

OFFICE OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
YAVAPAI COUNTY, ARIZONA

Prescott, Arizona

May 29, 2002

The Board of Supervisors met in special session on May 29, 2002.

Present: Lorna Street, Chairman; Gheral Brownlow, Member; Bev Staddon, Clerk.

Absent: Chip Davis, Vice Chairman, due to his attendance at the 49th Annual National Security Forum of the Air War College in Montgomery, Alabama.

Also present: Planning & Zoning Commission members Tom Thurman, Lee Nelson, Linda Bitner, Gene Kerkman, Walter Burcham and Curtis Lindner; Development Services Director Ken Spedding and Development Services staff members Alex Price, Steve Mauk, Elise Link, Chris Bridges, and Enalo Lockard; and Deputy County Attorney Randy Schurr.

ITEM NO. 1. Meet in joint study session with the Yavapai County Planning & Zoning Commission.

1. Development Services Director Ken Spedding. Introduction and opening remarks. Mr. Spedding briefly reviewed some of the items that would be discussed on this day, saying that well applications would be discussed as well as fees that had not been updated since 1987.
2. General Plan Consultant Dava Hoffman, Dava and Associates. General Plan update. Ms. Hoffman said the General Plan process started last summer with a widespread participation program to make people aware of the General Plan update. She noted that the entire General Plan was on the County's website, saying that since the adoption of the plan she had been gathering data on the four elements of the Plan and had conducted the first set of public meetings to gather information about implementation methods and strategies. Ms. Hoffman referred to the Yavapai County General Plan Info-Sheet, saying that it was a brief highlight of the data that had been gathered over the last few months, and that the information contained in it had been presented at the public meetings held in May. She said that at those meetings the public had been asked to identify one of four categories for implementation of the objectives in the Plan, with the four categories being: (1) Regulations/Code Changes; (2) Volunteerism/Organizations; (3) Government Expenditure; and (4) Private Sector Investment. Ms. Hoffman said that many of the comments related to objectives dealing with land use identified Regulations/Code Changes as the means for implementation. She said that many of the comments identifying Government Expenditure as an implementation method pointed to the state and federal governments for assistance, and that things like transportation planning and water resources were listed under this category. Ms. Hoffman said that during discussion of Volunteerism/Organizations as an implementation method, people seemed to feel that this method could tie in with Government Expenditure by encouraging such things as water conservation and that people also wanted to be involved in the development of a master plan for open space in the County. She said that under the category of Private Sector Investment, people seemed to feel that issues related to water, wastewater and planning for some roads was appropriate and that there was also mention of support for local aviation and airports, and for supporting parks. Ms. Hoffman said one area that had no clear method of implementation was providing public services to rural areas and that the comments indicated that this might involve both Government Expenditure and Private Sector Investment, and that this combination also seemed to apply to public access to waterways and maintenance of trails but that people seemed to feel that Government Expenditure and Regulations/Code Changes also applied to water resources. She said she had received numerous emails and phone calls about the need for the County to provide for motorized trails, and that there seemed to be some fear that motorized trails were being closed. Ms. Hoffman said comments indicated that a sharing of Government Expenditure and Private Sector Investment were appropriate for preservation of open space. There was brief discussion regarding the number of people who had attended the public meetings in both Prescott and Cottonwood, during which Ms. Hoffman said that about 25 or 30 people had attended each meeting. Supervisor Brownlow asked if the Board was going to let that number of people dictate what the County should do with regard to implementation of the General Plan. Ms. Hoffman said that the County was required by state law to have the public meetings, and that the purpose of the meetings was simply to ask for ideas about implementation of the General Plan goals. She added that data collection was being done by a consultant in cooperation with the County, cities and and towns. Mr. Schurr noted that the Commission and Board would make the final decision regarding the Plan, and that they did not have to approve the consultant's recommendation. Mr. Spedding pointed out that some items might be easier to implement than others because they

would not cost much to implement, but that some items might not be implemented for some years. Chairman Street said that at the Prescott meeting many people said that many of the objectives should be implemented through volunteerism instead of the County paying for them. Ms. Hoffman said there were almost no areas where implementation had been identified solely as a money issue, and that people seemed to feel that there were several ways in which to accomplish the various objectives. Mr. Kerkman said it seemed to him that information regarding projections of population growth would be important so that the Commission and Board could be sure the Plan that is created would be sufficient for future use. Ms. Hoffman said population projections were still being gathered and would be included once they are available. Mr. Thurman mentioned previous efforts to encourage clustering of houses in the Sedona area, saying that it had not worked very well because it resulted in compromising scenic views. He said he would like to see clustering of subdivisions, but felt that the Commission needed to be flexible within the subdivisions with regard to placement of houses. He said he did not know what could be done about water. Mr. Schurr said the legislature had amended portions of the Growing Smarter law, including changes to the water element in general plans. Mr. Thurman said that with regard to off-road vehicles, there were more off-road enthusiasts than there were bicyclists, and that although the tendency of off-road vehicles was to create noise and dust the County still needed to provide something for those people. Mr. Schurr said the people he had talked to regarding that were what could be called "extreme users" who were in it for the challenge and not for transportation, and that the Forest Service was already providing areas for them to ride. Ms. Hoffman said that there were also accommodations for off-road vehicles on both BLM and state land. Ms. Nelson said she saw a problem with off-road vehicle enthusiasts not being responsible. She said there had been fence cuttings and the like, and that as long as people were responsible and stayed on designated trails and roadways it was okay. She said it might be nice to have some parks available for this type of activity, but that it might be cost prohibitive. Ms. Hoffman said there were many parks or specific trail systems through the forest for this type of activity. She asked if she understood that the Board and Commission felt there should be some planning for off-road vehicles to keep them in the proper places but out of other places. Ms. Nelson said yes, because of the potential for environmental damage. Supervisor Brownlow said that in the future he would like to see information included regarding how many people attended the public meetings. He said that because the Board was facing a possible increase in the County's tax rate, he was receiving calls from people who were encouraging the County to cut all unmandated services and yet when it came to the General Plan people were saying they wanted all kinds of things. He said he believed that people who use trails should be responsible for maintaining them, and that this expense should not come from the general public. Supervisor Brownlow said he also knew from experience with parks that volunteers often do not follow through. He said that with regard to scenic routes he felt there were other roads that needed to be taken care of first. He said he had also seen in the back-up materials that 90% of the lots in the County were the result of lot splits and that there needed to be a better balance in that regard. Ms. Hoffman asked if the Commission and Board felt that the Plan should include incentives to encourage subdividing instead of lot splits. There was general agreement that it should. During brief discussion about what people expected with regard to sewer systems, Ms. Hoffman said it appeared that people felt it would take government to seed systems that would use things like wetlands as opposed to the standard wastewater treatment facility. She suggested that government could offer incentives for people to use new types of sewer systems if they offer better environmental alternatives. Supervisor Brownlow said he believed care needed to be taken with the General Plan because people would be throwing it in the faces of the Commission and Board. Ms. Bitner said the General Plan was a guideline, and was not etched in stone. Mr. Thurman said he thought that the bigger subdivisions in the County had done a good job of putting in roads, wastewater systems and other infrastructure. Mr. Lindner said he also felt that there should be better documentation regarding the people who attend the public participation meetings. He said the County needed to look at the right of the public to do lot splits because splits caused many problems for the County. He said he believed the County should be able to offer incentives to developers to use PAD zoning for development instead of doing two-acre lot splits, adding that the Commission often heard opposition regarding subdivisions with two-acre lots. Mr. Lindner said he agreed with Supervisor Brownlow that the Plan itself could end up being a problem. Mr. Schurr said he believed that staff agreed that PAD needed to be encouraged, and that what staff had talked about was not having to require a rezoning but just to allow people to apply for PAD and to provide incentives in the form of allowing an increase in density of 10% to 15% for utilizing PAD. He said it would be necessary to rewrite the PAD portion of the Planning & Zoning Ordinance in order to do this. Ms. Link said that currently it is difficult for developers to use PAD

because it requires rezoning, which in turn makes it open to referendum. Mr. Spedding said that staff looked to the Board and Commission for input on the General Plan. Chairman Street said she felt that the Board and Commission needed to balance everyone's wish lists for everyone in the unincorporated areas of the County. She stressed that the County's responsibility was for those people who live in the unincorporated areas and that cities and towns had their own general plans. Mr. Thurman said that as nice as it would be to not have some subdivisions come before the Commission, he felt that not doing that would cut the public out of the process. Mr. Schurr said the portion of the Ordinance related to PAD would be written in such a way to provide for notification and for a public process if there are objections. Ms. Hoffman said the City of Prescott had had something similar on its books for the last 20 years. She said she thought a comment made by Mr. Linder regarding allowing for an increase in density had merit because to do so would be to provide a real incentive for developers. She said she felt the County could also tie density to what kinds of amenities a developer would provide, saying that if it was not worthwhile for a person to be a developer then he would just split his land. Mr. Spedding said that unless state law changed, the County would never be able to stop lot splits.

3. **Permitting and Compliance Director Enalo Lockard. Update regarding the Zoning Ordinance and fees.** Mr. Lockard briefly reviewed the process for making changes to the Ordinance, saying he hoped that the update of the Ordinance would be ready for review by the Commission and Board in October or November of this year. He said that incentives would be looked at, but that they would be a separate issue from the Ordinance update. Ms. Link said that the land use and planning staff had gone through what had been done so far and had found things they believed were significant in terms of change. She said she would like to see a little more specificity in the Ordinance. Mr. Lockard said he was trying to provide definitions in the Ordinance so that it would be easier for staff to deal with, saying that, for example, he was defining "farm animal." Mr. Spedding said that people are often out of compliance with regard to farm animals because they might have two horses that are allowable under their zoning, but they also have chickens and a pygmy goat. He said staff would be bringing this to the Commission for formal consideration as things moved forward. There was brief discussion regarding fees for zoning related items, during which Mr. Price said that currently there are separate fees depending upon whether property is metes and bounds or a recorded lot, and that staff felt because the amount of time spent on either was about the same a single fee should prevail. He said staff was recommending that the current fee for metes and bounds parcels be used in both cases. Mr. Price said that if the new fees are implemented there would be an approximately 20% increase in fee collection. He said staff had also looked at implementing some new fees for services that other counties charge for, but for which Yavapai County has not charged. He noted that the fees as approved in 1987 were supposed to cover 75% of the County's cost. Mr. Spedding said the County was subsidizing services provided through Development Services. Ms. Nelson asked why there were no proposed fees with regard to wireless. Mr. Schurr said the Commission was no longer dealing with wireless issues because most of them were being approved administratively. He added that fees would be part of the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Price reviewed the proposed fees for well and septic reviews, saying that historically the County had charged a \$15 fee for for this. He said that if a septic system was not shown on a plan the department had just marked it "insufficient" and forwarded it the Arizona Department of Water Resources, where it was approved. He said that ADWR would no longer approve applications marked "insufficient" and that as a result review of the applications would require more staff research. He said that in order to do the necessary research a fee would need to be implemented to cover the cost. There was brief discussion regarding placement of wells and septic systems, during which Mr. Price said that wells could actually be drilled on a property line and that sometimes the location of a well on one property can negate the ability of the adjacent property owner to develop his lot. Jim Holt of the Arizona Department of Water Resources said his department's change in procedure resulted from the fact that this was a water protection issue. He said his department's regulations had been revised and that the County was now required to review well applications for parcels five acres in size or smaller. Mr. Burcham asked if the County had anything in place to prevent someone from drilling a well in such a way as to negate the ability of an adjacent property owner to develop his property. Mr. Price said he had seen this happen a couple of times and that there was nothing the County could do about it. Supervisor Brownlow asked if it would be possible to have a mandated setback for wells. There was brief discussion regarding alternate septic systems, during which Mr. Price said that some reviews would still need to be done by outside engineers but that most of them could be reviewed in-house.
4. **Permitting and Compliance Director Alex Price and Deputy County Attorney Randy Schurr. Subdivision Regulations/Minor Land Division and fees.** Chairman Street said she would like to see a system that was efficient and fair,

adding that these issues dealt with private property. She said she thought that many subdivision developers felt they were being held hostage to things that were perhaps not required and that the Commission and Board needed just to look at land use. Chairman Street said it was not possible to satisfy every group out there and that she did not think it was the Board's or Commission's job to try to satisfy every group. Mr. Spedding said that one reason why things were not moving forward more quickly on the Subdivision Regulations was the General Plan and the concern that if too many restrictions were put on developers the County would just end up with more lot splits. Chairman Street said the County needed to focus on its goals and not beat up on developers. Mr. Price said that Mr. Spedding had asked him to make sure that revisions to the Subdivision Regulations ensured a fair process. He said he did not want to do something that would have an impact on the General Plan. In response to a question from Chairman Street regarding the County road standard, Mr. Schurr said the County was chip sealing as many roads as possible in an effort to keep the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality happy. Discussion turned to fees for subdivisions. Mr. Spedding said staff did not want to raise fees so high that it would encourage lot splits. He said consideration had been given to what other counties charge, but that what he had asked staff to do was look at what it actually costs to provide services. Ms. Nelson asked if the proposed fees had been distributed to developers for comment. Mr. Bridges said that at this point he had only looked into actual costs for the County as well as what other counties were charging. Mr. Burcham said that developers were not concerned about fees so much as they were concerned about how long it takes to work through the system and how many hassles they have to deal with. Mr. Thurman said that, as vice president of the Yavapai County Contractors Association, he could say that developers would have no problem with the proposed new fees. Mr. Lindner said that what he had heard in the Verde Valley was that contractors and developers were concerned about the length of time it takes to work through the system, and that if the fee increases would result in better service he did not think anyone would have a problem with them. He said he did not think the public would be happy with the County subsidizing the services and that a better balance needed to be achieved. Mr. Schurr said that with regard to subsidizing services, if the County could get people to come through the system for development instead of lot splitting, then the County would be providing better protection for the public and that it would be worth subsidizing. Mr. Price said that the fee information provided in the back-up materials was really just for discussion on this day. He said that developers had not been notified yet because staff did not know whether the Board and Commission would be interested in moving forward with the fee increases. Supervisor Brownlow said he thought it was time to move forward with increases, saying the fees were really just peanuts for someone who would be making big bucks on a development. Mr. Schurr briefly reviewed legislation regarding minor land divisions and disclosure affidavit requirements. He said he believed the Commission would be forwarding to the Board a recommendation to adopt compliance with the statute as part of the Zoning Ordinance, but that the minor land division ordinance itself would stand alone.

5. **Senior Zoning Inspector Steve Mauk.** Discussion regarding storage containers. Mr. Mauk briefly reviewed the use of sea cargo containers for storage units, garages, temporary offices, and the like. He said that in 1997 the County had banned the use of sea cargo containers for such things, but that there were a couple of companies in the Prescott area who sold them. He said that currently a person would need to obtain a conditional use permit in order to have a sea cargo container on their property, and he noted that several of the cities and towns in the County, including the City of Sedona, allowed them. He said that staff just wanted to let the Board and Commission know that there was a demand for this product, and to suggest that consideration be given to relaxing the requirements regarding them. Mr. Schurr pointed out that staff had suggested this about three years ago and that neither the Commission nor the Board had expressed interest in changing the requirements at that time, but that since then the makeup of both bodies had changed. Ms. Bitner said she was in favor of allowing the use of sea cargo containers, and that she would rather see something like that than the kinds of structures that some people put up for storage. Ms. Nelson asked if the County could require that the containers be painted. Mr. Mauk said the County did not enforce painting on any other type of structure. Ms. Nelson asked if there could be a requirement that the containers do not have dents in them. Mr. Schurr said the County could require that the containers be painted the same color as the house. Roy Bennett said he sold sea cargo containers and that there were many companies who sold them without regard for local zoning regulations. He said that he was in favor of requiring that the containers be painted, saying that they should be one color and should match the building they are adjacent to.
6. **Deputy County Attorney Randy Schurr.** Role of the Planning Commission. Mr. Schurr said that because there were some new Commission members he wanted to remind everyone that the Commission was

subject to the Open Meeting Law. He said the Commission members should also be aware of conflict of interest statutes and that any Commission member having a property or financial interest, or whose relative has a property or financial interest in an issue before the Commission, should declare a conflict of interest and excuse himself from the proceedings. Mr. Schurr said the County had to be sure that the public was comfortable with the integrity of the process. He said the Commission had a specific responsibility to make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors, and that when Commissioners were not doing that they did not have the right to act as zoning inspectors or to otherwise use their position as Commissioners. Supervisor Brownlow said he does not try to influence the vote of anyone on the Commission and that Commission members should vote for what they think is best.

7. BLM Field Supervisor Gene Dahlem. Presentation regarding proposed land exchange (16,886.73 acres near Dewey, Humboldt and Mayer). Mr. Dahlem said that the proposed land exchange was called a National Landscape Conservation System (NLCS) Land Exchange because it was related to the management of national monuments or other preserve lands under the control of the Bureau of Land Management. He said that just less than a year ago the applicant, Aranda Properties, had approached the BLM regarding a possible exchange of BLM land near the Dewey, Humboldt and Mayer areas for private lands in other parts of the state. Mr. Dahlem said that this type of land exchange was not a "two for one" type of exchange, but rather an exchanged based on appraised value. He told the Board that the BLM land the applicant was interested in acquiring had been available for exchange since 1989, and that the exchange would help the BLM in its efforts to manage its land more effectively. Mr. Dahlem said that in considering a land exchange, the BLM would look at environmental impacts and endangered species. He said there were no endangered species on the land that Aranda hoped to acquire, but that there were endangered species on the lands that the BLM would receive if the exchange was approved. He told the Board that an environmental impact statement had been done when the lands in the County were made available for disposal in 1989, and that the comments the BLM was currently receiving from the public would be included as part of the environmental assessment the BLM was currently engaged in. He noted that the BLM would be accepting comments on the proposed exchange until June 15, 2002. He added that the BLM was looking at mineral potential on the exchange lands and that it had already held three public open houses to provide information about the proposal. Mike Taylor, Deputy State Director of Resources for the BLM, said he understood that people in Yavapai County were concerned about the proposed land exchange but that the proposed exchange was also of great concern to people in other parts of the state and that the exchange appeared to have some very good value with regard to land management in Arizona. He said that the lands in Yavapai County were hard to manage and were not economical to manage. Mr. Dahlem pointed out that the BLM was working with the Yavapai Trails Committee to ensure the preservation of the Black Canyon City Trail for public use across the exchange land. Mr. Thurman asked if the BLM exchanged lands with the state. Mr. Taylor said that up until about ten years ago there had been many exchanges between the BLM and the state but that the state had lost its ability to trade state land. He said it was his understanding that there would be an initiative on the ballot this fall to allow for limited trading of state land. Ms. Nelson asked what percentage of ranchers could actually afford to purchase buffer areas between their ranches and the exchange land. Mr. Taylor said he did not have that kind of information, but that the applicant had indicated a willingness to work with people who want to purchase buffers. Supervisor Brownlow asked who would be conducting the appraisal on the exchange lands. Mr. Taylor responded that the appraisals could be done by either the BLM or by private individuals but that in any event the appraisals would be done according to strict federal standards and that once completed the appraisals would be available to the public. Supervisor Brownlow asked what the likelihood was of the BLM not renewing grazing leases if the exchange was not approved. Mr. Taylor said that if the exchange was not approved the BLM would continue to handle grazing leases as it had in the past, that is, to determine if such requests were appropriate. Supervisor Brownlow said he had received calls from people who were in favor of the proposed land exchange because it would result in an increased tax base for the County. Mr. Taylor said it was true that currently the exchange land was tax exempt and that if the exchange was approved that land would be added to the County's tax rolls. Supervisor Brownlow asked whether, if the developer agreed to do certain things, anything could be done to ensure that the developer would follow through. Mr. Taylor replied that there might be things that could be made a condition of the exchange. He said the BLM was not interested in getting involved in the County's business, but that if the County wanted something and the applicant agreed it might be possible to include it as a condition of the exchange. He noted that if the exchange was approved, once the land was private it would be under the County's jurisdiction. Supervisor Brownlow asked about

Indian ruins on the property and how they would be protected. Mr. Taylor said the BLM was doing a survey to determine if there were sites on the property that were archaeologically significant. He said that if such sites existed, the BLM might excise those areas from the exchange or otherwise require that they be protected. Mr. Dahlem added that the BLM was working with the State Historic Preservation Office and with the Tribe. Mr. Schurr said that the County had zoning classifications on public lands that attach if the land becomes private. He said that the exchange land was currently zoned in such a way that would allow it to be split down to two-acre parcels, and that the Board might consider rezoning the exchange area now to ten-acre minimum lot sizes. Mr. Taylor said the BLM would have no problem with that. Supervisor Brownlow asked who would pay for the appraisal. Mr. Taylor said that sometimes the BLM paid for it and sometimes the applicant paid for it, and that he believed in this case the applicant was being required to pay for the appraisal. Gary Torhjelm of Aranda Properties said he was paying for the appraisal, for the archaeological survey, and the mineral report, among other things. He said his company had nothing to say about any of the studies, that it had no input and that it was not consulted by the BLM but merely wrote out the checks to pay for everything. He said that all of the work had been supervised by the BLM and that he had even been excluded from some meetings because the BLM felt his attendance at them was not appropriate. Mr. Torhjelm said that with regard to significant archaeological sites, they would either be excluded from the exchange or, if the County was willing to accept them, he would prefer to have a separate patent issued to convey them directly to the County for management. Mr. Torhjelm said he believed there were five areas to focus on, the first of which was land management. He said that if one looked at the quality of the private lands that would be conveyed to the public as a result of the exchange, the exchange made perfect sense. He characterized the second issue as ranching, saying that most ranches were small private holdings with leases of public lands. He said that a question for the County was how much those ranch lands provided in terms of the County tax rolls. He said he would be willing to give leases to ranchers on the condition that the lease would be effective unless the property is sold and the new owner does not agree to continue the lease. Mr. Torhjelm said that the property would not be developed and inhabited overnight. He said that with regard to private property owners who had land bordering the exchange he had worked with those people to provide them the opportunity to pick up a 20-acre buffer at practically no cost and that additional acreage would be available to them at a very low price if they wanted it. Mr. Torhjelm said the third area of focus was archaeological sites, and that he had already addressed that earlier on this day. He said the fourth area of concern was the possibility of the property being developed through uncontrolled lot splits. He said that Aranda's initial plan for the property was to develop 40-acre ranchettes, but that by law anyone holding one of those 40-acre pieces could split it again. He said his company was prepared to stipulate that it would come to the County on a cooperative, expedited basis and agree to zoning that would provide for no splits below ten acres and cap the total number of splits that could occur, or that it would give the County the control over the total number of building parcels for the property. He said he had already made commitments for 500 to 600 acres and had not talked with the beneficiaries of those commitments about limiting parcel size, and that he did not think he could go back on those commitments. He said that one of the beneficiaries was the YMCA, to whom Aranda Properties had agreed to donate 300 acres. Mr. Torhjelm said he would also agree to at least put in the major loop roads built to County standards, and that CCRs would be imposed on the properties as well. He said the fifth item was water, and that he did not have a magic wand for the County or any other area that is experiencing drought. He said that although he did not start out doing a water study, he had ended up with one because he wanted to know what effect his proposed development would have on the Phoenix Active Management Area and the Upper Agua Fria Watershed if only exempt wells for residential use were drilled on the exchange property. Mr. Torhjelm noted that the exchange was located south of the Prescott Active Management Area and the Upper Agua Fria Watershed, and that what he wanted to show was that potential wells on the exchange property would not tap into either the Prescott AMA or the watershed. He said he actually did not know whether water was available on the property but that based on average annual rainfall, historically the recharge to that area was greater than what the annual demand would be for 1,200 units for domestic use only. He said that no subdividing would occur for at least two years, and that the main point was that the exchange property was south of the Prescott AMA and the Upper Agua Fria Watershed, adding that he planned to maintain the rural character of the property. Ms. Bitner said she was glad to hear that the applicant was willing to limit the number of times property could be split, adding that part of the exchange land was within the community plan area for Dewey. She said she was also glad to know that archaeological sites would be preserved. Mr. Spedding asked Mr. Torhjelm how soon he thought Aranda Properties

would be coming to the County to discuss rezoning the property. Mr. Torhjelm said he did not believe he had the right to initiate a rezoning prior to owning the property, and that he had stated the intentions of Aranda Properties. He said he wanted only to ask that when the time came the County would provide an efficient process for rezoning, adding that he anticipated the rezoning would be some sort of stipulated agreement that was not typical of what the County normally did with regard to rezoning. Mr. Schurr said that the County could initiate rezoning of the property to ten acre minimum zoning at the next Planning & Zoning Commission meeting, if the BLM had no objection to it. Mr. Taylor said that was fine with the BLM. Mr. Lindner said he was glad to hear Mr. Torhjelm say that the parcels would be large, and that he hoped the developer would also consider deed restrictions to address the concerns of the public and those of the County. He said the Commission was often limited in what it could require, but that it sounded to him like the applicant was going to take a good look at what might be accomplished through deed restrictions. Mr. Torhjelm said he would want to work with the Commission on that, and that the only problem he could see with deed restrictions was that they could trump the County out of the process later on. Chairman Street told Mr. Torhjelm she was grateful that he was of a mind to meet the County at the table and be a good neighbor. She said she wanted him to know that the County would hold his feet to the fire, but that whatever was going to happen would happen regardless of what the Board thought. Mr. Taylor said the BLM was very much striving to be inclusive in its actions, and that it appreciated the opportunity to appear on this day and talk with the Commission and Board. He said the BLM wanted people to be involved and to tell the BLM what they thought about the proposed exchange. Ms. Link asked what the overall time frame was for the proposed exchange. Mr. Taylor said the BLM still had to go through the scoping phase, but that he hoped it would be finished in the fall. Chairman Street noted that the decision regarding the exchange was not one that would be made by either the Commission or the Board.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned.

ATTEST:

_____Clerk _____Chairman