

BOX ELDER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES JUNE 15, 2017

The Board of Planning Commissioners of Box Elder County, Utah met in the Box Elder County Commission Chambers at 7:00 p.m. The following members were present by a roll call, constituting a quorum:

<i>Roll Call</i>		<i>the following Staff was present:</i>	
Chad Munns	Excused	Scott Lyons	Com Dev Dir
Laurie Munns	Vice-Chairman	Marcus Wager	Planner
Kevin McGaha	Member	Diane Fuhriman	Exec. Secretary
Bonnie Robinson	Member	Steve Hadfield	Excused
Mellonee Wilding	Member	Brian Duncan	Deputy Co. Attorney
Desiray Larsen	Member	Jeff Scott	Co. Commissioner
Michael Udy	Member	Bill Gilson	Co. Road Dept.

The Invocation was offered by **Commissioner Michael Udy**
Pledge was led by **Commissioner Laurie Munns**

The following citizens were present & signed the attendance sheet

(See Attachment No. 1 – Attendance Sheet.)

The Minutes of the May 18, 2017 meeting were made available to the Planning Commissioners prior to this meeting and upon review a **Motion** was made by **Commissioner Mellonee Wilding** to approve the minutes; seconded by **Commissioner Bonnie Robinson** and passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Vice-Chair Laurie Munns called for the public hearings on the agenda by informing those in attendance that each item would be handled separately, and that the time for the hearings was to allow the public the opportunity to voice any concerns and that the Commissioners would listen to the comments and concerns. After the public hearing on an item the Planning Commissioners would then discuss and take action on the item.

BOX ELDER COUNTY RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN. (ACTION)

Staff said in a 2015 legislative session the legislature required all counties to prepare a resource management plan. The requirements outlined specific resources needing to be addressed within

each county and how those resources would be managed. The resource management plan is to apply only to public lands within the county. Once the plans are prepared and adopted by the counties as part of their general plans, they will be sent to the state and the state would use them to create a state resource management plan.

Vice-Chair Laurie Munns asked for comments from those in attendance. There were no comments.

With no comments being heard **Commissioner Desiray Larsen** made a motion to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by **Commissioner Bonnie Robinson** and the public hearing closed.

Staff informed the commissioners as a part of this effort, the county has been working with Bio-West, a consulting firm from the Logan area. Bio-West specializes in creating these types of plans. The county has also brought in a steering committee consisting of county commissioners, a representative from the planning commission, an agricultural representative, a representative from the Bear River Association of Governments, and a representative of west Box Elder County from the Park Valley/Grouse Creek area. The committee met once a month in person and once a month by phone in order to get to the point we are now. The committee held public outreach meetings in Brigham, Tremonton and the Park Valley area. The meetings were held to inform, educate and answer questions from any residents interested in giving input and participating in this process. A survey was created and mailed so citizens could participate if they could not make to the open houses. There was a good response to the survey. We feel we have a good draft of the plan we are presenting for adoption.

ACTION: Commissioner Mellonee Wilding asked if the plan is approved is there a way to make changes to the plan and can the changes be made at any time.

Staff answered stating the plan will be adopted as part of the Box Elder County General Plan and can be amended at any time.

Commissioner Desiray Larsen has read the plan and found some errors and typos. She submitted a corrected copy to staff with notations and questions outlined for staff to review.

Commissioner Kevin McGaha asked if the purpose of this plan is to guide future ordinances and not necessarily impose any restrictions.

Staff informed the commissioners when the federal government wants to do some planning for these lands within our county, they are required to consult any plan the county has. We are the local residents and should have a say as to what happens locally. There are federal statutes requiring them to consult county plans prior to making any decisions with public lands. One of the most common issues has to do with grazing rights.

Commissioner Bonnie Robinson questioned if this is one way of protecting our county as best we can. Staff agreed and stated it gives us a say about the land within our county.

MOTON: A motion was made by **Commissioner Bonnie Robinson** to forward a recommendation of approval county resource management plan to the county commission. The motion was seconded by **Commissioner Michael Udy** and passed unanimously.

SORENSEN TEXT AMENDMENT, Z17-015 Text amendment to Chapter 3-2-080-2.2, frontage regulations in the RR-2 zone, of the Box Elder County Land Use Management & Development Code. (ACTION)

Staff informed the commission the applicant is requesting a text amendment be made regarding Section 3-2-080-2.1 having to do with the width and frontage requirements. He is proposing the frontage and width requirement be lowered to 175 ft. for the RR-2 zone only; it currently sits at 250 ft. Staff reminded the commissioners of the approval standards for text amendments and zoning changes which are as follows:

Whether the proposed amendment is consistent with goals, objectives and policies of the County's General Plan;

The proposed amendment is consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the County's General Plan.

Whether the proposed amendment is harmonious with the overall character of existing development in the vicinity of the subject property;

This text amendment would affect all unincorporated areas of Box Elder County that have an RR-2 Zoning designation.

The extent to which the proposed amendment may adversely affect adjacent property; and

The proposed amendment should not adversely affect adjacent property, this is what the Public Hearing process is for.

The adequacy of facilities and services intended to serve the subject property, including, but not limited to, roadways, parks and recreation facilities, police and fire protection, schools, storm water drainage systems, water supplies, and waste water and refuse collection.

The proposed amendment should not put a strain on any of these facilities.

Vice-Chair Laurie Munns opened the public hearing for public comment.

Kelly Lemon, Collinston, read the email he previously sent to staff opposing the zone change.

(See Attachment No. 2 – E-mail.)

Pat Garner, Collinston, she and her husband oppose the reduction of the current 250 ft. frontage requirement for the RR-2 zone. She thinks it would dramatically change the look of the county. She stated Rupp Properties and Bingham properties have abided by the 250 ft. requirement and are selling their properties. She said the density will start packing in very quickly if the frontage is reduced. At one mile there is 21 homes at 250 ft. vs. 30 homes at 175 ft. She is very concerned about the look of the community. Ms. Garner asked the commission to keep the standard of what the county has already established.

Nelson Barksdale, Collinston, lives directly behind Pat Garner and to the side of Kelly Lemmon. He agrees with the points already made, and would like it to stay the way it is. He asked the commission to postpone this decision until such time the community can develop their own planning/zoning development next week.

Jon Sorensen, applicant, stated part of the reason we are asking for the text amendment is there are other properties in the county in the RR-2 zone that the frontage is not big enough and does not allow the landowners to utilize their property if they choose to develop it. As far as impact goes, his purpose is to tie into Bear River Water Conservancy, so this should not affect any wells. As far as frontage, it does make them narrower but he does not see how four lots is going to impact the area that much. Mr. Sorensen said the adjacent properties across the street do not meet the 250 ft. frontage. He said he can be flexible with the footage but he would like it to be reduced to not use up as much frontage so the individual we are purchasing the land from still has access to the property.

With no other comments being heard **Commissioner Desiray Larsen** made a motion to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by **Commissioner Michael Udy** and the public hearing closed.

ACTION: Staff said where this is a legislative item, there are things the commission may take into consideration such as public comment. If you so choose to forward a recommendation of approval, we do have some suggestions for conditions of approval.

Commissioner Mellonee Wilding asked how the 250 ft. came about. Was safety a concern when the number was derived so we should take that into consideration, or is it just a number. Staff is not aware of any safety or access concerns when the 250 ft. was decided.

Commissioner Desiray Larsen questioned what similar frontage requirements are. Staff stated RR-1 was recently reduced to 120 ft. and the RR-5 is also 250 ft.

Commissioner Mellonee Wilding thought it would make sense to adjust this footage to be in-between those two zones. There is some logic there that 175 ft. for a 2-acre would seem sufficient.

Commissioner Laurie Munns verified the Collinston area is the only area with the RR-2 zone in the county. She asked Jon Sorensen if 175 ft. is what he had to have or if he was willing to work with people and consider 200 ft.

Mr. Sorensen reiterated the reason they came up with 175 ft. is to not take up too much frontage. The person he is purchasing the land from plans on still farming the land. He is not necessarily opposed to changing it to 200 ft.

Commissioner Mellonee Wilding is concerned we are getting really nit-picky about a few feet. People need to be able to develop their land as they want. She feels this is a better solution than the one presented at the meeting last month.

Commissioner Bonnie Robinson questioned if other developers have had to abide by the 250 ft. rule is it right to change it for another developer.

Commissioner Laurie Munns said if the code is change to 175 ft., it would make an impact on what their community plan would look like.

Staff responded by stating generally community plans do not get this detailed. Code get detailed but community plans would address zoning or proposed zoning. They may be as generic as we desire residential here and commercial zoning there. Community and general plans do not address frontages.

Commissioner Kevin McGaha interjected he has heard in opposition largely just aesthetic questions of how the community will not like the way it is going to look, concerns about septic systems, ten home per half-mile as opposed to 15 homes per half-mile, growth and traffic and safety concerns and that there is a master plan in the works. None of those are really persuasive to him. The most persuasive argument for him is if there is a 250 ft. frontage on a 5-acre lot and it seems to him if it goes down to a 2-acre lot that there should be some adjustment for that. As far as esthetics, everyone can argue esthetics as long as the day goes and everyone will have a different opinion. Beauty is in the eye of the beholder. Commissioner McGaha is not hearing any health, safety and welfare concerns. He is leaning strongly toward forwarding a recommendation.

Commissioner Mellonee Wilding stated any developer who abided by the 250 ft. could have also requested a text amendment change to the footage. It is not like we are imposing on one and not the other; everyone had the opportunity to make their frontage smaller.

Commissioner Laurie Munns read the review standards.

MOTION: A motion was made by **Commissioner Kevin McGaha** to forward a recommendation of approval to the county commission for Text Amendment Z17-015. The motion was seconded by **Commissioner Michael Udy** and the motion passed with **Commissioner Desiray Larsen** voting nay.

PROMONTORY POINT RESOURCES, LLC CUIP17-001 Proposal to amend bonding requirements as set forth in CUP16-002. (ACTION)

Staff said the applicant is Promontory Point Resources, LLC. The applicant received approval, on CUP16-002 in the March 2017 Planning Commission Meeting, subject to conditions. One of the conditions of approval was a \$5M bond be posted to basically be a maintenance bond. Going along with the landfill operation, significant improvements would be made to East Promontory Road, approximately 36 miles of roadway. The applicant is requesting an amendment to CUP16-002 and proposed to the planning commission to reduce the bonding amount. Staff read the following proposal to the commissioners. *We believe the following is a reasonable compromise to address the county's concerns within our financing constraints. PPR will continue to take responsibility for additional grading and maintenance of the gravel portion of the road to county specifications. A \$3M performance bond will be posted by the company awarded the road improvements.*

Staff stated it was determined as part of CUP16-002 that a \$3.47M improvement would be done to East Promontory Road and as a part of infrastructure improvements, the winning bidder posts a performance bond to insure the work they do on the road holds up for one year. After one year the county would go out and inspect the road and insure it is holding up to its construction standards and the performance bond would then be returned to the highest bidder. The final portion of the new proposal is that a \$1M performance bond will be posted by the company for future maintenance and repairs related to the company's truck traffic.

Vice-Chair Laurie Munns opened the public hearing for public comment.

Gabriel Blackhelm, Brigham City, feels the people here are speaking about another county, and do not represent the values he was raised with. He thinks the commissioners do not pay attention to the public, and do not represent the values that Brigham City was founded on. He advised the commissioner to listen to the public and listen to the people who call this place home and not the people from Promontory Point Resources. He feels Promontory Point should not be granted \$5M to do road improvements.

Brent Kenley, North Shore Rock Products, said in 2009 when the economy crashed, prices were at a certain level. We are now above those prices in construction. He thinks the bond amount was set at what it should be, but here we are again with them trying to lower the bond amount. He thinks PPR will continue to come back until the commission is worn down and they have everything they want, their way. Mr. Kenley stated PPR has not complied with the DWR. They should still have to make those improvements and still have to have those approvals before they ever use the road. He does not understand why they are being allowed to continue to ask for changes, and when they don't get what they want, they can come back and ask again.

Boyd Udy stated he lives on Promontory Road. He thought there was going to be a speed limit posted, but there is not. The trucks go so much faster than 50 mph and there are a lot of sharp turns on the road. He stated he was run off the road by one of the big semi-trucks. He is concerned with the safety factor the commission was going to put in the proposal. He has cattle on the road and a granddaughter helping him once in a while. He asked the sheriff to look at it but nothing is being done. From the standpoint of safety, a speed limit sign needs to be posted.

Kris Udy, is concerned because the guidelines have already been set, but now we are starting with the back slide that she knew would happen, and why she opposed this in the first place. We are going to set out the criteria until everybody goes away and now we are going to come back and cut it in half and half again. The trucks are traveling the road now. She understood they were not to travel the road until the repairs were made. There are corners on the road where two trucks cannot pass. If the trucks are traveling 55 mph, someone is going off the road and it was her husband the other day. She said at the beginning of this, the citizens were asked what was wanted for safety. It was set in writing and now PPR wants to change it, and they will again, until everyone lets them get away with what they want to do. She is highly opposed to this and said the commissioners should be as well; these are your citizens. She asked the commission to please consider the safety of the citizens of Promontory.

Randy Moulding, Thatcher, said Bill Gilson and Brent Slater did an excellent job when the bond was first created. It was to be a minimum and he thinks we need to stay with what has already been decided. He said construction costs are going up, not down. He said Brent Slater told him the amount set was a minimum to cover costs. The county hired Mr. Slater to do his job and he did it. He would like the commission to take that into consideration.

Brett Snelgrove, Promontory Point Resources says he appreciates everyone taking the time to consider this. He clarified they are not changing anything safety wise. He does not want people run off the road, and he wants the speed limit met. The reason they are asking for the change is when the industrial revenue bond went through, the land was collateralized for that. In order to collateralize the bond, it has be cash, which to put \$5M into a non-interest bearing account to just sit there, doesn't benefit the county or benefit the project at all. What we have proposed is a total of \$4.4M; if we need to make adjustments to the amount we can. We originally were going to review the bond amount each year in September and the bond amount would be adjusted based on the conditions of the road. He has talked to Bill Gilson to make sure the needs of the county are being met. This would be a cash bond of \$1M as well as the bond that will be placed by the company that is awarded for the improvements. Mr. Snelgrove said he has been working with Bill Gilson to get money into an escrow account for the \$3.4M of improvements. That way, we are able to proceed and get the safety signs up.

Brent Kenley, North Shore Rock Products, said two different things are being talked about. A performance bond is what the contractor puts up do his work. The \$5M bond the standards were set for, was a bond set aside so if there was a disaster on the road, there would be the proper amount of money to fix it.

Bill Gilson, County Road Supervisor, agreed it is a performance bond. It ties the contractor Promontory Resources is paying. There are 22 miles of pavement and only 5 of those miles are not going to be overlaid by the contractor that their money is hiring through us. The argument was brought up – are we being heavy handed? Are we double dipping to a point? Not only are they hiring a contractor to fix our road, plus we are requiring them to have a one-year performance bond on the fixes they do to those 17 miles of paved roadway. They are financing the fixes, they are financing any overages on bids and also the performance bond for the year. It is almost to a point where we are asking for \$8.5M. Mr. Gilson agreed the cost to do construction and repair roadways is extremely expensive in this day and time. One thing PPR is doing by coming to the table and us recognizing the costs they are incurring for the performance bond, for the contractor to do the overlays, they are asking can we meet in the middle somewhere and bring it down to where it is a little more equitable. They are contractually going to be obligated for the care of the 14 miles of gravel road. He thinks going forward with this, for the costs they are incurring with the \$3.4M overlays, plus another \$1M bond and the contractual obligation on the gravel road section, he thinks if very doable from that point. Mr. Gilson address the issue of trucks on the road, Whitaker construction, he said he has received two phone calls about a week ago, contacted Brett Snelgrove and informed him his contractor was using our roadway and did not have pilot cars which is in violation of the CUP requirements and did not have their bond in place to be hauling or taking equipment down our roadway. He said Mr. Snelgrove contacted Whitaker Construction and told them to cease and desist. Mr. Gilson will call the sheriff's department to see if the patrol can be

increased. We will have a feasibility study on the speed limit and also have those signs installed at both ends of the roadway. The speed limit is unposted right now which means 55 mph or to conditions.

Charlie Young, Promontory, stated on the gravel road yesterday, two big semi-trucks with scrapers were on one of the sharp turns, we had to pull off to the side of the road so they could get by. There have been several trucks on the road every day he has been out there. So somebody is not telling the truth and it is not us.

John Young, Promontory, would like to make sure the safety of the public is taken care of. He thinks the integrity of the planning commission is at risk if you change what you said you were going to do.

Hearing no other public comment **Commissioner Bonnie Robinson** made a motion to close the public hearing on Promontory Point Resources, LLC CUP17-001 Proposal to amend bonding requirements as set forth in CUP16-002. The motion was seconded by **Commissioner Desiray Larsen** and the public hearing closed.

ACTION:

Brian Duncan, Chief Deputy Attorney for Box Elder County Civil Division, said the county does have the responsibility and liability to maintain county roads. This road is not well-trafficked, being a sparsely populated area and maintenance and repairs to the road have been minimal. Our concern is the maintenance bond was set at \$5M to insure the county's costs were adequately covered if not properly maintained by the waste management company. The reason why we do that is to draw down on if they do not meet up to their obligation. He understands it may be years before the spur comes in that will re-route the traffic coming in. The county attorney's office is concerned a \$1M bond would subject the county to financial liability to maintain this road and would not adequately cover a failure by PPR to maintain the road. The alternative is to do it ourselves or seek litigation. We are deeply concerned the \$1M bond is not enough to keep the risk involved in this on PPR instead of passing it on to the county.

Commissioner Desiray Larsen questioned the difference between a performance bond and a maintenance bond.

Attorney Duncan answered by stating a performance bond is going to be a part of the improvements that are made by PPR and the contractors going to bid on those improvements. Part of that is a one-year warranty under state statute. After the year is over the performance bond is no longer valid. The \$5M bond is a maintenance bond will kick in after the first year and will be for any deterioration, any problems and any maintenance needing to be done to keep the road up to standards and keep it in good repair.

Staff informed the commission the maintenances bond would remain in place until the site is used by rail and trucks are no longer used, then the county road department will do a final inspection on the road and the bond would be released.

Attorney Duncan agreed the bond is not limited by a specific amount of time but limited by use. Once the rail spur goes in, the road will no longer be used. The \$5M is estimated on the time and cost going into maintaining the road until the rail spur can be put in. All estimates he has seen suggest a \$1M bond will not be enough to cover the costs and we would be at the good graces of PPR to maintain the road.

Commissioner Laurie Munns surmised the \$5M bond is an insurance policy for the county on the maintenance of the road. She noted all the points made in the public hearing. She stated the safety issue is another topic, the issue here is amending the bonding requirements. We have rights and laws in this country and we are here to help make the transition work. We hope we do the best for the county we can. She questioned who pays for the performance bond.

Bill Gilson answered that PPR would be part of the bid package so when the bid is awarded to the contractor it is built in to their price to do the overlays. If there is a problem such as the overlay cracks or comes apart or fails in some degree, the county will not release the bond back to them at the end of the cycle unless it is repaired and there is a good product in place.

Commissioner Mellonee Wilding is concerned with starting at \$1M and trying to go up from there and questioned if the bond should start high and get lower.

Commissioner Laurie Munns is also concerned with starting at \$5M and dropping it to \$1M and then going back to \$5M, we are not being consistent with what we are doing. She reminded everyone what happened with I-15 and noted it was not just \$1M for repairs.

Bill Gilson stated when the initial approval of the permit, we were scheduled to meet every September and assess the roadway. At that time the option is to lower the bond or increase the bond. Part of the stipulations within the permit is allowing to adjust the bond on a yearly basis on the condition of the roadway.

Commissioner Laurie Munns said since this is a CUP, the planning commission will make the decision. It does not go before the county commission. The planning commission set the original conditional use. As chairman for this meeting she is aware she cannot make a motion but expressed her opinion that the planning commission set the bond \$5M and thinks that is where it needs to stay.

Commissioner Kevin McGaha suggested the conditional use permit that has been issued says what it say. He noted the concerns the citizens have of violations of the CUP and said if there is a violation of the CUP, then the CUP can be revoked. He feels he is not in a position where he can make an informed decision. He said with the county road director and the county attorney's office having differing views, he would like to see those offices get together and make another recommendation. He would like to see this item tabled until those two entities can hammer out the issues they have between them.

Attorney Duncan stated Attorney Hadfield and Bill Gilson have already had discussions and does not think tabling the item will for further discussion will not change things.

Staff read the original CUP16-002 / SP16-001 Letter of Decision.

(See Attachment No. 2 – Letter.)

Attorney Duncan stated from what he has heard, where there is not a front end for the bond, there is a bond that is in place until Phase 3 which is a four-lane highway, that bond would be a part of getting the CUP. He suggested the maintenance bond would have to be done up front.

Brett Snelgrove, applicant, said to get a bond you would usually collateralize your land. We can't do that with the landfill, so to get a \$5M bond we put \$5M cash into a non-interest bearing account. Our point was why put \$5M somewhere it does not benefit anyone. It does not benefit the county and does not benefit the project.

Commissioner Mellonee Wilding stated it does benefit the county because it acts as an insurance policy for the county. She understands it is frustrating for PPR but it is a condition of the CUP.

Staff suggested instead of adjusting the amount, change the type of account the cash would be put into such as an interest bearing account.

John Young stated his frustration with the violations of the CUP.

MOTION: A motion was made by **Commissioner Michael Udy** to deny CUP17-001 to lower the bond amount. The motion died due to the lack of a second. **Commissioner Bonnie Robinson** made a motion to table CUP17-001. The motion was seconded by **Commissioner Kevin McGaha** and passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

CEDAR RIDGE SUBDIVISION PHASE 2, SS17-010. Preliminary approval for a 63-Lot subdivision located at approximately 12400 North Hillcrest Drive in the Deweyville area of unincorporated Box Elder County. (ACTION)

Staff said the applicant is requesting to preliminary approval of Cedar Ridge Phase 2 Subdivision. Phase 1 was approved in 1979 with 26 lots. Phase 2 would add an additional 63 lots. To the north of the property is agricultural MU-40 zoning, south is agriculture RR-2 zoning, east agricultural and MU-40 zoning and to the west is some residential and Grover excavation. There is an existing access of State Highway 38.

Commissioner Laurie Munns is concerned with so many homes up there, if a wildfire comes, how would those people be evacuated?

Staff answered two access points are required for anything more than 30 lots. Staff said they are still waiting on a letter from the gas company and other letters from the health department for the septic tank feasibility, geotechnical report, and then a title report from the title company. It is currently being reviewed by other county staff.

MOTION: A motion was made by Commissioner Mellonee Wilding to approve application SS17-010 Preliminary Plat for the Cedar Ridge Subdivision conditional upon the comments of staff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Desiray Larsen and passed unanimously.

Commissioner Laurie Munns requested a recess at 9:02 p.m. and the meeting reconvened at 9:07 p.m.

PROMONTORY POINT RESOURCES, LLC. SP17-001. Proposal to add a rail spur/services to the landfill property located on the south end of promontory point in unincorporated Box Elder County. (ACTION)

Staff stated the applicant is requesting site plan approval for rail services located at the south end of Promontory Point. The county engineer has requested more detail from the applicant with regard to the road/rail intersection as well as the storm water detention basins and storm water calculations. He is not opposed to approval but would like his concerns added as a condition of approval.

Commissioner Bonnie Robinson asked for clarification on what is being requested.

Staff stated permitted uses come before the planning commission for review.

Commissioner Laurie Wilding asked if the railroad had to give their approval for having a spur. Staff replied the railroad does have to give approval.

Commissioner Mellonee Wilding read the review standards as follows:

- A. The proposed use shall be allowed as a permitted use in the applicable zone. Yes**
- B. The proposed use shall conform to development standards of the applicable zone. Yes**
- C. The proposed use shall conform to all applicable regulations of general applicability and regulations for specific uses set forth in this Code. *This information is currently under review.***
- D. The proposed use shall conform to any other applicable requirements of Box Elder County Ordinances. *This information is currently under review.***
- E. If the proposed use is located on a lot or parcel which has been subdivided without County approval a subdivision plat shall be approved and recorded as a condition of approval. N/A**

MOTION: A motion was made by Commissioner Desiray Larsen to approve the application SP17-001 based on the conditions as outlined by staff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kevin McGaha and passed unanimously.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS - NONE

WORKING REPORTS

Sign Code

Commissioner Laurie Munns stated Chairman Chad Munns requested this item. We will postpone this item until next month's meeting when he will be in attendance.

PUBLIC COMMENTS - NONE

Commissioner Laurie Munns thanked everyone for attending and letting the commission see the process through. She said she has been on the planning commission for six or seven years and is still learning.

ADJOURN

MOTION: A motion was made by **Commissioner Bonnie Robinson** to adjourn the June 15, 2017 meeting. The motion was seconded by **Commissioner Mellonee** and passed unanimously.

Passed and adopted in regular session this 20th day of July 2017.

Chad Munns, Chairman
Box Elder County Planning Commission
