

**From:** Gabe Charbonneau <[gabriel.dane.509@gmail.com](mailto:gabriel.dane.509@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 29, 2020 4:41 PM  
**To:** Monica Hoffman <[monica@townofstevensville.com](mailto:monica@townofstevensville.com)>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] opinion re: Burn Fork Estates

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Jenelle,

My opinion is that the subdivision should be denied. I've heard too many concerns about traffic, water, and infrastructure to support the planned development being a burden to our community. I also live bordering on the land, and would be lying if I said it didn't bother me to imagine it. We are at risk of losing the beautiful area that drew us here in the first place. Knowing when to say yes or no to development is hard. I'm all for a thriving community. I love Stevensville. I vote no.

Gabe Charbonneau

## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** Kalkofen, Jim & Marsha <nisspak@brainerd.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, January 1, 2021 1:16 PM  
**To:** Dan Ritter; Meghan@naturaldwellings.com; greenroadlogistics@gmail.com; Paul Ludington  
**Cc:** Greg Chilcott; Jenelle Berthoud  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Town Growth Policy

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

P & Z Board, Following is a note I sent to Greg yesterday. I thought all members should be aware of exactly what the Growth Policy states about public hearings. I will take the liberty of forwarding several details regarding the subdivision application that may be on your agenda soon. I feel instead of a meeting that this matter requires an official hearing at both the board and later the Council.

I will also copy Jenelle so she can make the correspondence a matter of public record.

Thank you. Jim Kalkofen, Stevensville

Greg, Please read page 37 and 38 of the Stevensville 2016 Growth Policy. This section specifically calls for public hearings by the P & Z board.

The section uses these words, "...requires public hearings..."

This section also states, "...public hearings will be conducted by the P & Z board and Town Council for proposed subdivisions in Stevensville."

Due to this language, I feel the Jan. 6 meeting to discuss the BFE application is premature and requires a public hearing. What is your interpretation of the words?

Jim K.

## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** Marilyn Wolff <wolffmarilyn@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, January 1, 2021 2:31 PM  
**To:** Kalkofen, Jim & Marsha  
**Cc:** Dan Ritter; Meghan@naturaldwellings.com; greenroadlogistics@gmail.com; Paul Ludington; Greg Chilcott; Jenelle Berthoud  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: Town Growth Policy

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good

Sent from my iPhone

> On Jan 1, 2021, at 1:15 PM, Kalkofen, Jim & Marsha <nisspak@brainerd.net> wrote:  
>  
>  
> P & Z Board, Following is a note I sent to Greg yesterday. I thought all members should be aware of exactly what the Growth Policy states about public hearings. I will take the liberty of forwarding several details regarding the subdivision application that may be on your agenda soon. I feel instead of a meeting that this matter requires an official hearing at both the board and later the Council.  
>  
> I will also copy Jenelle so she can make the correspondence a matter of public record.  
>  
> Thank you. Jim Kalkofen, Stevensville  
>  
>  
>  
> Greg, Please read page 37 and 38 of the Stevensville 2016 Growth Policy. This section specifically calls for public hearings by the P & Z board.  
>  
> The section uses these words, "...requires public hearings..."  
>  
> This section also states, "...public hearings will be conducted by the P & Z board and Town Council for proposed subdivisions in Stevensville."  
>  
> Due to this language, I feel the Jan. 6 meeting to discuss the BFE application is premature and requires a public hearing. What is your interpretation of the words?  
>  
> Jim K.  
>  
>  
>  
>

## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** Kalkofen, Jim & Marsha <nisspak@brainerd.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, January 1, 2021 5:48 PM  
**To:** Greg Chilcott; Dan Ritter; megan@naturaldwellings.com; greenroadlogistics@gmail.com; Paul Ludington  
**Cc:** Jenelle Berthoud  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Two Key Issues to Consider

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Greg Chilcott and P & Z Board Members, When mulling over the BFE subdivision application, please consider these two key points:

1. The Ravalli County Road Administrator requested information from the developers in a letter dated Sept. 11, 2020. That's nearly four months ago, and they have blown him off ever since. The road report is a required element of an application. It has not been updated per the Road Administrator's request. This is just one incomplete item in the application.

Specifically, the Road Administrator asked for up-to-date road counts for Logan Lane and Middle Burnt Fork Road. He asked for a traffic distribution map (estimate of number of vehicles heading north and south from the development's Logan Lane access). He asked for a pedestrian bike/walking path plan from the residential area to Middle Burnt Fork Road. He also denied the developer's request for an access onto Middle Burnt Fork Road. The lack of response is a slap in the face of a valued county employee and the entire Ravalli County. Without these answers the application should be dead in the water.

2. The BFE plat indicates that Phase One has no road access within the development, contrary to state law. The entrance/exit is only onto Creekside Drive. This must be rectified with a new plat. Until the corrected drawing is in front of you, this application does not deserve your time.

Thank you, Jim Kalkofen, Stevensville



## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** Kalkofen, Jim & Marsha <nisspak@brainerd.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, January 1, 2021 6:17 PM  
**To:** Greg Chilcott; megan@naturaldwellings.com; Paul Ludington; Dan Ritter; greenroadlogistics@gmail.com  
**Cc:** Jenelle Berthoud  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Major Water Issues

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Greg Chilcott and P & Z Board Members, The land proposed for the BFE subdivision does NOT have water rights. Until this issue is settled, there should be no action taken regarding this proposal. Stevensville tried to change these rights, but the DNRC terminated the request in 2015 because according to Jim Nave, regional DNRC manager, the Town did not meet the correct and complete threshold. Apparently nothing has been done to rectify the situation, and as of this time, Nave from the DNRC stated in an Aug. 12, 2020 email, "As such the Town of Stevensville cannot legally provide a municipal water supply to an area that is outside of their current service area..." He also stated, "This place of use, or service area, does not include the area proposed for the Burnt Fork Estates..."

The Ravalli County subdivision form, question number 26 asks about water rights with yes or no blanks. In the case of the application, the answer is, "No." That means, at least to this simple guy, that the project must be terminated.

With no action by the Town for five years, why rush the BFE proposal? Instead, demand that water rights be settled. Once that question is addressed and the rights become known, then take a look at the BFE proposal, not before.

The second water issue relates to the state subdivision laws. In Part II, Required Information for Approval of Subdivisions under Sanitation in Subdivision Laws, Section B, paragraph 3, "Where a public water system is proposed or existing," and continuing in paragraph 3.a., "If an existing system will be used," and Number 2, "Provide evidence that the system is approved by DEQ and is in compliance with the regulations." Here's yet another reason to halt proceedings regarding the BFE application. The Town wells are not in compliance. To move forward assuming this matter will be swept under the rug is not prudent. Correct the issues first, then place the application on the agenda, not before.

Point of Information: In August 2020, the Town water wells were running almost 24 hours daily, which increased the NW Energy electricity bill that month by \$3,000. If current usage is causing the wells to run continuously, how can the P & Z Board even consider 220 more BFE homes be added to the end of the hose?

Thanks for understanding my concerns, Jim Kalkofen, Stevensville

## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** Kalkofen, Jim & Marsha <nisspak@brainerd.net>  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 2, 2021 12:14 PM  
**To:** Greg Chilcott; Meghan Hanson; Dan Ritter; greenroadlogistics@gmail.com; Paul Ludington  
**Cc:** Jenelle Berthoud  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Stevensville Code - Subdivision Review

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

P & Z Board, I feel the direction in the Subdivision Review section of the Stevensville Code is of critical importance as you contemplate a subdivision application.

Chapter 10 of the Code, under Development, Article VIII 10-378 states, "Only after the zoning administrator has officially notified all parties that plans are complete and in conformance to all applicable state statutes and town ordinances, shall the town planning and zoning board, within time limits as specified by state statute: (1) Review the plans and all recommendations from town employees and officials."

The plans are incomplete, as you know from my recent emails. The County Road Administrator has not received any response from the developers to his many concerns. The state requires the public water system to be in compliance. The Town's wells are not. Water rights are not available to the parcel under consideration. A revised plat showing Phase One connecting to roads within the subdivision has not been re-drawn. Water capacity, even if water rights were available would exceed the town's system. The sewage/wastewater facilities would also be exceeded.

The key word is COMPLETE. The BFE application is NOT. Jim Kalkofen, Stevensville

## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** Kalkofen, Jim & Marsha <nisspak@brainerd.net>  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 2, 2021 1:13 PM  
**To:** Greg Chilcott; Dan Ritter; Meghan Hanson; greenroadlogistics@gmail.com; Paul Ludington  
**Cc:** Jenelle Berthoud  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] BFE Commercial Re-Zoning Request

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Greg and P & Z Board, When the BFE subdivision application comes before the board, please consider these comments.

Stevensville Code, Section 10-219 - C-2 Limited Commercial District contains this definition, "The C-2 commercial district is intended to serve as a transitional buffer between residential areas and the more intensely developed downtown area. Small scale commercial and recreation uses that generate LITTLE traffic are allowed, together with a wide range of residential uses."

My take on the commercial district:

1. It does NOT belong on the corner of Logan Lane and Middle Burnt Fork Road.
2. The Ravalli County Road Administrator denied access from the proposed commercial district onto Middle Brunt Fork Road.
3. There is nothing to "buffer" here, with downtown being a mile to the west.
4. Businesses in Stevensville should be in the traditional downtown area.
5. The proposal calls for 16 commercial lots. There is absolutely ZERO chance that these businesses would result in "...LITTLE traffic..." as stated in the Code above.
6. The BFE subdivision proposal requests re-zoning a portion of land from residential to commercial. That being the case, since the commercial re-zoning is not possible according to CODE, the entire application should be shelved immediately.

Once again, thanks for your attention to this and other serious concerns about the BFE subdivision application. Jim Kalkofen, Stevensville

## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** Marilyn Wolff <wolffmarilyn@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 4, 2021 8:48 AM  
**To:** Jenelle Berthoud  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Emails to the Planning & Zoning Board  
**Attachments:** Planning & Zoning Board Letter Jan 2021.docx

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

The attached letter is for the Board as I've listed the members, please distribute to them before the Jan 6, 2021 meeting. Thank you.

Marilyn Wolff  
529-3018

January 3, 2021

RE: Burnt Fork Estates Subdivision Application Review and Board Meeting January 6, 2021

TO: Stevensville Planning and Zoning Board Members: Greg Chilcott Acting Chair (with John Kellogg recused, BFE Developer's Consultant), Meghan Hanson, Dan Ritter, Paul Ludington, Council Rep, and Trenis Hindle, newly appointed by the Mayor

I'm a resident of Creekside Meadows (CM) and my home is by the boundary cow fence with Burnt Fork Estates (BFE), the proposed subdivision of 220 family units of mixed housing, plus a strip of 16 commercial business lots. The multi-family units, per the BFE Application, are for 16 four-plexes, 25 duplexes, one 7 plex and one 10 plex. This buildout will increase Stevensville's population 20-25%. The 2018 census listed Stevensville's population at 2,025. CM residents are opposed to this major subdivision as currently platted which would be the largest subdivision ever approved in the county. Under the Town Code, Chapter 10 (a), your review and recommendations should, "regulate the use of land in order to promote public health, safety and general welfare... to retain a small town environment."

I am upset by holding a Board "meeting" vs a "Hearing" to review the BFE Application during a pandemic and near busy holidays. My meeting notification letter arrived Dec 23, 2020, two days before Christmas, to announce a Zoom meeting by your Board on Jan 6, 2021. I'm 73, fearful of Covid, but I resent a Zoom meeting which limits public participation when so many people want to comment on BFE, particularly in person. Stevensville has a large population of seniors who will be limited by not having a computer or the knowledge to use Zoom. A major subdivision should have robust citizen involvement in a real public process. Why not hold a public hearing this summer after many receive Covid vaccinations? These are unprecedented times, as a Board you should make such a recommendation to the Town Council.

I spoke at a P&Z Board meeting January 27, 2020, the Minutes were approved at the September 3, 2020 meeting and can be reviewed on the town's website, September Agenda packet, page 4. The 1/27 meeting has disappeared from the town meeting list and I have no idea if they are archived but they should be. The audio would reveal more detail of my questioning the Board. My name was misspelled but more importantly I asked the Board and Mayor about the Board's review process regarding BFE. I asked if the 2016 Growth Policy would be followed. John Kellogg, the Chair and the BFE developer's consultant, and the Mayor said yes to my question. ***They stated two hearings and two ads in the local paper. Why has this not been followed?***

I really worry you not will have adequate time to review the Application details to make informed recommendations about BFE. Citizens also need more meetings/hearings for comment. You will be making recommendations that either protect town residents, town infrastructure, schools, law enforcement, roads or forever subject a small community to over development at a huge price as well as loss of public health, safety and general welfare. A cursory review invites legal action against the town.

I have studied the BFE Application and find many deficiencies and omissions and here are some of my concerns:

The original HDR engineering report ordered by the town in lieu of a town planner to manage the process made a number of points including “all off-site water and wastewater improvements related to the need to increase system capacity as a result of this project shall be the responsibility of the developer”. That needs to be a firm, required impact fee the Board should recommend.

“Encroachment permits shall be obtained from Ravalli County for access to Middle Burnt Fork Rd and Logan before the issuance of the final plat for Phase 1.” Absolutely, the road issues should be settled right away before there’s any digging. As of now the Middle Burnt Fork Rd approach permit has been denied by the county road manager because of the nearness of the intersection of that road with Logan Lane. Also, did you realize the Middle Burnt Fork Rd approach was only for the 16 commercial businesses, not BFE residents? Think of the number of cars 220 families will add to nearby roads. Accidents for sure, hopefully no deaths. Roads and intersections must be improved at the developer’s expense and this should be a Board recommendation.

BFE needs to obtain their own approaches. BFE is a separate subdivision and cannot run their traffic through CM. BFE roads will be private and maintained by the BFE HOA. CM residents’ property rights are being ignored, MCA 76-3-102 (8). Another Board recommendation.

The Stevensville Growth Policy, page 35 and 36, Local Services, requires services listed such as schools to be evaluated for impact cost. “The cost of providing services by determining the per capita or per lot cost of services and current and anticipated tax and fee revenue.” Absolutely needed, Stevensville residents just passed a bond issue and it may be impossible to pass another bond anytime soon to build more school rooms and pay additional staffing. To date there is no report in the Application on school impact and the Superintendent and School Board have not been contacted. This needs cost analysis and assessment to the developers, not current town residents. The BFE Application is not complete until this is done. The Board needs to insist this omission be corrected.

This same section applies to law enforcement and it would seem reasonable for the size of this development that another town officer should be hired at an appropriate cost to the developer.

Let me direct you to the enlarged maps you have of BFE, Preliminary Plat 1, Storm Water Plan Map 5, and Park Plan 6. The largest common area/park shown on 5 and 6 is right by CM and incidentally my home. The majority of this area is comprised of two huge retention ponds to hold toxic storm water runoff. Keep in mind there is shallow groundwater in BFE, 12-39 inches below the surface as stated in the Site Evaluation Section of the Application. These ponds will hold water year round without rain or snow melt. One is 2 feet deep, the other 4 feet. Map 5 does **not** show an emergency overflow pipe or spillway which my nephew a civil engineer mentioned to me. I am not convinced the water mitigation system, i.e. wastewater system will work and may in fact cause flooding in CM. The area is considered minimal floodplain by FEMA which is still potential with high groundwater already present and then throw in a huge wet period, it could be bad. It would seem grading and fill with berms between CM and BFE might be a solution. With the developers handing off the stormwater system to their HOA, what assurance does CM have that this complicated system of sumps, detention and retention ponds will be properly maintained over the years. Lastly, the stormwater system presumes to connect to CM’s stormwater system (BFE App Site Evaluation, 6.1). **BFE is a new subdivision which I don’t believe has the legal right to connect to CM’s system which could overwhelm and cause flooding in CM.** This matter should be of great concern for the Board and Town Council.

Retention ponds have a long history of being particularly dangerous to children and pets. These ponds will require fencing, a monitoring system and cleaning. Retention ponds are big breeding sites for mosquitos, form algae, produce algae blooms which are toxic and stink. I DON'T WANT THESE PONDS BY MY HOME AND OUR COMMUNITY. Relocate these water traps elsewhere in BFE. A deduction of this large pseudo park from the required green space per state law and BFE is below what is required. This isn't a park for residents' enjoyment, it's a HAZARD ZONE. Furthermore this "park" is proposed for the first Phase of the development along with a six lot cul-de-sac on Clover Lane, a CM street. Please refer to Preliminary Plat 1 map. The only road access these future BFE residents will have is in and out of Creekside Drive in CM! This cul-de-sac needs to be turned around into BFE and tied into their road system. This is a violation of state law unless changed on the plat, MCA 76-3-608 (3)(d), " the provision of legal and physical access to each parcel within the proposed subdivision and the required notation of that access on the applicable plat..."

I've listed many serious problems besides the big one with BFE not having legal town water rights. The town needs to settle their water use areas and well permits with DNRC before permitting a major subdivision. The water rights deeded to the town by the developers are for "irrigation only" six months of the year, hardly any help with municipal water needs. The Application needs to be tabled until it is complete with all the problems resolved or properly negotiated. To do otherwise is negligence.

Good Luck, you have a real lemon to review.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Wolff

300 Aspen Trail, Stevensville MT 59870

406-529-3018



Dear Jenelle: I am concerned about the seniors in Stevensville who may not have a computer and are not zoom Savy missing out on the council meeting about the proposed BFE subdivision. I am 83 and I know many others are being left out. Please bring this to the attention of the P/Z board. Thank you.

Public comment for P&Z meeting 01/06/2021  
From: 4062391413

## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** Kalkofen, Jim & Marsha <nisspak@brainerd.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 4, 2021 10:11 AM  
**To:** Greg Chilcott; Dan Ritter; greenroadlogistics@gmail.com; Paul Ludington; Meghan Hanson  
**Cc:** Jenelle Berthoud  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Read both Engineering Reports, Please

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Greg and P & Z board members,

A critical component of the BFE subdivision application is the engineering report. The Town hired HDR engineering to compile a report. That occurred to the tune of \$6,143. That report was only made available when I filed a Freedom of Information form with the town clerk.

The reason is simple. The engineering report on the Town's website and likely enclosed with your packet is the mayor's sanitized engineering report. Please compare the two reports; the "edits" are obvious and should give each P & Z board member cause to pause in this process and ask one simple question, "Why?"

One glaring difference is the original HDR Report, page 10. It reads, "The approval of the Preliminary Plat is therefore not a guarantee that the water system and wastewater facility will have capacity for service at the time of final plat application and capacity will be evaluated for each phase. If capacity issues are identified the developer will be required to address these issues as part of their final plat submittal."

The Town did not mention this in the engineering report they want you to believe.

Also, on Page 13, the original HDR Report reads, "All off-site water and wastewater improvements related to the need to increase system capacity as a result of this project shall be the responsibility of the developer."

The Town's engineering report conveniently omitted this key fact.

Does that mean that you and I and the Town's other taxpayers will be on the hook for these expansions?

You are in position to uncover these and many other unknowns related to this application. Thanks much for digging into this situation.

Jim Kalkofen, Stevensville

## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** Robin J <robinjohnst@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 4, 2021 10:51 AM  
**To:** Jenelle Berthoud  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] BurntFork Subdivision

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

As a resident and mother of an active 11 year old, I am strongly concerned about the proposed subdivision. If the traffic came through Creekside I would be very concerned for traffic safety with cars and children playing. Also, as a parent I am concerned about having an overcrowded school in Stevensville, particularly the High School. Finally, I am concerned about the huge demand on water supply. Water pressure at Creekside is already low. This will be impacted if the subdivision goes through.

Thank you  
Robin Johnston  
Resident of Creekside

## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** Laura Miller  
**Sent:** Monday, January 4, 2021 12:02 PM  
**To:** Jenelle Berthoud  
**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL] Form submission from: Contact Us

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged



-----Original Message-----

From: Stevensville Montana via Stevensville Montana <noreply@townofstevensville.com>  
Sent: Monday, January 4, 2021 12:00 PM  
To: TOS Info <info@townofstevensville.com>  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Form submission from: Contact Us

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Submitted on Monday, January 4, 2021 - 11:59am Submitted by anonymous user: 63.153.102.215 Submitted values are:

First Name: Tony  
Last Name: Norman  
Email: griznation2@gmail.com  
Question/Comment:

Janelle, please see that a copy of this letter is distributed to the planning and zoning board in advance of their scheduled meeting this week and also that a copy is given to the mayor and town council. Thank you.

My wife and I have lived in Creekside Meadows for 15 Years and am writing this letter in opposition to the proposed Burnt Fork Estates, "BFE", development for the following reasons:

1. Water is a major concern in that we have noticed a decrease in our water pressure since the ongoing building of homes in the Twin Creeks development. As this is an ongoing development we can only expect our water pressure to continue to decrease. With the addition of the major BFE development, our question is, where is the additional needed water going to come from and what will happen to our already decreasing water pressure? As we are already on water rationing, we shudder to think of the possible consequences.
2. Water drainage in our crawl space has been an ongoing issue depending on the weather and with the proposed addition of over a hundred slab foundations next to us, where is that additional water going to go? In my crawl space? And if it does, causing structural damage, who is going to be responsible, the developer, you?
- 3.. Sewage is also a major concern as we question the ability of our existing infrastructure's ability to handle the proposed new demands that will be required on it.
4. With the additional demands that will be made regarding water and sewage, can we expect new town bond issues to finance both ?
5. Traffic is a major concern as the BFE developers are proposing to direct a large portion of this traffic through Creekside Meadows. This will increase drastically safety issues and also change some of our neighborhood roads to major arterials. In addition, as the town is unable to repair major issues with our existing Creekside Meadows roads, how do they expect to handle the additional requirements? With all the traffic that will be generated by the BFE and Twin Creeks developments, the Middle Burnt Fork and Logan roads are going to require major upgrades. Is this an issue discussed in the proposal?

6. A development of this size is going to put a major strain on Stevensville's school system and might require ANOTHER bond proposal. Are the citizens of Stevensville aware of and prepared for all the possible expenses that might be required by the BFE development?

My wife and I are senior citizens and do not have the expertise to use Zoom and can only express our views and feelings with this email. We were hoping that because of the importance of this issue and the effects it will have on the whole town, that open meetings would be held which could require masks and social distancing. As a lot of the residents of Creekside Meadows and the town of Stevensville are senior citizens and do not have computers or smart phones, they are totally denied access to all Zoom meetings, especially those that can effect them and the whole town .

Janelle, once again, thank you in advance for seeing that the mayor, town council, and zoning and planning board get a copy of this email before their next scheduled meetings Tony Norman

303 Syringa  
396-1004

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.townofstevensville.com/node/7/submission/2331>

## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** George lundwall <geowlundwall@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 4, 2021 12:23 PM  
**To:** Jenelle Berthoud  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Burnt Fork Estates Subdivision  
**Attachments:** BFES Concerns.docx

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To: Mayor Brandon Dewey, Stevensville Town Council and Planning and Zoning Board,

I assume all of the supporting documents from the September 3, 2020 meeting agenda concerning the Burnt Fork Estates Subdivision will be considered during the new meeting date of January 6, 2021. I have attached another copy of my letter dated August 31, 2020 expressing my concerns for your review.

Regards,  
George Lundwall  
1700 Creekside Drive  
Stevensville, MT 59870

Dear Mayor Brandon Dewey and StevensvilleTown Council Members,

August 31, 2020

This email/letter is in response to the letter I received from you on August 26, 2020 regarding comments on the Burnt Fork Estates Subdivision. I am **strongly opposed** to such a poorly planned subdivision by the California Developer near Creekside Meadows Subdivision in the Town of Stevensville, MT.

The detrimental consequences to the residents of Creekside Meadows Subdivision are immeasurable. I have never had water in my crawl space in 15 years and am now concerned. The Hooley brothers have already installed three (3) massive sump basins on the proposed subdivision property for the purpose of re-directing groundwater to the Creekside Meadows Subdivision storm sewers during construction. I was told by PCI Inc. representatives on July 31, 2020 that you gave them permission to survey our storm sewers for connecting these sumps to our subdivision...is that true or for that matter even legal? Groundwater issues alone should be reason enough to **reject** the Burnt Fork Estates Subdivision.

**Next issue.** How is the town of Stevensville going to supply water to this new subdivision? Water pressure and supply are already pushed to the limit. Do the residents of Stevensville have to pay for additional water for the benefit of a California developer? Keep in mind once this 10 year development is complete he goes back to California with a ton of money and leaves the current residents of Stevensville holding the bag. Another reason to **reject** the Burnt Fork Estates Subdivision.

**Next issue.** The traffic on Logan Lane and Middle Burnt Fork road will be a dangerous situation. Are you Mayor Dewey and the Stevensville Town Council willing to approve this subdivision knowing that the risk for collisions and injuries will be dramatically increased? Numerous vehicles already enter Logan Lane from Eastside Highway at 70 MPH with no intent of slowing down. I have been passed on a double yellow line like I was standing still. Also, current Stevensville residents will be delayed even more when trying to get onto Main Street from Eastside Highway. Every Stevensville resident can attest to that problem. Another reason to **reject** the Burnt Fork Estates Subdivision.

**Next issue.** The Hooley brothers are dead wrong when they stated in the Bitterroot Star that the Burnt Fork Estates Subdivision is part of Creekside Meadows that was approved 17 years ago. That approval expired a long time ago...if it was still current why they would have to seek approval again. Under no circumstances should the three (3) stub roads in Creekside Meadows be opened to traffic into Burnt Fork Estates Subdivision. That is a separate subdivision with their own lenient covenants. Creekside Meadows is a quiet elderly community and should not be forced to endure 10 years of construction activity through our neighborhood. Another reason to **reject** the Burnt Fork Estates subdivision.

With all the potential damaging consequences why would the Hooley brothers, PCI Inc., John Kellogg, Mayor Dewey and any Stevensville Council member who votes in favor of the Burnt Fork Estates Subdivision put themselves at personal risk for legal action? This email/letter is now a public record.

Sincerely,

George Lundwall (406)381-1591  
1700 Creekside Drive  
Stevensville, MT 59870

To: Mayor Brandon Dewey, Stevensville Town Council and Planning and Zoning Board,

I assume all of the supporting documents from the September 3, 2020 meeting agenda concerning the Burnt Fork Estates Subdivision will be considered during the new meeting date of January 6, 2021. I have attached another copy of my letter dated August 31, 2020 expressing my concerns for your review.

Regards,  
George Lundwall  
1700 Creekside Drive  
Stevensville, MT 59870



## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** John Croft <cia0648@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 4, 2021 1:11 PM  
**To:** Jenelle Berthoud  
**Cc:** James Kalkofen  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comments for the Town Planning & Zoning Board Meeting 1/6/2021

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Town Clerk Berthoud,

Please provide my written comments below to the P&Z Board for the January 6, 2021 meeting. Thanks.

Regards, John Croft

Dear Planning and Zoning Board Members Kellogg, Chilcott, Ritter, Hanson, and Hindle

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the application for a major subdivision know as Burnt Fork Estates (BFE).

As a resident of Creekside Meadows I have grave concerns relative to the BFE application:

First, traffic on Logan (aka the Stevensville Bypass) and Middle Burnt Fork is substantial. With over 200+ homes and the commercial businesses in the proposed BFE subdivision, the significant increase in vehicle traffic on Logan and Middle Burnt Fork will be extremely dangerous. There are no shoulders on Logan as it is a farm road. Several bike riders use Logan which is already dangerous because there is no shoulder and no enforcement of the 45 mph speed limit. Even now on Logan, there are drivers that far exceed the speed limit and will even pass other vehicles in the no pass zone. Obviously with a significant increase in traffic on Logan and Middle Burnt Fork the risk for more accidents will substantially increase. Someone will get killed. Moreover, the additional traffic through Creekside Meadows will dangerous. Many of the residents in Creekside Meadow walk in the area. The BFE application should be denied because of the huge traffic issue.

Second, water will be a major issue. Apparently BFE does not have water rights to the Town of Stevensville's water. How will the 200+ homes and commercial businesses get water? Moreover, will the town's sewer system be significantly impacted by so many homes and commercial businesses? Is

there any assurance the town's sewer treatment plan can handle the additional sewage? The BFE application should be denied because of the water and sewer issue.

Third, commercial businesses in the proposed BFE will have a huge negative impact on the small businesses on Main Street. It is especially difficult for the existing small businesses to survive in a small town such as Stevensville. With additional competition it is likely that many of the businesses on Main Street will close. It will be sad to see so many empty store fronts on Main Street. The BFE application should be denied because of this issue.

Finally, the above concerns are just a few of the issues. There are issues related to potential crime, additional need for fire and police services, impact on schools, town services such as snow removal and street maintenance, employment and welfare, and environmental impacts. This issues will result in additional property taxes. The BFE application should be denied because of these issues.

Please use the power of the Town Planning & Zoning Board to provide the Town Council with a recommendation for denial relative to the BFE application for a major subdivision.

Regards,

John Croft  
1618 Creekside Drive

## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** Walter McCrumb <sikiq4me@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 4, 2021 1:21 PM  
**To:** Jenelle Berthoud  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Burnt Fork Subdivision Comments

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I am not against the growth and expansion of our town of Stevensville. But, when that growth does not include the necessary infrastructure like water and sewer considerations and just plan to use the existing facilities that are already beyond their estimated capacities then I must oppose this planned expansion. Our Planning and Zoning Board is there to protect and plan for expansion. This includes finding funding and sources for future projects. My understanding is that this has not happened and current users may lose their existing water pressure and sprinkler systems may not cover lawn areas and showers may lose pressure. Please call me if you need support or help. Walt and Faye McCrumb, 406 381-7941 or [sikiq4me@gmail.com](mailto:sikiq4me@gmail.com). Walt

## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** Kalkofen, Jim & Marsha <nisspak@brainerd.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 4, 2021 2:27 PM  
**To:** Jenelle Berthoud  
**Cc:** Greg Chilcott  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comments for P & Z Board

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Jenelle, Prior to the October regularly scheduled P & Z board meeting, a number of town residents submitted written comments. I was one of those. I feel all those comments should be submitted once again. There are new members on the board and it would be wise for these letters to be part of the record for this postponed meeting.

It will be especially important since the public will not be able to appear in public to express their opinions. Also, if some of the letter writers did not see the single legal notice, they may not be aware. By including their sentiments from three months ago, their voices will be heard at the upcoming meeting.

Thanks. Jim Kalkofen, Stevensville

## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** Mark Bickish <mbickish@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 4, 2021 3:05 PM  
**To:** Jenelle Berthoud  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Burnt Fork Subdivision

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I support the Burnt Fork Subdivision. We need proper growth and places for people to live. This subdivision makes a lot of sense, maybe not the exact proposal, but expanded growth for housing is important. Growth is coming, we need to plan it and prepare for it.

Thanks

Mark Bickish

Sent from my iPhone

## Jenelle Berthoud


---

**From:** Lori Greene <gvlorg@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 4, 2021 5:32 PM  
**To:** Jenelle Berthoud  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] BHE subdivision

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

As a concerned citizen of Stevensville, I have many concerns with the Proposed BHE plan.

1. Why is the developer allowed to alter the 2016 approved growth plan?
2. City hasn't gained approval from the county on new road access on Logan rd. Creekside Meadows subdivision can't handle the traffic and it's completely unfair to allow a different HOA to use Creekside Meadows subdivision roads. Logan Road cannot handle the added traffic on that narrow road. Safety is a major concern!
3. Water and sewer issues. No citizen of Stevensville should pay for added improvements.
4. Commercial property added to the plans. Totally unacceptable.
5. Too high density for the amount of land. No apartments should be built. The original plan on lot size and homes is the only plan that should be passed after water and sewer expansion is paid for solely by the developer.
5. Increase in school expansion passed on solely to developer.
6. I don't approve of this development. Should a modified plan be approved, please use the 2016 approved plan. The plan as it is, will destroy quality of life for all citizens. This is not California.
7. Town of Stevensville must be fair, transparent and not in bed with the developer. Which I believe is  happening. Mayor Dewey must follow the laws and not reinvent policies already in place, yet not followed.
8. Please reject this housing plan and resubmit a reasonable housing development which creates harmony for all citizens.

Respectfully,

Lori Greene

Sent from my iPhone

## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** Susan Turner <sturner@timberedgemachine.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 4, 2021 10:45 PM  
**To:** Jenelle Berthoud  
**Cc:** patrogj@gmail.com  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Planning & Zoning Board Zoom Meeting, Wed, Jan 6, 6:30 pm OBJECTION TO BFE  
**Attachments:** Goliath Is At The Door.docx  
**Importance:** High  
**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Jenelle:

I understand there is a Planning & Zoning Board zoom meeting this Wednesday, Jan 6, 6:30 pm. I'd like to be on public file with the Town of Stevensville stating my objections to the Burnt Fork Estates subdivision. It is my understanding any objections need to be to you by noon on Wednesday, Jan 6, so kindly reply to all on this email so I know the attached letter was received and you have distributed it prior to the meeting for all to read. I am also requesting the log in details for the zoom meeting prior to Wednesday.

I do not have a computer so am sending this letter to you from my daughters computer (sturner@timberedgemachine.com). If you need to verify the legitimacy of this letter please contact me on my cell phone at 406 239-1413. I do get a lot of spam calls so please leave a vm if you call and I do not answer.

Thank you in advance for letting me know this email was received and you will distribute my letter prior to the meeting on Wednesday, Jan 6, 6:30 pm.

I submitted the attached letter to the Editor of the Bitterroot Star twice but to date it has not yet been printed.

Respectfully,

Pat Johnson  
Stevensville, MT  
[patrogj@gmail.com](mailto:patrogj@gmail.com)  
406 239-1413

Jenelle:

I understand there is a Planning & Zoning Board zoom meeting this Wednesday, Jan 6, 6:30 pm. I'd like to be on public file with the Town of Stevensville stating my objections to the Burnt Fork Estates subdivision. It is my understanding any objections need to be to you by noon on Wednesday, Jan 6, so kindly reply to all on this email so I know the attached letter was received and you have distributed it prior to the meeting for all to read. I am also requesting the log in details for the zoom meeting prior to Wednesday.

I do not have a computer so am sending this letter to you from my daughters computer ([sturner@timberedgemachine.com](mailto:sturner@timberedgemachine.com)). If you need to verify the legitimacy of this letter please contact me on my cell phone at 406 239-1413. I do get a lot of spam calls so please leave a vm if you call and I do not answer.

Thank you in advance for letting me know this email was received and you will distribute my letter prior to the meeting on Wednesday, Jan 6, 6:30 pm.

I submitted the attached letter to the Editor of the Bitterroot Star twice but to date it has not yet been printed.

Respectfully,

Pat Johnson  
Stevensville, MT  
[patrogj@gmail.com](mailto:patrogj@gmail.com)  
406 239-1413



GOLIATH IS AT THE DOOR ...

I am referring to the mega subdivision proposed to go in adjacent to Creekside Meadows subdivision. We should all be concerned about public safety if Burnt Fork Estates (BFE) is allowed to funnel about 600 more cars through Creekside Meadows.

Montana Code Annotated 2019

TITLE 76. LAND RESOURCES AND USE

CHAPTER 3. LOCAL REGULATIONS OF SUBDIVISIONS

Part 1. General Provisions

Statement of Purpose

76-3-102. Statement of purpose. It is the purpose of this chapter to:

(3) lessen congestion in the streets and highways.

If BFE is allowed access through Creekside Meadows, it will add chaos to the already existing traffic on Logan Lane.

A few weeks ago I was headed South on Logan Lane (headed home) when a truck came off Eastside Hwy going at least 60 mph which is the speed limit on Eastside Hwy. The truck passed me in a 45 mph speed zone disregarding the double yellow lines and passing the truck ahead of me, which had flashers on with a big road grader ahead of him. Had someone been coming from the opposite end of Logan Lane, he had nowhere to go and no shoulder to pull off on; someone likely would have been killed. Should BFE be allowed to use our entrance, major construction would need to be done and that would come at a high price for all Ravalli County tax payers.

BFE has offered to pay \$200 per lot toward road construction, which would be just a drop in the bucket for that sort of construction.

Please let your voice be heard when the public hearing is held (very soon.)

Respectfully submitted,

Pat Johnson  
Stevensville, MT

## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** wallace whitney <wallaceawhitney@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 5, 2021 6:54 AM  
**To:** Jenelle Berthoud  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Burnt Fork Subdivision

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I am strongly opposed to the proposed subdivision. There is simply no rational reason for the planning board to approve this project given the endless list of potential hardships which will be placed on the current residents for year to come. The list has been well documented for months and yet the project moves forward. It's simply time for the members of the zoning and planning board to take a stand. Are you for corruption and greed or fairness and honesty? Please stop this madness once and for all with a unanimous ant outright rejection of this proposal.

Wallace Whitney  
Stevensville

Sent from my iPad

## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** lrkmjohnson@frontier.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 5, 2021 12:54 PM  
**To:** Jenelle Berthoud  
**Cc:** Jenelle Berthoud; 'James Kalkofen'  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comments on Burnt Fork Estates Subdivision

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

TO: Stevensville Planning and Zoning Board

FROM: Leonard and Karen Johnson, 1508 Creekside Dr, Stevensville, Montana

We have written twice – in August and again in October 2020 – concerning the proposed Burnt Fork Estates development, but have not had a response, nor seen any adjustments to the current plans in the intervening months.

As adjacent neighbors, we have significant concerns to the density of the development and the proposed street entrances. The plans include use of the existing Creekside Drive, utilizing Syringa and Aspen Streets and another proposed street that also exits onto Logan Lane. Traffic on Logan Lane is already hazardous as it is increasing used as a bypass of downtown Stevensville; traffic that seems to have little regard for the 45 MPH speed limit. The increase in truck and passenger traffic already adds to the hazard of exiting from Creekside Drive, where there is limited sight distance to the south without edging onto a very narrow road. **It makes absolutely no sense not to add a primary exit from the development at or near the existing entrance to the property on Middle Burnt Fork Road.** We understand that access onto Middle Burnt Fork Road was not approved by the county road manager, but that decision needs to be revisited. The potential traffic impacts on residents of Creekside Meadows and Logan Lane are both severe and hazardous. The plan should also not preclude direct connection to other existing streets that are located to the west of the proposed subdivision. Rather than add to congestion and traffic at the dangerous intersection of Eastside Highway and Logan Lane, a Burnt Fork entrance would provide a logical alternative for much of the newly generated traffic from the development.

Another concern relates to the impact on the infrastructure of the Town of Stevensville. Development and approvals should be withheld until there are definitive studies of the water and sewer capacity of Stevensville and resolution of the water rights issue regarding this subdivision. It does not represent prudent or wise planning to approve such a large addition until those issues are fully understood. We have not seen any current, reliable studies that indicate capacity on the part of Stevensville to handle this expansion. We have seen studies that indicate our water system would reach capacity with the build out of Twin Creeks subdivision. Now we find that we may not even have water rights to the water we have. What will 121 single family and multifamily units plus the proposed commercial activity add to that demand? Some definitive studies of the town's water and sewer capacity and plans to expand that capacity are needed before an expansion of this size is approved.

A third concern relates the proposal for retention ponds adjacent to Creekside Meadows to contain storm water runoff. There are already issues for some homes in Creekside Meadows having water in their crawl spaces. With general drainage of the area to the north and west, these holding ponds can only create additional issues as that water seeps into subsurface drainage. At a minimum they need to be relocated where potential drainage will be to the fields

to the west with planned drainage into existing drainage channels. In addition, their impact needs full engineering study with corresponding approvals from state and county authorities before subdivision approval.

We hope that the planning and zoning board will see the need for significant redesign of this proposal, will deny the application for commercial rezoning of the southeast corner if that still is in the proposal, and will request redesign of the proposed access to the development. The Town of Stevensville will be better served by that decision.

## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** stevedgibson52@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 5, 2021 1:40 PM  
**To:** Jenelle Berthoud; meghan@naturalddwellings.com; greenroadlogistics@gmail.com; Paul Ludington; ritter4@mac.com; Jenelle Berthoud; gchilcott@rc.mt.gov  
**Cc:** Steve Gibson  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comments for Proposed Subdivision Meeting Burnt Fork Estates Planning and Zoning Board January 6th 2021  
**Attachments:** Comments Regarding Proposed Subdivision of Burnt Fork Estates Public Meeting 1-6-2021.pdf  
  
**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please see the attached letter.

Sent from my

To: Jenelle Berthoud  
C.C. Board Members

Regarding planning and zoning board hearing for proposed Burnt Fork Estates Subdivision January 6<sup>th</sup> 2021

At this time the application for the proposed subdivision for Burnt Fork Estates is incomplete in relationship to following statutes, rules, procedures, required documentation, admissions, etc. This type of meeting also discriminates and restricts the ability of many citizens to participate in the process of a proposed subdivision of this magnitude.

The following are some of the concerns that have not been addressed by town officials and the developer:

1. Water rights. It has been documented that neither Creekside or Burnt Fork Estates have water rights.
2. Existing wells are not legally permitted. This has been documented and not addressed.
3. Both the 2016 growth plan and former town officials have stated that Stevensville does not have the capacity of water for what would be the largest subdivision in Ravalli County. This was stated even before this proposed subdivision of 220 family units and 16 commercial lots, as well as 16 family units being built behind ace hardware, and up to 40 new homes at Twin Creeks. Since 2016 there has also been many new residential homes built in Creekside and Twin Creeks. There would obviously be a large fee, tax increase to the citizens of Stevensville for upgrades. What is the cost? The town is already on water restrictions. In the summer of 2019, we could not water for two weeks due to failure of town pumps. What about the simple fact of there not being adequate water pressure?
4. No updated traffic study regarding impacts. There could be up to a thousand more vehicles per day. This proposal could increase the population of Stevensville by 20 to 25% not including increased traffic, mail, service providers, FedEx, contractors, school, and etc. What impact does this have on Logan and Burnt Fork Road as well as taking into consideration the dangerous intersection of Logan and Stevi Highway. An increase in the congestion on Main and Stevi highway which is already a problem. Who will pay and how much? In October the mayor requested that the developers move forward and obtain access of not just Logan but also Burnt Fork Road. It is my understanding that the county has not granted access off of Burnt Fork Road. In a meeting months ago the developers and consultants stated that they would limit traffic on Creekside Drive which is a separate subdivision with different covenants. Fact, it appears a majority of access would come through Creekside Meadows, which is a separate subdivision.
5. The school district has not been contacted in regards to impact on schools, with over a 20% increase in population, how much will this cost the taxpayers of Stevensville?
6. Recommendation of consultants that developer pay cost increases related to needed upgrades to current water and sewer capacity. This was deleted by town officials. Just yesterday this language was put back in the HDR report. What's up? Again, what cost to all taxpayers?
7. Proposed 16 commercial properties will have an impact to existing businesses. Proposed new fire station. What would this cost the taxpayer; building, fire trucks, man power. At this time it is ironic that this proposed fire station would not have access off Burnt Fork Road to the

subdivision. Where will the fire trucks go? Will they will have to come through this separate subdivision of Creekside Meadows?

8. Retention ponds to be placed within a few feet of residents in separate subdivision of Creekside Meadows. Many questions about retention ponds for waste water:
  - a. Safety concerns including children who are attracted to these ponds and can risk drowning and other water injuries.
  - b. Mosquitos lay eggs and hatch in these ponds. There are no mosquitos currently.
  - c. Unmaintained ponds can become a source of unpleasant smells, toxins in ground water, can have algae blooms and stink. Developers say that the Burnt Fork HOA association of this separate subdivision will maintain infrastructure. Who will be liable for issues that arise in relationship to Creekside Meadow residents who will have no control of these ponds? Other experts have stated that these types of retention ponds are not recommended anywhere due to the aforementioned issues.
  - d. Some have also reported that connecting the waste water system in to Creekside Meadows waste water system could potentially cause flooding.
9. Increase need for public safety since I have lived here for over 3 years there has never been more than 3 police officers currently two some times in the past only one.

With many unanswered questions and incomplete application with incorrect information, I respectfully request that action on this proposed subdivision be delayed and resubmitted.

Need to address issues:

- a. Water rights
- b. Illegal permitted wells
- c. School report
- d. Up to date traffic study
- e. Estimated cost to taxpayer for water and sewer upgrade
- f. Cost to county tax payer for needed upgrades of county highway

Finally, public hearing or any other action should be delayed till all citizens can participate. As was stated by the board chairman at the last planning and zoning board meeting, he was going to schedule public hearings and possibly multiple public hearings would be needed with a proposed subdivision of this magnitude.

In my opinion, to move forward at this time with the countless issues that are still unanswered or not completed may attract legal action and frankly is unethical. I am not opposed to reasonable and responsible development which this proposal is obviously not.

This impacts all the citizens of Stevensville, not just the special interests of out of state developers, paid consultants, and a few town officials.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Steve Gibson

1517 Creekside Dr.

Stevensville, MT 59817

## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** Nancy Kopszywa <kopszywa@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 5, 2021 2:52 PM  
**To:** Jenelle Berthoud  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Planning and Zoning committee meeting  
**Attachments:** Planning Board meeting letter one.docx

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please enter this attachment into the record and distribute to committee members.

Sent from Mail for Windows 10



One major concern for all of Stevensville's residents is exceeding the capacity of the water and sewer systems. Even as far back as 2002 when Creekside Meadows was being considered, concerns rose over the developers planned sewer line size. The concern centered around the proposed line being capable of handling volume when Phase 2 was fully developed. It appears that the entire Burnt Fork Meadows sewer line is connecting and flowing through the sewer pipes that could be totally inadequate. They were designed to handle 60 families, not over 280 families! Stevensville's Growth Policy of 2016 clearly states "that with full subdivision approval and build out of Creekside Meadows and Twin Creeks , an additional 255 wastewater connections would exceed the current capacity of Stevensville's wastewater treatment system. In just the last 4 ½ years, there have been 53 residential connections, 4 commercial connections, and 16 more coming up with the approval of the 16 unit low income complex off Eastside Highway. If you simply do the math, add the number of lots still remaining to be added in the approved Creekside Meadows and Twin Creeks , plus any infill or businesses in the downtown area, you can see that the current system is woefully inadequate to accommodate Burnt Fork Estates.

The same numbers also apply to the water system per the 2016 Growth Policy. Read pages 10-13 for yourself as well as how understaffed our police department and our fire department would be.

There are over 30 years remaining on the water and sewer bonds; are you willing to pass more bonds, and pay even higher water and sewer bills to increase the capacities? For a overly large subdivision that doesn't fit with the life we came to Stevensville to live?

## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** Nancy Kopszywa <kopszywa@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 5, 2021 2:54 PM  
**To:** Jenelle Berthoud  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Planning and Zoning Committee meeting  
**Attachments:** Planning Board meeting letter two.docx

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please include this in the comments for the committee meeting tomorrow and distribute to the committee members.

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

Of concern to me is the design, configuration and volume of the planned “retention ponds”. In their last revision, the developers made some changes but the fact remains that the volume still appears to be over 100,000 cubic feet. The two largest ponds are of a dangerous depth; one actually being 4 feet in depth. “Surrounded by a gravel path, with gentle rolling earth mounds for topographic relief” All of this in the center of their common area! Of note also, is that all of the drainage from these ponds appears to connect with the Creekside Meadows storm drainage system. **Is the re sufficient drainage capacity for those ponds? How will children, pets and other wildlife be kept safe around these ponds?**

To mitigate the drainage around the homes, a plan for “swales” and dry sumps is mentioned. By definition, a **swale is “a low-lying or depressed and often wet stretch of land”**. **Otherwise, a wide shallow ditch designed to carry away run -off water from rain, sprinklers and snow melt. Where does all this water go? Into the retention ponds? Into the storm drain system? Where does the water from the storm drainage system go? To the sewer plant? To the Bitterroot River?**

I foresee stagnant, standing water which we all know can lead to a mosquito issue which in turn can lead to mosquito borne illness. I lived in Lolo for 22 years; stagnant, standing water around that community lead to a perpetual SID for an annual 3 pronged attack on the mosquito population.

This planning board needs to consider all the negative implications Burnt Fork Estates has on our entire community. Traffic volume and safety, police protection, fire protection, overcrowding in our schools, and putting our water and sewer systems over their capacities. Absolutely **all** these items would put increasing property tax liabilities on **all of Stevensville’s residents.**

## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** Julie Bachman <jmbachman1234@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 5, 2021 7:37 PM  
**To:** Jenelle Berthoud  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] BURNT FORK SUBDIVISION

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Stevensville Planning and Zoning Board,

I am a resident of the Creekside Meadows subdivision, and I would like to voice my concerns in regards to the possible Burnt Fork Estates subdivision south of my property.

Please know that my property is on the North end of this particular piece of land, and I am extremely concerned for any kind of subdivision to be placed there.

There have been so many subdivisions put in our community in the last five years, it is affecting our way of life in our small town of Stevensville. I moved to this subdivision nearly five years ago, coming from Hamilton, because it was close to work, and there was freedom to roam without tons of traffic, people and problems. That has now changed in the last 5 years, because we are now becoming so overpopulated!

Ever since the subdivision to the south of me, which is the Middle Burnt Fork subdivisions, there is so much more traffic,

making for dangerous situations on these two-way lanes, and I have even noticed the water pressure is not the same. In the morning when everyone is getting up, the pressure is a lot less than it is late at night! There are simply too many people using water for the capacity of what we have in our water supply.

Which brings me to the next concern with the Burnt Fork Estates subdivision. It is my understanding that there are NO water rights, so there should be NO way that this piece of land can be used as a housing development! There is a reason why there are NO water rights, and it should be respected.

Which brings me to the next concern of sewage. There is not an adequate sewer system the way it is in our town of Stevensville, and now we are going to add many, many more people to this tiny piece of land!? This proposal never should have gone through to begin with, but it seems to me that there are outsiders from different states that come into Montana and purchase the land at what is a small cost to them, and then put in these huge subdivisions, making millions of dollars, and then leaving the rest of us who live here to put up with the repercussions.

Which brings me to the traffic problems. I work eight miles away from my job, and I drive toward Florence everyday at 7:45 am in the morning. The traffic is so heavy, that it is usually bumper to bumper going into Stevi, and going north toward Florence, and even Ambrose has had very heavy

traffic! This was never like this until the last four or five years. Our beautiful little town is being overtaken by so many people, it is losing it's quaint feel of the humbleness we all know and love about Montana.

Which sadly brings me to the added issues of lawbreaking. I have seen more drunk drivers on the roads in our community in the last 4 years, than ever before, and I truly believe it is because more and more people are moving into our community and bringing with them unsavory acts of unlawfulness. There was even a murder in the last couple of weeks!!

Adding another huge subdivision to our little community is only going to harm what we know and love about our town, not to mention water issues, traffic issues, sewer issues, over-population issues, and lawlessness! I sincerely hope and pray that our Planning and Zoning Board will realize that there are definitely more concerns than benefits, and it won't just affect the people at the Creekside Meadows subdivision or the Middle Burnt Fork subdivision, it will affect ALL the people who live in or close to Stevensville.

It is imperative that the Burnt Fork Estates subdivision does not go through for all of the reasons stated above, but more importantly because our community is so congested right now it is literally suffocating our way of life.

Respectfully submitted,

Julie Bachman  
303 Aspen Trail  
Stevensville, MT 59870



## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** Peggy Pope <peggyannpope@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 5, 2021 7:59 PM  
**To:** Jenelle Berthoud  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Planning and Zoning board

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

en

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** **Peggy Pope** <peggyannpope@gmail.com>  
**Date:** Tue, Jan 5, 2021 at 6:14 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Planning and Zoning board  
**To:** Kalkofen, Jim & Marsha <nisspak@brainerd.net>

On Tue, Jan 5, 2021 at 6:59 PM Kalkofen, Jim & Marsha <nisspak@brainerd.net> wrote:  
Very good. Email this to [Jenelle@townofstevensville.com](mailto:Jenelle@townofstevensville.com).

On Tuesday 05/01/2021 at 5:53 pm, Peggy Pope wrote:

RE: Burnt Fork Estate Subdivision Application Review and Board meeting January 6, 2021

I am a resident and homeowner of Stevensville and have many concerns and objections to the BFE proposed development. The town's infrastructure (water/wastewater) must be permitted and improvements completed before the proposed development can be considered by the Planning and Zoning board. Because of the recent passing of the Montana water compact S3019. The Montana Water Rights Protection Act was attached to the 1.4 Trillion omnibus package that just passed in the house and senate and signed by President Trump. How will this affect future water rights to Montana and the town of Stevensville? With unpermitted water wells this could greatly affect Stevensvilles future water permitting process with the DNRC to make them legal. As stated by Stevensvilles water rights lawyer Ross Miller in a letter to Mayor Dewey dated February 25, 2020. Mr Miller states as a next step we should arrange a meeting with the Missoula office of the DNRC to discuss the New Global Permit Application for the Twin Creek Well field. Question, has this been done yet? This is Stevensville water rights lawyers advice for Stevensvilles water rights needs and issues. This advice should not be ignored.

Also please do the math on how many more toilets will be flushing with this high density proposed development. When completed there could be possibly 500 residents or more living in this high density space using more and more water.

Peggy Pope, Stevensville



---

[Image] Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)

## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** Alva Mello via Stevensville Montana <noreply@townofstevensville.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 6, 2021 7:52 AM  
**To:** Jenelle Berthoud  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] 9-3-2020 Public Comment

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Submitted on Wednesday, January 6, 2021 - 7:51am Submitted by user: Visitor Submitted values are:

First & Last Name: Alva Mello

Address: 304 Smith avenue, Stevensville

Agenda Item : Public Comment (General)

Comment:

I have a very hard time believing that the city wants to take on more responsibility , costs as well as having to hire more people to maintain roads, water pumps as well as sewer needs.

I'm expressing my opinion because I've come to the Mayor as well as George no less than 7-8 different times in the last 2 years about continual flooding at the slightest rain or snow melt on the corner of heritage and smith. Also due to the flooding the sidewalk and the storm drain has sunk to the point that it is a safety hazard.

The patent answer that I always get is the city is short on manpower and costs to repair the the hazard. I have photos and videos where the city drainage water comes down to my corner and floods 4-6 feet onto my lawn where the landscaping company could not complete my project nor warrant the work if the the city can't or won't make the necessary repairs to the city drains and hazardous sidewalks.

It's shameful that you want to take on more responsibilities & costs where you can't take proper care of what you already have. Also by taking on more obligations with this new development taxes will surely go up..

We have a wonderful town and people, let's not turn this community into another Missoula!

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards

Al & Donna Mello

304 Smith Ave

Stevensville

406-361-0050

DO NOT REPLY DIRECTLY TO THIS EMAIL

## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** James Crews via Stevensville Montana <noreply@townofstevensville.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 6, 2021 7:56 AM  
**To:** Jenelle Berthoud  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] 9-3-2020 Public Comment

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Submitted on Wednesday, January 6, 2021 - 7:56am Submitted by user: Visitor Submitted values are:

First & Last Name: James Crews

Address: 316 9th St., Stevensville, Montana 59870 Agenda Item : Discussion/Decision: Recommendation on Approval, Approval with Conditions, or Denial of Subdivision Application for Burnt Fork Estates

Comment:

I do not support the Burn Fork Estates Project (BFE). The town does not have the water or sewer capacity to support a project of this size, nor will the developers pay to have the required infrastructure upgraded to support this project.

This project will cause an excess amount of traffic on Middle Burnt Fork, Logan and East Side Highway. We already have people who ignore the 45 mph speed zone on Logan and the 35 mph speed zone on Middle Burnt Fork Road. The stop sign at Logan and East Side Highway are already considered just a suggestion by most folks and sooner or later there will be deaths at all of the intersections.

There is no plan to extend Second Street thru the Creek Side Subdivision, nor the incorporation of those homes in that area to augment the tax base creating another "Town Limit Island."

The BFE Project will require securing additional water rights. The Town does not currently have water rights needed to support this project. The Town's Water Rights are in question as it is and there seems to be no relief in sight.

The town does not have the water infrastructure to support this project and the citizens of Stevensville cannot afford the additional costs for development and I see the BFE Project developers are not putting up the funds to develop the infrastructure.

The town does not have the sewer infrastructure to support this project and the citizens of Stevensville cannot afford the additional costs for development and I see the BFE Project developers are not putting up the funds to develop the infrastructure nor the additional funds needed to build a new Waste Water Treatment Facility.

The Town already has a commitment regarding annexation to develop waste water treatment and water supply infrastructure at the Airport as part of the annexation of the Stevensville Airport. See the annexation plan for the Stevensville Airport 5 and 10 year plan.

This project will also require additional streets and alley support regarding street maintenance, snow plowing, repairs, etc., that are not happening inside town at this time due to poor town maintenance management practices.

Additionally this project may require an additional substation installation by NorthWestern Engery, and expansion services by Spectrum and Centurylink.

James Crews

DO NOT REPLY DIRECTLY TO THIS EMAIL

## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** Kalkofen, Jim & Marsha <nisspak@brainerd.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 6, 2021 9:00 AM  
**To:** Jenelle Berthoud  
**Cc:** Greg Chilcott  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] P & Z Board Public Comments

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Jenelle, Good Morning. A couple questions for you this fine day:

When the P & Z board scheduled a public in-person meeting Oct. 7, 2020, there were a number of public comments submitted in advance.

Those letters were made part of the record and featured on the Town website.

Question # 1: Will the comments that have arrived at your desk be treated similarly?

Question # 2: Will the letters/comments be read at this evening's P & Z board meeting?

Question # 3: How will the letters/comments already submitted be addressed by board members? Asking this because the public will hopefully be tuning in as best they can, and it would only be fair for Town residents to know what others think about the proposed subdivision. Consider this a way to create the meeting as close to an "in-person" meeting as possible.

Thank you. Jim Kalkofen

## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** Jim Sayre <105csmo@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 6, 2021 9:57 AM  
**To:** Jenelle Berthoud  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Communication to Planning and Zoning Board for 6 January 2021 Meeting  
**Attachments:** Sayre\_PandZ010621.docx

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

**Jenelle**

**Please provide the attached communication to the Planning and Zoning Board members prior to the Planning and Zoning Board meeting this date.**

**Thank you for all you do for the Town.**

**Jim Sayre  
Stevensville, Mt.**

January 6, 2021

To: Stevensville Planning and Zoning Board  
Re: 6 January Meeting - Burnt Fork Estates Subdivision

I would like to call the Planning and Zoning Board's attention to just one of many traffic safety concerns I have related to the Burnt Fork Estates subdivision proposed to be developed at Logan Lane and Middle Burnt Fork Road.

I served as a peace officer for 15 years . My basic training was via the Missouri Highway Patrol. I have spent many hours patrolling and working accidents on county roads. I hold a Masters Degree in Criminal Justice /Public Administration, am a Graduate of the National Traffic Management Institute and the FBI National Academy. I have served as an Adjunct Professor of Police Science and as a consultant to police departments. It is from this experienced perspective I address the Board.

Logan Lane between Eastside Highway and Middle Burnt Fork Road is a dangerous stretch of roadway. Middle Burnt Fork and Logan Lane has, at this time, an ABOVE average crash rate, even based on the developer's report.

The proposed Burnt Fork Estates subdivision, as planned, would add another intersection on Logan Lane between Creekside Drive and Middle Burnt Fork Road. With the added traffic generated by up to 220 families plus a commercial strip, the dangers of high speed crashes on Logan Lane will increase significantly at Creekside Drive and the proposed new intersection.

Currently, traffic traveling south on Eastside Highway is often racing the oncoming Eastside Highway traffic through the intersection of Logan Lane and Eastside Highway. Some vehicles appear almost airborne through the intersection. Often they continue south past the entrance to Creekside Drive at speeds I estimate approaching 70 mph. There have been many close calls in front of the Creekside Meadows subdivision.

The Ravalli County Road and Bridge Department estimates the Burnt Fork Estates subdivision would cause a minimum 25% increase in traffic volume on Logan Lane versus the developer's estimate of 10 % and 20 %. My common sense and experience causes me to estimate an increase closer to 50% over time when you factor in the increasing population to the south and east of Stevensville and the growing traffic to and from Missoula.

To further exacerbate conditions, Logan Lane has no shoulder and is narrow. This type road is especially hazardous to young distracted drivers and the elderly. 35 % of young driver fatalities result from rollover accidents common on this type of county road with no shoulder. Distracted drivers run off road then over correct, which causes sharp turns across the road and then the rollover or the out of control vehicle is propelled into oncoming traffic resulting in a head on collision. Often the young are not using seat belts and are ejected through the windshield or through doors which are flown open on impact. To help reduce these dangerous crashes, Logan Lane needs widening and a safe shoulder. There is also a need for a solution to the dangerous intersection of Logan Lane and Eastside Highway with the increased traffic expected from this proposed subdivision.

In my years in Stevensville, I have yet to witness any law enforcement agency working radar or making any serious effort at traffic control on Logan Lane. The responsibility for traffic control on Logan Lane does not rest with the Stevensville Police Department, as this roadway is not in the

## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** cgwruss@aol.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 6, 2021 11:52 AM  
**To:** Jenelle Berthoud  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] New Subdivision

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Our home is in Creekside Meadows and we feel that the proposed new subdivision not be connected to Creekside meadows by extending the three truncated streets, Syringa, Aspen and Clover. The new subdivision has stated that they are not willing to have the same covenants as Creekside. The new subdivision will have homes which will have many more children than Creekside. Creekside is mostly made up of empty nesters and retirees. The two would be incompatible. Property values in Creekside would most likely drop causing lower taxes that benefit the city of Stevensville. The three short streets could end in a small Cul-de-sac. The school district will be impacted with a large number of students needing to be added.

Charles and Sandra Russ 1717 Creekside Drive



## Jenelle Berthoud

---

**From:** John Croft via Stevensville Montana <noreply@townofstevensville.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 6, 2021 5:00 PM  
**To:** Jenelle Berthoud  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] 9-3-2020 Public Comment

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Submitted on Wednesday, January 6, 2021 - 4:59pm Submitted by user: Visitor Submitted values are:

First & Last Name: John Croft  
Address: 1618 Creekside Drive  
Agenda Item : Public Comment (General)  
Comment:  
Dear Planning and Zoning Board Members Kellogg, Chilcott, Ritter, Hanson, and Hindle

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the application for a major subdivision know as Burnt Fork Estates (BFE).

As a resident of Creekside Meadows I have grave concerns relative to the BFE application:

First, traffic on Logan (aka the Stevensville Bypass) and Middle Burnt Fork is substantial. With over 200+ homes and the commercial businesses in the proposed BFE subdivision, the significant increase in vehicle traffic on Logan and Middle Burnt Fork will be extremely dangerous. There are no shoulders on Logan as it is a farm road. Several bike riders use Logan which is already dangerous because there is no shoulder and no enforcement of the 45 mph speed limit. Even now on Logan, there are drivers that far exceed the speed limit and will even pass other vehicles in the no pass zone. Obviously with a significant increase in traffic on Logan and Middle Burnt Fork the risk for more accidents will substantially increase. Someone will get killed. Moreover, the additional traffic through Creekside Meadows will be dangerous. Many of the residents in Creekside Meadow walk in the area. The BFE application should be denied because of the huge traffic issue.

Second, water will be a major issue. Apparently BFE does not have water rights to the Town of Stevensville's water. How will the 200+ homes and commercial businesses get water? Moreover, will the town's sewer system be significantly impacted by so many homes and commercial businesses? Is there any assurance the town's sewer treatment plan can handle the additional sewage? The BFE application should be denied because of the water and sewer issue.

Third, commercial businesses in the proposed BFE will have a huge negative impact on the small businesses on Main Street. It is especially difficult for the existing small businesses to survive in a small town such as Stevensville. With additional competition it is likely that many of the businesses on Main Street will close. It will be sad to see so many empty store fronts on Main Street. The BFE application should be denied because of this issue.

Finally, the above concerns are just a few of the issues. There are issues related to potential crime, additional need for fire and police services, impact on schools, town services such as snow removal and street maintenance, employment

and welfare, and environmental impacts. This issues will result in additional property taxes. The BFE application should be denied because of these issues.

Please use the power of the Town Planning & Zoning Board to provide the Town Council with a recommendation for denial relative to the BFE application for a major subdivision.

Regards,

John Croft  
1618 Creekside Drive

DO NOT REPLY DIRECTLY TO THIS EMAIL