Public Comment - Gallatin C.P. Board 11/10/09
Council Lee - Roark - Representing herself - GOMAG
Encourage support of TF/CUP process
Chance for local enforcement

Carl Hapacic - Lives in Gateway - does want to moderate
some of cards issues.
Encourage support of G.Pit TF

Grae R. Marin - 1300 Axtel Gateway Rd. Would appreciate
regulation of piggies. In support of proposed reg.

Sally Breider - Urges the following TF recommendations
would like single-use. Getting. Understands how long or
hard it was to get to a point of compromise

Charles Irvin - Gateway - Thanked Don for explaining
Saying living bad climate - Moved here in 2001, dropped
banker - Has table V. Support regulation

Tim Roark - Gateway - Urges board to support TF.
Meaningful - I readable information, education, input,
negotiation
Board Comments:
Marianne - confused w/two appendix A's Site Assessment
Further clarification - double bonding a county
expertise -> MCA letter paragraph 4

C.B. Demere -
About Site Assessment might inform the decision
on neighboring properties? Yes. Thoughts
Don talked about SIT removing section out of SP
and allowing them to stand alone. That is not enough
I understand work to be done. Bridge pit seep & Valley
Stream 1. establish baseline. Continue to be work in
progress.
Comment about non-located aspect of whole matter
might well be important.
Page 5 5.7: GAMO - look over definition for better
understanding. Appendix E
7.1.(b) will not have; nearby will not as a
very certain well standard. Would recommend putting
other words in place. 'Nearby' recommended be expressed
in a way of one mile or so... he didn't have a chance
to go through it.
7.2 Intake Objective - DEQ Permitted area not signed.
Advanced Signage unless already required
9.3 Discuss concept of permanent permit means?
Why permanent rather than long-term.
Don Answered Someone may have 30 year permit reclaimed
to pasture. Permanent is a long time but someone may
want to nine. then not then go back
CB Visceral view is that life change perhaps permanent is extreme
1.5(ii) Are there considerations made w/LUP?
Tom answers yes. Checking to ensure conditions are met from CUP. LUP Change & permit to verification.
Para 1(b). Staff may request an extension of the 60 working days if necessary.

Page 30: minutes is there any other way to achieve this besides zoning. Don: no.

Page 4: Vote. What is mechanism to amend?
Notice, public hearing, map 76.2-205.

What limits Amendments to B.D. re Zoning?
Don: understanding you can't limit future elected officials.

Where are limits? Public & elected officials. 3 Common.
Don talked about the intent of T&F of any other granting.

Strictly & Pts.

Last page of minutes. 3r pd paragraph. Is the thought that this requirement that a finding that there would be a significant impact would preclude sand or does it determine what areas are appropriate C which are not? Is it an 7.1(b) does C.C. find.
Doug Espelien - Lack of enforcement presently. Is the big bone of contention lack of enforcement? Don - DEQ admitted opencut is broken @ legislature. DEQ only deals with pit. County wants seat at table. Only way to get it was through CUP. The way it was dealt with previously was encroachment permit. Learned through lawsuit was so can't do that. The reg grants a seat @ the table permanently. Letter from must have some of the issues been resolved? Don said they have definitely been talked about. Ron Pike Pres. was on TF. So we could.

Pat Davis - Statement about not affecting property values that education to real estate people & permits. Don said that was one of the CUP & DEQ permit size differences.

Susan -
1. Changes in proposed reg from interim - step in right direction
2. Later time
3. Still worth pursuing
4. Planning districts should be boundaries plus one mile good
Marianne-

1. In favor of Changes w/ few exceptions
   page 7 sect B. Would like provision included

Page 8 - Extensions may be permitted. Why?
   A. If GPit Operator wants to apply 10yrs apply
   4yrs that, if want extension they will go through CUP

P.12 7.8(e) further on down CUP holder
   and following page defines persons instead of
   7.8(buying person)
   Clarify bonding for issues that aren't BEQ

2. Comments on Reg. Agree w/ Public Comment d/F/F That
   This is a good idea & should move forward
3. In favor of moving forward w/ STA
4. Do it for the whole County. One mile extension works
   today but as we grow CUP is needed when unsure
   what growth in 50 yrs will be.

Response to public comment: Implement Appendix A in document
   don't agree. Most were included w/ CUP where appropriate.
   Agree w/ local oversight. Gaping holes w/ CUP
   Lastly - Notes are addressed a little in text. Not
   just the pit area causing. Haul routes taken into
   account
1. Changes made from interim are generally good.
   Found compelling public test was not working. Goal of
   TF to bring closure making clearer to local. Seems
to be an amount reasonable use on both sides.

2. SA of BMP inclined to think if there is clarity
   in leg then use SA as a framework for Commission
   to address affects. Rather than locking them into overly
detailed policy. Can if it deemed to inform Commission
   only if the ability to need a more dynamic. Good thing
   Frustrated express concern that if the unintended
   consequences of that are many issues around County.
   Concerned if only enforce in certain areas creating
   other's uncertainty. Can something as something as important
   as this there isn't economic incentive to move them
   from one area to another.

- Kerry:
  (Pg 3 sec 4.1(d) adequate mitigation
  means something different. Likes reasonable better
  4.3(b) where protection of regulated property
  is addressed

  4.3(d) - Significant adverse impacts, it is
  up to CC. Mitigation. Reasonable mitigation
  1.1(b-c) all of those say will not have
  basically prohibition

  4.4 - To reduce significant adverse impact
  to reasonably mitigate
Site Plan 5.19 SITE Plan- no det. for haul routes.

83 Admin Remedies

Concerned about weather
PG 14 8.9 (PA) Send Language
GMD #19 X miles
Thinks it is a great doc.
S
good to proceed wt. however time is a factor
if there is an opportunity for extension. Affte impacts which they are egress or ingress
Zoning to allow zoning. DEQ regulate pits
does not believe it should fall onto Co. to enforce.

Don-

Relationship to 4 listed items

I3 know where he stands

1. Respectfully disagrees w/ Jerry. DEQ does not have local
   control over roads. Lost a lot of Control w/ lawsuit pits
   In favor of zoning. TF made level playing field. Everyone
   plays same rule. DEQ is zoning whole Co. Probably
   not feasible for uni support of 1 mile expansion.

Doug- The most controversial pit seems to be uni Gateway.
Just as an observation the trucks causing problems
seems to be independent contractors. How to enforce?
Sees zoning as slippery slope.
Kerry - one other concern is when you do eval. on different issues. Experts are needed. If Co. is going to put in place regs. Who will be experts. More tax? Possible litigation for not having experts? What so expensive Co?
Manhattan P. Brand
Steve Whitney, Dave Rowell, Alvinj Bsp Dewitt
Brad Price, Dave Hubner, Joyce Zacher
Leland Johnson

Ralph: or w/Sea changes from old → new
appropriately written
3. SST add element @ component
4. If you don't want zoning you get what you don't want

Alumni: Does not feel Commission will go 4 Sing Bear zoning but likes 1 mile extension

Alvin: more supports #1, #2, #3 (said individually)
- The board supports allowing Brad 2nd
- Brad ox w/gravel if SST @ maps are adopted
- Note: #4

2nd Steve: The would also
Discussion on motions - none → unanimous
Three Forks P. Board  11/19/09

Comments:

Ralph: Recommendations

1. Were appropriate made w/ consideration
to FAA. Addent to strength their positive.

2. Positive acc to be through reg w/.

3. Fail w/ and parallel it w/ T.F. Critical
element. Clear reg to neighbors & develop.

4. Positive element, wi argued outside of 1/ mile
dist. For BP, would be allowed but would
go through Cup.

Recommends as a board: Speax pos to CC.
To all 4 of comments required.

There was public comment.
Ex: B.A. Thought fuel should be removed from $500
Talk about businesses, neighbors, impacts.

Moved: 2nd
No discussion
Unanimous
Belgrade P. Board 11/23/09

Kevin, Sandy, Mike, Henry, Keith, Marty, Bob, John


Put it at local level. Would like to get it incorporated at local level.

John: Doesn't agree. Very onerous situation at area if Belgrade fails that grade will be tracked in. That is why we have state regulation. Largest non-governmental employer in ballast. Co. Will make industry Kantuck's job less competitive than others do.

Henry: Does not see the requirements would force anyone to go elsewhere. Doesn't think it would force them out. Kevin: Agrees.

Marty: #1 Don't it + glazed. Sandy: John, Henry: in agreement.

John: Represents ag potential + Source. If you take away rights for them to stay on land.

Henry: Interested in dealing with this as planning area. We have enough to do w/ zoning our own area. Bill agrees. Henry: Keep it local.

Bob: Possibility of pushing it outside planning jurisdiction.

Henry: Fort C.C. Has the authority to determine zones outside our jurisdiction. If the county wants to do it.

Sandy: Brings up a good point as to why maybe we are not ready.

Kevin: Would it not be easier in some areas than others?

Ben: Says yes there are unanswered questions. Bob: or maybe what happens?

John: We don't know industry response.