

**Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
June 16, 2003**

PRESENT: Mike Davis (Chairman), Bill Smith, Rod Dalling, Connie Ottesen, Dirk Mace, Linda Crapo, Kirk Mackert, Rich Zimmerman, Kurt Eidam, Kip Martindale, Karen Lords (P&B Administrator) and Susan Sommer (Secretary).

OTHER ATTENDEES: Ivel Burrell (Assessor), Pat McCoy (Treasurer).

WELCOME: Mike Davis called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m.

MINUTES: There were two sets of minutes in the packet to be approved. The May 19th, 2003 minutes had only a minor change to add Kurt Eidam to the attendance list. Rod Dalling motioned to accept the minutes with the noted change. It was seconded by Bill Smith. The May 19th minutes were approved, unopposed. Mike Davis asked if there are any additions or corrections for the minutes of June 5th. There were none and Connie Otteson moved to accept the minutes, with no changes, and Dirk Mace seconded the motion. The minutes were approved, unopposed.

OTHER BUSINESS: Because of the large amount of Sketch Plans and scheduled Public Hearings for July, Karen Lords asked the Board if they would be willing to have an extra meeting in the month of July. She suggested July 7th for the extra meeting and the regularly scheduled meeting of July 21st remaining the same. Bill Smith motioned to approve the extra meeting for July 7th, 2003. The motion was seconded by Rich Zimmerman and approved by the rest of the Board, unopposed.

PUBLIC HEARING – CITY OF ISLAND PARK IMPACT AREA:

Chairman, Mike Davis asked Karen if the proper notices had been given. Karen stated that she had and she also published the Public Hearing Notice in the Island Park newspaper for the people living in and around the Impact Area. A packet was mailed to each Board member last week for their review. Karen advised the P&Z Board that Laurie Augustine (the Island Park Mayor) had resigned last week and, because of her resignation, Ray Stratford would be representing and speaking for the City of Island Park. Karen stated that Brad Smith (I.P. City Councilman) has been temporarily appointed to replace Laurie Augustine.

Karen had several concerns over the Impact Area map. During this last winter, a representative of the City of Island Park Planning & Zoning Board met with the Fremont County P&B Board and during this scheduled Work Meeting it was decided that Bighorn Hills Estates & I.P. Village would be left out of the Impact Area. However, when the City of Island Park chose to have their Public Hearing – they left Bighorn Hills Estates & I.P. Village in. Her concerns are that the subdivisions that the city is asking to incorporate in their map some already have services that they are providing for themselves. They are either hooked into community sewer or they have individual septic systems or hooked up to community wells or have individual wells and the city will not be providing any of the services. Another concern is the status of the city government and apparently they have temporarily replaced the mayor with Brad Smith who was a City Councilman and his open position will need to be filled to act in that capacity during any upcoming proceedings. The biggest concern is that the I.P. City Planning & Zoning Board agreed to leave these subdivisions out and the City chose to leave them in. Karen feels that the Fremont County P&Z Board was told one thing by the I.P. City P&Z Board and the City Council chose to do another. The City of I.P. says that the only thing they provide is 'zoning' and there have been several complaints in the past about some of these 'zoning requirements' and 'permits' have not been taken care of in a timely manner. According to the newspaper articles they are, however, trying to resolve these issues. But if that's an issue with the citizens of Island Park already, shouldn't we take this problem into consideration and that if we give them (the city) a larger area, can they handle more on their plate. Karen stated that this was all she had to talk about at this time.

Chairman Davis asked if there were any further questions for Karen Lords. There were none.

Chairman Davis asked if there were any Board Members that felt there was a conflict of interest in this hearing proceeding. Board members Bill Smith and Rich Zimmerman advised Chairman Davis that they felt there was a conflict of interest, because they lived in subdivisions within the proposed Impact

Area and would possibly make 'Public Comment' as 'residents' of those subdivisions. Chairman Davis excused them and they went to sit in the audience.

Chairman Davis asked Ray Stratford to speak on the proposed Impact Area.

Mr. Stratford summarized the evolution of getting the I.P. Impact Area to the point it is at and what is being presented on the maps. The only change since the 'Work Meeting' with the county is the fact that Bighorn Hills Estates and I.P. Village were put back into the Impact Area by the City. He stated that they realized that the city would not be supplying any utilities to these subdivisions and, therefore, they would not be able to annex any of these subdivisions into the city until they could provide and maintain services to them. He stated that the City could make a decision to annex these subdivisions into the city, but he isn't aware of it happening any too soon.

Rod Dalling asked, 'then why are Bighorn Hills Estates and I.P. Village still in the impact area when they are totally self-sufficient of utilities and road maintenance and are not being planned to be annexed into the city.' Mr. Stratford stated that the City P&Z had agreed to remove them at a 'Working Session' with the county, but the city decided to put them back into the Impact Area.

Dirk Mace asked that 'if the city has no services for and doesn't plan on annexing, why is the Impact Area one mile out and including Bighorn Hills Estates & I.P. Village?' Mr. Stratford stated that, 'this decision would make the boundary line straighter and easier for the County Assessor's office and the Planning & Zoning Dept.'

There was a brief question and answer session between the Board members and Ray Stratford.

Chairman, Mike Davis, asked if there were any further questions for Mr. Stratford relevant to the proposed project. There were none, so Chairman, Mike Davis, opened the meeting to Public Comment.

Idaho Dept. of Lands: Karen read a letter, dated June 12th, 2003, from the Idaho Department of Lands and submitted by L.D. Benedick, Area Supervisor.

Richard Strissel: Mr. Strissel wanted to know if all the requirements had been met according to the Idaho Statutes have been met. He quoted the state statutes and if requirements are not met, then the proceedings are not appropriate.

Karen stated that this refers to 'when a city and county cannot come to any agreement to the area of Impact and then a nine member council would be put together which usually consists of three county commissioners and three representatives from the city of Island Park and then three outside members that are not from either governing board. They meet together and will have 180 days to determine what the area of Impact boundaries would be and what kind of ordinances will be abided by inside the designated Impact area.

Karen stated that the City of IP is, tonight, is in the first step of proposing their initial Impact Area boundaries to the County P&Z Board. The City and the County have to agree on these submitted Impact Area boundaries and if they cannot agree to the submitted boundaries then the proposal will need to revert back to the City of I.P. drawing board for further work.

Richard stated that he has concerns that the city cannot provide any of the sewer services, any of the water services and has turned the roads over to the county for maintenance – so why are they even here at the Planning & Zoning meeting tonight.

Blaine Skinner: He stated that he felt that he is repeating what has been already said, but he feels that this is very important – Why does the state go out so far with an impact zone when they cannot provide any services? Hasn't the state changed the suggested boundary from the original 1-mile?

Karen responded that the state legislature revised that statute and now it does not suggest or even recommend the 1-mile boundary from the city limits. It was never mandated to be 1-mile from the city limits, but was only a suggestion for the cities, in order to have a starting point to implement their Impact Areas.

Blaine reiterated that he thought it was ridiculous that beings the City of Island Park is so large now that they implement a 1-mile further out boundary. He stated that he opposes the 1-mile out boundary and the inclusion of the subdivisions that already provide and maintain their own services.

Barry Phillips: He stated that he lives in Big Horn Hills Estates and he feels that since his subdivision provides **ALL** of the services and maintenance and there would be no point in including his subdivision in either the City or in the Impact Area. He attended the Public Hearing on this issue in Island Park and it was a unanimous decision of the public AND the City Planning & Zoning Board to not include Big Horn Hills Subdivision or I.P. Village. The City Council then decided, for whatever reason, to NOT exclude Big Horn Hills Estates and I.P. Village. He stated that when the City Council conducted their meeting, there was 'NO posted Agenda, so we didn't know what was to be discussed at that time and

could have attended. Low and Behold - we read in the paper that the map was left 'AS IS' and they had not listened to what the City Planning & Zoning Board had recommended. So, we as a subdivision would again like to be excluded from the Impact Area and justify it by providing the information that we are totally self-sufficient and will not need any of the services that may be provided by the City at the present or future date. We feel that the County has competently and promptly handled any issues for our building and zoning issues and would like it to continue as such.'

Nancy Phillips: She also lives in Big Horn Hills Estates and stated that the city of Island Park is already 35 miles long and unyielding and that she just doesn't see anything 'positive' to having the Impact Area to include another mile on all sides.

Weldon Reynolds: No Comment

Maxine Layton: No Comment

Chairman Davis asked if there were any verifications or rebuttals on comments that have been made and Ray Stratford wished to speak again.

Ray Stratford: He wished to compliment Karen on the way she has been handling the P&Z Department. He stated that since she has been in this position she has strictly enforced and followed the Development Code and Comprehensive Plan. Since both the County and the City of Island Park codes are the same, it gave the City some local control over what was going on in the area. It needs to be understood that with the enforcement of the adopted Comprehensive Plan and Development Code it gives the City more local control on what is being developed. Without the local control, Island Park would most likely look like 17th Street in Idaho Falls – the 'signs' cluttering the streets and we do not wish our city to follow that trend.

Bill Smith: Bill stated that he is not signed up to speak, but would like to ask one question. Why, when the Planning & Zoning Board voted to exclude Big Horn Hills Estates and I.P. Village out of the Impact Area, did the city turn around and put it back in. He stated, "I do not know what constitutes a quorum in Island Park, but was there a quorum to vote that night and, also, if there was a quorum, please provide us with that information."

Ray Stratford: In answer to Bill Smith's question, Ray requested that Maxine Layton respond.

Maxine Layton: Maxine stated that at the time of the meeting they only had three on their council and there were two present. Maxine stated that she was NOT there. And, because there was only three on the council and two were there, that constitutes a quorum.

Dirk Mace asked, "Plus the Mayor, or what?"

Maxine stated, "There **were** supposed to be four members on our council, but one had resigned leaving us down to three and we hadn't replaced that one, yet, so that left three city councilmen and I was out of town at that time. I know the other two were there plus the mayor."

Chairman Davis asked if there were any additional rebuttals or comments and Blaine Skinner stood up.

Blaine Skinner: There has been a permit issued by the City of Island Park, but I'm not sure, but the city says there is a permit issued for a garage. I do not think the footings were ever inspected for this development and this 'garage' is NOT a garage. IT IS A HOUSE and it has 'living space' within it and I brought this construction to the attention of the Fremont County Building Inspector and he advised me that this construction is in the City limits and it is their responsibility to follow through with any unauthorized construction. I just want this panel to know what is going on in the city at this time. This type of construction should be followed through and made to abide by Idaho Code.

Kurt Eidam: Kurt briefly explained that when you have a city and are supposed to be providing services of any kind, these services should be provided according to any adopted International, State or County Codes or Plans. It is their responsibility to provide the services with employees that are appropriately State Certified (such as the Building Inspector), and to abide by and enforce these according to any International Building Codes, State or County rules, regulations or codes that have been adopted by the city.

In response to the comment about the City of Island Park enforcing ordinances to prevent the City from looking like 17th Street in Idaho Falls, (we) the County already has an excellent Sign Ordinance that we enforce already, so what is the difference if the City enforces it or the County does? It looks like the City of Island Park is just a 'title' at this point. Practically every service provided in the City of Island Park is being disbursed and handled by County offices anyway (Re: Law Enforcement, Road Maintenance and Snow Plowing). The City of I.P. is getting road maintenance funding through the State and then turns around and gives the funds back to the County to do the maintenance. If the city of I.P. was to dissolve

their incorporation, the County would, ultimately, be responsible to maintain those roads within the city limits, and the county would get those same funds directly from the state to pay for such maintenance. The county already has two building inspectors that are State Certified and receive continual training and updating of new codes/ordinances and could, if need be, do the inspections within the city limits. So claiming that the City of Island Park signing would look like Idaho Falls if the City of I.P. didn't exist is a moot issue. The County already has ordinances and/or codes in place that address these issues. He felt that the City of I.P. needs to address the issues and/or problems with the city government 'at hand' before going forward.

Ivel Burrell: County Assessor – She clarified the issues relevant to the splitting up of lots within a subdivision and the difficulty to decide what portion of a parcel/lot has the home or outbuildings on it and then deciding which portion is in the city limits, in an impact area or in the outlying county area. She stated that her suggestion is to put any given subdivision, in its entirety, either all in the city, or all in the impact area or all under county jurisdiction. It has been an impossible situation in the last couple of years to decide which lot(s) of a parcel has the buildings on and then split up the original parcel to put a portion of the parcel in the city limits (with a separate parcel number) and/or part of the lots/parcel in the county (with a separate parcel number) and/or now, possibly, in another impact area.

Linda Crapo: P&Z Board Member – Linda Crapo asked Ivel Burrell 'how can expanding the area of impact from ½ mile to 1-mile possibly resolve any problems with the lot splitting. The same problems would exist whether it's ½ mile or 1-mile.

Karen Lords responded that, currently, the City of Island Park is not a straight line 500 feet on both sides of the old highway. There may be a portion of a single ownership parcel that lands in the City and a part of that parcel that has been decided to be in the County. These parcels/lots have been split off from the original parcel and a person(s) may have two or more new parcel numbers assigned now (one lot, or more, may be in the City and one lot, or more, may be in the County). As the Administrator for the County Planning & Building Department, she has to have some guidelines to determine the distinction between the City Boundaries, the Impact Boundaries and County jurisdiction. Within the Impact Areas, there has to be a definite Boundary Line determination made, in order to follow through with the appropriate ordinances, approval process for construction, building permit fees established, who to issue permits in the Impact Area, etc. The P&B Office cannot 'just guess' to which area any proposed construction is being applied for. This P&Z Board will need to decide whether the proposed boundaries 'ARE agreeable' or 'ARE NOT agreeable.

Ivel Burrell stated that the City of Island Park boundaries are not an adequate boundary in the first place. They need to have it surveyed.

Ray Stratford interrupted and made the comment that the City is being surveyed now.

Ivel Burrell stated that it WAS NOT being surveyed by a licensed surveyor. He is NOT surveying the pins – he's only doing a small section and is not doing the whole City area and Ivel wished to clarify that fact.

Rich Zimmerman: Mr. Zimmerman stated that he is the Island Park Village General Manager and attended the City of Island Park meeting and asked (the same as Big Horn Hills) to be excluded from the Impact Area for the same reasons. The City P&Z Board spoke as if this would be no problem because our subdivisions were totally self-sufficient. It came as a shock that the City Council Board didn't listen to the recommendations of their own P&Z Board and went ahead and included our two subdivisions within the Impact Area boundaries. Rich stated that Fremont County already has an excellent 'Sign' ordinance and doesn't feel the City of Island Park can justify the existence of their City Incorporation by claiming that if they (the Incorporated City) was not in existence, that the City would end up with Idaho Falls' 'Signing' problems. He recommended that the Impact Area be in the City Limits, as now. The boundaries of the City are already 32 miles too long.

Elizabeth Laden, Island Park News: Ms. Laden commented that since the state law, which initially stated that the recommendation was for a 1-mile radius from the city limits for an Impact Area, has changed... why is the city trying to encompass such a huge area? There are only 3 city council members and no mayor at this point and, therefore, requested that the County P&Z Board 'postpone or table' any decision for the Impact Area boundaries until the city of Island Park is more 'structurally sound' and/or decide whether they are going to disincorporate the city or not. If they disincorporate, this would be a 'moot' issue. If the city government is restructured, they then will have proper representation and time to review and decide what they and the residents of Island Park want to accomplish. She, highly

recommended, that this issue be 'tabled' until later or recommend the shrinking of the Impact Area boundaries.

Ms. Lords stated that the Board can table their decision or remand the proposal back to the Island Park City Council. If the Board decides to 'table' this issue, the county has a code that states that a decision has to be made within 60 days.

Chairman, Mike Davis, closed the Public Comment portion of this project and opened the discussion to the P&Z Board.

Dirk asked Karen if there was an option or requirement that the Impact Area has to be the same distance.

Karen advised 'no' and that the original recommendation to the City of Island Park was to focus on the Commercial nodes for future growth and development in the Island Park area and to encompass those areas to be in the Impact Area. There was a lengthy discussion by the Board on the recommended size of the Impact Area.

Kirk Mackert suggested that the City government get 'up to speed' for replacement of their current offices and Mayor position and then come back before the County P&Z. His recommendation is to remand the Impact Area Boundary issue back to the 'drawing board' with the City of Island Park and to renegotiate those suggested boundaries with the residents of Island Park and the City Officials.

Kurt Eidam motioned to remand the Impact Area Boundary proposal back to the 'drawing board' and for them to schedule another Public Hearing and allow the City time to get the Officers and a Mayor up to snuff on these issues. Dirk Mace seconded the motion and it was approved unopposed.

FINAL PLAT – HIGH TOP ESTATES – 13 LOTS, MATT GROVER/MIKE KRIEGER – ST. ANTHONY:

P&Z Administrator, Karen Lords, explained that this is the Final Plat for High Top Estates and consists of 13 lots. The county surveyor has reviewed the plat and has made any, and all, corrections so that they can go before the County Commissioners on Monday if approved by this Board.

Ms. Lords stated that the roads will be maintained by the homeowners and the utilities have been provided to the subdivision and have been noted as such. Karen has inspected the roads and they meet to County standards.

Mike Krieger and Matt Grover spoke to the Board on this project. There will be no 'storage water' provided to this subdivision and/or property owners. There was a brief question and answer session with no further issues to be addressed.

Chairman, Mike Davis asked if there were any further questions and there were none. Dirk Mace motioned to approve the Final Plat. The motion was seconded by Linda Crapo and was approved unopposed.

SKETCH PLAN – H/K CONTRACTORS – HOT BATCH PLANT – CRUSHING GRAVEL – 200 NORTH – KURT HANSON:

Karen briefly explained why there are several Sketch Plans on Gravel Pits on the Agenda. There has been a complaint filed on the Island Park Gravel Pit and in consulting with our Land Use Planner he threw a fact at her that the County can give Class I permits for Gravel Excavation, but when they go and start the process to actually Crushing Gravel, that requires a Public Hearing. She stated that she was fully to blame for the misunderstanding in the interpretation of the process of obtaining permits on these Gravel Crushing Pits. Two of these tonight, have been, previously, provided Gravel Pit permits, but now have to go to Public Hearing in order to crush gravel at their pits.

In the packet there was provided a copy of the Sketch Plan Review, an Amended Sketch Plan Review with the legal description and proposed site plan, a Hot Plant Lay Out & Flow Diagram and plat map showing the proposed development location. Karen stated that they have already been Crushing Gravel, through Karen's error of not knowing, and still learning, about Gravel Mine requirements. What they have asked is to put a Hot Batch Plant in there for asphalt. She briefly explained the proposed project and the requirements that they will have to meet by the State and Federal Agencies. They will need to abide by the County Gravel and Excavation hours – which are daylight hours only.

Kurt Hansen, representative for H-K Construction, spoke on the reasoning to move this project to Fremont County. The State of Idaho has decided to get out of the 'pit' business and now has no active gravel pits in Fremont County. The state's long term plan is to work on Highway 20 so they will need a source for that highway project. This pit will, also, accommodate growth in Fremont County, City of Rexburg and Madison County. Previously, these sources came out of Idaho Falls. This source has the

quality that is not found very often in Fremont and Madison County. It has been approved by the State for 'quality, durability and hardness' to meet their project needs. This project will require very little county services and will be totally self-contained with no power being needed. The equipment will be diesel generated and the project will be highly regulated by the State & Federal guidelines and we will submit expected permits, reclamation plans & inspections on a regular basis in the future. This will not be a 'year round' use plant, because of the snow season in this area.

There was a short question and answer session by the Board to Kurt Hansen. There were definite concerns and complaints about this gravel pit being in operation after hours and during the night. Karen suggested to the Board that a condition of approval be set for operating hours of 7 am to 7 pm only – in residential areas.

Chairman, Mike Davis, asked if there were any questions. There were none. Rich Zimmerman motioned to accept the Sketch Plan and to go forward to Public Hearing. The motion was seconded by Dirk Mace and was approved unanimously to go to Public Hearing in July.

SKETCH PLAN – FREMONT COUNTY – GRAVEL CRUSHING – FALL RIVER – HWY 20

In the packet there was provided a copy of the Sketch Plan Review, a proposed site plan/plat map showing the proposed development location and the legal description (Bargain and Sale Deed). Karen stated that the County purchased this property from Danny Maupin, 1/8th mile south of the Fall River Bridge. Because the public has been asked to go to Public Hearing on their Gravel (Class II) Permits, the County has decided to follow suit and do the same. The County is not crushing yet, but they have touched base with the other agencies and are meeting their requirements.

Weldon Reynolds spoke for the County and explained that this parcel has 14 mine able acres and a good source for chips & road base for the surrounding county. The County plans on crushing rock every other year, March & April usually. This year it will be in late July and August to prepare for next year. The working hours will be 16 hours per day, but will talk to ALL neighbors before setting hours of operation for crushing. The reclamation will be done on as much of this source as possible after each operation. The area is fenced and can be secured.

There was a brief question and answer session to discuss the reclamation plans and limiting the working hours from 7 am to 7 pm. Weldon Reynolds stated that the County would abide by whatever requirements the Board recommends.

Chairman, Mike Davis, asked if there were any questions. There were none. Kurt Eidam motioned to accept the Sketch Plan and to go forward to Public Hearing. The motion was seconded by Rich Zimmerman and was approved unanimously to go to Public Hearing in July.

SKETCH PLAN – GRAVEL CRUSHING OPERATION AND CEMENT BATCH PLANT – KEVIN SEIPERT/CARY SARGENT – 400 NORTH – ST. ANTHONY:

In the packet there was provided a copy of the Sketch Plan Review, a proposed site plan/plat map showing the proposed development location and the legal description. Karen stated that Kevin Seipert had been issued a Gravel Crushing permit back in 1998 and, therefore, this permit is pre-existing and cannot be revoked. This Sketch Plan is for the Cement Batch Plant only, which will be located within the confines of Kevin Seiperts Gravel Pit.

Mr. Seipert and Carey Sargent explained that there would be an estimated 7-8 trucks a day (estimated – if a busy day). The daylight hours would be 'doable' between 7 am to 7 pm – except in emergency situations. This process is a quiet operation. Kevin stated that he cannot even hear the plant going from his shop. It is a fairly clean operation with dust catches and this location is a more appropriate location than any other proposed site. They are already abiding by the DEQ rules and requirements and there are no concerns for changes. Any future growth possibility is at a minimum with 12 loads or less per day (on a best day). They explained that they need to get into compliance within 30 days, as they are hitting their peak season right now.

Karen said that if the Board has an extra P&Z Meeting in July, she would put this project in the first one – possibly on the July 7th, 2003 Agenda.

Chairman, Mike Davis, asked if there were any questions. There were none. Dirk Mace motioned to accept the Sketch Plan and to go forward to Public Hearing. The motion was seconded by Linda Crapo and was approved unanimously to go to Public Hearing in July.

SKETCH PLAN – GRAVEL CRUSHING – RAY PIERCE – HIGHWAY 87 – ISLAND PARK:

In the packet there was provided a copy of the Sketch Plan Review, a Reclamation Plan Application (dated June 3rd, 2003) from the Idaho Department of Lands, a letter from Forsgren Associates with the proposal and the required site information for this project.

Karen stated that this project had received a Class I permit back in June of 2002, but this project has had complaints. This project is located past Yellowstone Acres at Henry's Lake. Their goal is to make a pond for residential homeowners on a 10-year plan to finish the lake project. Mr. Pierce said that he could abide by the 7 am to 7 pm rule, but because this project is 1-1/2 miles from the closest residence and due to the short summer months to do construction, Mr. Pierce requested that he be given an exception to work later in the evenings – 9 pm would be enough time.

The Board discussed the extra length of time and the majority felt that this project can be justified to run later in the evenings. There would be no neighbors close enough to hear the trucks and the length of actual working time is substantially reduced because of the snow depth in that area of Island Park.

Chairman, Mike Davis, asked if there were any questions. There were none. Rod Dalling motioned to accept the Sketch Plan and to go forward to Public Hearing. The motion was seconded by Rich Zimmerman and was approved unanimously to go to Public Hearing in July.

ADMINISTRATORS REPORT:

Karen explained that the Synoran Institute Report is due back on July 25th. The organization meeting is tentatively set in Red Lodge, Montana on October 26th, 27th, 28th and 29th, 2003. A Team of 5-7 people from each county will be going. The team is to be comprised of: 1 or 2 County Commissioners, County Planning & Building Administrator, 2 – Fremont County Planning & Zoning Board Members, a representative from a couple of the cities within Fremont County (Island Park, St. Anthony or ?). Karen will find out more on this and get back to the Board.

There is a joint City of St. Anthony and Fremont County meeting scheduled on July 15th, 2003 at the St. Anthony City Building. A reminder letter will be sent out to all the Board Members.

CLOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION:

Karen asked that the Board go into Executive Session to discuss possible future litigations. Kurt Eidam motioned to go into Executive Session. The motion was seconded by Rod Dalling and was approved unanimously.

CLOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION

It was motioned by Dirk Mace to conclude Closed Executive Session. The motion was seconded by Kurt Eidam and was approved unanimously.

MOTION TO ADJOURN:

Linda Crapo made a motion to adjourn the meeting and it was seconded by Connie Ottesen and was approved unopposed. Meeting was adjourned at 9:33 p.m.