



## Valley County Planning & Zoning Commission

PO Box 1350  
219 North Main Street  
Cascade, ID 83611-1350

Phone: 208.382.7115  
Fax: 208.382.7119  
Email: [cherrick@co.valley.id.us](mailto:cherrick@co.valley.id.us)  
Website: [www.co.valley.id.us](http://www.co.valley.id.us)

Todd Hatfield, Chairman  
Harry Stathis, Vice-Chairman

Ed Allen, Commissioner  
Mike Diem, Commissioner  
Gerald Patterson, Commissioner

### VALLEY COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING MINUTES

**DATE:** March 13, 2008

**TIME:** 6:00 P.M. to 9:30 P.M.

**LOCATION:** Valley County Courthouse

**ATTENDANCE:** Commissioner present: Chairman Todd Hatfield, Harry Stathis, Gerald Patterson and Ed Allen. Staff members present: Cynda Herrick, AICP, Planning and Zoning Administrator and Paula Amundson, Planning and Zoning Administrative Assistant. Mike Diem was not present until beginning of Liberty Springs.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Hatfield at 6:00 p.m.

**MINUTES:** Chairman Hatfield asked if there were any changes or corrections to the February 14, 2008 minutes. Commissioner Patterson stated on page 3 chairman was in front of his name. Commissioner Patterson moved to approve minutes for February 14, 2008 with change made. Commissioner Stathis seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

#### A. OLD BUSINESS:

**1. C.U.P. 06-20 Liberty Springs Subdivision No. 3 – Final Plat:** The applicant is Heath Cunningham, of Gannessa, Inc. They are requesting final plat approval of a four lot single-family subdivision on approximately 7.89 acres. The Commission will review the final plat and Conditional Use Permit to determine conformance with the preliminary plat. The site is accessed from Herrick Lane and is located in Sec. 20, T.12N, R.4E, B.M., Valley County, Idaho.

Chairman Hatfield announced the item and stated it was not a public hearing. He then asked for the Staff Report.

Staff presented the Staff Report. Since staff report was completed additional correspondence had been received:

Heath Cunningham, the applicant, responded to the Staff Report by e-mail received March 12, 2008 (exhibit 1). He stated the following:

- He does have a contractor to finish the job.
- Road Development Agreement will be the same as Phase 2.
- Water Storage tanks have been purchased and need to be buried.
- Landscaping was complete in the fall of 2006.
- Keith Jacobs will have to address the high ground water issue and water retention plan.

For the record Commissioner Diem has arrived.

Staff did recommend approval with the conditions that they complete the road, complete installation for fire apparatus, and get the certification from their engineer that the storm water pollution prevention plan was implemented according to the approved plans and there is no high ground water.

Keith Jacobs, Keith Jacobs Engineering, presented a letter from the contractor, John Pyle, stating that he can complete the work within ten days as soon as the road limits are lifted off of the roads (exhibit 2).

Commissioner Stathis asked about the status of the other roads that were never completed to proper standards. Keith Jacobs responded it was due to poor contractor. The roads were not built to county standards. We now have John Pyle who has obligated to complete these roads. The problems are the cul-de-sac on the north end that was not completed and Mr. Pyle started working on that last fall until weather set in. Mr. Pyle will also be working on the road that goes to the northwest that needs to be graded and three culverts that need to be put in for storm drainage. Initially the problems arose when we encountered the ground squirrels and that delayed any building on any of those lots until approval was given by Idaho Fish and Game and U.S. Wildlife Service.

Staff asked if anyone knew when road limits would be lifted. Chairman Hatfield stated this year could run to mid-May or the first of June, which does not give enough time for the 90 day final plat approval.

Discussion ensued amongst the Commissioners to postpone the final plat approval until the applicant is able to complete the roads to county standards before approving final plat for another phase.

Commissioner Allen moved to postpone final plat approval for C.U.P. 06-20 Liberty Springs Subdivision No. 3 until such time the roads are completed according to approved specifications and the fire tank is buried. Commissioner Diem seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**2. P.U.D. 98-01 Tamarack Resort, First Amended Lake Wing Condominium - Final Plat:** The applicant is Tamarack Resort, LLC. They are requesting an amendment to the previously recorded final plat. The original plat contained 41 units and now it contains 50 units. The site is located in the N ½ of Sec. 5, T.15N, R.3E, B.M., Valley County, Idaho.

Chairman Hatfield announced item and stated it was not a public hearing. He then asked for the Staff Report.

Staff presented the Staff Report. Staff stated she spoke with Amy Pemberton and she is preparing a spread sheet regarding the common area within the amended plat. Staff recommended approval for the addition of a couple of units and changing of some of the interior walls.

Chairman Hatfield asked if this was an addition to the lodge.

Greg Pittenger, Milleman, Pittenger, McMahan & Pemberton, 706 N. First Street, McCall, Idaho stated this is for the annex that was approved earlier to the Lodge at Osprey Meadows. This condominium sits next to the lodge and is not physically attached.

Chairman Hatfield stated he didn't see where the changes were made on the revised plat. Staff stated that the designated changes were not submitted. What was submitted was the revised amended final plat. Chairman Hatfield stated that in the future they should be able to see where the changes are that are being made.

Commissioner Allen moved to approve First Amended Lake Wing Condominium final plat for P.U.D. 98-01 Tamarack Resort. Commissioner Stathis seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

## **B. NEW BUSINESS:**

**1. VAC 08-01 Smylie Lane Subdivision – Extraction Easement:** The applicant is Statewide Construction Inc. They are requesting approval of vacation of Easement Instrument No. 42819 – a sand and gravel extraction easement. The property is within the proposed Smylie Lane Subdivision. The property is located in the NWNW Section 27, T.17N, R.3E, B.M, Valley County, Idaho.

Chairman Hatfield announced the item and asked for any exparte contact or conflict of interest. There were none. He then asked for the Staff Report.

Staff presented the Staff Report. Staff stated that this application is a vacation of the easement that was given to Valley County for extraction of gravel. This vacation has nothing to do with the subdivision and has nothing do with any of the ingress/egress easements that exist. This vacation will not affect them at all. Since the Staff Report had been completed additional correspondence had been received.

Joe Pachner, Toothman-Orton Engineering, responded by e-mail received March 12, 2007. He stated that they have been in contact with Jeff Schroeder and have resolved his concerns. He also wanted to know what appropriate deeds Staff was requesting.

Staff stated the easement deed was located and that is what they were looking for.

Larry Monkarsh, 13 Smylie Lane, Donnelly, ID responded by letter dated March 10, 2008 (exhibit 2) and he stated that he objects to this vacation. He believed that the easement vacation will affect his current ingress/egress to his property. Currently there are three existing ingress/egress easements.

Luke Crawford, Sequoia Pietri, Lonnie King and Larry Monkarsh responded by letter received March 10, 2008 (exhibit 3) and as Smylie residents they had the following concerns:

- Smiley Court is a private street owned and maintained by the home owner's association, which they are not a part of.
- The 5 lots to the south are the primary easement owners of #143336.
- The wetland and flood plains have been altered which may lead to flooding and damage to their properties.
- Where is the proposed septic drainage for the Smylie Lane Homeowner's Association?
- VAC 08-01 Smylie Lane Subdivision extractment easement.
- Believed that by vacating the gravel extraction easement they would lose their ingress/egress easement No. 143336.

Staff does not know why they would lose their ingress/egress easement by vacating the extraction easement. Staff believed that this would not happen.

Commissioner Diem asked who had the easements numbered as #143336 and #126889. Staff stated they were to the property owners to the south. Those easements are part of their subdivision application which needs to be vacated and allow the people to the south to use the platted road. Those easements are not part of the current application but the subdivision application. When the applicant came forward with their last final plat approval, it was noticed that there was the gravel extraction easement in favor of Valley County that was in lots 2 and 3 in Block 1. At that time the applicant was told to vacate that easement since there was no place to build on the lots with that easement in place.

Staff stated that the ingress/egress easements were put in place quite a bit later than the gravel extraction easement. At this time the ingress/egress easements are being decided in court.

Chairman Hatfield stated they would now hear from the applicant.

Brian Wanner, 1011 W. Roseberry Road, Donnelly, Idaho stated that there is a gravel extraction easement over two acres of his property that is in favor of the county and they are asking for a vacation of that easement.

Commissioner Patterson asked if there were property owners currently using that easement. Mr. Wanner stated that there are ingress/egress easements across the property that are currently being used by adjacent property owners.

Staff stated this application is for vacating the gravel extraction easement and not for the ingress/egress easements. We are not here to decide the ingress/egress easements.

Chairman Hatfield asked for proponents. There were none.

Chairman Hatfield asked for undecided. There were none.

Chairman Hatfield asked for opponents.

Lonnie King, 9 Smylie Lane, Donnelly, Idaho stated the biggest reason they do not want the gravel

extraction easement vacated is that it will give them a chance to build and push them off that road. Other vacations have happened on those properties that we don't know about. A lot of things have been done that we don't think engineers have had anything to do with. One of those things is the flooding and I think this year we will get flooded out because they have changed the whole makeshift of the road when they put their road in. We are asking you not to vacate this easement until the road issue is taken care of.

Chairman Hatfield asked if he was aware that this vacation does not effect your ingress/egress easement right now. Mr. King stated it shouldn't affect it, but it will affect it because it gives them the room to build. They want to push us out and force us to use their road. We are not going to sacrifice our easements to secondary on theirs. They want to own the other road and we are not willing to give up our easements. So vacating this easement will give them more ammo to push us off our road.

Chairman Hatfield asked for clarification on what lots were owned by the property owners opposing this vacation. Staff stated they were the five lots south of Smylie Court.

Commissioner Patterson asked if the gravel easement road was currently being used by them for ingress/egress. Mr. King said yes they are and was granted to them by Jack Kangas in 1983 and is used by them daily. The road is maintained by him and some other guys. Commissioner Patterson asked why you object to using Smylie Court for your ingress/egress. Mr. King stated we object because we will have to use someone else's road and go by their rules. They are an association and a subdivision and they can tell us whether we can bring our trucks and equipment through there. We were granted this easement along time before this subdivision was approved. Planning and Zoning three years ago told them that we were using the wrong easement and they could go ahead and build the road and work it out with us later. We were not using the wrong easement and that is on tape. Gerry Ikola and Tony Frontino also have an easement through there.

Sequoia Pietri, 7 Smiley Lane, Donnelly, Idaho said that they are concerned that their road easement would get wiped out once the extraction easement was vacated since it was given before theirs.

Chairman Hatfield stated that it would not.

Chairman Hatfield asked for applicant's rebuttal.

Brian Wanner said he sent a letter to the residents to the south from Mike Pierce, lawyer from Cascade, as far as vacating their easements and rewriting their 70 foot easement to use Smiley Court. Gerry Ikola and Tony Frontino have signed and notarized those documents. The other parties have not yet signed and are going to pursue that issue in court and let the judge decide. Mr. Wanner further stated that Idaho State Code 55.3.13 allowed them the right to be granted the vacation of those road easements.

Commissioner Patterson asked if there were going to be access limitations with the easement you are going to give them. Mr. Wanner said absolutely not. It is a road built to county standards. The road will be maintained by the homeowner's association of Smylie Subdivision. Lonnie said he removed the snow on it currently and gets paid and he only assumes the Homeowner's Association would ask him to continue doing so since he is a resident there.

Commissioner Patterson asked if they had told them all of that and that you are willing to put that in writing, and they still object to vacating the road easement. Mr. Wanner stated that is correct.

Staff stated again that the road easement issue does not have anything to do with the gravel extraction vacation.

Chairman Hatfield closed the public hearing and the Commission prepared for deliberations.

Discussion ensued amongst the Commissioners. They understood that the two easements are separate issues regarding gravel extraction and ingress/egress easements. It was understood why the residents have trust issues with vacating the road easements. They wondered why these issues hadn't already been resolved. It was contemplated not recommending the gravel extraction easement vacation until the road easement issue had been resolved. Commissioner Diem said that the gravel extraction easement issue could be taken care of easily, but the road easements would be more difficult to resolve.

Chairman Hatfield asked if the road easement vacation would be a separate application. Staff stated yes it would. She further explained that the application in front of Planning and Zoning Commission is just for the gravel extraction easement. This needs to be taken care of before final plat approval. Final plat approval had been given once but it had expired. Back then it had been decided that there was still room to build on those lots so they were not going to mess with the ingress/egress easements and let the neighbors figure that out amongst themselves. There are all kinds of subdivisions out there with easements on them.

It was agreed that they were here to take care of the gravel extraction easement vacation application that was in front of them today.

Commissioner Allen moved to recommend approval to the Board of County Commissioners for Vacation 08-01 Smiley Lane Subdivision – Vacate Easement No. 42819 – Sand & Gravel Extraction. Commissioner Diem seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

**2. Amendment to C.U.P. 06-43 Concrete Processing Plant – Phasing Plan:** The applicant is Tamarack Resort. The conditional use permit was issued in January 2007 and expires on January 11, 2009. They are requesting approval of an amended phasing plan to be completed by the end of 2012. The property is located at the southwest corner of Plant Lane and Koskella Road in SESE Sec. 26, T.16N, R.3E, B.M., Valley County, Idaho.

Chairman Hatfield announced the item and asked for any ex parte contact or conflict of interest. There were none. He then asked for the Staff Report.

Staff presented the Staff Report. Since the Staff Report had been completed the following correspondence had been received:

Bill & Cynthia Pennell, 12776 Koskella Road, Donnelly, Idaho, responded by e-mail dated March 12, 2008 (exhibit 1) and they oppose any extension of this application and that the Planning and Zoning Commission put a stop to this project for the following reasons:

- Tamarack currently has a concrete plant on their property that has been adequately

servicing their needs.

- Things have changed in the past year. This proposed plant is right across the street from an upscale subdivision which makes this facility incompatible with the surrounding residential and agricultural use of the area.
- Not compatible with the scenic corridor.

Ted & Phyllis Bohlman, 187 Davis Creek Lane, Donnelly, responded by e-mail received March 12, 2008 and agree with the Pinnel's e-mail and are very much against this concrete plant.

Commissioner Allen commented that it sounds like they are asking to have the Conditional Use Permit rescinded.

Staff stated that is correct. This is an application that came before the Planning and Zoning Commission. It was also heard in front of the Board of County Commissioners for variance approval. So it has gone through two public hearings. An extension was granted at the January Planning and Zoning public hearing. At that time the applicant wanted to change their phasing plan and I told them they should amend their conditional use permit along with their phasing plan. So at this time the applicant is asking the Commission to consider an amendment to their phasing plan.

Chairman Hatfield asked for a copy of the first phasing plan. Staff determined that an actual phasing plan had never submitted.

Greg Pittenger, attorney for applicant, 706 North 1<sup>st</sup> Street, McCall, Idaho came forward. He stated that he was not aware that there was a phasing plan originally. They came in for an extension because the C.U.P. was expiring in January. Rather than continuing with one year extensions, we are now coming forward with a multiple-year extension request with the phasing plan in one year increments. The original application approval was in January 2007 and we have now received an extension to January 2009.

Commissioner Diem asked about the reasons for the short timeline requested before with them originally looking at one year. Mr. Pittenger stated according to Amy Pemberton's submittal letter they intended to move forward last year, but with the market and financing conditions they have pushed it back. Regarding the phasing plan that has been proposed the applicant has considered the comments of the neighbors regarding landscaping and that will be the first element of the new phasing plan.

Chairman Hatfield asked for proponents. There were none.

Chairman Hatfield asked for undecided. There were none.

Chairman Hatfield asked for opponents. There were none.

Chairman Hatfield closed the public hearing.

Discussion ensued amongst the Commissioners. Chairman Hatfield stated that the Scenic Byway Overlay Ordinance public hearing is coming up in a couple of weeks. Now we have this

phasing plan spread out to 2012 that gives them exemption from what the ordinance is proposing. Doesn't seem right to have it spread out over so many years. Commissioner Stathis agreed and said the plant is too close to the highway with regards to the scenic byway ordinance. Commissioner Patterson agreed that if you project so far out into the future, so when the new ordinances become adopted, they are exempt from them.

Commissioner Patterson wondered if they should postpone this request until after the scenic byway public hearing. Chairman Hatfield stated that they had just granted a one year extension in January, so that gives them a year to do something. Chairman Allen also agreed that length of the phasing plan is too long into the future. It would be too easy to decide in a couple of years that they might not need to do this at all.

Commissioner Diem commented that all the components of the phasing plan are also addressed in the C.U.P. that has been approved. Now it seems like it is just a timing aspect for when all the conditions are implemented. We are not deciding on the landscaping issues or the grandfathering of this application, that decision has already been made by us. Regardless of the timing aspect regarding the scenic byway that decision has already been made. He asked Staff if this is not approved then what would happen.

Staff stated if this amendment to the conditional use permit was not approved then the applicant would have to proceed with the conditions that are in their permit as approved or reapply at a later date which then any new ordinances that have been implemented would apply to the new application.

Commissioner Patterson moved to deny amendment to C.U.P. 06-43 Concrete Processing Plant. Commissioner Stathis seconded the motion. Staff asked for the reasons of the denial to be stated. Commissioner Patterson stated that there is no need to approve the phasing plan since they have a year to move forward. Commissioner Stathis stated the phasing plan is to draw out. Commissioner Allen believed that under the circumstances it appeared they don't really need this plant but don't want to let go. Chairman Hatfield asked for all in favor of the motion. Commissioner Allen, Commissioner Patterson, Commissioner Stathis and Chairman Hatfield responded in favor. Chairman Hatfield asked for those opposed and Commissioner Diem replied no. Chairman Hatfield stated motion carries.

Chairman Hatfield stated there was a ten day appeal process.

**3. C.U.P. 08-01 Pero Subdivision – Preliminary & Final Plat:** The applicants are Joan & Mike Pero. They are requesting approval of a 2 lot single-family residential subdivision on 6.0 acres. The subdivision would be served by individual wells and septic. A 70 foot public right-of-way would be established for Gold Fork Road between the lots. The property is RP16N04E300755A and is located in the N ½ N ½ NWNW Section 30, T.16N, R.4E, B.M., Valley County, Idaho.

Chairman Hatfield announced the item and asked for any exparte contact or conflict of interest. There were none. He then asked for the Staff Report.

Staff presented the Staff Report. Regarding comment made by Valley County Cartographer that there was no curve table on front of plat that has since been corrected. A draft of the Road

Development Agreement was put into record.

Commissioner Patterson asked if what happened here was that they owned a piece of property and the county came along and put a road right down the middle of it and split their property, but did not split with two deeds.

Staff stated that was not correct. That road has been there a very long time, even before Valley County was created. The road predates the four parcels which were created from a larger parcel of land. That is the reason for their subdivision application because they were not eligible for a one-time split.

Chairman Hatfield stated at this time they would hear from the applicant.

Ralph Miller, Secesh Engineering, 335 Deinhard Lane, McCall, Idaho, engineer for the applicant came forward. He stated Staff covered the application very well. This is a small 2-lot subdivision off of Gold Fork Road.

Commissioner Allen asked what is on the west side of the property. Ralph stated it was a no build zone, wetland area.

Commissioner Diem asked what the difference was between FEMA 100 year flood plane and the adjusted 100 year flood plain. Staff stated they went out and actually delineated where the flood plane is by platting the high water line. This is better information than the FEMA FIRM (Flood Insurance Rate Maps).

Chairman Hatfield wondered how close is this to Demar Burnett's is doing his excavation. Staff stated this is north of Demar's property. Also the commissioner approved the Winchester Hill's Subdivision just east of here last year.

Chairman Hatfield asked for proponents. There were none.

Chairman Hatfield asked for undecided. There were none.

Chairman Hatfield asked for opposed. There were none.

Chairman Hatfield closed the public hearing and brought it back to the table.

Discussion ensued amongst the Commissioners and the general consensus was that they could see no problems with the proposed application. It was a natural split for the property with the road running down the center. Both pieces are large enough for a well and septic.

Commissioner Allen moved to approve preliminary and final plat for C.U.P. 08-01 Pero Subdivision. Commissioner Stathis seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

## **C. OTHER ITEMS:**

### **1. Correspondence:**

- **C.U.P. 07-02 Winchester Hills Subdivision – One year extension to March 8, 2009**

Scott Stanfield, with Mason and Stanfield Engineering, came forward. Our work to date is that we started with 50 test holes and monitored them until July of 07. During that study we found the potential of wetlands. At that point we began working the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers on 404 permits. Our roadway plans for the first three phases have now been submitted to Jeff Schroeder and Parametrix. We start monitoring again next week. Staff stated there are phases to this subdivision, so an extension would extend them all. Extension was for granted for one year to March 8, 2009.

- **C.U.P. 06-46 Barker Ranch Estates – One year extension to March 12, 2009**  
Wendy Adams came forward with Farm-to-Market 60 LLC. She stated that water monitoring took quite a bit of time and identified some spots on the property that were problematic. We probably could have worked it out with DEQ by going with shared septics, but the time frame would have been so lengthy to get those approvals. We have now applied with Northlake Sewer for annexation into the sewer district. We have begun the design process for running sewer to meet that line that's coming up Highway 55. Extension was granted for one year to March 12, 2009.
- **C.U.P. 06-49 Silver Hawk Subdivision – 90 day final plat extension to June 13, 2008**  
Staff stated they have final plat approval. They need an extension to get the well dug to finish fire water tank. So staff is requesting an extension for 180 days to finish well. Final plat extension was granted for 180 days to September 13, 2008
- **C.U.P. 07-05 Cascade Highlands – One Year extension to April 12, 2009**  
A letter was received requesting an extension due to the changing market conditions. They are currently working on a clarified marketing program for this project. The Commission felt that someone should have shown up for this subdivision to explain the current status regarding the progress of this project. Staff stated that their C.U.P. does not expire until April 12<sup>th</sup>, so this will give them an opportunity to come back in front of you to explain their situation at the April meeting.  
Extension request was denied for their reasons being market conditions and applicant not appearing to explain the progress of the project.
- **P.U.D. 05-01 Valley County Business Park and Storage Facility - Extension request**  
Mike Voris came forward. He submitted a letter previously for their review and was here to answer any questions they might have. Initially they were delayed by getting permits issued from the Army Corp of Engineers. He was asking for a three to five year extension and felt there was nothing negative to Valley County by granting their extension request. Ideally next year is when they are looking to move forward for optimum conditions. They do have some financing but it is just a hard time right now to move forward. They have quite a bit of time and money already invested in their project. Extension was granted for one year to June 27, 2009.
- **C.U.P. 07-18 Long Valley Operations Center (fka Idaho Power Operations Center) – Architectural plans**  
Staff stated it is not the exact architectural design as presented. On this particular application they didn't give exact plans for the design. They are now presenting them with their design and orientation of the building.  
It was agreed to accept the architectural plans that were submitted for their review.

## **2. Facts and Conclusions: Approved as presented.**

- V-6-07 Whitehawk Subdivision - Sky Ridge Culdesac & Shared Driveway

### 3. Work Session:

- Matrix and compatibility rating evaluation

Staff stated that this work session would consist of going through and evaluating each line of the existing system and add any additional lines that the Commission thinks are necessary based upon their experience with this tool. At that time they can then go to a public hearing and make changes where needed from the hearing or you may even decide you want to form a committee.

Staff stated the Compatibility Questions and Evaluation worksheet is a tool used to determine if it appears to be compatible with the surrounding area. It is not used for the approval or denial of an application. The Planning and Zoning Commission should be going through that compatibility rating to see if they agree with the numbers that exist or if the numbers need to be changed. The purpose of this work session is to go through the matrix and determine if those numbers still apply. Do we think that there are lines that need to be added? We are here to reevaluate the matrix and see if it is time to change it so that it could better define the uses. It might also be the time to change the questions asked on the compatibility rating form to coincide with Appendix A in Valley County's Land Use and Development Ordinance.

Discussion ensued amongst the Commission on how this tool ultimately impacts individuals and the surrounding areas. They thought it would be a good idea to add a column for mitigation of applications that fall in the 0 to 10 range for a total score. It was determined that questions one through three are the only questions to be considered with the matrix.

Commissioner Patterson commented regarding question three "Is the proposed use generally compatible with the overall land use in the local vicinity?", most of the land in Valley County is considered agricultural. He further said that the government's statistics from the last census stated that Valley County's agricultural activity only produced 2% of the total income for the whole county. This is information that we should know when talking about economic impact on our county.

Commissioner Allen asked how many other counties used this tool for evaluating applications. Staff stated there were probably a couple of counties that use a tool like this, but nobody uses ours. Staff stated a lot of them zone. Commissioner Stathis said it would be nice to find a county that is similar to ours with agricultural, forest service, resort and small business and see how they approach the planning and zoning side of things. Staff stated Teton County is similar to ours.

Commissioner Patterson asked if we should be talking about zoning now. What about the needs for the county for the next twenty years; you need some industrial areas and you need some business areas. Chairman Hatfield said that we might look at trying to establish zoning in a couple of areas for industrial. Staff stated that is what is trying to be done with the Scenic Overlay Ordinance.

It was agreed that the Compatibility Questions and Evaluation form needs to be expanded and that the Commission would do a draft from their own personal perspective. Then take their

comments from today into consideration and add their own questions or change the questions we have. When everyone is done give them to Staff and she will come up with a master list. Next time we can go through them and begin the next process.

**Meeting adjourned.**