

**Madison County
Planning & Zoning Commission**

**Public Hearing Minutes
February 11, 2016**

Vice-Chairman Aaron Swenson called the public hearing to order at 7:08 PM. Those attending were Arlene Anderson, Doug Sakota, Bill Squires, Mike Munns, Aaron Swenson, Mark Hansen, Ed Williams, Anthony Merrill, Christy Swenson, Brent McFadden, Troy Evans, Judy Coy, Stephen Stokes, Kimberly Tanner, Jared Stokes, Susan Stokes, Rob Young, Emily Stokes, Taylor Stokes, Joli Young, Kevin Halford, Wade Huntsman, Hailey Christensen and Shane Ruebush. Those excused were Matt Hartline, and Rick Robertson. New board member Shane Sutton was introduced to the commission. Shane will be representing Sunnyside on the commission. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by a Boy Scout and was recited by all in attendance and roll call was taken.

January 28, 2016 Work Meeting Minutes

Vice-Chairman Aaron Swenson asked if there were any changes to the meeting minutes from the January 28, 2016 work meeting. Christy Swenson mentioned one addition on page two that she wanted to make. A motion was made by Arlene Anderson to approve the minutes with changes. Bill Squires seconded the motion. All were in favor of the motion. Motion carried. Mike Munns and Doug Sakota abstained from voting due to their absence at the meeting

HEARING

Vice-Chairman Swenson asked if there was a conflict of interest with any of the commission members. No conflicts were mentioned. Vice-Chairman Swenson then read a letter from David L. Allred representing Allred Brothers LLP, PO Box 389, Rexburg, Idaho that stated that they had no objection to such proposed change. Vice-Chairman Swenson asked if the Public Hearing Notice had been posted appropriately. Judy Coy stated that the notices were posted in the necessary buildings and the meeting notice was published in the Standard Journal newspaper on two occasions. The public hearing notice was also posted at the property in question.

Note: These public hearing meeting minutes are taken as nearly verbatim as possible from the recording.

Stephen Stokes – Comprehensive Plan Map Change from Agricultural to Transagricultural

Stephen Stokes, 3760 West 6800 South, Rexburg stated: I have a few maps that we have made and I was wondering if you guys have this map. Is there anyone else in the audience that would like to have one of these? This is if you take a look at the map, 3760 where we live is in the lower right hand corner of the blue area. And then we also own the property behind that which is presently zoned Agriculture. I would like to begin by telling you that I appreciate your time tonight. I appreciate also the work that you do. I appreciate the challenge that you have of, and the big responsibility of weighing out individual rights as it compares with community needs and concerns. Our personal reason for being here tonight is, we purchased this property not to do any kind of, or make any subdivisions or anything but we did purchase it with the idea that

maybe someday we would like to be able to put or let our children build a house or two. And we knew that it was zoned Agriculture and that with the sixteen acre piece that we have here that we do have a right to apply for a building permit on that piece of property. But we have lived that for almost ten years and we have never really looked into making any changes because we really haven't seen a time when we wanted to build any homes there. There is a potential that within the next little bit that property, we will be applying for a building permit and one home will already go on that property. But with that, the loss of that opportunity, for one home, we would like this change in order to sometime in the future, if we chose, to be able to maybe build another house or have one of our children build a house on that property.

I would like to talk to you a little bit about, as you are looking at this map there is a curved line over on the left you can see that it comes running from the 6800 which is the road we are on. I'm not sure if you are familiar with this road. This road runs out to and meets the highway at the railroad bridge and it, that road will be closed eventually, probably within the next little bit. Now the reason, as they close that property, the highway is closing that road, because they are putting the interchange as you know down at Thornton. The property that is in the upper left hand corner belongs to Allred's and to access that property they have gone across the railroad tracks. There is a little roadway that they drive over and then there are two Allred properties in there. That property is in order for the state to provide the farmers who are farming there access to their property, then they came and took this piece that slivers across our property to the west side of our lot. It turns and supposedly goes on to somebody else's lot on to Allred's property but when they did the survey they said all of the lines were off and shifted over and the road remained in our field but that doesn't have anything to do with this. So they paid us for an acre and took two.

That road will go back into the property, it will continue clear on until it comes back on what is the canal that goes back into Burton. Liberty Park. And so that will go quite a ways back in and they have had access to that under that railroad bridge and that will be closed off and to our property, the road that goes by our property will also go back into that area. Now I point this out because the property behind us immediately to the north of us and over, the field next to us to the very very east of us is owned by Coleen Wilson and her sister, pardon me I don't remember her name. But they own that property and on to the east of them Pond's own that and then the property behind it. So the green there that is already Transagriculture and has the potential I guess to be developed sometime. The Pond's are older and I don't think they have ever had any interest in it but. He is in his nineties and I don't know what the family will do when they take over the property. But that will be up to them but there is the potential for them to develop that area. That area back there is very wild and undeveloped other than the farm land and some of it is not even developed as you can see over there to the right. The Pond's are quite excited that they would have a better road way into their property incase their kids ever wanted to develop that property.

I talked to Mr. Wilson who is a neighbor and he told me that he wasn't going to comment or come tonight but that he didn't have any opposition to this change. So he isn't opposed to it. At one time he was, the previous owner tried to make this change and he opposed it, he thought that she was going to put in a subdivision and I don't know what she was planning on doing but sometime in the past there has been a hearing before but he opposed it and the Hill's that are to the north to the south of us across the road and directly to the west and more of the southwest

they opposed it at the time and they don't seem to have any problem with it now although they are not here tonight either.

So the now, as I take a look at this half of a quarter piece you can see that it is really very much connected and it is going to be the connection to the Transag property behind it if that is ever developed. Remember that we really don't have any plans of doing a lot of development there. We just thought that maybe in the future there, other than there will be a, we are quite sure that there will be a house built back there in the near future that can be built there legally but we just have the hopes of being able to have this also included into the Transag in order to sometime, if one of our kids wants to build there or if we want to build there which we have thought about doing. We feel like of all of that property that you see that is Transag we are almost by nature a Transag piece. We are almost Transag already. There are three homes in the front of it. The other two property owners are here tonight. And so we already have this half of a quarter that has three homes on it. There will be four. There will be a county road running along the side of it and eventually it will connect up where whatever development might happen in the back of that property. So we feel that just by the nature of where it sits that it is a good choice to be able to change this from Agriculture to Transag. So I really don't have anything else. I guess I will yield my time and let others speak. Thank you.

Staff Presentation

Brent McFadden stated that Mr. Stokes had pretty well explained it. Everything to the north is already Transag. You would be changing his parcel. I was just showing you what is currently on your land use map. Transag is the green and the orange color is your Agricultural land so it is contiguous to the north of that parcel. I talked to the state today and that is not going to be a county road, it is just going to be an access road into the back of that property into the farm ground properties there. Bill Squires asked how far back does it actually run? Brent McFadden stated that he hadn't measured it. If you look at it that strip that goes in there and then curves that is what they have purchased from him. The state has purchased that from him. The state has put in the stakes. I just talked to them. I saw that and that is the strip apparently that has been surveyed and registered with the county clerk's office. They purchased his property and it is not showing what the right of way is. So that is purchased by the state. They will build that road. The county was given the option. I talked to Madison County Road and Bridge, they were given the option of picking up that road and did not. They said they didn't want it. So they will build whatever they are going to build in there because those gentleman's access because they are going to cut off all of the access along the railroad tracks that is how they get in and out when the interchange goes in. Anyway it meets the standards, I mean it is contiguous, so that is why he is here.

THOSE INFAVOR:

Kimberly Tanner, 3465 West 6800 South. So we are neighbors farther down to the right, to the east. We don't have any problems with it and think it is a great idea for them.

Jared Stokes, 6472 South 3100 West. I am talking to you guys I guess. I am related and one of those people that is a potential person that could build a house on my parent's property. I don't have any plans to do that right now because we are already pretty close neighbors. It is something we had talked about when my parents purchased the property if at some point building a house there and being closer and being on that property with them. For me I feel like

it makes sense logically because the property behind it is already Transag. I guess probably like my dad stated that you guys have to decide between which is in your best interest and people's rights. To me the money that was spent on the property was spent in the hopes of someday being able to do this if needed or desired and so the, I feel like that would fall into his right to be able ask for this and move forward and be able to move in that direction even if he doesn't have necessarily plans to do so. Being prepared in case the opportunity arises or if he decides to I think that the right of being able to have that opportunity should be his. I think it is a good idea and makes sense with how it is laid out.

Susan Stokes, 3760 West 6800 South. I am Steve's wife. This is something, like Jared mentioned, that we were, when we bought this we thought it was already Transag and we were told that when we bought the place and so of course we were very disappointed when we found out because that was something that we wanted to do to buy us some land, buy a little place that we could have our kids maybe build a house or two behind us and so this is something that we have always wanted to do and we thought that we were going to so. It is something we have looked into and really wanted to do it. I hope we can do that. I just feel like it would be a really good thing to be able to do with our land back there. We did pay full price I mean we I mean we paid full price. Thank you.

Rob Young, 3760 West 6800 South. Like Jared I am a potential home builder. It makes a lot of sense in my mind to have the option to do that in the future. Like Jared we have no current plans to do anything but just to have the ability to do it without having to go through a lot of red tape later would be, we would like to have that option.

Emilee Stokes, 6472 South 3100 West. I am just a little shy. I support those for it.

Taylor Stokes, 3760 West 6800 South. Originally when I was growing up the intent was that we were originally just going to buy the property but the house was coming along with it as well. So we bought the house with the property and the intent was to try to hopefully in the future build a house back there. So far our plans were to do in the foreseeable future hopefully to build back there, but right now I am in school and that is not really an option right now. So far from my view of this is that it isn't in anyone else's interest in the land and it doesn't interfere with anyone rights. We just see it as an opportunity to be able to have them closer and a little bit more united as well. So I am kind of pro for this and see it as an opportunity for a benefit for the community.

Joli Young, 3760 West 6800 South. I am a daughter of Steve and Susan. My testimony is similar to my other siblings. We've discussed fun things that we could do if we all lived by each other. We could be closer, have that closeness. It is not in any current plans but it is one of those things we talk about in the future how nice it would be to live by each other. That way, my dad, Steve Stokes, is a very fair person. He would never do anything that he wouldn't want. He wouldn't put a subdivision there because that is not what he would want to live around. He likes things to be nice and he likes his space too and so when I think of him doing this I think of it being nicely done if a couple of us were to build back there and to have that opportunity would be great. Thank you.

THOSE NEUTRAL:

Shane Ruebush, 1893 West 5350 South. I don't live near the area, but it is in Lyman. I kind of feel like I ought to be here. As far as I can tell, if anyone is concerned about subdivisions you already know that after they divide out a certain number of lots that is when the lots pertain to the subdivision rules. So that could be in the future, something that would have to be revisited if there were enough lots that were parceled off. Other than that I don't know much more about what the concerns would be of those opposed at this point in time. Generally it looks like if it is a large enough piece of property although it does at the end beg the question why do we have Comprehensive Plans and such things as this or at least maybe it is time to revisit it and look at what areas we want used for building residential and which areas we want to keep as agriculture, agricultural and such. Thank you.

THOSE OPPOSED:

Kevin Halford, 3808 West 6800 South. My house is the first one there right next to the direct road. The first one there. The only reason there is three houses there is because the same person built all three houses. That is the only reason there is three houses there. The lady built one, I bought it, she built another one and someone bought it, she built another one. So that is the only reason there are three houses there. And the reason that I am opposed is we have kind of been waiting for that road to dead end. It is a super busy road, we have been waiting all these years to dead end and now I guess I am worried about, as this gentleman said, once they get to those two acres he can do anything he wants. He can subdivide it. He can do anything he wants. He can say I've already heard rumors that we wants to sell eleven acres to Jerome Bowen's son and I don't want something like that back there because then he can bring equipment in. I mean they can do anything with it they want as soon as it passes. I have a shop in the corner there, a pretty big shop that I work late nights in and stuff. There is no bathroom in there. If I want to go out back of my shop it's just, it is going to change if a bunch of houses end up there it will just make me have to sell my house and go somewhere else. I just feel I was the first one there, I know the circumstances of that whole thing a lot of stuff. The ground was sold as it was Ag property. I know the lady. I've know her longer than any of them. They knew what they were buying. I had no issues that they put in a house or two back there but I don't want a subdivision behind my place. That is why I live out there. So thanks.

Wade Huntsman, 3780 West 6800 South. I am in the middle home there. Before I support anything I just had a few questions and wanted to voice my opinion on that. The first question was brought up with that access road that the state had purchased from Steve Stokes and then I found out tonight that it's not a county road. So my question is how are people going to access, is that legal or are they going to have to build another road into there. So the reason why I have that question is because Steve Stokes and I share a drive way and would that then be an actual legal access back to that other property that Steve is proposing to sell. And so obviously I have a concern that if that is if they won't be able to access it through that west, state or county road where will they be able to access that property. And then my other concern or opinion is I would just like to be informed of what does happen with the development, with all of the details of equipment or other plans just like to be informed before I actually voice a support to this or not. So that is where I stand.

REBUTTAL:

Stephen Stokes: I appreciate the comments that have been made. I have to tell you that this is a little different than what the state told me on the road but I guess it is up to the county as to whether they take the road over. The road itself was purchased as a right of way across our property and my understanding from the highway department was that they purchased the other as an easement, so I really don't know where the state is standing. I'm sure that the county said, well we don't want another road to maintain that goes nowhere, I don't blame them. But at any rate the road is there and it fits all of the specs of a county road in its right of way and in its size. My understanding is that it will be built. When we bought the property we didn't as my wife pointed we bought the property with kind of this intent. We were told by the seller that, she said that she went and talked to Mr. McFadden's office and there wouldn't be any problem. So we did have that in mind and we paid more than Agricultural price for it but I'm not saying that it was our fault that we didn't, I knew what we were buying and that we were buying Agricultural land. I guess the issue for me as I think about some of the comments that have been made that the land was for sale when we bought it. And if you want to protect yourself from things happening on your neighbors land or on the land that is next to you when you see a piece of property and you are concerned about what takes place then you should buy it yourself. We bought the property, we paid for it and it is ours and we would like this opportunity to feel that in the future if we wanted to have one of our kids build a house on it that we could do so. The price is right Kevin, I'll sell you a piece. I was just responding to what he was saying thank you. Well our problem is why we couldn't sell that acre is because it is our access to that property. Alright I guess I don't have any other comments accept that I appreciate you. Do you have any questions for me?

Christy Swenson: One of the questions was the shared driveway and the access. Could you respond to that question?

Maryjo Huntsman, 3780 West 6800 South. So we share a driveway with the Stokes and it is my impression that you own the driveway.

Stephen Stokes: You have the easement across.

Maryjo Huntsman: I have an easement, he owns the driveway. Our concern is that if that gets made into a road that people will use that to get back to that property.

Stephen Stokes: Well I can't really say for sure. My understanding is that a private drive could have as many as four houses on it. But that is not our thinking, I don't know, I can't tell you, I don't know. But I know that this is something that Mr. Huntsman has talked to me about and I apologize that I don't want to make a commitment because we do have that right to go through there if we wanted to put another house right directly behind our house rather than access if from a different lane and so I don't see it happening, but I don't want to make a commitment that it wouldn't happen. So do you have any questions or is it that the way it works.

Bill Squires: Did you say this is forty acres.

Stephen Stokes: Oh no what you see outlined in white would be a forty acre piece so that is a quarter of a section and then we are dealing with the twenty acres on the left which is a half of a

quarter with these other properties taken off and the road taken out which leaves sixteen acres. It is a little over sixteen acres.

Doug Sakota: I presume it is being farmed?

Stephen Stokes: It is. I farm it and then I, well I shouldn't say farm it I don't have any equipment. I do the watering and a friend of mine comes and harvests it for part of the crop.

Doug Sakota: Do you have water shares?

Stephen Stokes: Yes.

Doug Sakota: How many water shares.

Stephen Stokes: I'm sorry I don't know. I apologize I don't know but we are able to water it three times during the year for each crop of hay. It is excellent farm ground, there is not a rock on there. A lot of people around me are jealous. I see it remaining most of it as farm ground as it really is. We are just asking to make sure that we have that opportunity in the future if we want to someplace along that road or wherever, that is what we thought, and then it could continue to be watered and farmed so that it didn't end up being a weed patch. It would be great alfalfa land and that is what is in it right now. Anything else?

The hearing was declared closed at 7:47 PM.

The sixteen Comprehensive Plan Factors were reviewed as follows:

- Property Rights
- Population
- School Facilities and Transportation

Aaron Swenson: I guess I have a question for Brent. I can picture the road, so once that road is closed the road to the north and south that they are talking about is just an easement it is not going to be a through road anywhere.

Brent McFadden: They have purchased that in blue, Mr. Stokes. I don't know what is going on and how far this goes. I saw this and so I called the state to find out and then I called Madison County Road and Bridge and they said they didn't want it. The reason I called was because of a possible purchase back here and the purchaser wanted an address. If they had made this a county road then they would number the road but the state said no that the county had turned it down they didn't want to have anything to do with it, so it will stay whatever the state makes it.

Aaron Swenson: How will they close that? Will there be a turnaround?

Brent McFadden: They will put a turnaround down at the end of this.

Aaron Swenson: When the school buses come down that road they will still have to go down there and turn around?

Brent McFadden: They will have to make a turnaround. That is totally up to the state. I don't know what they are doing for sure. All I know is that.

Bill Squires: How about the road that goes north for a turn around?

Brent McFadden: This road here?

Bill Squires: Yes the one that he bought that the county is not going to do anything with.

Brent McFadden: There won't be a turn around. All that is is an access point for those farmers. For the farmers because if you drive up twenty you will notice that there are some crossings there into those fields. They are taking those out. They will no longer exist. So the state has purchased this, they will own this and they would not tell me or commit as to what kind of a road they were putting in there.

Doug Sakota: Why did the state buy it?

Brent McFadden: They bought it because Mr. Stokes wanted them to, and so they had to buy that to get access to the farmers back here. For those farmers farm ground, that is the whole reason the state bought it.

Christy Swenson: Can you zoom that out so we can see the surrounding area.

Brent McFadden: I cannot zoom this out. I will have to start making a bigger view for you.

Christy Swenson: I just wondered what the Comprehensive map looked like.

Brent McFadden: If you go across the highway it is Commercial because that is Bear World. To the west over here I believe is a cabinet shop and then there are some homes that sit down in here. A couple of homes just before you go across the railroad tracks. I believe that this is Dr. Christensen's home here. This home right here. There are homes all the way down this road.

Doug Sakota: What is that big one I am just curious?

Brent McFadden: This one here? I don't know what that is but it is Dr. Christensen's. Anything else?

Aaron Swenson: No that answered my questions.

- Economic Development
- Land Use
- Natural Resources
- Hazardous Areas

Aaron Swenson: We are far away enough from the river we are not in a flood plain area are we?

Brent McFadden: The only reason that is not in the flood plain is because of the levy. That is protected by the levy. Now whether it goes back in or not I have no idea. But right now that area is not in the flood plain.

- Public Services, Facilities, and Utilities
- Transportation
- Recreation
- Special Areas or Sites
- Housing

Bill Squires: Is there a need for more Transag in that area for housing?

Brent McFadden: I don't know, I don't have any idea. I will put it to you this way, there are three hundred empty lots platted in Madison County.

Christy Swenson: Is that inside subdivisions?

Brent McFadden: That is in platted subdivisions.

Christy Swenson: And there is a lot of Transag that is not developable.

Bill Squires: So that number only does subdivisions.

Brent McFadden: The number I gave you is only platted lots.

Bill Squires: Which is only in subdivisions.

- Community Design
- Agriculture

Aaron Swenson: I think one thing that stands out to me on this particular one is Mark's comment on this. Sixteen acres is not a very big piece of agricultural property. It is difficult for a farmer to do much other than have a hobby farm.

- Implementation
- National Interest Electric Transmission Corridors

Aaron Swenson: Those are the sixteen items is there any other discussion from the Commission?

Doug Sakota: Over on the east side there, that line going up the middle. Is the road going to be close to that area to get back to the new houses?

Brent McFadden: The only road I know about is this one. That one there.

Doug Sakota: But there is an easement?

Brent McFadden: There might be an easement here or right here. I don't know what this over here, whether it is just that.

Doug Sakota: You could take it off of the east side there to go back in?

Brent McFadden: Depending on the width of that property, I don't know what that width is. But if there is an easement here for whoever is sharing that drive way for this house. He can't stop them ever from going in there that easement is permanent.

Stephen Stokes: Is there any way for me to tell you a little bit about the road? I have seen the plans.

Aaron Swenson: No, we have closed the public hearing.

Christy Swenson: The only comments that I have is Mr. Stokes stated that this is really good farm ground, it's not very rocky. It appears that there is a lot of need for additional Transag. I don't know, my hesitation in passing the land use map change would be a dead end. I don't think that would be a great location for a future development which this would allow. Whether or not that is the intention or not it would open it for additional homes or a subdivision. It was purchased as Ag.

Ed Williams: Mr. Vice Chairman if people are worried about a subdivision creating a lot of traffic, before they can have the subdivision they have to have another hearing like this which would resolve those problems. So, access to it, driveways, plans for roads, and so on, all have to be handled. So I think some of the problems that people are concerned about would be resolved during that time.

Anthony Merrill: What we are looking at then is a twenty acre piece right. What about the houses across the front. Have those been considered in the splits.

Brent McFadden: Not for this no.

Bill Squires: That was pre-ordinance?

Brent McFadden: I don't know if that was pre-ordinance or not. I don't know when Linda bought those. I didn't research them because this isn't a subdivision question yet. If he sells another lot then I will have to look because he is allowed four splits. That property is allowed four splits before they have to plat.

Anthony Merrill: What I was thinking really is if it is already considered in the splits then with or without the change he could put one more house in back. But if it went to two then it would be forced into a subdivision.

Brent McFadden: No, well if there are three homes there and he sells one more. If this doesn't change the only way he can sell that is to sell the whole thing which will lock that all up. Because it is barely sixteen acres and they have to have sixteen acres to build another home.

Bill Squires: I think what he is talking about is that it is considered at split, a fourth split.

Brent McFadden: The back. We have not considered the Ag ground as part of the split. We usually do, anything that is a buildable lot, I mean a two acre lot we consider a part of the split.

Anthony Merrill: The other question I have is if the state has purchased that property as a road or driveway or something there, who has the right to use that road? Is that a farm road?

Brent McFadden: That is a public access road as far as I know.

Anthony Merrill: Public access.

Brent McFadden: I don't know how the state has worked it out. They own the ground, I didn't ask them that. My feeling that I got from talking to the gentleman, a Mr. Alvarez, is that this is open to anybody. They bought it and it is just an access road until it hits private property and then what happens after that is dependent upon the people who own the farm ground that they are accessing from that road.

Doug Sakota: So then they could have access back to the state land?

Brent McFadden: Yes.

Bill Squires: I am always frustrated with saying we want to zone this but we don't plan on doing anything right now. We are always giving up more farm ground. Would you run this ground (directed to Mark Hansen). You would run this ground even though it is only sixteen acres.

Mark Hansen: Yes I have a lot smaller.

Bill Squires: Looking in the Comprehensive Plan it says preservation of Ag land use is a top priority CDA57. Growth should be centered within...existing town centers CDA 95. It is important to the residents and county officials that the character of the county, which initially brought of has kept those residents here is maintained CDA58.

Mark Hansen: That would be kind of my comment. Do they propose a zone change with no plan. There is not really a plan why they are doing it. By the time that the plan develops then we can move to something as to why we are doing it.

Aaron Swenson: Any other comments from the Commission?

Anthony Merrill: If the driveway between the two homes is used and another house is built in the back which meets the current requirements for Ag, if its twenty acres back there or sixteen. So one more home could be built with current status then if the need comes up something could still be done later. A person could go in and plan. We will put the house here for now with this anticipation of the future. The driveway could be used. You are thinking, if there are sixteen acres back there so they can put a house on sixteen acres and then the next split would probably require a subdivision.

Brent McFadden: It depends on the date that these homes were split off and I don't know the dates on those.

Aaron Swenson: Any other comments? At this time we would entertain a motion.

Arlene Anderson: Mr. Vice-Chairman I move that we approve the Land Use Map Change.

Aaron Swenson: We have a motion do we have second.

Ed Williams: I second.

Aaron Swenson: We have a motion and a second. Roll call.

Judy Coy: Arlene Anderson.

Arlene Anderson: Yes.

Judy Coy: Mark Hansen.

Mark Hansen: No.

Judy Coy: Anthony Merrill.

Anthony Merrill: No.

Judy Coy: Mike Munns.

Mike Munns: Yes.

Judy Coy: Doug Sakota.

Doug Sakota: Yes.

Judy Coy: Bill Squires.

Bill Squires: No.

Judy Coy: Aaron Swenson.

Aaron Swenson: Do I vote?

Brent McFadden: Yes you can vote.

Aaron Swenson: No

Judy Coy: Christy Swenson.

Christy Swenson: No.

Judy Coy: Ed Williams.

Ed Williams: Yes.

Judy Coy: We have four in favor and five against.

Brent McFadden: Didn't pass.

Aaron Swenson: With that I would entertain a motion to dismiss.

Doug Sakota: So moved.

Christy Swenson: Second.

Aaron Swenson: All in favor.

Everyone responded in the affirmative to adjourn the meeting at 8:10 PM.

Meeting minutes accepted by:

Meeting minutes prepared by:

Aaron Swenson, Vice-Chairman

Judy C. Coy, Coordinator