1. CALL TO ORDER
Commissioners Present: Commissioner (Chair) Jean Curtiss, Commissioner Bill Carey, Commissioner Michele Landquist

Staff Present: Lewis Yellow Robe, CAPS

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS
The Elections Office is looking for 800 people to help with Elections. You need a certain number of people at the polling places so that the votes are secure and handled properly. You can call Rebecca in the Elections office to get signed up.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT
None

5. ROUTINE ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS
Current Claims List ($2,575,623.89)

Executive Session
Commissioner Carey made motion that the Board of County Commissioners approve the Current Claims List in the amount of $2,575,623.89. Commissioner Landquist second the motion. The motion carried a vote of 3-0.

6. HEARING (continued from January 8, 2014)
Resolution of Intent to Adopt Missoula County Growth Policy Profile Update (Chapter 2)
Lewis YellowRobe gave update and showed PPT Presentation. We did receive some comments since the January 8, 2014 Public Meeting.

Staff Recommendation:
Adopt a Resolution of Intent to Adopt the Missoula County Growth Policy Profile (Chapter 2) update as amended by the Missoula Consolidated Planning Board with additional amendments in Attachment 2 of the Request for Commission Action and the staff memos dated January 17, 2014, and January 22, 2014, based on the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

Public Comment

Jim Cusker: As Lewis pointed out, I looked at Table 13 which was in the draft document that you received on Page 36. If you have that handy why don’t you look at it. You notice that the insertion of two additional data points effectively messes up the entire table; percentages are all wrong. Those two data points however are very important. Those data points refer to all other soils in Missoula County that are non-agricultural use and the publicly owned land is in Missoula County. Consequently in trying to find a way that would incorporate those two data points while maintaining the integrity of the original table 13, I gave two recommendations. Lewis feels that the second table does a better job and I agree with him. In looking at it however, I see that and this was very recently brought to my attention — if you’ll look at table 13a that I provided you. It says; soil acreage in Missoula County suitable for agriculture gives a soil designation and the number of acres in the percent of the county total. The first entry on that table says public land unavailable for agriculture. Wait a minute, isn’t the grazing of cattle on public land a form of agriculture? Indeed it is. This could be easily corrected by changing the title of table 13a ~ Soil acreage in Missoula County suitable for crop agriculture. That same designation might be made line by line, public land unavailable for crop agriculture. And in each case, private land with soils unsuitable for crop agriculture, they well might be used for grazing.

The last one; public lands with soils suitable for crop agriculture. If that were done, that would certainly bring further clarification and would not neglect the fact that grazing is an important agriculture activity which might occur on public land.

Table 13b, this would essentially be the original table 13b that was found in the document before any changes were suggested. The only change that I would suggest on that one is to place the soils that are of agriculture importance. And once again perhaps with that very title we should put ‘of agricultural crop importance’. Because that indeed is the way these USDA soil types are designated and when you look at the tables in the USDA handbook they’ll tell you, okay on prime farmland you can expect 100 bushels per acre of wheat. Whereas, on farmland of statewide importance you can expect perhaps 50-60, etc. so I think that would be perhaps advisable. The order of soils on table 13b are listed in descending order of importance with prime farmland being the most productive. You might notice as you look at that that there’s just over 1,000 acres in the county and that’s designated as prime farmland. Going down one more; prime farmland if irrigated, same productivity anticipated there, except you’ve got to irrigate it. And if you’re wondering where that prime farmland without irrigation is, it’s up nine mile, which is rather interesting. But I would suggest that prime farmland be listed first, prime farmland if irrigated be listed second, prime farmland of statewide importance be listed third because that’s the third most productive. With the last one being farmland with local importance.
**Commissioner Landquist:** I’m a real firm believer in saying what we mean and mean what we say and I think Jim Cusker brought some interesting and valuable information to our attention to add that word crop. But I also think maybe if there was the ability to put a small tiny font print here, to put underneath it; just a statement that they are suitable for grazing. That it would help people in the future when we’re not here or Jim’s not here, that institutional knowledge that goes into making these documents what they are, that there’s some way we can go the extra mile and spell that out.

**Chair Curtiss:** Maybe it should be included in the paragraph up above, somewhere.

**Commissioner Landquist:** I just don’t want to lose that institutional knowledge that went into that.

**Chair Curtiss:** I’m wondering if instead of being under the table, it should be in the document. So the one paragraph says; soils are evaluated based on their capability to support agricultural production. You could put something behind that saying; other soils may support grazing…or something.

**Jim Cusker:** If I may make a suggestion. In the paragraph that precedes the table, Table 13 lists the type of acres of agricultural soils in Missoula County. Once again, crops should be inserted there ~ of agricultural crops in Missoula County. Although there was a total of 1.6 million acres, etc., etc. only 130,000, less than 8% are suitable for crop agriculture. Then the suggestion that Michele stated, perhaps could be inserted. Perhaps words to the effect that public and private land unsuitable for crop agriculture is very important for grazing.

**Commissioner Landquist:** I think that’s important language that you brought to our attention and I think it’s important that we incorporate both of them.

**Chair Curtiss:** So that one sentence would read; although there are a total of 1.6 million acres in Missoula County only 130,000 are suitable for crop agriculture. Then we’d insert a sentence; other lands including public lands may support grazing.

**Lewis Yellow Robe:** May support grazing in other?

**Chair Curtiss:** I’d put other lands, including public lands, may support grazing. Just pretty simple.

**Annie Hyser, Community Food and Agricultural Coalition (CFAC):** The last draft that you put out that had all the strikeouts and add-ins was really easy to read, very helpful. Thank you.

**Executive Session**

**Chair Curtiss:** I’d like to thank Lewis and other staff that helped you were pulling this all together. This was very easy to understand and not see where we made changes and where those ideas came from. I have one question with the Hazardous Waste sites we would only update and add the ones that were in Missoula County, right? That were provided by DEQ?
**Lewis Yellow Robe:** Yes. That list is page 4 of 6 that is an entire state wide report so yes you’re right, just the Missoula County. I know the report does include information from other counties in Missoula but yes, you’re right only Missoula County is listed in this report.

**Chair Curtiss:** And the land ownership that the Salish Kootenai Tribes have provided is in this working draft, right?

**Lewis Yellow Robe:** Not yet, no. It’s in the memo that I provided this morning and I apologize for the lateness of the memo. You’ll see the new map in the material. The new map in the memo then has that current land status or land ownership information that reflects the CSKT land at 96,229 acres and then individually owned held in trust by the Indian affairs at 1,435 acres. So that information then is reflected in the map and then also in the pie chart that’s below the figure information. Our GIS Manager, Nate Rogers, it took him a little while to work with the data and get us these figures and he was finally able to accomplish that task yesterday.

**Commissioner Landquist:** I’d also like to thank staff for their work on this but I’d especially like to thank the public that came forward to point various things out to us to help us make a whole better document. It’s always better when the public comes forward and helps us crunch some things because many eyes on documents like this see the things that maybe we would of glazed over. These things are supposed to guides us for a good long while so thank you very much.

**Chair Curtiss:** Procedurally, I think we would just work with the memo from today and incorporate that into the draft from January 8th. I think we worked through the crop and grazing language okay, if you’re alright with that. I know that Robin has been taking notes but we’ll have the finished document that she can add to the minutes in the end so that was on page 36. We’ll also incorporate the additional Hazardous Waste sites and the information and maps regarding the Salish and Kootenai Tribe ownership. So with those documents…our action today is to adopt a Resolution of Intent to adopt and then we would official adopt at a point in the future. Do we set that date today?

**Lewis Yellow Robe:** Yes and when you adopt the Resolution would that be at an Administration Meeting or at a future Public Hearing?

**Chair Curtiss:** I don’t know.

**Commissioner Landquist:** I was wondering why and I think I know the answer to this – is it to allow for possible more public comment? The reason we do the Resolution of Intent to adopt, rather than just adopt right now?

**Chair Curtiss:** Yes.

**Lewis Yellow Robe:** And perhaps another waiting period of a week or two.

**Commissioner Carey:** Maybe at our next Public Meeting?

**Lewis Yellow Robe:** Yes and staff could incorporate all the material if this is the direction the Commissioners are taking, the Planning Board revisions, then the public comments
that have been received since the Public Hearings beginning on December 18th, January 8th and January 22nd and also the revisions that the County Commissioners provided to staff that are included in the memo that’s attached from January 17th, this working draft memo.

Chair Curtiss: So we’re not required to give 30 days from this point?

Lewis Yellow Robe: No. There is no legal, the law doesn’t have a time period it just indicates a Resolution of Intent.

Chair Curtiss: Seems like folks have had lots of time so we wouldn’t have to give it a month.

Commissioner Landquist: I think two (2) weeks works.

Lewis Yellow Robe: Two weeks, okay.

Motion
Commissioner Landquist made motion that the Board of County Commissioner approve the Resolution of Intent to Adopt for the changes in Chapter 2 of the Growth Policy for Missoula County as incorporating the last changes that we have just reviewed today and included in this memo. Commissioner Carey second the motion. The motion carried a vote of 3-0.

7. OTHER BUSINESS
None

8. RECESS
Being no further business to come before the Board the Commissioners are in recess at 1:57.