

PUBLIC HEARING – SEELEY LAKE SEWER ANNUAL ASSESSMENT
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2005 – 1:30 P.M.
ROOM 201 – COURTHOUSE ANNEX

The Public Hearing on the Seeley Lake Sewer Annual Assessment was opened at 1:30 p.m. by Acting Chair Barbara Evans. Commissioner Bill Carey and Commissioner Jean Curtiss were at the MACo Convention in Billings, Montana and joined the hearing via speaker telephone. Also present were Chief Administrative Officer Ann Mary Dussault and Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney Mike Sehestedt.

Ann Mary Dussault: For the record, I'm Ann Mary Dussault, Chief Administrative Officer for Missoula County. For the record, we have received 13 petitions in opposition to the proposed assessments and those will be entered into the record. Up until today's meeting, there were two letters in opposition and we've received two additional letters in opposition. We've received one letter in support. I'm sorry, there are five letters in opposition, in addition to the 13 petitions in opposition and one letter of support. By way of background, Commissioners what you have before you, and I believe, Bill and Jean, you have a faxed copy of what I'm going to present here in terms of the Resolutions and the Request for Commission Action.

Chair Curtiss: Yes we do.

Ann Mary Dussault: The Request for Commissioner Action that I authored states as follows: The action requested is consideration of two resolutions setting assessments for the Seeley Lake Sewer District. The date required is As Soon As Possible in order to get the assessment on the 2005 tax bills or to notify the Department of Revenue that this assessment will not be on the tax bills. In terms of background, a \$72 per parcel assessment was authorized by Resolution of the Board of County Commissioners on September 16, 2003 and levied in 2004, as a one-time levy. The Seeley Lake Sewer District is requesting a continuation of this assessment. Therefore, we have drafted two resolutions for your consideration. The first resolution is a resolution continuing the assessment of \$72 per lot for one year only and the second resolution would be a continuing assessment of \$72 per lot until changed by resolution of the Board of County Commissioners. Staff recommendation is as follows: Mike Sehestedt, who is here, Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney, has made the following comments. "I have concerns about making this a continuing resolution. We are acting under the authority of MCA 7-13-2302, which authorizes a levy for administrative expense when the other income of the district is insufficient. I believe that under this section, we need to do the levy annually and give folk a chance to be heard on the subject. This is very different than an assessment spreading the cost of an improvement or the fixing of a charge for service. Given the requirement for an annual request in MCA 7-13-2302, I would strongly urge that we act only one year at a time." Fiscal impact or budget implications - \$72 per lot assessment for a total of approximately \$32,000. There's a typo in my memo, Jean and Bill, that you'll see. It should be \$32,000, not \$35,000.

Chair Curtiss: Okay.

Ann Mary Dussault: I believe just then to continue throughout your packet, you have a copy of Mike's e-mail to me, wherein he gives his opinion about a continuing versus a one-time levy. You have a copy of the proposed resolution entitled Setting Assessment – Seeley Lake Sewer District. That's for continuing the assessment for one year. The next resolution is Setting Continuous Assessment – Seeley Lake Sewer District. That would be the resolution that would continue it until repealed by the Board of County Commissioners. You have a copy of the notice of the hearing that was published in the Missoulian and the Pathfinder and posted, and then you have a Notice of the Hearing that was mailed to residents. Then you have a memo from the Seeley Lake Sewer District outlining their activities and their budget. Madam Commissioner, that's all I have.

Commissioner Evans: We will open the public hearing and take testimony from anyone who wishes to give it. We do not do it here in proponents and opponents, you just come and say what you want to say. We would ask that you give your name for the record because we do keep a record of it.

Don Larson: Good afternoon, Commissioner and members of the County Board. My name is Don Larson for the record and I'm here today to speak in opposition to this assessment. As you folks know, all lakes die and probably Seeley Lake is dying faster than most because it does not have an inlet and an outlet at opposite ends, as most lakes that are healthy do. If you take Holland Lake or Lindbergh Lake or even Placid Lake, they have an outlet at one end and an inlet at the other. As a consequence, they are fairly well

flushed. Seeley Lake, by contrast, has an outlet and an inlet at the same end of the lake, so it's a settling pond and there's probably 100 years of bad logging practices that have contributed to the 15+ feet of silt in the lower end of the bay. Given that, I'd like to discuss the proposal for a sewer system. I content that the Sewer Board has not established a need for this sewer. There is no meaningful water quality data that's established the pollution levels from that lake and they have not identified where, if any, pollution comes from. They have never monitored upstream users. They have never adequately dye-tested the residents around the lake. They don't know where pollution, if there is any in the lake, is coming from. I own the Grime Buster Car Wash, I built the Grime Buster Car Wash and it sits 300 yards from the lake, folks. The School of Mines, about 10 years ago, came in and drilled some test well around the city, the community of Seeley Lake, one of which was 50 feet from my car wash and I monitored that well and there was no evidence in that well of ground water pollution over the five years that I monitored that well. That's 300 yards from Seeley Lake. I don't think the Board has any meaningful, ongoing water quality monitoring. They don't know where there is pollution, if there is pollution and there's no ongoing study to find out if there is. They never dye-tested the lake. They don't know if the residents around the lake are polluting the lake or not. Finally, there's no assurance that if you build a proposed sewer system as you have envisioned, that you're going to clean up the water quality. The incidents of use and home ownership on Lake Inez has dramatically increased since Plum Creek sold the private homesites up there and that pollution comes right downstream and lands in Seeley Lake, which is a settling pond. Finally, I would like to propose that the assessment unfairly burdens the residential consumers. The filling station property, for example, is a 1.6 acre property, it sits in downtown Seeley Lake, it's 390 yards from the lake. I owned it for 20 years. It generates two million gallons of wastewater per year, yet it's assessed \$72. I built the car wash, it generates one million gallons a year, more or less, it's assessed as one unit, \$72. Now people with a household, which generates probably 10,000 gallons a month at a max, may happen to sit on two lots, they're paying twice as much as those two big users. I own the (inaudible) apartments. They sit on 12 lots. We generate less than one million gallons of waste effluent a year, we sit 900 yards from the lake, and we're going to pay \$1,000 for this assessment and I'm going to pass it on to the renters. So, you ask me about affordable housing. I say I can't help it, I have to pass this cost on to you folks. So, please consider very carefully what you're doing today. Thank you.

Jack Mackie: My name's Jack Mackie, I'm a resident of Seeley Lake. Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. What I'm concerned about, there's an awful lot of people that are within this proposed sewer district that are not capable of paying the amount of money that they're asking them to pay. Like Don was saying, there's a small portion of people in town that this sewer district has kind of shoving this sewer towards. It's not enough people that they can support a sewer district with the water, the filtration debts and everything, with people that are mill workers, people that are retired, people in general. There is not enough money, plain and simple. A lot of people can't understand the word "no." Well, an awful lot of the majority are saying "no," and they're not saying "no" because maybe they don't want something like this, it's the fact that they cannot afford it. The other thing is, is they talk about tests. Well, my folks were the first ones that were up in that area where we're at, the first ones, my dad cut the right-of-way for the road in there. At that time, which was years and years and years ago, they put in a cesspool, a regular, rocked up cesspool. That cesspool stayed in operation for the better part of 30 years. They had the University of Montana, a test group, come up there – one of a couple – and they tested the water 14 feet away from a cesspool that had been in there for 30 years. At that time, 14 feet away from that cesspool, the water proved pure. There was no contamination whatsoever. Also – now, correct me if I'm wrong – parts of Riverview down there, other parts of this town, the State said that they did not want this sewer district on State property. The Double Arrow does not want this sewer district. Up above us, that is not in the sewer district, didn't want their holding ponds or anything up there, and from what I understand, had to stop them from even considering putting holding ponds up there. Okay, that leaves a small portion of Seeley Lake, of which I'm in also, I've lived in Seeley Lake since 1956. I know the type of people that live up there, they're good people, they're honest people, they're people that when they tell you something, take it for a fact that that's exactly what they mean. They're not trying to push anything over on anybody. They absolutely cannot afford this. I can understand the businesses, or I should say a certain amount of the businesses – I know some of them that are in disagreement with this – want this, because they cannot continue to build in Seeley Lake without this proposed sewer district. I've heard several people from other towns that have got what they call a gray water system – they've had a lot of problems with them. It's cost them more money and more money. Where does that money go? It comes out of the taxpayers pockets. Who are the tax people? Part of them that are sitting right here in this room. They cannot afford it. The people around the lake, so far, they haven't even really pushed it too much on them. I'm sure it's headed that way, but so far they're kind of holding away from it and I hope they continue to do so. But you can't take a little tiny group of people and put all of this debt on them and expect them to take and survive. These people, they've got house

payments, they've got land taxes that they want to add more to, they've got children that they're raising, they've got children that they're going to school to, they got mill levies that they keep upping and upping every year, just like a big fancy gymnasium that they built at the grade school. The people voted it down twice and what did they do, they turned around the third time and shoved it through. Then turned around that fall and asked the people for another \$75,000 to heat it. This is one thing that somehow or another has got to get straightened out. Yeah, I'm sure sometime in the future, they are going to have to have a gray water system, a step system or some kind of a system. But it should be now. You got people up there that are making \$12, \$13, \$8, \$6, \$5.80 an hour. You've got people that are on welfare. You've got people that are living in rentals up there that have got the right to take and vote on this sewer system. It should be a property owner decision to decide whether or not they're going to take and allow this thing to come in. What right do people that come in to Seeley Lake and are allowed to vote that are renting. What do they do? Like Don Larson says, they go in, if they vote "yes, we want a sewer district," that's fine. If the rent gets too high, they can move out. Whose stuck with it? Us, the people that live there, the people that have lived there, the property owners. What they need to do is they need to stop and decide whether or not these people can actually afford it, not because the County Commissioners or anybody else operating this County says, "sure, we think they can afford it." Well look in their wallets. Believe me, they cannot afford it. Like me, my opinion is "no!" The do not need a sewer district and I'll tell you what, they do not need to take \$72 per person, per lot to take and continue this on. When I got my last tax statement, it said this was a one-time deal. Heck, it wasn't two or three months later and then we got another voice saying, "well, we're going to start this all over again, and maybe continue it and continue it." Well, that's like a filtration debt with the water system up there. Sure, in 20 years it will be paid for. How much do you want to bet that after that filtration debt's paid for, that you're not going to see nothing drop, you're going to see something go up, because what are they going to do – need to refurbish something that half the people in Seeley Lake doesn't think it works in the first place. Maybe they're pulling the wool over somebody's eyes, I don't know. Maybe they're not. Maybe it's just what a lot of people are saying and maybe they don't understand. I don't know. Maybe I'm one of them, but at the same time, I wished everybody that has anything to do with this sewer district and has any idea about doing something besides grabbing the tourists that are in Seeley Lake and think about the people that have lived there and built that town and died building the town and supported the town – not the tourists, not the people that come in there and spend three or four days or a week or a month – the people that live there. Think of the people that live there. Thank you.

Shirley Mackie: My name is Shirley Mackie and I'm Jack's mother and my husband was the one that cut the right-of-ways into the lots where we live, never thinking that we were going to have to fight to keep living there. But, as I said, when we built there, he had to cut a power right-of-way in, clear from the highway, because they told us that area was never going to be feasible to do anything with. Well, we built there. We drilled a well there and, as Jack said, we put in a rock cesspool that was there until 8 years ago. We cannot afford this sewer system, it is going to force us out. My daughter has put her house up for sale. In a 4 block square area where I live, there is 7 houses for sale that have went up since this sewer thing has started, in just this summer. My husband was disabled in '87, so we live on a very fixed income. We cannot afford all this – a sewer, the water, the filtration system. It is just, by the time we figure it out, our other utilities, we are down to where, well, we buy groceries and now that we got to pay per-gallon \$3 a gallon for gas. Our younger son lives at home, works 100 miles from home because there is no work right in that area. He doesn't work at the mill because he isn't capable of working at the mill. But I do think – and I'm like Jack – the people cannot afford it. It is such a small area they're trying to force this sewer into. Yes, if it took in the whole town, but it's not, it's only taking in one little square area that they want us to pay for the businesses downtown so they can expand and I do not think this is right. If they want a sewer system, let them put in something like Vohauer did on the island, where they can come in and pump it of their own and not force other people to have to pay for it, because, like I said, there is very few people that can pay for it and I have a daughter that built a log home, that figured she'd live there the rest of her life, it's up for sale. And do you know how many people have come and looked at it this summer – about 12. The minute you say "sewer system," they're gone. So, like I said, it's up to you County Commissioners, but I really wished that you'd stop and think of the people instead of the business owners, because we cannot afford it.

Sam Snobar: My name is Sam Snobar. I'm a resident of Seeley Lake and I am in the sewer district. I live up a private road, as well in the sewer district that was penciled in and the appraisals that I have to get the sewer district to my house from the nearest road is right at \$7,000 and that was for three different appraisals. That is as close as the sewer pipe will come to my piece of property. That alone is going to add quite a burden.

Commissioner Carey: Did you say \$7,000?

Sam Snobar: Yeah, it was \$7,000 by three different appraisers. That a fund I can't even come up with to get into the sewer district. But my piece of property is the first piece of property of seven other down my road. On top of all that, we're talking almost \$142 a month in costs. They're saying that it's going to be about \$100 service charge to start paying back. They're saying the cost to run it, per month, and this is a high/low average in there and I've read it a couple different times with the forms they've sent us, can be approximately \$40 to \$55, split the difference. And now I got to add another \$6 on that, is what it would break down by month – that's a \$146 - \$152 a month, after everything's done and said and in the books. I can't afford this. I mean, I'm a father of three, I'm a husband. This tax alone is saying, this is ridiculous. I am getting tired of fighting the sewer district. I lived the last 18 years up in Alaska and if a state can tell you about a sewer district, contact the people in Alaska. They can tell you what sewer's will grow to. I lived in a little outlet and we had our own sewer district and when we had to give it up to the State of Alaska, we went from \$22 a month to \$32 a month. Went from \$32 to \$64 and all I see is this charges going up and up. People can't afford this. I am highly against this sewer district. My wife and I have both decided if this goes through, another house is going up for sale in Seeley Lake and we're moving away from that area. I do have a job in Seeley Lake, I work at the mill. Once again, I am a family and we enjoy it there, it is a beautiful area to live and raise my family. I moved my family there to do this. But I am not going to put up with having to pay a hundred and fifty some dollars a month for a sewer that I don't want and then I got to come up with another \$7,000 to finish putting into my house. This will just be an ongoing argument and as a Seeley Lake resident now, this is not needed. I want to thank you guys all for your time.

Werner Probst: Thanks for letting me sit down, I'm facing back surgery on Wednesday. It's going to be a little bit complicated for your writers because I don't speak your language that good, but for the record, my name is Werner Probst, and I'm a German. Thank God my name is not Schwarzenegger, huh. I might be a German, but my heart is in Seeley Lake and I pay taxes here, so I think I'm qualified. I know exactly what shoes you are in, I've been there, 25 years ago in Germany, we faced the same thing. I was not County Commissioner but I was a legislator. Size of the lake exactly the same. Beautiful country, exactly the same. But around the lake there was 30,000 people. That makes a difference. We had to put it in, I was all for it and actually, I would be for it if they would not have blown it up 12 years ago when this whole thing was almost granted and all that. I personally think it is just done right or approached wrong – approached wrong. A lot of people in Seeley Lake, and I know a lot of them, they think, why did they come up with a collection for \$45,000 for just studying what we do. This is almost as dumb as putting a tunnel in for deers, if you know what I mean. They got that money for planning, for studying. Now you come up with an idea, \$72 each lot, for another planning stage and I can see the business people are the big winners. They live or they have their business right on the lake. They cannot do no nothing right now, before anything goes in, which is okay with me. We need that. But it's got to be shared between business and private owners and Jack Mackie is right. I know that area where he lives. There is not that many rich people. I don't live there. I live in the other section. But I can see their needs. They cannot afford that. They cannot afford giving \$72 a year just for planning and I encourage them, because United States is a little bit different than Germany, but we come up with a plan and put that plan up for a vote and one lot has one vote. Has nothing to do with women discrimination. Some households, the wife has the pants on, so she gets the vote. But it should not be renters. I rent out too, but it is my money I'm deciding on, so come up with a plan. Have them finance somehow, there's got to be some money out there, and then come up with a plan how we going to do it, why Phase I is the first, just by the number, that's not good enough. Got to be a logical conclusion to that. Why not putting the lakesides where the business are first. I mean, I made myself a little wise and I know you want to get as many grants you can get from State and all that, so #2 qualifies more grants, but these people, they don't think that. They want the business owner pay their fair share and maybe then they agree on it and we have, hopefully, the sewer system, which is not even a sewer system, you got to fight that among the people up there. It's a gray water system, it's not done right to begin with and I bet you, 15, 20 years from now, we regret not putting it in right. So, even just being a German, we have all the technology and, no, I better don't say that, something does not run uphill, it always runs downhill. Thank you.

Cal Bonnet: I have a couple questions. I'm sure the Sewer Board will probably answer these when they get up here, but these are ones that are sticking in my mind. I'm Cal Bonnet and these are some questions that are sticking in my mind and I'm sure the Sewer Board will answer them when they get up here, but, just for my own information, let me pose these questions. First, what is the total amount of revenue that this levy generates, does anybody have any idea?

Ann Mary Dussault: Slightly over \$32,000.

Cal Bonnet: Okay, and then, how is this money spent. Is it all spent just on projects or on studies or salaries or how it's all spent?

Ann Mary Dussault: I think that would be – if you could lay out your questions, I think then have the Sewer Board respond to them, that would be good.

Cal Bonnet: Okay. My second question, how is the money spent? How is the money accounted for? Is there an annual accounting of this money sent to the taxpayers to let us know where the money is going? After the sewer is in, will the levy go away when income is generated from the sewage usage? Let me see what else I've got here.

Ann Mary Dussault: Actually, I can answer that one. The answer is yes, this \$72 assessment would go away.

Cal Bonnet: Okay. Is all the money that is generated from this sewer levy, is all of this going to the sewer system or project or is some of this money used on other projects in the County?

Ann Mary Dussault: Again, this money is specifically collected for the purposes of the Sewer District.

Cal Bonnet: Okay. And then finally, is \$72 per lot excessive for this stage that we're in?

Ann Mary Dussault: Good question for the Sewer Board.

Cal Bonnet: Yes. And with that, I conclude the questions that I had and thank you for the opportunity.

John Reinhard: My name is John Reinhard. I own a parcel in Seeley Lake but I do not reside there. My parcel doesn't not contribute anything to the pollution of the area and I think that the other people in my shoes that don't really use their property up there probably feel like they've spent enough on this project. It looks like it's a project that designed to help a few developers and not the general public and I think the whole thing is too costly. With the current political climate in this Country, there probably isn't going to be an abundance of free money available to subsidize a project of this type. I think it should be postponed at least until there's proven to be a need for the Sewer District and when there is a Sewer District established, I think it should take in the entire area, not just a small amount of the people that live close to the lake, because those people are polluting just as much as people on the Double Arrow and down on the river, they're polluting just as much. It may not be going into Seeley Lake, but I don't think there's any proof that any of the pollution is going into Seeley Lake. So that's all I have to say. Thank you.

Commissioner Evans: Any one else who would care to speak? Okay, then we'll ask the Sewer Board to come up and give us as many answers to the questions as you can and give us your comments.

Glen Morin: I'm Glen Morin.

Stacey Newell: I'm Stacey Newell.

Glen Morin: Actually, Stacey has some copies here of the financial report and I was wondering if I could just hand those out and then she can kind of give a little bit of –

Stacey Newell: I have copies for those who want it and what these reports show, for one thing, is our budgeted amount for 2005. Also what it lists is our expenses, year to date, what we've spent and what we've spent it on. Okay. One of the questions that he asked was if this just goes towards the project. Actually, the project hasn't begun, this is all preliminary, this is all testing, but there are other fees that go along with it. Some of that is the mailings that we sent out, we send out newsletters and whatnot. We have someone on staff, a management consultant, Ralph, he gets \$500 a month. I get \$50 a month for taking the minutes of the meetings, so. We also have been doing ongoing well monitoring. I know there were a lot of questions as to water testing and we have been doing mountains of water testing and if any of you have attended any of the Board meetings where Vince Chappel has been there, he does give us water reports and shows that, yes, the well and the lake are both contaminated, unfit for human consumption. That also shows up on here, and what the ongoing well monitoring costs reflect here are the actual lab costs and Vince's wage for testing. So, I can pass those around for you guys to look at that. I did want to mention, too, one of the reasons why we wanted this to be an ongoing assessment is because that \$72 a year does

help pay for all those things that I just listed. It also – the engineer gave us a breakdown of some of the expenses we can expect in each phase of this, as in grants that we apply for. That all costs money to have a grant writer apply for those funds. In addition to that, you may also have to give matching funds. You know, they'll say, okay, we'll give you this much money, but you need to match this much. And the engineer, like I said, he gave us a breakdown of what to expect if all of the steps go forward. Today you're not really voting on the project, you're voting on giving us money to keep going as we are going. When the project comes up, everybody within Seeley has the right to vote for that project, and vote it down, no matter what these studies show.

Commissioner Evans: I'm going to ask you to do something for me and for the folks who will read the record later. I'd like somebody to start at the beginning and tell me how the Sewer Board came about, what the problems were that caused you to start the Sewer Board, how you came up with the size of the district, because some of these things, I don't know.

Stacey Newell: Right, and that was before my time.

Commissioner Evans: Okay, whoever's time it was.

Glen Morin: I wasn't on there when the Sewer Board first started. Dave might be better at when it was really formed and I can't remember exactly – I'll let Dave say how it was formed and I can kind of go from there.

Commissioner Evans: Thank you David.

David Whitset: I can't remember all the dates –

Commissioner Evans: I don't care about dates.

David Whitset: But I could tell you about – I would like to answer couple other questions first. One, a man commented about a gray water system. It's not considered to be a gray water system. It's going to be raw sewage and the Board is unanimous that we will not go for a gray water system. We've been advised by our engineers that the 20 year cost on a gray water system is always higher than the 20 year cost of a regular system. The other thing is, the Board made a resolution, I think two meetings ago, that we would support a sewer under a number of conditions and one of them was that we could come up with the cost of \$28, approximately, per month, per connection, per residential connection. So this high costs that are being mentioned, the Board would not support a sewer at that cost. That's the two questions I wanted asked. A number of years ago, I think it was about 1992, there was a ad-hoc committee got together to form a sewer district for the express purpose of giving local control in the case of a government mandate that we had to have a sewer. And we had hearings and the district boundary, I think, was too small, but I didn't have part on that. There was a vote and it was voted into effect. Bylaws were drawn up and I think they were filed with the State in either '94 or '96, I'm not sure of the year, but they're legally approved bylaws. One thing that the bylaws says is that the purpose of the district is to determine whether there's a need for the sewer and if there is a need, to pursue getting a sewer and going ahead operating it. Now, the Board was really just kind of sitting along for years, not really doing much, but there was a lot of pressure to have a sewer, so I can't remember, I think it was 2000, we decided to have an informal poll at a Spring Election, at the School Election, and at that time, we had several questions on the ballot, but one of them was – are you in favor of a \$5 a month assessment to continue the groundwater studies? Oh, I forgot to tell you back there, we had the State School of Mines do a groundwater assessment and they said at that time there was groundwater pollution that was due to septic systems but they did not think at that time it was serious enough to require a sewer. Then, through the years, there was quite a bit of pressure on the Board to have a sewer, so we decided that we'd have a poll at this election and we got a pretty good response of the electorate, I think we had something like 30% of the electorate answered these questions. The one question was are you in favor of a \$5 assessment per month to continue the groundwater studies, and 85% said they were and this is the people inside the district. Then there was a question, do you want a sewer now, regardless of the groundwater conditions, and exactly 50% said yes, I think it was 57 said yes and 57 said no. And then the question, do you want a sewer if there is definite indication of groundwater pollution, and the answer was, I can't remember, something like 70% in favor of that. So, for that reason, the Board got looking into the possibility of a Preliminary Engineering Report and I was in favor of this myself, I've been against the sewer all along, I think a sewer might do more harm than good, but when I figured, the people, half of the people think they want a sewer right now regardless of groundwater condition, are they still going to think so when

they find out how much it costs, so I was all in favor of this. And then the local community, mainly the business district, but some residents, raised \$30,000 or more for one year's operation and for a part of the Preliminary Engineering Report. And so then we got the Preliminary Engineering Report done and they find definite groundwater pollution which is likely going into the lake, or at least into the river below the lake, which would affect on downstream and they feel that a sewer's really necessary. And then as I said earlier, the Board has resolved to try and get a sewer – to support a sewer, if we can get enough grants and enough money to hold the cost down around \$28 per month, per residence and if the local people in the district vote for the bond issue. But there is no way that this sewer will ever be put in unless the people in the district vote for it.

Glen Morin: I'm Glen Morin. I'm on the Board and we're in the district also, we're not really particular wanting, you know, have to be having another payment go out, but also we felt the pressure that we need to find out some real answers and that's when we got a hold of the Preliminary Engineering Report and, of course, we had the Butte School of Mines study, which gave a lot of information and it helped with when we selected the engineer, they were able to use a lot of the information off there to go with it and they encouraged us that we should continue to do water study and, of course, that means, you know, we have to have some money, and so that's why we're still continuing doing that and, of course, some of the test results that I gave Barbara up there, they show a lot of contamination, so we've already got a lot of, you know, problems in the groundwater. Our previous newsletter have kept you up to date regarding the processes of the groundwater testing. As you know, these tests have indicated degradation of groundwater supply, including human fecal contaminations. In this newsletter you'll discuss the second question, the cost and then of course that's the cost that we're looking at, we're looking at a total cost of possibly \$12 million to do the whole sewer system, which we cannot raise that kind of money at one time so we're going to have to do it in four different phases and we've broke out up to probably about \$4.5 million per phase and we have to continue working as a Board, working with our engineer, working with grant places that we get our grant money, Community Development, State Tribal Assistance Grant (STAG), DNRC, TSEP, Rural Development. At this point, we have \$2.2 million that is granted to us at this point and we need to continue to do this so that we can get the cost, if we do do the sewer system, we can get it down and the reason we need to do this, we need to find out how much money we can get, so how much it's going to cost the each people that own the lots in Seeley Lake, and so we continue to need to do the study so we know how much we're going to be charging people and go from there and if we stop and wait 'til somebody else tells us that we have to have a sewer system, we won't have a chance to be able to apply for grants, and so we really need to have this opportunity to do this and we've only, just in the one year, did raise \$2.2 million, so we feel really happy with that and the people that we've talked to, the people that have granted us money, you know, they're encouraging us to come back for, you know, the next year's supply.

Commissioner Evans: Thank you Mr. Morin. Anything else you'd like to say?

Glen Morin: I think that was, you know, it's not a gray water system and we had the financial report here on how the money is being spent. That's all broke down and you know, our meetings are open, you know, we're not trying to put and take money that we're not supposed to and we felt that \$6 a month per lot wasn't exorbitant and it was just, you know, we figured out what we needed and that was kind of the amount of money we need to meet our budget.

Commissioner Evans: So explain one thing to me, would you please. It sounds to me, from what I've heard today, that there is a small area of Seeley Lake that is being assessed for this, not the entire area. Would you explain that to me please.

Glen Morin: The district boundaries, which was drawn up in '92, and that's the only area that we can actually draw, you know, are able to assess, and it is, of course, the most heavily area that with the septic systems and it's in the mainly the downtown and around the lake area. I have some, a map here showing the septic tank in the area and amount there, also have the map of the district that's in there.

Jack Mackie: Yes, Glen, I'd like to know, when they called it a gray water system, then all of a sudden it went from a gray water system to an advised step system, which is just a more advanced way of saying gray water system. I've got a couple of friends that are contractors – big contractors – down in Yuma, and they say all that is, is a glorified way of telling people that it's just a gray water system under a different name or any other – and something else I wanted to mention to a fellow that's been deceased for a few years, very good friend of mine, Bucky Walters. Bucky Walters said here when this sewer system first come into effect, he says, why call it a sewer system, he said it is not a sewer system. He says it never was and it

never will be. He says for the amount of money that the Missoula County or the township of Seeley Lake want to put into this system, he said, if you stop and think about it, at the time, that, and he said, in the near future, he says you can do the same thing for \$9 million, and he says put in a sewer system. That's getting rid of your septic tank, that getting rid of your doggone gray water deals and the whole works. Bucky Walters was a very highly recommended man in Seeley Lake and he told me that face to face.

Commissioner Evans: Did you have a question for Mr. Morin?

Jack Mackie: Yes, the question is, is what is the difference between a gray water system and a step system?

Glen Morin: Well, we're not using either.

Jack Mackie: What are you using?

Glen Morin: We're using a full system. You're going right in, plugging in right into your house and taking it all to the treatment plant and that is being treated and then, what actually comes out in the sprinkler system is .001 contamination, which we have to have by the State. State regulation and the Federal have a regulation on how much, you know, what has to be out and it has to be treated in such a way. This is going – this is not a gray, it is not a step, it's going right to your house and picking up, it's bypassing your septic system.

Jack Mackie: It's bypassing the whole septic system?

Glen Morin: Yes, and it all, the cost is all figured in and going right in, tearing up your yard, hooking right up to your house, refixing your yard and going back out again.

Jack Mackie: Okay, then, here just a few short years ago I just put in a \$2,000 septic system that met all requirements. What are they going to do, bypass that?

Commissioner Evans: Thank you. Michael, did you have something you wanted to add to the record?

Mike Sehestedt: There seems to be some confusion. Step system describes how the effluent is moved from point of origin to the treatment plant, for example, all of the Wapikiya area in Missoula is served by a step system. It involves force mains and basically, individual tanks that are holding tanks with pumps and it's then pumped from that. Sounds like what we're talking about here is a land application system with treatment either through plant or lagoons and then the treated effluent is disposed of by sprinkling on a field, typically alfalfa, I don't know what you'll do up there, or actually they use hybrid cottonwood or aspen in some applications. But, a gray water system is one in which there's segregation of effluent at the source, dishwater, so on, bathwater, goes into the gray water system and is used pretty directly for irrigation, common in some southern desert communities. Those are the distinctions.

David Whitset: A number of years before the sewer district was formed, there was a plan drawn up by the Sorenson Company for a sewer for the Seeley Lake district, well it wasn't the district, it was the whole area, they were going to run a pipe all the way around Seeley Lake and collect gray water. That was the gray water system and it was overwhelming voted down. And since the sewer district has been formed and we've come up with a Preliminary Engineering Report, we have not used the Sorenson plan at all and it is strictly a raw sewage plant where everything from the house will be pumped up to a site where it'll be settled in the lagoons, aerated, treated and used for irrigation is the current plan. I think the reason the people think it's a gray water system is because at one time, there was a proposal for a gray water system, but that was voted down.

Commissioner Evans: Did I hear somebody say something about the State having put an edict or something up there, that you have to do it.

Mike Sehestedt: Barbara, I was listening to that. I suspect, given the timing, if you will recall, the State Department of Health directed and required the installation of a sewer system in the entire Wapikiya area. Houses that were built, houses that were on septic. The groundwater monitoring there reached a state where the State simply ordered and required, as a condition to basically continue living in your house, that a sewer system be created. I'm thinking that the interest in Seeley Lake in this system probably picked up

about the time the State issued that order. I shouldn't say Wapikiya, I should say Linda Vista. I misspoke. The Linda Vista order, in terms of time, I suspect may have been the motivating factor in getting people started up there. I don't know that for a fact.

Commissioner Evans: But we don't know if there has been any such edict from the State.

Mike Sehestedt: There has not been any such order in the Seeley Lake area at this time.

Sam Snobar: Sam Snobar again. You said, just a few minutes ago, that the cost is going to go straight to our houses, I mean, the piping?

Glen Morin: Yeah, the piping will go right straight to the house.

Sam Snobar: So, 480 some feet from the nearest pipe where my house lies and the people up my road, that pipe's now going to go up our road?

Glen Morin: That's going to depend on what the engineer's going to feel, where they are going to run the line, or, you know, if it's going to go on the back side, the front side.

Sam Snobar: Well, I'm on the outer edge of nowhere.

Glen Morin: That's going to be all the houses that are in the district, they're going to go right to the house.

Sam Snobar: Actually the two containment walls, my concrete driveway – all that gets tore up and rebuilt, that's what you're saying, and by rights, it should cost me.

Glen Morin: No, that's all figured into this cost here, the whole thing. Like you say, we're trying to keep the cost down, I don't know where you got those figures at before.

Sam Snobar: Well, the pipe that came through where the initial line was supposed to lay, like I said, it's 438 feet or something like that, to where the pipe is supposed to be. And, like I say, I got two containment walls, a driveway – all this has got to get tore up and run to the nearest pipe, right, and it's like, I haven't read anything, I been trying to keep up with all the newsletters, I mean, I'm not out here in no man's land, I really do read all your letters that come out.

Glen Morin: We have had several meetings in town where these neighbors spoke.

Sam Snobar: I wanted to be there, the last couple, and then I've got family problems, with a son, anyways, so I just wanted to make sure I heard that correct, 'cuz I don't remember reading that in the newsletters and so, it just wasn't clear enough. But I do have my figures that I've had several different companies give me just.

Glen Morin: When you got to go that far, you're right.

Sam Snobar: Anyways, I'd just like to thank you for that answer and just to make sure what I heard.

Werner Probst: For the record, Werner Probst from Seeley Lake. I have three different things. Number 1, I mean, I like to hear the pulse of my town where I live in and what I'm hearing, I'm not very happy with. Is it true, and you probably can answer that in a heart beat, is it true, all the taxes we pay to Missoula County, only 23% comes back to Seeley.

Mike Sehestedt: It would be hard to say where that number comes from, your County tax bill starts out with about 70% for schools, right off the top, so you do have the schools in Seeley Lake. Of the County portion of the taxes, I couldn't answer that in the sense that they go to support Elections and the Clerk and Recorders Office.

Commissioner Evans: Health Department, Sheriff.

Mike Sehestedt: Sheriff has some individual stationed up there. Road Department, you're probably less than 23% of the total roads in the County. I honestly don't know and I'd need more information before I

could answer that. But, when you look at your tax bill and you see that total for property taxes, the first thing you need to pare out is the State levies and the school taxes, and I don't know, I can't remember the precise breakdown for Seeley Lake, but I would guess that probably 30% or less is what you're paying to Missoula County, of that total tax bill. We collect it for the State and we collect it for the schools, but it comes to rest here for no more than a month and then gets forwarded on to those other agencies. So, for whatever that's worth.

Chair Curtiss: The fire department in Seeley Lake, the Health Center in Seeley Lake, the Cemetery District in Seeley Lake. There's quite a break down on your tax bill.

Werner Probst: Yeah, well, we got to wise up the people up there, so we have got to give some information on that, would be very helpful in that case. Number 2 is, is I remember when I came over here in '90, I heard different voices on sewer being voted out and why and I don't think that one speaker – I don't know his name, sorry – is right, what I heard is and I had seen one of the ballots, it was like written – you want more information on a sewer system – and this is pretty much the only way they got that whole thing rolling in. It was voted down anyways by far. But that's what the people in Seeley Lake think, there was never, ever a direct voting in somebody in the Sewer Board or what, because it was just not existent. Number 3 is, and this is not even funny, we have problems in United States with elections all the way, goes from Florida even to Missoula. We don't need ex-President Carter to have a recount. But we got to make sure that the people there in the sewer district do not use their family trees and all that to vote something in or out. I think it is a matter of lot by lot, give them one vote and then let them decide. Otherwise, I see not guaranteed the value of a single vote. I mean, I like to see the mill vote as one voice so I can tell my friend, Roger Johnson, I have the same vote as you, actually I have more, because I have more lots, even they are way smaller. But I think that would make it much easier for people up in Seeley Lake to understand. One vote per lot in the sewer district, not voting people they live on Big Sky Lake or on Double Arrow or Sumrails, they're not in the district, they should not have a vote on that. That is all I have to say, and thank you again.

Commissioner Evans: Thank you. Anyone else from the Sewer Board have anything else they want to add? Okay, Ms. Mackie.

Shirley Mackie: I just wanted to ask, when the water system went in, it's all connected. I worked on the original water system that went in, worked to get it in and it was to be \$10 a month for as long as it took to pay for the system and then it would drop down, well, which it never did, and then they came along with the filtration system and I think that's supposed to be, I think it's fourteen dollars and something a month for 20 years. But it never was meant to be – it was for the people that were hooked to it. They have got lots that have nothing on them and they're assessing a fee. Like my son has three lots, he's assessed three filtration systems even though there is no water on them. My daughter has three and she has one lot that was filled in by the mill down there with wood products – cannot build on it, cannot have water on it, yet she is assessed a filtration system. They finally did cut one lot out, but she still pays on two. Now this sewer district is assessing every lot, even though there'll only be one hookup. That's not right. I mean, if they have to assess anything, why can't it be just for where there's water and the house, why does it have to be on bare lots. That's not right. You can't use it, they've got nothing there to use, like the other fellow said, he doesn't even have anything on his property, he don't even use it and yet he's assessed a filtration system and he'll be assessed a sewer system. That just isn't right. It should be, like he said, if you're going to have three assessments, then you should have three votes, I would think, or else one assessment and one vote.

Commissioner Evans: Michael, do you have anything to say on that? Sorry, but I am totally unaware of the filtration system, don't know how it's assessed.

Mike Sehestedt: I can fill some in, although the Water District has relied on outside counsel, as it typical of water districts, ever since their inception, but the history is at some point they were required by Water Quality Standards, to add an additional level of treatment or take whatever other action was necessary to bring the quality of the water into line. What they chose to do was the filtration plant or filtration system. The bonds that financed that are secured by a per lot assessment and to be honest, I can't recall whether those were voted bonds or a revenue bond, and the situation is that –

Stacey Newell: I can answer that. I guess I should say, my primary job is Secretary at the Water District, I just help out at the sewer, and that was a voted bond and it was over 60%.

Mike Sehestedt: Okay, now to go to the question of how voting is done under State law for creation of a district or for passage of a bond issue. Generally speaking, the Constitution says that all registered electors within an area are entitled to vote and that raises the issue that I've heard here that renters will vote, as opposed to property owners, and that's a fairly recurrent, whether it's school or otherwise. These statutes have an additional provision in them, if you're a resident there, you can vote. You can also vote if you're a registered elector and own real property within the district. The electorate for creation of one of these districts and the electorate for approval of a bond issue consists of all registered electors residing within the district, plus any registered electors who don't reside in the district, but own property there. Admitted, that still leaves you with the situation that a person who owns ten lots has the same vote as a renter who owns none, but that's the way the Legislature set this up and whatever your opinions about it are, the Board of County Commissioners can't fix it, and frankly there's no requirement that assessments be spread on a per lot basis. There are other options. I think with the filtration plan, you're probably pretty well locked into it because of the way the bond issue was approved, but I haven't looked at those documents and I'm not giving an opinion on it. I think when the time comes to look at a bond issue, if it ever comes, for the sewer system, that would be one of the things I would look at, long and hard, and I probably, if I were giving advice, would recommend that the bonds be issued as revenue bonds, i.e., paid by people who were using the service, guaranteed by an ad valorem tax based on property value on all of the property in the district. But those are decisions that would be made along ways down the road when finally there's a plan that's submitted to the voters for approval. Frankly, I think the method of assessment and the structure of the bonds should be the subject of a lot more discussion than we're having here. I guess the other thing I want to be perfectly clear, but I know the Commissioners know this, but the County staff, Ann Mary and myself, per say, don't have an opinion on whether or not this assessment is a good idea. This is a question for your board to recommend, the Commissioners make a decision on after they've heard all of you. The only position that I've taken is that I do not believe, under the authority we're acting under, to do this kind of special assessment, that the Commissioners can approve it for more than one year at a time. If it's approved, it's good for one year only and you have to come back and justify it again each year.

Commissioner Evans: Michael, the papers that I gave that have the testing results in it, I'm not qualified to read those, although it appears that there is fecal coliform and there's other types of pollution. Do you think it's important to put any of that in the record. Bill and Jean aren't here to see it.

Mike Sehestedt: I'm qualified to read it, I'm not qualified to interpret it. I can go across and say whatever it says, but I –

Commissioner Evans: Is it safe to say that there appears to be some pollution?

Mike Sehestedt: It would appear, it would be safe to say there appears to be some impact on groundwater from somewhere. This is interesting data, but it simply doesn't – I don't know what the background is for nitrates or chloride in Seeley Lake aquifer as a baseline, so I can look at the number and say, gee, that's swell. I do notice there is some fairly significant variation in it which may or may not be indicative of outside influences, but I'm simply not in a position to have an opinion on that.

Commissioner Evans: You're in a better position than I.

Mike Sehestedt: I'm in a position to have an opinion on anything, but it's not an informed or educated opinion.

Stacey Newell: Can I make one other statement? Shirley made a comment that water and sewer were all the same and I just wanted to clarify that the water district and the sewer district are not affiliated in any way, they're not combined and we have two totally separate districts, just so you know.

Shirley Mackie: I realize that, and the other thing, like you said ... was a 60% vote for the filtration system. That I understand. But I don't think the people – and when it first was in, the filtration system only assessed each household and then about 4 years ago, I believe, 4 or 5 years ago, then they started to assess every lot. That was not in the original part, it was that they approved of a filtration system that each person would pay, I think it was \$20 a month at that time. Then, about 5 years ago or so, I'm not just sure, 'cuz I'm getting old, but then it all of a sudden was every lot, not just each household, it was every lot and then it dropped down to \$14.75.

Stacey Newell: Right. I know what you're talking about. The bond was always written per lot, however, the district hadn't assessed every lot, and that was their mistake, and once they received maps from the County, then they went back and assessed each and every lot that they had missed, so nothing changed. It was always written that way, just some people weren't being assessed.

Shirley Mackie: And that just threw a hardship, like I said, on people with multiple lots.

Stacey Newell: Right, and then that's why they lowered it, too, because more people were paying it, so they lowered from \$20.05 to \$14.75.

Shirley Mackie: And then a lot of people combined their lots and I believe my daughter-in-law went to the last water meeting – or the sewer meeting – and they said, well, why don't you just combine your three lots. Do they realize that it costs about \$3,000 to have a new surveyor on a piece of property that's been surveyed 5 or 6 times already.

Stacey Newell: The listed that as a option.

Commissioner Evans: I'm going to point out that the subject here today is the assessments on the sewer district.

Shirley Mackie: And I'm opposed to that.

Commissioner Evans: And that's okay.

Mike Sehestedt: You've been perfectly clear.

Commissioner Evans: Stacey, I'd like you to stay there. Bill and Jean, do you have any questions for the folks here.

Commissioner Carey: Yes, I have a question for the sewer board.

Stacey Newell: I'm not on the Board.

Commissioner Evans: Mr. Morin, would you come up and answer whatever questions Bill has, if you can.

Commissioner Carey: I'm just wondering if the \$6 a month assessment is renewed for another year, does the Board anticipate that they will have enough information on water quality and cost to be able to make recommendations at the end of the year.

Glen Morin: I think what we're probably really looking at is if we can just get the project going, which, like I say, we need \$4.5 (million) to get the first phase to go and get the dollar amount down where the – that we can go to the voters on and getting voted. I don't know if we can do that in one year or two years.

Commissioner Evans: And I'm going to interrupt here, because Ann Mary has some information that I'd like her to give Bill and Jean and see if it affects their consideration here.

Ann Mary Dussault: Earlier today in briefing Barbara, we talked about what options might be available to the Board of County Commissioners. You have two options in front of you. One is an annual assessment of \$72. The second I would recommend we take off the table, since the County Attorney does not support it. That's the continuing resolution. It is also possible, though, if you would desire to do this, is to look at the per lot assessment and to determine whether the \$72 might be more than is needed and I don't know that because I can't tell enough from your financial to know whether or not that number could be reduced. I just want the Commissioners to know that if it is possible to determine that, and we can do that today, then I'm advised by the fiscal office that we could change this resolution and reduce the amount of the assessment for this coming year to under \$72. The reason that we're under a bit of a time pressure, is we've got to certify these numbers for the Department of Revenue, preferable by the end of the day today.

Mike Sehestedt: Let me qualify. I think, Ann Mary, we should say there are three options in front of the Board. One is the resolution as presented, two is the resolution with some modification in the per lot amount depending on what information we generate and the third is to simply decline to approve the levy. I

don't recommend anything to you between those, but I want – that is, in fact, the decision. You've got what's offered, something else or nothing at all.

Ann Mary Dussault: Just to clarify once again, I know there is – we've heard a lot of concern about the per lot assessment methodology. Unfortunately that is not something we can change at this time. That might be something that the Board may want to consider if they want to make a request again for next year, but at least for consideration for the 2005 tax bill, while we can change the level of assessment, we're not able to change the methodology of assessment, i.e., the per lot assessment.

Commissioner Carey: Could we say something like, at most, a \$72 per year assessment will be charged?

Ann Mary Dussault: Commissioner Carey, I think what we would need to do is to take a recess, huddle here and come back with an alternate figure. The figure that we're looking for we need to report to the Department of Revenue, so it needs to be a number specific.

Commissioner Evans: Let me say, for Bill and Jean's consideration, I believe that a sewer likely will be needed for Seeley Lake, maybe not today, but certainly I believe it will be needed. I don't believe it will be needed for a small area, I think it would be needed for the entire area and I do believe it can pollute the lake. I think it ought to be looked at, but whether or not it would be looked at in the size of the district they currently have or in a larger context, I don't know. I do believe that we probably need to study it some more and I'd certainly like to cut the costs for the folks as much as possible, so, if it's okay with you two, we could huddle here, come back in about 15 minutes, if that's possible, Ann Mary – 15 minutes, half hour. We need to give them some time to be back at the microphone or the telephone.

Ann Mary Dussault: Could I ask one question before we do that. Glen and Stacey, and other members of the sewer board, do you have a proposed, projected, 2006 budget.

Stacey Newell: Yes, and I did not bring it.

Ann Mary Dussault: Do you have enough of it in your head that we might be able to back into an alternate number.

Stacey Newell: The only thing I have with me is the engineer's proposed portion, the grants, the money that it's going to cost us for grant writing and that area. I can figure our wages and the ongoing well monitoring and that, but, I don't recall everything that we had in the 2006 budget.

Ann Mary Dussault: My sense from looking at the 2005 budget, is that there is probably not a lot of – if you're looking at continuing the same level of professional services and if you're continuing to do the monitoring, there's probably not a whole lot of room to maneuver, but there may be some room.

Stacey Newell: Yes.

Ann Mary Dussault: And I guess I would ask the Commissioners, Bill and Jean and Barbara, do you want us to recess here for about 15 minutes and see if we can figure that out and come back with an alternate number for you.

Commissioner Evans: I would like that because I'd like to ease the pain for the folks and still look at the issue. But, Bill and Jean –

Commissioner Carey: I agree as well.

Chair Curtiss: So would I. And I do have one question for the water board – sewer board – are any of the wells that you are monitoring outside the district, so that you have an idea whether there's pollution coming from other sources.

Glen Morin: There's a couple wells up real high that we have tested that have no pollutant in it and just the wells that are down in the community where all the septic systems is where we have all the pollutant on the tests that we've been taking.

Chair Curtiss: Okay. So, what time are you showing there?

Commissioner Evans: A few minutes before 3:00.

Chair Curtiss: Okay. So do we want to come back at 3:15 or do you need more than that?

Ann Mary Dussault: I think we could do it by 3:15.

Chair Curtiss: Okay. We'll be here to answer the phone.

Commissioner Evans: We will have a short recess 'til 3:15.

Ann Mary Dussault: Okay.

The Board of County Commissioners adjourned the meeting at 3:00 p.m. and reconvened at 3:20 p.m.

Commissioner Evans: Okay, Ann Mary, would you like to tell us what you have come up with here?

Ann Mary Dussault: We had the opportunity to look at the 2005 budget and the proposed 2006 budget. I think in your packets, you have the 2005 budget and you'll see that their total operating cost is \$21,415.

Chair Curtiss: Okay.

Ann Mary Dussault: Do you have that number? It's in that packet from the Seeley Lake Sewer District.

Chair Curtiss: We have it now.

Ann Mary Dussault: Okay, so you see that \$21,415.

Chair Curtiss: Yes.

Ann Mary Dussault: And if you go further down on, you see the assessment income of \$32,112. Then you see the total net income, which means budget over expenses of \$10,697. Okay. If you look at the 2006 budget, and remember, these folks are on a calendar year budget, not a fiscal year, but regardless of that, their proposed 2006 budget is slightly less than their 2005 budget. That's generally a good sign that folks aren't going crazy with their spending. What they've done is they have reallocated and then reduced their budget so more monies are going into, for example, grant writing and matching fees for their grants, slight increase on ongoing well monitoring, those kinds of things, so their total proposed 2006 budget is \$20,293. The proposed total net income over budget is almost \$12,000. I think we've agreed that we can hedge this by reducing the assessment from \$72 per lot to \$62 per lot for this year. The result of that will be assuming that they stay on budget, is that it will reduce their total net income about 50%, a little less than 50%. I think we agreed we feel okay about doing that. What we don't want to do is this – if they have to come back next year for an assessment again, we don't want that to bounce up, because the only worse than assessing a fee is having one that bounces all over the place. The other thing that we've talked about is if we reduce the assessment to \$62 per lot this year, I think it's important over this next year to look at the assessment methodology since that's one of the primary issues, I think, and the resistance to this per lot assessment. So, by reducing it for this year, by having a commitment to look at alternatives if it's necessary to assess next year, at least from my perspective in having looked at these policies and these numbers for some time, that seems to be a reasonable alternative, if you are inclined to do an assessment this year.

Commissioner Evans: Comments? Bill, Jean?

Chair Curtiss: So the Request for Commission Action then would be changed, if we agree to that, to say \$62 per lot, what would the total be then, instead of the \$32,000, it would be what?

Ann Mary Dussault: The total would be \$27,652, at \$62 and we're using a base of 446 lots.

Chair Curtiss: Okay. So, I guess, is there any further comment? The Board feels okay with this?

Commissioner Evans: Board, would you like to put that answer on the record?

Glen Morin: Yes, we've discussed this and I feel like we can make this adjustment and we'll see how it flies.

Ann Mary Dussault: This is Ann Mary. Ralph is out of town, so now's a good time to do it – only kidding!!

Commissioner Evans: Should I close the hearing Michael?

Mike Sehestedt: If there's no further comment, I would say, close the hearing and –

Ann Mary Dussault: You might want to see if there's anybody left in the room that would like to comment on this alternative.

Commissioner Evans: Anyone else left in the room that would like to comment again? Okay, there being none, I'll close the Public Hearing. Are there any motions or comments?

Chair Curtiss: I'm just trying to figure out how to word it. I would move that we – what language?

Ann Mary Dussault: Jean, let me try something because this is a little – tell me where you want to go and let me frame a motion, because we're going to need you to direct staff to do something depending on what it is you decide to do.

Chair Curtiss: Okay, well, where I was going was to agree with the \$62 assessment per lot for the one time, for the one year. The resolution to continue the assessment for one year but to reduce it to the \$62.

Ann Mary Dussault: So, if your motion could be to authorize, to adopt the Resolution continuing the assessment for one year only and setting the assessment at \$62 per lot and further, directing staff to communicate the same to the Department of Revenue, pending your signatures on the Resolution when you return.

Chair Curtiss moved that the Board of County Commissioners adopt a Resolution continuing the Seeley Lake Sewer District assessment for one year only and setting the assessment at \$62 per lot and further, directing staff to communicate the same to the Department of Revenue, pending Commissioners Curtiss and Carey's signatures on the Resolution upon their return to Missoula. Commissioner Carey seconded the motion.

Commissioner Evans: Any discussion?

Chair Curtiss: Should we add to this or do this separately to direct staff to work with the Seeley Lake Sewer District to review that assessment methodology for the future.

Ann Mary Dussault: I think in a separate direction after this motion, you could add that and actually you'd be directing the Sewer District to work with staff or whomever they –

Chair Curtiss: Okay. Alright. No further discussion on the motion then.

The motion carried on a vote of 3-0.

Ann Mary Dussault: So then, you might want to add for the record a request that the Seeley Lake Sewer District reassess the assessment methodology, in the event they need to request an assessment for 2007.

Commissioner Evans: And I would certainly agree with that.

Chair Curtiss: So would I, and I think that they not only need to review it in case their needs to be another assessment to finish the study, but for the whole project in the future, that it's probably better to tie the assessment to a dwelling unit rather than a lot, although there may be some assessment for a bare lot too, it just seems that it makes more sense.

Commissioner Evans: I totally agree.

Chair Curtiss: So, I don't know if we need it in a motion, but that's a directive.

Mike Sehestedt: I think I heard all three of you agree with it. That's good enough for me.

Commissioner Evans: Did I hear you, Bill?

Commissioner Carey: Yes, sorry, I did say I agree.

Commissioner Evans: Alright. Is there anything else?

Glen Morin: Who do I talk with?

Commissioner Evans: Mike and Ann Mary, they'll figure out who. Thank you folks for coming down on this lovely day and appreciate you input. We're adjourned.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the Commissioners were in recess at 3:30 p.m.