

LAKE COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
July 11, 2007
Meeting Minutes

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

STAFF PRESENT: Sue Shannon, Joel Nelson, Lita Fonda

John Fleming called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm.

Motion by Joyce Funda and seconded by Jack Meuli to approve the June 13, 2007 meeting minutes. Motion carried, all in favor.

VIEWS AT TIMBERLAKE MAJOR SUBDIVISION

Joel Nelson presented the staff report. Along with the information on pg. 18, Joel mentioned a study by Bob Miller, forest management consultant, has been received, and this was handed out. Some of the suggestions it includes could be incorporated in the covenants. Additional public comment received after the staff report was handed out and summarized. An additional letter was received from Fish, Wildlife and Parks regarding the effect on wildlife and wildlife habitat. This contained suggestions, which caused revision to the staff-recommended conditions of approval and the covenants. A correction to condition #8 on pg. 34 changed the reference to Condition 9, rather than Condition #10. Joel added an additional recommended condition of approval, #40, regarding the existing CC & R's of Timberlake Ranches, which he read.

Fred Mueller checked about the surface of Goose Bay Lane and Dewey Bay Lane. It would be asphalted. Joel showed the location where the gravel and 20' width is proposed, on Dewey Bay Lane south of Goose Bay Lane, and Sleepy Hollow. Joel reiterated portions of the applicant's variance requests. Staff recommended denial for variance #4 because the road will be ungated and available for full-time use, and emergency service providers might need a road that meets standards for base.

Joyce Funda asked if a gravel pit mentioned in the public comment letters impacted tonight's application. Sue clarified that the gravel pit is on a separate property. Joyce observed that the Rollins fire chief has changed from Don Armstrong, who commented on this subdivision last November, to Richard Pressel (sp?). She thought that the new fire chief's comments might be sought as well. She read the comments by Bob Miller, who seemed to feel that overall it looked okay, but there were 4 areas where he referred to extreme wildfire danger and how it spreads. Sue thought Bob Miller's homesite configurations included in his letter would be good to add to the covenants, and also the item on pg. 3 about pruning trees beyond 100' of structures. On the topic of fire, Sue also thought the Board might consider asking the developer if he'd be willing to clear the brush within the right-of-way along the roads they'd be constructing, and also to dispose of the slash on lots 10, 16, 22 and 23 that he refers to on pg. 3 of his report. Joyce asked for information on the practical difference with small-sounding changes in slope gradation. Fred noted that 8% is the standard. John thought an engineer might need to answer.

Ken asked if the proposed 10,000-gallon buried tank was simply a tank, or if there would be a well and water supply servicing the tank. Whose responsibility would it be to keep it filled? Joel noted this hasn't been worked out yet. Ken asked about the current condition of the emergency egress road north of White Blvd going to Flathead County. Joel thought it was probably a 16'-wide, pretty level road.

Joyce asked about the traffic to be expected with new 23 homes. Joel explained that this is typically about 10 vehicle trips per day per residence.

Shawn Rowland spoke on behalf of the applicants. He felt the main concern came down to roads. They know they need the easements to proceed with the project. They will obtain the easements when they have preliminary approval for the project. It's a tough road in the winter. They propose constructing a 26'-wide paved road with a 15 mph speed limit to access these 23 properties. He thought an estimate of 10 trips a day was high for a rural setting.

Regarding the fire chief change, he felt they needed to work with what they have. Bob Miller also reviewed both the specific sites proposed and an overall view of every lot, in case the homesite is modified or changed. Bob Miller's suggestions are not yet integrated into the covenants since Shawn did not receive it until Monday. The applicants will take his recommendations.

Regarding the Fish, Wildlife and Parks letter, he also received it on Monday. They have used FWP recommendations in the past, and don't anticipate a problem with this.

Regarding grade issues, they are required to meet the 8% standard. They realized they couldn't, so since it comes down to public health and safety, they approached Don Armstrong who was the fire chief at the time. They asked him if he thought it would work. He didn't think it would be a problem. The County road supervisor also saw the plans. The speeds were lowered so the curve radii would be safe. In an emergency, can people get out? This is why they've focused on obtaining the access out through Flathead County. It's not a problem to include the specific clean-ups detailed by Bob Miller as conditions.

John clarified with Joel that the variances needed for Dewey Bay Road that had not been asked for previously are now covered in this report. John asked what is going to happen to the west of this parcel, since Stoltze owns that and currently accesses through this parcel. Shawn replied that it is not their intention to allow access to the 640 acres to the west through the 273 acres. They felt it would stress the easement that's there. They've been working through the state to see if the 640 can be accessed via another way. Road access was further discussed on the maps. The road used for timber management was pointed out. That lot could be sold. The intention is to leave that for timber management. Once Stoltze sells that property, they will not have access through the subdivision.

Joyce asked about the weed management plan. Shawn explained the plan is described in a document. Weed management was discussed further.

Joyce brought up the covenants. Shawn explained that Views at Timberlake comes under today's standards. They adopted the Timberlake Ranches covenants, which they need to do, being party to those covenants. They have additional stricter covenants to cover additional issues, such as dealing with fire hazards and understanding the Fish, Wildlife and Parks requirements.

Joyce got a sense of a strong want for privacy with the homes along the road when she went to visit the property. She also wondered how the road could be used for additional demand, given its condition. Shawn responded they have to meet standards, based on public health and safety, with the road. He agreed that this would change the neighborhood. It's been known that lot 17 could be subdivided. Roads were further discussed. Shawn reiterated that with one road, they'd be putting it within the right-of-way, which is not the current case.

With the Bob Miller letter, Joyce verified with Shawn that his comments have been taken together with the fire chief's comments. These are two different things. Bob Miller is a forestry manager. Don Armstrong was a fire chief. They want to work with the new fire chief, but the problem is that they are now under statutory time lines. If they make significant changes to the plan as proposed, they have to do another public hearing. They worked with the fire department. At some point they can't keep looking for more information. Joyce verified with Shawn that the applicants were willing to accept the recommendations from Bob Miller.

Ken Miller checked about Bob Miller's credentials. Shawn explained that he is under contract with Lake County to assist private landowners with fuel reduction assistance. Brad Trosper thought he was the retired fire management specialist for the northwest area of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. He has over 30 years of experience. Ken thought some of the comments were on the liberal side, such as the distance for trees given at the top of page 4, given the slopes and the fuel loading. Shawn pointed out the specific recommendations for the homesites near steep slopes. Ken wondered if homeowners could keep up a 10-acre parcel to the given conditions. Shawn noted that the measures were for the homesites and driveways.

Public comment opened:

David Fortenberry: He opposed the proposal for a number of reasons. Legal access along Hersman Road is being questioned and legally researched. He felt the 273 acres exceeded the scope of use established in the Timberlake Ranches community, particularly with Hersman Hill and Benchmark Drive. With continued access via this road to the neighboring 640 acres for timber extraction, he thought this set up an unacceptable situation for the existing residents. His other concerns include the depletion of ground water sources in the area, and increased fire risk.

Dan Gullotta: He thought there were a lot of road variances. Hersman Hill is the only one road that goes from the top of the hill to the bottom. It's treacherous in the winter. It's the worst road. He thought the roads should be done to proper County standards. He was concerned about the water and if the amount would be sufficient. He thought the easements should be in place prior to this item going to the Commissioners. His understanding was that the current applicants have an option to buy the neighboring 640 acres. If Stoltze sells to someone else, they won't

have access, so who else would buy it? He felt the covenants and restrictions should remain in place.

Larry Shetler: He pointed out a road that doesn't exist and couldn't be built. He pointed out other road details on the map that he thought were incorrect. He and his attorney didn't feel the variances should be allowed. He thought that the applicants haven't tried to figure out a way to do this right. He noted they'd have to violate existing covenants. The developer said at a meeting last summer that if there were too much opposition, they'd go elsewhere. He noted that Shawn has promised to put the recent fire information in the covenants. He liked the point brought up on the weed control. He wants things done above-board and honestly. He felt the money should be spent to make the roads work right. He thought gravel roads would be less slippery than paved ones.

Jay Hoker: He's been a part-time resident since 1991. He had two neighborhood meetings at his house with developer friends from Dallas and the neighbors. Seven attended the first meeting, and 8 were at the second. The purpose was to allow them access/input into the project. Only one neighbor has called them since then with input. They are trying to improve the covenants, not override them. They want to put a road maintenance policy in, and fund it. They want the amenities that would benefit everyone. The purpose was to maintain the integrity of that development.

Public comment closed.

John summarized that the Board has to deal with a staff recommendation and 5 variances. John asked Joel to comment on the variances as they relate to the recommendation. Joel responded that the conditions reflect the 4 variances recommended for approval and the 1 recommended for denial. John understood the developer to indicate that the variance recommended for denial could be crossed off. Joel spoke about the road grades and curve radii in various places, with respect to the variances, pointing the places out on a map. Joyce asked about the combination of reduced radius and increased slope. What does this yield? Joel thought the combination of problems would probably make the situation worse. It was proposed because they're trying to get the roads to fit in the existing easements. Fred asked if it would be better for the folks up there to give easements to make the road better. They could put in the right radii. Joel thought this was up to them. Fred asked if the applicants were trying to get the easements to make the radius better. Shawn explained they approached this to show they could place the road in the confines of that easement. Their approach, after they get preliminary plat, is to seek out those easements to make that road straight or take care of the curve radius. To meet the 8% grade, without obtaining a large easement, is going to be almost impossible. It would involve buying a lot, and that hasn't worked out. By getting the road approved in the existing easements, they won't be held hostage for the easements. He talked further about the current and proposed configuration of the road. The existing road is really bad. They are proposing to get the road back where it belongs. It won't be like the road that's there now. They will take out one of the steepest portions of the road. John asked about the existing road grade in the worst place. Sue noted that the highest proposed grade on Hersman Hill is 9.91%. Joel located a section of the current road on the maps at 12.66%. That section would be changed to 8.91%. He listed a few of the other grades.

Joyce clarified with Shawn that the road in bad shape he referred to is Timberlake Road.

John summarized some of items to consider. There are variances, other than variance #4. Clearing the right-of-way as a condition could be added. Bob Martin's recommendations could be added, on fire-related activity, either as a condition or a covenant, and also the Fish, Wildlife and Parks recommendations. Sue referred to the slash cleanup for specific lots on pg. 3 of Bob Martin's letter. Joel reminded of the staff recommendation for the proposed condition #40.

The variances were considered separately.

Motion by Steve Hughes, and seconded by Jack Meuli, to recommend approval of variance #1 as proposed. Motion carried, 6 in favor (Fred Mueller, John Fleming, Jack Meuli, Clarence Brazil, Brad Trosper, Steve Hughes) and 2 opposed (Ken Miller, Joyce Funda).

Motion by Steve Hughes, and seconded by Jack Meuli, to recommend approval of variance #2 as proposed. Motion carried, 6 in favor (Fred Mueller, John Fleming, Jack Meuli, Clarence Brazil, Brad Trosper, Steve Hughes) and 2 opposed (Ken Miller, Joyce Funda).

Motion by Steve Hughes, and seconded by Jack Meuli, to recommend approval of variance #3 as proposed. Motion carried, 5 in favor (Fred Mueller, John Fleming, Jack Meuli, Clarence Brazil, Steve Hughes) and 3 opposed (Ken Miller, Joyce Funda, Brad Trosper).

Motion by Steve Hughes, and seconded by Fred Mueller to recommend denial of variance #4 as proposed. Motion carried, all in favor of the denial.

Motion by Steve Hughes, and seconded by Jack Meuli, to recommend approval of variance #5 as proposed. Motion carried, all in favor.

Motion by Steve Hughes, and seconded by Jack Meuli, to add the following conditions to the staff recommendation:

Clean the slash off of the right-of-way

Clear lots 10, 16, 22 and 23, per Bob Miller's recommendation

Add condition #40 as recommended by staff

Ken explained that although he appreciated the efforts by the developer to address negative impacts on public health and safety, he felt that the measures were not adequate to ensure adequate public health and safety, with roadway, curve radii, and especially the building sites on the tops of steep slopes in a fire front area. He didn't believe these were safe places for development. He will vote against it on the grounds of public health and safety.

Joyce explained she would vote against it based on the Lake County Subdivision regulations, section 2.B.3, based on the first 3 factors. She believed it was adverse to public health, safety and welfare based upon fire hazards, and with respect to the roads. The Growth Policy requires discussion on the impact on neighboring properties and to strike a balance, and she doesn't feel a balance has been struck. Lastly, there is a July 9, 2007 MT Fish, Wildlife and Parks letter which

refers to impact of subdivisions over time for winter range habitat, and also that strict guidelines need to be followed by the residents of the area to avoid chronic problems with negative human-wildlife interactions. This area is abundant with a variety of wildlife and she thought the impact in cumulation with others would be detrimental.

John explained that he would vote for this project because he thought the mitigations have been honest and he thought they did a good job of mitigation.

Steve clarified that his motion was to add the items to the staff recommendation, not on the subdivision recommendation itself yet.

Motion carried, all in favor.

Motion by Jack Meuli, and seconded by Steve Hughes, to recommend approval of the subdivision with the amended staff recommendations. Motion carried, 5 in favor (Fred Mueller, John Fleming, Jack Meuli, Clarence Brazil, Steve Hughes) and 3 opposed (Ken Miller, Joyce Funda, Brad Tropsner).

Sue alerted the interested public to contact the Planning staff in the next two days if they were interested in attending the Commissioners hearing for the date and time of the meeting.

Stonehorse Business Park Major Subdivision Informational

Joel Nelson presented the staff report.

Fred asked if the road supervisor specified the number of inches of asphalt. Joel thought he meant 4 inches, but the road supervisor did not say in his letter of comment. Steve asked if they meant an improvement of Tower Road from Highway 93 to the end of this subdivision. Joel replied that the road supervisor wants Tower Road improved from Highway 93 to the end of this subdivision and then Glacier Creek. Steve asked if the additional development occurring just to the west would also have an effect on Tower Road. Sue noted that Tower Road was improved in 2004 for an NRID. It was chip-sealed and improved at that time. The road supervisor's comments are based on use. He felt it needed to be paved because of the heavy truck traffic associated with the industrial uses proposed in the subdivision. He felt the impact of this subdivision warrants paving of the road. Steve pointed out some existing industrial uses, such as rock hauling, in the area. Joyce asked where the Business Park is located with respect to the residential areas. Joel referred to the maps.

John asked if lists of prohibited operations, as on pg. 5 of the staff report, were standard. Joel said these were common, especially for a commercial subdivision. Ken asked about operations not included as either permitted or prohibited, such as gas stations, bars or restaurants. Joel said that a lot of uses within the zoning that aren't specifically addressed. Those would be prohibited, or they'd have to convince us they are conditional use.

Marc Carstens spoke on behalf of the applicant. On pg. 6, section D, the developer would prefer to leave the whole of the responsibility of road maintenance with the residential properties, of which there will be a large number of lots, and as in previous subdivision reviews.

On pg. 7, regarding the first bulleted item, Glacier Creek Road is a private road within the subdivision. It has its own maintenance and procedure for repair. They request that the private road be allowed to continue with the chip-sealed surface. On the second bullet, he said that the only heavy traffic generated from this subdivision, in and of itself, would be the fire department. The commercial applications involved there are probably going to be ancillary to the subdivision, primarily for dry storage. The commercial lot would require zoning conformance, and they felt the amount of traffic generated could be weighed then, and a surcharge could be made on those who impact the facilities with the additional traffic with potential infrastructure increase. The road has been improved recently. At the time, there was a gravel company hauling over the chip-sealed road, and heavy construction traffic from a construction company. The road seems to be holding up well. It also serves another subdivision. They agreed they should waive the right to protest for RSID, but they felt the weight of improvements should be borne by those creating the business of impact, not by just creating the lots. Marc noted that this developer did pay for the turning lane onto highway 93, as an entrance into the subdivision, since he wants it safe. Glacier Road will be going from gravel to chip-sealed as they proceed with their improvements. The public isn't stopped from using this road for access to Hwy 93.

On pg. 8, they can comply with the second paragraph, but they viewed it as an element of DEQ review.

Joyce thought it was curious that professional offices were allowed for accountants, attorneys, etc., but not medical, dental, or employment agencies. Marc thought it might have to do with the amount of anticipated traffic. The developers commissioned market studies, and it may be a product of the earlier market studies.

Ken asked about the fire protection requested on pg. 10, especially the last bullet about minimum fire flows are not required due to the presence of the standpipes. Marc explained that what the developer inherited was a system never designed to provide fire flow. Steve Jensen, a contractor, suggested that the standpoint pipe points be established that would allow drafting into tanker truck facilities. These are located on the high-pressure side of the water system. The point locations have been coordinated to allow the water to be taken onto the fire fighting trucks without the potential of backwash contaminating a potable water system. It is unusual. There is also an oversized line run from a potable system to the lot being donated to the fire department. Ken asked about the kind of flow the lines are capable of producing. Marc thought it was in the neighborhood of 600 to 650 gallons per minute, as he understood. Fire flow approaches 1000 gpm's.

Joyce confirmed that Tower Road is a County road. Marc thought the improvements occurred in 2002. He reiterated that the applicants felt the stop-check for a heavy road usage being put in would be the zoning conformance review. She checked that the County was responsible for maintenance and repair on Tower Road. Steve thought having the waiver to protesting the future RSID would cover this.

Sue explained zoning regulations don't have provisions that would give the County latitude about requirements depending on land use. They would have to be amended to include

something like that, if that was to be done. Marc thought it would be an appropriate amendment. He agreed there needed to be some sort of stop-check. If zoning conformance won't do that, they'll need to coordinate to alleviate the situation. Sue noted that the Board was involved in creating that zoning district. They did discuss the impacts of a commercial development on Tower Road, and she thought at the time they felt it would be appropriate to discuss the potential impacts when the subdivision was created. If approval is recommended, there would be 6 commercial lots with unknown use. Marc thought they could brainstorm on some sort of review mechanism to put in. Sue suggested there could be a trip-per-day threshold that would kick it in to some further type of review. Marc thought there could also be a weight-per-trip factor. He would like to pursue that option, rather than put down 4 inches of asphalt at this point in time. Fred thought a heavy truck would have more rubber on the ground than the car, so the weight ratio might be similar for the comparison.

Joyce asked for clarification from Marc about the first bullet on pg. 7 regarding his comments that it was a private road, where they thought that the costs should be borne by the residents, and would be okay as chip-sealed, but now he's presenting a plan where that doesn't necessarily hold. Marc noted that on one page he says the residential people will pay for the repair and maintenance of Glacier, and on another page he says it should be mitigated. He will take that to the developers and they will have language on that for the next meeting.

Ken noted on pg. 3, it talks about 4 remaining development units. Are these designated commercial or residential? Joel said this is in the Stone Ridge Zoning. It's just development units.

Keith McCurdy commented on behalf of Elaine Murray, his client, who owns property west of the development. If approved as proposed, and a zoning conformance process was used to determine factors after the subdivision was allowed, he felt it would bypass the Board in terms of whether or not it's an appropriate purpose for the land.

Sue said that the Board was involved with the creation of the zoning district. Keith thought the current zoning was residential. Sue noted that it's zoned for commercial, which is pretty wide open in terms of the zoning. There are specific prohibited land uses. It's in the Stone Ridge Estates Zoning District. She referred to the map in the staff report. The north 20 acres of the 40 was zoned for commercial. Industrial/commercial is permitted. She listed the prohibited uses, and the definition of heavy industrial. Keith asked if the covenants intended for this proposed development going to further address or define what will be permitted on that particular property. Sue affirmed that they attempt to.

Stonehorse Phase IV Major Subdivision Informational

Joel Nelson presented highlights from the staff report.

On the sharp radii, the County road supervisor recommends 15 mph speed limit signs. John noted that line of sight is just as important as the curve. It matters what you can see.

A waiver from the parkland requirements has been requested, as outlined and discussed on pg. 3. Marc asked for some ideas on this. This is part of a Planned Unit Development (PUD), which

does have a lot of open space. A reasonable but problematic requirement of the County is to develop a legal description of the remaining non-subdivided or otherwise accounted-for properties. He pointed out on the map some small pieces that the developer would prefer not to have dedicated to park, when the end result is going to be a lot of open space. He pointed out what would be left for open space. John asked for clarification on some of the parcels. Marc referred to the PUD diagram of a previous approval, and said he would make copies of it for the Board. Jack said if the PUD was mapped out, with 'x' acres for the whole thing, he didn't know that there'd have to be a park for every part. Sue expressed the concern Phase IV could then be done without a parkland, and what happens if no more phases are done. What if the remainder is sold? There's nothing that can make the purchaser dedicate parkland or continue with the PUD.

Marc asked if it was possible with the remainder drawing and legal description to make a reservation to the legal description, something to the effect that 0.8872 acres undivided from this is to be used for open space for dedicated parkland. When Phase V is done, it's there. If they lose interest or sell the project, there's a deed restriction saying ground has to be dedicated to parkland. Joyce asked if that passed legal muster. Marc thought at that time, to go ahead, they would have to dedicate at that time.

John asked if there was one owner of the Stone Ridge Zoning District. Sue and Marc said there was one, plus the Lonnie Haack subdivision.

Steve suggested that the staff and Marc could come up with a mechanism that the Board could look at, at the next meeting for the parkland.

Marc thought the open points on these proposals were the parks, the paving, which was already discussed, and the water availability, which was already addressed.

Joel brought up pedestrian circulation. The developer was unwilling to show walking paths on the plat or be required to develop specific segments of walking paths on each phase. Marc explained that lots are being reevaluating and redesigned. The paths fulfill two obligations. One is augmentation of parkland. He summarized options and modifications for dealing with parkland. They intend to have ample parkland by the completion of the project. Pedestrian circulation is desirable. The applicant would like to have an agreement to let him continue with the development without putting in pedestrian walkways to a point. The trails could be installed with the last phase without fear of having to remove or reconstruct them in order to fit some phase change. John said he would like to see them drawn at all times, on every proposal, and how they change as time goes on, so when the paths do happen, it's known where they're going to be. That's part of the subdivision.

Sue said that the applicants don't want it to be part of the subdivision, and that's her concern. It's not being addressed adequately in the review if it's just going to be waived to a future phase and we don't know where it's going to be located. Marc asked if they could show trail locations through the planning process, but not install the trails until the future. Sue asked how to ensure that would happen. John confirmed with Sue & Joel that the paths were on the master plan for the PUD. Sue added that the PUD is a concept. It's not platted or installed. It's the concept they'd like to shoot for. A PUD allows reducing the design standards of the subdivision

regulations. Ken pointed out that 'Planned' is the first part of PUD. Why would this be changing so much from the plan? Marc replied that as they proceed, they're finding the lots of the single-family residences are acceptable for the marketing area, but they're running into trouble with the long skinny lots, which were a novel idea.

Joyce noted that the applicants want the walking path at their discretion, to construct as 'needed'. People could disagree as to what is needed. Marc explained that a PUD doesn't give you necessary approval for the configuration of lots. It does allow you to enter a conceptual arena that would allow changes in some of the regulatory needs. Joyce asked if this has come up before. Sue said that this is the first PUD to move forward. John was concerned that at some point in time, there would not be walking paths, and they were part of the deal. Sue liked John's idea of at least showing them. Ken was concerned that as things go along, the PUD changes so far from the original approved PUD that it won't be the same development. Marc thought the changes would be less impacting than the original plan. He thought perhaps they could show easements on these subdivision plats as they go, and how they interrelate. This would protect the ability for the walkways to exist, and they'd be reviewing the projected walkway with the change of the PUD design.

Marc mentioned a curve on one road is 300' rather than 305'. He thought they'd come in with a variance request to reduce the curve requirement, because the easement is already in place for this road structure. He's asking for a reduction of about 1.4%, and going back to the recommended speed limit. Clarence pointed out that no one actually drives 15 mph. John thought they'd need a speed bump to get people to go 15 mph. Marc commented that this road has tight curvature. This particular road corridor is major to the subdivision. They don't really want to slow the traffic below the 30 mph range.

Joel and Marc agreed to talk more about bus stops. Joel suggested the Board think about bus stops the next time this project comes up.

OTHER BUSINESS

Sue brought up a covenant change amendment request for Lakeview Addition #2, near Polson. Keith McCurdy was the subdivider. It requires Planning Board approval to amend the covenants. The covenants to be amended are in regards to on-street parking and fencing.

Ken asked for more detail. Sue read the language that they'd like to add. Keith McCurdy proposed the covenants. The majority of homeowners have already agreed to the amendments.

**Motion by Steve Hughes, and seconded by Joyce Funda, to approve the amendments.
Motion carried, all in favor.**

Motion by Jack Meuli and seconded by Steve Hughes, to adjourn. Motion carried, all in favor. Meeting adjourned at 10:15 pm.