

Missoula Board of County Commissioners

PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES COVER SHEET



THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 2021 – 2 PM

Hybrid meeting – Missoula County Courthouse Annex Sophie Moiese
Room/Microsoft Teams

[Click here to view the meeting recording.](#)

Time stamps (in green) correspond to meeting recording above. Please click to
the time stamps listed to view a particular item in the meeting.

ATTENDANCE:

Commissioners Present:

Chair Strohmaier
Commissioner Slotnick
Commissioner Vero

Staff Present:

Violet Plummer, Administrative Assistant, Commissioners' Office
John Hart, Civil Deputy Attorney, Attorney's Office
Heather Powers, Administrative Assistant, Community and Planning Services
Kyla Lehnerz, Administrative Assistant, Commissioners' Office
Mel Fisher, Strategic Initiatives Manager, Communications and Projects
Tim Worley, Senior Planner, Community and Planning Services
Anna Conley, Chief Deputy Civil Attorney, Attorney's Office
Bailey Minnich, Planner, Community and Planning Services
Nick Zanetos, Planner, Community and Planning Services
Donna McCammon, Administrative Assistant, Community and Planning Services
Allison Franz, Communications Manager, Communications
Jamar Galbreath, Equity Coordinator, Commissioners' Office

1. **CALL TO ORDER** *[Time stamp – 00:00]*
2. **LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT** *[Time stamp – 00:43]*
Missoula County acknowledges that this event takes place in the aboriginal territories of the Salish and Kalispel people.
3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** *[Time stamp – 00:58]*
4. **PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS** *[Time stamp – 01:18]*
 - a. [Proclamation: Juneteenth](#)

5. **PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA** [Time stamp – 05:16]
[None]

6. **CURRENT CLAIMS LIST** [Time stamp – 05:22]

Claims received as of May 25, 2021 to May 31, 2021 by the Commissioners' Office total \$1,179,084.46.

7. **HEARINGS**

a. **Neis-Moran Family Transfer** [Time stamp – 06:06]

Nick Zanetos, Planner, Community and Planning Services

Commissioner Slotnick made the motion that the request by Rachelle Moran to utilize the family transfer exemption to create and transfer one parcel to her mother, Debra Sorenson, as presented in the exemption application and affidavit, be approved.

Commissioner Vero seconded.

[Motion passed 3-0.]

[Letter 2021-150 Mailed to: Rachelle Moran.]

b. **Bourdon Family Transfer** [Time stamp – 15:30]

Nick Zanetos, Planner, Community and Planning Services

[Public hearing left open. Application eventually withdrawn by applicants, and Boundary Line Relocation application submitted instead.]

c. **Alexandra Estates Phasing Plan Modification and Condition Amendment** [Time stamp – 46:32]

Tim Worley, Senior Planner, Community and Planning Services

Commissioner Vero made the motion to approve the Alexandra Estates Phasing Plan Modification and Extension.

Commissioner Slotnick seconded.

[Motion passed 3-0.]

Commissioner Slotnick made the motion to approve amendments to Conditions 9 [with amended language presented by the applicant's representative], 10, 11 and 12, related to elimination of the non-motorized pathway along the subdivision frontage of Highway 93.

Commissioner Vero seconded.

[Motion passed 3-0.]

Commissioner Vero made the motion to approve amendments to Condition 18, related to the Weed Management Plan, subject to staff's recommended changes.

Commissioner Slotnick seconded.

[Motion passed 3-0.]

[Letter 2021-175 Mailed to: Jamie Erbacher]

8. OTHER BUSINESS *[Time stamp – 1:17:07]*
[None]

9. ADJOURN

Chair Strohmaier – Called the meeting to adjourn at 3:17 p.m.

BCC Public Meeting June 10, 2021 – Transcription

This transcription was produced by transcription software. There may be discrepancies between this transcription and meeting dialogue. You can view the recording of the meeting on the county's YouTube channel: <https://www.youtube.com/c/missoulacounty> or contact the commissioners' office to obtain a copy.

[00:00:56] All right. Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to the Thursday, June 10th meeting of the Missoula Board of County Commissioners. Things are a little different these days we are meeting in person for the first time in over a year and trying this hybrid meeting format where there are folks joining us online and also folks in the room here. Please bear with us if there are a few glitches, but so far, so good one minute into the meeting. So bear with us. And at this point in time, as per tradition, I would like to make a land acknowledgement. And this is that Missoula County acknowledges that this event today takes place in the Aboriginal territories of the Salish and Kalispell people. Would you please join me in the Pledge of Allegiance? I pledge allegiance to the flag

[00:01:51] Of the United States. And to the Republic for. One Nation. It is all a small.

[00:02:06] All right. Any public announcements today? We do have a proclamation to read, would one of my colleagues be? Hang on a second here.

[00:02:33] Sure. Ok. Whereas Missoula County acknowledges the lasting impacts of racism in the United States, fueled largely by the horrific institution of slavery and whereas news of the end of slavery did not reach frontier areas of the United States and in particular southwestern states for more than two years after President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation of January 1st, 1863 and months after the conclusion of the Civil War. And whereas on June 19, 1865, union soldiers led by Major General Gordon Granger arrived in Galveston, Texas, with news of the Civil War had ended and that the enslaved were free. And whereas African-Americans who had been slaves in the Southwest celebrated June 19th, commonly known as Juneteenth Independence Day. As the anniversary of their emancipation. And whereas African-Americans from the Southwest and across the country continue the tradition of Juneteenth Independence Day as inspiration and encouragement for future generations. And whereas more than one hundred and fifty years June excuse me, for more than a hundred and fifty years, Juneteenth Independence Day celebrations have been held to honor African-American freedom while encouraging self-development, respect and dignity for all people and where, as a strength of character, faith and resilience demonstrated by former slaves remains an example for all people of the United States, regardless of background, religion or race. And whereas the character demonstrated by former slaves should inspire us in this country to give thanks for the freedom won by so many people in all nations, and to strive for the goals of bringing freedom and democracy to people of other countries, no matter what their race or religion. And whereas although Juneteenth Independence Day is beginning to be recognized as a national and even global event, the history behind the celebration should not be forgotten. And whereas Montana proudly joins forty seven states and the District of Columbia observing Juneteenth as a state of ceremonial holiday, excuse me, as a state or ceremonial holiday. Therefore, be it resolved, we Missoula County and the city of Missoula do hereby proclaim the 19th of June as Juneteenth Independence Day to commemorate African-American emancipation from slavery, to celebrate the freedom won by people in many countries, and to rededicate ourselves to the cause of liberty.

[00:04:43] Thank you, Juanita. And it's my mic working for folks. Can you hear out there? Ok, I just need to get a little closer. So I failed to introduce ourselves earlier. For those of you out there in the viewing audience, I am Dave Strohmaier. I am chair of the commission. This year, I am flanked on my left. You're right by Commissioner Josh Slotnick and on my right, your left by Commissioner Juanita Vero. Next, we have on our agenda public comment on items not on today's agenda. And just by way of our hybrid meeting format. If you are in the room physically in the Sophie Moiese room and the Missoula County Courthouse, and at any point where public comment is relevant on a particular item. Just come on up and queue up behind the podium and we'll take you in order. If you are out there in the virtual world. Joining us via Microsoft Teams, please use the raise hand function and we will call on you in the

order in which you raise your hand or if you're on the phone, just unmute yourself. Star six, I believe. Is that correct? Violent unmute yourself and chime in when you can at the appropriate time. So any public comment on item is not otherwise listed on our agenda. All right, see none of our current claims list, and this would be claims received as of May twenty fifth. Twenty twenty one through May thirty first. Twenty twenty one by the Commissioner's Office total one million one hundred and seventy nine thousand eighty four dollars and forty six cents. We have three public hearings today and for each of these we will open with a staff report that would be followed by comments from or a presentation by either the applicant or the applicant's representative. It would be then followed by public comment. We'll close the public hearing, opening it up for questions from the commission, and that would be followed by a motion and debate and vote. So without further ado, I'll open the first public hearing. This is the nice Moran family transfer. Nick, would you like to introduce this for us?

[00:07:20] So this is a proposal by Rich Moran to use the transfer exemption to the Montana Subterranean Planning Act, starting with the quick background of the project, the location of the fatallly transfers off Broughton Drive, which is approximately one mile to the east of U.S. Highway 93 north in the foothills leading up to Everett Hill property, is currently on zoned. The growth plan that covers this area is the 2019 land use element. That plan does this. This track as working lands with a recommended density of one dwelling for 160 acres to one dwelling for 40 acres. Property is 40 acres in size. There's currently a one home on the property occupied by the claimant Rachel Moran, and there's one that detached shop structure as well. Current density is one dwelling for 40 acres. The first family transfer would result in the claimant's mother, Deborah Sorenson, receiving a 20 acre track, which is Pros Track Be the claimant Rachel Moran would retain ownership of the remaining 20 acres proposes A.. And this does include the home and shop structure. Deep both the chancellor would exceed the 2019 lady's element, recommended recommended density at one dwelling for 20 acres, and the application states that all tracks intend intended to mean rural residential. The application was sent out to Missoula County agencies for comment.

[00:09:06] The only comment received was from the health department, which commented that this project would would require sanitation review for Title 76 for. Now, as with every band, the chance of proposal, I would go over the rebuttable presumptions and general criteria points triggered in staff analysis. Generation number 14 is it is the proposed division incompatible with the good policy and this this is applicable current density is one dwelling for 40 acres and the recommended density is one point for 40 acres. The proposal would result in a would result in a new density of one dwelling for 20 acres, which would exceed the recommended density. Next, I will go over the family and transfer questions with the claimant. I think I saw the claimant Rachelle Moran online here, but could have you unmute? We can go over these questions. Yes, I'm here. Perfect, thank you. First, I'll ask you to state your name for record. Rachelle Moran Thank you. Question number one, did you buy the property with the intent of dividing it? No question. Number two, do you or your transferase intend to transfer the property within the next year? No. Question number three, have you talked to anyone at the county about going through the division review?

[00:10:42] No, not yet.

[00:10:45] Thank you. Question four Because it is not a minor, so we will go over these last two questions. Question for will the property be developed? As in getting, yeah, structure on it. Yes. My question or five, well, the recipient of the property be residing on the property. Yes. Thank you. And then based on staff analysis, Capps is recommending approval of the proposed contract transfer. I'll turn it back over to you, commissioner.

[00:11:21] Thanks, Nick. Mrs. Moran. Do you have anything else that you'd like to add? And you may be muted. I'm not sure.

[00:11:42] Yep, we can hear you now.

[00:11:44] No, not at this time.

[00:11:47] Ok, thank you. Is there any public comment on this proposed family transfer? Ok. Cnn will close the public hearing questions from the commission on this.

[00:12:00] Hey, Nick, can you

[00:12:02] Take us back to where we are and can we get a sense of the development in the area?

[00:12:09] Would that be

[00:12:09] So this is Bronson drive here, we must zoom out. So we have have I not three doors and we're in the foothills leading up to over a hill. We have the Y down here to the south and just zooming in on the immediate development area.

[00:12:39] Ok, and Rachelle, this is for your mother, right? Is that? Yes. Ok, great. Thank you.

[00:12:50] Anything else Juanita? So, Nick, I have a question. As you were reviewing this, clearly one of the evasion criteria that is triggered is the significant departure from the growth policy and the recommended density for this area. Were there any other natural resource concerns that folks had with what arguably is fragmentation of a fairly intact landscape here?

[00:13:26] I did not receive any comments based on a wildlife habitat. No.

[00:13:34] Ok, and no other concerns beyond non lack of of compliance with the growth policy. No other concerns.

[00:13:48] No, that was the only trigger sorry. The only point that was triggered during staff analysis. Everything else was compliant with our rebuttable presumption and general evasion criteria. Points.

[00:14:02] Ok, thank you. Other questions? Ok, Nick, would you provide us or whoever is driving this, provide us with the motion again?

[00:14:18] Sorry, back to that. Should be on your screen now.

[00:14:35] Thank you. Happy to do this one. All right. I would move that the request by Rochelle Moran to utilize the family transfer exemption to create and transfer one parcel to her mother, Deborah Sorensen, as presented in the exemption application and affidavit, be approved. Second.

[00:14:55] Further discussion. I would just say that I am generally reluctant to approve these sorts of things when there's significant or substantial lack of compliance with the growth policy and there is in this case, I worry that we find ourselves in a situation of death by a thousand cuts with large intact tracks being carved up this way. That said, we did not hear any additional concerns from staff as far as the proposal as presented. Let's go ahead and vote. All those in favor of the motion please signify by saying I. Ok, thank you, Miss Moran.

[00:15:47] Thank you. Oh, and also my mom's name is spelled wrong that

[00:15:54] What is the

[00:15:56] Letter

[00:15:57] And her last name? Nice. Not Sorensen.

[00:16:02] Well, does she wish her name was Sorensen? Ok, we can. We'll fix that. Thank you so much.

[00:16:13] Ok, thank you. All right. Goodbye.

[00:16:19] Moving right along our next public hearing, which I will open is the Bourdon family transfer. Nick, would you please provide the staff report for us?

[00:16:29] Yeah. So this is it. Proposal by Helen Bourdon to use the family temporary exemption to the Montana's Subdivision of Planning Act, starting with the background, the location of the proposed family transfer is within Flathead Reservation boundaries, which is on the east side of Highway 93 north near the top of every hill property is currently on zoned. The growth plan that covers the area as the 2002 Regional Laney's Guide, which designates this track as an open and resource with a recommended density of one billion for 40 acres. Property is sixty nine point

six acres in size and currently undeveloped. The claimant, Halliburton owns three additional tracts adjacent to and in the general vicinity of the proposed gambling transfer site. The claimant Miss Borden lives a fifty to thirty two musket lane. There's also a tourist home, but look at it on this parcel and that is the island parcel in the middle here that with the arrow pointing to it. The family transfer proposal would result in the claimant's adult son, Damian, receiving eight thirty seven point forty three acre track process track to any one, the claimant Helen Burdon would retain ownership of the remaining thirty two point one seven acre track acres track 10 to. The Bush family transferred would exceed the recommended density of the 2002 regional land use got it with a proposed density of one dwelling for thirty four point eight acres. The application states that all tracks intended to remain rural residential. The allegation is to send out teams of county agencies for comment. The water quality district commented that the area is known for high groundwater, and they recommended that they get in contact with the health department to to to conduct groundwater monitoring.

[00:18:38] The application was also sent out to the Confederate states of Scrutiny Tribes for comment. I think we received comment from the Wildlife Management Program that they do have records of group grizzly bears passing through the area. However, they do not see any adverse impacts to wildlife or wildlife habitat with the project. As with every family of proposal, I will go over the rebuttable presumption and general invasion criteria for one's trigger during staff analysis. Rebuttable presumption, number four, was found to be out of pool. The claimant owns the three it just on tracks adjacent to and in the general vicinity of the Post family transfer parcel. Apparently, relocation could be utilized to achieve the goals of the family transfer exemption without the creation of an additional lot. Generation before also Apple caps his record of 18 Majors subdivision called Cougar Ranch, which was proposed on the site of the other the proposed family transfer in approximately 2006. Internal records indicate that the project made it to the neighborhood phase of development, and it is. Our records do not indicate that this project made it any further than this stage of development. Castle also has a record of an improved gravel operation involving the chance of PRESSO and the parts of the North. Satellite imagery shows that the gravel pit operation may be fully contained to the president of the North. However, current records did specifically call out the geocode of the proposed family transfer site. General Vision Point or five, this is applicable to us six seven seven one zero six five nine zero six five six two zero six five four zero seven or hour are all exempt transactions involving the original track that the claimant has engaged with.

[00:20:42] These are all bank online relocations, with the exception, of course, 671, which is a barren, long relocation and and aggregation exemption generalization number six. This is applicable. The claimant has utilized for exemptions involving the proposed family transport truck and the adjacent tracks in the claimant's ownership. As previously mentioned in Suez, six seven seven one zero six five nine zero C was five six two zero and C was five four zero seven. These exemptions, when combined with the proposed container transfer, do show a pattern of utilizing it, utilizing exemptions to create the equivalent of subdivision without subdivision review. General Number 10, this abiteboul a battle every location could be utilized to create a backing track for Damien to build on the 14. This is, well, current density is one drawing for six nine point six acres, which is compliant with the one 440 designation recommendation. Sorry. Do you propose family transfer would further exceed the recommended density at one point four thirty four point four acres? Known as generation number 19, the information and exhibits provided by the claimant showed that the proposal for a film transfer exemption does not comply with the requirements established in the Sub Sub Regulations for the use of this exemption. And now I would go over the weekend to answer questions about the claimant, believe Helen is in person there today? Yes.

[00:22:23] Helen, if you could come up to the podium and

[00:22:29] Right on the front of the mic

[00:22:36] One. Thank you.

[00:22:40] Okay, thank you. Can I please ask you to state your name for the record?

[00:22:44] Well, Helen Bourdon,

[00:22:48] You question number one, did you buy the property with the intent of dividing it?

[00:22:53] You mean the parcel that we are talking about for the family transfer? Correct. Ok. No, I bought this. I bought this what I call the lower ranch, which were the two meadows, the one we are talking about and the one which is north. You know, I bought it as a ranch in 1998.

[00:23:16] Thank you. Question number two, do you or your transferase intend to transfer the property within the next year? No, no. Question three, have you talked to anyone at the county about going through subdivision review?

[00:23:33] There was this this thing that dating back to 2006 that you mentioned? I mean, I had absolutely no idea how you have in your file 18 lots. What I remember, you know, talking was the Nick Kaufman who was helping me with the was the planning. We were talking. We are thinking about doing four lots in this meadow. But my neighbor, Bill Magouyrk, raised such an opposition. I even had death threats, so I backed off.

[00:24:10] Thank you. Questioner for what the property be developed

[00:24:15] Only to put a house house, probably a lawn and then, you know, farming.

[00:24:22] Thank you. And last question, questioner five, what the recipient of the property be residing on the property? Yes. Thank you. Less chance of questions based on staff analysis, perhaps the recommended denial of the Fit family transfer, and I will turn it back over to you, commissioner.

[00:24:45] Thank you, Nick. Miss Bourdon, would you like to add anything?

[00:24:48] Yes, I was. I was. I mean, I exchanged emails with Nick before, and I'm surprised that some of the information that's in, you know, the county computers because it's, you know, for example, this gravel pit. I did have an offer to to have the North Meadow near my house be dug up for about, you know, about 10 15 acres in the days when Highway 93 was being fixed up in 290 to 2008 2009. They offered the company doing the the work of me, a gravel contract because the gravel there was very good. However, all the neighbors decided that it would detract from their lifestyle and get an injunction, so the contract went to the city scrutiny tribes, which cleared 40 acres next to the ranch for gravel. So it's not on my property is it's just an I see it every day because nothing has been reclaimed, but it's some tribal land. I mean, that's that's kind of one of the oddities of the records. Also, I maybe we should look a little bit at the history of this franchise. I mean, I love, you know, digging into history and can you

[00:26:14] Take us to the property again while she's speaking?

[00:26:17] So we know where you like to see some of the maps I wrote.

[00:26:20] Sure. If you could bring bring it up, that would be great.

[00:26:25] And zoom out a tad. Ok, thanks.

[00:26:29] Thank you. Thank you.

[00:26:38] But there has been so much going on in that area, that's. I think it's important to refer to maps. I'm a map

[00:26:46] And we can we can share this copy if you. And.

[00:26:54] So this match was scheduled.

[00:26:57] And and just so you don't have to repeat yourself, if you could talk into the microphone, please.

[00:27:07] Ok. So, yeah, the history is fascinating. This ranch and the Mercer ranch, which comes south of it. We have a common fence, was settled on nineteen forty five eighteen forty five, 1850. And as far as I could tell from my girls, we know with the help of the NRC, it was then wrenched by somebody little soul. And there were two other rights little Solon and Mercer. When when I came along with my husband in the 1970s and I bought twenty eight girls at that point, the ranch had been taken over from. It was in the hands of an older woman. We just couldn't cope with it. So she sold the two and 220 acres of the ranch to a local doctor, Dr. Dougherty, who cut it up in like 20 20

acre pieces, technical pieces, five acre pieces. So I bought twenty. And and then moved away because because of work situations, anyway. Meanwhile, you know, the property was cut up in smaller pieces and I had I had contacts in Missoula who told me when a piece would come up for sale. I bought it. So basically, I found myself. When I came back to live here in '96, I found myself with one hundred and sixty acres of, you know, a jigsaw of pieces and.

[00:28:45] I tried to I did develop, I did make some lots, but I always tried to do it in a manner that did not detract from the specific beauty of the place. And I was actually I saw an invitation to Nick to come and look because you drive down musket lane and you just see the property the way it was basically in the seventies. There are some I think that some of the some of the CEOs that that Nick was referring to don't. There was nothing to do with me. Must have been some of the neighbors, you know, when they cut up there, there are 20 acre pieces and sold them. I'm at the point I'm in my 70s now, and I'm at the point where I want to do them, I mean, I want to get into the final planning for the ranch. So I have last year I had a service company. Northwest Northwest, a survey I had them do a 47 acre wildlife corridor because where the ranch is located, it's like it's in the middle between the mountains and the highway, and I thought it was important to have this kind of weird shaped piece of land.

[00:30:02] But it is 47 acres, which gives a corridor for wildlife from the mountains to go down to a wetland area, which I own, which has the east fork of quake and then springs and obviously is of great importance to wildlife. It that that doesn't show on the plots you have here, it's you know. And and yes, there is this this middle, which is on the south side of the musket lane and it's not connected to the rest of the ranch, there is musket lane in between. And I thought it would be a great place for my son and his wife to to start to build something. And as they can afford it and and do some some other farming that he loves to do besides his job. And it's it's a great opportunity. I mean, I I don't mean to tug at your heart, of course, but you know, there's a lot of ranching families who just the kids go away because they don't they don't want to live that lifestyle. Damien does. And I want to. I would like to reward him for him, for it because he really loves the land. And I would like him to enjoy it on his own. You know, before I die.

[00:31:17] Thank you. Well, we might. And just just a minute here. So first, is there any public comment, either anyone else in the room or in the virtual room out there who would like to comment on this proposed family transfer? And see and I'll close the public here. And I'd also like to recognize City Clerk Marty Rehbein arrived to watch a well-oiled hybrid meeting machine in action here with Missoula County. Welcome questions. Thank you.

[00:31:50] Thanks, Miss Bourdon, for coming in today. I ask you a couple of questions, so if I understand it right, you live in the house, that's kind of on its own parcel in the middle of this property off of Musket Lane.

[00:32:02] What's showing you? And it's you can see the buildings on the map I gave you. Yeah, it's real clear this is from what I'm told. This is not a real parcel. It's a mortgage puzzle. When I bought the ranch from a family name Gillette, Bob Gillette and his wife, they they I got a mortgage that was just the buildings, and the land was a contract for deed.

[00:32:28] So, Nick, do you speak to that because this looks to to us, I speak be so bold to speak to for all of us. Well, it could make a difference. It looks to us like if this family transfer were to proceed in the way you would wish there would we would end up with three specific sellable parcels of land here. And is that is that correct? Maybe. Maybe it could speak to this wildlife corridor.

[00:32:56] I mean, technically it would be possible. I mean, I don't want to do it, but you know, it's then there is, there is the. So if you approved it one to two medals, the five acre, which might be a mortgage parcel or not a mortgage parcel. I don't know. I was told it's a mortgage parcel.

[00:33:16] So if I might interject so, so on this point, and maybe Nick or John Hart could interject here if if the if what we're looking at here is and was created as a mortgage parcel, would the boundary line associated with it be able to be relocated in such a way as to simply achieve the same goals, basically?

[00:33:42] I don't see what what Nick means, actually, to be honest, I don't see what he means about doing about relocation to give them this parcel. It's separated by the road. It's not connected to the rest of the ranch. And in terms of just, it's just more money for me and more time to do it for him.

[00:34:02] Hang on. Just a second, Mrs Bourdon. I think I think we might be on the same page, but talking slightly different language here. So John or or Nick, could you speak to the potential of achieving the goals of what is sought here through a boundary line relocation? Is that along the lines of what you're getting at Josh?

[00:34:27] It is. But this notion of a mortgage parcel is foreign to me and I'd like to get some clarity. Are we? If the family transfer were to go through as you would like, it looks to me like we'd end up with three separate saleable parcels of land. And I got, I guess I'd like to find out if I'm correct in that or not, if we're done.

[00:34:45] If you could just hang on just a moment and we'll get back to you, John.

[00:34:48] Right or wrong on that?

[00:34:50] Well, commissioners, I'm not. I'm not familiar with her other parcels of land. But if one of if one of the parcels was created in the past through the exemption, that allows somebody to carve off a part of their property and use that part that they've carved off as security for a loan. There was a time period where Missoula County, then once the loan was paid off, the boundaries of that parcel didn't go away and they weren't merged back with the parent parcel. And oftentimes we see in the past where that mortgage exempt parcel was then conveyed to a third party. And the Supreme Court has told us that if that is the case, then that that mortgage parcel becomes a new tract of record that then can be sold independently. You can use the boundaries of that parcel to do a boundary line relocation. You know, it's treated just the same as any other tract of record any place in Missoula County. I don't know if the facts and circumstances of this parcel meet that criteria, but if they do, then it would be a, you know, attractive record that she could use for a boundary line relocation. Nick may know the details of that,

[00:36:14] Nick. Just just a minute, Nick.

[00:36:19] So I am under the assumption that it is an independent track of record just based off of the previous CEOs that did involve both meadows in one parcel. It's specifically called out that this island parcel was not part of that class. So if it was in fact attached to the greater six nine point six acre parcel, it would have had to been part of that class. And I can pull that up if you don't help.

[00:36:45] Miss Bourdon,

[00:36:47] You know, that's fine with me because what we are talking about this parcel is, is my home. I live there. I don't, and I intend to die there. So if I still have a mortgage on it so I can't change anything, I would like to include it with that big meadow. That's fine with me, but I can't. I can't do anything at this point because I have that mortgage with Wells Fargo, and I've tried to tell them that anyway.

[00:37:11] No, and I think that that is the case. I think that this is.

[00:37:17] This is what I want to stay, this is my place,

[00:37:19] Sure, and I think I think the question before us is whether there's any opportunity on a mortgage parcel like this that is an independent tract of record to change the boundary line such that you would your home would stay with one of the tracks, but there would be a new tract as a result of the boundary line relocation that would be available for your son.

[00:37:48] Well. Our plan is to reference that that whole, that whole area you see around the around the houses, we have already started to plant an orchard. And we are going to slowly reforested this meadow, which is which is, as we know over the years, that's been our plan. I mean, there is no. I really don't want to see a house there, it's you know, it's it's I think it's better to go back to the wild as much as we can do it with native bushes and and pines. And we've got we got a good irrigation ditch there.

[00:38:32] Yeah, go ahead, Josh. So Nick, could you bring up the map of what the family transfer would look like if it came through? So thanks. So we're looking at this. It looks like we'd end up with three separate parcels of land. One is boredom where your house is? Yes, and then to the north, another one and then south of the road, a third one, right? So what this looks like, it may not be the case, but what it looks like is you're creating a situation where your

son gets a chunk of land. You remain where you're living and you've also created a third parcel that then you could sell. And if that's if that's the case, that's actually a subdivision, that's not a family transfer.

[00:39:18] There's no way I mean this.

[00:39:20] Yeah, it looks, it looks to me and I'm ready to be wrong, so I don't mean to argue I'm completely ready to be wrong. It looks like there are three sellable separate units here and there are two of you, which means one of them is going to be sold to somebody else.

[00:39:33] No, it won't. Well, it's just too close to my house. This is my backyard, you know, and I'm lucky to have a thirty five acre backyard. But that's what I have, and I'm hanging onto it. Could, could you so?

[00:39:47] So if I might interject so so what? We're what we're attempting here is currently you have two parcels

[00:39:54] Plus the wildlife corridor.

[00:39:57] Well, yeah, I don't either. What we're looking at is to begin and end with the same number of parcels. Yes, and if and I'm just just throwing this out hypothetically, as we're looking at this, this schematic where it's cos 1891. Could it be possible that the boundary line that surrounds that certificate of survey be realigned to follow musket lane so your home would remain with the parcel on the on the north side of Musket Lane? The other parcel south of Musket Lane would be the one that presumably would go to your son.

[00:40:46] Yes. With that on the map.

[00:40:50] Right, right. So so what I'm describing would allow what is in blue to be transferred to your son, everything to the north of musket lane stays with you.

[00:41:05] Except everything north of musket land becomes one parcel. Right, because as it is, if this goes through the way you're describing you, you could at some point say, I'm going to keep the five acres that I live on, but I'm going to sell this other thirty five.

[00:41:19] That was never happened. I mean, I'm not here to live with neighbors. I like neighbors. They don't count as neighbors don't know if you want me to take it. There is a way to to expand this five acre mortgage parcel to the whole thing. I've got nothing against it, but it's staying with me until I die.

[00:41:40] So let's get now. How about this for an option? Why don't we delay any action on this today? And what if you were to meet with our staff and see if what we were just describing here is possible? That would be the ultimately easiest way to move forward.

[00:41:59] You would like me to do. And then I would get this and his wife.

[00:42:02] Right, right. We believe me. We want Damian and his wife to get this land south of Musket Lane. We're right with you on there. We also want to prevent this from becoming a three unit subdivision.

[00:42:13] Yes. Yeah, we're

[00:42:16] Rooting for you. Same page.

[00:42:19] Nick, go ahead.

[00:42:21] Yeah, I just want to go to one part of The Pirate Point. There are some other tracks involved that could be utilized very badly in relocation, even if we take out the mortgage except track if it is in fact a exempt track because one two three four are all in ownership of Miss Borden and because they do share common boundaries, these could be also utilized as a four line relocation. Nick, could you, Nick?

[00:42:50] Could you show

[00:42:51] Him this map here where the wildlife corridor is? Helen, I'm sorry. Could you show on the map where the 47 acre wildlife corridor is with that wetland area, which I just did?

[00:43:09] And what document that is referenced in?

[00:43:11] I don't. I don't have this. I don't have the no number can just file it. If you have the the latest filing from Ken, Northwest is, is it? Is there any way I can approach this thing and point o on your computer, right?

[00:43:32] So we're having some pointing going on for those in the viewing world.

[00:43:38] I'm not sure exactly where on the coast the wildlife is.

[00:43:45] Here we are, this is the piece that I'd like to give to them. Yeah, this is the old property in the Middle Village.

[00:43:51] So the wildlife corridor

[00:43:53] Is a little piece of joint. Is this.

[00:43:59] You're saying this is the wildlife

[00:44:02] Filled out in that it goes it goes all the way to to the power lines, and it's here. So it's up the hill, the plateau, the hillside and down to the borderland.

[00:44:14] Okay. So so basically, the wildlife corridor is at the to the east of the property we're talking about right now down musket lane, kind of the southeast track 9A,

[00:44:28] It's all around the parcel. That's four nine nine seven.

[00:44:33] So here is my suggestion. Rather than trying to hash it out right here, which is a little bit awkward given the technology in such miss Miss Borden. What if you tie in with staffed connect with Nick? And if you guys can meet up and talk through the options for a boundary line relocation rather than a family transfer that would achieve the exact same goals that are sought here that would allow her son to have that southern parcel and would do so other than through a family transfer.

[00:45:10] Ok, and I, you know, I will also try to talk Wells Fargo into taking the whole meadow for the mortgage that North Meadow. This weather would not be two parcels. We just one. I mean, different options, you know? Sure.

[00:45:24] Maybe, Nick, can you reconnect with Miss Miss Borden? Yeah, that was a yes. Ok, well, we'll work together and see if we can't make this happen. Do you want

[00:45:39] To talk to this nice young man?

[00:45:42] Well, if the nice young man would like to say anything, the floor is yours. I'm assuming this would be the son

[00:45:49] Of the fact that he loves the land.

[00:45:52] Uh, yes, testing. All right. My name is Damion Bourdon. This was a great opportunity that my mom came up with, actually for us. My wife and I tried looking for housing here earlier in the year, and with the increase in pricing in the housing market, it was just almost unaffordable to kind of get what we were hoping to get into. We talked back and forth about different ideas as to what we could potentially get into, and I've grown up on this ranch just north of Missoula. We're up there every weekend working there. My wife and I and it would be amazing for us to actually be able to to be up there full time, and it's just kind of a dream of ours. So whatever we can do to to make this work would be would be amazing.

[00:46:36] Well, thank you. Sure, Piers, you have options. You work with Nick. I think you can come up with the right boundary lines to move around so you end up there.

[00:46:46] And then we wouldn't even have to be involved,

[00:46:47] And we don't have to mess with this. So. Ok.

[00:46:51] Good luck. Ok, thank you. So we'll go ahead and just keep this public hearing open for the time being until Nick and the Borden's are able to circle up and see if another option might be workable. So with that? Thanks so much, you can stick around for the rest of the festivities if you want, but you don't have to. Ok, thank you. You bet. So our third and final public hearing today is the Alexandra Estates Phasing Plan, Modification and Condition Amendment proposal before us. Tim Worley.

[00:47:36] Hey, good afternoon, commissioners. This is a request. From GM Crew Group for a phasing plan modification, as well as the phasing plan extension and then amendment of some conditions of approval for this major subdivision. Alexandra Estates dates back to 2011. It consists of twenty three lots on one hundred and sixteen acres in four phases, and this project is located between Missoula and Lolo on the west side of Highway Ninety three. Here's an aerial showing the. It's actually multiple parcels, but the location of the subdivision along that west side of Highway 93. Zooming in a little bit here is an aerial showing its location between Bird Lane on the North End and Valley Grove Drive on the southern end. So this request is essentially threefold the request is to modify the phase and plan to extend the the phasing dates and to amend certain conditions of approval. Let's start with the phasing plan modification. Throughout the history of this subdivision, the shapes, if you will, of the phases have remained the same. The request in this case is to simply swap phases one and two. Currently, phase one is on the southern end, so the first portion of the subdivision to be developed would be on the southern end. But the preference now is to move phase one to the northern end of the subdivision, and that consists of six lots adjacent to Bird Lane.

[00:49:35] And then phase two would switch to the southern six lots along Valley Grove Drive. So there's no change to the shapes of the phases with this requested modification, and one analysis that we undertook in this is to make sure that all the phases can operate independently and can mesh with the master conditions of approval. And we found that that was the case with this change. The conditions you'll notice in our conditions document, our master conditions document have been adjusted to deal with the phase order change. I should note that there's a correction to be made on conditions nine and 10. Condition nine, I think makes reference to phase two, when it should say phase one and condition 10 just the opposite. It makes reference to phase one when it should be making reference to phase two. Jamie Barker from GM pointed out that that mistake in the master conditions and we will change that should this modification go through today. So the second aspect of this request is to extend the four phases roughly three years into the future, which is the maximum period allowed by the subdivision regulations. So each of the four phases will be due for filing in late twenty twenty four rather than this year. So onto the third aspect of the requests, which is to amend certain conditions of approval.

[00:51:30] Those include conditions nine, 10, 11 and 12, as well as a condition related to ongoing weed management. So the non-motorized facility related conditions that I'm speaking of, and that's conditions nine through 12 have to do with the requirement for a non-motorized facility immediately adjacent to the subdivision on the west side of Highway 93 that was required before the Bitterroot Trail was installed on the east side of Highway 93. And we acknowledge that there are new conditions on the ground, those conditions being Bitterroot the Bitterroot Trail itself, which is a fairly heavily trafficked trail. One concern that's been raised recently is that if there's trails on both sides of Highway 93, there's going to be a temptation to cross from one side of Highway 93 to another, which is obviously a public public safety problem. And the local school superintendent has commented in the past that any path attributed to this subdivision that runs along Highway 93 really needs to run all the way into Lolo to provide access to to schoolchildren. And since that's not really physically possible, we support the deletion of the trail requirement along the frontage of Highway 93. So in lieu of a Highway 90 three path was being proposed by the applicant is a wider facility along the onsite road. The facility would expand and width from five feet to eight feet.

[00:53:26] I also mentioned that there's one condition related to a weed management plan, this is more of an administrative fix where the dates for required milestones, if you will, in reaching weed management plan goals have actually expired. And so the applicant in this case is volunteered to basically restart the weed management plan and get those dates properly set in twenty twenty one as opposed to being in the past. And it's basically an expired condition needs to be restarted, if you will. So as part of our criteria for reviewing condition amendments, proposed changes need to be essentially minor in nature, comply with the subdivision regulations. These sorts of changes can't reduce protections or safeguards offered in the regulations. These changes can't have any essential impact. They have to be consistent with the growth policy and with the subdivision findings of fact, they can't be incremental changes that actually trigger sort of a cascade of other similar changes. There needs to be essential change to the area to justify the request. And in this case, that's the big trail, and economic realities can't be a factor in these sorts of requests requests. So staff's recommendation is for approval, and we have three distinct motions, and I should note that this is subject to that new master list of conditions. And there are emotions.

[00:55:12] Thanks, Tim. Would the applicant or applicants representative like to speak Jamie?

[00:55:20] Ok, thank you. Do you mind if I do a quick screen chair on my.

[00:55:28] Go for it.

[00:55:31] Oh, do we need to grant?

[00:55:35] Well, hang, hang on, we should be able

[00:55:36] To promote you quickly.

[00:55:40] Thank you.

[00:55:50] Ok, we have you.

[00:55:52] You have me, all right. Perfect. All right. So really, I just want to say thank you to Tim and the rest of the cap staff for working on us with a phasing plan that they would recommend support of. This subdivision has a long history dating back to 2002. And really, this request now is driven by the need to amend weed management plan, as Tim stated, and to find an alternative option for mitigation to the jug handle turn around and that jug handle turnaround is associated with phase two. So during my short, short term time at WGN, we've been exploring mitigation options for the turnaround. However, at this time, we haven't been able to find a solution that's supportable. So therefore, that's why we are requesting a phasing plan extension for the entire subdivision. And so in doing so with this phasing plant extension and the modification, we will be able to file the first six lots in phase one as shown on the screen. And then that extended time frame will allow our traffic engineers to explore additional options with NBTC public works and planning office. But in the event that a solution cannot be reached, the developer knows that he will not be able to file the additional phases of the subdivision.

[00:57:16] Jamie, could you? Let's go back to that, that prior screen. So the idea with the jug handle is this Do I have this correct that if you're on Bird Lane, rather than taking a left hand turn, you would go right and then turn left onto the jug handle to turn around if you're wanting to go north on Highway 93. Right. Ok. That is the back story on the jug handle.

[00:57:46] I appreciate that, Jamie, I didn't understand it until then, so thank you. Ok, Jamie, how it was going to work some things, but it doesn't matter because it's being phased out, right?

[00:57:56] Right. It's quite possible that it would be phased out. So the improvements with phase one is shown on the screen, and they will include improvements to Bird Lane. Apparently, Bird Lane has this branched intersection, if you will. And so that will be reduced to one intersection only on the highway. Ninety three. There is a remaining portion of the underlying moth lots that would result if phases two through four not filed and that area is shown in pink here on the screen with as we filed. That is one of the subdivisions. The subdivision regulations now require that a restriction be associated with that remainder lot, if you will, and that cannot be developed unless it goes through some sort of boundary line relocation with an existing line. So just know that as this goes forward, phase

one would only include those six lots and that that pink area, the remaining area would not be developed unless it is contemplated through boundary line relocation with one of the existing lots to the south or lots one or six. Sorry for your out by screens here. There we go. And so with the condition amendment, we know that the trail may be physically feasible on this property and along Highway 93. However, as we consider the constraints of the land that the trail would connect to, we find that the trail really is almost a trail to nowhere along the highway frontage. We know that MDT does not want trails or walkways within the right of way, so future trails would need to be located on private property.

[00:59:49] So here I'm just showing a section of how a trail might be able to connect on private property. This area here is actually all within the right of way. And this ditch section along the highway is pretty steep. And so really, if you see a trail connection to the South, it would probably happen on this old logging trail. Here's a view without that line on top of it. But you know, again, just showing that the highway frontage trail probably isn't the best location, and rather having the sidewalk internal to the subdivision is a better connection. Here's a view looking north. Here we see a number of locks that are already developed along Bird Lane, heading further north. Bird Lane, I think it actually dead ends, but then we see Highway ninety three here and the frontage along Highway 93 for a good stretch of it is owned by the. So an additional trail heading north is not likely, and if it does happen, it would probably happen with public funds, public dollars to make those improvements. So we are intending to keep the non-motorised access easement in the event in the future. There is a trail that is desired on the west side of ninety three and we would also agree to a petition for our side by side waiver that would require us to prove easements as necessary along that frontage. Again, if that trail is desired on the west side. Just going over the condition changes that Tim had mentioned, as he noted, the condition currently relates to phase number three for condition number nine, and this is for the walkway improvements that would be adjacent to Lot one on the frontage of Bird Lane here.

[01:01:53] And so I would request that the language be changed to reflect phase one, as noted, but then also reflect that because we're not not providing the pathway at this time along Highway 93 that that be changed to access easement. So here is a look at that preliminary plat that shows where that trail connection would occur along the lot one percentage. And then her condition number 10, this required the trail connection along the utility lot and Lot 10, and it had originally referenced phase one, and as Tim noted, it would now reference phase two. So here's my little pen mark of where that location of the trail would be. And then here is the preliminary plat, with the dash line showing that trail. An additional request is that I would actually like to request that condition number 11 be deleted, and the reason for that is that this condition actually requires plans for an installation of a five foot wide private pedestrian walkway walkways separated from the road by men among the seven feet wide boulevards well along the entire Alexander frontage of the subdivision, with non-motorized access easement depicted on the plat. So again, because right now we are requesting that we not provide this trail. It does not make sense to provide plans for and review the installation by public works prior to final approval. That is all I have.

[01:03:54] Thank you, and just for clarification, Jamie or Tim, how do the proposed condition amendments that you just read Jamie align with what has been proposed by staff in the in the proposed motions?

[01:04:15] Condition number nine, I think. Is there a 12 men that to? Yes, but we were fine with the amendments to 12.

[01:04:28] So so in these these instances where you have shown some proposed amended language, does that align with what staff has presented or not?

[01:04:43] So on condition number nine, the only change that we would request is that pathway be changed to access easement. So that's the only different request than what Tim has presented. And then on condition 10, this is just confirming what Jim had mentioned and that phase one would actually be phase two

[01:05:08] And the deletion of conditional 11, is that something contemplated in? Staff's proposed motions.

[01:05:18] So currently, the Motion Stats Motion would have left conditional Levin in and changed it from a five day pedestrian path to an eight foot wide pedestrian path and your request to delete the condition entirely because we won't actually be providing that pathway along Highway 93.

[01:05:51] Ok, we're going to have to unpack that a little bit. So, so the other question I have before we move on is I'm a little confused by two of the schematics. So earlier on Jamie, you showed something that I think would. It was just to the south of phase one, which is now listed as phase. So phase phase three in the pink there, you'd mentioned something about that not being developed unless there was some sort of. Yeah. So what's going on there?

[01:06:30] So the underlying what I'm doing here is I'm showing you the underlying lots. So if this subdivision weren't plotted, you would have this here as one lot to lot three lots or lots and five lots. Ok? With our phasing plan modification, we would move phase one from the south down here, which is mostly in the floodplain up here to where there is more buildable area and it's outside of the floodplain. And that with the plotting of phase one, this pink area would remain as a remainder, if you will, and that area cannot be developed according to the subdivision regulations, unless it goes through further subdivision review under the Planning Act or through an exemption such as a boundary line relocation.

[01:07:25] So on the other. So that's not phase three.

[01:07:31] No it's part of phase three, if if phase three gets flat,

[01:07:37] Ok,

[01:07:39] It would be part of phase three if Phase three gets plotted. But if we can't find an alternate solution for mitigation to this jug handle, OK, this is important to will not be flat.

[01:07:52] Ok, so those those additional and subsequent phases are predicated on the jug handle

[01:07:58] Dilemma looks like there's a lot of incentive for that jug handle thing to be solved.

[01:08:03] Ok.

[01:08:05] That's why the request for the extension.

[01:08:07] So before we go on, is there any public comment on the proposed phasing, planned modification and condition amendment? Anyone out there in the virtual world who's been waiting to comment on this all day. Ok. Cnn will close the public hearing. Additional questions, and I guess the one that overriding one I would like some clarification on is from staff. So Tim, could you join us again and speak to the the proposed amendments or changes that Jamie has suggested?

[01:08:47] I think it might help, Jamie, if you could go back to showing. I think you said that you want a condition 11 deleted, is that correct?

[01:08:56] Correct, correct.

[01:08:59] So my understanding of condition 11. Is that it actually has to do with Alexandra Drive. And at least in the submitted materials it was. I mean, the way I saw it, it was proposing an expansion of the non-motorized facility along the interior road that would provide access to all of the lots. So I think that's I mean, that's that's how it reads because it talks about the entire Alexandra Drive frontage of the subdivision.

[01:09:49] Oh yeah, OK. Yes, that makes. I was thinking of the Alexander the front.

[01:09:58] Yeah, because that's we support the deletion of that facility and retaining just an easement along ninety three. But just in being consistent with with your request, which we support, you would expand the non-motorized facility along that interior road within the subdivision.

[01:10:22] Ok. Ok.

[01:10:25] So we would. Yes, I. So retain condition. 11.

[01:10:32] A lot of pain. Five foot to eight foot, which is what Tim has in his report.

[01:10:40] Ok. Yep. Ok, so we're sticking with the language from staff that we originally saw. How about the other? Yeah. The other conditions was at nine and 10 that there were some suggested modification from the applicant on. Yeah. Tim?

[01:11:06] And I believe we could support that change, because it just makes it clear.

[01:11:14] Ok. Clear is good. How about you always? Ok, so it would be nine as amended. What was the other one, Jamie? Was it 10?

[01:11:27] Correct, and I believe this is what Sam is recommending on his revised motion.

[01:11:35] Ok, so I'm confused. So number 10, you're OK with what Tim has proposed.

[01:11:42] So number 10? So number 10, as as depicted here is what was in your proposed motion, Tim. Is that correct?

[01:11:52] Yeah, I my master set of conditions had a number one and number two flips. And Jamie noticed that in in our document, and so it's more of an administrative correction.

[01:12:04] So the only change to staff's recommended motions or or conditions today would be pertaining to condition nine. Is that correct? Jamie, yeah, OK. Yeah.

[01:12:24] Yeah, that's correct.

[01:12:26] Ok. Other questions.

[01:12:32] Josh, thanks so, Jamie, this is more of a. And Tim, kind of a general question. 2011 was a long time ago. Well, why why the extensive why the 10 years between then and now? To see this thing realized.

[01:12:50] Sure. You know, I think a lot of it had to do with the economy at the time and then when the Tiger Grant was approved in the trail was constructed on the east side of Highway 93, MDT had requested that the developer reconsider mitigation options for that jug handle. And there was times where the developer and the team were considering options, and Beatty and trying to find alternate options just hasn't worked out. We did propose some alternate options to caps, but did not. Capps didn't feel that that mitigation option was enough at that time, and so we are just requesting additional time for that mitigation.

[01:13:45] So where some of those other proposals, like signalling Valley Grove or Bird Lane?

[01:13:53] Yeah, we did not propose a signal just because of the cost associated with that. We had considered some options as far as advisory language that could be included in the covenants. Options would include taking a right out of the subdivision, heading to Lolo, turning around and Lolo and then heading back to Missoula. You know, and I think that just a natural instinct of somebody maybe to get in the left or in the center turn lane. Yeah, that is like a green lane. Yep. So that may still occur, but it's not something that we would want to advise on.

[01:14:37] Great, thanks. Other questions. Need anything? No. Ok. Let us tackle it, Tim, do you want to flash up the motions again?

[01:14:51] We do this.

[01:14:52] Yeah, three, three, three separate ones, three separate.

[01:14:57] And I'm going to take the first easy one. I move to approve the Alexander.

[01:15:02] Can you get him on the screen?

[01:15:04] Can you flash him up there?

[01:15:06] Juan just memorize them an overachiever.

[01:15:19] Oh, I can't get nauseous.

[01:15:22] Like car sick.

[01:15:24] Ok, thank you. Ok, let's start picking away at this motion one.

[01:15:33] I'll take the easy one.

[01:15:34] I'll move to approve the Alexandra State's phasing plan modification and extension.

[01:15:40] I'll second that further discussion.

[01:15:42] All in favor. Hi.

[01:15:45] All right. I will move to approve amendments to conditions nine, 10, 11 and 12 related to elimination of the non-motorized pathway along the subdivision frontage of Highway 93.

[01:15:54] But what condition

[01:15:56] Would it be? Condition nine as

[01:15:59] Version of nine is

[01:16:00] That assessed by the applicant today?

[01:16:02] Yeah, after Tim would make what he called an administrative change. I thought that was for one without us, for one or two. Sorry.

[01:16:09] This would be the substantive change.

[01:16:10] Ok. Substantive change.

[01:16:12] So Tim, can you

[01:16:16] Help us out with number two? Yeah.

[01:16:19] As far as condition nine goes? Well, let the record state that the motion reflects the language presented by applicant's representative today.

[01:16:33] Well, that's perfect.

[01:16:34] Well said. Well done.

[01:16:38] Oh, you said.

[01:16:40] Oh yeah, I will. Second that, yes, I second that further discussion.

[01:16:46] Tim, are we straight?

[01:16:48] Yes, I believe you're straight.

[01:16:52] Any further discussion? All in favor. Hi. Motion three,

[01:16:59] And Tim, thank you for the clarification on condition number 11 is one of those things where I'm reading it before the hearing, I'm like, Oh no, I, I think I missed that, so thank you for clarifying that and correcting me.

[01:17:14] Ok, one more motion, if I'm not mistaken. Yep.

[01:17:17] And I moved

[01:17:18] To approve amendments to condition 18 related to the weed management plan, subject to staff's recommended recommended changes.

[01:17:27] What do you think, Josh? I'll second that

[01:17:29] Any further discussion on the motion as the dramatic pan out happens on the camera. There you see none all in favor. I. Great, we made it through our first hybrid meeting of the Missoula County Board of County Commissioners. Give yourself a hand.

[01:17:48] Yeah, thanks to the staff for.

[01:17:51] Yes, thank you all. A lot of work on that part. Good, good job, any other further business to come before the commission today. See none, we will be adjourned.