

Latah County Planning Commission
Minutes, 6 March 2001

Planning Commission [PC] Members: Skyler Schlueter [SS], John Hunt [JDH], Suvia Judd [SJ], Kathleen Warnick [KW], James Hagedorn [JH], Janet Hohle [JanH], Louise Barber [LB];
Planning Director, Gerard Billington [GB]

Present/Absent: SS, SJ, KW, JH, JanH, LB present; JDH, absent. Staff: GB, Sharae Moberly

Packet materials: agenda; minutes from 2/20/01

Handouts: rough draft of performance bond ordinance amendment; *Governing* (March 2001) article "Rendezvous with Density"

Meeting:

Minutes from 2/20/01 meeting accepted.

GB: CC passed the cell tower ordinance amendment, and then asked for a further amendment to include performance bonds in options ZC would have to use as a condition in any CUP application by a cell tower company. Information still lacking regarding whether a performance bond would be an unfair burden for smaller companies, estimates of removal costs, increasing cost of removal over time, etc. S. Moberly will continue to look into these matters. PC largely in favor of high amount for any performance bonds so the public would truly be protected from the cost of tower removal and land reclamation. Price of performance bonds is not exorbitant and any company unable to pay for one would not be welcome anyway; consumer price index might be applied to cover increasing costs over time; applied, say, every five years.

Question arose whether county would know if a bond were cancelled; the county would be notified by the bond company in the event of cancellation or non-payment, since the county would be the listed payee/beneficiary. PC/PD should come up with a timeline when it would act on removal in the case of a default. JH mentioned that it is difficult to get a performance bond, and harder to get one if you mess with one, so companies would probably stay closely in line. The bond would be tied to the permit in order to guarantee public's protection. The draft will be finalized and the public hearing for this amendment will take place at one of the April meetings. JH will ask an acquaintance who works for a tower installation/removal concern for assistance in assessing cost of tower removal. Other changes to the cell tower ordinance amendment were minor; typos, conflicting language; S. Moberly will address these.

Questions arose about whether PC should look at implications of clay mining vis-à-vis mineral resource development section of the ordinance in response to a recent newspaper article. GB said the March 10 conference in Lewiston is for the purpose of developing a market. The land in question in the Bovill area is ca. 10,000 acres of endowed land, under the auspices of the Land Board/IDL, managed for maximum return for public schools; ZC would not be involved. Janet will attend the conference.

Discussion moved to town meeting topics and format. Suggested topics include: mineral resource development, home occupations, junk, temporary dwellings for dependent persons, rural zone/land division/permitted and conditional uses, feedlots, and airports. PC decided to have trial town meetings that include all topics out in the county (as opposed to Moscow) and see how much response, and useful input, to these subjects it received; a change in the format of the meetings could be made if valuable input was not forthcoming. Presentations on each of the topics is necessary so public can meaningfully participate; decided that single-page summary sheets with information and questions for each topic would be drawn up by GB and SJ. JH would contact McClures (Daily News) to see about newspaper coverage. Further decided that

CC should peruse the draft of the revised ordinance in order to determine their topics of concern with draft before town meetings.

Next meeting 3 April 2001 at 5:30pm, County Courthouse, 2-B.

Submitted by: _____ 7 March 2001
Louise D. Barber