to the Subdivision Platting act. The western portion of the property, which was the larger piece, was existing. The eastern portion, a separate tract of land, was an expansion to the existing mobile home park. The expansion went through planning review. Joel added that the property is currently in 3 parcels

Brad asked if the well they drilled with the transfer zone that extends into the Hwy 93 right-of-way had an easement. Joel said they don't have an easement for that yet. Sue noted it had been addressed. Brad asked what happens if an oil tanker spills in that area. Ken affirmed with Joel that DEQ had seen a map of where the well is. John asked if MDT has ever allowed their road easements to be used as a well protection zone. Joel didn't know of specific situations. He thought it was a common thing. Brad asked about the well drilled by the previous owner on the Tribal property. The development as it is, is into the wellhead protection zone for that well. They don't have the easement for that. Sue said that the Tribe doesn't have an easement for that wellhead protection zone. Ken asked who owns the well. Sue thought the Tribe owns it since it's on their property. The RV park has utilized it in the past. She didn't know if they utilized it currently. Brad asked about the sewage treatment plume. It looks like it would extend into that wellhead protection zone as well. Joel said they weren't showing a plume or mixing zone. Brad asked if it was a sand-leeching situation. Joel thought why they're not showing a mixing zone would be a question for the agent.

Joel said the existing boat ramp is paved in response to Ken's question. The road to it is gravel. That road isn't part of the road network, since it's not providing access to units.

Johna Morrison spoke on behalf of the applicants, with Jeff Anderson, APEC's design engineer. She said the concept used in this subdivision is a new concept to this area, but not in the country. A Park Model RV is an RV, and fits under those guidelines in MT state law. A Park Model is 400 square foot unit on a chassis on wheels. You can skirt it, and hook a small modular living room onto the building. The modular portion can be unscrewed and moved.

This is a condominium subdivision, which means you own airspace. The Park Models would be set up prior to purchasing. A purchaser buys the Park Model RV and the airspace around it. There's common ownership but you're given a certain area in which to put your belongings. Each lot will fit two vehicles. She showed the dedicated parking area for boat trailers, and two common areas that could also be used. She said most of the Park Model RV sites would be bought by local people, and are only lived in on the weekends. Generally 50-60% of the park is full at a time. It might be full during the 4th of July. Parking will have to be orderly, but they believe there won't be a problem. Everyone is allowed one boat. 21 boat trailers will touch, but they'll fit. She showed more parking for people who come down for the day.

Johna continued that the staff report recommends asphalt. A 5-mph speed limit has been created so people won't speed and throw up dust, it's safer and they want to force people to walk. She showed where it's only 600' across. They are proposing an emergency access since it's easier to police one entrance and exit. They are concerned with asphalt because it's impervious surface. Water will percolate into gravel. The applicants are looking at snowbirds. Guests would have to be put elsewhere. Each lot will be developed with a Park Model and improvements already set up. There's a process through the Homeowners Association to replace units. The roads are a loop series of roads, so she had questions for Joel on the need for a variance for a road exceeding 1500'. They plan to dedicate common space rather than a specific parkland dedication. The difference between the high water and low water acreage is a little under 1/2 acre. She hoped for more details on the staff concerns on the covenants.

Clarence asked how the 5 mph speed limits would be maintained. She said it was part of the Homeowners Associations, and she thought the neighbors would be involved. Clarence felt that reliance on neighbors doesn't work. He also asked about the common area versus user space. She said there were sites of airspace, where an owner puts personal things, such as a barbeque. Clarence affirmed with Johna that it's not all common area, then. She said in the condominium unit declarations, an owner gets a description of where their airspace is, and where the common spaces are. She said there's over 2.5 acres of common area to utilize, even without the sites.

Ken asked about the ownership and maintenance of the docks. Johna said the homeowners will own them as an association, and each person in the association will be assigned a dock. He asked about the slope of the emergency access. Jeff Anderson said it was between 4 and 6 %. Johna mentioned she's received an approach permit. For security reasons, she has a problem with it being more than an emergency access.

Joyce asked when someone purchases a condo unit, would they then own the Park Model. Johna said they would own the Park Model and not the land. Joyce referred to the parking in the common space. Johna confirmed that most of the common area is available for parking. They would not be able to park in the drainfield area, which she indicated on the map. Joyce asked how the common area can be parking if it's the parkland. Sue explained that there are two separate requirements for parking and for parkland. Johna said that there's plenty of common space. Jeff said they can distinguish between the parking and the parklands. Johna said they didn't want to designated parkland because they want to dedicate everything as common space. There will be places to park and places where you cannot.

Johna reiterated that this is a condominium RV subdivision, to clarify Joyce's questions. This would create spaces for rent or lease. Joyce said the concept was clear. The question was if it was going to fit within the regulations, what to call it, and which regulations apply. John said that he would rely on staff to tell him if it meets with the subdivision or condominium acts.

Johna mentioned the 25' radius requested by staff for the roads was no problem.

Bob asked if the roads will have ditches. Johna replied they'll have roadside swales for storm water. Bob asked how the parking for the boat trailers would be accessed. Do you back up through that swale? Johna confirmed. The surface is grass. Bob asked if it would be dedicated

in some way such that people would understand how to park. Johna said it would be a storm water easement on the plat. Jeff said that behind the sand mound, there'd be a fence. Bob said they'll be backing off of Coneflower Trail. Jeff said they be able to back in, and there's not a drainage swale on that side.

Bob asked who does the water and septic. Jeff did that. It was a little awkward. Originally when he started the project, they had a public water [inaudible] not on their lot. The well was drilled on the wrong lot in 1989. Since then, they've drilled a new well. It was exceptionally difficult, with the lake, the highway and the neighboring properties, and to keep the well protection zone on the property. About 130' to 160' subsurface, there's a really nice layered clay. They clearly have a limiting layer. So runoff from an oil tanker or whatever it may be can't physically penetrate that groundwater. DEQ gave them really strict regulations on how to seal the casing into the bedrock, which he forwarded to Joel earlier in the week. DEQ is happy with it. As a replacement water supply for the current well, it is approved and ready to go. With the drainfields, they're looking at having to replace them anyway. He showed the current ones on the map, close to the lake. Currently, there's a lot of wastewater that can be generated, roughly 5000 gallons per day. With the revised plan, there would be less. They'd have to do the sand mound differently too. They've got 30' of clay to prevent contaminants hitting the public water source. Fred asked who monitors the water supply. Jeff replied that MDEQ does.

Ken asked where the lot lines of the 3 existing lots are. Johna showed this on the map. The lots would be aggregated, and then the RV subdivision created. She outlined the history of the RV park, beginning around 1970 or 1971, prior to the regulations. In 1982 approval was received for another portion. The older portion was grandfathered. Last October, they went to the Board of Adjustment and received a variance to go from 37 units to 21 Park Model units. Jeff noted that 60% of the current wastewater would be produced in the proposed subdivision.

Sharon Schaefer said the park was purchased in 2003, in response to Joyce's question.

Johna said there are Park Models on the property because they weren't aware there was a process to put them there. They weren't thinking of condominiumizing at that point. They were just going to rent them out.

Bob asked about the 2nd well mentioned in the DEQ. Jeff said that if they had a standard public water supply, they'd need 2 wells. Because they don't, they are a transient system. It's approved by DEQ but they wanted to make note this is a public system and if you do have a secondary well, you need to get that location. He just did the testing on the current well, and they'll meet their requirements on it. They're not going to shoot for water right, although they have existing water rights on the current well. They really can't transfer because it would be a new or increased source.

John asked if the applicants could meet with the staff prior to August 15. Johna said that she hoped so. She has questions for staff. John asked if the applicants were going to be able to come up with a buffer strip plan. Johna spoke with Jim Westerman from CSKT, who does shoreline protection. He told her he'd rather they kept it in its natural state, and not to do anything there.

There are grasses and trees. Unfortunately, it seems to be in a drainfield where the storm water catches right now. They believe that's why it failed.

Joyce asked with the current configuration, if it's typically filled during the season. Sharon said it was solid for 3 months. With the proposed configuration, it would be less people than currently. A lot of the interested people are in Missoula and the Bitterroot, who want to come up on the weekend. Joyce asked if the units would be winterized. Sharon didn't see that people would be using them much in the winter, but they could winterize them. Johna thought that would depend on the unit owner. Sharon said the Park Models are insulated. Johna added that the water and sewer systems are put in to regulations, so they're fine sitting there all winter with water and sewer. Joyce asked if they'd be open 12 months with the new proposal. Sharon pointed out that these would be condominiums. John said the approval from the Board of Adjustments limits this to consideration of limited seasonal use of the RV sites as a condition of preliminary subdivision approval. Jack (a member of the Board of Adjustment) didn't think the seasonal use was an absolute. Johna's concern with seasonal use is she didn't want to see an empty park all winter. It would be nice to have 1 or 2 people there year-round for protection purposes, to keep an eye on things.

Bob asked who pays for plowing the road. Johna said this was the Homeowners Association. Bob asked if each site owner was responsible for his lawn care. Johna affirmed.

Johna said that Ray and Sharon will live on site 19, so they will be there, and will be part of the Association. They will have a 1/21 share interest.

Public comment opened:

Merlyn Snavely: They have friends in CA who drive RV's and are selling the RV's to buy units like this in AZ and one elsewhere. They drive a regular car back and forth between the units. This saves money and time, with gas prices the way they are.

Marie Snavely: If you go into the RV park now, it doesn't look that good, esthetically. Something like this [proposal] will be very nice and neat and well-kept. It won't look packed together like condos, either. They won't have big lawns and will be self-maintained. She thought it would be an asset to Elmo.

Arnold Gomke: He lives close by. He thought going from 37 units to 21 units would be, environmentally and esthetically, a substantial improvement. As far as the concept, it's a condominium residential project.

Craig Crockett: He liked the concept and would be interested in getting information on them.

Wes Barr: The applicants contacted him about doing some construction there. He looked at the units that they had, and thought they were a high quality product. The skirting is concrete set on block. It looked professional and high-end. He disagreed with the Tribe about it not being affordable by Lake County residents. He thought it was as affordable as you're going to get on the lake. He thought it would be better for the lake and the residents of Lake County.

Public comment closed.

John asked the Board for other comments or things they'd like to be shown next time. Joyce said she'd like the things mentioned throughout the introductory report that are forthcoming to be there when the preliminary is done.

OTHER BUSINESS

Sue introduced LaDana Hintz, the new planner.

Joel gave an update on the Views at Timberlake subdivision. The Commissioners approved this as the Planning Board recommended. He talked to Shawn Rowland. The bids for the road improvements came to 2.8 million for 23 lots, for about 130,000 per lot. Some general discussion occurred about this.

Sue mentioned that at the meeting next month, Janet Camel would give a presentation, similar to the one given at Ninepipes. Janet's new assistant has worked on the Hwy 93 corridor plan, and hopefully she'll present some preliminary ideas on where they're heading with that.

Steve asked if other counties require the developer to be present at their Planning Board hearings. The consultants aren't sure what the developer would say about some questions. Sue didn't think it was a requirement. She tells them that it's helpful to be there, when they ask. The Board wants to hear their ideas. General discussion on this topic ensued. Sue thought it could be put in the subdivision regulations that it's encouraged that the developer attends. Steve and Joyce thought this was a good idea. Ken thought that if they don't attend, their agent better be able to speak for them.

John complimented the staff on the reports and the meeting. He asked how the Board felt about how the meeting went tonight with the change to go fast with the staff reports. The Board discussed this. John thought that possibly the staff could be asked to mention things unique to a proposal, and then the Board could ask questions.

Motion by Brad Trosper and seconded by Ken Miller, to adjourn. Motion carried, all in favor. Meeting adjourned at 9:28 pm.