

INDEX TO MINUTES OF
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
SPECIAL CALL MEETING
OCTOBER 6, 2008

1.	CALL TO ORDER.....	1
2.	INVOCATION.....	1
3.	PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.....	2
4.	DEPARTMENTAL MATTERS.....	2
	<i>4.A. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT.....</i>	<i>2</i>
	<i>4.A.1. CONSIDERATION OF PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS</i> <i>ON MINING REGULATIONS & GROUNDWATER ISSUES</i>	<i>2</i>
5.	ADJOURNMENT.....	21
6.	APPENDIX.....	22

October 6, 2008

SPECIAL CALL MEETING OF THE INDIAN RIVER COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS
ON MINING REGULATIONS & GROUNDWATER ISSUES

OCTOBER 6, 2008

The Board of County Commissioners of Indian River County, Florida, met in a Special Session at the County Commission Chambers, 1801 27th St., Vero Beach, Florida, on Monday, October 6, 2008, to discuss the Planning & Zoning Commission's recommendations on mining regulations and groundwater issues. Present were Chairman Sandra L. Bowden, Vice Chairman Wesley S. Davis, Commissioners Joseph E. Flescher, Peter D. O'Bryan, and Gary C. Wheeler. Also present were County Administrator Joseph A. Baird, County Attorney William G. Collins II, and Deputy Clerk Maureen Gelfo.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Bowden called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

2. INVOCATION

Planning Director Stan Boling delivered the Invocation.

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Joseph E. Flescher led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

4. DEPARTMENTAL MATTERS

4.A. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

4.A.I. CONSIDERATION OF PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

RECOMMENDATIONS ON MINING REGULATIONS & GROUNDWATER ISSUES

(Clerk's Note: Please see Appendix following these minutes for the complete text of the recommendations).

Planning Director Stan Boling recalled that due to time constraints at the September 16, 2008 Board meeting, the Commissioners had requested to hold a Special Meeting to consider the thirty-eight (38) recommendations on mining regulations and the two (2) recommendations on groundwater issues which were compiled by the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) and staff. He reviewed the backup memorandum of August 19, 2008 and used a PowerPoint presentation (copy on file) to report on the investigative work conducted by the PZC, and to highlight some of PZC's recommendations. He noted that the recommendations do not reflect final Land Development Regulation (LDR) amendment wording. He thereafter asked the Board to provide input on the recommendations, and to direct staff to initiate the formal LDR amendment process, which would need to be concluded before the January 7, 2009 expiration date of the Mining Moratorium.

Chairman Bowden read Recommendation Nos. 1-5, and there were no comments from the Commissioners.

Commissioner O'Bryan wanted to ensure that an independent, neutral, and unbiased party, such as the United States Geological Survey (USGS), would prepare the hydrology report required under Recommendation No. 6, "...require submission of a hydrology report...."

County Attorney William Collins, however, felt that having USGS do the hydrology reports might be problematic, due to agency cut-backs at this time.

A brief discussion ensued among the Board and staff regarding the lack of an on-site staff hydrologist, and how best to obtain an impartial hydrology study. Director Boling remarked that the County could hire an expert to review the hydrology reports.

Vice Chairman Davis felt that the one-year monitoring requirement on wet and dry season well data, which was part of Recommendation No. 6, would constitute a de facto moratorium, and would be in opposition to the State Statute to not have a moratorium for more than one year.

Staff reported that this requirement could be done in coordination with the application process, and would not constitute a second moratorium.

Commissioner O'Bryan declared that groundwater impacts are a huge concern, and stated that one year of monitoring is basically "just scratching the surface." He noted that the mining operations could be moving forward with other issues while the baseline monitoring is being conducted.

Commissioner Wheeler agreed with Commissioner O'Bryan, and added that it takes a long time to remediate once damage is done to the groundwater.

Director Boling responded to Commissioner Flescher's concern regarding how Recommendation No. 7, "... cumulative impacts from existing, approved, and proposed mining projects and excavations in the vicinity..." would affect existing projects.

The Chairman opened the floor to public comments on Recommendation Nos. 1-7.

Charles Cramer, 10729 U.S.1, disagreed that hydrologists might slant their reports in favor of their client. He related that many of Recommendations Nos. 1 through 7 were directly reflective of the St. John's River Water Management District's (SJRWMD) rules, and suggested that the County should align with the SJRWMD; otherwise miners would be trying to satisfy multiple engineering studies.

George Hamner, Chairman PZC, noted that the County and PZC want to see the hydrology reports, and then because the County does not have an expert, allow SJRWMD to be the ruling factor. Mr. Hamner recommended that the Board put monitoring wells on County property, to provide protection from surrounding areas. He also reminded the Board that the mining complaints have been on truck traffic, not hydrology.

Chuck Cramer wanted the LDR's to reflect that not all mines were going to be dewatering mines.

Commissioner Flescher wanted to know why, under Recommendation No. 7, it was necessary to have a seismic profile of the area beneath the project site.

Mr. Hamner explained that when sand mines are dug, the rock may become elevated and cause a fissure, which could cause contamination of the Florida Aquifer by surface water. He clarified that the requirements stipulated individual hydrological studies for individual mines, but the seismic study would be done County-wide, similar to a soil map.

Bob Adair, Chairman Agriculture Advisory Committee (AAC) said that the purpose of the seismic studies was to obtain a picture of a complicated set of geological formations underground. He said that the data would be compiled into an updated study, which would serve to help locate suitable and unsuitable mining sites. Regarding the hydrology report, it must be site specific, and certified, if possible. He stated that a professional geologist could review the report to make sure that it conforms to the established rules or requirements for the data.

Vice Chairman Davis asked Mr. Cramer if the reports he received were certified, and Mr. Cramer stated that he believed so.

Mr. Cramer then presented his views on the seismology report, and responded to the Board's questions and comments regarding the depth of the Hawthorn Layer, and the depths of aggregate and sand mines.

Mr. Adair related that a seismic fault was found south of John's Island in 1958, and that it was very important to do the overall seismic study to determine if there would be problems in the future. He thereafter responded to questions regarding sinkholes and the existing seismic fault.

Russell Herman, Friends of St. Sebastian River, suggested that the recommendations stipulate that the applicants must pay for a County-designated firm to do their report.

Johnathan Ferguson, Ruden McClosky, Pt. St. Lucie, objected to the notion that hydrologists might prepare biased and unprofessional reports. He then commented on Recommendation Nos. 1.B; 4; and 7, as follows:

Recommendation No. 1.B., “.....to implement any new or updated Best Management Practices (BMPs) identified by County staff...” He stated that it might be problematic to impose some of the new or updated BMPs to an operating entity, which has already achieved a certain sense of certainty in their existing permit.

Recommendation No. 4, “.....to submit baseline data on the type, extent, and condition of vegetation and wetlands located on-site and within off-site areas abutting...” He felt it was potentially problematic to try to obtain this information off-site, and cautioned staff to draft the regulations such that they can be complied with.

He felt that Recommendation No. 7, “...Establish specifications for the hydrology report...” was duplicating efforts of the regional water management districts, whose regulations preempt any local regulations on water issues.

Les Bromwell, P.E., Indian River County, believed that the hydrology reports would be signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer or by a Geologist.

Chairman Bowden enumerated Recommendation Nos. 8 through 11, with no comments by Board or individuals.

Commissioner Flescher questioned whether the boring, which might be needed for the assessment, might contribute to the problems that the County is trying to prevent on Recommendation No. 12, “Require assessment of location, depth, thickness, and extent of the confining layer....” He also felt that the word “assessment” was rather vague.

Director Boling revealed, for Commissioner Flescher, that the information should be addressed in a hydrology report. He reiterated that the recommendations did not contain the exact wording which would be reflected in the final LDR’s.

Commissioner O'Bryan wondered if the distances provided were sufficient on Recommendation No. 15, "Prohibit any excavation, stockpile, on-site haul road, or proposed ditch from being located closer than 100 feet from an existing, historical and a naturally occurring on-site jurisdictional wetland or within 300 feet of such a wetland located off-site."

Director Boling responded that both distances had been discussed in workshop meetings.

Mr. Cramer informed the Board that Recommendations No. 8, 10, 13, 13.A., and 14 were already required by the SJRWMD. On Recommendation No. 11, "...require testing for soils contamination in proposed excavation and stockpile areas...", he asked for more specific language so applicants would know for what they were testing.

Mr. Cramer noted that on Recommendation No. 12, "...require assessment of location, depth, thickness, and extent of the confining layer...", the only assessment which could be made would be to determine where the top of the Hawthorn layer is; one would not want to bore a hole into it, thus creating another irrigation well.

On Recommendation No. 15, "Prohibit any excavation, stockpile, on-site haul road, or proposed ditch from being located closer than 100 feet from an existing, historical and a naturally occurring on-site jurisdictional wetland or within 300 feet of such a wetland located off-site.", **Mr. Cramer** felt that PZC and staff were creating an unnecessary regulation, as an applicant was already making mitigation attempts to protect the wetlands with their mining plans.

Mr. Cramer commented on Recommendation No. 15.A., "...use of clay material 'barrier walls' and other techniques...". He thinks perimeter retention is much more efficient

and effective; clay barrier walls sometimes restrict horizontal water movement and will basically flood an adjacent property.

Mr. Cramer explained why he objected to Recommendation No. 15. C., “...requiring a 300’ setback between all on-site activity areas.... and any adjacent public conservation land or easement.”

A detailed discussion ensued between the Board, staff, and Mr. Cramer regarding conservation easements; the validity of the 300’ setback; draw down protection; the “cone of depression”; and the use of perimeter retention to offset dewatering impacts.

Mr. Adair did not believe the current regulation of a 150’ setback was enough.

Shawn Sexton, 7880 37th Street, felt that the 300’ setback might be required to make any necessary corrective measures.

Suzon Franzke, 8190 37th Street, stated that the property rights of residents in AG-1, who pay higher taxes, are being significantly impacted by having industrial mines in AG-1.

The Chairman called a recess at 3:30 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 3:43 p.m. with all members present.

Commissioner O’Bryan wanted to define “easement” as a conservation easement on Recommendation No. 15.C. “Consider requiring a 300’ setback between all on-site activity areas (excavation, stockpile, on-site haul road) and any adjacent public conservation land or easement”.

A brief discussion ensued whereby Commissioners O'Bryan and Wheeler advocated for the 300' setback for excavation, while Vice Chairman Davis wanted to see a 150' setback.

Chairman Bowden called for comments on Recommendation No. 16, 17, 18, and 19.

Commissioner O'Bryan required clarification on what would constitute a significant setback on Recommendation No. 18, "Consider establishing a significant setback between any excavation area.....", and Director Boling divulged that the setbacks in the Comprehensive Plan were set at 1,000 feet.

Commissioner O'Bryan wanted to see the setbacks set at one-half (1/2) mile.

Commissioner Flescher believed that on Recommendation No. 19, "Require submission of a comprehensive dust control plan...techniques that prevent tracking material off-site...", that it was unrealistic to prevent all tracking, and that the wording should be "reduce" rather than "prevent."

Commissioner Wheeler wanted to see the public roads abutting mining operations paved.

Chairman Bowden called for comments on Recommendation Nos. 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24. Hearing no further Board comments, the Chairman invited public comment.

Karen Phillips, 6855 West 82nd Avenue, asked the Board to consider the number of mines operating in one area, the operating days and times, and the road conditions.

Mary McGuire-Smith, 6625 West 82nd Avenue, stated that she had seen no provisions addressing concurrent mines. She objected to classifying mining as an agricultural enterprise.

Mr. Cramer asked for a definition of “public water supply well” to be included in Recommendation No. 18, “...setback between any excavation area and any existing or proposed public water supply well.” He said that it was cost-prohibitive to require an applicant to pave the road before commencing a mining operation, and suggested having the road paved at the conclusion of the project.

Discussion ensued between the Board and Mr. Cramer regarding the responsibilities of the mining concerns towards ensuring proper road maintenance; alternatives to paving; and the intention of Recommendation No. 24, ... “specific road surface protection requirements...”, to establish more specific road protection requirements.

Ms. Phillips voiced concerns about future mines adhering to restrictions.

Commissioner Wheeler wanted to see more direct consequences for miners if the roads are not adequately maintained.

Jens Tripson, Vero Beach, voiced that on Recommendation No. 18, “...setback between any excavation area and any existing or proposed public water supply well”, should also include private wells.

Ms. Franzke reported that residents living at the paved end of 82nd and 60th were experiencing problems from vibration, noise, and traffic. Although efforts have been made to ameliorate problems, residents still had quality of life concerns such as traffic, health, safety, and welfare.

Tom Hammond, Vero Beach, and pit owner, asked the Board to consider the necessity for having pits in the County, and for the new mining regulations to be economically viable for the mining concerns.

Johnathan Ferguson, wanted the setback to be 150' on Recommendation No. 15.C. "Consider requiring a 300' setback between all on-site activity areas (excavation, stockpile, on-site haul road) and any adjacent public conservation land or easement." On Recommendation No. 20, "...to limit the extent of disturbed area...", he wanted "disturbed area" to be defined as the actual excavation area, exclusive of the perimeter activities that go along with it.

Mr. Adair provided the justification for the 300' setback; however, Vice Chairman Davis maintained that the setback should be 150 feet.

Mr. Sexton was concerned about setting standards for the cumulative effects of mines, and learned from Director Boling that four of the recommendations, and the LDR's would be reflective of cumulative impacts.

Commissioner Flescher, regarding Recommendation No. 22, "...require pumps, crushers, and processing equipment to be placed behind berms ..." wanted the wording to reflect "any fuel operated machinery on site, both static and portable, other than motor vehicle or motor carriers."

Jorge LaTour, 2332 Vero Beach Avenue, wanted the Board to eliminate mining east of I-95. He also asserted that calling mines "agricultural" is a misnomer.

Commissioner O'Bryan suggested establishing different and more restrictive levels of standards for mines in AG-1, than those in AG-2 or AG-3.

Vice Chairman Davis felt that there was no “one size fits all” that is reasonable and rational to determine the impact of a mine, but felt that traffic counts could be used.

The Board and staff continued to discuss the standards which could be established for mining in AG-1, AG-2, and AG-3, and whether an existing operation would have to comply with updated Best Management Practices (BMP’s).

Nancy Offut, Treasure Coast Builders Association, urged the Board to consider the importance of sand and rock to the construction industry and to the County’s infrastructure. She pointed out that if the sand and rock are located in an agricultural zone, that is where one must obtain the materials. She felt that the best approach would be to mitigate the problems through the regulations.

Ms. McGuire-Smith discussed the importance of obtaining accurate traffic counts and wanted to see an enforceable density cap imposed on the traffic counts.

Commissioner O’Bryan wanted to know on Recommendation No. 28, “...forfeiture of posted security for... truck driver violations...”, if a more structured forfeiture plan would also apply to any violations of Recommendation Nos. 25, 26, or 27, which Director Boling affirmed.

Commissioner Flescher, on Recommendation No. 26.A, “...alternative to paving, consider use of asphalt millings” believed that the asphalt millings could not be graded. Director Boling agreed that the asphalt millings might not be the best way to go, but he stated that the LDR’s would take that into account.

The Chairman called for comments on Recommendation Nos. 27, 28, 29, and 30, and none were proffered.

Referring to Recommendation No. 31, "...limiting total haul route dump truck traffic...", Commissioner O'Bryan pointed out that it would be a challenge to come up with a total traffic count, and wanted to see more of a fixed cap, not just an average.

The Chairman called for comments on Recommendation No. 32; there were none.

Regarding Recommendation No. 33, "Re-classify mines from an administrative permit to a special exception use.", Vice Chairman Davis felt like an ordinance was being crafted toward a specific mine, versus developing a mining policy for the County. He wanted to streamline permitting processes, and to stop short at reclassifying mining from an administrative to a special exception use permit.

Commissioner Wheeler favored reclassifying the mines from administrative permit to special exception use, because he felt it would allow more public input.

Commissioner O'Bryan suggested that AG-1 go to special exception use because AG-1 is where the conflicts would occur with the residences and neighbors, and AG-2 and AG-3 could remain under administrative permit. He felt that the residents need to receive notice when a new mine is coming forward, and be given a chance to speak at a hearing. He noted that allowing mines in AG-2 and AG-3 to receive administrative permits would encourage companies to locate their mines further west.

Attorney William Collins wondered if Commissioner O'Bryan's suggestion would affect No. 34, "Require a special notice letter to owners of properties that lie within ½ mile of the proposed mining site...", and he was told it would not.

Vice Chairman Davis agreed that the notice should be provided regardless of whether the mine was in AG-1, AG-2, or AG-3. He then opined that there were a lot of places where it is appropriate to place pits in AG-1, and that the permit process should be streamlined.

The Board continued to discuss whether or not mining in AG-1 should remain under administrative, or go to special exception use; streamlining the permitting process; and the importance of giving residents near a proposed mine sufficient and timely notice.

Chairman Bowden called for comments on Recommendation Nos. 34, 35 and 36; no remarks were proffered by the Board or by the public.

Commissioner Flescher explained why he was opposed to the GPS monitoring device as presented on Recommendation No. 37, "...impose mining permit conditions for enhanced traffic law enforcement...and/or use of GPS monitoring." Under Recommendation No. 37.A., "...hiring full-time, FDOT certified deputy to provide continuous traffic law enforcement...", he believed the Sheriff's office could provide that type of enforcement at less expense than the FDOT.

Director Boling provided details of how the GPS could be used to track violations, such as speeding, and noted that the idea had been included in the Recommendations for consideration.

Further discussion ensued among the Board and staff regarding the use and cost of the GPS.

Commissioner Wheeler opined that it would be more effective to have in place very firm policies, with stiff penalties, for operators who violate the conditions of their mining permits.

Further Board discussion ensued regarding the pros and cons of using an FDOT deputy, a sheriff's deputy, or a code enforcement officer, in the event that someone is hired for traffic law enforcement.

Chairman Bowden conveyed that the bottom line was that bad behavior would not be tolerated.

Mr. Cramer suggested that the County create additional haul routes, rather than limit the amount of trucks on the single haul route, as presented in Recommendation No. 31, "Consider limiting total haul route dump truck traffic...". Regarding Recommendation 33, "Re-classify mines from an administrative permit to a special exception use", Mr. Cramer supported keeping mining in administrative permit use, and asked if more notification to the residents could be provided on an administrative permit.

The Board and staff continued to discuss haul routes, and the notification to residents in proximity to same.

Responding to Commissioner Wheeler's question, Director Boling reviewed some of the existing special exception uses, and gave the rationale for applying a special exception use designation to mining in AG-1.

Attorney Collins explained the County Code pertaining to administrative and special exception permits.

Vice Chairman Davis remarked that he did not want to create a policy for one pit; he wanted to create a policy that also applies in AG-2 and AG-3 zonings.

Commissioner Wheeler believed that putting AG-1 into special exception permitting would provide the public with a chance to speak at the public hearings.

Mr. Hamner acknowledged that AG-1 has changed over time, and he agreed with Commissioner Wheeler that putting AG-1 mining into special exception use would allow expanded public notice and input. He felt that AG-2 and AG-3 could be under administrative permit.

Mr. Cramer voiced his objections to Recommendation No. 37, "...allow the County to impose mining permit conditions for enhanced traffic law enforcement funded by permit applicants...".

Victor Knight, 3295 Ranch Rd., presented his arguments supporting the special exception permitting process for AG-1, and maintaining the administrative permitting process for AG-2 and AG-3.

Director Boling answered questions regarding the notification processes in the administrative and the special exception use permitting processes.

Vice Chairman Davis stressed the importance of Recommendation No. 34, "Require a special notice letter to owners of properties that lie within ½ mile of the proposed mining site...", for both administrative and special exception use permits.

Amy Banov, 69th Street, wanted the Board to make sure that strict requirements and penalties were established for the mining concerns. She read County Code relating to

Agricultural Districts and noted that industrial-type uses such as sand mining were not included in agricultural zoning.

Mr. Adair presented a brief analysis of the Agricultural Advisory Committee's unanimous vote to re-classify mines in AG-1, AG-2, and AG-3 to special exception use, as outlined in Recommendation No. 33, "Re-classify mines from an administrative permit to a special exception use."

Johnathan Ferguson presented his arguments opposing Recommendation No. 33, and declared that changing a permitted use on a piece of property to a special exception use is taking away property rights, and there is case law where that constitutes a Bert Harris violation.

Attorney Collins discussed the legal dictates of the Bert Harris Act. He opined that by changing to a special exception use, you would not be directly restricting or limiting use, you would be changing the process whereby the use is approved; thus it would not give rise to a Bert Harris claim.

Ken Godfrey, owner of Godfrey Sand Mine at 13515 101 St., was worried that additional regulations might put a small operator out of business, and that doubling the setback to 300 feet might make some pits unusable.

Commissioner Wheeler told Mr. Godfrey that his mine was grandfathered in, and this led to discussion by Attorney Collins on whether or not updated BMP's can be imposed on existing applications.

Don Simon, residing near 82nd Avenue, wanted the mines re-classified from administrative permit to special exception use; agreed to the importance of having a specific hydrology report for each site; wanted to extend the setback to 300 feet; inquired as to how a

determination would be made to apportion the traffic among the different mines; wanted to expand the notice to owners within 1 mile or 1 ½ miles; and felt that the Sheriff's Department could be used for enforcement issues.

There being no further discussion, Director Boling provided the following recap at Chairman Bowden's request.

General Intent:

The LDR's will be crafted to ensure reasonability, so an operation is not put in the position of trying to do something it cannot do, such as obtaining information on an adjacent site over which they have no jurisdiction.

Recommendation No. 7:

A State certified or professional geologist or engineer is to prepare the Hydrology Report.

A County-wide, but not site-specific, seismic profile is to be obtained.

Recommendation No. 15C:

No Consensus has been reached regarding whether to require a 150' or 300' setback between on-site activity areas and adjacent public conservation lands or easement.

Recommendation No. 18:

Clarify that the separation distances for a public supply well apply to a municipality or County well.

Recommendation No. 24:

Tie in the road surface protection requirements to actual roadway conditions that occur over time.

Recommendation No. 33:

No Consensus has been reached on whether to re-classify mines in AG-1, AG-2, and AG-3, or whether to re-classify only AG-1 mines, from an administrative permit to a special exception use.

Recommendation No. 34:

Require special notice letter to owners, whether or not mining goes to special exception use or remains under administrative use.

Recommendation No. 37:

Drop the use of the GPS monitoring for now.

Use law enforcement sparingly, but to good effect, with the emphasis to be on pulling security as an enforcement tool.

Lengthy discussion ensued as the Board members commented and debated on the following matters:

- Providing timely notice to owners of properties near proposed mining sites
- Whether to change AG-1 mining into special exception and maintain AG-2 and AG-3 as administrative permit
- The suitability of locating mines in AG-1
- Waiving the fee for an applicant who is appealing a PZC decision

MOTION WAS MADE by Commissioner O'Bryan,
SECONDED by Commissioner Wheeler, to reclassify
mines to a special exception use in the AG-1 land use
designation zone.

Director Boling recapped the LDR approval process on request by Chairman
Bowden.

Attorney Collins provided legal counsel that if Commissioner O'Bryan's Motion
failed today, the Board would lose the option to re-classify the mines, at the final public hearing
in December 2008, at which the LDR's are adopted.

Commissioner O'Bryan clarified for Chairman Bowden that his Motion was to
instruct staff to develop a LDR that reclassifies mines to a special exception use for areas with a
land use designation of AG-1, only.

Commissioner Wheeler wanted this item to be discussed at the public hearing, and
WITHDREW his SECOND to Commissioner O'Bryan's Motion.

MOTION DIED for lack of a SECOND.

Debate ensued between Commissioner Wheeler and Vice Chairman Davis as to
whether to leave the decision on Recommendation No. 33 (as pertained to AG-1 mines only), for
the Public Hearing, or whether to vote today.

MOTION WAS MADE by Vice Chairman Davis,
SECONDED by Commissioner Flescher, to keep the
administrative permit for mines in AG-1.

Under discussion, Vice Chairman Davis said he was fine with the ½ mile distance for the special notice letter, under Recommendation No. 34, but he wanted to know if the fee for an appeals process could be waived.

Attorney Collins stated that there would have to be some rational basis for waiving the fee, but he felt that a case could be made to do so, contingent upon the circumstances.

Debate ensued as the Board members explained their respective positions on Recommendation No. 34.

The Chairman CALLED THE QUESTION and the Motion carried. The Board, by a 3-2 vote (Commissioners O'Bryan and Wheeler opposed), approved to keep mines in AG-1 under administrative permit.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the Meeting adjourned at 6:12 p.m.

6. APPENDIX

See attached FINAL CONSENSUS RECOMMENDATIONS for Modified Mining regulations from the April, May, July, and August 2008 PZC Workshops.

ATTEST:

Mary Louise Scheidt, Interim Clerk

Wesley S. Davis, Vice Chairman
For: Sandra L. Bowden, Chairman

Minutes Approved: _____

BCC Special Call Mining/MG/2008