

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

March 7th, 2024

Completed by: Sue Bertrand, P&Z Staff

Site visits conducted by Adam Ossefoort and Lloyd Graves on 1/25/2024 for the Borntreger and Hartssock Sites.
Site Visits conducted by Kevin McKelvey and Roger Hendrickson on 3/1/2024 for Miller, Sundermann, Huhta & Hershberger sites.

Meeting attended by board members: Chair Jim Pratt, Vice Chair Ken Hovet, Lloyd Graves, Arnie Boie, Roger Hendrickson and Commissioner's Liaison Tim Denny.

Staff members: Adam Ossefoort and Sue Bertrand.

Other members of the public: Sign-in Sheet is available for viewing upon request.

Jim called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited as a collective group.

Introduction of the staff and board members by Jim.

Ken motioned to have the February 1st, 2024 meeting minutes approved. Arnie seconded the motion. Voice vote, no dissent heard. Motion carried.

No changes to agenda so motion by Lloyd to approve the agenda as is, seconded by Roger. Voice vote, no dissent heard, motion carried.

AGENDA ITEM 1: Todd County Feedlot Ordinance Revisions

Adam brought us up to date on where we left off last month and added no new additional information as we need to hear public comment and have board input from the first revision. Offered the link below from our website for updates.

<https://www.co.todd.mn.us/divisions/soil-water-conservation-and-development/planning-zoning/#feedlotordinance>

Correspondence received: Yes, from Deja Anton. Adam read the letter aloud. This letter may be viewed in full, upon request in the Planning and Zoning Office.

Public comment:

Roger Zastro stated he is speaking on behalf of himself and The Todd County Farm Bureau. Stated they have looked over a lot of this stuff, heard comments on two meetings already, and their feelings are: the current regulations have been working very well, and it doesn't pay to keep going on the public comment period meeting after meeting. He thinks we need to get down to the drafts. He stated they have field work coming up and they don't want to be here. Not in favor of animal caps, setback changes due to the fact there are houses that have been built already on places and people won't be able to expand their operation. He understands it's hard to tell people they can't build somewhere, but also, by letting people come in, you are limiting what a farm can do if they want to expand or bring family members in and somebody comes in and built a house on the corner. If we change the animal setbacks, we are limiting what they can do. He stated

that has already been brought out in testimony and doesn't know what, if any, new comments are going to come forth, that hasn't already been made. So, in his opinion, after tonight, there are some wording changes that are not a bad thing to change and they are in favor of, but overall, thinks we should leave it the way it is and get it done with.

Shawn Hollermann stated the last time he had talked about the complaints that don't have any merit to them, and the staff was going to talk to the County attorney and was there anything done with that? Maybe putting some kind of regulations on people calling in and chasing Deja, himself and everybody in the office around and wasting a lot of time? For the non-compliant complaints?

Adam stated no. We did not talk to the County attorney about that. He stated that we can't restrict people's ability to submit complaints but added he agreed and understood where Shawn was coming from. Often times we do spend a lot of time reviewing complaints that have been looked at before to find they are still not a violation. We can't limit the public's ability to submit complaints to us but we can look into how to limit the repeated complaints that have already been reviewed.

Shawn, even though it is the same person calling in over and over and over, and the same Lake Associations over and over that sooner or later we have to put something against it, because it's just going to keep getting worse and we can't keep using up our resources on things that have no merit to what they are doing.

Adam, stated he appreciated his comments, and something we can try and get an answer on in this type of scenario. We can't limit the public's ability to submit complaints, but maybe in that scenario there may be something else that our County may be able to provide, some guidance on how to respond to it, but it may be just some sort of guidance and not something that could be put in the ordinance. Just making that assumption based on his own basic understanding, but our County Attorney may have a different answer than he.

Shawn stated to him something has to be done because it is out of control and stated everybody knows what he is dealing with and it just goes on and on and on. He understands we have to have regulations, but he has to answer to their complaint, but why do they not have to answer or have no consequence to a false complaint? He has a consequence to their false complaint, but they do not. When they make a false complaint, basically he gets a fine because it costs him time, hours and money to go through this and they have nothing on their side. They know they are making non-legitimate complaints.

Adam stated he hears his concern but he doesn't have an answer at this time.

Virgil Schmidt, running off of Shawn's point, very frustrating when people take it in their own hands, make a telephone call and create havoc just because they can. Again, it not only effects Shawn, Deja and everyone in the office, and here we are sitting here again with the scenario one more time. In his opinion, He is with Jim last time when he stated they don't have the balls to come in here and stand behind what they put forth, then as far as he is concerned, hang up the phone. Weather that's possible to put this in our ordinance, he has no idea. He's with Shawn, you can't let these people run amuck and do whatever they want. The unfortunate thing about this whole situation, with these people, the only difference between a bull and a cow is a bull's got horns and a cow don't. He's been down that road and you can't talk sense to them. The main thing is he thinks the loopholes on our ordinance are for the public, and we just keep batting our heads against the wall

trying to make things better for us, while they get away with murder. He thinks if they are going to make a phone call on any one of "us" they need to show up to back themselves up, they should be here as well. That's the thing for a lawyer, there's no doubt about it. We need to make people accountable for their actions. We do as producers out here, whether it's feedlot, agricultural, cash crop, we have to be accountable for our actions, the rest should be too.

William Hartsock this compares to the camp Ripley scenario, noise barrier. These are generational farmers who have been around here for years, Camp Ripley has got money. They can buy their surroundings. There should be something somewhere, in writing when there is a purchase of land next to them that allows prior talking between the them and the farmer of what they have previously set for that part of their land, where they are going to purchase where they will put their home. So, they don't have to worry about their setbacks.

Jason Jarris, stated this is the third meeting. He couldn't make the last one, we were here for the first one, his wife is pregnant we have three kids and we were down here, and there's a bunch of other people. He noticed there are not as many people as there were for the other ones. This thing gets drug out. Any politician does it, any school board does it. You want something to pass and most of the people who are living in the area, or whoever has been there, doesn't want it to pass, just keep kicking the can down the road until everybody gets frustrated because nothing gets done. Like they have been saying, this is the third meeting, whose job is it here to stick up for the farmer? For the one who has lived here their whole life, their families are the generation farm. Whose job is it here to stick up for us, and why we always have to keep changing and complying to people who are moving up here from the cities wanting to get away from that dumpster hole down there? Because they don't like the crime or the noise or the pollution? Then they come up here and tell us how to live? We've been here before them. We don't get to go down there and say hey, we are going to put a feedlot here next to the Excel Energy Center or something. There is no way it could happen. Who sticks up for us? Why is this being brought up over and over again? What's being done about it? It is being kicked down the road again. Are we hoping nobody will show up anymore and nobody says anything? Like he stated the first time (addressed Jim) he brought his kids down, not last time because of wrestling, came down on a school night and didn't get home until a little after 11:00. There wasn't one person who brought up why they want this feedlot changed, not one person in here, out in the hall or in the other room he stated why they want it changed. Your guys' job to stick up for the people that live here. You heard everyone here ask why are we changing this? What needs to be changed? Because somebody moves in? What about the people, parents, grandparents and people who have been living here for a hundred years and why do they get ram-rodged out?

Roger Dukowitz stated in agreement with Jason and Roger Zastro had to say. Its time do document any changes, if any, the County board is proposing. There's been plenty said, what are the changes? Just exactly what do you want to change in the ordinance? That's what the subject is. As far as the commissioners doing something? He stated thinking back on his history, Thomas Jefferson, the third president, quite the scripter. Pretty significant, he said the best legislation is the least legislation. In this case it's the commissioners pushing the legislation. He also made the statement that every day the legislature is in session, we lose a little bit of our freedom. A lot of people are here, not free, tonight for the third time. That's the type of things that are going on. Specify what needs to be changed so people can comment on what exactly people think need to be changed. Otherwise, he thinks the county board right now, you guys have the authority to pass a motion to

tell the County Commissioners to take it off the table. He stated he thinks that is what should be done now, not next fall, not next summer, not when he is playing with the cows or whatever.

Scott Duchene, lives in the southern part of Todd County, he's here tonight to bring up some more unpopular ideas here, 4 years ago, he'd been living at his residence here for fifteen years, built the home himself and a producer came in and wanted to apply for a 1,000-animal unit feedlot, 250 feet from his house. His house is built on an R-10 zoned property, but there is nothing in the ordinance that prohibits anybody from/or has any kind of a setback from that R-10 property. So, they could build it on the other side of the road and there's no real setback ordinance in place to keep that from happening. He understands everybody's point of view here, he has in-laws that farm and has lots of his family that farms, not trying to make it harder for anyone that is farming but, there are other citizens in the County that provide critical needs for this community. They might be your healthcare workers, teachers, workers in other business that are living on these other properties too, that there needs to be a little bit of respect given for the investment on their own property, as well.

Roger in reference to Shawn's deal, stated he didn't think it could be put into this, but if they come with repeated complaints, somewhere that gets into the harassment deal. The DNR put that in there, somebody comes in and says stuff about hunters, they can get harassment charges filed against them. He didn't know where that would have to be in the County Ordinance. It may even already be in there, if the County attorney would do something, but if there are repeated complaints, that is harassment. So, it probably should be something the County Attorney should be addressing. If it's repeated over and gets to be four and five times, and it is baseless, that should be in a harassment deal. He stated he didn't think we could put that in this ordinance, but there should be something in the County deal or should be put somewhere in the County stuff because that does go on.

Adam explained, all setbacks are reciprocal. The same rules apply. If there is an existing feedlot and someone wants to come in and build a house, you have to meet that setback distance as a residential property owner. If there is an existing house and you want to bring a new feedlot in, it applies in both directions. He stated he wants to be CLEAR: The draft ordinance we have right now has no new setbacks. The setbacks are the same now, in our existing ordinance, as in the new proposal. He added, about Roger's comment, about wanting to see the changes between existing and what's proposed at this time. That's in the packet you picked up. There is the existing, there's the traced changes and then there is the proposed amendment in there. So, you can do the side by side comparison line by line. That's what he was hoping he could hear tonight. What the comments were on that, so we can continue to get to an end point. We will see what other comments are hear tonight, but that is available for you to do the side by side comparison of that. After that first meeting we went to a new work session with the Commissioners and talked about what the feedback was from the public related to new setbacks and if Tim would like to add anything in here, it was pretty quickly decided that no new setbacks were going to be implemented into this new ordinance amendment. He stated when he drafted That initial copy, we didn't add anything. What you see as setbacks are the same as existing now as what is proposed at the moment.

Adam stated it's really the best way to get information out in a fair and efficient manner. That first one with the watermark on it says "current ordinance" that is our language how it is written now, at this moment, that exists today. That second one says "tracked changes" and probably has a bunch of things crossed out. That means, as he re-wrote portions of it, it crosses out what he deleted, and that means it is going to be removed

and he added the underlined language. The last one says “proposed changes” that’s where he has accepted all of the changes and says the proposed amendment in a clean form.

Jim stated most of that stuff is just rewording.

Adam stated correct. We are just trying to clean up some of the inconsistencies. The things that we as staff have had a hard time interpreting or enforcing, to just kind of clean that up. That’s most of what you see. When we get through this section 9.11, there will be a little bit more work to do so that section 9.11 will match the use table in a different part of the ordinance, but that will go quickly once we get this part squared away or maybe the Commissioners may decide to just back off and not make any changes, he didn’t know. If we continue to move forward with this, there will be a little bit more homework for us to do, to make sure those other sections of the ordinance all play together. We have to make sure it all stays consistent throughout the ordinance. Including, potentially, modifications of definitions, creation of new definitions, and we have to make sure that in the end, everything is consistent and clean as something that is usable.

Shawn stated he sat down and studied it about three times, and stated there’s very little change, most of it’s verbiage, and switching things around to make it more user friendly. To him it looked like what was being proposed and what was there is basically the same. As long as we are leaving it to what is in here, as to what is the proposed change, after he read it and went through it, he does not have an issue with what is in this. He stated he thinks it’s good. We haven’t really switched nothing besides just cleaning up what is in the vocabulary. As long as you guys are going leave it at that, he is comfortable enough to where he does not have to come back, as long as that is what is going on.

Adam stated should you choose not to come next month, he totally understands, however, he urged them to review the website for any updates, so you can see the changes that we are making and we are not taking steps beyond what has been discussed here tonight, or whatever. Or if you do have concerns, whatever comes out of this meeting tonight, he hopes he can get it posted to the website within a week to ten days, so then you have another two weeks or so before the next meeting if you wanted to review it and then come to the meeting, or if you are comfortable with what you see, you can make the decision to not come. We just needed to hear the comments tonight, so he knows what that next step is, or what needs to be changed and we can keep posting to that website and you can pluck it off of there to see what we are working at.

Shawn stated what we have here, between the public speaking and everything, it’s not only us, but you guys have understood that nobody is really looking for any change and we really haven’t made any significant changes, by no means.

Adam stated right, that is not what he was intending, he is just wanting to clean up those things, what we as staff have seen as an issue.

Barb James stated there was talk about animal unit caps. Had anything been decided on that?

Adam stated that was never added. Good question. Nothing new for setbacks and the charts are identical.

Jim stated a couple of those items were brought up by Commissioners, not this board and just wanted to make it clear.

Public, he is with Shawn, about the harassment thing, is there anything that the PC board can do, or is that a completely different subject all together?

Jim stated as far as he knew, there is nothing this board can do. It would have to be discussed with the County Attorney, and not sure what they can do legally.

Roger, file a restraining order.

Shawn stated he never knows who is making the complaints when they come into Soil & Water. There is no way to know where the harassment thing comes in. He can't go to the County Attorney and say this person needs a harassment charge put against them, because he never knows who they are. So, there has got to be something done to protect the farmer.

Adam stated he will ask all of these questions as best he can and see what can become of it from there. It does become a drain on the resources, which affects everyone in this room and everybody else in the County.

Roger Hendrickson asked if a complaint comes in, do they have to identify themselves?

Adam stated yes, our County policy requires them to give us a name and some sort of contact information, to legitimize the complaint, and we follow up on it, but we cannot share who calls. The reason we take that information is if they, for some reason, end up in a courtroom that person may be taken in on that court case process.

Public, so it would be the staff who would know if it is harassment and it would be something that we could do, and it would fall on our hands to help the farmer out.

Adam agreed if we would get three or four complaints on Shawn, we would know who the person was. We would have record of that.

Public asked if we report back to the caller and let them know what we found out about that complaint?

Adam stated yes. We do follow up, but we can't always share everything about what was discussed. Adam explained we get a complaint, have a conversation with Shawn or whoever it is against, about how to resolve it, or whether it is legitimate or not, but what he is saying is when we go back to the complaint tee, we can't share all of the details, especially when it is an open violation. That is not public data.

Public so when it wasn't a legitimate complaint, and it is harassment, we do call Shawn and let him know he doesn't need to worry about it?

Adam stated yes, we relay the message and we would follow up with the land owner every case.

Roger Dukowitz, had a friend in Morrison County, had 80 acres and was going to build a house on it. Before he had the money to build it, they put a big turkey facility across the road. There is a setback on feedlots in Morrison County, so his friend is S.O.L as far as building a home on his land because, he is just bringing it up, the inverse is, the reciprocal part can become overwhelming and undaunting. What goes around comes around, and what usually goes around, it comes around twice as fast, and twice as much money.

Board discussion:

Ken stated has been to all three meetings now and he agrees with the comment he sees very little change other than grammatical, paragraph numbering and that kind of thing. He continued, the first meeting we had, he wrote down his own summary of comments made and there were nineteen of them. Two of them wanted to look at other counties and what they had and we had done that and actually handed out a chart showing what other counties had for setbacks, so we addressed that. Three said to be careful with setbacks and we will because we won't be changing anything or at least not anticipated at this point in time. Two of them said to limit where these small acreage houses can be built, and he stated we have that accounted for in the reciprocal setbacks. Five said to keep in mind the contributions the Ag businesses make to the County. We know that very well, some of us are farmers and we grew up there and some still do. Three of them said the ordinance works good so far and we don't need to change it. We are accomplishing that because we are really not proposing a lot of material changes. Three said we need less regulation and we should allow for growth and animal caps should be raised. Stated we haven't discussed that yet. Not sure if anyone has any interest in that or not. One said we should review our fees. So, for the most part, all of the comments made at the first meeting have already been accounted for and basically worked into the proposal, so, he is pretty satisfied with that. The second meeting was more of the same. One concern about nitrate and wells and that doesn't really fit into the ordinance, it has to come from the water authority. Three commented on reciprocal setbacks, the same thing we were talking about tonight. One of them stated the current ordinances were good. The thing that's not in our ordinance is how to handle complaints. That was a pretty good discussion. Also, the permit costs are not dealt with in the Ordinance, either, that is elsewhere. Summarized all the comments tonight and will go home and digest them. Excellent discussion. His suggestion on the frivolous complaints, since we have a lot of that going on, and it would not be precedented, if he was going to come in and make a complaint against any feedlot owner, I should have to pay up front, a fee to do that. If my complaint turns out to be legitimate, I get my fee back. If it is not, you forfeit. A \$100.00 fee might slow down a few of them. We would have to go through a lot of hoops, but it is just a thought. He stated he thinks all of these frivolous complaints are infringing on the harassment laws. There has to be someplace where they disallow that, and you would have to talk to your own attorney about that or the Sheriff, possibly. There has got to be some relief for that, because that is nonsense.

Tim stated he liked the old Ordinance, so the new Ordinance is perfect. Just a little bit of verbiage changes and clean it up to make it easier for you guys to maneuver around without all of the good public comment and this boards' hard work, he likes where it is at right now and besides addressing that harassment issue, to just get a more certainty or clarity on that is just one more thing we have to look at. He knows people are getting tired of these meetings but it has his support, as is, right now.

Roger stated had one caught his eye, setback distance from municipal limits or municipal growth boundaries. Page three, proposed amendments. This has been in there before, why should some person, we may not have

big enough cities in Todd County, but sees it in other Counties, where they keep annexing and annexing property, and we have a century farm here and all of a sudden, he cannot farm anymore. Now he is in that municipal growth boundary. How can we address that, to where this farm that has been there ten or one hundred years, should not have to abide by all of this stuff only because they keep moving in on him?

Ken asked how do we define growth boundaries.

Adam stated we don't. We look at the City limits only. That existing feedlot is protected, as long as they are legally established, so, they are protected as a legal non-conformity. Even if the city starts to encroach within this distance, they can continue to exist, however, they may not be able to expand, but they are not penalized for being legally established at the time.

Roger Hendrickson they would get sick and tired of all of the complaints, they are restricted by this rule.

Ken stated you can't move the city out to the feedlot and then start complaining about it. This needs to be addressed, that's not going to work.

Jim stated he thought the ordinance was just fine the way it was, and just clean up some wordage and go from there.

Lloyd asked if there was anything wrong with the proposed changes, or can we just say okay with it.

Adam stated, he thinks we were ready to say okay to this part of it, to wrap this up. What he envisions from here, and he is saying this out loud so the board can hold him to it, is the only thing in this is the part that is labelled "proposed amendments" the only thing he can see changing is that 7 months storage capacity requirement for existing manure pits. He can only see that as being a shorter window, 7 months or less or maybe even removed. That is something that he would like to have a more in-depth discussion with Deja about those impacts. 6.04 A. Accessory Uses: There are highlighted spots the need very little updating to do there to match Section 9.11 and look at some definitions. He will try in the next week or two to get all of that done and get it posted to the website so you can see it and hope there is a real chance at our April meeting we can take all of those parts and move it to the Commissioners to adopt it. Then we are done. He will make every effort to make that happen. Check the website, or call in and see where we are at with and we can e-mail copies or something. You shouldn't see any changes to Section 9.11 from this proposed amendment section other than Section M part two, which talks about that seven months storage capacity requirement, and we will update those other sections so it will jive together and then we can be ready to, if everybody is comfortable with it make that recommendation to the Commissioners, and have that adopted at the second Commissioners' meeting in April, not sure what date that is, middle to the end of April, but make that a goal and then we are done with it. Hopefully they can make that happen.

Adam read Section O, all expansions of feedlots with liquid manure handling system must have storage capacity to accommodate the increase in animal units. The plans for expansion must be provided to the department prior to any construction taking place. Must be completed within two years from the date that the permit was issued. This rule is not intended to be applied to any expansion that utilizes solid manure handling systems. So, the issue with that language is just says that it must accommodate the increase in

animal units. It doesn't set a standard of what that is. We are trying to set that standard and you have an existing pit, you need to have "X" amount of storage for it. We are trying to figure out what that number is. The initial thought was seven months, but is probably going to come down a little bit. For new liquid manure storage pits it's twelve months. It's what it was in the "existing". If you are trying to compare those side by side, in the "existing ordinance" it's Section O, part two, in the proposed amendment it is Section M, part two. Good question. Liquid manure storage only.

Long Prairie Township mentioned the conflict of meetings with Planning Commission and Township being on the same night and Adam stated he was eyeballing the Tuesday right before that, and that is probably another township meeting night, but we will figure something out. He does not think there will be a Planning Commission meeting that particular night, for that reason.

Ken motioned to table until the next meeting, Lloyd seconded.

Roll call vote commenced as follows:

Board member	Vote (yes or no)
Ken Hovet	Yes
Roger Hendrickson	Yes
Lloyd Graves	Yes
Arnie Boie	Yes
Jim Pratt	Yes

Motion carried. Jim noted Adam promised to have it all wrapped up so, we will look at it in April.

Adam stated so in the meantime, if you have any questions, call our office, he is happy to talk with anybody and we will try to get it out early so you have a chance to review it, and if you want to come to that April meeting you will have a chance, and we will get this thing rolling and have our end goal be adoption if the Commissioners are ready to adopt it at the second April Commissioners' meeting.

Adam said to pay attention to the newspaper, as he is thinking the first Tuesday in April which is April 2nd, and he doesn't have a back up plan yet, or call our office and we will have an answer by then, or look at it on line.

Jim called 6:58 short recess. And reconvened at 7:06.

AGENDA ITEM 2: Enos J. Borntreger – PID 07-0002200 – Eagle Valley Twp.

Request for Conditional Use Permit for Request to construct and operate a greenhouse with advertising sign in AF-1 Zoning.

Enos was present as the applicant.

Staff Findings: Adam read the staff report. The staff report is available for viewing upon request in the Planning & Zoning Office.

Proposed Condition(s):

1. The greenhouse operator must provide adequate off-street parking for all greenhouse traffic. No

- parking will be allowed within the road right of way.
2. No loading or unloading of materials will be allowed within the road right of way.
 3. The business is restricted to construction of a single greenhouse as proposed. Construction of additional greenhouses or expansion to an existing greenhouse will require review by the Planning Commission.
 4. Business signage must abide by the Home-Based Business requirements, Section 9.15 of the Todd County Planning and Zoning Ordinance. Placement of signage within the road right of way shall require approval from the road authority.
 5. Applicant must obtain additional permitting and/or licensing from additional government agencies as necessary.

Adam made an edit to #4 from Todd County to road authority.

Correspondence received: None.

Public comment: None.

Board discussion:

Jim stated it is close to a tar road, so that's a benefit.

Ken asked what township?

Jim and Adam informed Eagle Valley.

Public member stated we have gotten a lot of signage attached to County Roads. (Inaudible). Asked to keep it set back far enough.

Jim agreed that's why they have that in the conditions, that they will have to get a hold of the County or the Township road authority, depending on where they want to put the sign.

Jim stated they have plenty of room for parking up there.

Lloyd stated he did the site visit and saw nothing wrong with it and made a motion to approve with the five conditions, Arnie seconded with the five conditions as presented.

Conditions:

1. The greenhouse operator must provide adequate off-street parking for all greenhouse traffic. No parking will be allowed within the road right of way.
2. No loading or unloading of materials will be allowed within the road right of way.
3. The business is restricted to construction of a single greenhouse as proposed. Construction of additional greenhouses or expansion to an existing greenhouse will require review by the Planning Commission.
4. Business signage must abide by the Home-Based Business requirements, Section 9.15 of the Todd County Planning and Zoning Ordinance. Placement of signage within the road right of way shall require approval from the road authority.
5. Applicant must obtain additional permitting and/or licensing from additional government agencies as necessary.

Roll call vote commenced as follows:

Board member	Vote (yes or no)
Ken Hovet	Yes
Roger Hendrickson	Yes
Lloyd Graves	Yes
Arnie Boie	Yes
Jim Pratt	Yes

Motion carried. Jim noted the application will be presented to the County Board of Commissioners on March 19th, 2024.

AGENDA ITEM 3: Ammon C. and Lizzy J. Hershberger – PID 20-0023000 – Reynolds Twp.

Request for Conditional Use Permit Request for the construction and retail sales of hunting blinds in AF-1 Zoning.

Ammon was present as the applicant.

Staff Findings: Adam read the staff report. The staff report is available for viewing upon request in the Planning & Zoning Office. A motion to recommend approval to the County Board of Commissioners with the following conditions:

1. There shall be no loading/unloading of materials within the public roadway.
2. Off-street parking shall be provided for all business traffic.
3. Storage of supplies and finished products shall be stored meeting all setback requirements.
4. Land use permits shall be required for all future construction. The business is restricted to construction of a single shop as proposed. Construction of additional shops or expansion to an existing shop will require review by the Planning Commission.
5. Applicant must abide by all other applicable federal, state, and local standards.

Ammon confirmed the staff report was accurate.

Correspondence received: None.

Public comment: None.

Board discussion:

Roger stated he was on the site visit, on a forty-acre parcel with lots of room for parking, there was a low spot where the driveway come in and they filled that in, but they have plenty of high ground for parking. They had to get an easement because it was on a curve and they had to get a driveway in there. It is on an existing township road and didn't foresee any problem with extra traffic.

Jim asked if this is for retail and asked if he was going to sell them right off his place.

Ammon nodded yes.

Arnie stated it looks straight forward to him and motioned to approve with the five conditions, Ken seconded. Conditions:

1. There shall be no loading/unloading of materials within the public roadway.
2. Off-street parking shall be provided for all business traffic.
3. Storage of supplies and finished products shall be stored meeting all setback requirements.
4. Land use permits shall be required for all future construction. The business is restricted to construction of a single shop as proposed. Construction of additional shops or expansion to an existing shop will require review by the Planning Commission.
5. Applicant must abide by all other applicable federal, state, and local standards.

Roll call vote commenced as follows:

Board member	Vote (yes or no)
Ken Hovet	Yes
Roger Hendrickson	Yes
Lloyd Graves	Yes
Arnie Boie	Yes
Jim Pratt	Yes

Motion carried. Jim noted the application will be presented to the County Board of Commissioners on March 19th, 2024.

AGENDA ITEM 4: Ernest R. Huhta – PID 18-0050800 – Long Prairie Twp.

Request for Conditional Use Permit Request for several businesses in Recreational Development Shoreland Zoning.

Ernest was present as the applicant.

Staff Findings: Adam read the staff report. The staff report is available for viewing upon request in the Planning & Zoning Office.

Proposed Condition(s):

1. Applicant must abide by all applicable federal, state, and local standards.

Correspondence received: None.

Public comment:

Wally Zastro, Long Prairie Township asked if there was an after the fact variance? Or was there any kind of conditional use permit on this property before? There was already a building there.

Adam stated he did not believe there was a conditional use permit ever issued for the existing business that is in it, but with the change in use of it we are requiring a conditional use permit now. There was a land use permit for the structure, but there was never a conditional use permit for the business that's located in the structure.

Wally asked how did we get to this point with the three businesses in there without a conditional use permit? Stating he has no problem with it, just asking the question.

It was a use that has been there for a long time, and we don't always catch those, but they came to us and we were notified of some proposed changes and knowing the information we have now, and the change in use, we are requiring a conditional use permit, now.

Board discussion:

Roger stated he was on the site visit and was surprised, he had heard there was a new barber in town didn't know where he was at, and found out this is where. Roger's own barber is in his nineties, and might be quitting so, he will need a new one. Stated this building has been there at least 45 years and used to be a tire shop.

Lloyd stated before that, it used to be a green house.

Roger stated it looks like a very good use for it and as far as pollution and stuff, he didn't think haircuts produce more pollution than a tire shop, motioned to approve, with the one condition as presented and Lloyd seconded.

Conditions:

1. Applicant must abide by all applicable federal, state, and local standards.

Roll call vote commenced as follows:

Board member	Vote (yes or no)
Ken Hovet	Yes
Roger Hendrickson	Yes
Lloyd Graves	Yes
Arnie Boie	Yes
Jim Pratt	Yes

Motion carried. Jim noted the application will be presented to the County Board of Commissioners on March 19th, 2024.

AGENDA ITEM 5: Jacob C. and Emma Miller – PID 07-0037500 – Eagle Valley Township

Request for Conditional Use Permit for the operation of a sawmill and/or resaw business in AF-1 Zoning.

Jim noted there was a correction from the agenda listing retail sales as well, and this application does not request retail sales.

Adam confirmed.

Jacob & Henry Miller, and Joseph Borntreger were present as the applicants.

Staff Findings: Adam read the staff report. The staff report is available for viewing upon request in the Planning

& Zoning Office.

Proposed Condition(s):

1. Hours of operation shall be restricted to 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM CST, Monday through Saturday.
2. Operation of the sawmill shall be conducted within a permitted structure.
3. Outdoor storage of products shall be allowed but shall be conducted in compliance with Section 9.01B of the Todd County Planning and Zoning Ordinance.
4. Business traffic shall access the site via County 84 from the south. North bound traffic from the site shall not be allowed for protection of the roadway.
5. Operation site shall meet all the setback requirements for the zoning district in which it's located.
6. There shall be no loading or unloading of materials within the road right of way.
7. Applicant shall work with Eagle Valley Township to establish a sufficient business access and establish truck route signage.
8. Establishment of an exhaust system directed through the roof of the structure with inclusion of a muffler.
9. Applicant shall abide by all other applicable federal, state, and local standards.

Joseph confirmed the staff report was accurate.

Correspondence received: yes, two. Adam read the one from Scott Schnuckle, 821 Bearpaw Trail, Eagan, MN where he lives and owns property at 17007 344th street, and he has another property at the corner of County 84 and 165th Ave. This letter can be viewed in full upon request in the Planning and Zoning Office. He asked the township to speak on behalf of their correspondence.

Ken stated his home address is Eagan.

Public comment:

Justin Johnson passed out handouts of photos for the board for them to review and to keep for the record. He pointed out this is an after-the-fact conditional use permit and wanted to note he and his wife Shannon live 550 yards away from the applicant. Six days after they signed the application, they answered "None" to the question if the request would create an excessive burden on the existing roads or other utilities and this is what you see in photo #1. Appearance is another large concern of ours. He noted it was stated everything is inside the building and if you see in photo #2 of a pipe that exits the building, for sawdust, approximately 12' in the air. So, as stated, everything will not be in the building. We feel sawdust, chunk wood, slab wood etc. that is associated with the business should be screened from public view. Photos #3 and #4 shows other local saw mills in the area that have nothing contained inside the building like they stated on the applications. Hours of operation and noise level are a conflict as well with surrounding property. On January 29th, at 6:45 am a semi using Jake brakes pulled into the property. From 6:50 am to 7:50 am we listened to the backup alarm on a skid loader for one hour that morning. It was stated 8 to 6 as operating hours on their application. 6:45am does not fit into that time frame. 9-4 Monday through Friday would be a more reasonably fit time frame for adjoining land owners to continue to use and enjoy their property. Every motor manufacturer has specifications exhaust, resonators and mufflers and are engineered into those specs. This particular operation has a piece of pipe sticking out the NW wall facing our two properties, seen in the previous photos. The South wall would be a better option with the screening of trees and no neighbors to the South, or they could face the East wall towards their house, but this is not our preference.

Stan Johnson, Supervisor Eagle Valley township, stated he didn't have much to add as he sees Adam covered quite a bit. Keeping traffic off of our township roads for the conditional use permit. We are the ones who get stuck holding the bag once the CUP gets approved. We have to maintain the roads. Stated he has to listen to the calls complaining about the dust and traffic. We are talking Logging trucks. Meet that on a small narrow township road, he gets all the flack. He sees Adam has that pretty well contained. If we can keep the traffic on County 84, which is a chloride road, wider and meant for heavier traffic. One other thing, they are going to have to widen the driveway, we have already had damage from a trailer dragging through the ditch. He had taken care of it already, and that was greatly appreciated. As long as we keep the traffic off our township roads as we have too much already. Is there a possibility for him to be responsible for putting up truck route signs, with an arrow pointing toward 84?

Ken stated on your township road, you are the road authority and you can put up whatever signs you want.

Stan stated we had this before, with a green house situation, they paid for the signs, it was for their benefit and they put them up. The people that are residents, that don't have commercial property, shouldn't be responsible for signage. We'll see what we can work out.

Randy Meyer asked why not put in a condition that if they put an approach in, the shoulder should be widened to get into his business? It would save our township roads, too. Our township roads were designed in the forties. They were designed for five-ton trucks, not for ten-ton trucks.

Jim agreed that any time you are driving off the edge of the road, you are creating problems.

Stan stated before they widen the approach, they have to come to the township meeting

Roger Hendrickson was on site out there, and informed him to contact the clerk, to get on the agenda to get the road widened out, his approach. He stated the reason the truck went beyond his culvert and everything is he told the trucker, turn short enough so you don't have the front of that truck on the off side of that road. It ended up off of his driveway.

Board discussion:

Jim asked if Roger talked to them about the drive way, we should maybe have that as a condition. It wouldn't be a bad idea to have that signage up about being a truck route. He would have to talk to the township about it. Jim confirmed with Stan they could help him get the signs.

Stan stated it is only ¼ mile over to 84. No hardship for a truckdriver. If you take 84 between Browerville and Clarissa. No reason why they can't.

Ken clarified so, the truck route you are proposing would go from 84 straight up 171st just to his driveway. Stan agreed, just so when they are leaving they don't take 11.

Adam suggested condition number seven that he just added.

Roger Hendrickson stated, it looked like pretty stable roads, not going through a mucky swamp or anything and looked good to him.

Stan stated they get beat up pretty quick.

Roger agreed and added they have a lot of public logging trucks in his township.

Stan stated couple years ago, they put up a counter for cars and counted four to five hundred cars in one day, for the green house, and they damaged the road and donated money for the whole situation and helped pay for damage.

Ken stated the only Saving Grace there is the Green House traffic isn't year around.

Stan agreed, but added two months at three to four-hundred cars average a day, tell me that doesn't detrimental to the township. One day was over 600.

Jim stated the sawdust was brought up

Ken

Jim stated the sawdust was brought up, but normally that is not inside the building.

Adam stated we don't normally have that as a condition, but he did add condition #8: Applicant shall abide by all other applicable federal, state, and local standards.

Ken Jacob if his saw was a round blade or a band saw?

Joseph stated band saw.

Roger H. stated the motor just sitting there running. The PTO shaft for grinding feed and also uses it for that. Didn't want to sound bad, but a skid loader running at 6:00 in the morning is nothing new for farming country. There's a lot of people out there that have a lot of things running early in the morning. Not so much anymore. It used to be milk pumps, silo unloaders and stuff. It is out in the country and you are going to have farm equipment and tractors running. Stated he is sure it is not every day. If you are living in the country and working in town and you come home at night and want to get some sleep, that would get a little bit annoying. We have to realize it is the country and not the city limits. Talk about the roads, he knows what it is. They have a big saw mill, and now, with road restrictions, they tell them don't bring any logs in until the road restrictions are lifted. They have enough logs to last them road restrictions are off, and once in awhile these guys with loads of logs sneak in too soon, and it is not the saw mill operator, it's the logger.

Roger stated he would make a motion to approve it like it is here, then brought up the exhaust going out that way and asked if you could feed it out the South wall, realizes it is a lot to pipe? That would keep the noise level down from the quarter mile neighbors, and if they could do that, it would be appreciated.

Joseph stated it is possible.

Ken asked about condition #1, if 7:00 am would work for him, as 8am is too restrictive. Added, agriculture doesn't wait for 8:00 in the morning to get going.

Jim asked Jacob how early does he think he will be sawing?

Joseph stated he didn't think he'd be starting by 8:00, but did not want to be tied to that. Maybe some days we might get in a bind to get it done and we might have to start at 7:00 am.

Ken straight out asked if 7:00 am would work for him?

Jacob stated 7 would be perfect.

Ken suggested we move that to 7.

Henry stepped up to the applicants' table and stated he is the one who runs the mill, and asked if the exhaust could go out the roof? It would be a lot less distance and didn't know if that would work for the board or the West wall?

Roger asked if they could put a muffler on it?

Henry stated it has a turbo on it already.

Roger acknowledged a turbo would quiet it down by a non-restrictive large muffler would be better.

Joseph stated that would be the easiest route if we put a muffler on it.

Jim asked Roger if that was okay, and Roger came back with if you get the exhaust out the and put a muffler on it, it wouldn't bother the neighbor.

Adam asked if they are making condition or just suggestions.

Roger stated to make it a condition.

Jim asked Roger to withdraw the original motion.

Roger stated if you put a bent pipe on the top, bend it to the South.

Stan, don't you think 7-6 Monday through Saturday a lot of hours? What about the people who only have the weekend off? What would they think if I started up a sawmill on Sunday when they are having church? That's 66 hours a week, a grocery store isn't open that long hardly.

Public, first they requested 8 to 6 and now we extended that.

Jim stated they never requested that, it was our suggestion. How many hours do you guys run your tractors and machinery.

Ken stated you have to remember this is an agricultural operation, they work hours, so you know what that is, this is no different than your farm was.

Lloyd but, sawing logs is not farming.

Jim and Ken both corrected it is an Ag business.

Jim stated now we have nine conditions.

Adam stated to be clear, Roger is withdrawing the original motion and making a new motion with the nine conditions.

Roger, yes.

Ken seconded.

Tim asked how many sawmills do we have in the County with the hours of operation on them?

Adam stated he did not know the answer off hand, but it is common practice to list the hours of operation.

Tim asked if Adam knew if they all go six days a week?

Adam stated most of them are very similar to that. Whether they actually operate those hours, he doubted it.

Tim asked the applicants if they saw quite a bit on Saturdays?

Joseph stated it was very doubtful they will saw on Saturdays.

Tim suggested keeping the 7 to 6 with no Saturdays. We have to find compromise on this. Don't want to restrict you, giving more week day hours, but...

Henry stated he would like to keep Saturday, for an example plowing that week and it rains on Saturday, then he could saw.

Tim stated he sees both sides and he realizes it's agriculture.

Joseph offered say five days a week, then if we lose Wednesday to plant corn, then we could fill in Saturday.

Jim stated just because these are the hours, it doesn't mean you would be running that whole time.

Tim stated he was trying to get some consistency, he knows people are living close and trying to find commonality between agriculture and people living there. Not saying who was there first or second, but trying to find common ground with everybody. He is not a fan of Saturdays, obviously, understands people who work farms have to work on Saturdays. He stated he was speaking for the board and doesn't want to send it back to the Planning Commission, and trying to avoid that.

Jim stated that is good, because he is getting tired of that. He was fine with the 7 to 6, then offered to shorten the hours on Saturday.

Tim, about 8 to noon on Saturday? Does that do anything?

Wally stated he didn't think they were going to be sawing the whole 66 hours a week. Sawing logs is a lot like baling hay, might be able to Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and the next day doesn't work out, you bale hay while you can, that could land on Saturday. It's the same way with sawing logs.

Stan stated 5 days a week with limited hours might be better if they have to fill an order or something.

Jim stated he understood where Tim is coming from too.

Tim stated if you could cut it down to five days a week and be conscious of...

Henry stated they would try to avoid Saturdays, and added when it's cold they don't like to start up, doesn't want to give up a Saturday.

Tim stated he is not trying to discourage business at all, this will all help with the noise, and the change of exhaust. We have to work through this so it doesn't come back. Then you guys can continue.

Roger H. added once they get the exhaust and run it out the roof, and put a muffler on it, he didn't think anyone will hear it.

Tim, it will help immensely. 7-6 Monday through Saturday, choice of five days a week.

Adam stated we, as staff, would never be able to enforce that.

Jim stated we have a motion on the table right now, and a second.

Roger with a motion to approve with the nine conditions as amended, Ken seconded.

Conditions:

1. Hours of operation shall be restricted to 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM CST, Monday through Saturday.
2. Operation of the sawmill shall be conducted within a permitted structure.
3. Outdoor storage of products shall be allowed but shall be conducted in compliance with Section 9.01B of the Todd County Planning and Zoning Ordinance.
4. Business traffic shall access the site via County 84 from the south. North bound traffic from the site shall not be allowed for protection of the roadway.
5. Operation site shall meet all the setback requirements for the zoning district in which it's located.

6. There shall be no loading or unloading of materials within the road right of way.
7. Applicant shall work with Eagle Valley Township to establish a sufficient business access and establish truck route signage.
8. Establishment of an exhaust system directed through the roof of the structure with inclusion of a muffler.
9. Applicant shall abide by all other applicable federal, state, and local standards.

Roll call vote commenced as follows:

Board member	Vote (yes or no)
Ken Hovet	Yes
Roger Hendrickson	Yes
Lloyd Graves	Yes
Arnie Boie	Yes
Jim Pratt	Yes

Motion carried. Jim noted the application will be presented to the County Board of Commissioners on March 19th, 2024.

AGENDA ITEM 6: Christopher Sundermann- PID 14-0009002 – Kandota Township

Request to Rezone from R-10 to AF-2 for a permanent dwelling.

Christopher was present as the applicant.

Staff Findings: Adam read the staff report. The staff report is available for viewing upon request in the Planning & Zoning Office.

Proposed Condition(s):

1. All future land uses shall abide by Todd County Planning and Zoning Ordinances.
2. Land owner shall abide by all other applicable federal, state, and local standards.

Correspondence received: Yes, Michael and Linda Bregenzer. This letter may be viewed in full at the Planning and Zoning office upon request.

Public comment:

Scott Duchene, neighbor, wondering what the need to rezone is, as dwellings are already allowed.

Board discussion:

Roger Hendrickson stated he had viewed this before. It's out in a field with a township road on it. Field had soybeans on it last year, heard some things about prime farmland and in his opinion, it is not exactly prime farmland. Looked like a good spot to build. Good place.

Ken stated this is a whole 40 acres, right?

Adam confirmed, yes. When it comes to AF-1 and AF-2 we always want to rezone the whole forty acres because the decisions are made based on the whole forty.

Ken stated AF-2 would allow two residences. R-10 would allow how many?

Adam confirmed two for AF-2 and R-10 would ultimately allow four dwellings (each 10 acres).

Arnie stated the gentleman who asked the reason for rezoning has not been addressed yet.

Chris stated he could address that. The only reason he is rezoning is he actually farms that field and the guy that owns it wants to just sell me that five acres, and in R-10, you have to buy ten acres. In AF-2 you only have to buy two. That’s why we decided to rezone, because it sits dead in the middle where 2 ½ acres in an AF-2 zone and 2 ½ acres is in R-10 zone, so we have to rezone the whole quarter to AF-2. So that’s the reason.

Roger clarified, that is all he is requesting, the rezoning.

Chris agreed that is where he has to start, that accomplished first.

Ken, noticed it will not be spot-zoning and moved to approve this with the two conditions as presented, and Arnie seconded.

Conditions:

1. All future land uses shall abide by Todd County Planning and Zoning Ordinances.
2. Land owner shall abide by all other applicable federal, state, and local standards.

Roll call vote commenced as follows:

Board member	Vote (yes or no)
Ken Hovet	Yes
Roger Hendrickson	Yes
Lloyd Graves	Yes
Arnie Boie	Yes
Jim Pratt	Yes

Motion carried. Jim noted the application will be presented to the County Board of Commissioners on March 19th, 2024.

AGENDA ITEM 7: William Hartsock- PID 16-0010300 – Little Elk Township

Review of Conditional Use Permit #CUP-2020-027 for a 60-site campground in AF1 and Shoreland Zoning.

Christopher was present as the applicant.

Staff Findings: Adam read the staff report. The staff report is available for viewing upon request in the Planning & Zoning Office. This was remanded back from the commissioners from last month for further considerations. The time line we recommended was an additional two years and the commissioners felt it was too much time. He had some additional photos from Bill and we just need to re-establish a recommendation to the commissioner based on that.

Options:

1. Allow a continuation of the CUP.
2. Allow for a continuation of the CUP with an expected completion date of February 1st, 2026.
3. Revoke the CUP based on the findings.

Correspondence received: None.

Public comment: None.

Board discussion:

Tim, concluded two years was too long and more satisfied with one year, and when it came to the vegetative visual screening, they stated they were not satisfied with just the lilacs. We felt a little more compelled to go with a more substantial and to make up for some lost time, something more established more at the two to three-foot height, preferably trees and/or shrubs for two rows. Figured if someone had more of a financial investment into the screening.

Short recess by Jim at 8:18 pm. resumed at 8:21.

Tim continued, felt the screening should have been more established when putting that in and shared with the board Bill's explanation, that he felt they would be torn up while installing the water lines and sewage systems and what not. Going forward now, they felt the year was too long, and they also wanted an inspection date from Planning and Zoning department or a site visit would suffice from a board member. We need to find some more common ground and get it through to the board.

Bill asked to respond and asked he will be reimbursed for the lilacs? He stated he could put trees there, and when it gets seventy mile an hour winds they'll blow over. Or when it gets windy, it will topple small trees over. Cost of replacement. Lilacs are a good solid foundation, and if you want a good solid screen, Lilacs will promote that, a tree won't. When he does trees, on his property now, he wants a clean looking tree. His trees will stay trimmed. So, they will grow up and they will look scrubby as long as they have dead fall in them. A Lilac will fill in on its' own and keep growing thick and stay healthy, and give you full foliage.

Tim stated he is not in dis-agreement at all, but he stated you will have to put both of them in there, honestly to see this thing through. It was an actual condition from one of the commissioners was a row of shrubs and a row of trees. He is just telling him what the board recommendation is and is trying to get this approved and go through, in the best interest of all.

Where he is putting them, everything is powerlines. He has his campers where they need to be, far enough off the road, and the power lines are between him and the road. He has already talked to the power company about putting in the Lilacs where the power line is.

Jim stated the power companies don't want trees under the powerlines.

Tim stated he understands, however, the question from the board was being the CUP was 36 months old why there was no attempt there at all.

Bill in defense asked why Statema gave him a design and a bid for twenty some thousand dollars, for the septic system, and why he never put it in? Last year said there was still a shortage of tanks and was still going to put it in last year. He had it put in from a guy in Motley within a week of contacting him, but Statema said there

was still a shortage of tanks. He stated he was doing what he can and he is living on a fixed income and it cost him an extra ten grand to get it done so he could apply. There is seven thousand feet of wire sitting there and he has four thousand foot of plumbing with all the connectors, every corner, every breaker, sitting there paid for at the property. It's not me you are waiting on. He has four phone calls out to four different plumbers, Lahr, Randall area, and different plumbers, still no phone calls back. He is waiting on the licensed people. You are not waiting on him. He has everything he needs, Lilacs ordered and ready to be planted when they come in. Ditches and trenches are dug. Posts are in ready for the boxes. If you look through the pictures you can see every box in there ready for power, everything pre-done. All they have to do is stick conduit and the wire in it.

Tim stated he had relayed that to the board, as well, from last time.

Bill stated according to the legal terms of the County, as long as he hasn't vacated for 36 months, two years or three years extension doesn't matter. You can give it to him. You can take it away if I have vacated it for more than thirty-six months.

Adam stated he didn't agree with that interpretation.

Jim stated the Planning Commission does not have to give him an extension.

Adam clarified, last meeting we established that this board wanted to give Bill more time to complete this. Don't think the County Board was necessarily apposed to that, so really this discussion should be narrowed down to just that time frame. We are not here to discuss the conditions or anything like that.

Jim addressed Tim and asked what he thought the board...

Tim stated to be honest, he thought this board nailed it right on the money, the first time around.

Jim stated if we did what he wanted, he would send it right back to them, but knew that wouldn't work.

Roger stated it pissed him off this was sent back to us! We had one before, that had a CUP for ten years. Did not do a damn thing! We pulled his permit, he came back, reapplied and gave it to him for what he wanted in the first place. Now we are sitting here with a guy that went three years' worth of covid, can't get anybody to work, can't get the product. Roger stated he had the same thing when the hydraulic pump went out on his skid loader. None available! Luckily, Farm Right had one that had burned up and they took the used pump out of it. He was sitting there with a skid loader he couldn't use, because nobody was working during that time! And now, we are arguing if we are going to have Lilacs or trees or one year to do all of this. Like he said there was one that went ten years and didn't do a damn thing, and now we are worried about this one that went through a bad time?

Bill stated all the electric had to come out of New York, out of his pocket. Every box that he has sitting in the cupboard, put together come from Fargo, Twin Cities, Bemidji, Grand Rapids, Deer River any major store.

Jim stated our two years only gave him a year and a half basically. November through February you are not digging in the ground.

Ken stated the last meeting we approved this, admitted he was the one asking for the two years. We thought about doing one year and you said that was way too restrictive for what you had left to do. You already have a big investment and we really don't want to have to cut you off from that.

Bill stated remember, this is all done on his fixed military disability income. Prices have gone up.

Ken stated he would still argue for the two years and send it back to the commissioners, then if that's the way it's got to be.

Adam stated, so nothing changes. Last meeting, we had established that we would allow the continuation of the CUP with a completion date of February 1, 2026.

Jim stated we could go to November, because you are not going to dig after November.

Adam clarified, so shorten it up to four months and set the completion date to November 1, 2025.

Ken said to go to December 31st and make it an even year.

Lloyd stated if we get a bad winter, we can't do anything anyway, after that.

Bill stated his plans were hoping to have the plumbing, electrical and the digging done by this spring, with the only thing left is put the fencing in and get the Lilacs planted in the spring. He repeated he can't move forward if he cannot get a licensed contractor. He stated it is not something he doesn't know how to do, just that he is not licensed and can't according to the County.

Jim asked Adam if he had the list of the conditions.

Adam stated he does, and there were seven of them from back in 2020. It is not so much as to get the camp-ground started, but the conditions themselves, to operate as a camp ground, have not been met. We cannot amend the conditions, they are what they are.

Bill added he cannot get them without the licensed people to do it.

Jim stated to change the completion date.

Adam stated we could go with what Ken stated, to allow to continue with the CUP with the completion date of December 31st, 2025 and after that day we would do this review again and reconsider.

Jim, would it automatically get a site visit then?

Adam yes, we'd either verify that all of those conditions are being met and you guys won't see this again because Bill got it all done, or we would review it around that time and bring this back and we would do the exact same thing over here, again.

Jim stated that is what he was asking and that it will be reviewed again.

Ken motioned for continuation of the CUP with the completion date of December 31st, 2025, Arnie seconded.

Conditions:

1. Allow a continuation of the CUP.
2. Allow for a continuation of the CUP with an expected completion date of December 31st, 2025.
3. Revoke the CUP based on the findings.

Roll call vote commenced as follows:

Board member	Vote (yes or no)
Ken Hovet	Yes
Roger Hendrickson	Yes
Lloyd Graves	Yes
Arnie Boie	Yes
Jim Pratt	Yes

Motion carried. Jim noted the application will be presented to the County Board of Commissioners on March 19th, 2024.

Adam stated not having a meeting on April 4th, but possibly April 2nd, but we will notice it as such, and if that doesn't work we will look at another option. Check your calendars and we will confirm April 2nd will work for you, just to move it to Tuesday from Thursday and if it doesn't, we'll figure something else out.

Roger motioned to adjourn and Lloyd seconded. Voice vote to adjourn the March Planning Commission Meeting, no dissention heard. Motion carried and meeting adjourned at 8:35 PM.