



PUBLIC MEETING
December 13, 2016
MINUTES

The Lewis and Clark County Commissioners Public Meeting was held on Tuesday, December 13, 2016, at 9:00 AM in Commission Chambers Room 330.

Roll Call

Chairman Mike Murray called the meeting to order at 9 a.m.

Commissioner Susan Good Geise and Commissioner Andy Hunthausen were present. Others attending all or a portion of the meeting included Eric Bryson, Brian Coplin, Laurie DeLong, Pat DeLong, Grant Kier, Matt Heimel, Jim Henry, Jade Huckins, Al Knauber, Charles Lane, Glenn Marx, Greg McNally, Dani Mitchell, Dorothy Mitchell, Jarron Mitchell, Jim Mitchell, Lindsay Morgan, Tony Prothero, Andrew Silverman, K. Paul Stahl, Jim Stiffler, George Thebarga, Audra Zacherl, Hugh Zackheim, and Nadine McCarty, Recording Secretary.

Pledge of Allegiance

Everyone recited the pledge.

Consent Action Items

There were no consent action items.

Change Order No. 1 to the Contract Between Lewis and Clark County and Montana Civil Contractors, Inc. (Audra Zacherl)

Audra Zacherl, Assistant Director of Public Works, presented the change order to the contract with Montana Civil Contractors, Inc. on the phase II closure construction project for changes to bid quantities on actual quantities on the erosion control rolls and an increase in contract price of \$1,028.70. The original contract with Montana Civil Contractors, Inc. was \$124,647.

No public comment was received.

A motion to Approve was made by Commissioner Good Geise and seconded by Commissioner Hunthausen. The motion Passed on a 3-0 vote.

Petition to Establish Argenta Drive as a County Road Then Abandon/Vacate the Easement (Applicant, Jarron and Dani Mitchell) (Planner, Jim Henry)

Jim Henry, Planner I, presented the petition to establish a County road easement then subsequently abandon/vacate a segment of Argenta Drive within Holmberg Village estates subdivision-phase VI. The abandonment is approximately 157' long and 60' wide easement between lots 48-22 and 48-21, approximately .5 miles north of the intersection of Holmberg Drive and Canyon Ferry Road and 340 feet west of the intersection of Holmberg Drive and Hines Road. The house is at the end of Argenta Drive and the builders used Argenta Drive as the driveway. The shed and septic were already built into the easement when the current buyers purchased the property they were not aware of it at the time. Requests for comments were sent to various agencies with no comments received.

During a site visit they looked at Danny K Drive, which is a private access easement for lots north of Holmberg Village Estates Subdivision; four 5-acre tracts, created in 2005 through a family transfer subdivision exemption; one 140-acre tract; and one 10-acre mortgage tract. Staff is unaware of any proposals to further subdivide the properties. Argenta Drive is not part of any transportation network or a plan to extend into the area. If a subdivision were to be proposed; staff would recommend that Danny K Drive be converted to a public access easement. If an ingress or egress was deemed necessary Holmberg Drive could be extended into this area. He listed the three draft Conditions of Approval. Mr. Henry stated the applicant has seen the Conditions of Approval and is available to answer questions.

PUBLIC COMMENT –

Dani Mitchell, 4272 Hines Road, stated they agree with whatever they need to do to abandon the easement.

Upon no further testimony or comment, Commissioner Murray stated the public hearing is now closed.

Discussion was had on Stillwel Drive being a potential access as well as Strom Drive. Commissioner Good Geise stated she would like to review the findings of fact and that when this went out for comment, very little response was received.

Mr. Henry pointed out the typo on draft finding No. 1 ii; it should read documents the discontinuance segment of Argenta Drive rather than the street discontinuances. Commissioner Good Geise reviewed the draft conditions of approval in that the applicant shall provide a Certificate of Survey that shows and includes the retention of an underground public utility easement in the discontinued segment of Argenta Drive and a reference to the resolution that officially documents the street discontinuances; prior to final approval, the property owner shall apply for an encroachment agreement with the County to legitimize the existing private structures built within the utility easement and that should be done within one calendar year of the date of this preliminary condition of approval.

A motion was made by Commissioner Good Geise that in view of these findings the proposed establishment of a segment of Argenta Drive between lots 48-22 and 48-21, as a County road easement then subsequently abandon/vacate that easement located within the Holmberg Village Estates subdivision be conditionally approved. This conditional approval is in accordance with the criteria set forth in Title 7, Chapter 14, Part 26 MCA, based on the findings of fact in the staff

report, and subject to the draft conditions of approval. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hunthausen. The motion Passed on a 3-0 vote.

Subdivision Improvement Agreement. Northstar PUD Subdivision, Phase VI-B (Tabled 11/15/16) (Applicant: Northstar Development, L.L.C.) (Planner: Lindsay A. Morgan)

Lindsay Morgan, Planner II, stated on November 15, 2016 the Commission held a public meeting regarding a determination to be concluded by the Commission as to whether or not take action on the Letter of Credit that financially guarantees the remaining improvements required under the subdivision improvement agreement for the Northstar P.U.D. - Phase VI-B. This is located north of Valley View Road and west of and adjacent to N Montana Avenue. At that meeting the Commission asked for updated estimates for completing the remaining improvements along with an updated Letter of Credit for the new amount. The updated estimates were submitted to the Planning Department and have been reviewed by the Public Works Department. Public Works found that the estimates do not include the correct quantities for both the internal and offsite road chip sealing, equating to approximately \$14,000. The developer submitted an updated Letter of Credit in the amount of \$658,725.50, the same amount financially guaranteed last year and also the same amount of the updated estimates provided by the applicant's engineer. This Letter of Credit including an additional 25% on top of the amount to be completed for the remaining improvements was received December 12, 2016. The applicant has been financially guaranteeing three turn lanes to be completed on N Montana Avenue. A speed study was completed in 2015 that reduced the speed limit on this section of roadway from 55 m.p.h. to 45 m.p.h. An engineer completed a study of this section of road; it was determined with the new speed on the road the three turn lanes would no longer be required. The County submitted the turn lane study to a peer reviewing engineering firm and it has not been completed to date. Currently the new financial guarantee with the same amount as last year does not include the \$14,000 that Public Works says is necessary for the chip seal; but it does include an additional 25% mentioned previously and the requirement to complete all three turn lanes. The current Letter of Credit does expire on December 31, 2016.

Ms. Morgan explained they hoped the peer review study would be received prior to this meeting. It was submitted around November 15, 2016.

Commissioner Hunthausen stated after the peer review study is completed it seems at least one or more of the three turn lanes will be deemed unnecessary, the funds would be adequate in this Letter of Credit for the remaining improvements.

Ms. Morgan pointed out to remove the requirement from the Subdivision Improvements Agreement (SIA) they would have to amend the SIA and through that process the turn lanes could be reviewed, if there was a reduction in the number of turn lanes, then could make sure the dollar amounts are correct when the Letter of Credit is updated after the process is completed.

No public comment was received.

Ms. Morgan clarified the decision today is only whether or not to take action on the current Letter of Credit. Different from the meeting on November 15, 2016, there is now a new Letter of Credit, the issues with the amount have been discussed, and now have the updated cost estimates.

Eric Bryson, Chief Administrative Officers, stated in the past, after notices have gone out to someone who is potentially close to a default date for an SIA or expiration of a Letter of Credit an action item is put on the agenda authorizing the Commission to take the funds, which is the action item today. No action is needed if the Commission is comfortable with the current financial

guarantee that has been updated knowing that staff is going to amend the SIA with an acceptable Letter of Credit. This will come back for review.

Commissioner Good Geise stated she would like to acknowledge the receipt of the Letter of Credit and does not see any need to any action on the existing Letter of Credit. No action was taken.

Request for Open Space Bond Funds for Transaction Related Costs of the Lincoln Community River Park Project (Tabled 11/29/16) (Sponsor: Five Valleys Land Trust) (Planner: Matt Heimel)

Matt Heimel, Special Districts Planner, presented the request to fund approximately \$17,887 for transaction related costs of the Lincoln Community River Park Project that was heard by the Commission on November 29, 2016, with the decision tabled to today. Funding in the amount of \$85,000 was approved on November 10, 2016 under Resolution 2016-98, for Five Valleys Land Trust (Sponsor) to acquire a 9.45 acre parcel, located 0.6 miles south of Lincoln on the Blackfoot River east of and adjacent to Stemple Pass Road.

The proposal included a request for bond funds to be applied to transaction related costs of the project. Based on the project budget dated October 24, 2016, the remaining requested amount is \$17,887. County legal staff provided a written opinion to the Commission containing details of their review of using bond funds for transaction related costs. On August 2, 2016, the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) voted affirmatively (9-0) to recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that the Lincoln Community River Park Acquisition project receive funding of \$85,000. This recommendation is based on a determination that the level 2 application meets project criteria for: 1) protecting habitat for fish and wildlife; 2) provides opportunity for outdoor recreation; 3) protects water resources and quality; 4) preserves open lands and natural area; and 5) manages growth and development. Also included in the CAC motion was a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners that favorable consideration be given to the Sponsor's request for reimbursement of its transactional costs in an amount not to exceed \$28,300. As of November 22, 2016, no additional public comment had been received.

Commissioner Murray stated the public hearing was kept open until today and asked for any further comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Grant Kier, Executive Director of Five Valleys Land Trust, thanked the County Attorney's Office for their promptness and helpfulness in putting the final agreements in place. They are ready to complete the project next week. He also thanked the Commission for the careful deliberation of requests for costs and the request that you move today to act on this agenda item.

Commissioner Murray stated with no further testimony, the public comment period is now closed.

A motion was made by Commissioner Hunthausen to approve and fund the request for \$17,887 to complete the Lincoln Community River Park Project as presented and seconded by Commissioner Good Geise. The motion Passed on a 3-0 vote.

Proposed Amended Plat of Lot 1A-1B of the Foster Ranch Tracts (Ranger Estates Subdivision) (Tabled 11/1/16) (Applicant: Jim Mitchell) (Planner: Greg McNally)

Greg McNally, Planner II, presented the subdivision and variance applications for the proposed seven lot subdivision, known as amended plat of Lot 1A-1B of the Foster Ranch Tracts, Ranger Estates Subdivision located north of Canyon Ferry Road and adjacent to Hines Road and Ranger Drive that was heard on November 1, 2016, then continued to November 3, 2016; at that point continued the decision until November 29, 2016. At the November 29, 2016 meeting, two Commissioners were present and the applicant requested the review period be extended to December 16, 2016 with the decision be changed to a time when all three Commissioners could be present. He noted at the November 29, 2016 meeting it was stated that public comment would continue to be received. Also noted, Ms. Morgan presented this item in his absence and she indicated that Condition No. 8d - restrictive covenant that provides notice to future property owners of a waiver of right to protest joining or the amendment of a Rural Improvement District (RID) for the installation, maintenance, preservation, and repair of the following: roads; stormwater improvements; parks; and fire protection improvements, the item roads could be expounded upon for insurance that the reference included roads impacted by the subdivision, both onsite and offsite, such as potentially Holmberg Drive and Ranger Drive. Commissioner Good Geise referenced the two variances under consideration, specifically the variance regarding the two ingress/egress route. Is it possible no variance would be necessary, if in the future as a condition the applicant would have to demonstrate before final plat that the ingress/egress route was clarified?

Mr. McNally stated the variance request has been submitted by the applicant and would like the Commission to consider allowing the subdivision to just have one ingress/egress route. If an indication was made in the findings that the second access route, potentially Ranger Drive was a public access route then there would be two ingress/egress routes to the subdivision. If the variance is denied there is a draft condition of approval that instructs the applicant to go forth to make a determination or demonstrate at final plat that it is a public access easement. Mr. McNally read the drafted condition related to if the variance is not granted.

Tony Prothero, Shedhorn Engineering, represents Mr and Mrs. Mitchell. He stated he understood the meeting was delayed from November 1 to the end of November so that the County Attorney's office could review the access and make an opinion as to whether it was considered as suitable access for a subdivision. He never heard anything that there was a decision or determination made; he is hoping to hear something about that. There is probably more public comment and after that he requested an opportunity to close.

Commissioner Murray stated it is his understanding that the Commission extended the review period at Mr. Prothero's request through December 16, 2016.

PUBLIC COMMENT -

Jim Stifler, 4276 Canyon Ferry Road, stated a large part of his property borders Ranger Drive. He recognized the County planning department and the good job they have done. His objections are fourfold: one being the public notification process; secondly the access issue, to be discussed; third the conflict with the protective covenants controlling this application; and fourth the lack assurance to the County growth policy. He pointed out some errors and omissions in the planning report as well as correct some comments made in a planning commission meeting; that he did not have the opportunity to comment on previously. At a planning commission meeting there was testimony from one of the applicant's supporters that he never contributed to the maintenance of the road and because of this his comments should be ignored; this is disingenuous at best. He has always contributed and paid his fair share to the maintenance of the road, except for the portion of the road that the applicant was required to update because of a previous subdivision approval. The errors and omissions in the planning report tend to paint a picture that is different

from the facts on the ground; they would support a denial of this application. Staff correctly concludes that the applicant has been unsuccessful in negotiations with one property owner to change the designation of Ranger Drive to public access; he is that property owner. This is totally incorrect; in fact, there are three property owners opposing this change. The other property owner and he have always objected to the change and it appears that Planning staff did not fact check the issue before writing the report. Resolution 1994-71 of Lewis and Clark County Commission states in part "whereas the road requested to be named is not a county road, but is a road that is privately maintained" it goes on to say a street identification sign shall be installed by the property owners and shall be maintained by the property owners. It is further resolved that the above named road continued to be a privately maintained road and not an obligation to the County. The title insurance companies for their properties and the State of Montana, when Canyon Ferry Road was rebuilt, and the planning staff in the 1996 report all designated Ranger Drive as a private road. This is a clear definitive description of a private road and access is controlled by the property owners. With the objection of the two property owners that control the access off of Canyon Ferry Road, for approximately 1,800 feet to the north, there is no legal or physical access from Ranger Drive to the proposed subdivision. The staff report is correct in stating there is only one legal access and that is via Hines Road; the variance you are being asked to consider. The staff reported there were only four letters commenting on proposed subdivision; how does the staff count objections and/or comments by the number of letters or the number of signatures. He noted in 1996 the planning staff advised that a proposed four lot subdivision be denied because it did not comply with the county growth plan at that time; that has been omitted from the current staff report. Staff also notes that there is one informational phone call from a concerned resident and one meeting with a concerned resident; omitted from the report. The staff report has admitted a legal agreement between Holmberg Village Water System, DNRC, and residents of Foster properties, and two other adjacent properties. This agreement directs the Holmberg Village Water System to monitor the water level in wells described in the agreement to protect the water rights of the senior water rights holders. The staff report makes no recommendations to protect the water rights of the senior water rights holders from the wells even though there were two letters of objection that noted this concern. He and his wife specifically object to the following: the planning process being flawed, staff contacted the adjacent landowners by letter of the application to change the use of the land as directed in the county subdivision regulations. Staff also posted a public notice sign on the property. Staff noted that Ranger Drive and Hines Road as well as other roads in Holmberg Village would be impacted by this development. Why were the other residents of Ranger Drive and Holmberg Village omitted from the notification process? Publication in newspapers done by staff is one form of public notification, what about those that do not subscribe to a newspaper. The public notice sign was placed in such an out of way place, that only a few residents of Foster properties and Holmberg Village would ever see them. He talked to about twenty people in Holmberg Village and only one knew of the proposed subdivision and none of them had seen the sign. A public notice sign should have been placed near the mailboxes where all the residents of Holmberg Village could have been informed of the applicant's proposal. In the past signs have been posted at the intersection of Ranger Drive and Canyon Ferry Road; as well as Holmberg Drive and Canyon Ferry Road; not at the northern most end of Ranger Drive. The staff did publish notice of public hearing in front of the Planning Board; however the consistent thread of those he spoke with in Holmberg Village, is that it is useless to take time from work to present their objections as the Planning Board and the County Commission will do what they want to do regardless. The second objection is the access issue; Ranger Drive is a private road so designated by this Commission, the State of Montana, the County planning staff, and title insurance companies. There are two landowners that control the first 1,800 feet of Ranger Drive and do not agree to change the designation of Ranger Drive from private to public and will not grant access to the proposed subdivision and the applicant's request for the variance containing erroneous information. The planning staff agreed that this parcel is controlled by two sets of

covenants: one set is protective covenants of the Foster Properties; he finds it implausible that the planning staff found that the applicant's proposal is not in violation of the covenants article 13. This application does not comply with the current County growth policy and must be denied. Increasing wells in the area of this new subdivision will stretch the aquifer and may endanger the water rights of the senior water rights users in the area. The key management strategy is to regulate growth in the designated rural areas and to limit densities. The policy states the intent of the Helena Valley Area Plan is to limit density in the rural growth areas; the area this subdivision is located in. The proposed subdivision would increase the density of the area in direct violation and the prime directive of the growth policy. The adopted growth policy goes on to say limited densities will be the main mechanism to address the development constraints in rural areas. The growth policy prefaces all of this by saying lot sizes should be a minimum of 10 acres. This will address concerns for the development restraints of water, road, and rural fire protections. None of these lots will be 10 acres. This application must be denied as it is in direct conflict with the growth policy; it does not meet the statutory requirement of two ingress/egress routes, and violates the protective covenants of Foster Properties.

Commissioner Hunthausen confirmed with Mr. Theborge that the growth policy is not a regulatory document. He also confirmed, until implementation strategies and actual related regulations are in place existing regulations are applied to any proposals that come before the Commission. In terms of water, water rights, senior water rights, the Commission does not have regulatory authority over water rights. Mr. Theborge added part of the staff review is to consult with agencies, send notice and request for comments from agencies. The Water Quality Protection District hydrologist was asked to review the proposed wells; they provide comments and the planning staff follows their direction. This application also must get approval from the DEQ; they in turn contact the DNRC to determine if there are any restrictions on water rights or whether water rights permits must be acquired.

Commissioner Hunthausen confirmed with Mr. McNally whether the County has any authority over the private covenants. Mr. McNally stated the subdivision regulations do require compliance with all restrictive covenants. Those private covenants were provided with the application and noted as a project issue, as it was raised by a member of the public questioning compliance. Staff indicated in the report that there was compliance with the private covenants. Commissioner Hunthausen confirmed with Mr. Stahl that if a private covenant is violated the county is not the authority that would take action; it would be the individual.

Commissioner Hunthausen confirmed with Mr. Stahl whether a road is deemed public or public access the county may or may not perform maintenance on the road. Mr. Stahl added a privately maintained road has nothing to do with the status of the road.

Commissioner Murray asked Mr. Stahl to explain the statute that it is the County's decision whether county roads and/or private roads are maintained. Mr. Stahl stated the law provides that the County may have the discretion. Also, government money, tax money, however collected, including SIDs and RIDs cannot be used on private facilities.

Break/Reconvene

Laurie DeLong, 3911 Valley Drive, daughter of the applicant, stated from Canyon Ferry Drive up to the middle of Ranger Drive was labeled as access on the original plat, beyond that is was labeled as public access. She referenced Mr. Stahl's statement from a previous meeting that it used to be considered one of the same; if there were more than two houses it was considered public. It makes no sense that you would have to cross a private access road to get to what is designated as a public access. There are five households that have used Ranger Drive for a

number of years with no other way for them to get in and out. It should be considered a public access road.

Tony Prothero, Shedhorn Engineering, stated Ranger Drive is sole access for seven property owners at this time. It was an approved access road for a previous subdivision application. Mr. Mitchell was required to improve Ranger Drive up to gravel standards. He stated most subdivision roads are privately maintained. He added it is crucial that notification is done as the law states; no more and no less. He does not like to propose variances, but these make sense to do so.

Commissioner Good Geise stated she is considering the denial of the first variance that it is unnecessary if they conditionally approve if the applicant can clearly prove that Ranger Drive is a public road at final plat. Mr. Prothero stated that is an option.

Mr. Bryson stated what is definitive proof and what is opinion the County Attorney's office will render an opinion, but it is the court that determines the public nature of a road. In a similar past case the Commission put a condition on a preliminary plat approval that at final plat the applicant had to prove that the road is public. An adjacent property owner disputed the public nature of the road, the applicant believed the road was public and engaged in a court action in District Court asking for a declaratory judgment that the road is public. That applicant lost and never returned to final plat. If the Commission denies the variance and put a condition that states proof at final plat that the road is public there are options for the applicant; negotiate an easement to be recorded or have the court determine. He added in a non court solution, the applicant and the property owners that own the property underneath what is a disputed road would be the negotiators. If a mutually agreed upon recordation of a public access easement cannot be reached the only arbiter of the case is the court; not the Commission, not the County Attorney's office, and not a privately hire attorney.

Mr. Thebarga stated there is a term called the color of title. The applicant has to demonstrate that they have full rights to use whatever roads and other access property they need. The question would be have they demonstrated for consideration whether or not they have sufficient right title or interest to get the permit that is being requested. A third option might be to submit a legal opinion; it would not be definitive in terms of a court decision, but it may or not be sufficient in terms of the administrative decision. Mr. Stahl stated if it is not a recorded document put in place by either the parties or the court there is nothing.

Commissioner Hunthausen asked Mr. Stahl if the variance was denied and ask for proof of public road at final plat and in those three years that they have to do that and there is a court action saying it is a private road, would at that time they be able to petition this body to then consider it a variance again. Mr. Stahl stated this would become a preliminary approved subdivision; the way to amend it would be a modification.

Mr. Prothero stated he initially approached all the property owners the first time and Mr. Mitchell did the followup with the agreement for signatures. There were four property owners that border Ranger Drive in the area in question. An agreement was drafted that the property owners all signed and notarized declaring the access easements to be for public access. Copies were provided to the county; they have not been recorded. Three of the four owners agreed, as noted Mr. Stifler is still in opposition. The variances were requested because they thought for them to get Mr. Stifler to agree to the agreement was impossible. There are two physical access points; one being Ranger Drive and an alternate route through Holmberg Village.

Commissioner Hunthausen asked Mr. Prothero if the applicant had sought private legal help to determine the status of Ranger Drive. Mr. Prothero answered not yet.

Commissioner Good Geise referenced Mr. Stifler's comments where he cited Resolution 1994-71 that says whereas the road requested is to be named is not a county road, but that the road is privately maintained. She asked Mr. Prothero if he has any comments on Mr. Stifler's reference of the resolution and that the title insurance companies and the 1996 planning staff report all designated Ranger Drive as a private road. Mr. Prothero stated he has no way to dispute it, but that it was approved for a subdivision in the past.

Jim Mitchell, 3947 Valley Drive, stated he believes it is a public road. He is the one that had the surveying done and he must have requested it to be a public road because where the subdivision was it is designated as a public road. He does not remember designating it as a public road.

Commissioner Murray stated there being no further questions, this closes the public comment period.

A motion was made by Commissioner Hunthausen to render final decision on Thursday December 15, 2016. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Good Geise. The motion Passed on a 3-0 vote.

Public Hearing on Amendments to the Lewis and Clark County Subdivision Regulations. (Tabled 11/29/16) (Greg McNally)

Commissioner Murray stated the public comment period is still open on this item.

Greg McNally, Planner II, presented the proposed amendments to the December 19, 2013 Subdivision Regulations. He stated these amendments were also presented at the public meeting in Lincoln on December 3, 2016 as well as public meeting in Augusta on December 10, 2016. A couple of questions were answered during those meetings, but no additional public comments were submitted in writing or actual testimony provided. He noted that the decision option B recommended by the Planning Board was also supported by public comment from Mr. Simonich of Helena Association of Realtors. He added that the memo he provided to the Commission with three additional amendments for consideration were also supported by Mr. Simonich.

Mr. McNally stated the decision option b refers to a procedure that would allow for certain things not to be included in the subdivision review packets, in addition to the process by which it is reviewed also the materials submitted for review. The three additional amendments that staff added in the memo are related to a reference to the need for addressing public health and safety and some are in review of impact criteria. No public comment was received.

Commissioner Murray stated this closes the public comment period.

A motion was made by Commissioner Hunthausen to approve the proposed amendments to the Subdivision Regulations as presented, including Option B and including the amendments and addendum that was provided with additional information. The motion was seconded by Commission Good Geise.

Mr. McNally pointed out they were provided a draft resolution. It documents the actions today and includes blanks for the dates on which the public hearings were held. The most important blank is the adopted date.

Commissioner Hunthausen amended the motion to include the approval of the draft resolution with today being the effective date. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Geise. The motion Passed on a 3-0 vote.

Public comment on any public matter within the jurisdiction of the Commission that is not on the agenda above.

Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:58 am.

LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Susan Good Geise, Chair



Andy Hunthausen, Vice Chair



Jim McCormick, Member

ATTEST:



Paulette DeHart, Clerk of the Board