

LAKE COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
May 11, 2016
Lake County Courthouse, Large Conference Room (Rm 316)
Meeting Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT: Steve Rosso, Steve Shapero, John Fleming, Sigurd Jensen, Janet Camel, Rick Cothorn, Frank Mutch, Eileen Neill

STAFF PRESENT: LaDana Hintz, Robert Costa, Lita Fonda, Wally Congdon

Steve Rosso called the meeting to order at 7:00pm. Minutes deferred.

FLATHEAD LAKE UNITED METHODIST CAMP LAKESHORE:

Robert Costa presented the staff report. (See attachments to minutes in the May 2016 meeting file for staff report.)

Frank asked about the legal authority that gave Lake County control of land under the lake. Robert explained this was from state law, which provided that counties could adopt regulations to regulate the lake, lakebed, lake waters and a 20-foot area of land adjacent to the high water mark. Lake County had done so with Lake Mary Ronan, Swan Lake and Flathead Lake.

Eileen asked where this boat was docked without the buoy. Robert directed that question to Jay Davison, who was here as the agent for the application. His understanding, which Jay confirmed, was that they hadn't bought a boat to dock yet.

Janet confirmed with staff that this was off the reservation. She mentioned that Lake County didn't have jurisdiction on the south half of the lake. Robert added that the County would have jurisdiction over the 20-foot land strip on the reservation.

For the future, Steve R commented that the description of distances were about the anchor placement. The anchor line was longer than the water was deep so the buoy could move around this. The painter on the front of the boat went from the front of the boat to the buoy and then the boat was a certain length. The back of the boat could swing as in as much as a 40-foot radius around this anchor point. In the future, when the drawings were done, that would be helpful for the Board to see, so when the boat rotated around to where it would be closest to the riparian boundary of the property, they could see how close it got. The anchor point looked like a long way but in fact it might be 40 or 50 feet closer, depending on conditions.

Jay Davison spoke as the agent for the applicant. The buoy was for a new boat. The neighbor had a boat he didn't use and they agreed to buy it, subject to having a place to put it. They didn't want a place on the west side where kids would see it and it would be an attractive nuisance. They tried to put it in a place where the kids were shielded from it by a steep grade with trees. The purpose of having the buoy there was to be able to moor the boat during the summer, at least during the times when the storms weren't there. It was a 12-foot boat.

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

Eileen asked if there was an alternate place to put the boat during a storm. Jay replied there wasn't. They would take it out on a trailer at one of the landings. Eileen noted storms could come in quickly without much warning. Jay agreed. They continuously monitored the weather because not only would they want to get that boat out but they would want to be sure the canoes and kids were off the water. Robert affirmed with Jay that they would use the little strip access just NE of the buoy site. Robert pointed to the page of attachment 6 labelled 'Exhibit F'. You could see a little strip by Central Avenue where it wrapped around and turned east. He believed it was a county-owned strip that people used a lot.

Steve R mentioned if the anchor was done well and the mooring line was proper, attaching a boat to a mooring line in a storm could be very safe for the boat. It could handle a lot of water because the boat was free to bounce up and down in the waves. If you had adequate anchor and line on it, it could handle storms that it couldn't handle if it were tied to a dock. It was a pretty safe way to do it as long as you had a good anchor line. The application said they were going to use a fiber rope attachment rather than a chain to the bottom of the buoy. They would want to inspect that quite a bit. Ropes on the bottom might abrade as the line rotated around in the wind. They might find that they would want to have a section of chain close to the anchor and then go to a fiber rope from that 6 or 10-foot section of chain. A fiber rope with tension on it from the waves would pull at an angle and would pull up. If you had a heavy chain, the chain sank the line down towards the bottom and caused the line to come up [as gestured]. You were actually pulling horizontally on the anchor. The anchor could take a lot bigger pull if you were pulling horizontally rather than vertically. That was another reason people often had a row of chain on their anchor line.

Frank commented a number of people used stainless steel chain, which was 1.5 times the water depth. One person told him that his buoy was lost about every 3 years so he had his contact information on it and usually got it back. It seemed like the stainless steel chain was best.

Wally noted the length of the rope was what mattered for the Board. When you put the chain on, which worked better per Steve R's comments, the problem was you had a spring. The more you stretched it out, the greater you increased the radius of the circle. As you made the circle bigger, how far you were from the shore, or how much rope you had, changed the equation to go to the buoy. When you talked about the distance or the radius of the circle and how much it plugged up, that mattered to the equation a lot. It affected what they were doing, since if you got too much rope in the buoy and too much painter on the boat, you were too close to the shore and nothing could get between you and the shore safely. It depended on boat size too.

Steve R noted there were other buoys in the picture. Whose buoys were the existing ones? Jay didn't know. He thought the closest one to their proposed spot was owned by one of the residents in Central. He confirmed for Steve R that this nearest buoy was within [the camp's] riparian area. He mentioned it to the owner when he was out surveying and taking distances. He asked her how long it had been there, to which she answered 'forever'.

Steve R said when you looked at the radii, you needed to look at that distance too. The problem wasn't when the wind was blowing hard, at which time both boats moved in the same direction.

The problem was when there wasn't wind. The boats would be just bobbing around and they could bump together. He didn't know what the options were. That [neighboring] person could put the buoy on their own property. If it was in [the camp's] riparian zone, they might consider suggesting a different location for it. Robert reminded that [the neighbor] would need this [County] review. Steve R asked if there were other permits for buoys around that area. Robert said people usually hadn't got the permit. Steve R agreed that people put buoys out without understanding they were required to have a permit for buoys. There were a lot of unpermitted buoys.

Wally brought up another note to remember was that if you had too much chain, it would be too heavy and it would wipe the bottom. The boat would rotate around some buoy point. It wasn't as bad as an anchor ring but it was close. As it went around, it wiped things on the bottom and made a sediment plume and so forth. You wanted the chain length to be reasonable for what you had so it would hold it down and make the [inaudible] but you didn't want to be screwing up the bottom. You'd want to look at what you had for the surrounding bottom: was it rock, gravel, mud or whatever else. Jay said it was small rock. Wally said that worked better. Rick said with that small boat, you could even put a snubber on there, which would further lessen the impact.

Rick was inclined to make a motion to concur with the recommendations, which Frank was willing to second. Robert explained that in a sense, these were the Board's findings. The way the regulation was written, they weren't making a recommendation but rather the Board was asked to make findings, which was a recommendation in a sense. The way he might write a permit was that the Commissioners also adopted the same findings as the Planning Board. In a sense, the Board would be adopting findings that the buoy was not creating a safety hazard and would not cause navigational or recreational interference, and then recommend that the Commissioners approve the permit. Rick asked for some wordsmithing.

Steve R thanked Robert for reminding them of their focus. He proposed adding to findings A & B (on pg. 5 and pg. 6). In both findings, he suggested adding something to say the length of rope from the anchor to the buoy and the length of painter from the buoy to the boat should be considered when finally evaluating the safety and navigation aspects of this location. This would give some description that what they were really considering was not where the buoy was anchored but the travel of the boat around the anchor and making sure that area was reasonable to provide the safety and navigation in this. In the last sentence of A (pg. 5), Robert suggested adding a comma after improvement, crossing out 'and', add a comma after 'location' and then adding Steve R's wording. Jay checked that what they wanted to see was the radius of the circle of the boat. Robert asked the sailors of the group if there was a nautical technical term for that. Steve R suggested the wording to insert where Robert had indicated might be 'along with the circular travel of the boat when it is moored'. Frank provided the nautical term of 'drift' to replace 'circular travel'. Steve R asked for clarification and Frank ensured he got the drift, changing the insertion to read 'along with the drift of the boat when it was moored'.

Robert suggested doing the same thing in the last sentence of finding B on pg. 6, so adding a comma after buoy and inserting 'its location, along with the [circular] drift of the boat when it was moored'.

Motion made by Rick Cothorn, and seconded by Frank Mutch, to recommend the approval with the findings as modified above. Motion carried, all in favor.

Steve R asked Jay about the installation in the water. Wally, various Board members and staff contributed more details and suggestions.

DISCUSSION ITEM: Adopting amendments to the Planning Board's bylaws --Postponed

LaDana noted that Lita hadn't had a chance to work on the minutes. They should get the minutes so they could make the changes discussed at the previous meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS (7:28 pm)

Steve R talked about the memo on which he and LaDana had worked to give the Commissioners to advise them about the results of the Board's discussion at the last meeting for setting priorities. He wanted to find out if Board members thought the memo needed changes, and if so, what those changes were, and if they could agree as a Board to approve the memo and get it ready to present to the Commissioners.

John thought it looked very workable. Eileen suggested a possible additional priority. At the end of the last meeting, LaDana mentioned something about Finley Point people wanting to rent out their guest houses. LaDana explained that happened across the zoning districts and also fell under the Building for Lease or Rent regulations. Eileen thought the next priority might be to visit the Finley Point zoning. She spoke with residents on Finley Point. It was a hot topic. There were probably people doing what they wanted to do illegally because they thought [the County] wasn't doing what they should be doing. LaDana said this happened especially in the zoning districts around the lake. She thought maybe this issue could be addressed at one time in all of those districts. Eileen said that she would like to get the Finley Point zoning on the list beyond that particular issue although she was sure that issue would come up. If it was too late, she understood.

LaDana thought Building for Lease or Rent was a definite issue. They hadn't had the regulations that were required in 2013. If they could get that, it would address some of their issues, not just for a particular zoning district but for the whole county. In her mind, it was a top priority. The Board had chosen the first six [priorities]. She thought Steve R outlined it well in his letter. They would work on those and as time allowed, they would add the other things to it. Steve R referred to the first full paragraph of the second page of the letter, which brought up the Buildings for Lease or Rent regulations issue. It said it might be either an individual document or incorporated in other regulations. They could be more specific and say zoning regulations. They'd discussed the possibility that these could be in the subdivision regulations or elsewhere. He appreciated that Eileen was representing Finley Point just as he represented Upper West Shore and other members were from other areas. Eileen said she looked at the dates and they were at the tenth year and Steve R agreed. LaDana noted that Finley Point, Swan Sites and Upper West Shore were all similar in that date and all due for updates. The Density Map and Regulations were long overdue too, as were a number of things. They just had to start working through the list, and take on the tasks that the Board felt they could accomplish within a reasonable amount of time.

Rick thought it was prioritized pretty well, given the pressure that might be coming to the County and the wheels that would squeak the soonest. Steve R wasn't sure how many items they had [considered]. LaDana said 19 things were on the list. Steve R pointed out they picked 6 priorities, with the idea in mind that even if they got through those in order, enough time will have gone by that other changes would occur and other priorities would come up. It was foolish at this time to [list more] just because too many changes would occur. The attempt here was to set enough items on a priority schedule that would get going and in a year or two, they could reevaluate this. Hopefully by that time, they would cross the first 4 or 5 things off of the list.

LaDana reminded that as the state legislature met, changes could come from state law that had to happen. They hadn't really accounted for those. The Board's list would have to have some flexibility. Steve R said they didn't know what the demands for customer service and permitting would be, which he also mentioned in part of the letter. That would dictate a lot of the staff time. Steve S asked if state law impacted the 19 items originally considered. Should they have taken that into account? LaDana pointed to zoning and subdivision regulations. The regulations came from state law. Steve S asked if, in LaDana's opinion, they should move the priorities around to accommodate the state law requirements. LaDana thought they were accommodating them for the most part. They definitely needed to do things, like the Buildings for Lease or Rent regulations. They were trying to accommodate them as best they could. Steve S concluded the list was okay and the six things were reasonable. LaDana agreed. Robert noted you couldn't predict what the legislature would do.

Frank said the Density Map and Regulations (DMR) affected a large portion of the County. It seemed like it could have a higher priority. He was just pointing out that on a land mass basis, it had a far-reaching effect. Steve R agreed. He pointed to a comment in the letter that they recognize that work on the Growth Policy and DMR was very important but in extensive discussions about these things at the last meeting, they decided that even though those were a high priority, it would be helpful to cross a couple things off the list that they might be able to do more efficiently first and then tackle those big, longer projects.

Motion made by Steve Shapero, and seconded by John Fleming, to approve the memo to be sent to the Commissioners. Motion carried, all in favor.

Steve R confirmed with LaDana that she would see that the letter got to the Commissioners. He suggested that they add a statement at the bottom that it was approved unanimously by the Planning Board at this meeting. LaDana asked if the Board wanted to sign it. Steve R thought that the fact the Board approved it and that it would be in the minutes was fine.

Steve R asked if there was other business. Frank mentioned that, speaking as a private citizen, he wrote a paper from his point of view challenging the DMR. He thought it might possibly be an agenda item for the Planning Board. He recognized it wasn't a priority and wasn't sure where it fit. Robert added some background regarding a Density variance item the Board of Adjustment (BOA), whom Steve R and Frank were both members reviewed earlier in the day. Much of Frank's letter responded to that situation. Speaking from his experience as a planner (in general, as opposed to on behalf of Lake County) Robert was frustrated with it too. Frank said Robert described part of his motivation but it went beyond this one issue that came before the

Board. He was speaking as a public member, not in an official capacity. He referred to a group of citizens that were strongly opposed to the DMR when it was proposed. Frank and Janet shared their respective views. Steve R and Wally touched on the reviews that were to have been initiated.

John expressed concern that in the 'Other Business' section on the agenda that things came up for which some members couldn't be prepared. Maybe someone could contact the staff and put it on the agenda if they had something they wanted to talk about so other Planning Board members could be on notice. Steve R agreed that was important for the future. Wally said this was the discussion that you had when you got to that on the priority list. John thought Roberts Rules of Orders might say that things needed to be on the agenda or they shouldn't deal with them. Steve R thought there was a provision to review the agenda at the beginning of the meeting and possibly add things under certain conditions. Wally pointed to a motion to suspend the agenda.

Robert announced that this was his last Planning Board meeting. After 5 years, it was time for him to move on. Board members thanked him, wished him good luck and expressed that they would miss him.

LaDana announced that Friday was her last day with the County. She wished the Board luck and mentioned the great Board support.

Frank voiced that this was the best group of Planning staff he'd known. John agreed and extended that to the Board, which Wally had also observed. Other members also thanked LaDana and Robert. Dave DeGrandpre introduced himself. His firm had been hired by the Commissioners to provide contract planner services [under the direction of remaining Planner Jacob Feistner] to help with daily permitting, inquiries and support during the transition to new staff. Frank asked who would be in charge. Steve R said Jacob would handle the customer service and delegate to Dave DeGrandpre and Joel Nelson, depending on the work load, until they had a new director.

Motion made by Frank Mutch, and seconded by John Fleming, to adjourn. Motion carried, all in favor. Meeting adjourned at 8:10 pm.

LAKE COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
May 11, 2016
Lake County Courthouse, Large Conference Room (Rm 316)
Meeting Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT: Steve Rosso, Steve Shapero, John Fleming, Sigurd Jensen, Janet Camel, Rick Cothorn, Frank Mutch, Eileen Neill

STAFF PRESENT: LaDana Hintz, Robert Costa, Lita Fonda, Wally Congdon

Steve Rosso called the meeting to order at 7:00pm. Minutes deferred.

FLATHEAD LAKE UNITED METHODIST CAMP LAKESHORE:

Robert Costa presented the staff report. (See attachments to minutes in the May 2016 meeting file for staff report.)

Frank asked about the legal authority that gave Lake County control of land under the lake. Robert explained this was from state law, which provided that counties could adopt regulations to regulate the lake, lakebed, lake waters and a 20-foot area of land adjacent to the high water mark. Lake County had done so with Lake Mary Ronan, Swan Lake and Flathead Lake.

Eileen asked where this boat was docked without the buoy. Robert directed that question to Jay Davison, who was here as the agent for the application. His understanding, which Jay confirmed, was that they hadn't bought a boat to dock yet.

Janet confirmed with staff that this was off the reservation. She mentioned that Lake County didn't have jurisdiction on the south half of the lake. Robert added that the County would have jurisdiction over the 20-foot land strip on the reservation.

For the future, Steve R commented that the description of distances were about the anchor placement. The anchor line was longer than the water was deep so the buoy could move around this. The painter on the front of the boat went from the front of the boat to the buoy and then the boat was a certain length. The back of the boat could swing as in as much as a 40-foot radius around this anchor point. In the future, when the drawings were done, that would be helpful for the Board to see, so when the boat rotated around to where it would be closest to the riparian boundary of the property, they could see how close it got. The anchor point looked like a long way but in fact it might be 40 or 50 feet closer, depending on conditions.

Jay Davison spoke as the agent for the applicant. The buoy was for a new boat. The neighbor had a boat he didn't use and they agreed to buy it, subject to having a place to put it. They didn't want a place on the west side where kids would see it and it would be an attractive nuisance. They tried to put it in a place where the kids were shielded from it by a steep grade with trees. The purpose of having the buoy there was to be able to moor the boat during the summer, at least during the times when the storms weren't there. It was a 12-foot boat.

Public comment opened: None offered. Public comment closed.

Eileen asked if there was an alternate place to put the boat during a storm. Jay replied there wasn't. They would take it out on a trailer at one of the landings. Eileen noted storms could come in quickly without much warning. Jay agreed. They continuously monitored the weather because not only would they want to get that boat out but they would want to be sure the canoes and kids were off the water. Robert affirmed with Jay that they would use the little strip access just NE of the buoy site. Robert pointed to the page of attachment 6 labelled 'Exhibit F'. You could see a little strip by Central Avenue where it wrapped around and turned east. He believed it was a county-owned strip that people used a lot.

Steve R mentioned if the anchor was done well and the mooring line was proper, attaching a boat to a mooring line in a storm could be very safe for the boat. It could handle a lot of water because the boat was free to bounce up and down in the waves. If you had adequate anchor and line on it, it could handle storms that it couldn't handle if it were tied to a dock. It was a pretty safe way to do it as long as you had a good anchor line. The application said they were going to use a fiber rope attachment rather than a chain to the bottom of the buoy. They would want to inspect that quite a bit. Ropes on the bottom might abrade as the line rotated around in the wind. They might find that they would want to have a section of chain close to the anchor and then go to a fiber rope from that 6 or 10-foot section of chain. A fiber rope with tension on it from the waves would pull at an angle and would pull up. If you had a heavy chain, the chain sank the line down towards the bottom and caused the line to come up [as gestured]. You were actually pulling horizontally on the anchor. The anchor could take a lot bigger pull if you were pulling horizontally rather than vertically. That was another reason people often had a row of chain on their anchor line.

Frank commented a number of people used stainless steel chain, which was 1.5 times the water depth. One person told him that his buoy was lost about every 3 years so he had his contact information on it and usually got it back. It seemed like the stainless steel chain was best.

Wally noted the length of the rope was what mattered for the Board. When you put the chain on, which worked better per Steve R's comments, the problem was you had a spring. The more you stretched it out, the greater you increased the radius of the circle. As you made the circle bigger, how far you were from the shore, or how much rope you had, changed the equation to go to the buoy. When you talked about the distance or the radius of the circle and how much it plugged up, that mattered to the equation a lot. It affected what they were doing, since if you got too much rope in the buoy and too much painter on the boat, you were too close to the shore and nothing could get between you and the shore safely. It depended on boat size too.

Steve R noted there were other buoys in the picture. Whose buoys were the existing ones? Jay didn't know. He thought the closest one to their proposed spot was owned by one of the residents in Central. He confirmed for Steve R that this nearest buoy was within [the camp's] riparian area. He mentioned it to the owner when he was out surveying and taking distances. He asked her how long it had been there, to which she answered 'forever'.

Steve R said when you looked at the radii, you needed to look at that distance too. The problem wasn't when the wind was blowing hard, at which time both boats moved in the same direction.

The problem was when there wasn't wind. The boats would be just bobbing around and they could bump together. He didn't know what the options were. That [neighboring] person could put the buoy on their own property. If it was in [the camp's] riparian zone, they might consider suggesting a different location for it. Robert reminded that [the neighbor] would need this [County] review. Steve R asked if there were other permits for buoys around that area. Robert said people usually hadn't got the permit. Steve R agreed that people put buoys out without understanding they were required to have a permit for buoys. There were a lot of unpermitted buoys.

Wally brought up another note to remember was that if you had too much chain, it would be too heavy and it would wipe the bottom. The boat would rotate around some buoy point. It wasn't as bad as an anchor ring but it was close. As it went around, it wiped things on the bottom and made a sediment plume and so forth. You wanted the chain length to be reasonable for what you had so it would hold it down and make the [inaudible] but you didn't want to be screwing up the bottom. You'd want to look at what you had for the surrounding bottom: was it rock, gravel, mud or whatever else. Jay said it was small rock. Wally said that worked better. Rick said with that small boat, you could even put a snubber on there, which would further lessen the impact.

Rick was inclined to make a motion to concur with the recommendations, which Frank was willing to second. Robert explained that in a sense, these were the Board's findings. The way the regulation was written, they weren't making a recommendation but rather the Board was asked to make findings, which was a recommendation in a sense. The way he might write a permit was that the Commissioners also adopted the same findings as the Planning Board. In a sense, the Board would be adopting findings that the buoy was not creating a safety hazard and would not cause navigational or recreational interference, and then recommend that the Commissioners approve the permit. Rick asked for some wordsmithing.

Steve R thanked Robert for reminding them of their focus. He proposed adding to findings A & B (on pg. 5 and pg. 6). In both findings, he suggested adding something to say the length of rope from the anchor to the buoy and the length of painter from the buoy to the boat should be considered when finally evaluating the safety and navigation aspects of this location. This would give some description that what they were really considering was not where the buoy was anchored but the travel of the boat around the anchor and making sure that area was reasonable to provide the safety and navigation in this. In the last sentence of A (pg. 5), Robert suggested adding a comma after improvement, crossing out 'and', add a comma after 'location' and then adding Steve R's wording. Jay checked that what they wanted to see was the radius of the circle of the boat. Robert asked the sailors of the group if there was a nautical technical term for that. Steve R suggested the wording to insert where Robert had indicated might be 'along with the circular travel of the boat when it is moored'. Frank provided the nautical term of 'drift' to replace 'circular travel'. Steve R asked for clarification and Frank ensured he got the drift, changing the insertion to read 'along with the drift of the boat when it was moored'.

Robert suggested doing the same thing in the last sentence of finding B on pg. 6, so adding a comma after buoy and inserting 'its location, along with the [circular] drift of the boat when it was moored'.

Motion made by Rick Cothorn, and seconded by Frank Mutch, to recommend the approval with the findings as modified above. Motion carried, all in favor.

Steve R asked Jay about the installation in the water. Wally, various Board members and staff contributed more details and suggestions.

DISCUSSION ITEM: Adopting amendments to the Planning Board's bylaws --Postponed

LaDana noted that Lita hadn't had a chance to work on the minutes. They should get the minutes so they could make the changes discussed at the previous meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS (7:28 pm)

Steve R talked about the memo on which he and LaDana had worked to give the Commissioners to advise them about the results of the Board's discussion at the last meeting for setting priorities. He wanted to find out if Board members thought the memo needed changes, and if so, what those changes were, and if they could agree as a Board to approve the memo and get it ready to present to the Commissioners.

John thought it looked very workable. Eileen suggested a possible additional priority. At the end of the last meeting, LaDana mentioned something about Finley Point people wanting to rent out their guest houses. LaDana explained that happened across the zoning districts and also fell under the Building for Lease or Rent regulations. Eileen thought the next priority might be to visit the Finley Point zoning. She spoke with residents on Finley Point. It was a hot topic. There were probably people doing what they wanted to do illegally because they thought [the County] wasn't doing what they should be doing. LaDana said this happened especially in the zoning districts around the lake. She thought maybe this issue could be addressed at one time in all of those districts. Eileen said that she would like to get the Finley Point zoning on the list beyond that particular issue although she was sure that issue would come up. If it was too late, she understood.

LaDana thought Building for Lease or Rent was a definite issue. They hadn't had the regulations that were required in 2013. If they could get that, it would address some of their issues, not just for a particular zoning district but for the whole county. In her mind, it was a top priority. The Board had chosen the first six [priorities]. She thought Steve R outlined it well in his letter. They would work on those and as time allowed, they would add the other things to it. Steve R referred to the first full paragraph of the second page of the letter, which brought up the Buildings for Lease or Rent regulations issue. It said it might be either an individual document or incorporated in other regulations. They could be more specific and say zoning regulations. They'd discussed the possibility that these could be in the subdivision regulations or elsewhere. He appreciated that Eileen was representing Finley Point just as he represented Upper West Shore and other members were from other areas. Eileen said she looked at the dates and they were at the tenth year and Steve R agreed. LaDana noted that Finley Point, Swan Sites and Upper West Shore were all similar in that date and all due for updates. The Density Map and Regulations were long overdue too, as were a number of things. They just had to start working through the list, and take on the tasks that the Board felt they could accomplish within a reasonable amount of time.

Rick thought it was prioritized pretty well, given the pressure that might be coming to the County and the wheels that would squeak the soonest. Steve R wasn't sure how many items they had [considered]. LaDana said 19 things were on the list. Steve R pointed out they picked 6 priorities, with the idea in mind that even if they got through those in order, enough time will have gone by that other changes would occur and other priorities would come up. It was foolish at this time to [list more] just because too many changes would occur. The attempt here was to set enough items on a priority schedule that would get going and in a year or two, they could reevaluate this. Hopefully by that time, they would cross the first 4 or 5 things off of the list.

LaDana reminded that as the state legislature met, changes could come from state law that had to happen. They hadn't really accounted for those. The Board's list would have to have some flexibility. Steve R said they didn't know what the demands for customer service and permitting would be, which he also mentioned in part of the letter. That would dictate a lot of the staff time. Steve S asked if state law impacted the 19 items originally considered. Should they have taken that into account? LaDana pointed to zoning and subdivision regulations. The regulations came from state law. Steve S asked if, in LaDana's opinion, they should move the priorities around to accommodate the state law requirements. LaDana thought they were accommodating them for the most part. They definitely needed to do things, like the Buildings for Lease or Rent regulations. They were trying to accommodate them as best they could. Steve S concluded the list was okay and the six things were reasonable. LaDana agreed. Robert noted you couldn't predict what the legislature would do.

Frank said the Density Map and Regulations (DMR) affected a large portion of the County. It seemed like it could have a higher priority. He was just pointing out that on a land mass basis, it had a far-reaching effect. Steve R agreed. He pointed to a comment in the letter that they recognize that work on the Growth Policy and DMR was very important but in extensive discussions about these things at the last meeting, they decided that even though those were a high priority, it would be helpful to cross a couple things off the list that they might be able to do more efficiently first and then tackle those big, longer projects.

Motion made by Steve Shapero, and seconded by John Fleming, to approve the memo to be sent to the Commissioners. Motion carried, all in favor.

Steve R confirmed with LaDana that she would see that the letter got to the Commissioners. He suggested that they add a statement at the bottom that it was approved unanimously by the Planning Board at this meeting. LaDana asked if the Board wanted to sign it. Steve R thought that the fact the Board approved it and that it would be in the minutes was fine.

Steve R asked if there was other business. Frank mentioned that, speaking as a private citizen, he wrote a paper from his point of view challenging the DMR. He thought it might possibly be an agenda item for the Planning Board. He recognized it wasn't a priority and wasn't sure where it fit. Robert added some background regarding a Density variance item the Board of Adjustment (BOA), whom Steve R and Frank were both members reviewed earlier in the day. Much of Frank's letter responded to that situation. Speaking from his experience as a planner (in general, as opposed to on behalf of Lake County) Robert was frustrated with it too. Frank said Robert described part of his motivation but it went beyond this one issue that came before the

Board. He was speaking as a public member, not in an official capacity. He referred to a group of citizens that were strongly opposed to the DMR when it was proposed. Frank and Janet shared their respective views. Steve R and Wally touched on the reviews that were to have been initiated.

John expressed concern that in the 'Other Business' section on the agenda that things came up for which some members couldn't be prepared. Maybe someone could contact the staff and put it on the agenda if they had something they wanted to talk about so other Planning Board members could be on notice. Steve R agreed that was important for the future. Wally said this was the discussion that you had when you got to that on the priority list. John thought Roberts Rules of Orders might say that things needed to be on the agenda or they shouldn't deal with them. Steve R thought there was a provision to review the agenda at the beginning of the meeting and possibly add things under certain conditions. Wally pointed to a motion to suspend the agenda.

Robert announced that this was his last Planning Board meeting. After 5 years, it was time for him to move on. Board members thanked him, wished him good luck and expressed that they would miss him.

LaDana announced that Friday was her last day with the County. She wished the Board luck and mentioned the great Board support.

Frank voiced that this was the best group of Planning staff he'd known. John agreed and extended that to the Board, which Wally had also observed. Other members also thanked LaDana and Robert. Dave DeGrandpre introduced himself. His firm had been hired by the Commissioners to provide contract planner services [under the direction of remaining Planner Jacob Feistner] to help with daily permitting, inquiries and support during the transition to new staff. Frank asked who would be in charge. Steve R said Jacob would handle the customer service and delegate to Dave DeGrandpre and Joel Nelson, depending on the work load, until they had a new director.

Motion made by Frank Mutch, and seconded by John Fleming, to adjourn. Motion carried, all in favor. Meeting adjourned at 8:10 pm.

LAKE COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
May 11, 2016
Lake County Courthouse, Large Conference Room (Rm 316)
Meeting Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT: Steve Rosso, Steve Shapero, John Fleming, Sigurd Jensen, Janet Camel, Rick Cothorn, Frank Mutch, Eileen Neill

STAFF PRESENT: LaDana Hintz, Robert Costa, Lita Fonda, Wally Congdon

Steve Rosso called the meeting to order at 7:00pm. Minutes deferred.

FLATHEAD LAKE UNITED METHODIST CAMP LAKESHORE:

Robert Costa presented the staff report. (See attachments to minutes in the May 2016 meeting file for staff report.)

Frank asked about the legal authority that gave Lake County control of land under the lake. Robert explained this was from state law, which provided that counties could adopt regulations to regulate the lake, lakebed, lake waters and a 20-foot area of land adjacent to the high water mark. Lake County had done so with Lake Mary Ronan, Swan Lake and Flathead Lake.

Eileen asked where this boat was docked without the buoy. Robert directed that question to Jay Davison, who was here as the agent for the application. His understanding, which Jay confirmed, was that they hadn't bought a boat to dock yet.

Janet confirmed with staff that this was off the reservation. She mentioned that Lake County didn't have jurisdiction on the south half of the lake. Robert added that the County would have jurisdiction over the 20-foot land strip on the reservation.

For the future, Steve R commented that the description of distances were about the anchor placement. The anchor line was longer than the water was deep so the buoy could move around this. The painter on the front of the boat went from the front of the boat to the buoy and then the boat was a certain length. The back of the boat could swing as in as much as a 40-foot radius around this anchor point. In the future, when the drawings were done, that would be helpful for the Board to see, so when the boat rotated around to where it would be closest to the riparian boundary of the property, they could see how close it got. The anchor point looked like a long way but in fact it might be 40 or 50 feet closer, depending on conditions.

Jay Davison spoke as the agent for the applicant. The buoy was for a new boat. The neighbor had a boat he didn't use and they agreed to buy it, subject to having a place to put it. They didn't want a place on the west side where kids would see it and it would be an attractive nuisance. They tried to put it in a place where the kids were shielded from it by a steep grade with trees. The purpose of having the buoy there was to be able to moor the boat during the summer, at least during the times when the storms weren't there. It was a 12-foot boat.

Public comment opened: None offered. Public comment closed.

Eileen asked if there was an alternate place to put the boat during a storm. Jay replied there wasn't. They would take it out on a trailer at one of the landings. Eileen noted storms could come in quickly without much warning. Jay agreed. They continuously monitored the weather because not only would they want to get that boat out but they would want to be sure the canoes and kids were off the water. Robert affirmed with Jay that they would use the little strip access just NE of the buoy site. Robert pointed to the page of attachment 6 labelled 'Exhibit F'. You could see a little strip by Central Avenue where it wrapped around and turned east. He believed it was a county-owned strip that people used a lot.

Steve R mentioned if the anchor was done well and the mooring line was proper, attaching a boat to a mooring line in a storm could be very safe for the boat. It could handle a lot of water because the boat was free to bounce up and down in the waves. If you had adequate anchor and line on it, it could handle storms that it couldn't handle if it were tied to a dock. It was a pretty safe way to do it as long as you had a good anchor line. The application said they were going to use a fiber rope attachment rather than a chain to the bottom of the buoy. They would want to inspect that quite a bit. Ropes on the bottom might abrade as the line rotated around in the wind. They might find that they would want to have a section of chain close to the anchor and then go to a fiber rope from that 6 or 10-foot section of chain. A fiber rope with tension on it from the waves would pull at an angle and would pull up. If you had a heavy chain, the chain sank the line down towards the bottom and caused the line to come up [as gestured]. You were actually pulling horizontally on the anchor. The anchor could take a lot bigger pull if you were pulling horizontally rather than vertically. That was another reason people often had a row of chain on their anchor line.

Frank commented a number of people used stainless steel chain, which was 1.5 times the water depth. One person told him that his buoy was lost about every 3 years so he had his contact information on it and usually got it back. It seemed like the stainless steel chain was best.

Wally noted the length of the rope was what mattered for the Board. When you put the chain on, which worked better per Steve R's comments, the problem was you had a spring. The more you stretched it out, the greater you increased the radius of the circle. As you made the circle bigger, how far you were from the shore, or how much rope you had, changed the equation to go to the buoy. When you talked about the distance or the radius of the circle and how much it plugged up, that mattered to the equation a lot. It affected what they were doing, since if you got too much rope in the buoy and too much painter on the boat, you were too close to the shore and nothing could get between you and the shore safely. It depended on boat size too.

Steve R noted there were other buoys in the picture. Whose buoys were the existing ones? Jay didn't know. He thought the closest one to their proposed spot was owned by one of the residents in Central. He confirmed for Steve R that this nearest buoy was within [the camp's] riparian area. He mentioned it to the owner when he was out surveying and taking distances. He asked her how long it had been there, to which she answered 'forever'.

Steve R said when you looked at the radii, you needed to look at that distance too. The problem wasn't when the wind was blowing hard, at which time both boats moved in the same direction.

The problem was when there wasn't wind. The boats would be just bobbing around and they could bump together. He didn't know what the options were. That [neighboring] person could put the buoy on their own property. If it was in [the camp's] riparian zone, they might consider suggesting a different location for it. Robert reminded that [the neighbor] would need this [County] review. Steve R asked if there were other permits for buoys around that area. Robert said people usually hadn't got the permit. Steve R agreed that people put buoys out without understanding they were required to have a permit for buoys. There were a lot of unpermitted buoys.

Wally brought up another note to remember was that if you had too much chain, it would be too heavy and it would wipe the bottom. The boat would rotate around some buoy point. It wasn't as bad as an anchor ring but it was close. As it went around, it wiped things on the bottom and made a sediment plume and so forth. You wanted the chain length to be reasonable for what you had so it would hold it down and make the [inaudible] but you didn't want to be screwing up the bottom. You'd want to look at what you had for the surrounding bottom: was it rock, gravel, mud or whatever else. Jay said it was small rock. Wally said that worked better. Rick said with that small boat, you could even put a snubber on there, which would further lessen the impact.

Rick was inclined to make a motion to concur with the recommendations, which Frank was willing to second. Robert explained that in a sense, these were the Board's findings. The way the regulation was written, they weren't making a recommendation but rather the Board was asked to make findings, which was a recommendation in a sense. The way he might write a permit was that the Commissioners also adopted the same findings as the Planning Board. In a sense, the Board would be adopting findings that the buoy was not creating a safety hazard and would not cause navigational or recreational interference, and then recommend that the Commissioners approve the permit. Rick asked for some wordsmithing.

Steve R thanked Robert for reminding them of their focus. He proposed adding to findings A & B (on pg. 5 and pg. 6). In both findings, he suggested adding something to say the length of rope from the anchor to the buoy and the length of painter from the buoy to the boat should be considered when finally evaluating the safety and navigation aspects of this location. This would give some description that what they were really considering was not where the buoy was anchored but the travel of the boat around the anchor and making sure that area was reasonable to provide the safety and navigation in this. In the last sentence of A (pg. 5), Robert suggested adding a comma after improvement, crossing out 'and', add a comma after 'location' and then adding Steve R's wording. Jay checked that what they wanted to see was the radius of the circle of the boat. Robert asked the sailors of the group if there was a nautical technical term for that. Steve R suggested the wording to insert where Robert had indicated might be 'along with the circular travel of the boat when it is moored'. Frank provided the nautical term of 'drift' to replace 'circular travel'. Steve R asked for clarification and Frank ensured he got the drift, changing the insertion to read 'along with the drift of the boat when it was moored'.

Robert suggested doing the same thing in the last sentence of finding B on pg. 6, so adding a comma after buoy and inserting 'its location, along with the [circular] drift of the boat when it was moored'.

Motion made by Rick Cothorn, and seconded by Frank Mutch, to recommend the approval with the findings as modified above. Motion carried, all in favor.

Steve R asked Jay about the installation in the water. Wally, various Board members and staff contributed more details and suggestions.

DISCUSSION ITEM: Adopting amendments to the Planning Board's bylaws --Postponed

LaDana noted that Lita hadn't had a chance to work on the minutes. They should get the minutes so they could make the changes discussed at the previous meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS (7:28 pm)

Steve R talked about the memo on which he and LaDana had worked to give the Commissioners to advise them about the results of the Board's discussion at the last meeting for setting priorities. He wanted to find out if Board members thought the memo needed changes, and if so, what those changes were, and if they could agree as a Board to approve the memo and get it ready to present to the Commissioners.

John thought it looked very workable. Eileen suggested a possible additional priority. At the end of the last meeting, LaDana mentioned something about Finley Point people wanting to rent out their guest houses. LaDana explained that happened across the zoning districts and also fell under the Building for Lease or Rent regulations. Eileen thought the next priority might be to visit the Finley Point zoning. She spoke with residents on Finley Point. It was a hot topic. There were probably people doing what they wanted to do illegally because they thought [the County] wasn't doing what they should be doing. LaDana said this happened especially in the zoning districts around the lake. She thought maybe this issue could be addressed at one time in all of those districts. Eileen said that she would like to get the Finley Point zoning on the list beyond that particular issue although she was sure that issue would come up. If it was too late, she understood.

LaDana thought Building for Lease or Rent was a definite issue. They hadn't had the regulations that were required in 2013. If they could get that, it would address some of their issues, not just for a particular zoning district but for the whole county. In her mind, it was a top priority. The Board had chosen the first six [priorities]. She thought Steve R outlined it well in his letter. They would work on those and as time allowed, they would add the other things to it. Steve R referred to the first full paragraph of the second page of the letter, which brought up the Buildings for Lease or Rent regulations issue. It said it might be either an individual document or incorporated in other regulations. They could be more specific and say zoning regulations. They'd discussed the possibility that these could be in the subdivision regulations or elsewhere. He appreciated that Eileen was representing Finley Point just as he represented Upper West Shore and other members were from other areas. Eileen said she looked at the dates and they were at the tenth year and Steve R agreed. LaDana noted that Finley Point, Swan Sites and Upper West Shore were all similar in that date and all due for updates. The Density Map and Regulations were long overdue too, as were a number of things. They just had to start working through the list, and take on the tasks that the Board felt they could accomplish within a reasonable amount of time.

Rick thought it was prioritized pretty well, given the pressure that might be coming to the County and the wheels that would squeak the soonest. Steve R wasn't sure how many items they had [considered]. LaDana said 19 things were on the list. Steve R pointed out they picked 6 priorities, with the idea in mind that even if they got through those in order, enough time will have gone by that other changes would occur and other priorities would come up. It was foolish at this time to [list more] just because too many changes would occur. The attempt here was to set enough items on a priority schedule that would get going and in a year or two, they could reevaluate this. Hopefully by that time, they would cross the first 4 or 5 things off of the list.

LaDana reminded that as the state legislature met, changes could come from state law that had to happen. They hadn't really accounted for those. The Board's list would have to have some flexibility. Steve R said they didn't know what the demands for customer service and permitting would be, which he also mentioned in part of the letter. That would dictate a lot of the staff time. Steve S asked if state law impacted the 19 items originally considered. Should they have taken that into account? LaDana pointed to zoning and subdivision regulations. The regulations came from state law. Steve S asked if, in LaDana's opinion, they should move the priorities around to accommodate the state law requirements. LaDana thought they were accommodating them for the most part. They definitely needed to do things, like the Buildings for Lease or Rent regulations. They were trying to accommodate them as best they could. Steve S concluded the list was okay and the six things were reasonable. LaDana agreed. Robert noted you couldn't predict what the legislature would do.

Frank said the Density Map and Regulations (DMR) affected a large portion of the County. It seemed like it could have a higher priority. He was just pointing out that on a land mass basis, it had a far-reaching effect. Steve R agreed. He pointed to a comment in the letter that they recognize that work on the Growth Policy and DMR was very important but in extensive discussions about these things at the last meeting, they decided that even though those were a high priority, it would be helpful to cross a couple things off the list that they might be able to do more efficiently first and then tackle those big, longer projects.

Motion made by Steve Shapero, and seconded by John Fleming, to approve the memo to be sent to the Commissioners. Motion carried, all in favor.

Steve R confirmed with LaDana that she would see that the letter got to the Commissioners. He suggested that they add a statement at the bottom that it was approved unanimously by the Planning Board at this meeting. LaDana asked if the Board wanted to sign it. Steve R thought that the fact the Board approved it and that it would be in the minutes was fine.

Steve R asked if there was other business. Frank mentioned that, speaking as a private citizen, he wrote a paper from his point of view challenging the DMR. He thought it might possibly be an agenda item for the Planning Board. He recognized it wasn't a priority and wasn't sure where it fit. Robert added some background regarding a Density variance item the Board of Adjustment (BOA), whom Steve R and Frank were both members reviewed earlier in the day. Much of Frank's letter responded to that situation. Speaking from his experience as a planner (in general, as opposed to on behalf of Lake County) Robert was frustrated with it too. Frank said Robert described part of his motivation but it went beyond this one issue that came before the

Board. He was speaking as a public member, not in an official capacity. He referred to a group of citizens that were strongly opposed to the DMR when it was proposed. Frank and Janet shared their respective views. Steve R and Wally touched on the reviews that were to have been initiated.

John expressed concern that in the 'Other Business' section on the agenda that things came up for which some members couldn't be prepared. Maybe someone could contact the staff and put it on the agenda if they had something they wanted to talk about so other Planning Board members could be on notice. Steve R agreed that was important for the future. Wally said this was the discussion that you had when you got to that on the priority list. John thought Roberts Rules of Orders might say that things needed to be on the agenda or they shouldn't deal with them. Steve R thought there was a provision to review the agenda at the beginning of the meeting and possibly add things under certain conditions. Wally pointed to a motion to suspend the agenda.

Robert announced that this was his last Planning Board meeting. After 5 years, it was time for him to move on. Board members thanked him, wished him good luck and expressed that they would miss him.

LaDana announced that Friday was her last day with the County. She wished the Board luck and mentioned the great Board support.

Frank voiced that this was the best group of Planning staff he'd known. John agreed and extended that to the Board, which Wally had also observed. Other members also thanked LaDana and Robert. Dave DeGrandpre introduced himself. His firm had been hired by the Commissioners to provide contract planner services [under the direction of remaining Planner Jacob Feistner] to help with daily permitting, inquiries and support during the transition to new staff. Frank asked who would be in charge. Steve R said Jacob would handle the customer service and delegate to Dave DeGrandpre and Joel Nelson, depending on the work load, until they had a new director.

Motion made by Frank Mutch, and seconded by John Fleming, to adjourn. Motion carried, all in favor. Meeting adjourned at 8:10 pm.

LAKE COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
May 11, 2016
Lake County Courthouse, Large Conference Room (Rm 316)
Meeting Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT: Steve Rosso, Steve Shapero, John Fleming, Sigurd Jensen, Janet Camel, Rick Cothorn, Frank Mutch, Eileen Neill

STAFF PRESENT: LaDana Hintz, Robert Costa, Lita Fonda, Wally Congdon

Steve Rosso called the meeting to order at 7:00pm. Minutes deferred.

FLATHEAD LAKE UNITED METHODIST CAMP LAKESHORE:

Robert Costa presented the staff report. (See attachments to minutes in the May 2016 meeting file for staff report.)

Frank asked about the legal authority that gave Lake County control of land under the lake. Robert explained this was from state law, which provided that counties could adopt regulations to regulate the lake, lakebed, lake waters and a 20-foot area of land adjacent to the high water mark. Lake County had done so with Lake Mary Ronan, Swan Lake and Flathead Lake.

Eileen asked where this boat was docked without the buoy. Robert directed that question to Jay Davison, who was here as the agent for the application. His understanding, which Jay confirmed, was that they hadn't bought a boat to dock yet.

Janet confirmed with staff that this was off the reservation. She mentioned that Lake County didn't have jurisdiction on the south half of the lake. Robert added that the County would have jurisdiction over the 20-foot land strip on the reservation.

For the future, Steve R commented that the description of distances were about the anchor placement. The anchor line was longer than the water was deep so the buoy could move around this. The painter on the front of the boat went from the front of the boat to the buoy and then the boat was a certain length. The back of the boat could swing as in as much as a 40-foot radius around this anchor point. In the future, when the drawings were done, that would be helpful for the Board to see, so when the boat rotated around to where it would be closest to the riparian boundary of the property, they could see how close it got. The anchor point looked like a long way but in fact it might be 40 or 50 feet closer, depending on conditions.

Jay Davison spoke as the agent for the applicant. The buoy was for a new boat. The neighbor had a boat he didn't use and they agreed to buy it, subject to having a place to put it. They didn't want a place on the west side where kids would see it and it would be an attractive nuisance. They tried to put it in a place where the kids were shielded from it by a steep grade with trees. The purpose of having the buoy there was to be able to moor the boat during the summer, at least during the times when the storms weren't there. It was a 12-foot boat.

Public comment opened: None offered. Public comment closed.

Eileen asked if there was an alternate place to put the boat during a storm. Jay replied there wasn't. They would take it out on a trailer at one of the landings. Eileen noted storms could come in quickly without much warning. Jay agreed. They continuously monitored the weather because not only would they want to get that boat out but they would want to be sure the canoes and kids were off the water. Robert affirmed with Jay that they would use the little strip access just NE of the buoy site. Robert pointed to the page of attachment 6 labelled 'Exhibit F'. You could see a little strip by Central Avenue where it wrapped around and turned east. He believed it was a county-owned strip that people used a lot.

Steve R mentioned if the anchor was done well and the mooring line was proper, attaching a boat to a mooring line in a storm could be very safe for the boat. It could handle a lot of water because the boat was free to bounce up and down in the waves. If you had adequate anchor and line on it, it could handle storms that it couldn't handle if it were tied to a dock. It was a pretty safe way to do it as long as you had a good anchor line. The application said they were going to use a fiber rope attachment rather than a chain to the bottom of the buoy. They would want to inspect that quite a bit. Ropes on the bottom might abrade as the line rotated around in the wind. They might find that they would want to have a section of chain close to the anchor and then go to a fiber rope from that 6 or 10-foot section of chain. A fiber rope with tension on it from the waves would pull at an angle and would pull up. If you had a heavy chain, the chain sank the line down towards the bottom and caused the line to come up [as gestured]. You were actually pulling horizontally on the anchor. The anchor could take a lot bigger pull if you were pulling horizontally rather than vertically. That was another reason people often had a row of chain on their anchor line.

Frank commented a number of people used stainless steel chain, which was 1.5 times the water depth. One person told him that his buoy was lost about every 3 years so he had his contact information on it and usually got it back. It seemed like the stainless steel chain was best.

Wally noted the length of the rope was what mattered for the Board. When you put the chain on, which worked better per Steve R's comments, the problem was you had a spring. The more you stretched it out, the greater you increased the radius of the circle. As you made the circle bigger, how far you were from the shore, or how much rope you had, changed the equation to go to the buoy. When you talked about the distance or the radius of the circle and how much it plugged up, that mattered to the equation a lot. It affected what they were doing, since if you got too much rope in the buoy and too much painter on the boat, you were too close to the shore and nothing could get between you and the shore safely. It depended on boat size too.

Steve R noted there were other buoys in the picture. Whose buoys were the existing ones? Jay didn't know. He thought the closest one to their proposed spot was owned by one of the residents in Central. He confirmed for Steve R that this nearest buoy was within [the camp's] riparian area. He mentioned it to the owner when he was out surveying and taking distances. He asked her how long it had been there, to which she answered 'forever'.

Steve R said when you looked at the radii, you needed to look at that distance too. The problem wasn't when the wind was blowing hard, at which time both boats moved in the same direction.

The problem was when there wasn't wind. The boats would be just bobbing around and they could bump together. He didn't know what the options were. That [neighboring] person could put the buoy on their own property. If it was in [the camp's] riparian zone, they might consider suggesting a different location for it. Robert reminded that [the neighbor] would need this [County] review. Steve R asked if there were other permits for buoys around that area. Robert said people usually hadn't got the permit. Steve R agreed that people put buoys out without understanding they were required to have a permit for buoys. There were a lot of unpermitted buoys.

Wally brought up another note to remember was that if you had too much chain, it would be too heavy and it would wipe the bottom. The boat would rotate around some buoy point. It wasn't as bad as an anchor ring but it was close. As it went around, it wiped things on the bottom and made a sediment plume and so forth. You wanted the chain length to be reasonable for what you had so it would hold it down and make the [inaudible] but you didn't want to be screwing up the bottom. You'd want to look at what you had for the surrounding bottom: was it rock, gravel, mud or whatever else. Jay said it was small rock. Wally said that worked better. Rick said with that small boat, you could even put a snubber on there, which would further lessen the impact.

Rick was inclined to make a motion to concur with the recommendations, which Frank was willing to second. Robert explained that in a sense, these were the Board's findings. The way the regulation was written, they weren't making a recommendation but rather the Board was asked to make findings, which was a recommendation in a sense. The way he might write a permit was that the Commissioners also adopted the same findings as the Planning Board. In a sense, the Board would be adopting findings that the buoy was not creating a safety hazard and would not cause navigational or recreational interference, and then recommend that the Commissioners approve the permit. Rick asked for some wordsmithing.

Steve R thanked Robert for reminding them of their focus. He proposed adding to findings A & B (on pg. 5 and pg. 6). In both findings, he suggested adding something to say the length of rope from the anchor to the buoy and the length of painter from the buoy to the boat should be considered when finally evaluating the safety and navigation aspects of this location. This would give some description that what they were really considering was not where the buoy was anchored but the travel of the boat around the anchor and making sure that area was reasonable to provide the safety and navigation in this. In the last sentence of A (pg. 5), Robert suggested adding a comma after improvement, crossing out 'and', add a comma after 'location' and then adding Steve R's wording. Jay checked that what they wanted to see was the radius of the circle of the boat. Robert asked the sailors of the group if there was a nautical technical term for that. Steve R suggested the wording to insert where Robert had indicated might be 'along with the circular travel of the boat when it is moored'. Frank provided the nautical term of 'drift' to replace 'circular travel'. Steve R asked for clarification and Frank ensured he got the drift, changing the insertion to read 'along with the drift of the boat when it was moored'.

Robert suggested doing the same thing in the last sentence of finding B on pg. 6, so adding a comma after buoy and inserting 'its location, along with the [circular] drift of the boat when it was moored'.

Motion made by Rick Cothorn, and seconded by Frank Mutch, to recommend the approval with the findings as modified above. Motion carried, all in favor.

Steve R asked Jay about the installation in the water. Wally, various Board members and staff contributed more details and suggestions.

DISCUSSION ITEM: Adopting amendments to the Planning Board's bylaws --Postponed

LaDana noted that Lita hadn't had a chance to work on the minutes. They should get the minutes so they could make the changes discussed at the previous meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS (7:28 pm)

Steve R talked about the memo on which he and LaDana had worked to give the Commissioners to advise them about the results of the Board's discussion at the last meeting for setting priorities. He wanted to find out if Board members thought the memo needed changes, and if so, what those changes were, and if they could agree as a Board to approve the memo and get it ready to present to the Commissioners.

John thought it looked very workable. Eileen suggested a possible additional priority. At the end of the last meeting, LaDana mentioned something about Finley Point people wanting to rent out their guest houses. LaDana explained that happened across the zoning districts and also fell under the Building for Lease or Rent regulations. Eileen thought the next priority might be to visit the Finley Point zoning. She spoke with residents on Finley Point. It was a hot topic. There were probably people doing what they wanted to do illegally because they thought [the County] wasn't doing what they should be doing. LaDana said this happened especially in the zoning districts around the lake. She thought maybe this issue could be addressed at one time in all of those districts. Eileen said that she would like to get the Finley Point zoning on the list beyond that particular issue although she was sure that issue would come up. If it was too late, she understood.

LaDana thought Building for Lease or Rent was a definite issue. They hadn't had the regulations that were required in 2013. If they could get that, it would address some of their issues, not just for a particular zoning district but for the whole county. In her mind, it was a top priority. The Board had chosen the first six [priorities]. She thought Steve R outlined it well in his letter. They would work on those and as time allowed, they would add the other things to it. Steve R referred to the first full paragraph of the second page of the letter, which brought up the Buildings for Lease or Rent regulations issue. It said it might be either an individual document or incorporated in other regulations. They could be more specific and say zoning regulations. They'd discussed the possibility that these could be in the subdivision regulations or elsewhere. He appreciated that Eileen was representing Finley Point just as he represented Upper West Shore and other members were from other areas. Eileen said she looked at the dates and they were at the tenth year and Steve R agreed. LaDana noted that Finley Point, Swan Sites and Upper West Shore were all similar in that date and all due for updates. The Density Map and Regulations were long overdue too, as were a number of things. They just had to start working through the list, and take on the tasks that the Board felt they could accomplish within a reasonable amount of time.

Rick thought it was prioritized pretty well, given the pressure that might be coming to the County and the wheels that would squeak the soonest. Steve R wasn't sure how many items they had [considered]. LaDana said 19 things were on the list. Steve R pointed out they picked 6 priorities, with the idea in mind that even if they got through those in order, enough time will have gone by that other changes would occur and other priorities would come up. It was foolish at this time to [list more] just because too many changes would occur. The attempt here was to set enough items on a priority schedule that would get going and in a year or two, they could reevaluate this. Hopefully by that time, they would cross the first 4 or 5 things off of the list.

LaDana reminded that as the state legislature met, changes could come from state law that had to happen. They hadn't really accounted for those. The Board's list would have to have some flexibility. Steve R said they didn't know what the demands for customer service and permitting would be, which he also mentioned in part of the letter. That would dictate a lot of the staff time. Steve S asked if state law impacted the 19 items originally considered. Should they have taken that into account? LaDana pointed to zoning and subdivision regulations. The regulations came from state law. Steve S asked if, in LaDana's opinion, they should move the priorities around to accommodate the state law requirements. LaDana thought they were accommodating them for the most part. They definitely needed to do things, like the Buildings for Lease or Rent regulations. They were trying to accommodate them as best they could. Steve S concluded the list was okay and the six things were reasonable. LaDana agreed. Robert noted you couldn't predict what the legislature would do.

Frank said the Density Map and Regulations (DMR) affected a large portion of the County. It seemed like it could have a higher priority. He was just pointing out that on a land mass basis, it had a far-reaching effect. Steve R agreed. He pointed to a comment in the letter that they recognize that work on the Growth Policy and DMR was very important but in extensive discussions about these things at the last meeting, they decided that even though those were a high priority, it would be helpful to cross a couple things off the list that they might be able to do more efficiently first and then tackle those big, longer projects.

Motion made by Steve Shapero, and seconded by John Fleming, to approve the memo to be sent to the Commissioners. Motion carried, all in favor.

Steve R confirmed with LaDana that she would see that the letter got to the Commissioners. He suggested that they add a statement at the bottom that it was approved unanimously by the Planning Board at this meeting. LaDana asked if the Board wanted to sign it. Steve R thought that the fact the Board approved it and that it would be in the minutes was fine.

Steve R asked if there was other business. Frank mentioned that, speaking as a private citizen, he wrote a paper from his point of view challenging the DMR. He thought it might possibly be an agenda item for the Planning Board. He recognized it wasn't a priority and wasn't sure where it fit. Robert added some background regarding a Density variance item the Board of Adjustment (BOA), whom Steve R and Frank were both members reviewed earlier in the day. Much of Frank's letter responded to that situation. Speaking from his experience as a planner (in general, as opposed to on behalf of Lake County) Robert was frustrated with it too. Frank said Robert described part of his motivation but it went beyond this one issue that came before the

Board. He was speaking as a public member, not in an official capacity. He referred to a group of citizens that were strongly opposed to the DMR when it was proposed. Frank and Janet shared their respective views. Steve R and Wally touched on the reviews that were to have been initiated.

John expressed concern that in the 'Other Business' section on the agenda that things came up for which some members couldn't be prepared. Maybe someone could contact the staff and put it on the agenda if they had something they wanted to talk about so other Planning Board members could be on notice. Steve R agreed that was important for the future. Wally said this was the discussion that you had when you got to that on the priority list. John thought Roberts Rules of Orders might say that things needed to be on the agenda or they shouldn't deal with them. Steve R thought there was a provision to review the agenda at the beginning of the meeting and possibly add things under certain conditions. Wally pointed to a motion to suspend the agenda.

Robert announced that this was his last Planning Board meeting. After 5 years, it was time for him to move on. Board members thanked him, wished him good luck and expressed that they would miss him.

LaDana announced that Friday was her last day with the County. She wished the Board luck and mentioned the great Board support.

Frank voiced that this was the best group of Planning staff he'd known. John agreed and extended that to the Board, which Wally had also observed. Other members also thanked LaDana and Robert. Dave DeGrandpre introduced himself. His firm had been hired by the Commissioners to provide contract planner services [under the direction of remaining Planner Jacob Feistner] to help with daily permitting, inquiries and support during the transition to new staff. Frank asked who would be in charge. Steve R said Jacob would handle the customer service and delegate to Dave DeGrandpre and Joel Nelson, depending on the work load, until they had a new director.

Motion made by Frank Mutch, and seconded by John Fleming, to adjourn. Motion carried, all in favor. Meeting adjourned at 8:10 pm.