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

Staff Present: Jamie Erbacher, CAPS, Todd Klietz, CAPS, Tim Worley, CAPS

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS
PROCLAMATION: County Day of Recognition for National Service
Chair Carey read the Proclamation

4. PUBLIC COMMENT
None

5. ROUTINE ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS
Current Claims List ~ $2,290,841.11

Executive Session
Commissioner Curtiss made motion that the Board of County Commissioners approve the Current Claims List in the amount of $2,290,841.11. Commissioner Rowley second the motion. The motion carried a vote of 3-0.

6. HEARINGS
a. Canyon Creek Village Major Text Amendment Rezone
   Jamie Erbacher gave staff report with PPT presentation
   Missoula County Community & Planning Services has received a request for a major text amendment for the Canyon Creek Village Subdivision PUD zoning standards.
Canyon Creek village was approved in March of 2001 and contains over 200 residential lots. The subdivision is located on the eastern edge of the development park, with Direct TV. South of Interstate 90, North of Expressway and about 1.5 miles west of Reserve. Windsor Park is the East as is Canyon East Subdivision. Canyon Creek Village is comprised of 16 phases, in five (5) zoning sub-districts. Currently phases 1-12 have been filed and phases 13-15, which are in sub-district #4, have not been filed, neither has sub-district #16. When the zoning was approved sub-district #4 was permitted to allow for live-work units. In 2008 there was an amendment that came to the Commissioners that allowed just multi-family housing in sub-district #4, without commercial component. The focus of the text amendment today is predominantly on sub-district #4; however there are some other clarifications that I’ll go over throughout the presentation.

**Commissioner Curtiss:** Can I ask for one clarification?

**Jamie Erbacher:** Yes.

**Commissioner Curtiss:** Even though we said that it could have multi-family housing it could still be a live/work?

**Jamie Erbacher:** That is correct.

So the major purpose of this zoning amendment is to clarify previous approvals and incorporate all existing language into one document.

**Perry Ashby, Project Representative:** Your discussion about carport vs. garage on the east side, the owners association made a valid point in that the enclosed garage is very utilized. That people would do what they’re currently doing out there, they store their clothes, their toys, whatever, and then park on the street. The reason that we have not included restricting it to carports is that it...although you don’t see it in the streetscape, these are townhouses. They look more like a design that would be well suited for Canyon Creek Village for multi-family. These are actually individual townhouses, there’s a little alley in the back and they have tuck-under garages. So you drive in your garage and the door comes down and then you're in your individual townhouse. So I didn’t want to place a restriction on the design in the event that we would put in townhouses like this.

**Commissioner Curtiss:** If you went with that model then, where they actually have a garage tucked under, then the zero setback in the back wouldn’t apply? Or would you end up having parking space then instead?

**Perry Ashby:** That would be the back of the garage. So you would have a parking space and then a garage door and a garage.

**Commissioner Curtiss:** So the building would go back to the property line?

**Perry Ashby:** No. The only thing that’s allowed is carports and parking. Garages themselves would not be allowed.

**Commissioner Curtiss:** So a garage isn't considered an accessory?
Perry Ashby: I’m not real sure.

Jamie Erbacher: If you did a detached garage, then that’s an accessory building.

Commissioner Curtiss: That’s the other question I have about...I know when we built our garage, detached from our house; it was a requirement of how far they had to be apart for fire code. Does this allow room for a carport and space between it and the building?

Perry Ashby: Yes, it does. That’s actually driven by building code, for fire separation. I think its five (5) feet.

Commissioner Curtiss: I did drive out there and one of my concerns is whether cars...if you have that zero line, do they have room to swing and get in there?

Perry Ashby: The answer to that is yes.

Jamie Erbacher: The carports are 16 feet?

Perry Ashby: The carports are likely to be 20 feet.

Jamie Erbacher: So your parking space is 18½ feet long but there’s overhang allowed, with a wider sidewalk, as they are proposing.

Commissioner Curtiss: The other concern is about those planter boxes out front of the current building, they are attractive but if you look at them, I didn’t get out with a tape measure but it looks like about seven (7) feet, you could put a little fence and have it be considered your yard. There really wouldn’t be an accessible sidewalk so between the planter boxes and where you park your car, there’s not room for a stroller or pulling a kid in a wagon.

Perry Ashby: What we’re planning to do is what you see here in the City. That is the grates that are at street level. The elevated planter boxes work well with that commercial environment for people to sit there or to confine the planter box. Where we’re proposing trees and plants as you see here, those will be in wells, so they will be perfectly flush with the surrounding.

Commissioner Curtiss: How wide are the sidewalks, before you can hit a porch?

Perry Ashby: I can’t tell from that. That’s human scale right there where you see that tree (looking at PPT slide).

Jamie Erbacher: So the edge of the well, there’s going to be plenty of room between that and the porch area so a wheelchair or something else can easily access.

Commissioner Curtiss: So you’ll probably move the tree well towards the street?

Jamie Erbacher: Paul’s thinking the boulevard area is twelve (12) feet.
Commissioner Curtiss: One of the other things I got from reading the home owners comments is; it doesn’t seem to me like they’re very excited about something above a 2-story building. What I picked out of it was they understood the parking, seemed to be okay with that, although when I look at that ~ am I going to park way down there and pack my groceries down to the 3rd building? Is the need to go four (4) stories high more of an economic choice?

Perry Ashby: Initially we designed it partially for economic, but mainly because of the design perspective. In the very original documents we had commercial on first and second floors and then any building that was three stories or greater was allowed to have residential at levels three and four. And then we found around 2008 that after extensive marketing efforts that there was very little interest in live/work and that’s what I think we expressed at the Planning Status Meeting. As far as the home owners association goes, we worked with them pretty extensively, they weren’t even aware that multi-family was allowed on this, so that opened up dialog on facebook and then that’s what precipitated the meeting at Territorial. I felt like we have really viable comments and I feel I accommodated 100% of their comments. It was an education session also; it gave us all an opportunity. I may be there frequently, but their boots are on the ground, they live there, they walk around in the evenings, so they were able to provide that inside input. They were very willing to work with us on what we ended up with on this final document.

Commissioner Curtiss: The one wall on that building is cinderblock, I’m sure it was built that way so you could put another on it. What’s your plan to blend that in?

Perry Ashby: That’s a fire rated wall, that’s why we put it there, so you could go zero, just like anywhere downtown here. More than likely it would be that the wall of the adjacent building would be right up to it. If there were walk thru passages/areas, they would be softened architecturally. The building would actually touch it and then if we needed to have access from Kendrick to the alley, there would be corridors between the architectural buildings. It wouldn’t be as harsh as what you see there now.

Commissioner Rowley: What kind of parking is required for businesses or is there parking requirements if it’s a business? And how would that impact the overall parking that’s available for residents?

Perry Ashby: Depending on the type of business it is. I just learned this today, it’s one (1) parking space per 100 square feet of floor space for a business. But that changes depending on high intensity retail vs just low intensity office. Residential uses are not there when retail or commercial are there, so that’s a concept that was used in this document.

Jamie Erbacher: We don’t see much for mixed use buildings within the county but the county itself does have a reduction for mixed use buildings such as this. How it reads and how we were intending it to stay is that all live/work units share a minimum of 50% of the required off-street parking spaces, based on the counties only Resolution for each use. Essentially they’re getting that credit for having different hours of operation, if you will.
**Perry Ashby:** What we found so far is with the current live/work that we have there it's worked quite well. Overflow parking does take place on the street, not a lot of it. I will tell you I'm sensitive to parking, I can't sit here and present you with data and say it's going to work perfectly but, I will say, that the 42 spaces on Kendrick is going to make a huge difference.

**Commissioner Rowley:** I guess I'm just concerned that there's nothing written into the document that if a high traffic business comes in, or something like that, that you don't have to take that into consideration really in any future multi-family residence that you put in because it's not in here. That's it's not accounted for, not that I think you would do that but do you see my concern?

**Perry Ashby:** I do. But what's interesting is the way the zoning is currently setup, I haven't done the calculation, I think Paul has but we can put less parking in with live/work. The city allows one (1) per unit under 850 square feet.

**Commissioner Rowley:** When something is built residential there's...you have to have the rear setback, getting rid of that rear setback is based on live/work zones?

**Jamie Erbacher:** That's just for the carport structures. Typically it is a three (3) foot setback to the rear or the side property boundary, instead of zero.

**Commissioner Curtiss:** Because of the large park that's close, that will be a place for kids to play, because they aren't going to have a yard.

**Jamie Erbacher:** Right, they're not going to have a yard. There are parks close by. These spaces at the subdivision...the parks requirement was taken care of already.

**Commissioner Rowley:** Can you address a concern I have? It seems like we're trying to build things to work/live standards and are just going to build residential units. It's a way of perhaps getting around needing the general residential multi-family standards.

**Perry Ashby:** What I'm trying to do here is essentially...we went back in 2008 and we were able to prove to the Commissioners that multi-family might be a more viable option based on, as I mentioned before, Reserve Street and the services there and the higher need for residential. I'm not here to try to circumvent anything, what I'm trying to do is essentially develop a better and clear design guideline standard for something that we already have and we have approval to do. With a lot of input from different agencies and frankly the highest level of input was from the neighbors. Did I touch on your concerns?

**Commissioner Rowley:** Yes. It sounds like moving forward this is perhaps just going to be 100% residential, potentially. It is nice to have the option to do live/work but will it be a particular unit is live/work? and it will be built with those standards? But if we have just 100% residential units then it doesn't have to have the usual residential standards because you have this either/or hybrid. Maybe we're all okay with that, this was approved in '08 and I'm not sure what the vision was then, I'm just having troubles wrapping my mind around. This could all end up being all residential but to be built to
less aesthetically pleasing standards because you have the option to do live/work, but you didn’t.

Perry Ashby: I understand. And when you say residential standards, primarily my interpretation is more parking, is that what you’re thinking?

Commissioner Rowley: I think more of the aesthetic things, the landscaping, the setbacks, the parking and the neighborhood nature that is built into the regulations that go along with residential.

Perry Ashby: A lot of this ties back to the whole philosophy of the traditional development design where affordability is heightened by density. Then you provide a street scene that frankly we’ve achieved today, 15 years ago we put in 1½ caliber trees, now some are really big, it started to get the feeling that a flavor of some of your original watercolors done by Jeannie Hauffman to create a street scene to give the Commissioner an opportunity to see what my vision was, as the founder of the project.

I feel like we’re...even if does go multi-family or residential 100%, which I don’t know right now. I’m here just requesting the flexibility knowing that; A) it can already be multi-family but it’s gonna be something a little more harsh that we can’t get the approvals for or get the changes on the parking. B) That sort of street scene that you saw, if you’ve been out there, to see the live/work that we created. No it doesn’t have a yard out front but what it does have is a very good flavor, a very good feel in this one district, sub-district 4. The park is within 80 feet of the NE corner of the most northerly lot, so as far as outdoor recreation, outdoor living, it’s used a lot, the home owners association extremely active and giving parties and kids playing there and so on.

Jamie Erbacher: One thing we heard from the homeowners is that having that seven (7) feet of green space in the front may even be for maintenance wise, why maintain something that’s really not much prettier than a porch. You get muddy areas, you’re able to do townhouses, condos or multi-family, so who’s in charge of that maintenance? That was an issue for them and I think that was why they were more acceptable to having the porches and patios come up to the property line.

Commissioner Rowley: I do think it looks fine and I’m not trying to accuse you of trying to hurt any rules or anything.

Perry Ashby: Defining it with little steel railings, whether they are outdoor living or….this is for the ground floor. They’re gonna have BBQs and they’re gonna have patios, little outdoor living areas.

Public Comment
Paul Forsting, Territorial Landworks: I’m another representative. Perry’s been working on this project since 2001 and he works with the HOA, we’ve had several meetings. Some of the dialog we’ve heard today is coming from that. I could add more to the conversation that we’ve been having here but I’m not sure if you’re still uncomfortable about some of these topics like the front yard, setbacks and encroachments. Or cola, you’re concerned that we’re doing something abnormal regarding residential here, we kind of are because Perry’s been through the process of playing with the development. That’s where you go through a pretty elaborate review
process but you come up with exhibits like he presented here and those really define what you can do and it's very unique.

**Commissioner Curtiss:** So the sidewalk portion of that front space is considered in the right-of-way, right?

**Paul Forsting:** Correct, yes.

**Commissioner Curtiss:** So anything we do there is gonna have to be day-to-day.

**Paul Forsting:** Yes, absolutely.

**Executive Session**

Commissioner Curtiss made motion that the Board of County Commissioners amend #4, Section b, page 9, off-street parking, to strike the last sentence; all multi-family buildings shall provide one (1) parking space for each multi-family dwelling unit. Commissioner Rowley second the motion. The motion carried a vote of 3-0.

Commissioner Curtiss made motion that the Board of County Commissioners adopt the memo dated March 20, 2015, that was presented for Conditions of Approval regarding floodplain, to strike the conditions regarding 2 feet above the flood elevation. Commissioner Rowley second the motion. The motion carried a vote of 3-0.

Commissioner Curtiss made motion that the Board of County Commissioners approve the request for the major text Amendment of Canyon Creek Village Subdivision Standards subject to conditions as amended today based on the findings and facts in the staff report and public testimony. Commissioner Rowley second the motion. The motion carried a vote of 3-0.

b. Shoreline Regulations Update (continued from March 11, 2015)

Todd Klietz, Floodplain Administrator gave staff report with PPT presentation

Our Shoreline Regulations have been in effect since 1997. They were amended slightly in 1998. A lot of Administrative changes have happened at the county with the Planning Office and the Office of Planning and Grants. It’s time to update our Shoreline Regulations so what we’ve done is we started in earnest, last summer, and from there went out for public comment, received comments from agencies and property owners. Went before the County Planning Board, they had some suggestions that we worked with and are in the draft in front of you.

To summarize what we’ve done, basically there are three (3) different groups of changes that we made to the Shoreline Regulations;

1. Administrative Cleanup – replacing the Office of Planning and Grants with Community and Planning Services.
2. Fee Amounts that were set in 1997 ~ the following year is when they became out-of-date so we ruled the fee amounts from those regulations.
3. Discrepancy between what we could issue permits for with boat houses and boat shelters, we’ve cleaned that up.

We’ve incorporated site visits, when weather permits.
There are only two (2) actual regulatory amendments:
1. To allow recreational campfires. The current Shoreline Regulations do not really address campfires.
2. 500 square foot amount of dredging that can happen with any shoreline permit application.

We added purpose statements to the regulations to define why we’re actually doing the shoreline regulations, to include restoration and to do what we can to protect wildlife and fisheries. And also provide education to the shoreline property owners.

**Commissioner Curtiss:** We don’t have the fees in the regulations but are they listed in the appendix?

**Todd Klietz:** When the fees are updated by the County Commission, the Community Planning Services has a list of what all those fees are and they're also identified on our website. Currently the shoreline permit fee is $200.00.

**Public Comment**

**Allen Castonguay:** Do you have a definition of a campfire ring?

**Todd Klietz:** No, we do not.

**Allen Castonguay:** Why not? For instance, within my area of ½ mile along the shoreline you can find anywhere from a pile of rocks, to a cement circle, to an iron circle, to an area of grass up to the fire pit with an area 20 feet around the fire pit. You can find them above the beach and you can find them on the beach. I think you should have a definition of a campfire ring and the location.

**Todd Klietz:** What we do have is that a campfire cannot exceed two (2) feet in diameter. But as far as what they utilize to form their two foot diameter, whether it’s rocks or iron, we didn’t specify that.

**Allen Castonguay:** I had a little discussion with my neighbor; he has a little pile of bricks on the gravel and the grass. He was concerned if this was a qualified fire pit. He called the local fire department and they came out to look at it, they said yes, it looks great. They said it’s a qualified fire ring. I don’t think it was, it’s just two rows of bricks so that’s 8 inches high.

**Commissioner Curtiss:** We don’t require a ring, it just has to be a small fire and according to our fire regulations it shouldn’t be unattended.

**Allen Castonguay:** Well, I don’t agree with that? I think it should be in a ring. You people are saying that you want natural vegetation in this 20 foot area. If you go out there where the grass is brown and growing and you throw a pile of wood in the center of that and light it off, it’s a campfire.

**Commissioner Curtiss:** It’s hard to legislate common sense.

**Allen Castonguay:** So I think some type of a definition of a fire rig should be there.
Commissioner Rowley: Some sort of fire protection.

Allen Castonguay: Yes.

Commissioner Rowley: You kind of alluded to another point, as well, of the area around the fire ring and how big that is and if it's in the riparian area, do we no longer have a riparian area?

Allen Castonguay: That’s right; we’re back to square one. Next question, what do you do for enforcement?

Todd Klietz: Enforcement is largely complaint based. So if we get a complaint we go out and evaluate.

Allen Castonguay: Okay. Who does the enforcing?

Todd Klietz: Missoula County.

Allen Castonguay: If someone doesn’t get the proper permit, who goes out then? The Sheriff?

Todd Klietz: Typically we don’t go through the Sheriff unless we really have to. Typically we work with the County Attorneys’ Office. We don’t initially go through the County Attorney’s Office; we try to work in-house with people and to educate them as to why they need a permit. Ultimately if they refuse, then the Planning Office seeks assistance with the County Attorney’s Office.

Allen Castonguay: I have a question probably out of your area of what’s going on here but during this winter three (3) snowmobilers went across the lake and the snowmobiles went into the water. To my knowledge they are still there. I see we have someone with a badge here, maybe he can answer that.

Lad Knotek: I have that same question. They do plan to pull those out; we’re concerned about all the fuel. I share the same concern and I’m not going to forget about it either.

Lad Knotek, Montana Fish Wildlife & Parks: We generally support your vision of the Regulations and think they’re really an important component of the overall picture up there. We’re starting to see water quality issues. We’re glad that you’re revising the regulations as part of that bigger picture. The one thing that I would comment on specifically on the regulation that you also alluded to is that the campfire areas within that riparian resource area, I don’t think they’re very compatible because we’re not just talking about campfires. We’re talking about a center of activity. You have a 20 foot buffer riparian area, they have a campfire in an area where people are occupying, hanging out in areas, and it’s not a good idea. Most of these lots are plenty big to have an area above that riparian resource strip for a fire pit. To me that makes more sense and is more compatible with the spirit of the regulations and makes more sense on the ground. There may be some exceptions on a lot here or there. I’ve looked at most of these lots from working up there on all these lakes and there’s probably a couple of
exceptions where there’s a restraint there where they don’t have a spot for a fire pit. But I would weight that very seriously, if you would.

**Allen Castonguay:** I would say that if you have a qualified fire ring in the area, the people are going to use that area anyways. If they have a qualified ring, they aren’t going to throw a pile of wood on the ground and burn it.

**Commissioner Curtiss:** Todd what is our distance that we have in these regulation that we have jurisdiction?

**Todd Klietz:** 20 feet from the high water mark. There are some lakes that are zoned further, independently zoned but it’s 20 feet.

**Commissioner Rowley:** Do you have a rebuttal to the point made about the rings in the riparian area or do you think that’s legitimate?

**Todd Klietz:** Again, from my perspective the Office of Planning and Grants used to recommend they be removed when they were from shoreline protection zone. But again, the fire safety issue was, at that time that was compelling to the County Commissioners to stay and remain. The purpose of having that here in the regulations was actually to address them and specifically address that they are allowed, and then limit them to what size and make sure they are compliant with what our Health Department requires are for recreational campfires. As far as them being in the shoreline and protection zone, from the shoreline protection zone again we had long recommended that they be removed.

**Commissioner Rowley:** And from the fire protection perspective, perhaps, rather than be close to the water. Do you agree with putting in a designation as for a ring, or is that up to people in the fire regulation people.

**Todd Klietz:** Once it’s outside the shoreline protection zone, shoreline regulations have no jurisdiction. So anything outside 20 feet.

**Commissioner Rowley:** So it’s kind of either/or, you could, if we wanted to put a regulation on a ring? Or, a regulation that it had to be moved out of the zone but not both.

**Todd Klietz:** We could simply prohibit them within the shoreline protection zone.

**Commissioner Curtiss:** I don’t see that we need to let them use the shoreline protection zone, however, to clean up their property and barrel their stuff. If they live in a forested area and they need to clean up all the down fall and that stuff, maybe they should be hauling it away. I’m kind of mixed as to whether…I know it’s nice to sit by the lake and have a fire but we’re only talking about that 20 feet, so we don’t have any control about whether or not they have a fire ring on the rest of the property.

**Commissioner Rowley:** Right and they can have a fire at 20 feet from it and still maintain the riparian area in good condition.
**Commissioner Curtiss:** As long as they have 20 feet that we have regulations on and they could go to 24 feet and still be in the riparian area and have trouble.

**Todd Klietz:** Within 20 feet if we have this regulation, they’re limited to two (2) feet in diameter based on enforcement, based on compliance. Outside of 20 feet there is no limitation from the shoreline regulations.

**Commissioner Rowley:** When they were not allowed in the riparian zone before was there significant problem with fire, as opposed to allowing them down closer to the water?

**Todd Klietz:** Not with fire, it’s more of the socialized aspects of what we’re talking about, with people wanting to do what they want to do down by the water.

**Commissioner Curtiss:** I don’t think this easement is that clear either because it says a recreational campfire defines it. Is there another reference in here as to when you could have one? It says that the primary purpose of a fire is supposed to be to clear the material; it is not considered a recreational fire. But it doesn’t say you can’t have one.

**Todd Klietz:** So what we say as to what is not allowed within the lake or shoreline protection zone. What’s new is excluding recreational campfires.

**Commissioner Curtiss:** that could be one place where we could put excluding recreational campfires in areas not in the riparian area. We could add that so at least they’re not burning in the brush. We might want to strike recreational fires.

**Commissioner Rowley:** Right because really by allowing them that goes against that you can’t really protect native vegetation because people are going to trample it or burn it. Could you apply for a variance to place it close to the water?

**Todd Klietz:** Any person can apply for a variance from any course of the regulations at any time. It’s a process that they would go through and we’ve added to the shoreline regulations is that they would also go before the planning board and you would have the recommendation from the planning board as well as staff.

**Commissioner Curtiss:** The Planning Board hasn’t been involved before have they?

**Todd Klietz:** No, Planning Board has not. Planning Board is in State law, as far as them having the ability to comment on permit applications and also on new regulations so when our current shoreline regulations were initially adopted in 1997, of course, it went before the Planning Board and basically the words from planning board aren’t even in our current shoreline regulations. So the Planning Board recommended adoption of regulations that did not include them but in reviewing both our regulations, multiple regulations across the State. I forgot to mention Jamie and Mitch assisted greatly in these regulations, but particularly with State law we went back and added Planning board to our shoreline regulations, in regards to variances and also updates to the regulations. These regulations are 1998 regulations did not require that they be taken before the Planning Board but that was something that CAPS wanted to do, in
accordance with State law. Depending on how the Commission wants to go with the campfire I think this Item J could be instead of just saying; excluding recreational campfires. I, being one of the people that deals with these regulations, I would like you to address recreational campfires in some way. So if the Commission is weighing whether or not they want to allow recreational campfires or not, if it’s to not allow them, I would ask that instead of this word saying excluding recreational campfires, that it says including recreational campfires, which would then give us the direction to go do what we need to do. We could remove the definition if we’re including recreational campfires. I would recommend that we remove the definition of a recreational campfire so that someone doesn’t say well, we have a campfire here that’s three (3) foot in diameter and you’re specifically excluding ones that are only two (2) feet in diameter. So I would reprimand that this definition be removed and that we change the verbiage from excluding to including, if the commission is so inclined.

Commissioner Curtiss: So I’ve been trying to figure out how if someone wanted to have a fire pit, as this gentleman has described his, that it could be approved through an administrative review, not have to go to Planning Board, not as a variance but rather meeting certain criteria. In other words, if you don’t have room on your lot to have it out of the protection zone then your office could somehow evaluate if you wanted to dump it to us, you could. But this makes the best sense so I was thinking that maybe a recreational campfire could, if you added to say as approved the Planning Office, or something. I was looking at the variance criteria and some of that would apply but I would hate to see somebody have to go through that whole process just to put a fire pit in a place that makes sense. So our goal would be to not have them in the 20 foot space but on some lots it’s going to make more sense than on the hill. I guess we could take some time to think about that, there’s no reason that we have to adopt these today, to try and figure a way to administratively have some criteria that says; here’s our goal but here’s how we can mitigate that, or something. Do you think that is something that’s workable? You guys have been working on this a long time.

Todd Klietz: We can attempt to do that.

Lad Knotek: If you want to go up and spend a day on several of the lakes and see the different situations, I think it would be very helpful so you know exactly what the regulations should be. I would really recommend that you do that. I would like to offer to take you by one of our boats, just let me know.

Chair Carey: So when do we have to get this done?

Todd Klietz: We’ve told the general public that we would have these done prior to the primary permitting season, which is Memorial Day through Labor Day. We do have on our workload, we also have the Floodplain Regulations that will be coming to you in the very near future, that do have a very definite timeframe that have to be adopted, long before July 6th when the new floodplain maps go into effect. From the office perspective we were hoping to get this done so that we could complete this project before we go into the next.

Tim Worley: I think it would work to continue the hearing and we could tinker a little bit. We have some comparable things we’re trying to do with the subdivision
regulations, we’re trying to route certain processes away from variances through certain criteria. I think we could attempt to do this with campfires where we don’t necessarily go through that rigorous, more rigorous variance process that takes you through planning board. We’d actually come up with a criteria for dealing with campfires. When would you like to see this come back?

**Commissioner Curtiss:** We have April 22nd, would that be a good goal? And we could visit at planning status to see. My goal would be to see if we could find a way to establish some criteria. Again, it’s going to end up being complaint driven.

**Executive Session**
Commissioner Curtiss made motion to recess the hearing until April 22nd. Commissioner Rowley 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 3:20.