

## **PUBLIC MEETING – FLORENCE/CARLTON SCHOOL DISTRICT - OCTOBER 30, 2006**

Acting Chairwoman Barbara Evans called the public meeting to order at 7:15 p.m. Also present were Commissioner Jean Curtiss, Chief Financial Officer Dale Bickell, and Chief Deputy County Attorney Mike Sehestedt.

[Note: Due to technical difficulties with the public microphone, some public testimony was not sufficiently recorded for transcription. The microphone was exchanged on page 4.]

John McGee: First of all I'd like to welcome the Missoula County Commissioners [inaudible] and taking time out of your day to come down here to the Florence Community and speak with us about the issue that we have with [inaudible]. The Florence/Carlton School District is – has requested this meeting so that we can formally request that an advisory council be established to review the impact fee study that [inaudible] have completed.

One of the issues that [inaudible] is facing [inaudible]. There are many [inaudible] that impact our schools, one of them being capital improvements. Under Montana Code 7-6-1603, we want to know can we ourselves, the school district, impose impact fees against contractors and land developers building in our school district to help pay for extensions to the school required because of the growth in the school district. Now we've had questions [inaudible] we believe that it would be appropriate. If impact fees are used to offset the cost of developing [inaudible] the immediate area, whether it's roads, sewers, and parks, and so on and so forth. We also believe that tax dollars that come to support [inaudible] come to support schools.

So, what we're looking for – I just wanted to give a little bit of background information on some of the [inaudible] that we've done. Impact fees became [inaudible] for the authorized in 2005 [inaudible] of code 7-6-1603. Impact fees are one-time fees imposed on new development for the purpose of constructing new growth-related infrastructure. As we understand it, it cannot be used to fund the operation of facilities or for improvement of existing public facilities. Rather they are specific to the use of growth development needs of public infrastructure as required to keep up with increased growth in municipal areas. Under this statute, cities and county governments such as yourself are given the right to charge these fees to builders and developers when they begin new development that directly impacts public infrastructure. Several cities were imposing prior to the passage of this statute under their independent local government authority. For example, Bozeman and Missoula have been imposing impact fees based on a 1990 Supreme Court decision recognizing the power of local governments to impose such a fee. Needless to say, this has been a source of significant contention between land developers and local government. For some time City local government representatives pushing for the passage of legislation favor the impact fees as a revenue source for needed growth-related infrastructure demands. Many believe the cost [inaudible] should be the cost payers and that general property taxes should not be a sole source for paying for the needed infrastructure. Rather than imposing impact fees outright, representatives of the building industry and construction industry also propose a merging of impact fees legislation in Senate Bill 158 in front of the Montana Legislature for its consideration. The versions were very similar in many ways to Senate Bill 185 that was passed, but they did have some distinct differences. Despite the difference, both sides agreed that a statute authorizing fees was necessary and appropriate empowering local governments to impose fees provide uniformity and consensus through counties and cities with which developers and contractors could rely for a decision. With both sides in agreement that impact fee legislation was needed, the difficulty began when coming to a compromise on how the statute should be drafted and ultimately the scope of the impact fees themselves. Mr. Kakuk can surely [inaudible] building industry all these fees exaction. For these exactions to be legal, he argued, they need to meet three tests. A substantive due process of local government must have the authority imposing them. The statute would clearly grant that authority. Equal protections must be applied to all development equally. Number 3, impact fees cannot be a taking, done without just compensation. This requires a) a nexus: there must be a rational connection between the desired action and the impact fee; b) proportionality: it must only be used for

new infrastructure development that is affected by the new building development. Impact fees cannot be used for existing problems or maintenance. There was a great deal of discussion on the need for both the nexus between the fee and infrastructure needs and proportionality of how the amount would be determined. The Senate and Local Government Committee noted there were more similarities than differences between the two proposals in Senate Bill 158 and 185 and encouraged both parts of Congress to get together and come to some kind of compromise and present a mutually supported proposal for the House Local Government Committee. This they did and presented an uncontested proposal to the House on March 10, 2005. At this hearing, again, the scope of impact fees was discussed. It was expressed that this was a topic of contention between the opposing fractions but that they had reached a compromise. It was proposed that impact fees be only imposed on construction of public infrastructure and facilities. The definition of these facilities included five specific areas: public water, public sewer, public storm drainage; public transportation facilities; emergency fire; police; medical rescue facilities.

As you can see, schools do not fit within there. However, impact fees can also be used for public infrastructure between these five areas if supported by two-thirds vote in City Council or local government [inaudible] for counties. This added provision demonstrates an option deliberately left available for impact fees to be imposed for areas beyond the five explicitly stated. These other areas of use were to be left up to the individual local government or counties to decide. This additional provision presented to the House Committee and ultimately placed in statutory language closes the door to [inaudible] arguments supporting strict adherence to imposing impact fees for only a select few public facilities. The scope of the impact fee was deliberately left open and up to the determination of the Committee of Local Governments. There is a strong argument that the expansion of public schools is a valid reason for the imposition of impact fees and current [inaudible] states allow impact fee reviews for public school development. It appears Legislators [inaudible] the proposal that was presented to the House almost verbatim the definition Section Part 16, 7-6-1601 statute defines public facilities as, and if you go up through the list, we feel we fall into is other facilities. "Other facilities for which documentation is prepared as provided in 7-6-1602 that have been approved as part of an impact fee ordinance or resolution by a two-thirds majority of the governing body of an incorporated city, town, or consolidated local government; or a unanimous vote of the board of county commissioners of a county government." From the text of statute and from the Legislative history it's clear the Legislature [inaudible] a lot of time local government we seek to use impact fee for use beyond the five areas they initially define. The theory clearly numerates statute provides the avenue for procedure for authorizing these other areas.

Today I just want to let you know that the school district has conducted this study. We hired TischlerBise, consulting firm out of [inaudible] to conduct this study for us. We believe this study has a lot of validity and strength and we would like to bring it before Missoula County Commissioners and have it reviewed and studied and then allow Commissioners to take action, whether to approve it or not approve it. But we'd like it to be something the public can see [inaudible] that we work with the government process and how the Legislature intended so that we could fight to serve our students in the best way we can. The fact and the reality is our school district is overcrowded. We have [inaudible]. We face a future where we see development coming time and time again. A couple of weeks ago I read an article in the Missoulian with the MaClay property and the ski resort where it said 2500 homes were proposed for development within that development. Now, 2500 homes over 40 years sounds great. What if the market conditions changed in such a way that development would occur faster than the 40-year period of time. What are we left with --- what does that do to our children and their educational opportunity? We're very concerned about this. We see impact fees as an avenue that can assist us in planning for our future. To be honest with you, I don't believe the current tax structure in Montana has addressed growth. It is just not fair to the people who have lived in our community all their lives who have been there and supported us and have moved on [inaudible] for us to be asking for taxes on a level that will compromise their standard of living, something has to happen. Something has to protect those individuals. And is it time for impact fees to feed that mechanism to balance the books? I don't know if that's the way it needs to be, but I do know [inaudible]. And with that, I'd like to turn the mike

over to Dwayne Guthrie if you have questions for him so that he can do a presentation on impact [inaudible].

Commissioner Evans: Before we do that, I have to apologize for not introducing the folks at the front table. This is Dale Bickell on my far left. He's our Finance Officer for Missoula County. Mike Sehestedt is the Deputy County Chief Civil Attorney for the County Attorney's office and Jean Curtiss, other County Commissioner, and I'm Barbara Evans. So feel free to go ahead.

John McGee: So if there are any questions I'll be more than happy to answer the questions at this time.

Commissioner Evans: Go right ahead.

John McGee: Okay, I will [inaudible]

Dwayne Guthrie: Commissioners, members of the public, this is about a 15-minute slide show that I want to walk through some of the assumptions around what we did about the impact fee. And it really is a draft at this point we're at [inaudible] in Montana.

Commissioner Evans: Excuse me Dwayne, Cathie our secretary would like to say something.

Cathie Cichosz: Something to help me with my typing, if you aren't introduced by someone before you come, please state your name and if you could spell your last name, and if your first name is a different spelling, just let me know. Thank you.

Commissioner Evans: That's so we immortalize you correctly.

Dwayne Guthrie: My name and telephone number and email are all in there. And we will gladly help out with anybody's questions. And try to help with any concerns or questions. Talk about the forum in that we basically have pulled together the numbers to document what the impact fees could be. But then there's a [inaudible] process and that here in Montana you have to have an advisory [inaudible] that's one thing that John was talking about, where there is a process where development communities [inaudible] on development projections. Things that they know about like possible [inaudible] all those kinds of things. And so it is popping up where we will go back and forth and make some refinements.

But I think John's covered the impacted ground rules, but let me just [inaudible]. It's not [inaudible] a tax. People would like to think that it is but it's really not. If you [inaudible] new houses community, you would have to pay an impact fee too. It runs with the land. The concept is as you have private sector development you need more public sector development to go with it. So if you or your children or anybody who [inaudible] 50 years you're still going to have to pay an impact fee if you build a new house. So it is not a newcomer's tax. So that is something that is kind of an eye-opener for a lot of people. It's not really revenue raising [inaudible]. It will raise money but the money is earmarked for very specific purposes. Only growth related capital improvements for the specific type of facility that's it's approved for, so in this case it would be for a public school. So we can't put a new roof on this building or we can't [inaudible] or anything like that with [inaudible]. Those will have to come from other revenue. The whole idea of the [inaudible] portion of this [inaudible] how to go through and look at the housing data and school enrollment [inaudible]. How many public school students are we likely to get from new houses? How many [inaudible]. All that requires [inaudible]. And then because of its fee, not a tax we [inaudible]. You can't just take money and sit on it for 20 years. You have to do the timing factor and for Montana, it's typically spelled out to be no more than five years. So if you don't [inaudible] collecting money [inaudible] a whole new school in five years you have to do something to add [inaudible].

I think that's clearly the case here in Florence-Carlton district. Also, we have to be concerned about the geographic service area. That's not a problem here. We have [inaudible] school facility that will be the

location of the new school in the future to have additional land across the street. And so any improvements will feed capacity for all the grades and will allow you to have reconfiguration of the building. [inaudible]. There are accounting and expenditure controls, so we have to work out how we put up the money [inaudible] because we tie to septic tank or sewer service where basically before you get a septic tank permit you will probably have to go to the school district or county, pay your money, pay the school impact fee [inaudible]. It will be more complicated than this issue handing it over to the county, so [inaudible].

Cathy Cichosz: Excuse me sir. When you turn your head away from the mic, I'm not picking you up.

Dwayne Guthrie: John and I talked about the voting process so I'm going to skip down a little bit. The advisory committee that has to be set up requires according to State law one developer, and one accountant, certified public accountant has to be on that. And that's kind of a procedural process to get the impact fees from the county you have to get that in place. And that's something that the county would set up or the fee would be imposed by this county [inaudible]. And then you are allowed in Montana to add an administrative surcharge. It cannot be more than five percent of the total fee. That helps cover the cost of collecting the money, the [inaudible] study and things like that. So that's kind of nice to be able to do that. Most of the time with the impact fees it's not a technical question as to what the fees should be. It's more of a policy kind of consideration. Because we are changing rules of the game; who pays when you pay and is it a [inaudible] or is it a revenue? So that [inaudible]. It's really a political [inaudible] kind of decision. But there is a technical aspect, and I'll just kind of look through that and let you see how it works.

At the top, I kind of describe a perpetual impact fee formula [NOTE: at this point the microphone was replaced] where we identify the demand units per development unit. And this case with schools, it's public school students and we have to match up how many come from each housing unit, so that's what at the top box, or the left-most box on the diagram below. Then in the middle, what we're trying to do with the money is identify the infrastructure units that match up with each one of those demand units. So for a school impact fee we're trying to provide additional school building space. So it's measured by square feet of school building and match that up with a number of students. So we have data on that. We know how big all the buildings are, we know how many of students we have, so we come up with those level of service standards. And then there's the cost factor. What's it cost to provide the additional infrastructure, so it's just dollars per square foot? And there big dollars that you'll see in our report. It's because it's total project cost. It's not just the raw construction. It's the design fees, it's the cost of utilities – to connect utilities, it's the cost of the furniture and equipment, the lights, all the things you need basically to open the doors of the school building and make it useful. So it's a total project cost. Okay, so why impact fees? Well it is an additional source of revenue. Right now, especially in Montana the State is pretty restrictive on your options. Right now, we're down here at the bottom you see a box where property tax is the main driver that we're using. On one hand, it's kind of nice in that it's a broad revenue. It spreads the pain over everybody. But like John was saying, then if you have to build a new school either try to pay for it out of cash, which hardly ever happens, or you have to float a bond to do that, then everybody has to pay. So that on one sense is bad, because as you see on the left side of the diagram, there's a weak connection between the revenue source – everybody's paying it even if you're not generating the need for additional school capacity. So impact fees try to make a little closer connection. As new development takes place – we have more private development – we need more public sector infrastructure to go along with it. So there's a little closer connection there with the impact fees, so that's one of the advantages of that.

Now at the bottom, I know the numbers are kind of small, but let me use my pointer here and see if this works. Where how much revenue can be generated is really the function of two things – and that's what the little diagram, the little matrix kind of shows for you. It's a function of how many housing units you have and we've been running in the middle here, about 60 housing units per year. So if you have more units you're going to generate more revenue, if you have less units you're going to generate less revenue. And then it's a function of not only the amount of units being built, but how much each one's

paying. You'll see in just a minute that the maximum's around \$10,000 a housing unit. The politicians, elected officials can chose to adopt a lower amount, and say we don't want to totally radically change how we're paying for schools, but we don't mind to maybe pay for some of it through impact fees. So you can adopt a percentage of the maximum, so there's a range there with the different dollar amounts. Even if you only adopt a fee of \$5,000 a house, at 60 units a year that's 300,000 a year. So you kind of get an idea of the magnitude. At the low end, it's as little as \$200,000 a year or maybe as much as \$800,000. Depends on the amount of development and the amount of the fee that's actually approved. And so that's one of the reasons you have this public hearing process, so the Commissioners can hear your thoughts on this – the magnitude of the fees, and try to decide all things considered, what's the best to do. So they key numbers are all summarized on this chart. Right now in the school district we know how many housing units we have. We have a good census data for every time the census is done, 90 and 2000 that matches up the number of housing units in the community. We also got from the Ravalli septic tank data on the number of septic tanks permitted since 2000, so we have a pretty good count on how many housing units we have here in the community. Match that up with the enrollment, it averages out to .42 students per housing unit. So it might be easier to relate to that number if it's in hundreds. So if you had a hundred houses you'd get on an average 42 public school students out of that hundred houses. So that's the current ratio. We're not doing anything on land, this section of the boxes right in here, because we already have a school sight, 19 acres to build on, so we're focused on just the building. So we take this current infrastructure standard, in square feet per student is divide the size of these buildings by the number of students, its 146 square feet per student. Total project cost to build a new school estimated from the architects, \$175 per square foot, so just multiply them together, its \$25,000 per student station if the State doesn't help out. And that's part of the problem. A lot of the states, not only Montana, but have really been cutting back and back and back on funding school infrastructure. So it looks like here the current situation is you can't count on State money. Basically, it's all going on the locals to come up with. So if the State were to help out, then we could of course reduce the impact fee – or you would reduce the impact fee. There is a credit here because there are some existing bonds that are in place that it's not fair to ask you to pay for the new capacity and pay off the bonds on the existing building, so there's a credit for the existing bonds. And just kind of one of those things that we still have to work out the details.

If the school district decided they were going to build an entirely new school and had to do a new bond, we might actually have to make the credits bigger. And so that's kind of like one of the circular things where you work out the details of your capital improvements and then you might have to go back and adjust your impact fees a little. So about half of – since this is 42% of that \$24,000 number, \$10,000 per student station is what it works out to be. Just a couple things on demographics then I'll turn it over to questions from anyone in the audience or Commissioners. Let's talk a little bit about what's going on as far as growth. I just have three simple things on here. The students are in the triangles here, it's kind of a yellow color, it's kind of faded. The housing units are in the pink box, squares, and the black diamonds are the population. See the population has been going up at a rapid rate since 90. The housing units going up, the students also went up from 90 to 2000, but then it's been real flat the last five years, and that's part of the issue. What's going on? Well it could be just a capacity constraint. We basically have filled up the school system so people are going elsewhere – are going to private schools or are taking their kids up to Missoula with them. So that's part of the problem. Will that go down, stay flat, or go up? If we – just assuming – and this is something that we'll have to monitor over time to make sure, but if it stays like it is today, as the projected development happens at 65 housing units a year, we'll get on average 34 new students every year. So it might fluctuate a little up and down, but that's what would happen if student generation rates stay constant. That's about, if you see up here, average annual about 3% growth rate. So what's the projected capital improvements over the next five years, because the State requires you to come up with a five-year capital improvement plan? So just in general planning terminology, we have to expand the school building by 24,700 square feet to accommodate the projected increase in students. That would be 169 additional students over the next five years. At \$175 a square foot, that's \$4.3 million to accommodate those kids.

So we're kind of in a little bit of a quandary and have some details to work out. So what will probably happen if you build an entire new school, you'd have capacity for 500 students, so it would be much bigger than you'd actually need for the next five years. And so the impact fees aren't going to pay for the whole new school, they're only going to pay for a portion of it. So you're looking at probably doing bonds for the remainder of the building. Entire new school could be a huge price, about \$13 million, or \$12.8 million for a 500-student high school. So impact fees aren't all the solution. They can certainly help with the funding of a new facility, but there's going to have to be additional local money still to be able to cover the cost of – if you built a whole new school. If the capital improvement plan is just we're going to add some portable classrooms and try to make do for a couple of years. And basically let the overcrowding get worse, then we'll go to building a new school. So there's that timing question there and that's really up to the local school board and school staff and local officials to figure out.

So that's basically the gist of what you have to do to calculate an impact fee. It's easy to document, all the numbers of there. I'd be glad to answer any specific questions you might have or comments from the Commissioners, but that's my presentation.

Commissioner Evans: Thank you Mr. Guthrie. We'll now take public testimony for anyone who would care to comment either for or against this proposal.

John Cornish: My name is John Cornish. I've been in Montana all of my life. I was born in Hamilton and spent many – all my years in western Montana going to different schools. I guess that's the reason I became a schoolteacher. I evaluated each school system and what it took and what they had from Three Forks to Kalispell to Whitefish to Dillon and I was – I found that a great resource through my years of education here at Florence. I've been here at Florence for 34 years. We've had some buildings – well we have not destroyed or gotten rid of anything in the last 34 years even though we built a Quonset hut down here that was supposed to be on our campus for ten years and that was maybe 25 years ago. So the problem being is the fact that watching people and working with our people in our community we have contractors here that should not be burdened by the whole situation of building new schools. But we also have an older generation that I'm well aware of and fast approaching that myself, that don't need to be burdened by higher taxes. I think it's a situation that I've seen and I hope that would happen in Montana for the last decade or so is that Montanan's would step up and take care of education together. And I see this as a method and an ideology that could possibly work out with impact fees throughout the state being just one more way of helping an education, not necessarily supplanting everything else. But everybody carrying their fair share. I would hope that we would have some sharing of costs and this is one idea that I think I'm kind of proud of our school to be setting forth in our state to try to help our educational systems out. Thank you.

Commissioner Evans: Thank you Mr. Cornish. Anyone else who would care to speak? Come forth and give us your name please.

Duane Zeiler: My name is Duane Zeiler. I was born and raised here, 39 years old. My children are 4<sup>th</sup> generation in this community. I feel that by looking at the TischlerBise situation that I've ah – to start with I'm not an educated person by going through college or anything. I graduated from high school here. I grew up east of town here in a two-bedroom trailer house with five children in our family. I feel through construction and the development in our community that it's upgraded many of our lives in this community. I feel that this impact fee would be an unfair shot at contractors and developers in the community. I've looked at the numbers with the TischlerBise. To start with, I'm not opposed to impact fees; however, I am finding some fault with the numbers that they have in this situation. I believe in year 2000 we had 971 students. As of right now, I believe we have 905 this year. With a growth rate of 65 homes per year, I don't see where we're coming up with .42 children per household. And not only have those 65 homes pre year not been a negative impact to the community, but I also feel they've become a positive impact by property tax base in the community. Like I said again, I'm not opposed to impact fees; I am opposed to the numbers that they come up with in this impact fee statement. I grew up here; my family's grown up here. I feel that development creates a positive cash flow to the community, not

only in property taxes, but it also brings in businesses in the community that are not a direct impact on the school of the community. These are just some of the things that I felt that are wrong with the impact statement, I feel that are wrong with the impact fees. I feel that, as a contractor, I've developed two small subdivisions in the area. I don't feel that what I've done has created a huge impact on the community at all. I've developed two five-lot subdivisions in the community. But I also feel that I've been a hard member working in the community and I don't feel that as a community member that I should get blasted with an \$11,000 impact fee which ultimately will go back to the consumer.

The other thing that we need to take into account when we run these numbers if we \$300,000 raised per year on this impact fee, over the course of five years that's \$1.5 million. But at the same time, we have to pass a mill levy to create the other revenue from this income to go along with this to pass this. Out of those 65 homes per year, I believe we probably are going to average approximately two voters per household. Out of those two voters per household, we have to look at the fact that how many of those people who already felt they paid their impact fee are going to come down here and vote yes on a mill levy to pass that mill levy when they feel that they've already paid their share by the \$11,000 that they paid on an impact fee on their house? Those are just some of my views, some of my perspectives on the thing. With that said, I'd just probably like to leave it at that.

Commissioner Evans: Thank you Mr. Zeiler. Next person who would like to speak.

Tim Miller: My name is Tim Miller. I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight. I have three children who've gone through public schools here in Florence. And they've done a fantastic job and they've all lived with the overcrowding in the school system. I don't think that they're – in looking at this for having been here for about 15 years – that there are good solutions always to school funding sometimes I think it requires blended funding. This looks to me like it's a great opportunity to use some blended funding to solve a longstanding, long-term problem. I'd like to thank the leadership in the school district for the administration for providing the leadership and stepping up I think really for the whole state and I would like to urge you to consider to being in the same position to be able to provide leadership to the state and support the advisor committee or council to be established. Thanks.

Commissioner Evans: Thank you Mr. Miller. Anyone else who would care to speak.

Dan Mahm: My name is Dan Mahm. I would like to throw my support under the impact fee process .because I do think that as the outlying areas become more and more popular and as the population seems to shift it seems to be kind of an unfair burden to accommodate all the growth and not have an impact fee associated with it to help spur that along. I think that the impact fee opportunity gives us that method which we can improve the situation without having to diminish the quality of education and the conditions that we're living in I guess, if you want to call it that. Or that the students are having to live in. And I think it seems to be a pretty fair way, and quite honestly it sounds like a lot of money, but at the same time when someone's planning to move and buy a new house, I don't think it's going to be a deterrent over the 30 year life of a mortgage to pay the fair price to come and live in the community. So. I support it.

Commissioner Evans: Thank you Mr. Mahm. The next person who would like to speak.

Candy Jerke: Hi, I'm Candy Jerke, I'm from here in Florence. My kids have already graduated from school. They were in high school when they had the biggest group here, the 970 kids going to school. And it was a problem. The kids can't even get through the hallways. It creates a lot of stress and a lot of tension for the kids particularly. Having been a teacher for over ten years, I can tell you that research shows that people become grumpy if they don't have space. You every notice if you get a bunch of people in a room and they're all crowded together? And that's the same thing that happens within the school system.

One of the remarks that I got from another person was that when this school was expanded and they were having a lot of problems here in Florence, and most people don't remember this, back in the early 1990s, before they built the newer part of the school. What happened at that point is they were having a lot of problems. They were occasionally getting the Sheriff in and different things because there was stress between the kids. And what happened was they built a new school and everybody had more space. Suddenly it made a huge difference. So for the best education of the children, they do need to have more space. One of the things that's been talked about is the fact that we don't have all these kids in school that according to records which show what we have here. Well what's happening? We've got kids that are being home schooled, we've got kids that are being sent to Missoula to Loyola, to Sentinel, to Big Sky, to different places because the school is so crowded and we do have some problems here because of it. And it really made a difference because we moved here I think it was about 12 years ago now, and this was definitely the best school in the entire valley. Because I did a lot of research to find that out because I wanted to send my kids to the best school. And I really felt that it was the best school.

Just to go on to some of the things about the Tischler report, this report does not put the burden of building a new school on the developers. It puts the burden back on the community to decide how it will support the school. The rapid growth in the Florence area has placed an unfair tax burden on the present taxpayers. I have talked to a great number of people in this area, and when the last bond issue for this building was presented, why didn't they want to vote for it? The developers aren't paying their fair share. I would hate to tell you how many people told me that. That is exactly how they felt. They felt that they were bringing the kids in and therefore they didn't want to vote for a new school because they were going to have to pay an unfair burden. And that's the people who have lived here for quite a while. I feel that this report is actually conservative in its estimates. I do agree having appraised most of this area at one time that about 65 new homes is really close to about how many new homes we are getting every year. That translates into taxes that the school district gets of approximately on an average home of about \$475 per average home. Most of that money, where does it actually go? It goes for salaries for the teachers, it goes for books, it goes for the things that are needed in the school. It doesn't go so they have extra money to buy – to do a building. There isn't that extra money there.

We're still paying off – a small portion of that is still for paying off that bond issue like they mentioned previously. The TischlerBise uses 146 square feet of school building per student. I want you to realize that this includes the gym and the boiler room. At the present time, this is the lowest average number of square feet per student in western Montana. So what does that mean? Well, that means that if you're looking at this report and looking at what's going to happen, if we have this 3% increase in housing units each year, what's going to happen if we start getting another – if we even get two more classrooms in here? We don't have anyplace to put the kids. It's going to have to be portable classrooms; it's going to have to be something. And it doesn't take very long. All you have to do is have a couple of subdivisions get filled up real quickly. We know there's a lot of demand in the area. We know there's a lot of people that come into this area and want to live here. We get a lot of people that move out of Missoula and want to be in the Florence area. Why? There's a couple of reasons. One, at present time, our housing costs are less down here than it is to buy a house in Missoula. That's why a lot of people move down here. And the other reason is they want a good school system. And we, for quite a number of years there was a big demand in the Florence school district just for that reason. That has lessened in the last few years because of the overcrowding.

This is one situation I really feel we should have the developer's pay their fair share. What it ends up doing is it ends that the cost of the house is a little bit more for the people that are coming into the area. The developer doesn't eat all of this, that's for sure because he passes it on to the person who buys the house. And I think that most people realize that. I don't think that it's going to hurt the housing market in this area that much if we did have development fees. If you don't think the \$10,000 is reasonable, you can cut that in half. But I do think we have to get – at least get this started. As this happens across the state and with all the school districts, then it's going to become a fair deal.

The hard part right now is Florence is the first school district that's trying to do this. They're trying to follow SB 185. This makes this very, very difficult. It puts you, the County Commissioners in a tough spot because you're going to be the first ones doing something. But you know, somebody's got to be first.

Commissioner Evans: Thank you Candy. Next person who would like to speak.

Cheryl Holden Rice: Hi, I'm Cheryl I grew up in Missoula. I was down at the end of Cleveland Street where Cleveland and Mount intersect, where there's a light now. Mount Avenue was the city limits. I'm 58 years old, I dug bitterroots in that area with the Salish when they came in from Arlee. In that lifetime span, which I don't think is too far back. It was only 35 years ago that I was digging those bitterroots, I have watched Missoula Valley explode. I moved up here in 89 and am in Eagle Watch. When my husband and I bought our ground on 2 ½ acres, we paid \$46,000 for a house that had been nine years old and lived in six years. We bought two adjoining acres for \$4,600. Within six years, it was appraised at \$195,000. But I did protest that a little bit and weeded it down a little bit. I was told last Sunday after church that those 2 ½ acres, if I sat on them just a short time, they're going to be worth \$125,000. And I know in my neighborhood where it is one house per two acres and has been for 30 years, we have seen the price go up. That means our taxes are going up.

When my husband and I added a deck, we were asked if we wanted pine or fir. We said well, whatever's going to last the longest because we plan on living here the rest of our life. We went with redwood, but if those taxes keep going up, and with our income being a fixed income, that is a big issue. In the last couple of years, we have watched the request come to our County Commissioners for Aspen Springs, 680 some homes, the Legacy Ranch, 580 give or take a few. With that influx of proposals in certain subdivisions, not counting the other homes that we are facing, and without considering all the other infrastructure such as emergency services which we have volunteer here, no high school in Missoula County that serves the kids between the Ravalli County line and Missoula unless they come into Ravalli County. Impact fees are really vital to help us survive here and to also protect the quality of life that we have. To me it's a no-brainer. I think it's something that – because the person who buys land cheap and puts out whatever, like if we were to sell those two acres next to us, we're going to make some money on that. And you can't tell me that those developers aren't making it.

A third – a very important issue that I have seen is people in the other end of the County where the County seat is looks at Florence as Missoula County. You go into Missoula they look at Florence – where's Florence? They're in the Bitterroot. My family were the Carltons. My dad's mom's side came from West Florence, Ohio. And I think those Carltons wanted to be in Missoula County. And I am personally about ready to say let's draw that school district line where Missoula County is. But that will put a big burden on Missoula County. But the point that I'm bringing out is, you have to consider this as a Missoula County issue too. I have been to the emergency services in Missoula County. I have given Ravalli County Commissioners letters. I have been to the Sheriff's department and I'm trying to make everybody aware that this is an issue that we have to work together on as it stands unless we change county lines, which is not feasible. Please consider it, not just from your head, but from your heart. Our kids' lives are at stake, and the Bitterroot quality of life is at stake. Thank you.

Commissioner Evans: Thank you Cheryl. Anyone else who'd care to speak?

Steve Arno: My name is Steve Arno. My wife and I have lived here since 1975 and our kids went through school here at Florence and graduated in 1989 and 1992 and went on to, both of them went to University of Montana and got bachelor's degrees there. And we've been concerned and supportive of this school, not only when our kids were in school, but in subsequent years. And we feel that it's quite an uphill battle for a bedroom community that's in two counties, where the school district is in two counties and so many of the people that move here don't develop roots, as would have been the case 50 or 100 years ago. They don't have so much in the way of roots in the community because they're working in Missoula. Great numbers of them they do their recreation in Missoula. This is just a place

where they sleep. So partly for that reason, it's really difficult to get a positive vote. And it has been historically extremely difficult. One of our children and his family now and our grandkids live in Victor and it's amazing how much more connectiveness there is in that community. It's quite a bit further away, it's not as quite as much of a bedroom community. I think there are a lot of factors going there, but just what they're able to do in support of the school is quite a contrast with Florence. I think Florence just has a really difficult time. And I remember, and maybe Barbara you were on the Commission at the time, I can't recall if you were on the Missoula County Commission in 78 and 79.

Commissioner Evans: Started in 79, elected in 78.

Steve Arno: So there was a Bitterroot Meadows subdivision in 78 or 79.

Commissioner Evans: I think it was just before I was elected.

Steve Arno: And it was a large one. It was where the Schrader Ranch is north of Schrader Brothers on the west side of the highway. And the developers – and we were as parents and taxpayers interested in that because they were proposing 300+ or so houses – and the developers ultimately proposed a voluntary impact fee of, as I recall \$1200 or \$1500. That was in 78 or 79. It didn't happen because for a variety of reasons, which I can't recall, the Commission chose not to approve that subdivision. But I think it was a valid idea then and it's just, the concept of impact fees, not particularly any amount or any one approach, but I think it's high time that this proposal to discuss this officially, this report and consider it officially, it's high time for it. That's all I have to say.

Commissioner Evans: Thank you Steve. Anyone else who's here to speak?

Kathleen Driscoll: I'm Kathleen Driscoll from Hamilton, raised in the Bitterroot. I just want to bring up three points. One is there's a lag time when a house is built. And I appreciate the fact that that brings tax dollars into the community, but you have to take into account that it's anywhere between 18 months to 6 years before that property is up and running and ready to put it on the tax base, depending on when it's appraised and gone through all of that. The second thing is that when they actually are doing mitigation for the county, they're taking in money for the roads, they're taking in money for the park district and all those different issues, but the schools get a very minimal amount and we have to look at that issue. Then also, if you're concerned as far as looking through the eyes of a developer, as far as the builders passing that on, that \$10,000 on to the person buying the home, if you're worried about that, Paul Tischler did mention that those homes can have exceptions for low-income housing. So those are three issues that I think need to be brought up. Thank you.

Commissioner Evans: Thank you Ms. Driscoll. Anyone else who would care to speak?

Bob Chaffin: I'm Bob Chaffin and I have lived in this community for about 40 years. I have lived in this community, my family, and I appreciate the problems that the school's having. I think the impact fee is not all bad, but the dollar amount seems extremely high, extremely high. We need to look at a better way of formulating this because basically that \$10,000 translates into about \$63.30 a month for 30 years. Now these people that are going to pay this in that mortgage – even if they pay cash, it's built into the house, okay. You have a period of 30 years, 60 years, 90 years, whatever, okay. But on top of that, they are going to pay as we all will, and will need to do it at some point, pass a levy to build more school. At that point, they'll be taxed again on that new property. They'll have to pay the mill levy and basically, the winner on the \$63 a month turns out to be the mortgage company. Or the insurance company or whoever collects the interest over the 30 year period. So we need – and being in real estate, a great deal of our people have moved here are bringing no children, are retired. Two and three hundred thousand-dollar houses. Two hundred thousand is kind of a low figure. You're looking more at \$275,000, \$300,000 or more because of cost of infrastructure to build and to develop and cost of basic plan. So I do think that we need to look at not nearly that high because those people are going to pay in perpetuity as the rest of us will and that's about all I have to say.

Commissioner Evans: Anyone else who would care to speak?

Don Nelson: I'm Don Nelson and I live here in Florence. My grandfather was W. W. Wicks and he moved to Missoula for the educational opportunities that were there from Boulder, MT in about 1895. And I grew up over in Livingston, MT and I owe the people in Livingston and Park County a great debt for providing me with an adequate education at Park County High School. My grandchildren live elsewhere. But I live here and I voted for the bond issues every time they've come up because I believe we need necessary schools in this community and we don't have them. We have overcrowding. I think at this point we need the impact fees in the mix to provide for adequate schools here. So I hope you'll support them. Thank you.

Commissioner Evans: Thank you Mr. Nelson. Anyone else who would care to speak?

Steve Hall: My name's Steve Hall. And I always wonder when I get in these meeting if I'm losing my nerve because I start to shiver or if it's because I'm cold. I think that we can all agree it isn't real warm in here. I think that's kind of an indication of what we're facing. My group that I was spokesperson for in the past is the Florence Coalition Against Aspen Springs. And I'll humble myself a little bit to Candy Jerke who has always seemed to come up with some incredible figures and is quite a statistician. When she speaks, I think we all need to listen. I guess I've asked myself several times in all these proceedings that I've been to the last couple of years is what kind of people are we? I see three types of people: some people make things happen, some people let things happen, and some people wonder what happened. I think that we'll all agree that the people here in Florence want to make things happen. I think that we proved that when we stopped a subdivision that wasn't a bad idea, it just wasn't a good idea for this area. This is a tool that we're looking at, and it's a funding tool that could be very, very important to not only the Florence community, but the State of Montana in the near future. I talked with Michael Kakuk a number of times. He said no, it's not a perfect piece of legislation. He said we did the best we can with what we had to work with, and when the legislation Senate Bill 185 came out, it was a do or die effort. They said get it on the table, we've got to vote on it, so you guys need to quit bickering and you need to put something together. So he went from drafting Senate Bill 158 into 185. He was pushed into that and I think they did a reasonable job with the timeframe they had to work with. Is it going to be fine-tuned in the next Legislature? You betcha. They understand the need for funding in the state of Montana for schools. And I think that our County Commissioners and I think our area residents realize that also.

And so what we've got now is an opportunity to set together a five-person advisory committee to start this ball rolling. Is it going to happen overnight? No, it's not. Is it going to happen in the next year? By God, we hope so. It's really getting tough. I would encourage you, any of you on invitation to come down to the Florence Carlton School and wander through the halls and see what the kids are going through. And if you think for a minute that this congestion doesn't go out into the playground and streets and into the communities, you need to think again, because it's not a good scenario.

We've done real well. We've had wonderful administration. I want to thank John for his efforts. He's come over from the Helena area and done a wonderful job. I also want to thank Duane. I'm glad he came forward and spoke. Duane Zeiler, he's a hell of a contractor; he's a hell of a person. I admire him; I have an immense amount of respect for him. Whenever anything needs to be done, he's there first in line. So his input, we don't want it to go on ignored, not at all. But we're going to disagree on some of this about the impact fees.

So I guess my position right here when I talk to you people and the media and the rest of the Florence residents who are home taking care of their children, let's set the standard. We have the ability to set the standard for development in Montana because we have taken the challenge right now. To ask the Florence Carlton School to come up with a super-majority from the County Commissioners is an almost insurmountable task. No matter who sits on the board, to get six people to agree, it's a tough one. So

I'm asking the County Commissioners to sit together and decide on a unanimous vote for or against these impact fees. But I do not want to see one person stand in the way of progress. Thank you.

Commissioner Evans: Anyone else who'd care to speak?

David DeCan: Good evening Commissioners. Thank you for coming our tonight. We appreciate you taking the opportunity to look at this and try to help our situation here in Florence. My name is David DeCan. I've lived in Florence for about four years. I own a real estate company, real estate broker in Missoula; Ravalli and Missoula County.

I'd like to publicly go on record to thank our school board and thank John McGee for the work they've done on impact fees. It's commendable. It's cutting edge, it's progressive and I think it's going to set a standard for the State of Montana. We moved here to Florence four years ago after researching the whole State of Montana for schools. We did not choose this community haphazardly. We chose Florence for a very specific reason. I have four young children from ages seven to 15 in this school. And I am intimately aware of the overcrowding in this school. It is to a point – I don't know if you understand it. I think you need to hear Mr. Hall in his comments to come to our school and to see what we have going on here. They are doing a Herculean effort to try to keep this thing in order, but there is a situation that is building here that you have got to address. You cannot ignore this. This is a situation that is going to explode. We have these explosive problems going on all over the United States. We see in Colorado schools, California schools, east coast schools, we see shootings, we see people – abusive teachers, we see all of these different things going on. I can tell you, I mean I've overseen schools myself previously and I can tell you when you cram this many kids in this small an area; you are going to get an explosion. And it's going to come back on the Commissioners. It's gonna come back on each one of you on how you looked at this issue. Did you pass over it? Did you bring it forward? Were you progressive in your thinking? Did you examine it? Did you give it a fair hearing, and did you do the right thing?

Someone is going to pay for the education of these children. We live in the United States of America, the greatest country in the world, and I'm thankful to live here. Every child in this country has a right to an education. A good education. Our President says no child left behind. I'm all in favor of that, and I think most of us are. We want to see children educated. But the problem is in Florence is we have got to figure out who's going to pay for it. There is a problem here. Somebody has to pay for it. These folks are coming. It's the most beautiful place – I have lived coast to coast in this country. This valley is the most beautiful place in the world to live. I've lived in New York, Florida, California, Washington, up and down this whole country, and this is the most beautiful place I've ever lived and I don't want to leave. I don't want to sell my home, I don't want to leave Ravalli County, but somebody's going to pay for this.

And here's the question, and I think this is what it comes down to. Those children are going to get an education. That is government's duty to educate these children, and the people to pay for it, but who? Should it be Joe and Susie Smith in their two-bedroom, one bath house on their two acres? Should it be them, that don't even have kids in the school? They're living on Social Security. Why should they have to pay? Why? It makes absolutely no sense to raise their property taxes to pay. It doesn't make any sense at all. It's the most ridiculous thing I've ever heard. Why would you not want to pass on the cost of growth onto the people that are causing the growth? They're coming. I just had someone in my office from Minnesota today. Day before yesterday Florida, California, Colorado. They are coming and they are coming to Ravalli County. And the question is who will pay to educate those children? Will it be the citizens who have lived here their whole lives with their property taxes being raised, 'cause those children will be educated. They will be educated. But who will pay? Or will it be impact fees? Will it be a fee imposed upon those people that are coming that increase the cost to pay for the building so that those children are educated? It seems only rationale, it seems only logical that the people that cause the increase should have to pay. Thank you very much. I appreciate your time.

Commissioner Evans: Thank you. Anyone who'd care to speak?

Dale Brown: I'm Dale Brown. I live here in Florence. There's been some people before me here tonight that's really brought up some good points, and I know there's not – you can't put an impact on the schools. But they do a prorata on the roads, the fire department gets money – they can request the money and they get it. So I mean if your house burns down usually you have insurance that'll pay for your house. You're not out nothing really. But if your child doesn't get an education because he's in an overcrowded school, then can you recoup that? Now I think the TischlerBise \$10,000 is probably high. As Duane Zeiler said, he realizes you need an impact fee, but that is quite a bit of money. The other gentleman brought up \$63 a month. But still I sat in a couple of meetings, they offered \$500 to the fire department, the offer \$150 for a school per lot. That don't even buy the books for one student. And as Kathleen brought up, it takes upwards of six years before that house, the taxes are up to standard. So I think right now as overcrowded as they are any little bit of help would be quite a bit of help. If we did have an impact fee on the schools. So that's all I've got to say.

Commissioner Evans: Thank you. Anyone else who would care to speak.

Vicky Cornish: My name is Vicky Cornish. I currently serve on the Florence Carlton School Board and have for the last five years. I very much appreciate you coming tonight, Barbara and Jean, to hear our plea. I appreciate the things that you have to deal with everyday in your careers as Commissioners, vast issues, some of them overwhelming. I think about the things that come to us as school board members and some of those to us are vast and overwhelming, and one of those overwhelming issues that's come to us in the last four or five years since I've served on the board is the fact that we have been overcrowded for 12 years. We have tried to pass three different bonds to build additional school. We've tried to do it the best fiscally sound way we can think of. We've tried to do everything we can to educate our community on what our needs are and yet at the end of every vote, it was a negative for us.

And so three years ago we ran a survey run by a company that was out of Idaho, had nothing to do with the school district, this is all they did, and they ran a survey of the community. As we as a board went through that survey, one of the things that just jumped out from the pages was a question posed to that survey. That question being, if there was development help, meaning that if there was help from developers to put money towards a bond, would you be in favor of supporting the bond? There was a 63% yes. On almost every other question that was posed to the public, it was between 40-50%. So when we looked at the 62%, which was a huge percentage of our community that said yes, we will support a bond if in fact you bring another entity into the equation. So as a school board, we looked at this issue and realized that we could either sit – I loved what Steve said earlier – we could either just sit and hope that this thing would get better, or do nothing, or we could make a choice to move ahead. And it was our choice to move ahead. And we started researching this thing, and a year ago, House Bill 185 did come forward and we started reading more about it and we felt like maybe this was the State's way of helping a district such as us to be able to help our community so that we could continue to provide the same kind of educational process that we've been very, very proud of here.

I've lived in this community for 34 years. I have five children of my own. They've all graduated from here. I love this community; I've watched it grow from a little Class C school to one of the largest Class B schools in the state. I want to be proactive as a board member. I don't want in ten years for people to look at this community and say, "why didn't they do something ten years ago when they could have? They had something there but they didn't so anything." I'm just asking you to please seriously look at this. And form an advisory board that could look at this issue and then come to you and give you their input on whether or not you feel that this is something that could be looked at with a very serious approach. I appreciate your efforts to be here tonight and I thank you for coming.

Commissioner Evans: Thank you. Anyone else who would care to speak?

Mel Waggy: Hi. I wasn't going to talk, but I got pretty inspired. I'm probably the newest resident to talk tonight. I've been here only about 5 months. And I'm shocked to hear how crowded our school is here. I moved down here from Whitefish and I don't have any children, now will I be having any children coming to this school. However, I feel that as a member of the community we all benefit strongly from a strong school system. Listening to everybody's concern, it seems like the growth has come from three directions. One we have families who have been here in the valley for a long time who have had children, their have children have had children and maybe their children have had children, children, children. So that's part of the growth; you can't deny it. A gentleman talked about he moved here four years with his four children. So in the last 15 years, people have moved here for many reasons, mainly because it's a great place to live, and they've added to the school system currently, and that's why these hallways are crowded. It's not the people coming in the future. It's the people who have already been here. And then thirdly it sounds like development is inevitably and more people will be coming. I would like to see some kind of system where the cost is shared between the new development and the people who live here. I don't want to see people burdened who can't afford to pay it. So if there's some kind of tax relief for people who cannot help to support the schools. But I would be happy to help support the school here as a new resident, because again I think we all benefit from a strong school system. Thank you.

Commissioner Evans: Thank you Mel. Anyone else who would care to speak? I'm going to ask the staff and the other Commissioner if you have any comments?

Commissioner Curtiss: I have a question for Mr. McGee. Do we know how many kids are out of district this year that have chosen to go to either home school, private or down to one of the schools in Missoula?

John McGee: Currently right now we know of 45 students that are attending school in Missoula. And that's from the high school population.

Commissioner Curtiss: They're all high school age?

John McGee: High school age, correct.

Commissioner Curtiss: I think that the folks here tonight brought up a lot of really important points, and I would be in favor of appointing the – or putting out – I believe Ravalli County has already advertised for an advisory committee, and Betty Lund is nodding her head that they have. I would be in favor of Missoula County asking for an advisory committee to look at the report, see if there's some numbers that need to be changed as a few people have suggested there might be, and review and then make a recommendation to the Commission. I don't think that that means that impact fees would be imposed, but it would sure help us to understand them better and see if there were any changes needed in the report.

Commissioner Evans: Michael, Dale, do you have anything you'd care to say?

Dale Bickell: I have a question for Dwayne maybe to explain one aspect of impact fees because maybe you'll do it better than me. It has come up in other meetings as well about the data used on the growth of the student population. I was wondering if you could comment on how, if impact fees were imposed, how as they are collected over time and the impact fee advisory committee would review those, how that might change how credits might be given if in fact the population didn't grow as it was projected in the report.

Dwayne Guthrie: Basically, the procedure would be pretty easy to monitor. You just have to keep track of your housing units that are added every year and get the official enrollment data, and you can check to see what your actually average student generation rate is. So you have to update the capital improvement plan probably every other year. You get different cost factors as things change or as you

keep track of your data. So that's something that's easy to do. And even if we are off say  $\frac{1}{4}$ , like if the numbers kept going down all the time and got down to .3 students per house instead of .4. Well, that would be like a 25% reduction in the fee, so you know what some communities do to make sure you don't overcharge is you don't adopt that full maximum amount. You just take some percentage that you think you're going to be comfortable and reduce it. And the other factor that I explained earlier is that if we do decide that we are going to have to do a bond, then we probably want to estimate how much would be bond financed and try to work in a credit up front, knowing that bond was coming. So that would also reduce the fees. But, even with that, you could still probably well justify the \$5,000 fee, it could be a bigger number than that, so I think somewhere between the five and ten thousand once everything's done and said.

Commissioner Evans: Other questions Dale? Michael?

Mike Sehestedt: Mike Sehestedt, I'm Deputy County Attorney, and I want to make one point perfectly clear about impact fees. In and of themselves, impact fees can't be used to address any current deficiencies. Impact fees are to address increased demand for public services, in this case a school building, and have to be calculated so that even with the growth, you'll be able to add the facilities necessary to maintain the same level of service. Impact fees won't address if you have a current crowding problem. If 146 square feet per student isn't enough, impact fees will make it possible to get facilities as the population grows it doesn't become 130 square feet, but you can't use it to fund an improvement for everyone. They are simply there to address the cost of the new incoming people. If you want to do something about current problems, you're still going to have to look to another funding mechanism. In effect, the story is if you find yourself in a hole, the first thing you should do is stop digging. Impact fees are a way of addressing that by kind of keeping the hole from getting deeper. It doesn't solve the problem that you're already in a hole.

Commissioner Evans: I'm the bad guy tonight, because I'm not persuaded that impact fees are a good thing. I've been in office for a long time and I have wanted affordable housing in all that time. You added \$10,000 onto every house for someone who can afford a new home, and affordable housing is kind of a misnomer, because I don't think very many of the houses are really affordable in today's young population. I know that the City of Missoula charges impact fees; County does not. Jean favors the formation of the committee and I expect Bill Carey will support that. And I have no problem with hearing what the people have to say. But I am not persuaded that impact fees is the way to solve your problem.

I think that everyone who lives in the school district should recognize that their children need a good education and they ought to vote for the bond issues. I have no children in school and I pay a sizeable amount in school taxes. I don't appeal them. I might squawk about them, but I pay them. And that helps to provide a good education for the kids in Missoula County across the state. So I think it's something we all ought to pay. Now in my mind there's a very definite difference between a mitigation fee for roads that I have to travel to get to my house and a school fee, an impact fee for everyone who buys a new home and don't have any kids. So I would expect that Bill Carey would agree to form this committee and if so, we will put out a call for folks to apply to be on it. I don't know how I'll vote at that time. Like I say, I don't mind hearing what the public has to say. At the same time, I don't like to waste your time. And if you serve on a committee and you bring us a recommendation that the entire Commission does not accept, it will have been time not particularly well spent. So I try and be honest with people and tell you up front I do not favor impact fees. I probably won't vote for them. And that doesn't mean that I don't appreciate your problem, because I do. I think you guys are trying very hard and I think the parents who live in this school district ought to be supporting them. Jean, did you have anything?

Commissioner Curtiss: I would just move that we make the decision about whether or not to form this committee at an administrative meeting, either Wednesday or Thursday when we can fit it on our schedule.

Mike Sehestedt: Given what I've heard, we probably couldn't reach a decision here tonight anyway. This is listed as a hearing, not as an action item, so we'll put it on our regular Commissioners administrative meeting, give notice the way we usually do and take it up when we have all three Commissioners.

Commissioner Evans: Now, as I told you, Mr. Carey has a cold and is not able to be here tonight. I don't know how long his cold's going to last, so it would probably be a good idea if we plan for next Monday, hoping he will be well and we'll all be there. And our administrative meetings are held at generally 9:00, 10:00, whatever. 10:00 in the morning at the courthouse. They're all open to the public and you're certainly welcome to come. At the moment, if there's a lot of you, we're going to have to go upstairs because our meeting room is being used for elections. So if you're planning to come, it probably would be a good idea if you let our secretary know that so that they can make arrangements for the room. And if there's nothing else, we will... Yes sir, would you like to come up front?

Bill Ostheimer: I just have a question for Barbara Evans. I understand that you don't like impact fees, but you spoke for somebody that wasn't here. You don't want to make a decision as to whether or not you want to form a committee?

Commissioner Evans: No I would rather that Mr. Carey be able to participate in that discussion.

Bill Ostheimer: And how many Commissioners are there in Missoula County?

Commissioner Evans: Three.

Bill Ostheimer: So, you're just going to wait.

Commissioner Evans: Yes, I would do him that courtesy the same as I would ask him to do it for me.

Bill Ostheimer: I don't think he would speak for you if you were absent.

Commissioner Evans: No, that's why he would wait and have another meeting where I could speak.

Bill Ostheimer: You just said he's probably for it.

Commissioner Evans: I said that he would want to participate in the discussion when we discuss whether to have this committee. If there's nothing else, we'll thank all of you for coming and the meeting is adjourned.

Commissioner Curtiss: And we'll make sure we notify Mr. McGee of the day it's on our agenda.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the Commissioners were in recess at 8:46 p.m.