

**FLATHEAD COUNTY PLANNING BOARD  
MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
APRIL 29, 2009**

**CALL TO  
ORDER**

A meeting of the Flathead County Planning Board was called to order at approximately 6:00 p.m. Board members present were Marie Hickey-AuClaire, Gordon Cross, George Culpepper Jr., Marc Pitman, Jim Heim, Mike Mower and Frank DeKort. Randy Toavs had an excused absence. Dianna Broadie, Andrew Hagemeyer and Jeff Harris represented the Flathead County Planning & Zoning Office.

There were 14 people in the audience.

**APPROVAL OF  
MINUTES**

DeKort motioned and Hickey-AuClaire seconded to approve the 3/18/09 and 3/25/09 minutes as corrected.

**PUBLIC  
COMMENT**

Cross reported Rita Hall's resignation and commended her for her time on the board.

Erica Wirtala, Sands Surveying, said her client, Pentelute et al (FZC 08-13), had presented a zone change request which had been tabled at a prior meeting. The board had decided to table the petition until a master plan amendment had been made. That amendment was on the agenda tonight and if the board had any questions under old business when they were discussing the zone change for Pentelute to call on her. She asked the board to untable the petition for the zone change and ride the master plan amendment and zone change together to the commissioners.

**WHITEFISH  
HILLS FOREST  
PH 2-5  
(FPP 09-01)**

A request by Whitefish Hills Forest, LLC for Preliminary Plat approval of Whitefish Hills Forest, Phases 2-5, a forty-nine (49) lot single-family residential subdivision on 524.050 acres. Lots in the subdivision are proposed to have individual water and septic systems. The property is located north of KM Ranch Road about 1.2 miles west of Highway 93.

**STAFF REPORT**

Dianna Broadie reviewed Staff Report FPP 09-01 for the Board.

**BOARD  
QUESTIONS**

Culpepper brought up the fact in the staff report, DNRC recommended the buyers be made aware to expect logging activity near the property boundaries. He did not see that fact mentioned in the findings.

Staff and the board discussed where the information was in the report.

Cross said the letter from DNRC concerned a tanker recharge system. He asked if that was included in the report.

Broadie said that stipulation was usually taken care of by the local fire department.

Cross wondered why staff omitted the comments from DNRC.

Broadie said staff felt the comments would be covered by the fire department's requirements on the final plat. The tanker recharge systems could be used to fight both wildfires and structural fires.

Cross had a question on the paving issue which related to the phasing of the project. He asked for clarification on the initial phases and the timelines for the rest of the project.

Broadie and Cross discussed the possible phasing of the project and the consequences for either Stelle or KM Ranch Road being used for the primary construction traffic.

Cross brought up the fact the developer offered to pave all of KM Ranch Road to the entrance of Whitefish Hills Forest. He asked if the paving required in the conditions was less than the distance offered with the paving of KM Ranch Road.

Broadie said the requirement was slightly less.

**APPLICANT  
PRESENTATION**

Eric Mulcahy, Sands Surveying, brought a physical model of the subdivision and presented it to the board to show how gentle the grades of the slopes were on the project. He concurred with most of the staff report. What he would like to address was a couple of the conditions, m & n, that were to be placed on the final plat. Condition m concerned CC&Rs. He felt that should not be a note but a condition on its own. He wanted to make sure the board knew that the CC&Rs were amended a couple of years ago as far as fence height because one of the owners in the subdivision owns jumping horses and the horses were clearing the fences. They allowed the fence height to be increased for that particular owner. All the other owners have their fences at the originally required height and were made of a smooth rail construction. The second condition was n. He did not know whether they

wanted a note on the plat that specified what was in n. He thought they would want a condition that said they would place buffers on the face of the plat around wetlands. He agreed with Broadie in that the local fire department was the one who signed off on the project. Since 90-95% of the proposal was in the Whitefish Fire District, he did already have some stipulations worked out. The fire department wanted each unit to be sprinkled, and a tanker recharge at the southern edge of the development. He knew there would be discussion and questions about the paving issue. There were concerns about both Stelle Road and KM Ranch Road on opposite sides of the development.

## **BOARD QUESTIONS**

Culpepper brought up an email public comment which voiced concern about the increase in traffic and asked Mulcahy to go over the traffic situation which may arise from the construction aspect of the project.

Mulcahy said he had not been out to the site on a typical day. He thought there could be a bit of traffic on the roads with the crews and machinery going to and from the sites.

Cross asked the applicant's opinion on the paving issue since it was more radical than what the applicant originally proposed.

Mulcahy said they felt KM Ranch Road was the number one priority. It was a long stretch of county road which had a fair amount of traffic on it. The developer owned a large stretch of land on Stelle Lane and they were currently working on a reconstruction of that part of Stelle Lane which bordered the property. They assumed that when they came in with a project for that piece of land, they would be paving the entire road in front of the development.

Cross said it could be several years before there was any extra traffic on Stelle Lane.

Mulcahy said they may want to swap phasing on phase 2 and 3. He did not want an assumption made that they would not be up near Stelle Lane first.

## **AGENCY COMMENTS**

Anne Moran, a planner from the Kalispell unit of the DNRC, had no objection to the project. They were very strongly in favor of staff's recommendation for notification on the plat of ongoing silvacultural use on their trust lands. They felt that neighbors

needed to know that the rifle range was an approved pre-existing use and in good standing.

**PUBLIC  
COMMENT**

Dick Hirschi 1065 KM Ranch Road, concerns were traffic, increased dust, when the road would be paved and how much of the road would be paved.

Denise Manning, 221 Old Ranch Road, concerns were the road impact, safety on the road, and the paving of the road.

Lee Gray, Broker with Century 21 Whitefish Land Office, represented a client, Kevin Brooks. His client's concerns were the paving of KM Ranch Road, dust and safety of the road. He thought the amount of paving due to the county's formula was not effective.

Patrick Sullivan, site manager for the developer, 760 Whitefish Drive, recounted the history of phase 1 with dust abatement and the paving issue. His concern was the management of the forest, the requirements for paving and gating of the road so people do not misuse the property farther beyond the pavement. He explained the necessary flow of traffic and turn around space for larger construction trucks. He liked the 50 foot buffer around the wetlands and witnessed the wildlife going over and under the higher fences. He wanted to see bear-proof containers for trash and a specific number of gallons for the tanker recharge station.

Lee Gray spoke again and reiterated his concerns about the use of the formula for paving and where the paving should go.

Denise Manning spoke again and reiterated her concerns about dust and dust abatement.

**APPLICANT  
REBUTTAL**

None.

**STAFF  
REBUTTAL**

Broadie said that they would not have a problem with the occasional deviation from the recommended height on fences for special circumstances.

Sullivan said their setbacks did take into account the pathways for wildlife.

Harris commented on the partial road improvements on both roads. When there was a traffic impact study which said there

would be an impact on both roads, staff felt they needed to take that fact into account when they recommended the paving.

**MAIN MOTION  
TO ADOPT  
F.O.F.  
(FPP 09-01)**

Pitman motioned and Hickey-AuClaire seconded to adopt findings of fact for FPP 09-01.

**BOARD  
DISCUSSION**

Cross said since the applicant stated they may switch phasing on the project, that affects the issue of paving and which road would take more of the traffic. He asked staff as to how they viewed such a switch.

Broadie said the phasing was part of the board's approval. If the phasing changed drastically, then the applicant would need to resubmit for the board's approval again.

Harris said if there was a change, the change would go directly to the commissioners.

Cross said there were dust issues on both roads which would be affected by the decisions on paving. There were several ways to recommend paving all of which hinged on which phase was slated for construction first.

The board and staff discussed the different options for paving and which was the better way to go.

**SECONDARY  
MOTION TO  
(Add F.O.F. #20)**

Pitman motioned and Hickey-AuClaire seconded to add finding of fact #20 to state; *The applicant has stated on the record that they would be willing to pave KM Ranch Road from the current edge of the pavement to the northwest corner of the Whitefish Hills plat.*

**ROLL CALL TO  
(Add F.O.F. #20)**

On a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

**SECONDARY  
MOTION TO  
(Add F.O.F. #21)**

Cross motioned and Hickey-AuClaire seconded to add finding of fact #21 to read; *The applicant is considering swapping phases 2 and 3.*

**ROLL CALL TO  
(Add F.O.F. #21)**

On a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD  
DISCUSSION**

Culpepper wanted to bring up the issue of bear-proof containers and that private haulers should be used instead of green box sites.

Cross said those issues were usually taken care of in the conditions.

**ROLL CALL TO  
ADOPT F.O.F.**

On a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

**MOTION TO  
RECOMMEND  
APPROVAL OF  
(FPP 09-01)**

Pitman motioned and Heim seconded to send a recommendation for approval on FPP 09-01 to the commissioners.

**MOTION TO  
(Add condition  
#25)**

Culpepper motioned and Pitman seconded to add condition #25 to state; *A statement shall be shown on the face of the plat and shall be included in the CC&Rs that states that bear-proof containers are required for garbage. [MCA 76-3-608].*

**BOARD  
DISCUSSION**

Cross asked Broadie if there was a condition on solid waste removal in the report.

Broadie said it was in the standard conditions. She said the commissioners did not want staff to be so specific on such issues. The condition was condition 19i

*Culpepper withdrew the motion.*

Cross asked if the condition on Whitefish Hills right now was to use a private hauler.

Mulcahy said it was a private hauler, but they were not required to be bear-proof containers. It was recommended to be bear-proof containers, but not in the covenants.

**SECONDARY  
MOTION  
(Add condition  
#25)**

Culpepper motioned and Hickey-AuClaire seconded to add condition #25 to state; *A statement shall be shown on the face of the plat and shall be included in the CC&Rs that states that bear-proof containers are required for garbage. [MCA 76-3-608].*

**ROLL CALL TO  
(Add condition  
#25)**

On a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD  
DISCUSSION**

Cross asked if revisions to 19m and 19n in the conditions were to appear on the final plat. He asked if staff wanted to work on the wording.

Broadie said the wording was fine, they needed their own numbers.

**SECONDARY  
MOTION  
(Amend condition  
#26 and strike  
19m)**

Culpepper motioned and DeKort seconded to amend condition #26 to read; *Revised CC&Rs should be submitted that reflect a change to the fencing requirements that meet requirements for FWP wildlife friendly fencing. [MCA 76-3-608]* and strike 19m.

**ROLL CALL  
VOTE  
(Amend condition  
#26 and strike  
19m)**

On a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

**SECONDARY  
MOTION  
(Add condition  
#27 and strike  
19n)**

Culpepper motioned and DeKort seconded to state; A wetland buffer of 50 feet shall be placed on Wetland 1 and Wetland 2 and shall be *shown on the face of the plat as a "Native Growth Protection Easement and No Build Zone."* [MCA 76-3-608]

**ROLL CALL  
VOTE  
(Amend condition  
#27 and strike  
19m)**

On a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

**SECONDARY  
MOTION  
(Amend condition  
#4)**

Cross motioned and Culpepper seconded to amend condition #4 to read; The applicant shall comply with reasonable fire suppression and access requirements of ~~both~~ *the DNRC, the Whitefish Rural Fire District, and the West Valley Fire District* as applicable for the portion of the plat in that district. A letter from those ~~at~~ offices stating that the plat meets the requirements of the both Fire Districts *and the DNRC* as submitted with the application for Final Plat. [Section 4.7.27, FCSR]

**BOARD  
DISCUSSION**

Cross said that the amended motion was normally covered, but the board did not usually see a request from DNRC and he did not want to see it fall through the cracks in the process.

The board briefly discussed the wording of the amendment.

**ROLL CALL  
VOTE**  
*(Amend condition  
#4)*

On a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD  
DISCUSSION**

The board, applicant and staff discussed at length what was best for the county and what was best for the residents around Whitefish Hills as far as paving went. The discussion included placement of paving, the formula used, the timing of the phases and the offer of the developer to pave KM Ranch Road.

**SECONDARY  
MOTION**  
*(Amend condition  
#23 )*

Cross motioned and Pitman seconded amend condition #23 to read; Offsite improvements to include ~~.45 miles of~~ paving on KM Ranch Road *from the edge of pavement near the intersection of Spring Prairie Road up to the northwest edge of Whitefish Hills Forest Phase 1 and .93 miles of Stelle/Big Ravine Roads* which shall be certified by a licensed engineer and constructed in accordance with the Flathead County Minimum Standards for Design and Construction prior to the completion of the first phase, Phase 2. [Section 4.7.9, FCSR]

**ROLL CALL  
VOTE**  
*( Amend  
condition #23 )*

On a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD  
DISCUSSION**

Cross asked Harris to bring up to the commissioners the fact if the applicant chose to change the phasing on the project, it would change the board's view on the application.

**ROLL CALL TO  
RECOMMEND  
APPROVAL**  
*(FPP 09-01)*

On a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD  
DISCUSSION**

The board discussed wording to take into account condition #23.

**SECONDARY  
MOTION**  
*(Amend FOF #8)*

Cross motioned and Pitman seconded to amend finding of fact #8 to read; *Adverse impacts to County maintained roads will be mitigated because the applicant will be required to pave KM Ranch Road.*

**ROLL CALL  
(Amend FOF #8)  
FLATHEAD**

On a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

A request by Flathead County to amend the Whitefish City-

**COUNTY**  
**(FPMA 09-01)**

County Master Plan 2020. The Growth Policy Amendment is to change the zoning designation from Limited Rural Residential to Highway Commercial. The properties are located off Highway 93.

**STAFF REPORT**

Andrew Hagemeyer reviewed staff report FPMA 09-01 for the board.

**BOARD**  
**QUESTIONS**

Cross asked if the county was the applicant as well.

Hagemeyer said yes they were.

Mower asked how the county would protect against strip development from developing both north and south of this commercial node.

Hagemeyer said if people started to pour in and wanted to change the zoning north and south, then the planning department could say they are developing a commercial strip which was not allowed. The county would not be applying for any more map amendments north of the site application.

The board and staff discussed the boundaries and definitions of the existing zoning, and the conformity of current sites to zoning.

**AGENCY**  
**COMMENTS**

None.

**PUBLIC**  
**COMMENT**

Erica Wirtila, Sands Surveying, pointed out which businesses were affected by the proposed map amendment on the map used as a visual aid.

**MAIN MOTION**  
**TO ADOPT**  
**F.O.F.**  
**(FPMA 09-01)**

Pitman motioned and DeKort seconded to adopt findings of fact for FPMA 09-01.

**BOARD**  
**DISCUSSION**

DeKort asked for clarification on the staff report. He asked if the sensitive areas were an overlay on the map.

Hagemeyer said it was a mapping error.

**SECONDARY**  
**MOTION**  
**(Add FOF #3)**

Cross motioned and DeKort seconded to add finding of fact #3 to read; *Sensitive areas will keep that designation.*

**BOARD  
DISCUSSION**

DeKort asked why the area was classified as a sensitive area.

Hagemeier said when the ground was frozen, it may hold some water.

**ROLL CALL  
(Add FOF #3)**

On a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

**ROLL CALL TO  
ACCEPT FOF**

On a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

**MOTION TO  
RECOMMEND  
APPROVAL &  
SIGNATURE IF  
NECESSARY  
(FPMA 09-01)**

DeKort motioned and Heim seconded to recommend approval of FPMA 09-01 to the commissioners and approve a signature if necessary.

**ROLL CALL TO  
RECOMMEND  
APPROVAL &  
SIGNATURE IF  
NECESSARY  
(FPMA 09-01)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**BIELENBERG &  
THORSRUD  
(FZC 09-01)**

A Zone Change request in the Bigfork Zoning District by Robert Bielenberg, Claudia Bielenberg-Thorsrud and Lloyd Thorsrud from SAG-5 (Suburban Agricultural) to SAG-20 (Suburban Agricultural). The properties are located at 295 and 273 River Bend Road.

**STAFF REPORT**

Andrew Hagemeier reviewed FZC 09-01 for the board.

**BOARD  
QUESTIONS**

Mower did not understand why the owner wanted to change the zoning designation to a larger acreage.

Hagemeier said the applicant felt they would be adding to the value of the property. It would preserve the function of the property and they felt the SAG-5 designation was inappropriate due to the shallow ground water. They do live on the property and had to obtain an easement on an adjoining property to put in a septic system. They felt in the long term if anything were to happen to them then they would be protecting the resources of the river.

Culpepper asked why when there was an application which went through a land use committee, the minutes from the committee

meeting was not included in their packet to review.

Hagemeier said it was due to the timing of when the packets were sent to the board and when the land use meetings usually occurred. That was why staff reported orally to the board the land use advisory committee's outcome.

Hickey-AuClaire said the committees email all the minutes to the board members.

Culpepper said the committees must not have his email address.

DeKort asked if there were two or three parcels involved.

Hagemeier said there were two, but the way the boundary lines were placed, it gave the appearance of three. He showed on the map where the two parcels were.

**APPLICANT  
PRESENTATION**

Claudia Bielenberg-Thorsrud explained the history of the land and the difficulty in obtaining a septic system. They have water quality issues with the Swan River and the Flathead River. She also reiterated she felt it was beneficial to rezone the acreage higher.

**BOARD  
QUESTIONS**

None.

**AGENCY  
COMMENTS**

None.

**PUBLIC  
COMMENT**

None.

**APPLICANT  
REBUTTAL**

None.

**STAFF  
REBUTTAL**

None.

**MAIN MOTION  
TO ADOPT  
F.O.F.**

Hickey-AuClaire made a motion seconded by DeKort to adopt staff report FZC 09-01 as findings-of-fact.

**(FZC 09-01)  
ROLL CALL TO  
ADOPT F.O.F.**

On a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

*(FZC 09-01)*

**MOTION TO  
RECOMMEND  
APPROVAL  
(FZC 09-01)**

Hickey-AuClaire made a motion seconded by DeKort to adopt Staff Report FZC 09-01 and recommend approval to the Board of County Commissioners.

**ROLL CALL  
TO  
RECOMMEND  
APPROVAL  
(FZC 09-01)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**COMMITTEE  
REPORTS**

Hickey-AuClaire from committee A said after their meeting with the commissioners on mapping, they were discouraged and not sure which direction they wanted to head. They decided to work on one map at a time. They decided they wanted to work on a water quality map. A question was brought up for them during this process as to how committees accept data from private individuals.

Pitman said the task of making a map on water quality was a huge project to take on.

Hickey-AuClaire said they were trying to decide what data to use and how to go about the whole task.

Harris said it was a huge undertaking committee A was trying to do.

The board and staff discussed the difficulties of the mapping project committee A was attempting.

DeKort brought up the fact that DEQ had a list of streams which were impaired. They had a list, but not a map.

Cross said within a short amount of time, someone could put together a map of all the streams in Montana. All the information was out there.

DeKort said another problem was there were not any county approved maps the board could turn to when considering applications.

Cross said moving towards an official map was a public process

where the public could come in and point out where potential errors were.

Hickey-AuClaire had questions about the process which was needed to get the maps approved and verified.

The board and staff discussed various options for map approval and verification.

Mower said Committee A might now have a place to start on their project by first figuring out the process, then going back and making a map to go through the process for approval.

Hickey-AuClaire asked what role Committee A would have with helping Committee B with public information, etc.

Cross said that the commissioners thought there was potentially an opportunity to educate the public on what planning in Flathead County was all about. It was an opportunity to have public opinion formed by something other than letters to the editor, public comment, etc.

Mower said it was an opportunity to be proactive with the public as to what exactly the steps were, what was possible with planning and what was not, and to not have views tainted by misinformation or political views.

The board and Harris discussed the opportunity to put together an official version of planning in the Flathead, especially with various neighborhood plans and the growth policy up for review in a couple of years coming to the attention of the public.

Hickey-AuClaire reiterated that it was very important that the committees present what they would like to do to the board before anything was done on their respective project so all the members were informed, up to date and had voiced their opinions on the projects.

Cross said Committee B was meeting on Thursday morning to look at all the different regulations as far as zoning, lakeshore, floodplain, and possibly ODP. At their meetings they had been getting updates from the respective planners who were working on the different regulations.

There was a short discussion as to whether or not the committee

meeting times were posted on the county website.

**OLD BUSINESS**

Cross said the first part of old business would be to talk about untabling the zone change petition by Pentelute et al (FZC 08-13).

The board discussed the history of the petition up to the current date and the process of taking it off the table.

**MOTION TO  
UNTABLE  
PENDELUTE ET  
AL  
(FZC 08-13)**

Pitman motioned and DeKort seconded to untable Pentelute et al (FZC 08-13) for discussion.

**ROLL CALL  
VOTE**

On a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

**MOTION TO  
CONTINUE  
PENDELUTE ET  
AL  
(FZC 08-13)  
UNTIL 5/13/09**

Pitman motioned and Culpepper seconded to continue Pentelute et al (FZC 08-13) until the 5/13/09 meeting under old business.

**BOARD  
DISCUSSION**

Hagemeier will send the staff report to the board members for review before the meeting.

**ROLL CALL  
VOTE**

On a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

**NEW BUSINESS**

Pitman said there was a new committee called the Flathead River Committee. His concern was there were a lot of committees in the valley whose meetings and decisions affected what the planning board did and there was no mechanism in place for the board to receive updates on what the other committees were deciding. He wanted to ask the commissioners for the board to be updated on the other committees' decisions so the board could stay in tune with what they were doing. He gave examples of commissioner appointed committees he was aware of.

Mower said those committees were not responsible to the planning board but reported directly back to the commissioners

and that had been a concern of his before.

Culpepper was frustrated because all these other committees were being formed and he felt it took the teeth out of what the planning board was trying to do.

The board discussed their role in the overall process, what control they had and if they needed to know what the other committees were doing.

Harris said the planning board was statutory and had duties which were well defined. If the committees did anything which was going to be part of a county plan, it had to come through the board so they were involved. They had the authority to either make a positive or negative recommendation to the commissioners or change it.

Several members of the board expressed their frustration and feelings of being left out of the loop or being powerless in this situation.

Culpepper expressed his feeling of frustration at the lack of communication and the thought that if there were better communication, then the board could better help everyone involved and affected by the decision making process.

Harris explained how the Flathead River Committee was formed and why.

Culpepper said it was his understanding that the committee would create their own bylaws. They did not care what happened in the North Fork of the Flathead River, all they wanted to be concerned about was the riprap which occurred after the Old Steele Bridge. He said it was a problem and would be problematic in the near future.

Harris said the commissioners would have to decide who they were going to put on the committee.

The board discussed if there were people on the board who wanted to sit on the other committees.

The board and Harris discussed the topics of river erosion, the possible causes of erosion, possible bias of the members of the

committee and whether or not the commissioners had an agenda for the Flathead River Commission.

The discussion again turned to the question of if there were members on the board who wished to be included on the other committees.

Harris said he would let the commissioners know there was a feeling of a lack of communication between the planning board and commissioners. If someone on the board wished to be on the committees, then they could put their hat in the ring with everyone else. If the planning board directed him, then he would go back and ask if the commissioners would make a seat assignment on the committee for a planning board member.

Cross said it entirely depended on what the scope was of the group. They did not have to have a seat on every board.

Pitman brought up the fact that since it was a public meeting, then a member of the board could attend the meeting for information if that was all they were after.

Harris handed out handouts which concerned difficulties with LED billboards other areas are dealing with. He said he would bring the hand out to committee B as well at their meeting. He brought up several bills which had been passed. He referenced HB 46 and explained it briefly. He also said sand and gravel resources now needed to be identified as part of the growth policy. He also mentioned after preliminary approval was granted, the applicants in the past could go to final plat without making improvements. Now, the county could require a portion of the improvements be finished before final plat was approved. The bill's name was HB 486. It included changes to the zoning process, to setting up a planning and zoning commission, and several other changes. Another bill essentially fined county governing bodies if they did not process subdivisions within the statutory guidelines, and the fines went back to the applicant. Flathead County did not have that issue like a lot of the other counties in the state because they paid attention to the timelines. He would get the board copies of the bills in the next two weeks.

The board took a poll on who would be able to attend the 5/13 meeting. Pitman, Hickey-AuClaire, Culpepper and Heim would

be attending.

Culpepper asked when a replacement for Hall would be in place.

Harris explained the timeline and process and said it could happen that the new appointee would be able to attend the 5/13/09 meeting if things moved rapidly.

The board discussed possible dates for the Committee B meeting and when the open meeting law applied.

**ADJOURNMENT** The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:25 pm. on a motion by Pitman. The next meeting will be held at 6:00 p.m. on May 13, 2009.

---

Gordon Cross, President

---

Donna Valade, Recording Secretary

*APPROVED AS SUBMITTED/CORRECTED: 6/10/09*