

**FREMONT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
7:00 PM, MAY 26, 2016
450 N. 2ND ST., ROOM 205
LANDER, WY 82520**

Open of Meeting: Chairman Kristin Paulsen called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. The following were present: Vice Chairman JR Oakley; Planning Commissioners Tom Jones and Harold Albright (arriving at 7:15 p.m.); County Commissioner Travis Becker; Planning Department Staff: Director Steve Baumann, Small Wastewater Specialist Marcel Lopez and Department Secretary Cheryl Crowson. Absent: Planning Commissioner Chris VonHoltum. Guests: See attached sheet.

Pledge of Allegiance: Chairman Paulsen led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Approval of Agenda: Vice Chairman Oakley moved, Commissioner Jones seconded to approve the Agenda of the May 26, 2016 meeting. No further discussion, the motion carried unanimously.

Approval of Minutes: Commissioner Jones moved, Vice Chairman Oakley seconded to approve the Minutes from the April 28, 2016 meeting. No further discussion, the motion carried unanimously.

Staff Progress Report: Director Baumann reviewed the Staff Progress report presented to the County Commissioners for April 2016. Discussion: (1) the financials for March 2016 showed income \$2,300.00 above budget, mostly due to unpermitted septic systems; (2) small wastewater permits are ahead from this time last year, most are replacement systems; (3) Director Baumann testified in a lawsuit regarding the Rawhide Subdivision, and at this time has not heard the outcome; (4) the first invoice has been received regarding the Lander Area Study, there will be a public meeting held sometime late in the summer; and (5) in the process of sending out a Notice of Violation to an individual in the Lander area that has not complied with the regulations regarding the merging of two adjacent parcels, several letters have been sent without receiving a response.

Chairman Paulsen asked Marcel Lopez if there have been septic system problems due to the recent flooding. Mr. Lopez answered he has received several reports of failed systems and has been advising them if there has been no problem previously, to wait to see if their system gets better once they have had time to dry. Since then, most have stated the systems are getting better. No further discussion.

Unfinished Business: None.

New Business:

Cash Second Subdivision:

Tom Johnson of Apex Surveying, Inc. came forward to represent the proposed subdivision. In 2014, Erin Sorenson did a one-lot simple subdivision which created the lot in the southwest corner of the property, which Dustin Cash purchased. Sue and Gordon Bush have purchased the remaining property from Erin Sorenson and would like to split the property into two lots; one lot they plan to keep and one lot will become Dustin Cash's. The boundary has already been surveyed and this plat was created from the previous survey. The overall boundary does not change, the access easement on the west side of the property is as it was approved for the first Cash Subdivision. This proposed subdivision is being approached as a second simple subdivision requesting a Variance from the time frame allowing a second simple subdivision, this is just under three years. Director Baumann stated the plat would need to include: (1) a soils disclaimer; (2) irrigation plan as the original plat is incomplete and needs to comply with how the water is delivered to the two properties and how the wastewater will be managed; (3) twenty feet easements need to surround Dustin Cash's lot #1; (4) needs a thirty feet (30') road and utility easement alongside the already existing thirty feet road easement to be in compliance with the forty feet (40') road and twenty feet (20') utility easement requirements of our regulations; (5) draft of a Variance regarding the need for a twenty feet (20') easement along the south boundary, and leaving a fifty feet (50') road and utility easement on the west side of the property. Additionally, need to make sure the Certificate of Title and Dedication have the middle initial of the owners either in or out, to be consistent with the title document. Mr. Johnson stated he has made note of the severe soils and the easement on the east side of the property. High Plains Power has requested the easement be made a utility as well as an access easement, as far as the width, this was not intended during the first subdivision to be the primary access and is not intended to be the primary access now. The developer would appreciate not having to be burdened by a sixty feet (60') easement. On the plat is a forty feet (40') road and utility easement, which is a ten feet (10') enlargement of what was previously there. The south boundary, regarding a twenty feet (20') drainage easement makes sense because there is a drain ditch, what is on the plat is a thirty feet (30') drainage easement. The developers do not have their middle initials on the deed for this particular piece of property, so they were taken off the plat. Regarding the irrigation plan, Mr. Johnson read what was just added to the plat which was written by Mr. & Mrs. Bush as follows: "Irrigation water enters the property at the northwest corner within the irrigation easement shown. Water is conveyed to the lots using gated movable pipe, tail water is collected on the east side of the lots and drains southerly into the Ocean Lake drain on the south side of this plat." Director Baumann asked to also include the landowners are responsible for water rotation. State Engineer's Office commented everything was acceptable.

Ralph White, adjacent property owner, came forward to comment. The irrigation water runs across the highway into his property. Having had difficulty with the previous owner, Erin Sorenson, the problem is there is only one head gate and to irrigate his land, they needed to schedule times. What is needed is another box to separate the water flow, so when the people in the subdivision need the water to irrigate they can get their water without him adjusting his. He doesn't believe there is an easement across his land, and has called Midvale Irrigation District about it. He doesn't have a problem with the water going across his property. There is a need for a box to separate the flow so the subdivision will be able to irrigate at the same time as he is. They will need to get together and figure out a way to put a box in allowing the separation of the water flow so they can irrigate at the same time.

Discussion: (a) length of time being seven months short of the three year requirement for another simple subdivision; (b) parcel is being subdivided is only going to be three lots total (c) possible ways to accomplish same results without issuance of a Variance, such as a regular subdivision; (d) issuing a variance for something that meets the minimum requirements; (e) cost to developer if changed to a regular subdivision; (f) variance to geology report if changed to a regular subdivision; (g) possible precedence set if a variance is issued for three year term. The reasoning for the three year term was to avoid chaining of simple subdivisions. (h) possible hardship when working with mortgage companies; (i) regular subdivision would require installation of roads to county standards and phone lines; (j) requested variance would not change what is already on the ground; (k) easement on east side being either sixty feet road and utility or forty feet road, irrigation and utility easement, if less than sixty feet would require a variance on south and east side of property.

Chairman Paulsen called for a motion. Vice Chairman Oakley moved, seconded by Commissioner Jones to approve the two Variance applications, one being a variance from the three year time period of a simple subdivision parcel; and the second being a variance on the ingress, egress and utility easement on the west side from sixty feet (60') to fifty feet (50'). No further discussion, motion carried. Commissioner Albright abstained from voting.

Chairman Paulsen called for a motion. Commissioner Albright moved, seconded by Vice Chairman Oakley to send to the County Commissioners for approval the Cash Second Subdivision with the following additions: (1) add the #8 soils disclaimer in the notes; (2) completion of the irrigation plan relating to water rotation; (3) a sixty feet road right of way, utility and drainage easement on the east side of Lots 1 and 2 and the southeast boundary of Lot 2; (4) remove the initials from the owners signatures and notary jurat; (5) twenty feet (20') drainage easement along the south of Lot 2 from thirty feet (30'). No further discussion, motion carried.

Summer Hill Subdivision

Tom Johnson of Apex Surveying, Inc. came forward to represent the proposed subdivision. This is a single lot, simple subdivision that is part of a larger parcel representing a major portion of Southeast Quarter of Section 32. There are county roads on the south and east, the north is bordered by Pilot Drain. The subdivider is retaining land on the north side of the drain and the property line has been adjusted allowing access to live water on a portion and the purchaser of the subdivided lot has access to live water in the drain on the eastern side. There are some recorded easements, which are shown on the plat, and after communication with Midvale Irrigation District, there is a ninety feet (90') easement which represents the fences, for the drain ditch with the understanding that the ditches are subject to the Ditch Act, a note has been made on the plat, that allows the Irrigation Districts sufficient room to maintain the ditch. Midvale Irrigation District was satisfied with the ninety feet (90') easement. There is a sixteen and one-half feet (16-1/2') wide communication easement on this piece of property that abuts the Gabes Road right of way on the western side. The Transportation Department has asked that the sixteen and one-half feet (16-1/2') also be made part of Gabes Road.

Discussion: (a) The plat was taken to roads department for review as to whether or not the easements associated with Gabes and Summer Hill roads were acceptable to the roads department or if there were any changes needed; (b) Dave Pendleton indicated, if possible, the additional sixteen and one-half feet communications easement would allow for easier snow removal, road maintenance, graveling and ditch work. Gabes Road and Summer Hill Road both have sixty feet road and utility easements the county maintains and the sixteen and one-half feet easement is a communications easement encumbering the property in that area. The intention of the road department is not for that to be a road, but to allow wider movement in the already existing sixty feet road easement. (c) No written communication from the transportation department as to why they would like to have the additional footage nor the question asked if other landowners in the area will be asked for an additional sixteen and one-half feet easement; (d) The sixteen and one-half feet communication easement was issued by the previous landowner for the purpose of buried telephone and fiber optic lines. (e) There is an existing roadway, but to acquire access the landowner will need to apply for a permit.

Planning Commission's opinion to the sixteen and one-half feet easement:

Commissioner Jones stated the roads are bad and muddy and has no problem with the easement; Vice Chairman Oakley was opposed, stating it was putting an extra burden on the landowner; Commissioner Albright was opposed, commenting if the road department has a compelling reason from the health and safety standpoint, to come back later and present their case; Chairman Paulsen was opposed. It is the recommendation to leave the easement at the sixty feet and not add the sixteen and one-half feet onto it being the roadway.

Director Baumann stated he received a telephone call from Mr. Forrest Benson, adjacent property owner on the east side of the proposed Summer Hill Subdivision. Mr. Benson indicated he is not in favor of the subdivision as he believes the area is rural and agricultural and should remain that way. Mr. Benson suggested that it would be appropriate to institute an agricultural zone in the county to minimize the loss of agricultural land and the changing of the rural nature of Fremont County.

Received an e-mail dated May 24, 2016 from Trevor A. Votruba. "My wife Jennifer and I own the land in the north west corner of this property. I am writing this e-mail for I am unable to attend the meeting on May 26th. I want to stress Jennifer and I are against the subdivision of this land. We moved to the country to be in the country and be agriculture where we currently raise sheep. If we wanted to live amongst a bunch of houses we would have bought land in town where multiple homes belong. Since Fremont County has no laws to force people to keep their property clean people constantly move to the country bring their trash with them. You only need to look around this country to see a nice home with a pile of trash next door. This is not something we want to see in this area. We are proud of our place along and it shows it. The subdivision of this land, which is agriculture, would remove agriculture further away. Agriculture land needs to stay as such and not subdivided for housing. Since we purchased the land in 2005 there has been four homes put in. These homes are less than a mile away. This was not the purpose of the land and something needs to stop. Fred purchased this land on an agriculture basis and it needs to stay this way. Bottom line, I don't need to see another home from my window especially a trailer house which seems to be the normal when a house goes in out here. These old run down trailers and the trash brings my property value down while the county assessor raises the value regardless of what we have to look at. What is the purpose of living in the country if you cannot be in the country. Furthermore, I am tired of trash blowing in my yard and don't look forward to more from more neighbors. These are the same people who think they can just drive up and down my private road which the subdivision would further acerbate this situation. Steve, please take our concerns into consideration. This land needs to stay in tact. If a realtor wants to buy land to subdivide then they need to buy land in town where these types of subdivisions belong. Thanks and have a great day. Trevor A. Votruba, Territory Director, WY & MT" [end of e-mail] Director Baumann stated no further correspondence on a negative note.

Chairman Paulsen asked Mr. Lopez if this property had severe soil. Mr. Lopez answered "yes". Chairman Paulsen asked if there is irrigation with the property. Director Baumann answered no. There is a recommendation received from Lower Wind River Conservation District. "The LWRCDD Board of Supervisors recommends that Sewage Lagoons not be utilized in this area." Chairman Paulsen asked Mr. Johnson if he was agreeable to adding no sewer lagoons to Note #3. Mr. Johnson replied if it is put in as it is the recommendation of the Lower Wind River Conservation District that there will be no sewer lagoons. What could possibly happen is someone could hire an engineer and the engineer does not agree with the findings, which could leave it open

with the engineer having a conflict of opinion. Chairman Paulsen stated Mr. Johnson may have a conversation with LWRCD to find out why it is they do not recommend the sewer lagoons. Commissioner Albright stated to leave it as written without the addition. Vice Chairman Oakley commented it was acceptable the way it is stated, no need to define. Chairman Paulsen stated, there is already an existing well and septic located on the property.

Chairman Paulsen called for a motion. Commissioner Albright moved, Commissioner Jones seconded to send the Summer Hill Subdivision to the County Commissioners for approval the plat as presented. No further discussion, motion passed unanimously.

Knight Subdivision Lots 8, 9 and a Fraction of Lot 7 Block 1 Replat

Tom Johnson of Apex Surveying, Inc. came forward to represent the proposed subdivision. Mr. Dave Ramage is asking for the ability to add property to his existing property, which is a fraction of Lot 9 in Knight Subdivision. Knight Subdivision was originated in the late 1970's and there has been a variety of portions of lots having been sold. Lot 9 was broken into three pieces with Mr. Ramage owning the southern portion. This plat will create a Lot 8A, which adds one-half acre to Mr. Ramage's property; recombine the two northern sections of Lot 9 into a Lot 9A; and clean up a fraction of Lot 7 and all of Lot 8 owned by Ms. Hampton-Warwick. This plat is going beyond the borders of what is required to clean-up. Both portions of Lot 9A are being re-combined and are owned by the Hughes and another fractional portion of the old Lot 7 to the east of this plat. Not able to do anything with Lot 7A because it is owned by another party. Director Baumann stated he would like to thank Mr. Ramage for his efforts to clean-up the subdivision allowing anyone in the future to be able to follow where their property is and the title situation.

Commissioner Jones stated no problems with the plat, just verifying some property lines. Vice Chairman Oakley stated nothing at the moment, being a straightforward subdivision, just lot of housekeeping just trying to clean-up lot lines. Commissioner Albright had a question for Chairman Paulsen asking from the viewpoint of a title company, when you look at this does it look nice and clean without anything that jumps out. Does everything that is going to happen here [on the plat] meet the intent of the developer, which is to clean this up and make it better. Is there anything that could possibly come back later on that could create a problem? Chairman Paulsen asked if there are mortgages against any of these. Director Baumann answered there are mortgages against, what will be Lot 9A and have received notification from the lender everything is acceptable. Mr. Ramage has a mortgage on his lot, a small portion in the southern end of Lot 9A and has not received any communication from his mortgage company. Assuming the mortgage company will not have any issues because they will be getting more property to hold a lien against. Chairman Paulsen responded the mortgage company can only foreclose on what their original collateral was, they can't take anything more. Chairman Paulsen commented there is a lot going on with the plat, but this accomplishes everything they are trying to accomplish. At the end of the day it

would just be a matter of any mortgage issues that may arise, but do not anticipate there being any. Director Baumann stated one of the issues to think about is eliminating the existing easements that were out there and Mr. Ramage was going to locate them, possibly objects may be located within the easements. Mr. Ramage stated there is nothing located within the easements. Chairman Paulsen asked if there are any issues with the abandonment of easements. Director Baumann answered no problem with that, but notes that when the lot splitting was done on the original Lot 9, it was divided into three lots, called Lot 9A, 9B and 9C. On the record the Planning Commission is looking at, perhaps the 9A connotation on the map should be changed to 9D to eliminate the potential confusion. Mr. Johnson stated he didn't have a problem with that change. Chairman Paulsen agreed with the change because 9A already exists and it could become an issue later on. Mr. Johnson commented the deeds reviewed for the properties do not actually use those designations, but making that change to 9D is not a problem. Director Baumann stated no written comments, but would like to note that Far View Circle is a right-of-way utility and drainage easement sixty feet (60') wide and Mr. Johnson stated it as fifty feet (50') wide. Chairman Paulsen asked to match the description of Far View Circle to the original plat. Commissioner Jones asked about a water pipeline easement, if there actually is a pipeline located there. Mr. Ramage answered not to his knowledge.

Chairman Paulsen called for a motion. Vice Chairman Oakley moved, seconded by Commissioner Jones to send to the County Commissioners for approval the Knight Subdivision Lots 8, 9 and a Fraction of Lot 7 Block 1 Replat with the following changes, (a) abandonment the existing utility and drainage easement on Lot 7A that runs north to southeast; (b) abandonment the portion of the utility and drainage easement of Lot 8A that runs north to south; (c) change Lot 9A to Lot 9D; and (d) on the original description of the road from the original Knight Subdivision and this plat match what the road descriptions being road right of way, utility, irrigation and drainage easement. Mr. Johnson had additional discussion, on the copy of the original Knight Subdivision that has the road for Far View Circle and calls it a right of way, utility and drainage easement. Is this what is being asked to conform to? Chairman Paulsen answered yes. No further discussion, motion carried unanimously.

Review and Discussion of Linden Subdivision One

Commissioner Albright recused himself from this section of the meeting due to the fact he is related to the developer.

Gary Hatle of Apex Surveying, Inc. came forward to discuss the proposed subdivision. Mr. Hatle stated the reason he is here is for the Planning Commission to look at this subdivision in a preliminary fashion. There is a lot of detail, lot of existing easements and proposed easements. Mr. Hatle explained the various items detailed on the plat. Mr. Hatle will be meeting with LeClair Irrigation District to find out where to put the easement. The LeClair Irrigation District By-laws indicate fifty-five feet on each side of the center line of the canal. In discussions with Mr. Linden, the boundary line will

probably be in the center of the canal and monument the easement. The monuments will show the same and basically be on the ditch easement, but the property will go to the middle of the canal. There isn't irrigation north of the canal, but the canal isn't very big and there is room to use the space to park things. The proposed lots along the canal will show a ten foot wide utility and drainage easement, and will ask that High Plains Power and the telephone company have input as to whether or not this width is acceptable. Discussion on the boundary lines and easement size. A twenty foot easement is next to Majdic property because it flows with the boundary. Mr. Hatle explained the colored hatch markings on the plat. The topography of the land is flat, with a small hill on Lot 3. Director Baumann will call LeClair Irrigation District to inquire if their by-laws will allow an easement within their easement. If so, it would be the solution to utilize the fifty feet that already exists, for the requirement of the twenty foot utility and drainage easement. The drainage part is already in there, essentially all we are asking is they allow for utilities to be run within their easement. There are existing right-of-ways. This subdivision has already been done and letters have been sent out that it was an illegal subdivision. This process is trying to reconcile what was previously done by putting onto a plat what has been recorded as deeds. Easements were not set by recorded documents until the deeds were transferred. There is a forty foot easement, but could modify the existing easement based off this plat. Phone and power are already in place within the forty feet wide ingress and egress easement. Discussion of easements on Lots 1 and 2. The High Plains Power easement is just a short stub going to the Majdic's place. All lots have water wells with the exception of Lot 5. Items to review: (a) can the utilities be within the drainage easement; (b) larger view on plat for preliminary review; (c) show Zuber Road; and (d) check on easements; (e) ten foot wide easement paralleling the ditch right of way on lot side; (f) twenty foot easement on the southern end of Lot 5 where it meets Zuber's property.

Review Chapter 7 Regular Subdivision Regulations

In previous discussions a few months ago regarding Mobile Home Parks, was to regulate them or not. Since that time, having located in the State Statutes some regulations that are required. Do not have the option to take them out, but what circumstance should they be regulated. In the previous meeting that discussed the nonsensical items in the current regulations that were more of a zoning application of mobile homes than a subdivision regulation, the general sense was to make this resemble what we are wanting to do, which is have some sort of a regulation regarding the number of mobile homes on a lot; define conditions for placement of the mobile home on a lot; minimum square footage per lot; where the mobile home would sit on the lot versus roads; and putting in minimal road standards similar to the simple subdivision regulations. All the rest that had been part of the Mobile Home Park Subdivision is just in there as "if proposed". This gives the developer the opportunity to have proposed buildings, location of solid waste and fire protection, which are no longer in as a requirement. The minimal requirements are the ability to have six or more mobile homes, lots cannot be sold, lot size minimum of 4,500 square feet, and have a road and parking. Discussion regarding micro-homes and man camps, there are two versions of

Chapter VII for review. Micro homes are becoming more popular in more areas, whether they are put on a foundation or on a trailer that can be moved. At some of the Wyoming Association of Planner seminars, attendees have commented the man-camps or temporary housing facilities for different kinds of workers has been an issue in Wyoming where there were not any provisions for them, so there was not the ability to regulate them once they came into their location. Even though a lot of the man-camps were not using water or sewer, they were hauling the water in and the sewer out; they still didn't have any regulations on managing those facilities such as the trash, the number of people, the roads and the development. Some places were seeing the development there for periods of over six years. What started out as a small amount of acreage and limited locations, overwhelmed what they were going to use it for. Then when they left, it was a piece of property that was destroyed. There is no vegetation left and roads were damaged. Other Planners within the state have commented they have seen these issues. This was brought up for a discussion point since other counties within the state have had this issue and is something they would have looked at prior to those development opportunities coming in so they would have had the ability to regulate it somehow. It may not happen in Fremont County, but at least have a discussion on this issue. It is essential to discuss issues relating to conditions after the man-camps have left leaving behind property destruction, no vegetation and destroyed roads. If man-camps and micro-homes are to be regulated, it needs to meet the appropriate minimum standards and what is to prevent the adjacent landowner from allowing the same to occur on their property. The land is private property and the property owner is allowed to choose how to utilize their own property. Another issue would be to determine the definition of "temporary". The State Statutes for this issue reads "subdivision of land, including mobile home parks, shall be regulated." There is the ability to make this issue restrictive or loose, but do not have the ability to not do anything. A possibility is to have a bond posted to ensure the property will be reclaimed once it is vacated and review the type of land that is going to be used. Fremont County is unique as there is no zoning.

Comment from Mr. Ramage was to go on the loose side of regulating. Natrona County, for example, cannot do it at all because of zoning. If you want the ability for this to occur, some regulation is necessary. Those putting in a man-camp should have a conversation with the Planning Director to discuss the correct way to approach the issue. It would be beneficial to have a site review, rather than just have strict regulations.

This item has been tabled to be further discussed at the next Planning Commission meeting.

Discussion of Burial on Private Property

Director Baumann has received two telephone calls requesting information on the process for burying themselves on their own property. Fremont County has several unofficial cemeteries within the county that have been surrounded by private property and the individuals that have relatives in the cemetery are unable to visit. State Statute

35-8-101, Surveying and Platting of Cemetery Grounds. "Any person, firm, corporation or municipality desiring to maintain a cemetery or to sell lots or parcels of land for cemetery or burial purposes shall cause such land, or such portion thereof as may, from time to time be or become necessary for that purpose, to be surveyed into lots, blocks, streets, avenues and walks, and platted, . . ." This is a nebulously written statement and the legal opinion is that it is a nebulously written statement except for the fact that it states any person. If you read the statute in its entirety, it sounds like they are taking about municipal cemeteries, except for the provision at the top stating "any person". There are possibly two ways to handle this, one is to follow the state statute and require a plat and as a part of that plat define the size of the burial plot area on the parcel and describe a permanent public easement; possibly doing this for free since the person who wants to bury themselves is trying to do the right thing. They come and talk with the Planning Director, hire a surveyor, survey the area on the property they wish to be buried on, figure a method to get to that burial plot, have the surveyor put on a plat and present to the Planning Commission. It would be recorded as a Cemetery plat and recorded as a subdivision within the county. The alternative would be to have a surveyor produce a metes and bounds description for the burial plot, and deed from yourself to yourself as a burial spot and describe an easement getting to it and attach as part of the deed which would be of record. The first option would be better since it can be given directly to the Assessor who will then remove the area of the cemetery from the tax rolls and would become forever a cemetery plot. A potential problem could be when the property is sold and no one advises the new purchaser of the existence of a cemetery plot and it is inadvertently unearthed. We should provide those individuals wishing to do this, an opportunity for them to accomplish their wishes and making sure it is protected in the future. However, we should not be regulating those wishing to have a burial site on their property.

2016 Fee Schedule

Previously discussed: (a) the cost for the individual replacement address numbers and metal plates; and (b) the as-built septic system permit, which is an unpermitted septic system having been installed and the department is made aware of it at a later date, if that fee should be changed. The Planning Commission members were in agreement to charging \$3.00 for replacement of individual address reflective numbers and \$5.00 for the metal plate. The as-built septic system permit will remain at \$500.00. The Subdivision Variance Application Fee is a new proposed fee representing the length of time involved in putting together a Variance Request and Application. After discussion, Commissioner Albright not in favor; Commissioner Jones in favor; Vice Chairman Oakley not in favor; Chairman Paulsen not in favor.

Mr. Lopez commented effective July 1, 2016, the issue the County Clerk is changing their fee charges and the charge for the plat copy states it is dependent on the size of the plat-consult staff, so they do not have a definite fee. Mr. Lopez recommends removing the copy fee from the Fee Schedule. The copy fee was put on the Fee Schedule for the department's use since it is a requirement of the developer to provide

a copy of the final recorded plat. Before final decision to remove or leave on the Fee Schedule, Director Baumann will check with the Clerk's office. No further discussion

The members set the next regular meeting for Thursday, June 23, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. There being no further business for the Planning Commission, Chairman Paulsen adjourned the meeting at 10:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Cheryl Crowson
Department Secretary

Kristin Paulsen
Chairman