

**LAKE COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**  
**April 13, 2011**  
**Meeting Minutes**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Bob Kormann, Sigurd Jensen, Steve Rosso, John Fleming, Janet Camel, Brad Trosper

**STAFF PRESENT:** Tiffany Lyden, Joel Nelson, LaDana Hintz, Lita Fonda

Bob Kormann called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm. A quorum was present.

**Motion by Steve Rosso, and seconded by John Fleming, to appoint Bob Kormann as the 2011 chair. Motion carried, Sigurd Jensen, Steve Rosso, John Fleming, Janet Camel and Brad Trosper in favor, and Bob Kormann abstained.**

**Motion by John Fleming, and seconded by Janet Camel, to appoint Brad Trosper as the 2011 vice-chair. Motion carried, Bob Kormann, Sigurd Jensen, Steve Rosso, John Fleming and Janet Camel in favor, and Brad Trosper abstained.**

Brad noted corrections to the February 2011 minutes. In each of the last two sentences of the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph on pg. 4, the intention was to AVOID illuminating the water. Steve thought the last four sentences of that paragraph were confusing. He noted on pg. 5 in the middle of the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> full paragraphs, it would be clearer to say 'summed up' instead of 'summed'.

**Motion by John Fleming, and seconded by Steve Rosso, to approve the Dec. 2010 and Jan. 2011 meeting minutes as presented, and the Feb. 2011 meeting minutes as corrected. Motion carried, all in favor.**

Bob mentioned a meeting the Commissioners had about conducting boards. The meeting was well attended by various boards and a lot of information was shared. One point brought up was that the Board had rules on file with the Clerk and Recorder. The Board could do some things housekeeping-wise to help prevent potential conflict. There wasn't time at that meeting to get into the agenda item about legal implication for board members. He returned to mention of the rules. Joel offered to send a copy of the rules/bylaws to the Board members. The Planning Board rules or bylaws were last updated around 2007.

Steve noted the April notices did not appear on the web. Planning staff offered to check what happened.

**LAKESHORE REGULATIONS UPDATE**

Tiffany Lyden mentioned the lakeshore information was posted on the web, except for this week. She showed the list from the website, where covered items were underlined. The drafts shown on the web were those prior to the comments from the meetings.

Tiffany highlighted on Vegetation Removal and Plantings, her consideration to incorporate some incentives for vegetation in the regulations, rather than just dealing with removal. She

encouraged people to think of creative ideas. Possibly this would happen for some future update, rather than this time. Other miscellaneous projects that had been mentioned were retaining walls up on the land (more like a landscaping retaining wall rather than a seawall). She thought of addressing heights so they didn't have 10- or 15-foot retaining walls, and maybe screen with vegetation. Gazebos were another subject that wasn't really covered. She applauded the Board for covering a lot of ground in the last months.

Tiffany proceeded to the Review Procedures section. She shared two handouts for reference. One was the Policy Criteria section that was reviewed in January. Steve asked if the handout was updated from that meeting, and Tiffany clarified it was not. The second handout listed some of the applicable definitions. Those were from the current regulations, so those were not redone either.

She highlighted a new section of 4-2.B. A conditional use section might also be added for projects with impact on neighbors, possibly such as a boat ramp, marinas and fences, so these would be allowed but have a little bit of extra review.

John inquired if the procedures here reflected current practice. Tiffany answered no. Currently the Commissioners signed all of the permits. They were the governing body. She referred to the definition section. In the current regulations, the Planning Board was mentioned regarding variances with large environmental impacts, which created an extra level of review. The Planning Board would make a recommendation to the Commissioners. So the equivalent of the summary review in the new regulations was pretty much what happened now.

Steve asked about 4-4.C. When the planning staff determined that a conditional use or variance was needed, should environmental impacts be added to the list of considerations? Tiffany thought that would be covered with the policy criteria.

John pointed out that in 4-4.B, project conformance was referenced and in 4-4.C project compliance was referenced. For consistency, it might be good to use the same word. Janet suggested using conformance.

Tiffany talked about the current way minor versus major variances work. Bob asked for the Board's input on 4-5.A.2 regarding that hardships not be economic in nature. He recalled a situation where a non-lakeshore child of elderly people came in, who needed to subdivide a property where they had little money and illness in the family. He thought the request was granted. Would 4-5.A.2 prevent such people from applying for a variance? Janet thought state law said hardships could not be economic in nature. Joel agreed for subdivision review. Tiffany thought this was stated in the zoning. Joel thought that came from case law. It was a standard criteria that they struggled with. It seemed like if you threw enough money at something you could overcome the standard.

Steve recalled a subdivision review in the fall where people wanted to change the width of the paving of the road to save money. If the change was denied, they weren't going to pave the road at all, since their approval said to chip seal. They were doing this based on money. The request was denied, and then went to the Commissioners. Because there was an improvement in the

quality of the job, it was decided that was the hardship rather than the money. So there may be some ways to get around that by recognizing even though people choose an option because they can't afford other options, there are other reasons besides economic.

Bob wondered if that was included as a general criteria for all variances, would, for instance, the neighbor come in and say according to 4-5.A.2 the hardship couldn't be economic in nature. Steve thought there could be more than one hardship. It could be for one reason and also economic. If the decision was made on the other hardship and not the economic one it would be okay. Sigurd believed some hardships were economic. Bob was concerned about situations where somebody came in, with death and illness in the family and they had a problem, and suddenly it was an economic deal. Janet and Joel suggested saying that the hardship was not primarily economic in nature. Joel said when taking zoning variances to the Board of Adjustment, the typical evaluation standards for variances talked about finding that all of the following criteria exist, for 6 or 8 items. Sometimes it's a completely reasonable project, but it's challenging to support. By wording this as not primarily economic in nature, it would be allowed to say that it was partially economic in nature, but it's reasonable, and to look at the rest of the criteria.

Steve read a section from the Upper West Shore Zoning District Regulations under variances, item e, where it said a hardship was not economic when a reasonable or viable alternative exists. Bob returned to the scenario where someone had a property and couldn't afford to fix it or take care of it. Steve said the reason to ask for a variance was to ask for something that was bigger or deeper than what the rules are. They wanted to do something that didn't meet the rules. The alternative was to follow the rules. He didn't know how not allowing someone to go beyond the rules would put someone in a bad situation. What would be a situation where they wanted to do something that wasn't in the rules, and the Board would recognize that it was important to allow them to do that? Bob gave the example of older people he knew who owned property around the lake, maybe a widow or widower. They didn't use the dock and it was falling into disrepair. It became apparent the dock needed to be redone, and the owner couldn't afford to redo it. Would 4-5.A.2 prevent the person from doing it because it said economic?

Bob thought putting in 'primarily' was a great idea. Would that make things quicker and easier? Steve thought having an out was fine, but he still wasn't sure they'd run into that. In the case of Bob's example, Steve didn't think they'd be required to tear down the old dock. Would they need a permit to tear down the old dock if they weren't going to build a new one? Tiffany affirmed that they were supposed to get a permit to do that. She did not recall a situation where they had to force someone to get do something like that. Joel envisioned a scenario where there was a safety hazard with a nonconforming dock and the owners could maintain it, but could not rebuild it 5 years down the road. They'd need a variance 5 years down the road to rebuild. There could be an economic hardship down the road. Tiffany thought adding 'primarily' would allow that little wiggle room. She mentioned there were some existing living quarters in the lakeshore protection zone, and expansion wasn't allowed. Maybe a scenario would be they really needed to expand for some economic reason.

Joel asked what variances Tiffany might recall. She mentioned that sometimes minor variances were done on the length of breakwater wings for boats that were slightly longer, if it didn't

impact the neighbor. She suggested considering that hardship not be required for a minor variance, since this was asking for a minor deviation, such as asking for 52' rather than 50' because of the length of the boat. John said when he thought of a variance, he thought of someone asking for a narrower road to a subdivision to save money. He didn't see where there would be that many with lakeshore. In some cases, people weren't trying to save money—they were trying to spend money. Steve thought there was always a hardship, a reason. Tiffany said if someone wanted a longer dock because they liked the looks of it, that wouldn't cut it. Steve thought with minor variances, if hardship wasn't a criteria, someone might just say they wanted a longer dock because they liked the way it looked. Tiffany asked if having a longer boat would be considered a hardship. Steve said that would be a minor hardship. Tiffany said they did need to provide information to justify a minor hardship. Staff would review and make a recommendation for the Commissioners. She described a situation in Woods Bay where a change to a dock that was placed in the 1960's would cause major changes. A variance was under discussion to make a less dramatic change. The hardship there would be the impact on the neighbors.

Tiffany summarized that leaving hardship in there would be okay, and 'primarily' would be added so the sentence would read 'hardship is not primarily economic in nature'. She checked on how the group interpreted 'undue hardship'. Joel replied they didn't deserve the hardship, so it kind of went back to whether or not they were creating hardship. Steve expanded that it was reasonable to say a hardship was small, and it wasn't undue, so the people had to follow the rules.

Steve touched on determining minor versus major variances. Major had to do with policy criteria and minor had to do with construction requirements. Tiffany thought the definitions had to be adjusted to meet whatever would be done in here. Steve suggested looking quickly through the policy criteria, because it didn't include the construction standards or safety. Tiffany noted it included public nuisance and a little on scenic view. Joel pointed out interference with navigation was included. Steve thought it was pretty clear with little grey. Tiffany said the only grey was deciding it was a minor deviation. On major variances, it would deviate substantially from the construction requirements or design standards. John said Steve was referring to the way it was currently. Steve said this hadn't happened in the draft. He saw a real incentive for a variance to be minor rather than major. A major variance required an environmental impact statement, which could take months and cost thousands of dollars. He thought the difference between a minor and major variance needed to be really clear to avoid fights, so he would like to eliminate as much of the grey area between a major and minor variance as possible. Tiffany affirmed for Steve that the lakeshore regulations distinguished between major and minor variances whereas the zoning regulations did not.

Tiffany said Flathead County distinguished between major and minor variances in their lakeshore regulations. Missoula County did not. She didn't recall that the Tribe differentiated either. Flathead County had minor and major, and that if something caused a big impact, it could be construed as major. If it deviated substantially from the construction requirements or design standards, and if it created a major environmental impact, it was a major [variance] for them. Steve said [a major variance] had to include an environmental impact. It wouldn't just be design standards. Tiffany supposed that made sense since the environmental impact statement was

required. Steve preferred that it would still be a minor variance if it were judged to make no environmental impact. Tiffany said some other criteria were still covered, such as it couldn't be a navigational hazard and so forth. Some of these other things would be cause. Brad said regarding the qualifiers of a major variance, only one [qualifier] had to be met, since the list had 'or'. He didn't know how to get around it, but he had trouble with 'major' or 'significant'.

Steve suggested changing the 'or's to 'and's, and remove the 'at least one'. Tiffany thought that any time it would be adverse to the policy criteria it should be a major variance. Maybe 4-5.C.1 and .3 could be combined to say the request deviates substantially...and creates a major environmental impact, OR (4-5.C.2) it's adverse to the policy criteria. Brad asked if 4-5.C.2 and .3 said the same thing. Steve said not necessarily. Tiffany rephrased the question, as could there be an environmental impact that wasn't in the policy criteria. Steve added the question of was there a policy criteria item that wasn't environmental. Joel pointed out navigation. Others pointed out public nuisance. Janet mentioned for some of the items, it depended on how environmental was defined. In an environmental impact statement, it's the impact on the human environment.

Steve asked if creating a problem for public health and safety should be included in the policy criteria, perhaps as 5-1.A.7. He noted if the variance was adverse to the policy criteria, it didn't matter about the construction standards or the environmental impact. He thought that worked. Brad thought it made sense. Policy criteria were pretty all-encompassing. Janet brought up a concern. What if they deviated substantially from the construction requirements, but they wouldn't really have environmental impact? Tiffany said that would be a minor variance. Janet asked about 'substantially'. Steve suggested taking out 'substantially', so a minor would be a deviation didn't impact the environment. A major would be a deviation of the standards that did impact the environment. Tiffany suggested deleting minor, and Steve agreed. Tiffany thanked the Board for their good attention to detail.

Tiffany proceeded to minor variances of 4-5.D on pg. 4. For 4-5.D.1.c.iii, 'substantially' came up again. Steve noted that was taken out of the major variance phrasing. Tiffany checked that if something required review as a major variance, the Board was okay with the Commissioners making the determination as outlined. Board members said yes, the Commissioners did that. Tiffany continued that a major variance required an environmental impact statement, but not necessarily a formal EIS (environmental impact statement).

Brad asked on 4-5.D.2.a.iv on pg. 5. The group discussed this. Janet suggested a description of direct, indirect and cumulative effects. Steve thought that eliminated more grey area than saying known or probable.

John suggested changing the wording about environmental impact statement to something like the report on the impact to the environment or impact to the environment report so it could not be construed to be a federal environmental impact statement. Tiffany explained her concern would be that this is what is referenced in the MCA. She didn't know if it was a problem to change the term, since they were doing the same thing. Steve thought they had what they were calling an environmental impact pretty well defined. He proposed someone could do it on their own if they had a small project. Janet said in an environmental assessment (EA), you also had to propose

mitigation measures to address impacts that were identified. An EIS was a more detailed EA. She thought it had one more section. She didn't think it hurt to say environmental impact statement. Then the developer will go the extra mile to make sure that things are right, but she did think that it needed to say proposed mitigation measures. Proposed mitigation measures could form another section before 4-5.D.2.vii (other information that might be required) to address identified impacts and effects. Vii would become viii.

Janet repeated the wording on request: proposed mitigation measures to address environmental effects identified. Steve asked if that should be included with vi. Janet replied that usually in an environmental assessment, [mitigation] was a separate section. You'd come up with a preferred alternative, and vii could say to identify a preferred alternative with proposed mitigation measures to address the identified effects. Steve said you'd ask the applicant to come up with some alternatives to the variance project they wanted. Janet confirmed, and explained that usually you had alternatives you addressed. One was to conform to the requirements. You identified other alternatives because there's a reason you couldn't conform to the requirements. That would be your preferred alternative to conforming. Then you would propose how to mitigate for the impacts if able to go with that preferred alternative. Steve said that was an alternative to the regulations, rather than an alternative to the proposed project. Tiffany clarified that there was what someone requested as the variance, and there was the regulations. Steve said the mitigation that needed to be described was that for the preferred alternative. Janet added an applicant could have more than one alternative. Steve said mitigation measures wouldn't be required for following the regulations, just for the alternative. Janet suggested the wording of alternatives to a conforming project, or alternatives to conformance or regulations.

Steve said there should be an analysis of the impact on the environment and neighboring properties and mitigation measures for the proposed project. Janet said they could say an analysis of an alternative to a proposed project. That way, they might come up with a modified proposal. That allowed them to come up with more than one project alternative. She suggested some other wordings, such as the proposed project and any alternatives. Steve said they didn't want to receive 3 or 4 designs proposed, and then have to choose one. The applicants needed to come up with the proposal they wanted to do, and why. Janet said if someone thought they might not get their proposed project approved, then they should come up with an intermediate alternative that could be analyzed in this, so they didn't have to go back to the drawing board. Tiffany suggested using the part Janet said for vi about analysis of the impacts on the environment and neighboring properties for the proposed project and any alternatives. Janet added the next one, vii, would be to identify a preferred alternative with proposed mitigation measures to address the identified effects. Tiffany checked that the environmental impact statement wording would be kept for now.

Steve asked what public nuisance meant. Janet and Joel thought there was a definition in the [inaudible]. [Janet] thought it was good to have public health, welfare and safety in here as a reminder to consider that. Tiffany said when the BOA heard a variance, it was very specific what must be met for approval. This was written so the Board would consider these things and then make a recommendation, which would go to the governing body, who would hold a public hearing. She outlined details. She noted in 4-5.D.2.f that it was environmental impact statement rather than assessment near the end of the portion.

Bob asked about timelines, and Tiffany moved on to the review periods of 4-5 on pg. 8. [Editor's note: Review Time Period was labeled 4-5, but may actually be 4-6.] She noted nothing put a limit on timeframes for [issuing] the variances. She asked Bob what his thought was. He was asking on behalf of the variance seeker. Tiffany suggested that 90 days might be sufficient for a minor variance. John asked if they were thinking of creating a sense of urgency, where an applicant could get something small back and get started. A major complaint on government was too much time. Bob said he heard a complaint from Brett McCrumb and other contractors that they didn't like working with Lake County Planning Dept because it took so long to get things done, compared to say, Flathead County. Janet pointed out that Flathead County also had a bad reputation for letting contractors do what they want. In Lake County and Missoula County, the governments were protecting the environment. As a citizen, she was appreciative of that. Steve said part of the conversation he heard with Brett had to do with the Tribe being quicker. He wondered if they could talk about shorter time periods than 90 days for straightforward requests.

Brad asked if the Tribe had to do the same notification of neighbors. Janet said the Tribe didn't have to notify neighbors. Brad said the notification was critical to him. Steve said it wasn't required right now. Tiffany noted they were adding Administrative Review. LaDana said they didn't want to be locked in too much to one timeframe. If you say 30 days, every contractor will be on the doorstep in 30 days, wanting to know where the permit was, and right now, for instance, Tiffany had twenty applications that came in, in one week. It did take a while to process them. Joel said that with subdivision review, something was added recently where if the preliminary plat review wasn't done in a given timeframe, money starts going back to the developer. Some regulations say if it's not issued in a certain timeframe, it was considered approved. He didn't know what the implications were if they broke their own time frames. (Lita added that now and then someone from out of the area came in and lit up when they found out the timeframes here.)

Tiffany said this was true that Lake County was slower. Sometimes the workload was big. She also was scrutinizing the permits more. In the past, things were different. Steve suggested that rubber-stamped was the word she was looking for. Tiffany agreed. That wasn't helpful and it caused problems. Some of the really complex projects, like the one in Woods Bay she mentioned earlier [in the variance discussion] which was a project of Brett McCrumb's, they'd been working on since July. It's been really frustrating. It was a foreclosure property, and they worked with the bank. Sometimes there were other circumstances and sometimes there were not. Steve said in some places there was a clock that started, but not until the applicant and staff agreed that it needed to start. He knew some subdivisions reviewed in Flathead County where during the review process, more information was needed from the applicant. After all this information was in, the clock started.

Brad asked why the response time was taken out of 4-5.B Tiffany replied that sometimes she might not have a chance to look at the application within 5 days. Brad suggested a longer response time, such as 10 days. Steve thought it would help the county's reputation to know that they were going to try. Bob thought people with construction projects generally wanted to know how much and how long. Tiffany wondered if they put a timeframe, if they could say sometimes

the time gets extended because a project doesn't meet the criteria, and there's back and forth involved. This didn't talk about that. Steve thought the Planners needed to talk about this. It would be nice to have a timeframe in there. Joel thought maybe they could mimic the subdivision timeframes, where there was perhaps a 2- or 3-week timeframe to notify if there were items missing. John thought people would be more comfortable if they had some sense of how things would proceed. Otherwise they felt like it was disappearing into a pile. Steve thought people needed to know in the same respect that there were requirements for things like public notice requirements. They took a lot and there wasn't a way to shorten it. Bob thought it was good to have something in there so the applicant had some idea. He thought the planners could make that call. Brad thought it could be a plus, if they were able to get through permits quick than the timeframe given.

Steve recalled a long-ago permit for lakeshore where someone was issued a permit that required a variance but it didn't go through the process. The permit was issued with a description of regulations that didn't meet the design standards. It was done quickly and didn't take much time. With that one, the time was too short. Tiffany said that when you were in a rush, that's when you miss things.

Tiffany moved on to section 4-6 on permit validity. Bob asked about the cost of permit extensions. Tiffany replied this was currently a \$25 administrative fee. Brad asked about a word missing in 4-7.D. Tiffany added the word 'require' to the first sentence. Janet pointed out a typo in the same section, where it should be 'result' rather than 'results' in the second sentence.

Brad asked about timeframes for appeals. Janet thought that might be part of district court. Tiffany thought they might just have to file it with district court. In MCA, it spoke of 3 things that district court might hear: complaints about an order to restore a lake, someone petitioning action, and for someone who didn't agree with adopting or amending the regulations. She suggested adding this to be consistent. Steve asked if it was clear that either the applicant or a neighbor could go to the district court to have a decision reviewed. He noted Tiffany spoke of an appeal, but appeal wasn't written in. Bob thought the people would talk to an attorney by that point. Steve said they were talking about both the option that the applicant had and the option that the neighbors or anyone else had. Tiffany explained that MCA said interested person. Steve read from the Upper West Shore zoning district regulations. It specified a landowner within the district. Tiffany was okay with interested persons, and asked how the Board felt. Janet and Steve thought it was okay. Steve thought it should be clear to someone that they could appeal without having an attorney read it. Tiffany suggested adding 'applicant or other interested person'.

For the amendment of regulations section, John asked about the difference between amending the regulations and a review. Was the Board amending or reviewing currently? Tiffany noted this was a major overhaul. She thought the last one was just a couple of tiny things. She thought they were all amendments, whether it was an overhaul or just changing a couple of words.

The Board moved on to review of nonconforming structures and uses. Tiffany suggested adding a policy section. The idea was that a non-conforming structure was something that was allowed previously that would not be allowed now. It would be allowed to stay until such time as there

were major changes to it. The idea was that eventually over time, you would get to a point where [the non-conforming structure or use] would need to comply with the regulations. Tiffany delved into the section, referring also to the definitions section, which she had provided for the Board. Steve asked about uses, which were referred to in the title of the section, but not elsewhere. Tiffany highlighted a mention in section D. She agreed with Steve in that this [section] really dealt with structures. Steve gave an example. If someone had an old boathouse and decided to change it to living quarters, it might be a change of use without being a change of structure. Did they need to include 'use' in section 5-4.A, so it read 'Any nonconforming building or structure or use...'? Tiffany said a structure could be a dock. They could take out building and say 'structure or use'. They could add something like any changes to the existing use. Tiffany noticed today the word 'expansion' in the definitions, although she wasn't sure she'd run across it in the regulations. She noted the portion about aerial extension was important. Steve asked about an example where someone wanted to add a canopy to a boat hoist a couple years after the boat hoist was installed. Tiffany said she handled those by permitting them as a shore station with a cover.

Tiffany suggested changing the definition of reconstruction/ remodel, as it was confusing. Other counties did it so if you were remodeling, it was less than 50% of the value. Reconstruction was more than 50%. She noted on 5-4.E, that sometimes people tried to use this for continual wave damage, whereas she thought the intention was that this was for a calamity, a big event that happened at one time. Janet asked about adding lack of maintenance after fire or other calamity. Others agreed this was a good catch. Tiffany clarified for this section that if someone got rid of a structure and wanted to put a new one in place, it was gone and could not be put back. Joel asked about the appropriate section in which to include lack of maintenance. Did they want it to be comparable to a fire or calamity, or did they want it to be comparable to [inaudible]. Janet said she was thinking about the replacement costs language. Tiffany agreed with Joel that perhaps it should be in the upper section. John said that it was kind of the policy that nonconforming uses would go away with time. Tiffany asked how the Board felt about that. She thought the Commissioners were sometimes split on that, given that if you had something there was a feeling you ought to be able to keep it and rebuild it. Steve thought as time went by, we learn more about what impacts the environment, and what impacts neighbors, and what kind of social and economic impacts things had. We upgraded the regulations to reflect that new knowledge gained about our life here. We ought to be able to apply that and improve on the planning. He thought it was legitimate to ask that structures and uses evolve to a higher order or better use for society, the environment and the neighbors. Brad asked if the inconsistency between definition 2-30, which talked about original value, and 5-4.E had been covered, which talked about replacement value. Tiffany agreed that should be a change; it was hard to determine original value. She summarized that there would be a definition for remodel (less than 50%) and reconstruction (more than 50%). Joel and Tiffany touched a situation with a nonconforming double-decker dock.

With remodels, Tiffany asked if someone could remodel 25% a year for a series of years, or how should this be tracked. She mentioned situations where a single remodel might be split into two halves with 48% change each time, so the actual change was 98%. If the evaluation remodel cost was evaluated, it had to be the complete remodel cost. John suggested that to remodel piecemeal, it would cost so much more, you might just let the person do it.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

Tiffany announced the County would be getting new floodplain maps and described upcoming meetings that would occur next week. A couple of streams and one lake were getting new floodplain studies. They looked at flows and 100-year floods, and what elevations that would come to. Public meetings would be occurring next week about those. These were for Mission Creek and Post Creek, and there would be a meeting in St. Ignatius on Monday at 7pm on those. Part of Dayton Creek was studied, so they'd have a meeting in Dayton at 3pm on Tuesday. A meeting for Johnson Creek and Swan Lake would occur at 7pm on Tuesday at the Swan Lake Community Center. Janet asked if there was information for the Tribe to preview. Tiffany said the information was super-preliminary, a preview. The official release was in June. There would be more public meetings then. She noted she had some of the preliminary reports. Who would that go to? Janet asked that it be sent to her. She could forward it to others as appropriate. It would be really useful for her because of the Dayton Creek information. Tiffany noted that the Tribal lands would be clipped out of the study. If the Tribes decided to participate at some point, the information was there and could be put back in. This wasn't the case with the existing maps. John asked if he could get information, as he couldn't be there. Tiffany said the files were large. Some were on the FTP site, and she would probably do that with the others. She could give him the link. All of it would be released in June. She mentioned they'd sent out nearly 500 postcards to property owners about the upcoming meetings.

Bob thought that perhaps the Board might be willing to sign a letter of recommendation for Tiffany, if that would be of value to her, since she was leaving. Tiffany said it had really been pleasure working with the Board, and thanked them for their time and effort.

Joel outlined some upcoming items.

**Motion made by Steve Rosso, and seconded by Sigurd Jensen, to adjourn. Motion carried, all in favor.** Meeting adjourned at approximately 9:25 pm.