

LAKE COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
January 9, 2008
Meeting Minutes

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

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

Bob Kormann called the meeting to order at 7:10 pm.

Motion by Fred Mueller and seconded by Ken Miller to approve the Dec 12, 2007 meeting minutes. Motion carried, seven in favor (Fred Mueller, Bob Kormann, Jack Meuli, Joyce Funda, Ken Miller, Clarence Brazil, Steve Hughes) and one abstention (Brad Trosper).

Sue noted that since it was the year's first meeting, the Board officers needed to be elected.

Motion by Joyce Funda, and seconded by Brad Trosper, to reelect John Fleming as president and Bob Kormann as vice president for the Board. Motion carried, all in favor.

BIG ARM STATE PARK RENTAL SITES MAJOR SUBDIVISION

LaDana Hintz presented the staff report, and handed out updates. The Commissioners are scheduled to consider the subdivision on January 29, 2008. Page 3, 1.a should read MTFWP rather than USFWS. On page 11, 1.d should refer to a cul-de-sac rather than a T-turnaround. She noted that for variance #1, staff recommendation is for approval of the variance if the developer improves and maintains the unimproved road, which extends beyond the cul-de-sac, and the proposed breakaway gate to the internal roadway that acts as this campground loop B. The developer must also maintain the breakaway gate on Meadowlark Lane to provide emergency ingress and egress. For variance #2, staff recommendation is for approval for a roadway with a 20' driving surface, rather than the 16' requested by the applicant. On page 17, she pointed out condition #16 should be corrected to read 'the final plan' rather than 'the final plat'.

Joyce mentioned that she liked the inclusion of the criteria for the consideration of variances. She asked what was recommended to mitigate the fire hazard other than the installation of a dry hydrant. Sue referred to condition #11. Joyce also asked about weed management, which is a huge issue on Meadowlark Lane. She thought the fire and weed control went hand in hand. Sue thought that it was probably a term of the lease of FWP from MT DNRC to control the weeds and the wood. Joyce said that they want to expand their use, but there are problems with the use, as it is. Sue explained that in the past, if weed problems exist on a property, the applicants have to demonstrate that they've treated the weeds in the year prior to the final plat or plan. As far as the dead wood, typically whoever did the cleanup would submit the evidence, and the planners would verify that this occurred. She outlined what would happen if the planners felt the cleanup was inadequate. Joyce asked about Fire Dept involvement and Sue replied the Fire Dept didn't comment on a fuel problem on the property. Staff could put language in about consulting with a

professional if staff feel it's necessary. DNRC should have personnel who could handle this for the planning staff.

Brian Holling spoke on behalf of the applicant for the project. The conditions have been reviewed and they have no objections to changing the variances, and other conditions. They are committed to working with the Rural Fire Dept to locate a dry hydrant. Fred asked if they were opposed to widening the roads. Brian replied they don't have a problem for not getting the variance for the 16' for the new road to be put in. They aren't proposing to widen the existing roads.

Ann Moran spoke on behalf of the landowner (DNRC) for the project. She had some issues on which to make recommendations. For a rental subdivision, her understanding is that it goes as far as preliminary plat in Lake County, but does not go to final plat, so there's still one parcel. She had concern with 2 conditions. LaDana already pointed out a change for condition #16, from final plat to final plan. Ann thought it might also be appropriate to modify the language following that, where it says 'causing this land to be subdivided'. She suggested something along the lines of 'causing a rental subdivision' or 'a plan for a rental subdivision' to more clearly reflect that this is a rental subdivision. This has importance to them, since the DNRC does not create new legal parcels of trust land lightly, and that would require a very different process and due diligence than they gave this one, given their understanding at the outset that this would be preliminary plat only for a rental subdivision.

Ann mentioned condition #17. With the utility easement language, it begins in some respects starts to cross into the state administrative rules pertaining to easements on trust land. The condition makes sense for multiple parcels. When just one parcel is being dealt with, that can create problems with how the State requires the DNRC to handle trust land. FWP are a lessee, like any lessee on trust land. Their lease grants them the right, with DNRC approval, to do whatever kind of service lines they need to do for utilities that are internal to their use. The potential of doing utility easements that go across the property to somebody else or that have additional uses are another thing entirely. The DNRC has a very rigorous internal process for those. In this case, for the condition as written, it appears that the DNRC would have to record a legal easement for FWP, which means they'd have to be charged for something they already have per the terms and conditions of their lease. The DNRC has a concern with that language and that it may create conflict with how they have to legally manage easements on state trust land. She was still researching this.

The lessee is accountable for the fire and weed management, and would be better able to comment on specifics on those, but DNRC certainly cares and looks into questions on that. Steve asked about the current lease and weed policy. Ann responded that the lessee is required to take care of noxious weeds at their own expense and keep the area free. She is aware that they do a great deal of work and spraying, and that it is hard in that area, due to other noxious weeds in the area. DNRC does inspections on a periodic basis.

Joyce asked if Ann was suggesting eliminating condition #17 because they have it covered under state law. Ann said she didn't want to interfere with subdivision requirements for the County, but as a cursory review, the information in the condition seemed to apply to final plat. If so, then

it would be more appropriate to eliminate that condition. Ann and Joyce touched further on the language. Sue said staff could make it easy by requiring them to meet the requirements of the Lake County subdivision regulations regarding that. The language could be kept vague enough to allow for discussions before final recordation of the site plan. Bob asked if the Board approves this, can they say subject to #16 and #17 being further defined by staff and the State. Sue thought so.

Jerry Sawyer, the park manager, spoke on behalf of the applicants for the project. Regarding the slash pile, it's located where the new storage building would go, and is scheduled to be ground up and removed as part of the project. For the stuff found downhill from there, their policy is to gather the fallen wood, pile them up, and come in with their chipper. They use the wood chips for trail surfacing or areas around campsites. They have a weed management plan. They can't do the amount of spraying that they'd like. Budgets for weed control are limited. Fiscal year 2007 entire budget, for the entire region of 11 state parks and roughly 26 fishing accesses, was \$9200. He listed some specifics for labor, chemicals and equipment for Big Arm annual spraying. The weeds are one of their biggest problems and they try to address it every year with the resources allocated. Regarding the bug trees, Big Arm was one of the first parks around Flathead Lake to have a commercial cleaning project completed. The intention was to reduce the bug-killed trees and remove those from the park, and also the weaker trees, so potentially they would not have more spread. They are fighting the western bark beetle, which is endemic to the valley, by making the remaining trees healthier and more resistant. Jerry provided Bob with more details on the spraying, and verified for Steve that the spending on chemicals was about \$2 per acre.

Joyce asked why this particular project was proposed. Jerry pointed out the need for an ADA site, and also that federal standards require an ADA site. They need to meet standards to add to or develop facilities. Part of their job is to provide services to the public. The sites are first-come, first-serve, and are not reservable. For the yurts, it's a recreational experience that has become very popular. The one they have is occupied every weekend during the summer. Part of their mandate is to provide recreational opportunities. They're proposing to add 2 more yurts to meet that demand. Joyce felt that they needed to be able to maintain what they had and keep it in good condition before they move on to the next level. The additional 7 units were, in Jerry's opinion, to provide better service. Part of the proposal calls for an additional host site, with full hook-ups. The additional set of volunteers would free up paid staff to do more ground maintenance, weed spraying and so forth, which also could improve the ground maintenance standards.

Public comment opened:

Jack Konitz: They live by the park and enjoy it. He didn't know if bigger was better, and didn't want to see the park develop into a denser item than it already is. It's heavily used in the summer. They wrote a letter, which was in the staff report packet. FWP is responsible for the entire area. The camping area is well maintained and densely used. The weed problem is a hazard. He was concerned about the fire threat to the people on Meadowlark Lane and also to people camping in the campground. The weeds are out of hand in the park, which is also a concern as far as fire. He wasn't opposed to making the park friendlier to the handicapped. He

was concerned about more foot traffic out of the park down their lane and road. He wasn't opposed to a certain extent of expansion. He thought the weed management was neglected, and thought federal funding for spraying should be applied for. He talked about new sprays available. He thought they should take care of that before making more facilities to be in harm's way.

Les Thomas: He thought it was a good idea to have more sites there, especially for the disabled and handicapped. In western MT, most of the land, especially on Flathead Lake, is owned by people who live here 6 weeks or less per year. Those who live here have little access to the lake, and every bit is precious. If we can make it easier for more people to use it safely without causing damage, then he's in favor of it. He felt Jerry was a passionate professional, making sure as many people who want to use the park can use it, without devastation happening. He didn't see that 7 extra sites would increase the noxious weed problem, or that noxious weeds and fire had a lot to do with each other. He thought the park tried their best to deal with the slash hazard and had standards to meet. He thought the project would be a good idea.

Public comment closed.

Bob summarized there are two variances (page 15) and the proposal itself to deal with. They also need to be aware of modification of conditions #16 or 17 in the motions.

Joyce expressed concern with loose language as far as weeds, and lack of money in the budget for it. Bob thought if there were 7 more developed sites, you'd have fewer weeds. Sue reiterated that in the past a requirement for properties with significant weed problems has been that they demonstrate they've treated the weeds in this season for the entirety of the property prior to the final plan being recorded. Jack said the area by the highway is better than it was. He hadn't been on the site. Steve said that if a neighbor turned someone in for lack of weed control, the County would spray and bill the landowner. He asked how that applied with DNRC and FWP. Ann noted the FWP lease requires them to pay all costs. Ken had the impression that if a weed management plan was in place and the plan was followed, they are in compliance with the law, whether there are still weeds or not. Steve and Ken agreed that \$2 an acre was insufficient.

Ken asked about the width of the road from the highway. LaDana replies that it's initially 24' when you first enter the park. Toward the campground, it narrows. Ken confirmed with LaDana that there's a substantial amount of roadway in violation. Sue said the portion of road that they're proposing to develop exists as a roughed in road that's 12 to 14' wide and doesn't meet other standards, such as the base. This is the road that is proposed for access to the site.

Motion by Jack Meuli, and seconded by Steve Hughes, to approve variance #1. Motion carried with all in favor.

Motion by Jack Meuli, and seconded by Steve Hughes, to approve variance #2. Sue pointed out that condition #4 says the road should be at least 20' wide. The variance requested is for 16'. A 20' driving surface has been recommended based on fire department comments. If a variance is approved allowing for a road width reduction, staff are suggesting that the variance be modified and be approved for a 20' width rather than a 16' width. She verified for Jack that a variance is

needed for less than 24' in width. Motion withdrawn by Jack Meuli and second withdrawn by Steve Hughes.

Motion by Steve Hughes, and seconded by Jack Meuli to amend variance #2 to 20' minimum width, and to approve the amended variance #2. Motion carried, all in favor.

Motion by Jack Meuli, and seconded by Fred Mueller, to recommend approval for the subdivision with staff recommendations and with modification to conditions #16 and 17 to meet the State's lease requirements, to be worked out between the Planning Dept and the State prior to the Commissioners meeting. Motion carried, all in favor.

SEIFERT MINOR SUBDIVISION

LaDana Hintz presented the staff report. The Commissioners are scheduled to hear the subdivision on 1/23/08. She noted that on pg. 10 to cross off 'irrigation', and to correct rivate to private. On pg. 11, she pointed out an overlap in the numbering, and changed 'Cockrell' to 'Seifert' on pg. 12, # 17.

Joyce referred to the NFPA fire code on pg. 4. The code is complex and huge. She asked if it would be more appropriate for the Fire Dept to point out the relevant sections that are not in compliance rather than putting the onus on the owner to figure it out. Ken pointed out the staff concerns about this on pg. 5. Joyce noted condition #20 on pg. 12, where future landowners are encouraged to consult with the local fire department. Sue explained that these fire standards are confusing, and so she suggested this language in condition #20. The NFPA code is mentioned because of the comments of the Fire Department. If the Fire Department makes comments, those comments need to be acknowledged. Joyce was concerned about what responsibilities the Board places on future landowners.

Ken thought it was appropriate and a great thing to encourage the homeowners to consult with the Fire Department, and the Fire Department could whittle down which portions are important and applicable. He thought it was appropriate the way staff has addressed this.

Marc Carstens spoke on behalf of the applicant. The applicant was satisfied with the conditions in the staff report.

Public comment opened:

Francis Davidson: He commended the Seiferts on their efforts to improve the eastern 5 acres of the property. He expressed concerns on behalf of he and his wife and 2 other couples, the Laceys and the Morgans, about maintaining the current covenants of the westernmost 10 acres, as recorded in document #380072. There is a recommendation that covenants be attached to the proposed 11.32-acre parcel, which includes these 10-acres. They have no objection to the attachment of covenants to the proposed parcel, provided the original covenants aren't superceded, changed or degraded with the inclusion of the proposed covenants. Their specific concerns are in 3 areas: further subdivision, temporary structures, and businesses and commercial activity. They would support the subdivision request, provided the Board consider addressing these concerns in the proposed covenants.

Public comment closed.

Jack asked if pg. 5, H covered the concerns that Francis mentioned. Sue clarified that the old covenants would still be in effect, unless they are modified in terms of the covenant document. The new covenants are in addition to the old ones. Francis said that they have no objection to this subdivision, in this case.

Ken thought that since this was a variance to the density map, that it might be appropriate to limit guesthouses on these properties. Marc said he would have to consult with the applicant to understand what his position on this would be. Sue thought this might have been a more appropriate condition of variance approval. Where would this be put with the findings? The variance was allowed to allow them to go through subdivision review. Discussion needs to happen about how it complies with the density regulations. If the Board adds that condition, a place in the findings to support that condition needs to be found. Ken felt that this fit. He pointed out the section about how it complies with local zoning regulations. Sue asked if he was suggesting the Planning Board feels it would be even more in compliance with the local zoning regulations if this additional requirement were made in addition to the BOA approval. Jack didn't see a problem with a guest house, since it's not another dwelling and would not be more in violation of the density.

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

FINLEY POINT MEADOWS MINOR

Joel Nelson presented the staff report. The Commissioners will consider the subdivision on 1/23/08. He handed out a letter from the Road Superintendent.

Joel clarified for Bob that the easement in the first paragraph on pg. 5 discusses an existing 20' wide easement on the property to the north. That's the existing one, not the conditional public access easement. Bob asked on page 10, in the covenants, regarding the allowance for lot 5 to be further subdivided into a total of 4 lots, should that be eliminated or is that handled in the condition #25 where they have to get a variance to do 4. Joel thought it was covered pretty well with the recommended conditions of approval. It wouldn't hurt to clarify that, although it might require them to amend the covenants in the future. Bob asked if that's just left in the covenants then, even though it doesn't say it has to have a variance in the covenants. Joel was comfortable with how it is.

Ken asked why variance #3 would be considered but not variance #2. Joel explained that historically it has been the road width standard variance that hasn't been required in the given circumstances. Sue explained that they are recognizing that Finley Point has a big problem. There's only one way in and out, and that needs to be considered in any subdivision in that area. There are other areas with this problem also, and the public health and safety issue needs to be addressed in the subdivision review process. With roads, the problem can often be fixed with

something like an RSID. Ken asked if this would set a precedent by requiring a variance for the 1500' maximum cul-de-sac. Sue replied that it's been done before.

Joyce liked the analysis of the variance factors at the end. Joel noted the agents had submitted this. On pg. 7, Joyce said that she liked the specificity of the Fire Dept comments, where the Fire Chief requested specifically that standard 13d of the NFPA code be met. She liked this better than the requirement suggested by the Fire Chief in the previous agenda item.

Ken Jenkins of MT NW Company spoke on behalf of the applicants. He noted that Deb Evison, planner, and Tony Dalpiaz, owner were both in attendance. He reiterated the dual fire access problem that Finley Point has. With 5 lots, they can't solve that problem. They are willing to do what they can, and he pointed out an area on the map, which was a conditional easement that could be granted if there's ever an effort to connect coming out in the other direction. Maybe as time goes by, you may get more pieces of the puzzle and there might be other mechanisms to get the rest of it. The conditions seemed standard and made sense for a development of this nature.

On condition #18, fencing is required. The concern about dogs and livestock is legitimate. This would involve 4000 feet of fence, which is a lot of fence to build. Included in the subdivision covenants are provisions that deal with pets. FWP requirements for rural subdivision have provisions where legally, people are supposed to keep their dogs on their property, and dogs are not allowed to run loose. He also thought it was valid to shoot a dog that's chasing your livestock. There are lots of ways to control pets. They would be willing to beef up the covenants in addition to the FWP requirements. Rather than having to build 4000 feet of fence, he thought a more workable plan might be to require fencing as the property is developed, and to require in the covenants that outdoor dogs be fenced. A new road is going to come in here. Is a gate built? The subdivision cannot practically be built such that a dog can't get out.

Fred asked about power, which comes off of Finley Point Road. Ken J replied that the power will go underground, and will be installed as part of the process when the road is built.

Tony Dalpiaz, of Sandstone Development spoke on behalf of the application. In response to Joyce's question, he explained that the llamas belonged to the people who sold him the land, and he'd allowed them to keep them there. They will be removed. He thought this might eliminate bothering of the neighbors by pets while the land is vacant. He wanted to secure it better while they continue to work with the development and put up No Trespassing signs. As the owner, he'd be part of the HOA until all the lots were sold. He wasn't sure about the aesthetics of a fence around the entire property. He reiterated they can tighten the covenants and that he felt it was more reasonable to deal with the pets as the land became occupied and each individual owner would build their own fence. He wanted to sell the lots as owner-occupied. He wanted to work further to see about building the road. He had no plans for the 10 acres and wanted to see if someone wanted to buy that as a larger parcel.

Public comment opened:

Lucille Buchmann: She spoke at the map. Her family has cattle and calves. Two dogs got in once and killed 19 sheep on a Sunday morning. She made it clear at that time they would

dispose of any dog found on their land. They are not opposed to the subdivision but want to be sure the dogs get fenced in or tied up. She didn't think it had to be a full fence around. The llamas don't bother anyone. She spoke about the section line. The 2 neighbors to the north had that section line abandoned, but her family was never notified. The neighbors appropriated the section line. Her family didn't discover this until a year later. She'll talk to the Commissioners about this. That is a section line and is a natural access onto Finley Point, and would work great for North Finley Point Road. She thought it needs to be opened again and a road put in.

Dennis McCrumb: He didn't see how the fence would control the dogs. He thought such a fence would create weed patches.

Public comment closed.

Jack agreed that the fence wouldn't keep the dogs out, but there's got to be a fence for the livestock. He didn't think shooting the dogs would work well. Lucille pointed out the law allows to shoot a dog that's harassing livestock.

Bob summarized that there are 2 variances to consider, listed on pg. 16, and then the subdivision.

**Motion made by Jack Meuli, and seconded by Fred Mueller, to approve variance #1.
Motion carried, all in favor.**

Bob reminded that variance #2 is not needed. Joyce noted that the developer did request the variance. Sue suggested that something be done by motion.

Motion made by Ken Miller, and seconded by Joyce Funda, that variance #2 does not need to be addressed by the Board. Motion carried, all in favor.

**Motion made by Jack Meuli, and seconded by Fred Mueller, to approve variance #3.
Motion carried, all in favor.**

Bob suggested that the Board discuss recommendation #18, regarding the woven wire fence. Fred thought there ought to be a fence to MT standards. Sue verified for Bob that on pg. 10 a requirement for perimeter fencing of the subdivision was listed. Joel noted that this is a staff-recommended amendment for the covenants. Bob asked if the developer needed to do this. Sue explained the individual lots need to maintain the perimeter fence to MT standards with a woven wire to contain pets. It may need some modification. Bob said that in August and September, his horses eat near the fence edge and get their feet stuck in it. He also wondered if it needed to be a woven wire fence specifically. Steve suggested the reference to woven wire fence be removed from the covenants or conditions because it won't work. Jack thought they should stick with legal fence. Joyce asked what a legal fence is. Jack replied that this was 3 wires 16' apart. Ken M and others pointed out this wouldn't keep a dog in. Bob thought a dog could get around a woven wire fence. Jack said he was talking about a legal fence, not a dog fence. Ken M said this doesn't solve the problem. Bob said if the owner had to be responsible for pet containment, and it's in the covenants, and the owner is not responsible, and Lucille shoots the dog, then owner beware. Sue said there is a recommendation of approval for that language, that pets can

harass livestock and be legally shot, in the covenants to make future landowners aware. It would probably be prudent to add language to require property owners to control pets on their property. Joyce asked if the owners coming into the area historically used for livestock would be required to take some higher precaution so that these animals are not destroyed or endangered. Bob described how his wire fence was tough on wildlife. Joyce asked if there was something besides a wire fence. Joel read the covenant language regarding pets. Sue suggested taking out the woven wire. Ken M asked if all of condition #18 should be removed. Sue replied since livestock was grazing on the property, a legal fence is required. Bob summarized that the “In addition...” portion of #18 would be eliminated (the second sentence), and Sue added that the staff report and findings would be modified appropriately. Joel added this would be put in the covenant section.

Brad said that since the livestock was along one boundary, there was no point in doing the entire perimeter. Jack added as long as they know they have to be responsible for their part of the boundary fence, and he thought it was better to start that way. Ken J said the property is currently fenced on 4 sides, with a livestock-type fence.

Motion by Jack Meuli, and seconded by Steve Hughes, to recommend approval of the subdivision with staff recommendations except with the second sentence of condition #18 taken out, and to strongly have dog control in the covenants. Motion carried, all in favor.

Sue noted for the remaining agenda items, only the Board and the developers/agents were present.

AMENDED PLAT OF LOT 3 OF SUNNY HILLS

LaDana Hintz gave highlights of the staff report. She pointed out on condition #5, the agent wanted to submit a new document rather than amending the lot owners association document. That would address the division of lot 3 and their maintenance requirements for the road. Marc Carstens clarified each new lot pays a full lot share. LaDana also noted that condition #8 had also been discussed with the agent, and staff and agent agree the existing covenants already adequately cover these new lots to be created, so they don't need to amend the covenants to address lots 3, 4 and 5, and lot 3 is adequately covered already.

Fred asked why the fire fee was \$250 rather than \$100. LaDana replied that this was the Fire Chief's request in his letter. Joel commented that the others he's gotten from the Polson Fire Chief have been \$100 per lot. Joyce asked when a potential reconfiguration in the case of high ground water mentioned on pg. 2 would occur. LaDana explained that this would be when Environmental Health reviews it.

Marc had no additional comments on behalf of the applicant.

Public comment: No public were present to comment.

Motion made by Jack Meuli, and seconded by Ken Miller, to recommend approval of the subdivision with staff recommendations except for the changes to condition #5 as

mentioned by LaDana, changing \$250 to \$100 in condition #6, and deleting #8 (and renumbering appropriately). Motion carried, all in favor.

COCKRELL MINOR

LaDana gave highlights of the staff report. Sue noted the largest issue with this subdivision is the irrigation plan. Conditions #11 through 13 detail what needs to happen for compliance to subdivision regulations.

Steve said the pump has to be on a turnout, not in the ditch. He asked why this wasn't hooked to the main line.

Jack Duffey spoke on behalf of the applicants. The Cockrells don't actively farm and have not used it in their ownership. There is no pump to it, so the infrastructure would have to be put in. Steve thought they should put the infrastructure in, and that's where they sprinkler-irrigate on this subdivision. Jack asked Jack Duffey if they irrigated anything now. Jack D explained they own another 42 acres, and the turnout is on that property. There they have that pump. The pump rider knows about it. Steve said the use was probably too small for him to mess with, but now this would be a subdivision with 28 acres to irrigate. They've got the main line and need a pump. It's not legal to put a pump in the ditch. If the irrigation project is turned over, those issues will be resolved. It's a water measurement problem. Sue said to put in a pump, get that main line working and establish easements to each tract to access.

Jack Duffey spoke further. The Cockrells have no complaints about the staff recommendations. The only thing to work out is the southern tract only has 4 acres. It may be a question of what would be the best spot, or maybe they need to request their own turnout on that piece. Steve said the Project provides a turnout for every parcel. If you want another turnout, you have to put it in yourself.

Public comment: No public were present to comment.

Ken didn't like the wording at the bottom of pg. 1, about being 'entitled' to create lots. He didn't think the density regulations said anything about entitlement. Sue said it could be reworded.

Motion by Steve Hughes, and seconded by Fred Mueller, to recommend approval of the subdivision with staff recommendations. Motion carried, all in favor.

OTHER BUSINESS

Sue encouraged members of the Board to attend an adult education class in Polson on Roberts Rules of Order.

Motion by Jack Meuli and seconded by Ken Miller and others, to adjourn. Motion carried, all in favor. Meeting adjourned at 9:40 pm.