

BOX ELDER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES JANUARY 21, 2010

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

Richard Day	Chairman	<i>the following Staff was present:</i>	
Chad Munns	Member		
Desiray Larsen	Member	Kevin Hamilton	Director
David Tea	Member	Elizabeth Ryan	Secretary
Jay Hardy	Member	Tamara Wright	Planner
Jay Christensen	Member	Steve Hadfield	Co. Attorney
Laurie Munns	Member		

Chairman Richard Day called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. The Minutes of the December 17, 2009 meeting were made available to the Planning Commissioners prior to this meeting and upon review **Commissioner David Tea** pointed out three corrections that needed to be made. **Commissioner David Tea** then made a Motion to approve the Minutes with the corrections as noted; seconded by **Commissioner Desiray Larsen** and passed unanimously.

The following citizens were present:

Amy & Ryan Nish/Plymouth	Sterling Stoddard/Brigham City
Jay Harwood/Salt Lake City	Dale Barnett/South Willard

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chairman Richard Day informed those present that there were four public hearings scheduled for this meeting and each one would be handled as separate items. The time for the hearings was to allow the public the opportunity to voice any concerns and the Commissioners would listen to the comments and concerns, but this was not a questions/answer time.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE BOX ELDER COUNTY LAND USE MANAGEMENT & DEVELOPMENT CODE (BEDLUM&DC), ARTICLE 1-3 (GENERAL PROVISIONS) 1-3-040. DEFINITIONS; TO UPDATE COUNTY DEFINITIONS WITH THOSE OF THE UTAH STATE CODE DEFINITIONS.

Staff explained that it is recommended that each year the County Code be reviewed and at this time they were requesting a text amendment to 1-3-040 of the Box Elder County Land Use Management & Development Code to bring the County definitions up to date with the State Code. No comments were made and a Motion was made by **Commissioner David Tea** to close the hearing; seconded by **Commissioner Chad Munns** and was unanimous.

CHANGES TO ARTICLE 6, SUBDIVISIONS OF THE BEDLUM&DC. SECTIONS: 6-1-030, 050, 060, 120, 130, 140, 160, 170, 200, 220, 230, 240, AND 250. THE PROPOSED CHANGES

WILL IMPLEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE COUNTY ENGINEER, COUNTY ROAD DEPARTMENT AND COUNTY FIRE MARSHALL FOR BEST ENGINEERED PRACTICES WITH SUBDIVISION REQUIREMENTS.

Staff was also requesting an amendment to Article 6 of the County Code which would implement the recommendations of the County Engineer, the County Road Department and the County Fire Marshal. This petition had been before the Planning Commissioners in July 2009 and was tabled at that time to enable Staff to review the comments that had been received from all of the County agencies. A comment was made by *Dale Barnett* of South Willard regarding emergency service vehicles access on dead-end streets. *Mr. Barnett* asked if there was any provision mandating that a turn-around be at the end of those streets to allow for better service and access by emergency vehicles. Staff responded by saying that the maximum length for a dead-end street was 1800 feet and any turn-around would be addressed by the County Fire Marshal in regards to the fire code. Also in the current language of the Code it states that any cul-de-sac must have a turn-around sufficient to handle vehicles. *Mr. Barnett's* concern was that without adequate space for a vehicle such as a snowplow, garbage truck, or emergency vehicle to turn around at the ends of these streets it could be a potential problem, especially an emergency vehicle if it were to find that it had turned on the wrong street and needed to be able to quickly to get out of the area. No other comments were made and a Motion was made by **Commissioner Laurie Munns** to close the hearing; seconded by **Commissioner Jay Christensen** and was unanimous.

AMENDMENT TO RECENTLY ADOPTED ORDINANCE 319, CONSTRUCTION & MUNICIPAL WASTE ZONES, PART 3 [MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE ZONE (MSW)] TO ADD BALLAST AS A USE IN THE DEFINED TABLE.

Staff was requesting a text amendment to the recently adopted Ordinance 319, to add gravel/rock (ballast) quarry as a conditional use permit to Table 3-8-040.4. This would be an accessory use to a landfill as often ballast is an end product that may be created when removing material during the construction of a landfill. Staff also said that in discussing this amendment with the **Shoshone Promontory Landfill LLC.**, it was noted that they would (likely) be making ballast and suggested that the Planning Commission may also consider adding other uses to this Table such as: mine, quarry, gravel pit, rock crusher, concrete batching plant, or asphalt plant, oil and gas wells, steam wells, test boring for exploration as these uses are accessory to gravel and rock quarries. *Mr. Sterling Stoddard*, General Manager with the **Shoshone Promontory Landfill LLC**, addressed the Commissioners saying that with the Promontory Landfill that they are developing, there will be some boring of the rock material in the area to get the desired design of the landfill and that material will be crushed. This crushed material would then be used to build the drainage fields of the landfill. *Mr. Stoddard* further stated that the rock material at this landfill site is of high quality and they would also like to be able to manufacture some railroad ballast as they crush and quarry other aggregate materials. If not, they would need to go outside to purchase the materials to build the landfill. No other comments were made and a Motion was made by **Commissioner Desiray Larsen** to close the hearing; seconded by **Commissioner David Tea** and was unanimous.

PROPOSAL AND ADOPTION FOR BOX ELDER COUNTY ROAD STANDARDS TO INCLUDE NEW DESIGNS FOR RURAL RESIDENTIAL ROADS, CATTLE GUARDS, BICYCLE PATHWAYS, AND ROAD GRADES.

Staff explained that this is also a text amendment and would be added to Article 6 (Subdivision Ordinance) to supplement the Land Use Code. Staff has worked with the County Engineer and the County Road Supervisor to determine what are the best engineered practices currently being used in the construction of (all) roads in the County. These standards include private and public roadway

sections, driveway details, standard intersection details, typical wheelchair ramp and irrigation box details, cul-de-sac details, catch basin and storm drain cleanout details, Type 5 catch basin and outlet dip stone details, storm drain manhole and subsurface drainage details, fencing standard details, and cattle guard details. *Mr. Dale Barnett* asked if this would update the current code and standards. Staff responded saying that this would clarify new standards and minimum right-of-ways for private drives and also for public streets that are to be dedicated to the County. No other comments were made and a Motion was made by **Commissioner Chad Munns** to close the hearing; seconded by **Commissioner Jay Christensen** and was unanimous.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

NISH ONE-LOT SUBDIVISION, SS09-017, (RYAN & AMY NISH) LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 5000 WEST 20800 NORTH IN THE PLYMOUTH AREA OF BOX ELDER COUNTY.

Staff explained that this petition received concept approval at the 12-17-09 Planning Commission meeting. The petitioners are now seeking preliminary and final approval. This property fronts a county road and does not need approval from UDOT as was originally thought. The petitioner has received an agreement with Plymouth Town for their culinary water via a pump connected to the Plymouth reservoir. The culvert on the property will be a 24 inch pipe as determined by the County Engineer and Road Supervisor and the petitioners agreed with that requirement. **Commissioner David Tea** asked about the access to the property and if there was to be a turn-around for emergency vehicles. Staff said that a new plat drawing had been submitted with a wider road and a turn-around for vehicles as required by the County standards. All of the other utility letters have been received and are in the petitioner's file.

MOTION: A Motion was made by **Commissioner Chad Munns** to grant Preliminary and Final approval to the Nish One-Lot Subdivision with the conditions as outlined by Staff. Motion seconded by **Commissioner Desiray Larsen** and passed unanimously.

Conditions of Approval:

1. Conditions, requirements and recommendations of culinary water provider: Where no culinary water system is available the letter shall come from the state or local agency having jurisdiction to approve the new well or water system. The developer is required to comply with all the requirements and recommendations of the culinary water provider and/or state/local approving authority prior to the recording of the subdivision, unless a financial guarantee to cover the costs of installing the required and recommended improvements has been approved by the County Commission.
2. Conditions, requirements and recommendations of wastewater treatment provider: Where no wastewater treatment system is available the letter shall come from the state or local agency having jurisdiction to approve the new wastewater treatment system. The developer is required to comply with all the requirements and recommendations of the wastewater treatment provider and/or state/local approving authority prior to the recording of the subdivision, unless a financial guarantee to cover the costs of the required and recommended improvements has been approved by the County Commission.
3. Conditions, requirements and recommendations of Box Elder County Fire Marshal: The developer is required to comply with all the requirements

and recommendations of the county fire marshal prior to the recording of the subdivision, unless a financial guarantee to cover the costs of installing the required and recommended improvements has been approved by the County Commission. **The developer must have the fire department send the County Planner a letter specifying their recommendations and requirements have been met.**

4. Conditions, requirements and recommendations of the County's Engineer: The developer is required to comply with all the requirements and recommendations of the county's engineer prior to the recording of the subdivision, unless a financial guarantee to cover the costs of installing the required and recommended improvements has been approved by the County Commission. **The developer must have the County Engineer send the County Planner a letter specifying their recommendations and requirements have been met...**

5. Conditions, requirements and recommendations of the County Building Department: The developer is required to comply with all the requirements and recommendations of the county building department prior to the recording of the subdivision. **The developer must have the building department send the County Planner a letter specifying their recommendations and requirements have been met.**

6. Conditions, requirements and recommendations of the County Road Department: The developer is required to comply with all the requirements and recommendations of the county road department prior to the recording of the subdivision. **The developer must have the road department send the County Planner a letter specifying their recommendations and requirements have been met.**

7. Letters of approval from gas, electric, and/or other utility providers.

8. Rural Road/Improvement Agreement

9. Compliance with all state and county subdivision regulations for which a specific variance has not been granted.

10. Financial guarantee for all required improvements not installed prior to the recording of the subdivision.

NEW BUSINESS

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE BOX ELDER COUNTY LAND USE MANAGEMENT & DEVELOPMENT CODE (BEDLUM&DC), ARTICLE 1-3 (GENERAL PROVISIONS) 1-3-040. DEFINITIONS; TO UPDATE COUNTY DEFINITIONS WITH THOSE OF THE UTAH STATE CODE DEFINITIONS.

Staff explained to the Commissioners that a decision to amend the text of the Land Use Code is a matter within the legislative discretion. In determining this amendment the Planning Commission needs to determine if this amendment is consistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the County's General Plan. As this amendment has been on file in the Community Development Office for public review, it was not necessary to read the entire amendment into the record. Staff further stated that it is good planning and zoning practice to update the County's definitions in the Land Use Code to conform to those of the State Code in an annual review. Staff recommended that the Planning Commission forward their approval of this amendment to the County Commission for their action and approval.

MOTION: A Motion was made by **Commissioner David Tea** to forward the recommendation of the Planning Commission to the County Commission in adopting the Text Amendment – Article 1-3-040-Definitions. The County Commission would hold a public hearing and then adopt an ordinance to amend Article 1-3-040-Definitions. Motion seconded by **Commissioner Jay Christensen** and passed with **Commissioner Jay Hardy** abstaining from the vote.

CHANGES TO ARTICLE 6, SUBDIVISIONS OF THE BECLUM&DC. SECTIONS: 6-1-030, 050, 060, 120, 130, 140, 160, 170, 200, 220, 230, 240, AND 250. THE PROPOSED CHANGES WILL IMPLEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE COUNTY ENGINEER, COUNTY ROAD DEPARTMENT AND COUNTY FIRE MARSHALL FOR BEST ENGINEERED PRACTICES WITH SUBDIVISION REQUIREMENTS.

Staff explained that this text amendment to Article 6-Subdivisions is also a matter within the legislative discretion. In order to ensure that future growth enhances rather than detracts from the County’s character, it is important that the County land use and development objectives are reviewed and updated on a regular basis to determine if they are using the best engineered practices for development. Kevin Hamilton spoke with the Planning Commissioners about making approval for one and two lot subdivisions an administrative action. After some discussion the Commissioners felt that approval for one-lot subdivisions on a county road [that did not require improvements] could be done administratively. This would shorten the process for approval from a three-four month process to a three-four week approval process. Any petitioner would still need to meet all of the requirements set forth in the Code for approval and all of the required signatures would still be needed. There would be no public hearing as the State has removed that requirement, leaving it to the county to determine if a public hearing is necessary. Notification could be sent to the surrounding landowners informing them of the proposed subdivision in the area. Flag lot petitions would still come before the Planning Commission for approval.

MOTION: A Motion was made by **Commissioner Chad Munns** to Table action on the amendment to change Article 6, Subdivisions of the Box Elder County Land Use Management & Development Code (specifically **Sections 6-1-030, 050, 060, 120, 130, 140, 160, 170, 200, 220, 230, 240, and 250**) at this time and direct Staff to move forward in drafting these changes for consideration by the Planning Commissioners. Motion seconded by **Commissioner David Tea** and passed unanimously.

AMENDMENT TO RECENTLY ADOPTED ORDINANCE 319, CONSTRUCTION & MUNICIPAL WASTE ZONES, PART 3 [MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE ZONE (MSW)] TO ADD BALLAST AS A USE IN THE DEFINED TABLE.

Staff outlined the approval standards in considering the text amendment to Article 3-8 construction and Municipal Solid Waste Zones as follows:

1. A decision to amend the text of this Code is a matter within the legislative discretion.
2. Whether the proposed amendment is consistent with goals, objectives and policies of the County’s General Plan;
 - a. The addition of Gravel/Rock quarry as a use makes our “Use Table” for MSW zone more comprehensive for a Landfill.
 - i. Often times ballast is produced in the construction of a Landfill
3. Whether the proposed amendment is harmonious with the overall character of existing development in the vicinity of the subject property;

- a. Gravel/Rock quarry in conjunction with a Landfill makes for a cleaner development and project
- 4. The extent to which the proposed amendment may adversely affect adjacent property;
 - a. Gravel/Rock quarry in conjunction with a Landfill minimizes the adverse affects to adjacent properties
- 5. The adequacy of facilities and services intended to serve the subject property, including, but not limited to, roadways, parks and recreation facilities, police and fire protection, schools, stormwater drainage systems, water supplies, and waste water and refuse collection.
 - a. The Gravel/Rock quarry will be done by CUP and the adequacy of said facilities and services would be reviewed at the time the CUP application is made.

Staff then said that it was at the discretion of the Planning Commission as to what, if any, uses they wanted to add as an accessory use to this ordinance. **Commissioner David Tea** said that he thought it was a good idea if a petitioner was going to dig a hole for garbage, that they should be able to do something with the materials that are removed in the process, however, he was concerned that the process could get a *“little lop-sided. They could get a little carried away digging holes and not putting anything in it. We can call it a landfill and not a gravel pit, when in fact it might be a gravel pit. Is there a way to put some verbiage in that would keep... check and balance?”*

Chairman Richard Day asked if this use would become a conditional use permit that would have to be applied for separately, if it is an accessory use in the ordinance. **Kevin Hamilton** said that this use would be added as an accessory use ... and that should solve the problem of the site becoming a gravel pit instead of a landfill. The definition of an accessory use is that it is a subordinate use to the permitted use of a solid waste landfill. Typically the County is more restrictive in where a solid waste landfill can be located and they are usually away from residential and other uses, whereas a gravel operation can be located within a closer proximity to other uses.

Commissioner David Tea then commented that in making a landfill there would be a straight up and down cut as opposed to a gravel pit that would have a 2/1 slope cut. *“By going to accessory, rather than gravel pit standards, it gives them the ability to make a straight up and down cut rather than a slope.”* **Kevin Hamilton** then said that as an accessory use, when the petitioner came in for the CUP for the landfill they would need to inform staff of their intentions and the slopes and cuts that were being made on the property. If the accessory use is kept as a conditional use, each of those uses would need to be identified in the review process of the application. The approval of the application would still come to the Planning Commission for final approval with any and all uses that would be in conjunction with the landfill.

Commissioner Jay Hardy expressed some concerns that as an accessory use the petitioner could remove the gravel first from the area and never really establish a solid waste landfill. **Kevin Hamilton** replied saying that they would receive approval for the landfill as that was the primary use, and as part of that approval, if they were going to remove soils, and then they would apply for the accessory use; unless they were just going to remove the soils and then use it again to cap the landfill in the future. Then **Commissioner Jay Hardy** asked if a petitioner could end up with a gravel pit and not a landfill under these conditions. **Kevin Hamilton** said that the only way that he could see that happening was if the petitioner were to remove all of the soils in preparation for the landfill and then for some reason stopped their operation. Further it would be important for the Planning Commissioners to look at the overall operation depending on the size of the operation and the phases proposed.

Commissioner Chad Munns then asked about the end product being ballast and that it was going to be sold.

Jay Harwood, one of the original owners of the property at Promontory approached the Commissioners and said that *“the intent of the property is to actually be able to have a ballast*

operation there as well as the landfill, and what that is, that is some of the best ballast rock for several states around from all of the testing on it . . . and that's used on the railroads, that is what is underneath the actual rails in there, so it is a very popular . . . well very necessity . . . very necessary product . . . like Union Pacific probably uses a million tons of ballast a year. The site there on Promontory in that 2000 acres has over 147 million cubic yards of rock there that could be made into ballast. Out of the ballast operation and crushing that, 30% of that would be fines . . . so that fines would be used for the daily cover at the landfill. So my question is, those could be two separate operations, is it possible to get a permit for the crushing, ballast crushing operation on the same land that you have zoned for a landfill? When we were going for the landfill and the zoning change we thought that was what we were doing.

Commissioner Chad Munns said that he agreed and that was also his question as these were two separate operations. The waste from the ballast would be used for the landfill cover and would that be called the accessory use? If this were an accessory use, would [any] petitioner be limited as to the amount of [gravel/ballast] that could be removed at any given time?

Sterling Stoddard said "I think for our situation . . . I think two conditional use permits is fine. For your overall, the majority of your landfills that may want to crush a little bit of product to use as drain rock and as cover and other stuff that it would be an ancillary use . . . in our case I think we want it as an ancillary use and we want an opportunity as a separate use. Ours is a little bit different . . . I think you need to make sure that you keep in mind in your zone that ancillary use may be important for other people out there . . . for us, both separated would be fine.

Commissioner Jay Hardy then said that in moving forward with the Shoshone operation their gravel operation may be the main focus, especially at the beginning. **Jay Harwood** agreed saying that the gravel operation may be financing the landfill operation.

After this discussion the following motion was made.

MOTION: A Motion was made by **Commissioner David Tea** to allow the sale of the gravel from a landfill hole as an accessory use; but this Motion does not to entail an open-end gravel pit. This use would be a conditional use as an accessory use. Gravel can only be done as an accessory use to a landfill operation. Motion seconded by **Commissioner Chad Munns**.

With this Motion, **Kevin Hamilton** said that this may not allow Promontory to do what it is that they want in their landfill operation. The Commissioners agreed. **Commissioner Chad Munns** said that the item being considered was a text amendment to an existing ordinance and that it was not just for the Promontory landfill zone that was recently approved. Because the property was re-zoned to the new Municipal Solid Waste Zone it could not also be zoned for a gravel operation as an overlay zone is not permitted. There was more discussion as to what is allowed in the newly created landfill ordinance and Staff read the uses that were currently allowed in **3-8-040.4**; *Accessory uses buildings customarily incidental to conditional uses; construction equipment and supply trailers, temporary; construction field office, temporary; grazing of animals; municipal solid waste landfill; waste recycling facilities; and waste to energy facilities.* After further discussing this issue and what would be considered mining of gravel in a landfill and the amount that could be removed at any given time, **Commissioner David Tea** called for action on the Motion. Those in favor **Commissioners Jay Christensen, David Tea**; opposed **Commissioners Chad Munns, Laurie Munns, Jay Hardy, Desiray Larsen**. Motion failed.

MOTION: A Motion was then made by **Commissioner Jay Hardy** to add to the **Municipal Solid Waste Zone (MSW) Table 3-8-040.4** as Staff recommended, but that gravel/rock

quarry be added as a permitted use and not as an ancillary use in the table, along with Staff's conditions. Motion seconded by **Commissioner Desiray Larsen** and passed unanimously.

PROPOSAL AND ADOPTION FOR BOX ELDER COUNTY ROAD STANDARDS TO INCLUDE NEW DESIGNS FOR RURAL RESIDENTIAL ROADS, CATTLE GUARDS, BICYCLE PATHWAYS, AND ROAD GRADES.

Staff reviewed the standard drawings of the proposed road standards with the Commissioners. Staff explained that this would be a supplement to the Subdivision Ordinance; however it would not just be applicable to subdivisions, but would cover the entire County, as it also addresses cattle guards and fencing standards. There were some questions regarding the size of the cattle guards indicated in the drawings at seven feet nine inches; and **Commissioner Chad Munns** said that he had never seen a cattle guard of that particular width. The Commissioners discussed this issue for some time and concluded that the ideal size of the cattle guard should probably be one half of the width of the road [to determine the size]. In regards to the fence issue it was asked if this would be applicable to the County Fencing Ordinance and *Steve Hadfield, County Attorney*, said that this would be directed more at subdivisions, or perhaps if a fence needed to be installed at the site of a canal, these would be the minimum standards to be followed. It would not apply to the fence-in/fence-out Ordinance. **Commissioner Jay Christensen** mentioned the rolled gutters that had been discussed in the past and they were not addressed in the proposed drawings, stating that if this was the standard then everyone would be required to use the curb and gutter design as outlined. **Commissioners Richard Day** and **Chad Munns** both said that they liked the rolled curb and **Commissioner Jay Hardy** said that in areas where the land is relatively flat, the rolled curb works well; however where there is a slope in the terrain the other type of curb and gutter design is usually better. It was then noted that the rolled curb design was included on page 5 of the drawings. *Kevin Hamilton* told the Commissioners that at this time there is no standard in the County for these issues that they were discussing and these drawings were the minimum that the road department personnel had come up with. At the conclusion of the discussion the following motion was made.

MOTION: A Motion was made by **Commissioner Jay Christensen** to recommend to the County Commission the adoption of the Box Elder County Road Standards [to include new designs for rural residential roads, cattle guards, bicycle pathways and road grades], with the change in the size of the cattle guards to be one half the width of the [travel surface] road where they are located. Motion seconded by **Commissioner David Tea** and passed with **Commissioner Jay Hardy** abstaining from the vote.

WORKING REPORTS

SUBDIVISION LIGHTING OPTIONS 1) HOMEOWNER RESPONSIBILITY WITH YARD LIGHT, OR 2) SPECIAL SERVICE DISTRICT TO INSTALL, MAINTAIN AND FINANCE LIGHTING IN SUBDIVISIONS.

Dale Barnett approached the Commissioners regarding lighting within subdivisions and said that he felt it should be an essential part of any proposed new subdivision in the County. In the area that he lives in South Willard, there are children waiting at bus stops and the flow of traffic where there is no lighting at intersections can cause a real hazard. Often time the streets are missed because it is not possible to see the street signs, especially with oncoming traffic headlights. Also as there are not sidewalks in many of these newer subdivisions, it causes additional hazards for pedestrians. In areas where there are street lights it is less of a problem. Realizing that this is a problem, especially with

the financing, *Mr. Barnett* asked if street lighting couldn't be added as part of the development requirements and process. **Commissioner David Tea** agreed with *Mr. Barnett* and responded saying that having the developer install lights as part of the development could be done, but what about the perpetual care once the development was completed. It was mentioned that there is a Special Service District in South Willard, but the citizens voted against any funding for the District. **Commissioner Jay Hardy** said that even though the District exists it does not have the ability to collect any taxes to fund this or any other project. It would be difficult to impose a tax on all of the citizens of the County to fund lighting for one particular area such as South Willard. **Commissioner Jay Christensen** mentioned that in some areas in the Salt Lake Valley that the residents are required to install yard lights at the time the home is built in the subdivision since utilities for street lights were not available. *Mr. Barnett* said that he had also seen this and the expense of the yard light then becomes the responsibility of the individual homeowner after that time. The spacing for these yard lights could be determined by the developer and with a county ordinance. At the conclusion of the discussion it was recommended that Staff look to other counties to see how (and if) they have addressed this issue in their unincorporated areas where development is occurring.

WORK SESSION SCHEDULED FOR TUESDAY, JANUARY 26, 2010 AT 6:00 P.M. REGARDING WIND TURBINES IN BOX ELDER COUNTY. ELISE BROWN PRESENTATION.

The Commissioners were reminded of this upcoming work session to discuss wind turbine ordinances.

Elizabeth Ryan informed the Commissioners that as this was the beginning of a new year, the chairman and vice chairman needed to be elected again. **Commissioner Chad Munns** nominated **Richard Day** as Chairman of the Planning Commission for 2010; seconded by **Commissioner David Tea** and was unanimous. **Commissioner David Tea** then nominated **Chad Munns** as Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission for 2010 and the nomination was seconded by **Commissioner Jay Christensen** and was unanimous.

The Planning Commissioners would meet for their annual retreat on Friday, February 5, 2010 at 6:00 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENTS – NONE

A **Motion** was made to adjourn at 8:50 p.m., unanimous.

Passed and adopted in regular session this 18th day of February 2010.

Richard Day, Chairman
Box Elder County
Planning Commission