

Missoula Board of County Commissioners

PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES COVER SHEET



THURSDAY, JANUARY 29, 2026 – 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 Josh Slotnick
Commissioner Juanita Vero
Commissioner David Strohmaier

Staff Present:

Cheryl Hartman, Administrative Assistant, Commissioners' Office
Katy Reeder, Planner, Planning, Development, and Sus
Mattie Scott, Administrative Assistant, Commissioners' Office/Facilities
Lauren Ryan, Planner, Planning, Development, Sustainability
Tim Worley, Senior Planner, Planning, Development, Sustainability
Ian Varley, Planning Manager, Planning, Development, and Sustainability
Kevin Dantic, Planner, Planning, Development, Sustainability
John Hart, Lead Civil County Attorney, County Attorneys' office
Karen Hughes, Director, Planning, Development, and Sustainability
Michaelyn Grimmer, Budget Analyst, Finance
Annie Cathey, Lead Administrative Assistant, Commissioners' office
Melissa Fisher, Strategic Initiative Manager, Commissioners' office
Jordan Hulla, Planner, Planning, Development, and Sustainability
Kathleen Arthur, Planner, Planning, Development, and Sustainability
Patrick Swart, Planner, Planning, Development, and Sustainability
Kyla Lehnerz, Office Coordinator, Lands and Communities
Nathan Cohan, Deputy Elections Administrator, Elections
Jill Johnson, Planner, Planning, Development, and Sustainability
Sarah Bell, Deputy Elections Administrator, Elections
Tenzin Lhaze, Engagement Coordinator, Communications
Patricia Spotted Wolf, Administrative Support Specialist, Commissioners' office
Chris Lounsbury, Chief Administrative Officer, Missoula County
Carey Powers, Communications Coordinator, Communications
Anaeshia Rodriguez, Administrative Assistant, Lands and Communities
Allison Franz, Manager, Communications
Vincent Pavlish, Civil County Attorney, County Attorneys' office

1. CALL TO ORDER [Time stamp – 0:00]

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE [Time stamp – 0:07]

3. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT [Time stamp – 0:23]

Missoula County acknowledges that this event takes place in the aboriginal territories of the Salish and Kalispel people.

4. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS [Time stamp – 0:32]

- a. Closed Captioning

5. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA [Time stamp – 9:11]

6. CURRENT CLAIMS LIST [Time stamp – 10:47]

Claims received as of December 27, 2025 to January 21, 2026 by the Commissioners' Office total \$2,944,821.32.

7. HEARINGS

a. Hoyer Family Transfer [Time stamp – 11:10]

Patrick Swart. Planning, Development, and Sustainability

Commissioner Vero made the motion that the Board of County Commissioners of Missoula County hereby move to approve the request by Julie Hoyer to utilize a family transfer exemption to create and gift a single parcel to our son, Sean Michael Durham as presented in the exemption application affidavit.

Commissioner Slotnick seconded.

[Motion Passed 3-0.]

[Letter 2026-044 sent to Julie Hoyer.]

b. FY26 Mid-Year Budget Amendments [Time stamp – 23:33]

Michaelyn Grimm, Finance

Commissioner Strohmaier made the motion that the Missoula Board of County Commissioners approve the resolution for the FY26 budget amendments as written and presented by staff.

Commissioner Vero seconded.

[Motion Passed 3-0.]

[Resolution 2026-017. Book:1124 Page:425]

[Resolution 2026-018. Book:1124 Page:432]

[Resolution 2026-019. Book:1124 Page:433]

c. Resolution: Swan Valley Neighborhood Plan Amendment [Time stamp – 23:21]

Ian Varley, Planning, Development, and Sustainability

Commissioner Strohmaier made the motion that the Missoula Board of County Commissioners hereby adopt the resolution of intent to adopt the Swan Valley Neighborhood Plan as an amendment of the Group Missoula County Growth Policy as

recommended by the Missoula Consolidated Planning Board and as amended by the Board of County Commissioners.

Commissioner Vero seconded.

[Motion Passed 3-0.]

[Resolution 2026-020. Book:1124 Page:434]

- d. **Ram Division Plat Adjustment** *[Time stamp – 1:39:35]*
Katy Reeder, Planning, Development, and Sustainability

Commissioner Strohmaier made the motion that the Missoula Board of County Commissioners approve the RAM addition plot adjustment based on the findings of facts and conclusions of law in the staff report subject to the recommended conditions of approval

Commissioner Vero seconded.

[Motion Passed 3-0.]

[Letter 2026-022 sent to IMEG in c/o Tamara Ross]

- e. **O’Keefe Ranch Estates Condition Amendments** *[Time stamp – 2:05:13]*
Katy Reeder, Planning, Development, and Sustainability

Commissioner Strohmaier made the motion that the Missoula Board of County Commissioners approve the O’Keefe Ranch Estate subdivision landscaping condition amendment, subject to the master conditions as modified.

Commissioner Slotnick seconded.

[Motion Passed 3-0.]

[Letter 2026-024 sent to PCI, INC in c/o Ron Wetzsteon]

8. OTHER BUSINESS

[None]

9. ADJOURN

Chair Slotnick – Called the meeting to adjourn at 4:18 p.m.

BCC Public Meeting January 29, 2026 – 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.

Dialogue in the transcription attributed to "Sophie Moiese Room" is for all speakers that attended the meeting in person. Attendees that participated virtually are labeled individually.

0:02

Meeting for Thursday, January 29th.

0:04

Please join me in the pledge.

0:04

**Pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands,
One nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.**

0:23

Missoula County acknowledges that this event takes place in the aboriginal territories of the Salish and Kalispell people.

0:30

Do we have any public announcements?

0:38

Hello everyone.

0:39

If you're joining us for this meeting virtually today, instructions for turning on closed captioning or on your screen.

0:46

If you're joining us in person, we'll have closed captioning on all the screens here in the Sophie Louise room.

0:51

Just a friendly reminder that there will be multiple chances during the meeting for public comment in person and virtually.

0:58

The Chair will open discussion for public comment after each staff presentation.

1:02

Please respectfully keep your comments to 3 minutes.

1:05

If you're on Microsoft Teams, we ask that you use the Raise Hand feature.

1:08

This is the small hand button at the top of your screen.

1:11

If you're calling in on the phone, you'll need to push *5 to raise your hand.

1:15

Then once called on, you'll need to push *6 to unmute.

1:18

If you have any questions, please come find me during the meeting.

1:21

Thank you, thank you.

1:24

So at this point it would call for any public comment on items not on the agenda.

1:36

Hello Travis Metier, 26 year Missoula County resident.

1:42

I have an article today I just wanted to bring a little attention to.

1:46

It's about the homeless outreach team.

1:48

The homeless outreach program is one that I helped establish in 2010 and there's a little inside baseball I want to share.

1:55

It's kind of about magic and about jurisdictions and about the untold story that I'll be helping to tell at my blog, Zoom Cron.

2:02

You can check it out.

2:04

I'm pretty funny sometimes also I can be annoying but when I was the homeless outreach coordinator I started learning things like how a homeless person and I will use my non updated vernacular just because I can and like free speech and stuff.

2:16

But I could magically make a homeless person, a city homeless person into a county homeless person by moving them from a city sidewalk to the lawn out there where the anti ice people are, are doing their thing.

2:27

And so the the county attorney's office does play a role when a person is very old and they no longer have capacity.

2:33

But one of the problems, their state hospital is an utter joke.

2:35

They literally can't even get like paper records.

2:38

And that I'm pretty sure, like, I'm not a time traveller like Charlie Kirk was, but this is the 21st century.

2:43

And so we're here with like paper records at the state hospital.

2:46

And that's one reason why the County Attorney would be reluctant to send a person without capacity to a place where they need to be instead of trying to get them into housing that's not appropriate.

2:55

And then they die outside.

2:57

But the empathy offensive also doesn't help because it, it's a partial story with an agenda behind it.

3:04

And that agenda, and I can say after, you know, 10 years in the, in the nonprofit social service sector has been an utter failure.

3:10

Yet the people at the top that are like part of that failure, they keep they keep their jobs and those on the ground like me that have like probably some level of PTSD from what I've seen and what I continue to know about the breakdown of the systems.

3:22

I actually get really tired seeing like the same story that I was involved deeply in finding creative solutions like the magic wand that can make a homeless person a city wand into a county wand by putting them on the lawn.

3:32

And that was facilitated by the city police.

3:35

So I'm eager to continue having multi jurisdictional conversations.

3:39

I tend not to always have patience, especially with uneducated protesters.

3:42

So I probably won't let them know about the Sheriff's Office role and Operation Stone Garden.

3:48

And that's like a Homeland Security FEMA thing that like gives you money.

3:52

And so one of the things that would suggest to anyone that's virtue signalling, I'm pretty close to 3 minutes, is if you're serious about being sad about the feds, give them their money back and you will have less leverage.

4:02

Thanks, guys.

4:03

Thanks, Travis.

4:07

Anybody else?

4:08

You get to chat about anything you like for three minutes.

4:15

We're class in condo Montana.

4:17

So let me let me just stop you a SEC.

4:19

If you're here for an item on the agenda, we should wait.

4:21

Not on the agenda.

4:22

OK, have at it.

4:23

So you get 3 minutes.

4:24

OK.

4:26

You put out that you were going to change the condo community notice that you were going to add 2 members to the condo community council.

4:35

And I was told that by the newspaper that that was put out in October of last year that we're going to make those changes by referendum.

4:45

Is that correct?

4:46

As you're?

4:48

The only reason I know about this is when I was looking at the kind of community thing, there was 2 new seats that were not filled at this point in time.

4:54

And then those two new seats, I look at the referendum, we found in the newspaper that sometime back in October the community councils were apprised of the changes that were coming for the new year and you were going to be looking for two new members to be appointed.

5:11

And we weren't going to be allowed to vote on those members as we discussed, you know, many years ago about the Condon community would like to vote on the members that go on the council.

5:21

So my question is, my question is, did you put that out in October and if so, to whom?

5:28

Because nobody in Condon actually got any appraisal or knows about this until last week when we looked up that there were student receipts in red on your your page.

5:41

So in this public comment, we don't do dialogue or go back and forth.

5:45

Just do but what we can do is get you answers to the questions you're asking.

5:49

I'd like answers to we can do that informed and why the community was not informed about the changes and didn't have an opportunity to participate.

5:58

Thank you very much.

5:59

We'll get you that.

6:06

Anybody else public comment?

6:10

OK.

6:11

Our current claims list, claims received as of December 27th, 2025 to January 21st, 2026 by the Commissioner's Office total \$2,944,821.32.

6:25

We have 12345 hearings today.

6:29

The first one is on the Hoyer family transfer and Patrick Patrick Sport will present.

6:44

Good afternoon.

6:44

Sorry, Patrick, I might have missed somebody on the public comment online.

6:47

I apologize.

6:48

No, that's all right, Matt.

6:52

You're welcome to you got 3 minutes if you'd like.

6:59

Yeah, I'll, I'll be brief.

7:00

This is Matt Slurce from Missoula County.

7:03

I had some questions regarding the accessibility of the claim sheet itself and the completeness of the claim sheet itself.

7:12

And, and some of the claims the like there's an \$80,000 P card claim, which is a credit card it looks like.

7:20

And I'm just wondering how citizens are supposed to effectively track or or keep account of what's being bought if everything's just lumped into an \$80,000 payment to a credit card.

7:33

There's some other stuff in there.

7:35

And the scope of the completeness of the list looks it it's it's, it's a scan of the list and it's not searchable.

7:47

It would really help people if these would be able to be searched.

7:52

And I just am seeing also some duplicate charges just under the the \$5000 mark for Ace Hardware, which seems to be like the magic number that requires approval by this committee or this Commission.

8:13

So there's just some basic questions that I'd like to get answers from.

8:18

And I'd like to ask that the Commission improve the accessibility of these documents and all other meeting documents that are posted to the website or the meeting agendas just so that they're more easily navigable by the community.

8:38

Yeah, that's about it.

8:40

Thanks, Matt.

8:41

And we will get you some answers.

8:45

OK, Patrick, take it away.

8:54

All right, Good afternoon.

8:55

For the record, my name is Patrick Swart.

8:57

I'm a planner with the Office of Planning, Development and Sustainability.

9:00

And today I'm presenting the staff report for the Hoyer family transfer request.

9:05

This comes to us from Julie Hoyer, who's represented by WGM Group.

9:13

The subject property, which you can see on the screen outlined in black and green here, It's addressed 17500 Mullen Rd.

9:20

It's directly off of Mullen Rd.

9:22

in the Frenchtown area.

9:23

We're just to the southwest of that main I-90 interchange there in Frenchtown.

9:30

The property is a portion of tract B1 of Certificate of Survey 2432 and it's 1.42 acres.

9:38

And as you can see on this image, it's currently developed with a single family residence.

9:42

This area is unzoned, so there aren't any zoning use restrictions or density, space and bulk requirements that come into play here.

9:50

It is subject to the 2002 Regional Land Use Guide and amendment to the 1975 Comp Plan, which recommends a residential density no greater than two dwelling units per acre.

10:01

And it is also within the Frenchtown Area Activity Circle.

10:08

The applicant is proposing to divide this parcel and create a .87 acre tract to give to to their son, Sean Michael Durham.

10:16

And the intent is for that lot to be developed and to be the future full time residents for the recipient.

10:23

And the plan is also for the applicant to retain ownership of that remaining tract.

10:30

Here's a look at the proposed lot layout.

10:32

You can see that new NS approximate boundary.

10:35

There on the left, identified as Track 2 is a .56 acre parcel that will have the existing home on it and then the .87 acre tract one will be transferred if approved to Julie's son.

10:52

This request was reviewed for the evasion criteria and rebuttable presumptions in the Missoula County Subdivision Regulations for Family transfers.

11:00

It did raise a few flags.

11:02

One of the criteria asks us to evaluate if the division appears to be made for speculation or resale.

11:08

And one of the criteria there that we look at is does the applicant own multiple parcels in Missoula County?

11:14

It was identified that the applicant did own a neighboring parcel to this and the Frenchtown area.

11:21

We also evaluate if this would result in violations of federal, state or local regulations.

11:26

While this request itself wouldn't result in any violations that were identified, we did receive a comment from Missoula Public Health that noted a prior deed divided.

11:36

And that's why we have a portion of this tract and it may be evaded.

11:40

Sanitation and subdivision review.

11:42

They didn't give us an absolute, it was an evasion, but that did raise some concerns for them that they are hopeful will be addressed by going through this process and the the sanitation and subdivision review side of things as well.

11:58

And also we evaluate if the request will result in any significant impacts relative to the subdivision review criteria.

12:06

And again, this was raised as as in part by comments we received from the Environmental Health office, which noted there would be limited area available for replacement drain fields for the existing living unit.

12:20

We also received comments from the water quality district that also noted there's high groundwater concerns in the area and some known water quality issues in the area as well.

12:32

To provide a little bit more context about the comment received from Missoula Public Health and the potential evasion of sanitation and subdivision review.

12:40

This is an image of the current survey for the property.

12:43

You can see it's tracked B1 as the notes on the survey indicate it's 3.90 acres and it's divided into two non contiguous pieces.

12:56

So there's a separate fee simple ownership Frenchtown irrigation project right of way that's about 70 feet wide that divides this.

13:04

When the survey was done in the 1980s, they created a single tract that wasn't contiguous.

13:10

As a result, they were able to deed away the northern portion of it, which in effect resulted in some issues with the sanitation review because the original parcel was reviewed as if it was 1.

13:23

But the piece in question here is just the southern portion you can see.

13:29

And then we did receive one other comment from the Public Works Building Division, just noting that any future construction will require the appropriate permits.

13:41

And then prior to today's hearing, we haven't received any public comment, but we are recommending approval.

13:46

And I have a motion on the screen for when you're ready.

13:50

Thank you, Patrick.

13:51

Would Julie Hoyer or her representative like to speak?

14:03

Thank you Commissioners.

14:05

Share my screen.

14:19

All right.

14:19

Thank you.

14:20

Jamie Erbacher with WGM Group.

14:21

For the record, this is actually a family transfer with Julie and her husband Carl Hoyer.

14:28

The first two slides here, I believe that Patrick covered fairly well just existing conditions.

14:34

These are our proposed conditions showing the future layout of the two lots that we are proposing.

14:41

So just first like to touch on the rebuttable presumptions in particular #4 Patrick had mentioned in his staff report that Carl and Julie's name was also on an adjacent parcel.

14:57

And that is true.

14:58

It is also on this northwestern parcel highlighted in the black and green here on your screen.

15:03

Eric, their other son, he is also on title to this property and he owns the existing trailer home on this property.

15:12

So Julie and Carl actually reached out to us in 2020, excuse me, to talk about estate planning and how that they could put create a parcel for their Sean, Sean to live in in the future.

15:28

And so we talked about it and we actually started doing some title research at that time for Carl and Julie.

15:37

And then unfortunately their son Eric, who lives in the mobile home on the property that's highlighted here, he was going through a divorce.

15:45

And so they had to put all of their proceedings on hold until that finalized, which just happened to believe that was last year.

15:54

So yes, while Eric, or excuse me, while Carl and Julie's name is on this additional property, Eric does reside there and intends to continue residing there.

16:07

Carl and Julie do live on the home that is on the subject parcel and that has been their primary home.

16:17

In regards to your rebuttable presumption #16 and the comments from Sanitation, just want to walk you through how this parcel was created.

16:26

So in April of 1936, the recording of the right away for the ditch lateral was recorded, and that was created as a right of way.

16:35

Prior to that, this tract was known as Tract 50 or track #50-A, and you can see that on the screen there.

16:44

And January of 1980 is when the Cosa was approved for one single family residence.

16:49

September of 1980, there was a retracement survey done and that was Cos 2432 showing on the screen here.

16:57

And this was to survey the parcels of ownership at that time that were in common ownership.

17:06

In 2009, the mini warehouse structures were built on the North End of the property.

17:12

And as I just mentioned, in 2020 is when Carl and Julie began their estate planning and we confirmed the number of parcels.

17:19

We did reach out to the clerk and Recorder's office as well as the surveyor's office to confirm this.

17:25

At that time, again, because of family matters and the divorce that Eric was going through, they had to put their their estate planning on hold until that was complete.

17:37

Carl and Julie reached back out to us in the end of 2024 and said that they were ready to pick this project back up.

17:46

So we have been working with them over time and in November of 2025, they updated the ownership of the northern parcel to the Hideaway Storage LLC.

18:00

And then today we are bringing before you the family transfer to create a parcel for their other son, son Sean.

18:07

And that's the eastern vacant parcel.

18:12

This is just a snip of that deed that was transferring ownership from Carl and Julie to Hideaway.

18:20

And then I'm going to escape out of this real quick.

18:22

I think it's important if we go to the property information system, we can look at this and we can see that this ditch lateral that runs, I'll let it here.

18:45

So this is our subject property in Carl and Julie's name, currently Hideaway Storage.

18:54

Nope, Nope, thank you.

18:56

There we go.

19:06

So this one here is Carl and Julie's property.

19:10

North of the irrigation lateral is Hideaway Storage property.

19:16

This here is showing the property that Julie, Carl and Eric all owned together.

19:26

If we go east of the property, the northeastern property is only owned by Bradley Borough South of the lateral Teresa and Roger Hilton.

19:42

And then if we go West of the property, we see that that is in Forlorn Hope LLC ownership.

19:48

So just really showing here that this irrigation lateral has existed for a long, long time and that it that the properties North and South of this have all been transferred in different ownership.

20:21

In regards to rebuttable presumption #18 here's a screenshot of the groundwater monitoring that has been done in this area.

20:29

While we certainly understand and respect that the Health department has commented on high groundwater, we have found from data that the test pits that have been done in this area show dry until we get South of Mullen Road.

20:47

And here we show 102 inches of separation, which is about 8 1/2 feet.

20:53

And then here is 90 inches of separation, which is about 7 1/2 feet.

20:59

And I'm sure Carl can attest he has built a number of homes including his well, his his own home he did not build, but it has a basement.

21:08

The home South of Mullen Rd., he built that one and it has a basement and there's another of other homes in this area that he has built that do have basements.

21:18

We have put him on notice though that the health department has recognized high groundwater in this area.

21:22

So it is at his own risk that if he does or his son builds a home on this property with a basement, that groundwater could be an issue.

21:34

That is all I have for today and I believe Carl and Julie are here and can answer questions.

21:40

Thanks, Jamie.

21:41

Thank you.

21:46

You guys have any questions?

21:50

No.

21:51

Anybody from the public want to speak on this?

21:56

We can entertain a motion.

21:59

I'll make that motion.

22:02

And I appreciate.

22:04

Ouch.

22:06

Yeah.

22:06

Patrick and and Jamie, your explanations.

22:09

Thank you.

22:09

I move to approve the request by Julie Howard to utilize a family transfer exemption to create and gift a single parcel to our son, Sean Michael Durham as presented in the exemption application affidavit.

22:21

Second, once again, I'll ask for any public comment.

22:26

OK, seeing none.

22:26

All in favor, aye.

22:29

Thanks, Patrick.

22:29

Thanks, Jamie.

22:33

Next up, a mid year budget amendment.

22:35

Michelle or Micah, Sorry.

22:42

Hi, my name is Micah Grimmatt and I'm in the finance department here with the county.

22:45

And I would just like to quickly present three budget amendments to the commissioners for approval as required by statute to present a unbalanced budget.

22:53

And these three are all grants that the county was newly awarded and require BCC approval because they are funding personnel.

23:02

Thank you.

23:05

You guys have any questions?

23:08

No, I move that we approve the budget amendments.

23:12

Second, any public comment?

23:15

OK.

23:16

Thank you, Mike.

23:16

Thanks, Mike.

23:17

All in favor, Aye.

23:21

All right, now the Swan Valley Neighborhood plan amendment and Ian Varley will present.

23:27

Oh, Lauren.

23:28

Lauren will prevent.

23:29

OK, great.

24:04

Ian's going to pass you guys some copies real quick.

24:07

For the record, Lauren Ryan, I'm a planner with planning, development and sustainability.

24:12

Like I said, I'm gonna start off the presentation and then hand it off to Ian to present the rest of it.

24:17

And for your consideration, this afternoon we are presenting the Swan Valley Neighborhood Plan.

24:23

This is the resolution to adopt.

24:28

Wanted to cover quickly what I'll be going over in my presentation.

24:33

So going over the basics of what a neighborhood plan is throughout this process, what are the community values and concerns that we've identified, the elements that are in the plan itself, the quick process timeline, and then go over some of the implementation strategies.

24:54

So an area or also called a neighborhood plan is a land use plan for a geographic region of the county that covers one or more elements of the growth policy in more detail.

25:07

So these area plans are going to be more specific than the county wide growth policy because it focuses on the smaller geographic region and looks specifically at that region's land use and other community issues from a closer vantage point with a little bit sharper focus.

25:25

Neighborhood plans are adopted under the statutory authority of growth policies.

25:30

Therefore, the neighborhood plans have to be in compliance with the county's growth policy.

25:37

The neighborhood plan serves as a policy tool.

25:41

This is not a regulatory document, but it sets the guidance for future regulations if that is within the strategies of the plan and again serves as that policy guidance in the county.

25:59

There are 19 area plans that are adopted throughout the Missoula County area.

26:06

The oldest plan was adopted in 1986, with the most recent plan being adopted in 2010.

26:15

That was the Sealy Sealy plan.

26:31

There we go.

26:33

So again, the statutory requirements layout what is required to be part of an area or neighborhood plan.

26:41

So those include future land use and development, housing, commercial or industrial development, public services and infrastructure, natural resources and community character.

26:52

Since these are area plans and they focus on a more smaller geographic region, they will include typically include sections that are more based on the region and important topics to that area.

27:05

So in the next couple slides, I'll go over what are some of those elements that were identified and had a little bit more focus in the plan.

27:17

So the basis of the plan and kind of identifying the core community values throughout this process were identified both initially through a community questionnaire that was distributed and then also through essentially A2 plus year long process and and hearing from community members.

27:37

So I want to touch base on the the community questionnaire specifically because this really set the basis and foundation for elements of the plan and those strategies that were included in the plan.

27:51

So the community questionnaire was distributed to tax addresses in Swan Valley.

27:56

It was also made available online and in person for people to take.

28:00

So if you weren't didn't receive a survey, there were still ways that folks could participate in the survey.

28:09

And again, the goal of this questionnaire was really to help us identify what the community values were and their priorities to help guide those objectives and strategies in the plan.

28:19

So I think this is really important to emphasize in this process, to note that the content of the plan really is based upon what we heard from the community itself.

28:38

So some of the core community values that were identified and again, we didn't see, you know, the, the values really carried through from the from the plan that was adopted in 1996 to today.

28:50

So those are looking at, you know, preserving the real character of the Swan Valley, specifically low density housing, open spaces, small family run businesses and strong community volunteerism, protecting clean air water in a resilient forest with abundant wildlife and also ensuring accessibility to our public lands for hiking, hunting, fishing, camping and riding.

29:14

Again, these really set the basis of the plan to, you know, structure the plan around these core community values as far as challenges and concerns that were identified.

29:30

Of course, development pressure in the area, affordable housing, limited services and infrastructure impacts from tourism and recreation and the potential sale for public lands.

29:43

Again, there's, you know, probably a lot more issues, but these were kind of the the highlighted themes that we had identified throughout the process.

29:54

So in the plan itself, elements that were included a future land use map, which I'll show here in the next couple of slides, discussion on the population, housing, economy, transportation, education, utilities and community services.

30:14

Each of these topics all had a objective and then strategy that was identified with those and looking at kind of some closer issues that were raised and so were included in the plan, you know, community services, fire resilience, water and sanitation, abundant wildlife and resilient forests and Parks and Recreation.

30:39

So again, this is what makes up really the core elements of the plan and each of these sections were written to include a strategy with them.

30:52

So looking back at the timeline, again, this process has been two years plus in the making.

31:00

So in November of 2023, the planning committee was formed as a subcommittee of the Swan Valley Community Council.

31:08

And we're essentially in the beginning tasked with looking at, did the subcommittee want to explore potentially zoning or look at updating the neighborhood plan.

31:20

And so those first couple meetings really emphasized learning and staff presented kind of what those two tools were.

31:30

And ultimately the subcommittee had the go ahead from the community Council to explore updating the neighborhood plan.

31:39

So begin the process again, that was kind of winter 2023 to 2024 was really the like learning and

exploratory phase for the subcommittee and hearing from community members and again took time learning from staff on what those two tools were.

31:58

In May of 2024, the planning committee begins the processing process of updating the neighborhood plan.

32:05

In the fall of that year, the existing conditions report was drafted and that community questionnaire that I talked about was sent to community members.

32:15

And the following spring we wrapped up those existing conditions report and those were published.

32:22

And we also held the first public open house.

32:25

And the goal of that open house was to get the feedback on those goals and policies that were in the plan.

32:32

The summer of 2025 was really to refine those goals and policies and also released the first draft of the neighborhood plan.

32:41

The fall of 2025, we spent the review and adoption of the plan itself.

32:51

So I talked about the future land use map.

32:54

So this is an element that's required to be incorporated in the plan itself.

33:02

These maps serve again as a policy document.

33:05

These are not regulatory and these designations work to align realities on the ground and reflect current development trends and patterns.

33:14

So you can see the future land use map that was adopted in 1996, which was the last update of the plan on the left hand side of the screen and the proposed future land use map on the right hand side of the screen.

33:28

So again, what we did here was align some of these changes.

33:34

Ian's going to go over a little bit more detail as far as some changes proposed with the floodplain.

33:40

But essentially what we did was again look at the reality of development on the ground and try our best to align future land use map on the right with what was happening.

33:51

Again, everything may not totally be perfect, but we did our best to align what was on there.

33:57

Also made some minor tweaks to the the land use designations from the 96 plan and those are included in the plan itself and give a description of what type of uses are ideal to go in those areas.

34:17

So included in the plan as an appendix is the plan implementation tool.

34:22

So you know a plan is only as good as the implementation strategies that are included, right.

34:30

So in 96 we'd really didn't get any implementation of that plan just because there is no follow follow up as far as any regulatory measures go.

34:42

And so in that appendix, some of the strategies that are included for the community to explore together would be zoning as a regulatory tool, creating a subcommittee, and also developing some

partnerships up there such as with the Forest Service MDT to try to make some of those strategies in the plan a reality.

35:05

So again, these implementation tools are important to have to look at so that the plan itself, again, being a policy document, you could actually make some of those idea ideas that are in there, you know, realistic by having some regulatory measures potentially.

35:26

And that's all I have.

35:28

I thought I had another slide.

35:29

Sorry, passing it off to Ian now.

35:31

Thanks, Lauren.

35:45

All right.

35:45

Good afternoon.

35:46

Commissioners, members of the public and staff, we're all here.

35:48

Thanks for joining us.

35:50

I'm going to look at this plan and the process that was kind of gone through to create it in a slightly different lens here.

35:57

So I'm not going to repeat too much with what Lauren covered, but try to illustrate a few other elements of the plan that we think are important to highlight.

36:06

So I'll talk about the planning area, the roles that different entities played, some of the alternatives that were created in terms of evaluating zoning.

36:13

We'll talk a little more about public engagement and public comment.

36:17

We'll talk about what happened at the community council as well as planning board.

36:21

Then also the consistency of the neighborhood plan with the overall growth policy right, that it will be amended to.

36:27

And then we'll finally close with a recommended motion.

36:31

All right.

36:32

So the planning area that we're discussing here, this is of course the upper Swan Valley, right?

36:37

The planning area boundary corresponds with the community council boundary and the school district boundary for this area, right?

36:43

So it's not not necessarily unknown, but certainly it's done the northern end of the county here.

36:48

I'm sure we're all familiar with this, this area.

36:50

There are lots of different entities that kind of had roles in the process.

36:55

Certainly.

36:57

And one we'll talk quite a bit about is that 13 member Swan Valley Planning Committee, which is appointed by the Swan Valley Community Council in November of 2023.

37:05

It's role is to explore the land use planning tools in response to concerns about development in the area, right?

37:10

First and foremost of course of that was probably the development of the Holland Lake Lodge.

37:16

Staff attended all meetings provided of the planning committee, right?

37:20

We provided Rd.

37:21

access to the meetings, administered the community questionnaire, we prepared documents and maintained the project website on the Missoula County Voice.

37:29

The plan development process did last about two years from start to finish.

37:32

It was pretty typical for a plan of this magnitude.

37:35

The Community Council and Planning Board have both reviewed and provided a recommendation on the plan in public hearings.

37:42

I'm going to talk a little bit about the land use alternatives, right?

37:46

These are going to come up quite a bit, or at least they didn't like they were a reoccurring theme throughout the planning process.

37:52

So it's very important to understand what it was that we that were what do what do these alternatives do and say?

37:58

But really it was it was kind of about the planning committee and the staff developed these three alternatives with regards to how the plan might recommend the implementation of zoning, right?

38:10

This helped communicate the options that were available to, you know, essentially to the plan and to the ultimately to the community, right?

38:16

That could be pulled into it because it's very important, right, If zoning, if it is implemented, right, the zoning has to be consistent with this plan and it can't kind of zoom off in its own direction.

38:30

So the first land use alternative was an implementation of a zoning ordinance, right?

38:34

It recommends this implementation of a zoning ordinance that restricts just certain uses in the valley.

38:40

They would they felt that these uses would degrade the rural character of the valley and that include large scale tourism and resort uses, right.

38:47

It was to generally like the kind of benchmark that was established was anything that more than 30 beds.

38:51

This would exclude things like smaller guest ranches and you know, Airbnb's and you know, kind of smaller, more community scaled things, commercial uses, you know that that it's a wide range of things, but amusement parks was one example of that heavy industry.

39:06

So utility scale wind farms, other large in enterprises, but specifically not including like any wood products industries that might be up there especially like log home buildings and other other businesses that are very prevalent up there.

39:19

And finally, it would also a restrict telecommunications towers over 200 feet.

39:26

All right, so that was land use alternative one.

39:28

We developed a second land use alternative which was to implement the zoning ordinance with everything from alternative one, right.

39:35

So everything that we just discussed, plus in addition it would regulate residential density using the plan's future land use map.

39:42

We'll look at that.

39:43

That was certainly, Lauren showed that we could certainly come back to it.

39:47

New residential home development would have to adhere to the residential density standards and if new lots are created, they would have to meet the minimum lot size that's specified in the map.

39:58

We would add a public land designation applied to only US Forest Service lands that would would establish 160 acre minimum lot size to guard against the potential privatization and sale of public land.

40:08

Right?

40:08

This this change made it into the future land use map, but this would become part of the zoning if this was implemented.

40:15

And finally, all existing course uses and lot sizes are grandfathered in right?

40:19

That basically is a catch all comment that says like yes there are zoning works to regulate certain uses.

40:26

And certain types of development and largely what's on the ground now isn't affected, right?

40:31

Those would become legal non conforming uses and structures and so forth.

40:37

And alternative 3, right?

40:38

That was a lot, a lot, a lot of things in alternative 2 and use alternative three would not implement any zoning, right?

40:45

The plan would and its recommendations would remain advisory only, right?

40:50

All right.

40:51

So with those clear, the three different alternatives that were sort of present, these were presented in a, the public open house in that was April, right?

40:59

And they were sort of revisited and the, the second public open house in June.

41:05

So I'll come back and we'll, we'll talk again a little more about the, the alternatives here in a minute.

41:11

There's a brief summary of the, of the different public engagement that occurred throughout the, the two years of the planning process.

41:16

Right?

41:16

There was the community, the questionnaire that Lauren talked a little bit about.

41:20

There were two community letters that were sent to all the tax addresses in the Valley, multiple articles in the Seedly Swan Pathfinder, the two open houses that I mentioned April and June of last year, Materials from the open houses were typically hung up in the Mission Mountain Mercantile in Condon, right, so that people could, as they came by to fill up gas or get a snack or whatever like that, they would see the and and get an idea what was being discussed.

41:42

There were four local community groups, Q&A sessions, right?

41:44

One of the AARP up there, the fire department of QR and QRU Station SMART, which is kind of an educational foundation that's associated with a school up there, and finally the Historical Society.

41:56

There were over 30 monthly meetings of the planning committee.

41:58

All meetings were publicly accessible either in person, online or both.

42:03

Information agendas and meetings.

42:04

Minutes available on the project website were available on the project.

42:08

That is the Missoula County Voice with physical copies of the minutes and the planned drafts were always shipped up to the Condon Library so people could see them in person and in summarizing a few of the key themes of public comment.

42:20

Right.

42:20

Of course the community values.

42:22

Folks out there love the Swans, big and wild landscape, the wildlife and the forests up there.

42:26

They want to maintain the rural and undeveloped character in the valley.

42:30

There's strong community ties with support for neighbors and self-reliance.

42:35

Lots of concerns about development pressure, you know, issues with limited services and infrastructure.

42:40

It's a very rural area, so folks had different concerns about, you know, services for older adults, right, roads and, and different kinds of infrastructure up there.

42:49

And of course, locals value the outdoor recreation, but have concerns about the impacts that that recreation brings on, on the resources.

42:56

I'm going to go a little bit deeper into some of the other key themes that kind of came up.

43:00

Zoning, of course, was a big topic of this plan, right?

43:03

And a lot of energy was kind of put into, you know, kind of both sides of the zoning issue.

43:09

Many felt that the implementation of zoning is important to maintain the rural character and ultimately the conservation of the valley.

43:16

Many also opposed zoning, right, as you would imagine, citing concerns about private property rights, impacts to local builders, limited housing and just general a distrust of government regulations in Missoula County in general, confusion about how zoning works, what it does and does not do.

43:31

Right.

43:31

We mentioned a little bit earlier about the kind of legal non conforming uses and how that works.

43:34

And that's that's fairly complicated, right?

43:35

It's not necessarily super easy to understand what you can do and what you can't do after zoning is implemented.

43:44

One community member submitted A petition to the community council opposing zoning with 120 signatures.

43:50

I'm sure you'll correct us.

43:51

A particular source of concern was the residential density and minimum lot size restrictions in Alternative 2, right?

43:58

So folks we tend to jerk out the general feel that some folks might be more could live with certain types of zoning, but not other types of zoning, right?

44:07

So the, the type of zoning that would restrict residential use and subdivision, right, there's probably more hostility and concern about that, right, than some of the more broad types of zoning that would just regulate, you know, commercial and resort and other types of uses.

44:26

Also key themes are the key themes of the planning process, right?

44:28

The community members raised concern about the planning process, particularly the composition and functioning of the 13 member Swan Valley Planning Committee.

44:35

Additional concerns focused on the procedural issues, including failure to post a meeting agenda 48 hours in advance, lack of a voting quorum at every meeting, early meetings, lacking meeting minutes.

44:46

We reviewed all these issues as they were raised in public comments, right, with the Board of county commissioners, sometimes you and the County Attorney often providing opinions on how best to proceed and how to address some of these issues.

45:00

And so some corrective actions were taken, right?

45:02

We did re hold some meetings and, and tried to kind of address issues as they came up.

45:07

Other issues we didn't feel had merit.

45:11

Stafford Overall, though, that there was a very robust public engagement process and that the public had many opportunities to participate in the planning process and provide comment.

45:25

All right, we'll talk a little bit of the Community Council summary, right?

45:28

This was done October 21st of 2025 was the public hearing date in Condon.

45:35

Just as kind of a reminder, Montana law doesn't require a community Council recommendation, but our own growth policy does, right?

45:40

So we, in our own growth policy, ask that the Community Council review the plan and provide a recommendation on it, right?

45:47

So we had 44 people signed in and there were 4 council members in attendance.

45:53

And then the Swan Valley, the the first action of business was really the Swan Valley planning committee was disbanded by the community council and having determined that it has fulfilled its mission right, it no longer had a purpose.

46:04

Public comment focused on concerns about zoning, of course, how grandfathering again these non conforming uses work and the impact of development and rural character.

46:13

And a month later on the 17th of November, the council voted to recommend the neighborhood plan.

46:17

All members were in in there at the time for the second meeting, with three in favor, one against and one person abstaining.

46:24

The community council did recommend changes and these are incorporated into the plan, right?

46:30

They recommended that the maximum resort and hotel size go from 50 beds down to 30 beds.

46:35

They removed the recommendation regarding the feasibility and creation of a water quality district.

46:40

And they changed the plan to recommend zoning more consistent with alternative one that would regulate again, this commercial, industrial, resort and telecommunication uses instead of alternative 2, which included residential and minimum density sizes, right?

46:54

So they took out the residential density and minimum lot size recommendations, right?

47:00

They took that out of the plan.

47:01

So it's not in there.

47:06

December 16th, the Planning board heard the heard the plan.

47:12

They heard presentations from myself and John Simon, Swan Valley resident and former member of the planning committee Planning Bemer Board.

47:19

They sought clarification on issues regarding the floodplain designations, zoning implications, or service cabins and implement the various implementation strategies.

47:28

The board discussed an agency request to amend the future land use map to reflect the map flood hazard areas, but it chose not to make that recommendation.

47:37

Public testimony reflected a wide range of perspectives.

47:40

Some speakers opposed any zoning and raised concerns about public notice and process, and while others expressed strong support for the plan, the Planning committee's work and the Community Council's recommendation.

47:52

With five members, president of the Planning Board, the motion was approved unanimously.

47:58

All right.

47:59

So part of our job as staff is to look at the consistency of the neighborhood plan with our growth policy.

48:05

And so of course, neighborhood or area plans that are intended to provide locally driven guidance for land use planning.

48:11

The plan should be developed to help implement the county's growth policy by providing a more focused guidance on conservation and land use development.

48:19

Future land use maps are incorporated into the county's overall future land use map.

48:22

We have this big map that basically has designations almost everywhere, right, or I believe everywhere.

48:27

And so that gets updated with this, the adoption of this plan review and recommendation from the community council and planning board or of course, necessary for this to proceed.

48:40

The area plans must use a variety of public engagement methods according to our growth policy and be open to the public, right?

48:45

And they're required to just certain topics feature land use and development, housing, commercial, industrial development, public services and infrastructure, natural resources and community character.

48:54

And the, the Swan Valley Neighborhood plan does all of this.

48:57

The area plans don't have to be consistent with all goals of the growth policy, right?

49:01

Not all.

49:01

Like there's 16 policy goals in total.

49:05

They don't have to be, they don't have to address every single one, but they, they can't be contrary to any, you know, one particular goal.

49:13

So we determined that the plan is consistent with 13 of the 16 goals.

49:17

It does not contradict any of those goals.

49:20

So also like at the in December staff, we made a changes to the future land use designations that would essentially link them and made them consistent with the designations in the growth policies land use element, right?

49:30

And we're just trying to keep and establish a link between the land use element and this plan so that all of the the land use designations in the county have at least some a certain number of common denominators.

49:45

OK.

49:45

So we are seeking a recommendation from you with regards to the, the, the, the, the floodplain basically, right.

49:55

Matt Heimel, our floodplain administrator suggested that assigning any zone AE or the floodplain or flood fringe right, We would establish in that zone the plans open and resource designation and any zone AE floodway with the public lands and open space designation, right?

50:11

So we're playing two designations within the floodplain.

50:14

This designation creates a framework for potential future zoning and creates and growth policy review and development projects that preserve the flood hazard areas as open space and that ultimately guides development away from the flood hazard areas.

50:29

Again, Planning Board did not provide a recommendation from on this issue, so we are looking to get that recommendation from you.

50:37

I'll show those little illustration for us.

50:39

Right at left is the future land use map as it exists currently in the plan.

50:45

And at right you can see there's the the long sort of strip down the middle is the Swan River floodplain.

50:53

I also have maps, we also have maps that we printed out and they're in the back of the of the room here, right, that that show the basically this the same sort of illustration, right?

51:02

Here's what the future land use map looks.

51:04

Now here are the flood hazard areas.

51:06

And then this is what the updated plan would look like.

51:09

And I have a map of that here.

51:11

Obviously not super easy to see, but if we zoom in a little bit, right, what kind of happens is there are these two designations get applied to the floodway and the flood hazard of the flood zone, right?

51:23

And they get applied.

51:23

So the basically that it's most noticeable here in the one per 10 designation, The pink area kind of right in the really of the heart of Condon, right, The river kind of cuts through there and you can see this like ribbon of green, the two colors of green that kind of cut through there.

51:38

And that's what this map would look like if it was to recognize the flood hazard areas.

51:48

I also have a second set of recommendations that I'm going to ask you.

51:51

This really comes down to essentially a series of comments that Commissioner Strohmeier made in some emails to to staff, right?

51:57

So I'm just making kind of open things up for public for the public to see, right?

52:01

The so the different items that we would be addressing.

52:03

So I'll have to do with Fire Protection, right?

52:05

What the comment was and then what we are recommending to address this.

52:10

So Fire Protection objective #2 we would flip that one and two to ensure that fire suppression is not the highest priority, right?

52:17

We would, that's an easy switch to make.

52:19

We would just flip those two.

52:22

Those two objectives in strategy #9 right?

52:26

We would work this to get away from the generic flood fire hazard framing, right?

52:30

And it would read as such.

52:31

Landowner should focus efforts on reducing risk in their home ignition zone or HIZ through the appropriate use of mechanical thinning, prescribed fire slash pile burning, chipping, mastication, and other treatments.

52:48

Fire Protection strategy #10 Similar comment right as above.

52:52

We would reword this to say the Swan Valley Community Council should encourage land owners to reduce fuels within the home ignition zones, right?

52:58

Vegetation treatments and prescribed burning on the landscape that reduce fuels are important for ecological health, but will not eliminate the risk of fire to homes and structures.

53:09

And finally, Fire Protection strategy #11 right, It's not the community council to act in the matter.

53:13

Essentially that that that strategy kind of had the community council providing recommendations on sort of fire apparatus and, and sort of kind of supporting the local fire department there.

53:25

And I think in order to address this, right, we would probably just remove strategy #11 from the list.

53:36

OK, in conclusion, awesome.

53:42

I want to know.

53:42

So of course, this is the second, this is the first of two meetings, right?

53:46

Today is this of course, is the resolution of intent to adopt.

53:50

And the second hearing is the adoption hearing, right?

53:54

And so just for everyone's knowledge, right, this is scheduled for the 12th of January at 2:00 PM.

53:59

Oh yeah.

54:00

February, OK.

54:02

Yeah, 12th of February, right?

54:05

Unless you have a time machine.

54:08

12th of February at 2:00 PM in this very room right in the Missoula County Courthouse Annex.

54:15

And with that, I will conclude with this recommended motion that the Missoula County Board of County Commissioners hereby adopts this resolution of intent to adopt the Swan Valley Neighborhood Plan as an amendment of the Group Missoula County Growth Policy as recommended by the Missoula Consolidated Planning Board and as amended by the Board of County Commissioners.

54:37

Thanks so much.

54:39

And to be clear and John, correct me if I get this wrong, that means we will still be collecting public comment until February 12th.

54:47

Thanks.

54:47

So now is the time when anybody is welcome to speak specifically on this issue.

54:52

And I just want to let you know how the rules work on this.

54:55

You get 3 minutes on this one.

54:58

If you want to ask a question, direct the question to me, I'll ask it of staff.

55:02

I it, it's just three minutes.

55:04

You can't give your 3 minutes to somebody else.

55:06

That's just that's just how we do this.

55:09

OK Oh and also when you come up, make sure you push the button, the light turns green, then you get recorded and first say your name and spell your last name if it's needed.

55:18

OK, come on up.

55:19

Oh, did I miss one?

55:22

Did everybody sign in?

55:29

The sign in is so we can contact you if if needed.

55:33

OK, Grace come on up.

55:35

And, and these are these are how we know 3 minutes is up.

55:40

No, sorry.

55:41

All right.

55:41

Well, my name is Grace Salodi and I'm a resident since 1976 of Condon Swan Valley.

55:53

And I also am chair of our local community council.

55:57

So I would like to say one thing quickly as a resident, I wrote a few notes down here.

56:04

We, we, I have all lived in Condon in complete, which I didn't realize the freedom we lived with with in Condon.

56:19

We were able to do what we wanted, have what we wanted and it was very lovely way of life.

56:26

But times are changing in the state of Montana and it's changing.

56:32

You hear about it every day in all these small towns.

56:35

So I think rather than being fighting it, we're trying to be proactive and be ahead of what's coming.

56:45

So on the council we put together a planning committee, the planning committee which I was a part of as well, volunteering for over 2 years, 2 plus years now.

56:57

We put together a rock solid plan, listening to many, many voices throughout our community and trying to come up with a compromise that would make everybody happy, which obviously is not possible.

57:12

The planning committee suggested they voted on alternative two.

57:18

It came to us, the community council.

57:21

We compromised and we went with alternative 1.

57:24

Alternative one is to zone out.

57:27

All the commercial like was read off in the beginning.

57:32

So what I would like to do is after so much work going into this, ask you as commissioners to please approve our neighborhood plan for our community and zone our alternative one that the community has put forth.

57:50

And I thank you for your time.

57:53

Thank you, Grace.

58:07

Hello, my name is Gary Lazarowski.

58:09

Am I supposed to push a button here?

58:18

Thank you.

58:20

My name is Gary Lazarowski.

58:23

I live in Condon and I lived in Lincoln before Condon and spent a little bit of time in Seeley Lake.

58:34

And one of the concerns that I have is, is the overall wall air quality in the Condon area.

58:40

We already have two areas.

58:43

One is at the workstation and 1 is that Holland Lake where we came up with a little bit higher nitrate levels.

58:51

And as far as I know, I haven't seen anybody come up with any the county or anybody else come up with any other tests that have been done in the valley.

59:04

So, you know, I, you know, so I think that with the density that's going on in Condon and the closeness of the, of the lots and stuff like that, that, you know, we need to, to kind of have a good look at what's going on in Condon in terms of if we do actually have a nitrate problem and a phosphorus problem.

59:29

And so we have, you know, a couple places that are already identified as being kind of high.

59:35

And so one way to try to avoid what's happened in Seeley Lake is to try to do something now to try to figure out what we can do to slow this down or change it.

59:46

And I already just, I sent you all a letter that you probably already have.

59:53

But anyway, that was kind of the most of all the statement that I would want to make is that.

1:00:01

It would be nice to figure out if we can figure out how to keep the nitrogen and the phosphorus level down as we move along through Condon and even with the buildings that are there to try to figure out ways to overcome the problem before we have to come up with 30 or \$40 million to try to take care of it.

1:00:20

Thank you very much.

1:00:21

You all did a good job.

1:00:23

Thank you.

1:00:33

My name's Connie Hunt.

1:00:36

Huh.

1:00:38

It's on.

1:00:39

My name's Connie Hunt.

1:00:42

I sent several concerns and questions about things, and I understand, You know, things like this are hard.

1:00:50

Some people want things, some don't.

1:00:53

Compromises have to be made.

1:00:55

One thing I don't think we should compromise is following the rules and the law.

1:01:02

As of right now, the on the public on The Voice, we are still missing 2 meeting minute or agendas.

1:01:12

They didn't turn in seven of their meeting minutes and the county has updated with two of them.

1:01:21

Without meeting minutes, the public doesn't know what would discuss or whether a quorum was presented.

1:01:28

No public meetings are required to keep minutes and made available for the public, according to the Missoula County Voice Answer the meetings before the Swan Valley Planning Committee decided whether to update the plan or pursue zoning were foundational and informational meetings that focused on public comment but didn't take.

1:01:50

There's no meeting minutes available.

1:01:52

They didn't take any and there's none for us to see.

1:01:57

The meeting minutes that are available show that there are 10 meetings that did not have a quorum.

1:02:04

Without a quorum, no action can be taken.

1:02:07

So any voice votes or decisions made can't be counted for those.

1:02:14

I mean, that's already 15 minute or meetings.

1:02:18

We don't know.

1:02:19

10 of them we know don't have a quorum.

1:02:21

Another five, we have no idea so and according to the Missoula County Handbook for Councils, all in person meetings shall be conducted in a neutral public building and must comply with the Missoula County.

1:02:40

You guys probably know all that.

1:02:42

However, there were several meetings that were told to us they were online only and apparently they were held in private residences.

1:02:52

So they changed from going to the community hall to going to have some meetings in private homes and didn't allow the public to those meetings.

1:03:00

Even though the meeting minutes show they did attend in person, several of them and on one of them like the November or the April 7th of 25, it shows that after the meeting was adjourned, someone had said for anyone wanting to attend the face to face or versus calling online can meet at Christine's residence.

1:03:31

Connie, you just hit that 3 minutes.

1:03:33

Sorry.

1:03:33

OK, Thanks.

1:03:35

Thank you.

1:03:43

Edward Klassen, Connor Montana.

1:03:46

And we've had quite a few public comments.

1:03:52

They went on The Voice.

1:03:53

Some of them didn't go on The Voice.

1:03:55

I want to be very clear, anybody that falsified the record or is trying to impede the record can be prosecuted.

1:04:03

And I want to quote one thing here by whoever's signing these things or they said the quorum is not required for the subcommittee today or was it yesterday?

1:04:12

And so the Sunshine Law is not one to be messed with.

1:04:16

We had private meetings for the dump had individuals that council members went to these private meetings.

1:04:22

We're having the same thing happened here.

1:04:23

Some of the same individuals are having these private meetings, doing business for this coming down here and attempting to meet with you guys and down here at the planning board and we as a community would like to be involved.

1:04:37

And most of the process issues that he doesn't find foundational is that he null and voided the actual vote in his own words or whoever answered that that meeting that they voted for this plan was null and void.

1:04:52

So all the documents for this plan are null and void.

1:04:55

We had 19 out of the 30 meetings that are null and void.

1:04:59

Now I'm not so much concerned about the opinions of the individuals that were at the the board meeting.

1:05:08

They all had the same opinions.

1:05:09

Grace picked the individuals she decided who she wanted on there.

1:05:13

They're from her 501C threes and everybody has the same like kind views.

1:05:17

However, when I asked them to do and look into the community of what they want, I was told they're not doing zoning.

1:05:26

For two years the entire community said we are not doing zoning.

1:05:30

So now the referendum is they want you to zone under plan one or the criteria for one and us to just accept what you say.

1:05:41

If they want to do zoning, do like I did.

1:05:44

I turned in today the petition and we will have it on an agenda item where the opposite side gets 30-40 minutes.

1:05:51

They've had almost six hours of response time to push the plan forward and I understand they believe they're doing the right thing.

1:05:59

But if we go down the zoning Rd.

1:06:01

we're going to lose ability to have businesses build homes.

1:06:07

We already have a problem now and if you take the opportunity this month, I have 28 pages of individuals on their petition.

1:06:17

They're that say they don't want zoning, they don't want more regulations and a few of them are pretty pointing at you guys, which we won't.

1:06:27

They just don't want the zoning portion of this thing.

1:06:30

They understand, but none of it actually comports to the plan.

1:06:35

This is not a growth plan.

1:06:39

This is an anti growth plan with A1 in 40 and a one in 10 or anything of that nature.

1:06:46

We are not going to be able to build homes in Condon.

1:06:50

There is no dividable land except for the 50 acres.

1:06:53

That's there's one spot.

1:06:55

The rest are in conservation easements.

1:06:58

You guys are given another conservation easement for 100 and what is 123 acres that's going out now for the community.

1:07:04

If you look at the map and where we live, the community doesn't want this.

1:07:10

All right.

1:07:11

Thank you.

1:07:23

Good afternoon.

1:07:24

My name is Helene Michael Michael and I'd like to make a public comment as a property owner or up in the Swan Valley since 1990.

1:07:36

And there's a couple of things that I think the community really can dispute on and that is the effort that has been going on for the last 18 months, couple of years of trying to obtain voices of the Valley information, the desires, what is your future, what do you want?

1:07:59

That was an extensive outreach to get a lot of voices and we did pros and cons.

1:08:08

The other thing that as a community we really don't dispute is that Swan Valley is an unbelievable place.

1:08:16

It's a magic land.

1:08:18

It's a very healthy world for people, for the fauna and for our flora.

1:08:24

And if I look at the bigger picture, which I always like to do, where does Swan Valley fit?

1:08:30

In Montana or in western Montana?

1:08:33

And you look at the Yukon to the Yellowstone, kind of falls right through the Swan Valley.

1:08:40

You look at the Crown of the continent, same thing.

1:08:46

And there's a lot of discussions by a lot of groups and a lot of communities and a lot of states of what how do we connect, create connectivity.

1:08:56

So that's another thing that we all understand and see now, how do we retain this magical place?

1:09:09

And I think that's where a lot of people differ.

1:09:12

And I think the goal, the community values are very continuity over time and very agreed upon in the community.

1:09:24

But how to get to that, how to retain it and protect it?

1:09:28

I think it's where we differ.

1:09:30

Some people say there's not going to be any change, not in the change that you fear of large industries.

1:09:36

You haven't seen it for years and years.

1:09:38

Why would it occur now?

1:09:40

Yes, it is currency some of the other places, but Swan Valley doesn't lend itself to that.

1:09:45

Then you have the other side and that's where the differ that please make sure that we help manage change.

1:09:52

We know we can't stop change.

1:09:54

Change is inevitable and it will come, but in what format and when?

1:10:00

So please help control density, look at water quality.

1:10:05

So that's the other side.

1:10:06

So that's kind of where we differ, not that we don't want the same community values, but how to get there.

1:10:13

The last one define the final outcome of the Swan Valley neighborhood plan, which is you have if you will have in front of you and you have seen it already is a compromise and several people have mentioned the world compromise and I agree.

1:10:32

And when I look at as a property owner and you just hit 3 minutes.

1:10:37

OK thank you so much.

1:10:39

You're welcome.

1:10:40

When when for the community.

1:10:47

Hello, my name is Charles Perniciero.

1:10:49

That's PERNICIARO.

1:10:52

I'm I'm a resident of Condon.

1:10:55

I do want to inform you that some of the information you've been presented today, particularly regarding zoning, is not an accurate representation of what was agreed upon by our community council, including what was in the presentation regarding zoning.

1:11:10

I was present at these meetings.

1:11:12

It's in the minutes.

1:11:13

Alternatives 1-2 and three did not include anything about zoning ordinances.

1:11:19

Those alternatives were not for zoning.

1:11:21

They were purely for policy to be contained with the plan.

1:11:25

All of that information about zoning, including what community member Grace as stated earlier, is not what was voted on by our community council and it was not presented to us before debate for debate.

1:11:36

This is in the minutes of the meeting November 11th, 17th.

1:11:41

Sorry, I implore you before even voting on intent to adopt, to consider adoption, that you examine the minutes from our meetings and including the PowerPoint and other materials presented to us.

1:11:54

Zoning Alternatives 1-2 and three have all been reworded today in this meeting to include language about zoning that the community was specifically told was unrelated to these things.

1:12:06

I regard this as a major clerical, clerical issue.

1:12:09

Secondarily, what I really wanted to discuss today was there's been a lot of heat over this entire issue.

1:12:16

I was hoping I could present one perspective regarding affordable housing.

1:12:21

One of the main issues that the community is worried about, including myself, is the ability to build homes in our own community on property we already own.

1:12:28

Alternative 2 is a particular problem here as in co-owner of A50 acre lot with one of my friends who's I'm currently the godfather of their incoming child.

1:12:38

We would like that child and future children to be able to build more houses to live in Condon, perhaps even our own on our own property.

1:12:48

That may become impossible if zoning is implemented, especially in a way similar to alternative 2 that limits the number of residences per property.

1:12:59

For example, on my 50 acre plot we would only be limited to one house.

1:13:05

That means that myself and my Co landowner should that be adopted or implemented by the county in any way that would prevent not only us from building both of our houses in that property, but for our future children from doing that along with many other people.

1:13:20

The people in the community, most do not come from particularly wealthy backgrounds and their main interest.

1:13:26

The main reason this has gotten so heated is they just want to know that their children will be able to

afford to live in the community where they grew up and that when they are old they will be able to live there with their children.

1:13:38

Thanks, Jonathan Simon, former member of a Condon resident and member of the planning Commissioner.

1:13:55

Simon, I, I apologize.

1:13:56

Let me commissioners, there's a participant online who is using the clap hand feature and the some sort of <3 feature.

1:14:07

I would like that person to stop.

1:14:09

Otherwise they'll be removed from the meeting.

1:14:11

Thank you.

1:14:12

Thank you for bringing that up.

1:14:16

You can't just no more emojis, please.

1:14:20

Thank you.

1:14:22

Can you restart the clock?

1:14:23

Absolutely.

1:14:24

Of course.

1:14:24

Of course.

1:14:25

I'll go quickly.

1:14:25

I don't know you.

1:14:26

Of course.

1:14:26

Everybody gets everybody gets 3 minutes.

1:14:28

Everybody gets there 3 minutes.

1:14:29

OK in.

1:14:30

Thank you, John.

1:14:31

Right.

1:14:32

In 1996, the Swan Valley community submitted a neighborhood plan.

1:14:38

The county Board of Commissioners approved that plan, probably from the very same seats in which the three of you sit today.

1:14:45

The plan expressed the preferences of the Condon community and was full of very good ideas.

1:14:51

Many of those same ideas and certainly as you've heard many times, many of the same expressed values for wanting our community to retain its rural nature with low density housing, a strong preference for family run and small scale businesses, access to public lands for hiking, hunting, fishing and others, and a spirit of community volunteerism remain.

1:15:16

As in 1996, the community wants to protect our beautiful valleys, clean air, clean water, manage and steward for a more fire resistant forest and preserve our dark sky so we can enjoy what makes the Big Sky state special.

1:15:32

2 plus years later when our community, when our community council asked for volunteers to update the 96 neighborhood plan, we representing many of us on the committee, we're told by fellow citizens, don't waste your time.

1:15:47

This is county nonsense, which is a change of language from what was actually said.

1:15:52

And we did this and the county commissioners ignored us.

1:15:58

Since 1996, our structural density has increased markedly.

1:16:03

Our water quality may have degraded, our water quantity certainly has declined as wells have run dry, our access to open spaces is under threat, and our dark night sky is being challenged by the Missoula County Building Department's approval of a 280 foot cell tower in the center of town with 24/7 flashing strobe lights.

1:16:26

We fully understand that neighborhood plans are advisory.

1:16:30

That is why our neighborhood plan explicitly asked Missoula County to enact a zoning ordinance restricting commercial and industrial development that would violate the core values and express preferences of the community.

1:16:45

We've been told by county staff and by one of you sitting before me right now that the zoning ordinance process typically is a 2018 to 24 month process.

1:16:57

Wow, Governor Shapiro of Pennsylvania rebuilt A collapsed bridge in 12 days.

1:17:07

Get stuff done.

1:17:10

I find it there.

1:17:12

There must be boilerplate language for area specific commercial zoning ordinances.

1:17:17

The county staff could adapt and in respect to the Swan Valley Community Council request and to do it in short order, the public comment review and finalization processes could be initiated and kept moving along.

1:17:32

Why can't we right here in Missoula County get stuff done?

1:17:38

Failure to implement the will of the community is a repeat of the 1996 experience.

1:17:44

Taking 18 months to enact a zoning or John just hit 3 minutes.

1:17:48

It leaves us vulnerable to irreversible changes.

1:17:51

We hope you will work with the community to avoid a repeat of the 1996 experience.

1:17:57

Thank you.

1:18:10

Hi, my name is Zoe Mohesky.

1:18:12

Mohesky is MOHESKY and my husband and I own a couple of properties up in the Swan Valley and even though I spend a considerable amount of time there, I don't live there but have loved it for over 40 years.

1:18:25

I was part of the 1996 planning process and I am thrilled to see the community take on this rewrite.

1:18:32

It does nothing but make it better.

1:18:36

You know, it was hard in 96 because we had a lot of different opinions.

1:18:40

I'm surprised we even got it passed then.

1:18:43

Anyway, I appreciate their time, the staff and yours to give them the opportunity to put this together with the support of the community council.

1:18:51

And so I would support of their recommendation to approve the plan.

1:18:56

The one thing I would ask though is that you do move forward with some kind of implementation.

1:19:01

At least hold the hearings.

1:19:02

The momentum is here, yes, everybody's not going to agree with it.

1:19:06

But even with the first alternative, you're not looking at a broad zoning across everything and across every property.

1:19:12

It's sort of setting, I think you can do it in a specific rural zoning district, if you want to call it that is specific to the needs of that valley.

1:19:22

It doesn't have to be like every other zoning district.

1:19:25

And that would, I think, really help, because I agree with Grace and John that Montana's changing some and you got to get on top of it or there's going to be a things up there that could ruin the valley.

1:19:36

And as people have said that one of the best things about the valley is the things that they value there, like the wildlife and the scenery and water quality.

1:19:45

And I mean, everything's in the plan.

1:19:47

You know about it.

1:19:47

You've been there anyway.

1:19:49

I would just hope that you don't put the plan on a shelf somewhere.

1:19:53

Yes, the Site 96 plan sat on a shelf, but then there wasn't growth policies and all the momentum that there is today.

1:19:59

And so I hope that you take advantage of it and move forward.

1:20:03

And thanks to you all and the staff and the council for getting something moving.

1:20:07

And you know, even if you do move forward some zoning, it's still a public process.

1:20:11

It's not the end of the world.

1:20:13

Other people can come.

1:20:14

I would like to see people that kind of object to it get on the committee.

1:20:18

Find out where you can make it fit for you.

1:20:21

So thank you.

1:20:23

Thanks, Peter.

1:20:29

Gwen GUYNN Some 15-16 years ago, I was not living half time or half my time in in Swan Valley, but I heard about community telecommunication.

1:20:42

Cell towers, iPhones and cell phones were getting pretty common.

1:20:47

Everybody is using them.

1:20:48

People in the valley wanted them.

1:20:50

They wanted to get a tower.

1:20:51

And I said, well that's fine, but but I was worried about the scenic impacts.

1:20:56

The Swan Valley is unique as we know.

1:20:58

You can look up the mountains and both sides at you can pretend that it's still wilderness like it was a 200 years ago, and it still looks the same way from the mountains inside.

1:21:08

A flashing light out in the middle of it is just not going to work.

1:21:12

Anyway, that's what we have now.

1:21:14

But 16 years ago, I went to the community council meetings and I presented ways to make cell towers amenable to the environment and I was criticized.

1:21:24

I was treated hostilely, like I didn't want cell service.

1:21:26

But we did.

1:21:27

We got a great tower there.

1:21:29

It's been there for 16 years.

1:21:30

It's AT&T.

1:21:31

It's just short of 200 feet.

1:21:32

It doesn't require the strobe lights.

1:21:34

We have great service in that limited area.

1:21:36

But this new proposal that came up that comes up calling for a a 260 foot, really 280 foot tower because it's sitting on a on a funny little hill and it's in a hazardous location next in a flight plan of the airport.

1:21:52

But it they there was no consideration Co hosting it with with the AT&T tower.

1:21:58

And I suspect that the ATT it and is this is comp rivalry between telecom companies, which is not in this case in the public interest.

1:22:09

They could have cohort.

1:22:10

There's no there's no evidence that they couldn't cohabitate there with that same tower, but they want to build this tower well over to 200 foot limit.

1:22:18

And yet 1516 years ago AT&T was able to do that and we're all happy with this one tower that we got.

1:22:26

So that's please we're doing, we've been doing every all that we can.

1:22:33

The the proponents of the power accusing all people in the valley of trying to delay, delay, delay like we're, you know, naughty children and stuff.

1:22:42

But that's not true.

1:22:44

They come out with an EPA report that was fraught with fraud, arrogance and incompetence.

1:22:49

The FCC begrudgingly held off on it and said, oh, you got to do this.

1:22:54

And they did do come out with any and A and then there's been about close to a year of doge in the federal government plus the government shutdown and that's extended this all out to this point here.

1:23:07

Now it's right at the limit.

1:23:08

It's going to fall into the hands of the FCC and then they're going to probably render a decision.

1:23:14

But the telecommunication acts in 1996, section seven O 4 commit pretty much limits the public.

1:23:21

It's just hit it.

1:23:23

OK, thanks.

1:23:33

Good afternoon.

1:23:34

My name is Gary Wolf, that's spelled Wolfe and my wife and I are part time residents of the Swan Valley.

1:23:43

We have recreated there for over 35 years and have owned our residents there for 13 years.

1:23:50

And the main thing I don't want to say is that we truly appreciate all the hard work that the volunteer Swan Valley Planning committee did.

1:23:59

They put in tremendous number of hours.

1:24:02

They worked really hard to seek public input.

1:24:06

I can't tell you how many emails I received from the committee asking for input, asking for information.

1:24:13

I received the questionnaire, I received follow-ups making sure that we knew that there was a questionnaire.

1:24:20

I received many emails inviting me to committee meetings and participate in the discussions.

1:24:26

So I just wanted to thank the committee for all the hard work they did.

1:24:28

It was tremendous.

1:24:29

It was all done as volunteers, and I'd finally like to say that I fully support the Swan Valley Community Plan that they've put together, and I encourage the county commissioners to adopt it.

1:24:41

Thank you.

1:24:52

Do we have anybody online?

1:24:53

There's no more people in the room.

1:24:58

Cheryl, let me know if you see somebody.

1:25:05

OK, Dave, Juan, do you have any questions for Oh, sorry about that.

1:25:10

Go right ahead, Ted.

1:25:14

I appreciate it.

1:25:14

Thanks for your time.

1:25:16

I just had a question about the floodplain map.

1:25:19

It's just not something that we were presented on the community council or something that I feel like was really shown to our community yet.

1:25:27

And I just wanted to see if there'd be any, you know, potential tax ramifications or something to adopting this new map.

1:25:35

It would be of them or that department who handles that to come up and present that to our community if it is covering new area that wasn't currently held and if they have to hold insurance on those properties.

1:25:47

Thank you, Ian, Karen, who would like to speak to Floodplain.

1:25:57

Karen will thank you.

1:26:01

Thanks for the question, Ted Sharon.

1:26:04

He is Missoula County planning, development, sustainability.

1:26:06

So the floodplain map is not new?

1:26:09

The floodplain map was adopted some time ago and became affected.

1:26:16

What was the date?

1:26:17

It's 20/19/2019.

1:26:20

The use of the floodplain map to suggest some changes to the land use designations is what's new and it was presented.

1:26:28

I believe the comments were presented to the at the time of the community council meeting, correct, and to the planning board, neither which chose to act on those comments.

1:26:43

So we've put it before the board of County Commissioners.

1:26:47

A follow up.

1:26:48

So, Michael, yeah, just my question specifically is, so you're saying that that we already have this map in place up in Condon and there won't be any, you know, changes to potential, you know, insurance or anything like that for property owners.

1:27:03

The floodplain map itself has been effective since 2019.

1:27:08

What's what's being discussed today is a recommendation to change the land use designations in the community plan based on that map.

1:27:20

So Karen, would that have any, would that mean any change for the insurance people have to buy who are there No impact on the flood insurance program.

1:27:27

Thanks.

1:27:27

So Ted, no impact.

1:27:29

Thank you.

1:27:33

Anybody else online, anybody else in the room?

1:27:43

OK, we'll go to Dave and Juan.

1:27:45

Any questions?

1:27:46

We do have a question while we're talking about the flood hazard mapping.

1:27:49

So talk to us again just just briefly in terms of how this, so this would be basically superimposed on the future land use map in a way that would change some of the land use designations on that map.

1:28:05

Is that, is that what we're talking about?

1:28:07

That's correct, yeah.

1:28:08

We would take the designations from the flood zones, right, that are already in existence, right.

1:28:12

They're already regulated spaces and then they would be reflected in the future land use map.

1:28:18

And primarily what happens, right, is in higher designation places, they become now a lower density or like a lower intensity type recommendation in that location, right?

1:28:29

And so there's, that's primarily the, the, the impact here, right, is that the, the designations are now sort of consistent with what we do in other places of the county, right?

1:28:41

The certainly the, the Missoula land use element recognizes the floodplain in its land use map.

1:28:48

So this is a fairly common thing and this would kind of bring it more into consistency with other elements of our growth policy.

1:28:55

Yeah, I guess that was my the thrust of my question.

1:28:58

It seems pretty standard.

1:28:59

Why would we not do that?

1:29:02

And, and is there a reason why the planning board did not discuss this that much or make a recommendation?

1:29:09

This can be a little bit of my own like kind of personal opinion, but I kind of think that they felt that it wasn't their role to make the recommendation at that particular time, right?

1:29:20

Like this.

1:29:20

They'd sort of recognize that this plan had come out of a long kind of public process and a committee, you know, driven and, and my public process that was that had come together over many, many months, years, right?

1:29:35

And I think they kind of felt like maybe they didn't have enough information.

1:29:40

There might have been a couple of things that kind of went on, but they just opted not to weigh in on that particular recommendation.

1:29:47

And it wasn't really presented to the community council as an option at the time, right?

1:29:55

We kind of took the, the plan forward from the committee to the community council.

1:29:59

They had all the comment, right?

1:30:00

So it's like certainly they, they had the, this came in as an agency comment right, from our floodplain administrator.

1:30:06

And so they had it was aware, certainly wasn't highlighted as a as a recommendation, right.

1:30:13

And and some of that is, is my own, like our own, like Staffs, like it didn't kind of rise back up to an A concern right until it went back out for agency comment.

1:30:24

And this was in, I believe in November or early December.

1:30:27

And Matt said, Hey, you didn't make the change that I asked you to make.

1:30:29

And I was like, well, at this point, like, let's let's see if we can whatever we can find a recommendation for this.

1:30:37

Lauren, did you have any insight?

1:30:38

And this, this is the time for, I mean, it's our prerogative to make a change like this.

1:30:42

So, yeah, Ian did a great job describing that.

1:30:45

I think I just want to emphasize again, the intent and purpose of those future land use maps, as I mentioned in my presentation, is to reflect reality on the ground as best you can, right?

1:30:55

And so these areas where you have a mapped floodplain, right, designated by FEMA, you want to make sure that your future land use map reflects that, right?

1:31:05

The goal of future land use map is to set at the stage for future potential regulatory measures, right.

1:31:11

If that is the case, that goes forward, right.

1:31:14

So you want to make sure that those floodplain areas, right, are going to reflect a potential zoning that would be appropriate for those areas.

1:31:22

So just want to add that as some more further clarification to that.

1:31:27

Thank you.

1:31:28

So this is more of a clarification than an actual change.

1:31:34

Is that fair?

1:31:36

Yeah, I believe, right.

1:31:39

Because again, the the plan itself is a policy document, right?

1:31:41

It's not regulatory, right.

1:31:42

And and the Philippine is already a regulated space, you know by FEMA, the county, right.

1:31:46

So we sort of implement that on those that regulated space on behalf.

1:31:52

And so in some ways it doesn't really change anything, right.

1:31:56

Like it's, it's essentially it's a recommendation for density.

1:31:59

If the plan were to be implemented through zoning and that zoning includes a residential component, yes, it could definitely, it could impact rather like your ability to subdivide or build homes in the floodplain could be restricted if that zoning was done right.

1:32:14

As it stands right now, that's not the zoning recommendation in the plan, right?

1:32:17

It doesn't largely the designations in the future land use map are they're you know, they're not implemented in that way, right, Because those the feature line each map primarily looks at residential density and minimum lot size, right.

1:32:32

It's really what that map is recommending and the zoning recommendation as it stands right now does not recommend any doing that.

1:32:40

So there isn't a lot that it would change I think.

1:32:44

Thanks.

1:32:45

I just wanted to see if I can restate this and tell me if I got it.

1:32:48

I got it right.

1:32:49

That and I like the way you describe this, Lauren.

1:32:51

If we incorporate the floodplain into floodplain designation into the map, we're making the map be consistent with reality.

1:32:59

This floodplain is already designated.

1:33:01

If we put it on the map, we're acknowledging that this exists.

1:33:04

Whether or not it becomes part of zoning or zoning gets overlaid on top of floodplain is an entirely different matter.

1:33:10

And in fact, what's before us today is to adopt A resolution of intent to consider this, to adopt in what, 2 weeks time?

1:33:19

Zoning is not on the table at the moment, correct.

1:33:22

Yeah.

1:33:22

And to even further clarify that, you know, you know, today if someone were to submit, say, a building permit to build in one of these floodplain areas, you know, they'd have to still adhere to all the requirements of the floodplain.

1:33:33

This isn't going to change the reality of that.

1:33:36

No new regulation becomes of this.

1:33:37

We're just making the map line up with existing reality, Correct.

1:33:41

Thanks.

1:33:41

And I see that Ted has a question.

1:33:45

Hi.

1:33:46

Yeah, thank you for the clarification there.

1:33:49

Commissioner, pretty much my final question is though, why wouldn't you take something that goes hand in hand with zoning and maybe, you know, it'd be part of that process compared to this community plan, which is obviously just a recommendation to you guys.

1:34:04

If it does pair with zoning and potentially you guys go through that process, I would just like to see why it would match up with that process rather than the community plan.

1:34:16

Do you want me to answer that question?

1:34:22

Yeah, so I'll clarify that by saying growth policies and area plans all include these future area land use maps, right?

1:34:33

They're required to do so.

1:34:35

And again, if the intent of the land use map is to reflect current and future growth in those areas, and so again, you want that future land use map to really set the stage for future regulatory measures.

1:34:50

So you can't after you adopt A future land use map, say you have an area on your future land use map designated as commercial.

1:35:00

You can't then, you know, without changing that land use map to, you know, if you said I want to take this commercial zone at residential, it needs to match what the zoning is, right?

1:35:10

So that document again serves as a policy document and so you can't create regulations not based on that document.

1:35:20

So Lauren or Ian, my my inclination would be to to implement maps recommendation as far as as the mapping and and have the flood hazard mapping reflected in the the land use map and the density changed accordingly.

1:35:37

What what would our action, how do we make that so is, is that a separate motion or are we just directing you to update the the plan that we are going to ultimately adopt on the 12th of February?

1:35:52

Yeah.

1:35:52

So we included the language in this motion in front of you has it does say as amended, Yeah.

1:36:02

So that as amended would cover if you were to choose to include the change with the the floodplain and also the additional recommendations that Ian went over regarding the fire section.

1:36:17

So that as amended I believe is an appropriate language that would say as an amendment not I just wanted to add to not predestine the future.

1:36:26

We will be voting not we on on February 12th.

1:36:31

Yeah, that that is absolutely correct.

1:36:32

I guess the question is for today before the 12th, how do we go about signaling that that which amendments were actually contemplating in the word amendment here.

1:36:47

I mean we it's discretionary whether we amend it or not.

1:36:58

Aaron, could you speak to that?

1:37:01

Sorry, Karen, just want clarification on if that would be better as a separate motion to include the amendments to the future land use map regarding the floodplain.

1:37:15

I don't, I don't think, I don't think it needs to be a separate motion.

1:37:18

I think you could do that and you could list, you can use this motion and you could list the changes to the, was it the fire section as outlined by Commissioner Strohmeier and changes to the land use designations to reflect the floodplain map would be the two sets of amendments.

1:37:38

So you could just list those in the in the motion to be clear.

1:37:48

OK, thank you.

1:37:53

OK.

1:37:53

Any other questions?

1:37:55

No, those are my questions.

1:37:56

Yeah, thanks.

1:37:58

Entertain a motion, OK.

1:38:00

And I will not be here on the 12th.

1:38:02

So I will just say that I really appreciate everyone's work on the plan staff, community members.

1:38:09

This has been a long slog, I know and and I can guarantee that 30 years will not elapse before implementation begins.

1:38:19

It it might not be as quickly as as all of us would like, but a plan is only as good as its implementation and I certainly have no desire to see this thing gathered dust.

1:38:32

So with that, I would move that the Missoula Board of Connie County Commissioners adopts this resolution of intent to adopt the Swan Valley Neighborhood Plan as an amendment of the Missoula County Growth Policy as recommended by the Missoula Consolidated Planning Board and as amended by the Board of County Commissioners.

1:38:50

The amendment including changes to the fire resiliency section and changes to the future land use map and land use designations based on the flood hazard mapping.

1:39:05

Second, any other public comment?

1:39:10

The only, only comment I have is that I love thinking of this as as just as meaningful and relevant as the key bridge in Baltimore.

1:39:19

We're going to get right after that, John, and we're going to apply the same level of resources and there'll be the same level of national scrutiny.

1:39:26

OK, all in favor, Aye, aye.

1:39:29

Thanks.

1:39:29

Thank you all.

1:39:34

OK.

1:39:35

The RAM division plat adjustment with Katie Reader, that's a great question.

1:41:13

I'm going to do a bio break if you're OK.

1:41:15

I'm going to do a.

1:41:16

Can we do a 2 minute break while you get sick?

1:41:18

Thanks.

1:47:17

OK, we're back.

1:47:18

Katie, take it away.

1:47:30

Thank you.

1:47:31

Good afternoon, commissioners.

1:47:32

For the record, my name is Katie, reader Planner with the Office of Planning, Development and Sustainability.

1:47:39

Today, I'm presenting the RAM addition a lot to plat adjustment.

1:47:44

This request was submitted by the property owner, Seiko Holdings, LLC and is represented by IMEG.

1:47:51

We have representatives from IMEG present with us this afternoon and they are available to address any technical questions.

1:48:02

The Ram Addition Minor Subdivision was originally approved by the Board of County Commissioners on July 11th in 2001 as a 5 lot commercial subdivision encompassing approximately 12.54 acres subject to 19 conditions of approval.

1:48:19

The final plat was filed on October 29th.

1:48:22

In 2001, the subdivision was approved under the CC-2 Zoning District which supports general commercial development including retail trades and services as well as automotive and Hwy.

1:48:35

oriented uses.

1:48:41

The applicant is requesting to vacate a portion of the 20 foot drainage easement which is highlighted highlighted here on the graphic.

1:48:48

As shown, the drainage easement continues N onto Lot 5, however, the request before you today is limited solely to a portion located within Lot 2.

1:49:01

While the drainage easement continues N through Lot 5, conditions on that lot have changed since the subdivision was planted in 2001.

1:49:10

Site inspection and aerial imagery show that RV trailers, internal roadways, and related improvements associated with Jim and Mary's RV Park expansion are located within the area of the recorded easement.

1:49:27

Additionally, the land has been altered, A berm has been constructed, and the grade now runs uphill, meaning the easement no longer functions as a drainage conveyance.

1:49:38

As a result, the easement does not currently operate as a functional storm water feature across the subdivision.

1:49:47

We sent this request to various Missoula County agencies.

1:49:50

Travis Ross of the Missoula Valley Water Quality District.

1:49:54

I'm sorry.

1:49:55

Missoula Valley Water Quality District cautioned against vacating the drainage easements in this area due to documented drainage problems in the vicinity.

1:50:05

While the subject lot may not currently experience issues, future redevelopment or changes in impervious surface or topography could increase the the drainage impacts and recommended hydraulic justification to demonstrate the easement would not be needed in the future.

1:50:23

Matt Heimel, Missoula County Floodplain Administrator, noted documented stormwater and groundwater issues throughout the O'Keefe Creek and Y area.

1:50:31

Emphasize the need to evaluate drainage as a subdivision scale, not just on an individual lot.

1:50:39

He cautioned that the drainage easement may serve future storm water needs tied to subdivision design changes.

1:50:45

Recommended verification that vacating the easement would not create adverse impacts.

1:50:51

He also suggested that an adjustment to the easement, rather than a full abandonment, may be more appropriate to maintain drainage protections.

1:51:00

Staff considered these comments alongside the fact that the easement contains no existing infrastructure, that stormwater standards have evolved since the original subdivision approval, and that current county practice requires site specific stormwater design and review at the time of development.

1:51:17

The requested adjustment is limited in scope and is not part of a series of incremental changes and resolves in a single identified constraint prior to future development review.

1:51:29

Based on comments from the Water Quality District and the Floodplain Administrator staff has amended has an amended recommendation that is intended to provide developer flexibility.

1:51:40

Before I elaborate on that, I'm going to run through the plat adjustment criteria real quick.

1:51:47

This request has condition.

1:51:50

This request as condition has met the criteria identified here.

1:51:56

The Request The request plot adjustment is minor in nature and limited, so lead a lot to with the recommended conditions of approval.

1:52:04

The subdivision remains in compliance with all applicable subdivision regulations and laws.

1:52:08

Stormwater and drainage will be addressed through future site specific coastal review and must meet current county and state standards, which could involve an amended easement location.

1:52:20

Altering the drainage easement on Lot 2 does not create a public health or safety risk and does not increase impacts to neighboring properties or the broader community.

1:52:29

The adjustment is consistent with the Missoula County Growth Policy and the original findings and intent of the RAM Addition Subdivision approval.

1:52:38

The request is not part of a series of incremental changes and is justified by site specific and context and contextual conditions that have evolved since the original plot was recorded.

1:52:50

The request is based on practical site constraints rather than an economic rather than economic considerations.

1:52:58

Staff finds the request meets the criteria for a minor plat adjustment, remains consistent with applicable regulations and policy, and can be approved with conditions to ensure stormwater is addressed through future site specific review.

1:53:16

While staff finds the request meets the criteria for a minor plat adjustment, a condition of approval was prepared in response to water quality comments to ensure that the potential drainage issues are appropriately appropriately addressed and that new condition is the 20 foot drainage easement shall be maintained on Lot 2.

1:53:37

The easement location may be modified but shall connect to the easement on Lot 5 subject to PDS review and and approval.

1:53:46

And with that, staff is recommending approval.

1:53:48

Approval Commissioners, here's your language.

1:53:52

Thanks a lot, Katie, Please, Dan.

1:53:56

Thanks commissioners.

1:53:57

Danny Roizer for the record, Senior planner and project Manager for iMac.

1:54:01

Also in the room with the owner, Jared, in case you guys have questions for him, brief context and then I'll just answer and facilitate any questions you have for me.

1:54:11

The, the, the goal here is to potentially do a commercial condo project, unknown density, maybe 8 units, 6 units, 10 units.

1:54:21

Can't really get into schematic design yet with this easement bifurcating the site.

1:54:25

So that's just our, our first go at this, you know, it's setting up the site so that we can plan for the owner.

1:54:33

You know, we, we did our due diligence and with meeting with the county, with Tim and Katie, kind of what the expectations of us was for the due diligence.

1:54:42

We did the background research, we reached out to the county, pulled as much data as we could and frankly both from a desktop analysis and what's on the ground, couldn't find any real reason the easement was there.

1:54:55

You know, there's no recording instrument that gives like a use and benefit of who this easement was for.

1:55:01

It was a little disjointed in how this plat was filed.

1:55:05

The original plat didn't have Mastad court cul-de-sac as part of it.

1:55:09

And then there was an amendment after the fact that designed the road.

1:55:15

Brian O'Connor with Public Works didn't have those Rd.

1:55:18

plans or drainage report or anything that would kind of justify why that easement was there.

1:55:24

Totally understand where the water quality districts coming from.

1:55:27

There's issues out there, there's clay, there's aquifer issues under the ground and there's water coming up here and there.

1:55:35

But from a drainage easement perspective, we couldn't justify a reason it was there.

1:55:42

So we felt abandonment was appropriate and that's why we submitted the application accordingly.

1:55:48

You know, I, I articulated to Katie and Tim that I'm not, we're not necessarily against the potential amendment, but we would like to have a dialogue around abandoning it first with that as a backup option.

1:56:02

I think there's other mechanisms as we move forward with this process to mitigate the water quality district's concerns of potential drainage.

1:56:14

So we have AC Ted application we'll have to go through, we'll have to go through a subdivision exemption application.

1:56:21

We'll have to do a full grading and drainage report for the county because we're in the MS-4 district.

1:56:26

So the county has control over what we propose and what they can improve for drainage and we do have to account for quote off site flows coming on to lot 2.

1:56:36

So if it's justified that we need to mitigate water from off lot to through off through lot 2, it can still be done with other mechanisms than an actual easement.

1:56:50

So I would like the easement to be gone so that we can fully optimize the site for our development plan and continue to work with the county to make sure conveyance of any needed storm water can be accomplished through those mechanisms.

1:57:02

So I'll leave it at that.

1:57:04

Happy to answer any other contextual questions or thoughts you might have for me.

1:57:08

Thanks, please.

1:57:10

Yeah.

1:57:10

So just to be clear, are are you wanting to us to table this for the time being and have more discussion or no?

1:57:19

I'm still hoping that our proposal to abandon the easement can be voted on without the recommended amended motion.

1:57:28

Is that their proper terminology there?

1:57:31

So this this is a new recommended motion from the planning staff just today and it's kind of a backup plan for what we want, which is a full abandonment.

1:57:42

OK, thank you.

1:57:46

Now I'm confused, what is the question before us?

1:57:49

So commissioners, what we're recommending is an additional condition that would retain the easement but allow for it to move on the site.

1:57:59

So what Danny's asking for is the original request which is to make it completely go away on Lot 2.

1:58:05

So that's kind of the choice before you today either allow it to go away completely or retain it in some modified form on Lot 2.

1:58:16

Question for you Tim.

1:58:17

So what do you think of Danny's thought on if future regulation would be required to deal with drainage given that an MS-4 permit would have to be required, it could be dealt with at that point and and an easement, actual easement wouldn't be required.

1:58:39

I think there's going to be a robust drainage review whatever happens on Lot 2.

1:58:44

I think what Travis and Matt are looking at is that if there needs to be subdivision wide conveyance, you don't want to get rid of an easement if you have it at your disposal kind of like it's kind of like Rd.

1:58:58

abandonment.

1:58:58

If you have like a road easement, you all are typically reticent to get rid of those easements unless there's really good reason to get rid of them.

1:59:07

And that's I think I'm just using that as an analogy for this easement.

1:59:11

I think Travis would like to just see it stay even if it in a modified form.

1:59:17

So that still allows Danny to do what he needs to do is just, I mean, that those those conversations and discussions would still happen and you could do what you needed to do with this easement still in place.

1:59:33

You're just saying it would be simpler if it were abandoned and then you could.

1:59:39

Yeah, I, I, I guess that is true.

1:59:42

I think that there is some Gray area nuance there within county Public works regulations and DEQ Circular 8 regulations that wouldn't necessarily require an easement at the end of this project, but would still require us to mitigate off site flows of the subdivision through lot 2 without an easement.

2:00:01

The regulations are clear at DEQ that an easement isn't necessarily required, but the facilities to convey it are.

2:00:09

So from my perspective, I would end up with more flexibility to optimize the site for development.

2:00:16

Without an easement and just the facilities after?

2:00:22

Oh, I'm sorry, could you bring up the the slide that precedes this one where you explain, OK, So what would the process be of if the easement is is retained?

2:00:40

What would the process be to move it at a later date based on what eventually gets proposed to be constructed on site?

2:00:52

Well under that condition that Katie just showed, they would have 60 days to record an instrument showing the easement in a new location.

2:01:01

Now as far as like a future easement, I'd it may or may not be required as part of like the Cosa process that Danny is describing, it very likely might not require an easement.

2:01:16

But what this condition gets at is that and our regulations require a new instrument to be recorded within 60 days showing the change.

2:01:29

And that would be true of the abandonment too.

2:01:31

I mean, basically they have to show it provide an exhibit within 60 days that would show it going away if we don't want to do this condition 60 days of our taking action.

2:01:42

Yes.

2:01:44

So just going to lay my cards out here.

2:01:46

Given the what, what how involved the Cosa process is and that storm water is an essential piece of that.

2:01:52

If during the KOSA review, the regulators determine that there's a real stormwater issue, they will recommend or they will require certain mitigation measures are taken and the developers will have to do those to make sure the stormwater is dealt with.

2:02:07

So given that that exists and that the grade goes uphill, I personally am OK.

2:02:12

I totally get the logic on that.

2:02:14

Why would you ever give this up?

2:02:15

It's your ace in the hole if you have it.

2:02:16

But given how intense the KOSA process is and what the conditions are on the ground, I personally am OK just letting this go.

2:02:23

But you guys can go the other way too if you want.

2:02:28

Having been involved in Cosa recently, I can't say it's, it's a very rigorous thing.

2:02:35

I mean, I'm that's my initial feeling.

2:02:38

But then I wanted to know, like how much heartburn does that cause staff or Travis or Matt?

2:02:46

And am I missing something?

2:02:49

Yeah, I don't, I don't know if I can really represent Travis or Matt.

2:02:52

I mean, our original recommendation was for the easement to go away just because we had been on

site, we had seen that there were great issues that Jim and Mary's actually encroaches onto a portion of the Lot 5 easement.

2:03:04

And so it, practically speaking, probably could never happen, at least on Lot 5.

2:03:09

So I don't think we have a lot of heartburn public comment.

2:03:20

Thanks a lot, Danny and thanks a ton, Katie and Tim, any public comment on this or if the owners would like to speak, you're more than welcome to.

2:03:28

You don't have to.

2:03:28

It's just if you would like to, no problem.

2:03:35

Sorry, one more question.

2:03:36

So if hypothetically we were to not choose to not adopt the condition of approval that we were just looking at, what would the motion look like?

2:03:47

Just we would just strike the as amended, OK, we just added that today.

2:03:54

So OK, I'm going to go ahead and try to make a motion here.

2:03:59

So I would move to approve the RAM addition plot adjustment based on the findings of facts and conclusions of law in the staff report subject to the recommended conditions of approval.

2:04:09

Second, any public comment.

2:04:14

OK, seeing none all in favor.

2:04:16

Aye, aye.

2:04:17

Thanks, everybody.

2:04:18

Thank you.

2:04:19

Thanks, Kevin.

2:04:25

Thanks, Tim and Katie.

2:05:11

Good afternoon, commissioners.

2:05:13

For the record, my name is Kevin Dantic, a planner with the Missoula County Department of Planning, Development and Sustainability.

2:05:20

Today I am here to present the staff report for the O'Keefe Ranch Estates Landscaping Condition Amendment.

2:05:27

This is brought forth by Technical Representative Ron Wetstein from Professional Consultants Incorporated on behalf of RIN Built Homes.

2:05:37

The property location is northwest of the Interstate 90 US 93 N Interchange, more commonly known as the Y in O'Keefe Ranch Estates, Phases 3, five and six.

2:05:51

The vicinity maps here.

2:05:52

As we can see, we have the Y interchange here off of I9093 going north.

2:05:57

The subdivision itself is accessed off of Waldo Waldo Rd.

2:06:01

on the West side of 93 through Victoria Dr.

2:06:05

is the main thoroughfare.

2:06:08

Again, we are in phases 3, five and six of the O'kee Franchis stage.

2:06:12

This is a general overview of the area this aerial image was taking on September 3rd of this year.

2:06:22

A little bit of background on the proposal and O'kee Franchis states it was a O'kee Franchis states were originally.

2:06:29

It was originally approved on October 19th, 2005, subject to 27 conditions and approval.

2:06:38

Phase 3 was filed in 2025.

2:06:41

Phases 4 through 8 have final plat deadlines.

2:06:44

Between 2028 and 2031, this subdivision has had additional plot adjustments, condition

amendments and phasing plan modifications that have been approved by this board with the most recent being on May 11th, 2023.

2:07:01

The original subdivision approval in 2005 did contain 7 conditions of approval related to pedestrian facilities and non motorized transportation.

2:07:10

Condition of approval #17 at that time in that document referenced these common area strips that I'll be showing on the screen here.

2:07:19

These condition amendment requests are subject to the Missoula County Subdivision Regulations 6.7, which the purposes and antennas in call to accommodate modest changes to plat elements, supplemental plans and documents that accompany a file plat or the conditions of approval for a file plat.

2:07:37

That's what we're dealing with in phase three because the plat has been filed.

2:07:42

Missoula County Subdivision Regulations Section 5.9 adjustments to preliminary Platts will go through, includes Phases 5 and 6 of this subdivision as they have not yet been filed.

2:08:01

Again, here's the approved phasing plan that came through this body on May 11th, 2023.

2:08:07

We have an 8 phase subdivision here, the common area strips border phase three, phase five, and phase six.

2:08:15

I will show a closer up view of this in just a moment here.

2:08:21

The applicant is requesting an amendment to Condition of approval #14 relating to those common area strips in Phases 3, five and six.

2:08:29

Again, the condition as currently written was part of the amended Subdivisions Conditions of Approval from 2023.

2:08:40

The approved O'Keefe Ranch Estates Residential Landscape Guidelines were part of that 2023 amendment and phasing plan extension.

2:08:51

As you can see here.

2:08:52

These are the approved Residential Landscape Guidelines that were approved for meeting the subdivision conditions of approval.

2:09:01

What we can see here is 0 escaping these plans were brought up.

2:09:07

This was the vision for Oke Franch Estates.

2:09:11

This is what the spirit and intent of what the Residential Landscape Guidelines were meant to be.

2:09:18

We see a lot of diversity in plantings.

2:09:21

We see more plantings, we see different mulches, we see organic mulch, we see non organic mulch, more diversity and color.

2:09:32

And what we have and what has happened is the guidelines were not regulatory, they were a guideline.

2:09:44

This is what we want the intent of this subdivision to look like.

2:09:48

Some common area strips that have already been changed into the 0 escaping.

2:09:52

One of them is at the end of Winterset Court, which was previous phase of the subdivision.

2:09:59

As we can see here.

2:10:00

We do have some fontanellas.

2:10:02

We have some blue gamma glass grass.

2:10:04

We have some common white yarrows that were approved and this is the plan itself.

2:10:08

This came from the O'Keefe Park landscaping.

2:10:12

This was the only document that actually referenced these other ones.

2:10:15

Again, we're not talking about Winterset Court here, but I wanted to show you as compared to the spirit and the intent of that landscaping plan, what we're seeing on the ground.

2:10:26

Again, these pictures depict something that has been most likely been planted the end of last growing season.

2:10:33

And what we want to see is more diversity.

2:10:37

We want to see more control over what actually gets planted.

2:10:42

Again, these plants are small.

2:10:44

There is confirmation from the developers that if these plants don't overwinter they will be replaced.

2:10:52

Confirmed with a collagen extension.

2:10:53

These most likely are one gallon plantings that were put in.

2:10:57

Again, this is previous phases of the subdivision that were approved for 0 escaping on Sandy Pond and Winterset courts.

2:11:05

Here we're looking at phase one and two of O'Keefe Ranch Estates.

2:11:09

This is Victoria Drive from Google Maps as going into the subdivision and this is Palmdale Court where the common area strip was removed by this body due to steep slopes and excuse me, storm water management.

2:11:26

The condition amendment itself it the condition amendment.

2:11:33

These strips are approximately 660 linear feet in total.

2:11:38

The break up the blocks Missoula County Subdivision regulations, section 3.3, point 2.2.

2:11:44

The block length shall be no longer than 450 feet.

2:11:48

These common area strips break up the the long blocks between Dufferin and Contera, Contera and Covenant and Covenant and Gratton drives.

2:11:59

Again, this is similar to the condition amendment that came before this board just a few years ago.

2:12:04

Agency comments that were received through appropriate in Missoula County agencies climate action, which is actually within the planning development sustainability.

2:12:18

Their recommendation for the o'kee franchise estates will be include a balanced mix of native trees, which would actually increase canopy cover and are most effective at cooling developed areas.

2:12:28

Low lying green infrastructure such as native plantings and flowering plants as well as you're escaping in order to reduce the heat island effect and meet the county's climate goals.

2:12:39

Other agency comment that was received from the Missoula County Department of College and Extension said that there is quite a misunderstanding of 00 escaping.

2:12:49

It's misunderstood as landscape dominated by rocks and the occasional drought tolerant plant.

2:12:55

This comment did note that the O'Keefe landscape guidelines are a general overview and they don't provide specifics.

2:13:04

It was noted that some of the recommended species well made to Montana were not considered water wise and that a more comprehensive species list will be helpful.

2:13:12

And again, that the landscape rock itself that we see in some of the pictures may be too big and damage the plants due to their large size.

2:13:24

The condition amendment here in front of you through numerous iterations.

2:13:28

I can break this down for you, make it a little bit easier to read what the condition amendment and what our motion today will read will be.

2:13:38

Plans for the installation of landscaping per the approved O'Keefe Ranch Estates Residential Landscape Guidelines.

2:13:45

Updated October 14th, 2022 with a 5 foot wide asphalt path and a commercial irrigation system and the 20 foot wide common area strips that break up the blocks between Dufferin and Contera drives, Contera and Covenant drives, and Covenant and Gratton drives shall be subject to review and approval by the Missoula County Departments of Planning, Development and Sustainability and Ecology and Extension.

2:14:10

Those plans shall include planting quantities, species and sizing, quantity and sizing of landscape, rock and commercial irrigation plans.

2:14:23

That last commercial irrigation system plans to be included that was adjusting some language related to the irrigation after the final staff report was issued at the Board of County Commissioners update meeting on Monday, January 26th, there was a commissioner recommendation to really beef up the language a little bit in relating to that commercial irrigation system.

2:14:49

Hence is why this condition amendment reads a little bit different than what was in the finalized staff report.

2:14:58

These condition amendments do have to go through review criteria out of Missoula County Zoning Relations.

2:15:03

Section 5.9, Point four and six point 7.4.

2:15:09

The changes are of a minor nature.

2:15:13

The proposed condition amendment complies with the subdivision regulations.

2:15:17

It will not reduce protections or safeguard provided by those regs.

2:15:22

The proposed condition amendment is to change the required landscaping per the approved O'Keefe Ranch Residential Landscaping Guidelines.

2:15:30

Will not create any new impact or increase a previously previously recognized impact.

2:15:36

It's consistent with the currently adopted growth policy.

2:15:40

It's consistent with the findings of facts and conclusion of law adopted by the subdivision.

2:15:45

The O'Keefe Ranch Estates Residential Landscape Guidelines were deemed efficient sufficient as meeting the conditions of approval for the required landscaping as part of the approved 2023 condition amendment.

2:15:56

The amendment's not incremental.

2:15:59

The proposed amendment is related to change from seeded grass on those common area strips into 0 escaping, which is allowed per the O'Keefe Ranch Estates Residential Landscape guidelines.

2:16:13

And lastly, the proposed amendment is not related to economic changes.

2:16:20

In the end, staff recommends approval of the proposed condition amendment.

2:16:25

And Commissioners, I do have a proposed motion on the screen before you.

2:16:33

Thanks, Kevin.

2:16:36

Ron, do you need to speak?

2:16:49

OK.

2:16:51

I'd like to thank Kevin for all his work on this.

2:16:53

We had many conversations in person, on phone, e-mail and so on.

2:16:58

Also here today is are Scott and Ryan of the development company.

2:17:02

I just want to say that we are in, in, in support of the recommendation.

2:17:08

As you know, the 0 escaping concept is more ecologically responsible, especially in this, in this type of of soils.

2:17:17

If you haven't had a chance to get go up and drive around in O'Keefe Ranch, it's, it's coming together quite nicely.

2:17:23

We've, we just have phases 5 through 8 to file and everything is going well and we want to make it look very nice.

2:17:33

And, and again, you know, anytime you, you plant something, it's small and then it grows up nice and big.

2:17:38

So we'll, you know, go ahead and take a good look at, at the landscaping plans and make sure the landscapers put in the right stuff and everybody's happy.

2:17:47

Thank you.

2:17:49

Thanks.

2:17:51

You guys have any questions?

2:17:53

No, I'm, I'm sorry, did you have questions?

2:17:58

I'd move to approve the O'Keefe Ranch Estate subdivision landscaping condition amendment, subject to the master conditions as modified.

2:18:04

Second, any public comment?

2:18:08

OK.

2:18:09

All in favor?

2:18:10

Aye, aye.

2:18:12

Thanks, everybody.

2:18:12

Thanks.

2:18:19

We're adjourned.