

<b>Description</b>	County Planning Board November 24, 2009		
<b>Date</b>	11/24/2009	<b>Location</b>	County Planning Board
<b>Time</b>	<b>Speaker</b>	<b>Note</b>	
<a href="#">6:00:35 PM</a>	President Kerry White	Call to Order. Members Present: Kerry White, Marianne Jackson Amsden, Don Seifert, Mike McKenna, Julien Morice, Susan Riggs, Byron Anderson and Pat Davis. Members Absent: C.B. Dormire and Doug Espelien. Staff Present: County Administrator/Interim Planning Director Earl Mathers, County Planners Sean O'Callaghan and Warren Vaughan, Compliance Officer Amy Waring, and Recording Secretary Glenda Howze	
<a href="#">6:00:44 PM</a>	President Kerry White	Public comment.	
<a href="#">6:01:03 PM</a>		There was no public comment on matters not on the agenda.	
<a href="#">6:01:08 PM</a>	President Kerry White	Approval of November 10, 2009 Minutes.	
<a href="#">6:01:29 PM</a>	Susan Riggs	Correction on page 7, timestamp 8:34:09: The Planning District should be the boundaries with the one-mile buffer. Also requested clarification on the mapping.	
<a href="#">6:02:56 PM</a>	Marianne Jackson Amsden	Correction on page 8, timestamp 9:06:28: "Perhaps there is a way to have a better score for those..." Also to page 7, timestamp 8:37:10 - this stamp needs to be re-listened to and re-written to be more clear.	
<a href="#">6:04:41 PM</a>		The minutes stand approved as amended.	
<a href="#">6:04:49 PM</a>	President Kerry White	Planning Department Update.	
<a href="#">6:05:06 PM</a>	Sean O'Callaghan, County Planner	Distributed a guide to Montana Water Quality Regulation. Also noted that today the County Commission passed two separate resolutions of intention regarding the subdivision regulations pertaining to the legislative updates (from the 2009 session) and flood plain issues. The Planning Department will be working with the County Attorney's Office once to get their input on our proposed draft and then we'll work with the subdivision regulations committee of the Planning Board to work with them and get those amendments in from of the Planning Board. We hope to	

		<p>have a meeting with the subcommittee the second or third week of December. Distributed a more detailed analysis of the projects that came before the Planning Board (in FY 2009) and noted that this does not account for all of the projects that have come before the Planning Department last year, only those the Planning Board was involved in. The number isn't a good indicator of the work load and doesn't translate to complexity either. The numbers in this document are a little different than those provided in September due to multiple hearings on the same item and the difference of using the fiscal year that the Planning Board had the hearing, not the fiscal year the application was received. We are confident in the numbers that are presented in this document.</p>
<a href="#">6:09:29 PM</a>		Discussion between Board and Staff on the update.
<a href="#">6:11:42 PM</a>	Earl Mathers, County Administrator/Interim Planning Director	<p>Added a couple thoughts regarding the work load. We all agree that the work load has diminished in some areas, however it has probably intensified in some other areas. Also reminded the Board that currently the Planning Department is operating with 3.4 fewer staff than it did in the past. We have quite a lengthy set of priorities that we are working to fulfill, that have been vetted and driven by the County Commissioners. Many of these activities are extremely intensive and we do have a very full plate. I'm strongly encouraged by the performance of all of the team members; they are functioning well together.</p>
<a href="#">6:13:38 PM</a>	President Kerry White	Regular Agenda
<a href="#">6:13:40 PM</a>		a. Public Hearing and Decision on a Resolution Recommending to the County Commission that the Commission Revise the Gallatin County Growth Policy to Include the Proposed Amsterdam/Churchill Community Plan and Future Land Use Map.
<a href="#">6:13:59 PM</a>	Warren Vaughan, County Planner	Opening presentation and note of appreciation to the Board and those who have worked on this plan.
<a href="#">6:19:26 PM</a>	Walt Sales, Chair Amsterdam/Churchill Community Planning Group	Presentation.
<a href="#">6:23:44 PM</a>	Jim Potts, Resident and Member of Planning Committee	Background and presentation.

<a href="#">6:27:57 PM</a>	Walt Sales, Chair Amsterdam/Churchill Community Planning Group	Presentation.
<a href="#">6:35:05 PM</a>	Jim Potts, Resident and Member of Planning Committee	Presentation.
<a href="#">6:38:01 PM</a>	Tim VanDam, Resident and Member of Planning Committee	Presentation.
<a href="#">6:44:03 PM</a>	Leroy Logterman, Resident and Member of Planning Committee	Presentation.
<a href="#">6:50:35 PM</a>	Walt Sales, Chair Amsterdam/Churchill Community Planning Group	Presentation.
<a href="#">6:54:30 PM</a>	Warren Vaughan, County Planner	Wrap up regarding staff findings and important criteria noted in the staff report for the Board to consider. Distributed additional public comment and noted that the plan was built on public comment based in 2.5 years of conversations throughout the community at various events and places. Public notice was mailed to 650 land owners advertising this hearing, County Commission hearing and the last community event that was held. This was placed in the Belgrade News and the Bozeman Daily Chronicle and the plan has been distributed all around the community for approximately 3 weeks. Noted the three determinations listed on page fourteen of the staff report that the Board needs to consider and reported that this will go before the County Commission on December 8th. This will be a resolution of intent with a 30-day protest period and then a final resolution right after the first of the year. The plan is great but it is also a piece of paper. One of the benefits of this is that the community has been able to come together and have some serious conversations about how they want to grow, what that means, what they are going to do. This continues and there will be a lot more work in the future. I've been impressed by the commitment that they've put forth.
<a href="#">7:02:14 PM</a>		Questions and discussion between the Board and Staff

		regarding the Amsterdam Village Preliminary Plat and its impact on the plan if it does or doesn't receive final plat approval, voluntary school impact fees, and the gap between Manhattan and Belgrade planning areas.
<a href="#">7:06:34 PM</a>	Pat Davis	Asked about the percentage of landowners that have been involved and what percentage of the area of land within this boundary is already in a conservation easement.
<a href="#">7:06:42 PM</a>	Warren Vaughan, County Planner	Indicated that he doesn't have the numbers of landowners involved but that it was a large number. He also stated that he doesn't know how much land is in conservation easement; showed a map that has many of those parcels indicated.
<a href="#">7:07:41 PM</a>		Additional questions and discussion between the Board and Staff regarding the boundary and portions that are out or in based on the wishes of those landowners; discussion regarding the landowner meetings held recently and the tenor of those meetings - which was very positive by the end of the meetings; and clarification on the area noted in 4.4.3, which is to be determined.
<a href="#">7:11:36 PM</a>	Marianne Jackson Amsden	Noted that she enjoyed reading the plan and pointed out various areas of concern within the document: page 3-2, second paragraph of category A "development standards"; page 3-3, category D "property" versus "area"; page 3-6, 3.3.5 discussion regarding parks and the requirement of playground equipment; page 3-7, incorporation of trail network in this section; 3.5.4 - inclusion of equestrian, possibly "rails to trails" in this section; page 4-3, section 4.4.1 and 4.4.2 - suggested defining "lot" or using a different word (Mr. Vaughan suggested "development right" may be more appropriate); and page 5-5, noxious odors discussion and request for clarification.
<a href="#">7:21:19 PM</a>	Mike McKenna	Made an observation that under the Growth Policy it says there is a balance between the present and the future and that they are trying to balance the present needs and the future needs. Commented on the proposed density and stated that this is a great plan. Also stated that the Planning Board and present community members need to think about the future. Provided examples to support the importance of this foresight. Looking at the agricultural situation, if that is a core value and a majority of the people in the 51,000 acres want to keep it that way and if our County Commissioners and this Board feels that it is best for the future, great. It is just something that I think about

		when I think about 318 homes versus 100,000. Stated that this plan [you] are adopting, when it gets zoned it is there and it isn't going back. Questions on page 3-11, trips per day [3,000 currently]; and the community water district.
<a href="#">7:25:50 PM</a>	Warren Vaughan, County Planner	Also noted that there are hundreds more lots in the town core if that gets developed. The larger area is big but the intent is to put growth where the infrastructure is and they are proposing to increase the town core by about five fold. We are making a policy that says that every five years the plan will be reviewed to see if it is working. If need be things can be changed, including the zoning.
<a href="#">7:28:23 PM</a>	Mike McKenna	Commented on 3-9, 3.5.2 - suggested a change in the language to say "...sidewalk or trail..."
<a href="#">7:29:05 PM</a>	President Kerry White	Commented on the water issues and sewer system in relation to community services and improvement of the systems in the future to accommodate the industrial flows of development.
<a href="#">7:31:26 PM</a>	Warren Vaughan, County Planner	The flow is all coming down to the lowest point. DEQ did some work in relation to the Churchill North development a few years ago. There is a leak that needs to be taken care of but fortunately it is at the lowest point. HKM is going to expand the size of the district to cover the town core and size it so that eventually the district is the main provider out there. Water could proceed the same way that it has for a hundred years. There are many subdivisions with their own public well and this could continue if state law continues to allow it. Coordination, however, would allow for the elimination of all the individual systems and have a complete system instead. There are a lot of reasons for a coordinated system, so putting in the plan the intent to have a system in place is a good idea and allows for the possibility.
<a href="#">7:35:11 PM</a>	Pat Davis	Noted one comment that this is a great plan and the idea of preserving agriculture and the way of life out there is great.
<a href="#">7:35:31 PM</a>	Public Comment	Public comment: Robert Urich, Gail Weidenaar, Jack Vander Molen, Amy Waring, Loren Blanksma
<a href="#">7:46:13 PM</a>		Discussion with Mr. Blanksma regarding where his property is located in the district.
<a href="#">7:50:06 PM</a>		Public comment closed.
<a href="#">7:50:55 PM</a>	Walt Sales, Chair Amsterdam/Churchill	Wrap-up comments and addressed comments made by board members in discussion.

	Community Planning Group	
<a href="#">7:57:01 PM</a>		Discussion regarding the ability to amend zoning regulations, the difference between 101 and 201 zoning districts, and water problems in the area.
<a href="#">8:02:36 PM</a>	Jim Potts, Resident and Member of Planning Committee	Responded to questions and comments regarding the water and sewer issues in the Amsterdam/Churchill area.
<a href="#">8:06:59 PM</a>		Discussion regarding incorporation of the area. Amsterdam/Churchill is not incorporated and it is very hard to do so in the State of Montana. Also discussion regarding when the group anticipates having the zoning in place. It will be difficult to have this project done by May 8th.
<a href="#">8:11:21 PM</a>	Don Seifert	Encouraged the group, if they have concerns about gravel pits (the interim zoning on gravel pits goes away on May 7th), to consider doing a single use zoning within the proposed boundary to provide desired protection on that issue.
<a href="#">8:13:11 PM</a>		Board discussion.
<a href="#">8:13:15 PM</a>	Marianne Jackson Amsden	Question regarding the trail that was referred to by Amy Waring [Mr. Vaughan indicated that the landowner is not interested in this option.] I am in support of this. I move that this Planning Board adopt a resolution recommending adoption of the Amsterdam/Churchill Community Plan as a revision to the Gallatin County Growth Policy to the Gallatin County Commission.
<a href="#">8:14:36 PM</a>	Don Seifert	Second.
<a href="#">8:15:07 PM</a>	Marianne Jackson Amsden	Findings: Determination one whether the proposed Amsterdam/Churchill Community Plan substantially complies with the goals and policies of the Gallatin County Growth Policy - I would adopt the findings of the staff and the staff report, they did an excellent job of identifying which Growth Policy items we needed to consider and I feel very comfortable that this plan fits nicely into the Growth Policy. Item two whether the proposed Amsterdam/Churchill Community Plan substantially complies with Section 9.2 of the Gallatin County Growth Policy regarding amendments and revisions - again I think the staff identified that very well. Also item three meets the procedural requirements of Montana Code 76-1-602 through 76-1-604 regarding adoption and revision of

		<p>Growth Policies - I feel like that was laid out very well in the staff report and I don't feel like I need to make any additional findings [pertaining to these areas]. The other findings I'd like to make is that the public comment we received tonight was very favorable on the adoption of this with perhaps the one land owner that didn't feel he had time to really assemble his family and figure out whether or not they supported it. They might want to do that in the next couple weeks before it gets adopted. More than that I think that the community members that came together and formed a committee to advance this went above and beyond the call of duty in letting the community know what was happening and being very thorough and diligent in their discussions and openness to the public. I feel very comfortable in recommending this to the Commission.</p>
<p><a href="#">8:17:43 PM</a></p>	<p>Julien Morice</p>	<p>I am for the planning and appreciate all the work that was done on this. I do have some concerns and share some of the concerns that Mike has as well as how many other property owners are potentially out there that granted we may have gone beyond the call of duty and done everything to notify them but working families may not have had time to get involved in this or understand the severity of how this could impact their property value. Potentially this could dramatically decrease it in the next 10-20 years as development land - the demand for it goes up, especially along this eastern boundary. So I don't know what the requirements are right now for notifying people, exactly, but I'd almost like to see more concrete numbers as to who was for it, who was against it, where they were. What if someone is in the middle of this thing and they haven't had any time to make comment or go to any of the meetings and don't realize what is coming down the pipe? Or someone who is along this eastern boundary who didn't participate and in 10 years development in Belgrade is needing more land and their property is gone from potentially tens of thousands an acre down to three or four thousand an acre and ag land. I think you don't want to have anyone tell you what to do, which was the point of one of the speakers but in a sense I want to make sure that everyone knows what they are doing and realizes that they are going to have people telling them what they can do with their land now, much more than they did before and potentially could dramatically decrease the value of it in the long run. The process that we do this is where some of my concerns - how many people get notified and do they</p>

		<p>really understand and know the potential implications of what they are doing?</p>
<p><a href="#">8:20:04 PM</a></p>	<p>Byron Anderson</p>	<p>I first want to commend all of you that participated in this process. I have lived here on an off for over 50 years. I have had nothing but total admiration for the people who dwell in the Amsterdam/Churchill area. You are great stewards of your land. You have taken great care of it and you live the values that you've established in your lives. I would have a lot of heartburn about the county-wide zoning and the 1 per 160; I have absolutely no heartburn over the fact that you have chosen to take 51,000 acres or 80 square miles and say this is where we live, this is where we raise our families, this is the life style that we want to protect. I have watched zoning change in other places and this gives you some opportunities to govern that as a community. Sure, you will address certain things down the road but I'd rather see you do that through zoning than I would through the conservation easement concept. That isn't a bad concept and if a family chooses to use that to protect their land then God bless them, but that is one that you're not going to get out of if you choose it because every environmental group in this country will stand behind the courts in fighting that you never get out of it. I believe the approach you're taking is right on. I never thought I'd be voting for any plan that had a 1 per 160 but I'm going to vote for this one because this is the wishes of a group of people that live in a certain area that have taken the time - two and a half years to get together and talk about this and I just don't have any concern that all of your neighbors are very well aware of what you've been doing, what you've been talking about and if they had a heartburn about it they would have expressed it. That is why I asked the questions about what happened in your meetings - if there were people at the meetings that showed strong concern. As far as Mr. Blanksma's comments, there is still time if your family feels it wants to do that, there is still time before the County Commission acts on this but I don't want to do anything to take away from what this group has done. I want to pass this out tonight and I want to pass it out without making any major amendments, just some clarifications that have been discussed that Warren is aware of. I want to commend Warren on all the time and effort that he put into this. We have been updated and made aware of what these neighborhood groups are doing and this is the process that I believe needs to happen in our</p>



		<p>beautiful county. This process is what allows groups, neighborhoods, communities to make those decisions rather than just a few people making the governing decision over the County as a whole.</p>
<p><a href="#">8:24:23 PM</a></p>	<p>Don Seifert</p>	<p>There is a saying that not to decide is to decide. If you folks had not decided to go through this, at times painful process then you would have decided to let yourself open to every whim that came by. I think the title says it all. It is a community plan. When you take 650 landowners and just a shade over two townships and as a group decide this is what we want - it is an amazing process and it is in essence it is what the land use concept is all about. I believe it is determining your own destiny and I think that is important. I think you got your money out of your planning fees that you pay through your taxes. Warren is a bit of a magician. He can juggle Four Corners, Amsterdam/Churchill and Gateway all at the same time - three very diverse communities - and bring them all to the table with plans that work for their area and that is an amazing thing. Byron's right, Amsterdam to a lot of people is the beacon on the hill. It is a great effort, a great plan and I'll be very interested in seeing your zoning proposals as they come down the line. I'm going to support it wholeheartedly, it is a good deal.</p>
<p><a href="#">8:27:02 PM</a></p>	<p>Susan Riggs</p>	<p>I think this is an ideal planning effort, it is grass roots efforts it is a compact town center surrounded by productive agricultural land. I've seen presentations throughout the west where people have used Amsterdam/Churchill as an example of good planning compared to other sprawled areas in Gallatin County and Montana. I think you have something to be proud of and I think that the document that you've produced is something you'll continue to be proud of. My only comments are that as this moves forward with establishing your development standards (zoning) you have several goals that talk about safe walkable neighborhoods and speed reduction methods and I'd urge you to come up with a street standard that includes boulevard sidewalks if that is really a goal to have safe walkable neighborhoods. Also with speed reduction methods - the plan mentions signs and rumble strips and those are certainly things you can use for speed reduction but there is also more creative ways out there that you can use for speed reduction methods. If you're doing curbs anyway in the town center you could look at doing curb bulbs or even painting the asphalt, things like that besides</p>

		rumble strips and signs can add to the character of the town center if that is something that you'd choose to do. Explore all of your options.
<a href="#">8:28:50 PM</a>	Don Seifert	I'd find that the proposed Amsterdam/Churchill Community Plan substantially complies with the goals and policies of the Gallatin County Growth Policy; I further find that the proposed Amsterdam/Churchill Community Plan substantially complies with Section 9.2 of the Gallatin County Growth Policy regarding amendments and revisions; and I would further find that the proposed Amsterdam/Churchill Community Plan meets the procedural requirements of 76-1-602 through 76-1-604 MCA regarding adoption and revision of Growth Policies.
<a href="#">8:29:49 PM</a>	Pat Davis	I have one idea. Is there any way that we could add this area to the water and sewer study?
<a href="#">8:30:01 PM</a>	President Kerry White	Not right now, Stahly has already done the contract and there is no way to increase the area without changing the funding. Maybe the wastewater committee could discuss with Stahly the possibility of including some of this in their study, how much that would cost and then we could kick that around to see if there is any funding available to proceed with that. I would talk to C.B. about that. I used to eat in the little cinder block building across from the church in Churchill, go to Churchill Equipment and go in there for lunch. I never really thought I was in Churchill until I went past the Pine Butte School. I have concerns that in the document on page 13, the new policy 4.4.3, allow greater densities in certain areas in rural Amsterdam/Churchill. I guess where they are requesting increased density is not really Amsterdam/Churchill but Four Corners. I voted against the Four Corners Neighborhood Plan when it came up because I thought that it was too big. The area down by Cameron Bridge/Frank Road, that was Belgrade, not Four Corners. I think if you're going to do a "neighborhood" it should be an actual community neighborhood. To me, everything that is east of Pine Butte School Road is really Four Corners. On the map there is a section that jets out toward Four Corners and it comes clear to the river and you're basically a mile or less from Four Corners yet you are 7 or 8 or 9 miles from the Amsterdam/Churchill area. So to me that portion of the area within this plan is really not part of the Amsterdam/Churchill community and I commend you folks for doing all the work that you did and you really

		<p>looked out for farming and ranching and water conveyance facilities which is very important. I do have a concern about moving equipment on the highway. If we are going to protect rural ag and agriculture in this valley we need to do something so that these farmers and ranchers can move equipment. We should have a big respect for agriculture and I think you folks are really trying to protect agriculture in this area but I just have a problem with this area on the map that is so close to Four Corners. I am going to support this, though because I think overall it is a good plan. I would encourage those folks that if you want out of the boundary to do it before the neighborhood plan boundary is adopted by the Commission because then chances are that if you want out you're not going to be able to get out. Those folks that want in, same thing, do it before it comes before the Commission for the neighborhood boundary. I think this is set for the Commission for December 8th on their agenda.</p>
<a href="#">8:35:46 PM</a>		<p>Vote: Vote: 6-0-1; Member Morice abstained, Member Amsden absent.</p>
<a href="#">8:36:01 PM</a>		<p>Other.</p>
<a href="#">8:36:03 PM</a>	<p>Don Seifert</p>	<p>On December 8th the Gravel Pit Task Force will be giving its presentation of their final recommendation to the County Commissioners.</p>
<a href="#">8:36:31 PM</a>		<p>Meeting adjourned.</p>