

MISSOULA COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES
January 18th, 2023 – 6:00 p.m. MST

Hybrid Meeting held in the Sophie Moiese Rm of the Missoula County Courthouse
and virtually over Microsoft Teams

MEMBERS PRESENT	ALTERNATES PRESENT	STAFF PRESENT	APPLICANTS PRESENT
Babak Rastgoufard – p Andy Mefford – p Ryan Schumacher – p Vanessa Gardner – non-participatory	Jonathan Haber – non-participatory ALTERNATES ABSENT Connor McMahon	Emily Andrea – p Jennie Dixon – p Tim Worley – p Heather Powers – p Laura Collins – p	Shauna Gappmayer – v Ben Olson – v Ron Martin Dent – p Eric Bostrom – p Gabriel McMurray – p
MEMBERS ABSENT Swarna Reddy	3 rd alternate seat vacant		

Please Note: “p” indicates physical attendance and “v” indicates virtual attendance.

Application materials, staff reports, written comment, and meeting video are available for review at Missoula County Department of Planning, Development & Sustainability (PDS). An administrative fee is required for photocopies. The digital agenda and corresponding documents may be found here:

[**CivicClerk BOA Jan 18, 2023**](#)

I. CALL TO ORDER

Board Chair, Mr. Rastgoufard, called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Ms. Powers called the roll. Four regular members and one alternate was in attendance. Seeing that a quorum would still be met, Mrs. Gardner and Mr. Haber excused themselves from the remainder of the meeting, due to health reasons.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Mr. Mefford moved & Mr. Schumacher seconded approval of the December 21st, 2022, minutes, as written.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were no public comments; no public was present.

V. STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Powers introduced Laura Collins, the new PDS Administrative Assistant. Administrative support for both the Board of Adjustment and Planning Board will be transitioning to Ms. Collins in the coming months.

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

a) 4867 Technology Ct - Peterbilt Sign Variance Request

Hearing continued from the Dec. 21, 2022, meeting.

STAFF PRESENTATION

The project is located at 4867 Technology Court and the applicant is Peterbilt, represented by Shauna Gappmayer, YESCO, LLC. New information was received from the applicant during the December hearing; the application request and staff report were updated, and the general public and adjacent property owners were re-noticed with the corrected sign dimensions. The sign package proposal includes six signs – one pole sign and five wall signs.

Updated Sign Package and Variance Requests:

- S2 – three wall signs
 - originally 29.2 sq ft each
 - now 66.4 sq ft each
- Variance #1
 - originally 643.24 sq ft
 - now 754.90 sq ft

New Public Comment

Reep, Bell & Jasper on behalf of Red Sock, LLC, withdrew their prior objection to the variance requests due to explanations provided by Peterbilt at the December meeting, including information that the signs would be automatically dimmed at night.

Brian Freeman on behalf of 836 Technologies Corporation: They object to the sign variance, stating the pole sign will be distracting, block view of the skyline, and degrade the appearance of the area, and the signage on the building will distract motorists – additional signage is unnecessary since motorists rely on GPS for navigation, and Peterbilt should be required to adhere to the Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&Rs) to protect other business' investments in the area.

Variance Review Criteria

1. The proposed variance will not authorize a use that is not already authorized in the zoning district.
2. The proposed variance will not authorize additional density beyond what is allowed in the zoning district.
3. Special conditions exist that are unique to the property, such as size, shape, topography, or location, which do not apply to other lands in the same zoning classification.
4. Literal enforcement of the provisions of these regulations will result in unnecessary hardship that is not of the applicants own making.
5. Granting the variance will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of these regulations and the *Missoula County Growth Policy* and will not be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare.
6. The request for the variance is not based on monetary factors or potential economic gain

Staff's Recommended Motions:

- **That** the Board of Adjustment **approve** the Variance Request from Missoula Development Park zoning regulations Section 6.08 E(3)(b)(i) and allow for a cumulative sign area of 754.90 sq ft, subject to the conditions of approval.
- **That** the Board of Adjustment **approve** the Variance Request from Missoula Development Park zoning regulations Section 6.08 E(3)(b)(vi) and allow for a night business pole sign with a sign face area of 177.6 sq ft, subject to the conditions of approval.
- **That** the Board of Adjustment **approve** the Variance Request from Missoula Development Park zoning regulations Section 6.08 E(3)(b)(vi) and allow for a night business pole sign with a height of 40', subject to the conditions of approval.

- **That** the Board of Adjustment **approve** the Variance Request from Missoula Development Park zoning regulations Section 6.08 E(3)(b)(vi) and allow for 5 wall surface signs, subject to the conditions of approval.

Recommended Conditions:

1. In accordance with the Missoula Development Park Section 6.08 E(3)(b)(iv), the proposed internally lit signs must be turned off when the business is closed.
2. All sign illumination must be designed to automatically dim after sunset and illumination must be limited to within the boundaries of the property and directed away from residential areas.
3. All other necessary permits administered by agencies other than the Department of Planning, Development & Sustainability shall be obtained by the property owner or designated representative. These permits may include, but are not limited to, building, zoning compliance, electrical, mechanical, approach, and sanitation permits.

This concluded the staff report.

Ben Olson, YESCO, spoke for the applicant. This sign package has been significantly reduced from the usual Peterbilt sign package due to consideration of the zoning and the surrounding area. He noted that the signs are not typically “auto dimming,” because they are not designed to project light; they have a backlit, internal illumination to make the sign visible.

BOARD QUESTIONS

Mr. Rastgoufard referenced the auto dimming consideration and inquired about light projection from the signs. Mr. Olson said that they’d determined that the nearby residential area was roughly 900 ft away from the signs. The signs glow and are visible but are not bright and projecting. Ms. Gappmayer added that the light does not go much beyond the signs themselves and would not project beyond the property line.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Sue Holden, who was not in attendance at the December meeting, asked for an explanation of why the applicant had requested a larger increase in sign size. Mr. Rastgoufard explained that public comment session was not a Q&A discussion period, and welcomed her to make a comment, noting that her questions may be answered during board discussion. Ms. Gappmayer offered that the pole sign height will allow it to be seen from the highway. Mr. Olson explained that smaller signs would look aesthetically weird on such a large building if they were to strictly adhere to the zoning.

BOARD DELIBERATIONS

Mr. Rastgoufard asked if the reference to CC&Rs in the public comment was applicable to this situation. Ms. Andrea answered that while covenants are common in most situations, PDS does not oversee the covenants, and she believes what was being referenced in the public comment was the general idea of following all the regulations. Covenants would not be likely to include sign details.

Circling back to the discussion regarding sign illumination, Mr. Rastgoufard asked for clarity regarding last month’s discussion and the applicant’s feelings on this condition of approval. Ms. Gappmayer explained that the “auto dimming” components only apply to their electronic message centers, LED billboards/readerboards with changing advertisements; she misspoke previously when using that terminology in connection with the sign package at hand. Mr. Rastgoufard asked if the condition concerning auto dimming would be superfluous or burdening to the applicant. Mr. Olson asked that the auto dimming condition be removed. Mr. Worley, PDS, suggested that the board could simply strike the auto dimming language from Condition 2.

Mr. Mefford concurred with Mr. Worley, and he suspected that other signs in the area did not dim, either – it is also difficult to quantify relative dimming.

Mr. Schumacher said he was fine with either keeping the language or removing it. He asked for a visual representation of the size changes of the signs before a motion was made. Ms. Andrea explained there were no changes to the schematic, only to the sq footage calculations. Mr. Olson confirmed that the building diagrams in the original packet were correct and to scale; it was the numeric labels which were incorrect and needed to be updated in the language of the variance request. Ms. Gappmayer noted that if they were to construct the signs to the original stated dimensions, then the signs would not fit architecturally on the building; they would be too small – it was a math correction that was needed.

Mr. Rastgoufard referenced the 826 Technologies’ comment about the pole sign and minimizing impacts on the view of the skyline, and he asked about the smaller rectangular sign “JGP” that sits below the main Peterbilt sign. Mr. Olson explained that JGP stands for Jackson Group Peterbilt, which is the owner of this facility. He pointed out that this pole sign is less than half the height of their usual signs and, at 40 ft in height, should not impact the skyline. For perspective, Ms. Andrea offered that the building itself is 38 ft high, comparable to the sign height.

Mr. Mefford pointed out that this parcel was an aggregated parcel, composed of several lots which could have each had 200 sq ft of signage – what is currently proposed may not be that far out of alignment with the zoning given how much cumulative signage could have potentially existed along this 10-acre tract. With an amendment to the language of Condition 2, he is prepared to make a motion to approve.

Mr. Schumacher felt that there had been sufficient discussion of the proposal and was ready for a vote to be called.

MOTION: Mr. Mefford moved & Mr. Schumacher seconded the four recommended motions of approval, as written, subject to three conditions – Condition 1 and Condition 3 were moved, as written, and Condition 2 was amended as follows: *“All sign illumination must be limited to within the boundaries of the property and directed away from residential areas.”*

A voice vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously.

This concluded the public hearing.

b) 4086 Sherman Gulch - Special Exception Request

STAFF PRESENTATION

Jennie Dixon, PDS

Applicants Ronald and Melanie Martin-dent have made a special exception request for a second principal structure at 4086 Sherman Gulch Rd.

- The subject property is an 11-acre residential tract bisected by Sherman Gulch Rd.
- Adjacent properties are varied in size, but comparable in use and in terms of being larger tracts, residential, timbered, and vacant land.
- The Clark Fork River is proximal to the Northwest of, but does not abut, the property.

Zoning

- This property is zoned AGRR-5 which allows one dwelling unit per 5 acres.

- In this zoning district, only one principal use is permitted per lot.
- Multiple principal uses may be permitted if approved as a special exception
 - This ensures that multiple principal uses are compatible with the character of adjoining adjacent properties.

Site Layout

- There is a driveway accessing to the home at 4086 Sherman Gulch.
- Across that road is a property that has several address points on it. The owners provided a comment letter asking for the second home to be placed further from the road

Slope Map

- The property contains areas that are steeply sloped and non-buildable as well as flatter, more buildable areas.
- The applicant has chosen a general location for the second structure that is most appropriate given topography and existing development.

Secondary Use Structure

- The applicants propose to place second principal use (manufactured home) on 11-acre tract for adult child.
- The proposed second home will meet all required building setbacks, height, and lot coverage requirements of the AGRR-5 zoning district.
- The area proposed for the driveway and the second dwelling is relatively flat, with observed slopes under 5%.
- A few trees will be removed to place the manufactured home on a flatter portion the property with a driveway access to the home.
- Public Works staff visited the site to ensure slope requirements could be met.

Special Exception Review Criteria

1. The proposed use or development will be compatible with and will not substantially injure the value of adjoining property
2. The proposed use preserves the character of the district, and the property is suitable for the use proposed (e.g., can meet the bulk and dimensional standards without requiring a variance).
3. The proposed use promotes the purpose and intent of the TIF Special District, where applicable.
4. Substitute or additional design standards will preserve and protect the area's architectural and aesthetic qualities.

Staff's Recommended Motion

I MOVE to approve the Special Exception Request to place a second home as a principal use on property located at 4086 Sherman Gulch Road, legally described as Lot 8 in Section 1, Township 13 North, Range 21 West, subject to the recommended condition of approval.

Recommended Condition of Approval:

All other necessary permits administered by agencies other than Planning, Development and Sustainability Department (PDS) shall be obtained by the property owner or designated representative. These permits may include but are not limited to, building, zoning compliance, electrical, mechanical, approach, and sanitation permits.

This concludes the staff report.

Applicant Ron Martin-Dent was present and provided reasoning for constructing additional structure on the property to provide housing for a close family friend and her two children. The proposed occupant has resided in the primary residence for approximately 15 years when the family moved away for work. The Martin-Dents plan to move back into the residence within the next couple of years and want to provide attainable housing for her and her children to live.

Mr. Martin-Dent also provided response to concerns from an adjoining neighbor on the location and visibility of the second dwelling. The selected location is the most buildable location on the property for a second dwelling, as well as minimally visible from the road. He suspects it could be moved no more than five feet further back from the road than the selected location without major issues. Mr. Martin-Dent thanked staff for their efforts.

BOARD QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Mr. Mefford asked how bullet three from the Special Exception Review Criteria (the proposed use promotes the purpose and intent of the TIF Special District) is applicable. Ms. Dixon confirmed it is not applicable in this situation.

Mr. Mefford also asked Ms. Dixon to indicate on the aerial photo the proposed location of the manufactured home. Ms. Dixon indicated the location and provided additional clarification: The intent of this approval with the conditions as written is to allow that home to be placed in that general location, but in compliance with AGRR-5 and not imposing any greater setbacks than anyone else would be subject to. Mr. Mefford asked what the setback requirements are. Ms. Dixon referred to the new zoning regulations which require setbacks in front for a principal structure twenty-five or more feet from the edge of the right of way or easement. Mr. Schumacher then asked if the property was previously zoned and so had similar classification, to which Ms. Dixon informed him it was.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments; no public were present.

BOARD DELIBERATIONS

Mr. Mefford asked if a new driveway will be constructed, and if so, will it meet the density requirement. Ms. Dixon said it will and offered an example: the applicants could have chosen to subdivide the property in compliance with zoning. However, they did not want a property line. So, multiple principal uses was determined to be appropriate and supportable given the criteria.

Mr. Mefford asked if there might be skew in the aerial photo of the property based on perceived proximity of a neighboring house to the applicant's parcel. Ms. Dixon agreed there is skew to the aerial photo. He also asked if the aerial photo depicts the three neighboring properties included in the comment letter. Ms. Dixon said they are, and that two comments were received from adjacent neighbors: one neutral and one in support of the request.

Mr. Rastgoufard expressed support for the applicant's request which meets the setback and density requirements and appreciated hearing the reasoning for the second structure and what its use will be. He asked Mr. Martin-Dent if the intent is for the second structure to be a permanent or otherwise in place for the indefinite future. Mr. Martin-Dent said the intent is for a permanent structure as long as they have ownership of the property. Mr. Rastgoufard cited a reference in the report about providing foundation. Mr. Martin-Dent said he is undecided whether to put it on a permanent foundation or not but is open to recommendation.

Mr. Schumacher seconded being in general support of this request.

Mr. Mefford stated that if approving the request approves the parcel in perpetuity for a second primary residence if the owners could tear both structures down and build two new primary residences in the

future. Ms. Dixon said he is correct. Mr. Mefford deferred on the matter of a permanent foundation and advised the applicant to comply with building codes and attain necessary permits, but that the board should not address the matter of a permanent foundation at this time. Mr. Rastgoufard and Mr. Schumacher concurred.

Mr. Schumacher asked if since the property could be subdivided and have single primary structures on each individual property, could the owner theoretically have four structures total if approved, realizing the applicants are only asking for two. Ms. Dixon stated that the property is not proposed for subdivision. If it were proposed for subdivision, and the two structures were already on the property, it would need to be in compliance with zoning and each tract would need to be five but that is not the current situation.

MOTION: Mr. Mefford moved & Mr. Schumacher seconded

I move to **approve** the Special Exemption request to place a second home as a principal use on property located at 4086 Sherman Gulch Rd. and legally described as lot 8 in Section 1 Township, 13 N, Range 21 W, subject to the recommended condition of approval: All other necessary permits administered by agencies other than PDS shall be obtained by the property owner or designated representative. These permits may include, but are not limited to, building zoning, compliance, electrical, mechanical approach and sanitation permits.

A vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously.

c) 3790 Highway 200 E, "The Local" - Special Exception Request

STAFF PRESENTATION

Jennie Dixon, presenting on behalf of Nick Zanetos, PDS

Cannabis Dispensaries in Neighborhood Center (NC) zoning districts are allowed through Special Exception approval only.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

- Proposed dispensary will be called "The Local"
- The application states besides selling recreational cannabis products, they also plan to sell other locally made goods
- Hours of Operation: 11am – 7pm, seven days a week minus major holidays
- The dispensary will be located in an existing tenant space that was previously occupied by a Diesel Mechanic Shop

Agency Comment

- The Missoula County Building Division commented that the proposal will require a "Change of Use" Building Permit as the previous tenant is considered a S-1 and the new proposal is classified as an M.
- The Air Program at the Missoula City-County Health Department commented that if growing or manufacturing is occurring on site, then they recommend mitigation efforts to limit the effects of odor associated with cannabis
 - ****No growing or manufacturing is proposed on site****
- MDT commented that there are no highway related comments or concerns based on the utilization of the existing commercial structure and parking spaces

Special Exception Review Criteria

1. The proposed use or development will be compatible with and will not substantially injure the value of adjoining property
2. The proposed use preserves the character of the district, and the property is suitable for the use proposed (e.g., can meet the bulk and dimensional standards without requiring a variance).
3. The proposed use promotes the purpose and intent of the TIF Special District, where applicable.
4. Substitute or additional design standards will preserve and protect the area's architectural and aesthetic qualities.

REVIEW CRITERIA LISTED IN SECTION 11.6.D.1.a.m.

1. Access, traffic, and parking demand created by or impacted by the use, and pedestrian, bicycle, and onsite vehicular circulation
2. Dedication and development of streets, right-of-way, and public areas such as sidewalks adjoining the property and the capacity to handle the use.
3. Impacts on or of public and private utilities or services.
4. Proposed siting of any new structures necessary to accommodate the use and their relationship to adjoining and surrounding properties.
5. Recreation opportunities and open lands available to serve the use.
6. Natural resource protections.
7. Landscaping and screening requirements.
8. Signage and sign lighting, as applicable.
9. Noise, vibration, outdoor lighting, and other on and off-site impacts resulting from the use.
10. Frequency of use and hours of operation.
11. Area of land necessary and adequacy of the site to accommodate the use and meet the intent of the district and character of the neighborhood.
12. Where applicable, how the proposed use addresses the purpose of the TIF Special District intended to attract, retain, grow and develop secondary value-adding industries.
13. Any other unique or relevant circumstances related to the property.

STAFF FINDINGS – CRITERIA #1

- Surrounding uses include residential and commercial uses.
- The project site contains one commercial structure with multiple commercial tenant spaces.
- The proposed cannabis dispensary is restricted to an existing tenant space in the existing commercial structure; no new structures are proposed at this time.

STAFF FINDINGS – CRITERIA #2

- The NC zoning district requires a 0'-10' build-to-zone for front yards and side (street) frontages. There are no other required setbacks for principal structures.
- The Missoula County Zoning Regulations define a legal nonconforming structure as a structure existing legally at the time of the passage of the Missoula County Zoning Regulations, which were adopted 7/1/22.
- The existing structure is considered a legal non-conforming structure in regard to build-to-zone compliance.
- The Missoula County Zoning Regulations allow legal nonconforming structures to continue in accordance with Section 10.5 of the Missoula County Zoning Regulations.

STAFF FINDINGS – CRITERIA #3

- Not applicable, the subject property is not located in a TIF Special District.

STAFF FINDINGS – CRITERIA #4

- The Missoula County Building Division commented that the proposal will require a “Change of Use” Building Permit as the previous tenant is considered a S-1 and the new proposal is classified as an M.
- The proposed floor plan includes retail floor space, one office space, a storage room, and one bathroom.
- The application indicates there are no proposed exterior modifications to the existing commercial structure.
- The Air Program at the Missoula City-County Health Department commented that if growing or manufacturing is occurring on site, then they recommend mitigation efforts to limit the effects of odor associated with cannabis.
- The application indicates there will be no cannabis cultivation or manufacturing on site, only the proposed dispensary.

STAFF FINDINGS – CRITERIA #5

- Landscaping
 - The site currently contains no frontage landscaping on Highway 200 E.
 - Section 6.4.B.2.b of the Missoula County Zoning Regulations exempts the proposed project from Chapter 6 landscaping requirements
- Signs
 - There is an existing pole sign located on the Highway 200 E frontage
 - There is also an existing wall sign on the western side of the structure
 - The applicants indicate they plan on changing copy to the existing pole sign but do not plan on adding any additional sign structures.

RECOMMENDED MOTION & RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Recommended Motion:

I move to approve the Special Exception Request to allow a Cannabis Dispensary in a Neighborhood Center (NC) zoning district, as presented in the proposed application, with the recommended conditions of approval in the staff report.

Recommended Conditions of Approval: All other necessary permits administered by agencies other than Community and Planning Services shall be obtained by the property owner or designated representative. These permits may include, but are not limited to, building, zoning compliance, electrical, mechanical, approach, and sanitation permits.

This concludes the staff report.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Sue Holden, Chair of the East Missoula Community Council: Ms. Holden thanked the applicants and staff for presenting at the January East Missoula Community Council meeting. She reported mostly positive public comments as well as concerns regarding the amount of development in East Missoula and the resulting traffic, as well as a proposed family apartment building development which spurred concerns of underage cannabis sales. She stated that the proposed owners pledged to take every precaution to prevent underage sales and to comply with the desires of the community. She also stated that while attendees of the meeting were generally supportive of a second dispensary, most individuals expressed a desired limit of two dispensaries given the community's density. She commended the owners for having presented their proposal and themselves well and stated the general consensus of the community and council is welcoming of the new business. Mr. Rastgoufard asked if Ms. Holden's comments were delivered in an individual capacity, representative capacity of the Community Council, or combination of both. Ms. Holden states that her

comments were delivered as the chair of the Community Council as well as in personal support of the proposal.

Christy Lawrence, owner of Hellgate Canyon storage, across the street from the proposed business: Ms. Lawrence stated that she trusted Ms. Holden's interpretation and endorsement of the proposal. She asked owners whether they will be installing security cameras at the dispensary to prevent theft. Mr. McMurray thanked Ms. Lawrence for her support and informed her they are taking multiple security measures, including the installation of deterrent security cameras to the exterior of the building, installation of security mesh in the building's door and window glass to prevent forced entry, and that the building is armed with a Vivint motion detection security system which will detect motion inside the building. He added that the business is required by the state to maintain hard drive storage of security footage for 60 days. Ms. Lawrence thanked him for the effort and explanation.

Ms. Holden cited concerns of possible criminal activity at neighboring properties and added that the Sheriff's Department had increased surveillance to monitor the issue. She reaffirmed her support given the level of security. Ms. Holden stated on behalf of the Council that she believes the applicants have a high probability of being a good tenant if they maintain their pledge and work with the community and thanked you Mrs. Lawrence for her comment and support.

BOARD DELIBERATION

Mr. Mefford clarified that only two zoning districts permit the business: Neighborhood Commercial and Civic Employment Center, and that the applicants are leasing from an owner. Ms. Dixon confirmed. Mr. Rastgoufard noted that had the applicants applied a year ago, they would not have been met with the same zoning requirements because it would have been permitted [use by right], [and thus would not have had to appeal to the board for a special exception]. Ms. Dixon confirmed.

Mr. Rastgoufard asked about the property to the North, given the NC zoning to the North and South, if it is storage or mobile homes and noted the proximity of structures to each other. Ms. Dixon confirms from her remote and field observations that it is mixed mobile homes with piles of materials. Mr. Mefford offered that it may be timber and other building materials. Ms. Dixon confirmed they're also homes. Mr. Rastgoufard clarified that the adjoining property owners were noticed of the proposal and Ms. Dixon confirmed.

MOTION: Mr. Mefford moved and Mr. Schumacher seconded

I move to **approve** the Special Exception request to allow a cannabis dispensary in a Neighborhood Center (NC) zoning district as presented in the proposed application with the recommended conditions of approval and the staff report: All other necessary permits administered by agencies other than PDS shall be obtained by the property owner or designated representative. These permits may include, but are not limited to building, zoning, compliance, electrical, mechanical approach and sanitation permits.

A vote was taken and passed unanimously.

VII. COMMUNICATIONS & SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS

There were no communications or special presentations.

VIII. COMMITTEE REPORTS

There were no committee reports.

IX. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

X. NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Worley shared that a board training is planned, likely in March. He asked for board feedback about the timing of a training and confirmed it would likely take no longer than 30-45 minutes. After some discussion, the board determined that a training presentation would be preferred during a regularly scheduled meeting rather than as an extra meeting.

XI. COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS

There were no comments from board members.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:41 p.m.

*Respectfully submitted,
Heather Powers & Laura Collins, Administrative Assistants, Lands and Communities
Please send any document requests to pds@missoulacounty.us*