



Great Falls Public Schools

District Offices • 1100 4th Street South • P.O. Box 2429 • Great Falls, Montana 59403
406.268.6052 • www.gfps.k12.mt.us

October 27, 2023

City of Great Falls
Great Falls Planning Advisory Board
Attn: Brock Cherry
PO Box 5021
Great Falls, MT 59403

To Whom It May Concern,

Thank you for your letter denoting the Park View Assisted Living Permit Application. This property is located within our school district boundaries. The following is a response to the information sent to the Great Falls Public School District. We have formulated the questions below to comment on the proposed subdivision.

1. Will the existing school facilities be able to accommodate additional students?

The addition of the development will have an not have an impact on the Great Falls Public School District student numbers because this is a retirement home project.

2. Do you have any other comments or requirements on the proposed subdivision as it affects the public school system?

There may be a slight increase in traffic by Meadow Lark Elementary school, but not be significant enough for the school district to be concerned about.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Brian Patrick".

Brian Patrick
Director of Business Operations
Great Falls Public Schools

Vision Statement: All kids are engaged in learning today. . . . for life tomorrow.
Mission Statement: We successfully educate students to navigate their future.

City of Great Falls Planning Advisory Board/Zoning Commission

To Whom it May Concern;

My wife and I are writing to speak against the conditional use permit for Park View Assisted Living, as we are unable to attend the public meeting. This house should have never been allowed to be an assisted living home to begin with. Too many stairs and the house was built for multifamily in 1976. Marge Dahlquist built the home and snuck an apartment on the main level next to the single garage. I have lived at my home across the street for 30+ years and the two prior owners always rented out that apartment. It is unlawful in our neighborhood, as it is zoned for single family residence only. No house in this neighborhood should have THIRTEEN + people in it!

Traffic/Noise:

Just today during the 8:15 school drop off time, there was an ambulance and a fire engine in front of the house, creating major traffic issues while parents were dropping off their kids. It was a very unsafe situation for the children. (See enclosed photo)

We talked to Mike Macintosh at Great Falls Fire/Rescue. He said there has been 150 plus calls to the home since 2018.

On school mornings and afternoons during the drop-off and pick-up times for the Meadowlark School children, there is approximately 50 or more cars dropping kids off in front of this home, since it borders the school playground. It is extremely unsafe and difficult to drive in the area, as parents park on both sides of the street. The children are attempting to cross the street, as well as the children who are walking to school. In addition to this, we have the cars of the employees that work in the home as well as the Great Falls Transit paratransit van. This van parks in the driveway to pick up and/or drop off residents backs up

during this congested time, and children are also walking to the school, creating more danger. The van has back up alarms that can be heard three houses away, which occurs multiple times a day.

When the caretaker's spouses/boyfriends, etc. come to pick up their wives from work, they often leave their vehicles running (many times for 10-15 minutes) and/or leave their stereo blasting while they wait.

Many times my next door neighbor has to park his car in front of my house due to the visitors and employees parking in front of his house. Many times, he has to park his boat in front of my house just to unload it.

Unruly/mentally unstable people:

About 10 days ago in October, our outside cameras picked up a woman trying to hide out by our large stone mailbox. As we were watching, she eventually sat down on the lawn and then laid down. Finally, a police officer showed up and figured out she belonged to the assisted living home and after much talking, finally had to walk her back to the home.

Our neighbor who lives two houses down from the home is a single elderly lady. She has had men from the home ring her doorbell and stand on her porch for some time. I have had to call her and let her know there is a strange man at her door.

We as neighbors have all had to help with the residents that wander away. This happens quite frequently as many of the residents are outside with no supervision. Two of the men in wheelchairs/scooters ride them right down the middle of the street. We have been in the car behind them, and they are either unaware that there is a vehicle behind them, or don't care.

They have a bench in front of the home that gets used all day long by the smokers and workers who smoke. The parents of the young children

that are walking to school have told us that their kids are frightened by these residents and are scared to walk by the home.

Neighbors are aware that there is a sexual predator living in the home. His record was updated 7/20/23 and shows that this home was his current address (see enclosed attachment.) And this is at a home that is bordering a school playground?!? The owner is always advertising vacancies in the home via her Facebook page, and from what we have seen, she is obviously not vetting any of these people.

In conclusion, our preference would be that this business was never allowed in the neighborhood in the first place. But since we obviously are stuck with it now, our wishes would be that lets not make it bigger and add even more people and more traffic/problems.

Why is it possible for this owner to currently have 13 residents, when they are not allowed to have over 9 residents without a fire sprinkler system installed? Once they are allowed to refurbish/remove the garage, this will never be a family home. It will lose its curb appeal and will forever look like a commercial business. Please do not approve this conditional use permit to allow this assisted living business to grow even more and have even more residents than it already does.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Steve and Lynne Durkin

1101 23rd Ave SW

Great Falls Mt 59404

REDACTED



Typical morning Congestion
When parents are dropping
off Meadowlark Students !

From: Lori Luoma <loriannluoma@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 9, 2023 12:34 PM
To: Jamie Nygard <jnygard@greatfallsmt.net>
Subject: Opposition to CUP for Park View Assisted Living Facility

To whom it may concern-

I am opposed to granting Park View Assisted Living Facility located at 2201 11 St. SW in Great Falls, MT a conditional use permit in order to convert their garages into additional bedrooms which allows for an increase in residents living in this facility. We have lived kitty-corner to the facility since 2019.

The facility is located next to a well-used path that leads to Meadow Lark Elementary School. Parents drop their children off and neighborhood kids are crossing the street right next to the facility. This busy business located in the middle of a residential neighborhood significantly contributes to the traffic congestion due to frequent emergency vehicle visits, numerous staff vehicles coming and going and paratransit vehicles. Increasing the number of residents will lead to further traffic congestion.

Facility residents have wandered away from the facility ending up in our neighbor's yards or at their front door. This is especially concerning because one of the residents is a convicted 3rd degree felon child sex offender from Utah. Allowing a sex offender to reside in a facility that is next to an elementary school and within in a neighborhood full of children shows lack of proper screening and concern by the facility's owner for the wellbeing of the neighborhood children. This is particularly alarming as we have four children.

I request the Great Falls Planning Advisory Board/Zoning Commission to please deny the conditional use permit for Park View Assisted Living Facility.

Sincerely,

Lori Luoma
1101 22nd Ave SW
Great Falls, MT 59404

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

From: Terri Lester <terri.lester@icloud.com>

Sent: Friday, November 10, 2023 8:25 PM

To: Jamie Nygard <jnygard@greatfallsmt.net>

Subject:

My name is Terri Lester. I am a former resident of the Meadowlark school neighborhood, a retired teacher from Meadowlark, school and currently a grandparent of children in the area one who attends Meadowlark school. I would like to submit my opposition for a conditional use permit at 2201 11th St. SW.

As a parent, my husband and I raised three children in that neighborhood at that time it was a very family friendly place to live. I now have great concerns as a grandparent, for my grandchildren walking to school down the path, walking to the park, playing with their friends and riding their bikes around the assisted living home.

I question the safety of the children with the increase in traffic and emergency vehicles not to mention the fact that a sexual offender resides in the home.

I realize this is one business in one neighborhood however, it also affects the entire city of Great Falls.

Therefore, more notice should be given to the entire city of Great Falls not just to a small number.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my opinion. I hope you do what is best for our children.

Terri Lester

Sent from my iPhone

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

From: Mary <marykelly5@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, November 10, 2023 3:39 PM

To: Jamie Nygard <jnygard@greatfallsmt.net>

Subject: Planning and Advisory Board and Zoning Commission

> Planning Advisory Board and Zoning Commission,

>

> Re: Conditional Use Permit for a "Type II Community Residential Facility" land use at 2201 11th St. SW

>

> Thank you for your request for public comment and considering our concerns in this matter. I wanted to be present at the meeting to read my letter but had to leave town to attend a work conference in Minneapolis.

>

> My name is Mary Bowe, and my family and I reside next door (across the path) from the Park View Assisted Living Residence at 2109 11th St. SW. I am writing today to express our strong opposition to the proposed expansion of the business in the above-stated residence.

>

> Our personal experiences with the facility, coupled with our aspirations for the neighborhood's growth and thriving community, have led us to the firm opinion that expanding the business would be detrimental.

>

> We have encountered multiple instances of residents attempting to escape, causing distress to our children and placing an uncomfortable burden on both my husband and me.

>

> Our neighborhood, which we take great pride in, is negatively affected by the increased number of residents and workers smoking out front. Additionally, the four to five garbage cans lining the streets, compared to the typical one at other residences, detract from the residential atmosphere we value.

>

> Moreover, we are concerned about safety issues associated with the assisted living residence. Despite claims of thorough vetting, a registered Sex Offender resides in close proximity to a school and a bus stop as well as near my five and seven-year-old children. The rise in traffic, both from residents and employees using the driveway and emergency vehicles frequenting the residence, further exacerbates safety concerns.

>

> Converting the garages into living spaces and installing an industrial fire sprinkler system would permanently eliminate the possibility of the property reverting to a single-family residence.

>

> We have always had concerns with the current residence. I have read in the Agenda's supporting document that it has resided in the neighborhood with no issues for 20 years. This is not true. The issues have just not been presented or neighbors have not had the opportunity to state their opinion. It is disappointing how the notice has gone out to a small contingent of neighbors. The sign presented in the lawn can only be read if you go physically onto the property to read the details. It is simply a piece of paper taped to a public hearing sign. I have had several parents of children inquire to us what it is about because it is not easy to find the details.

>

> I would like to request a listing of the Neighborhood Council names and addresses and question how they can have an educated opinion on this matter. The school's response is also disappointing referencing no increase in student population and little traffic issues. There are greater issues impacting the students that were not addressed in his response, but again the responder does not live in the area or work at Meadow Lark Elementary School.

>

> For the aforementioned reasons, we respectfully request that you deny the proposal from the Assisted Living Facility to add additional residents and renovate living spaces.

>

> Thank you for your attention to this matter.

>

> Sincerely,

>

> Mary Bowe and family

>

From: Brad Bergman <brad.bergm@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 11, 2023 7:17 PM
To: Jamie Nygard <jnygard@greatfallsmt.net>
Subject: Conditional Use Permit application

To whom it may concern,

This letter concerns the conditional use permit (CUP) for a Type II Residential Facility at 2201 11th St SW, Great Falls, MT.

We reside directly across the street from Park View Assisted Living. We recognize the need for assisted living availability in our community, and we appreciate the services that Park View Assisted Living has provided for Great Falls. However, when taking into consideration the pros and cons of the facility expansion, our opinion is that this permit should not be approved.

Our primary concern relates to the safety of children attending Meadowlark Elementary School. Park View Assisted Living is located at a very busy location. During the school year, dozens of vehicles park out front to drop off and pick up children at Meadowlark Elementary school. This occurs twice daily. During these drop off times there are many children entering the road from behind parked vehicles. Over our 22 years here, we have witnessed some scary near-misses between child and vehicle. Vehicle traffic at Park View Assisted Living is also significant and will be expected to worsen should the expansion occur. I am concerned that the additional traffic will increase the likelihood of a child getting hit by a vehicle. I am not aware of any traffic safety measures occurring in front of our house, and I suspect the majority of non-bussed students are dropped off at this location.

As you are probably aware, there is another assisted living facility within two blocks of Park View Assisted Living. The other assisted living facility can be seen from Park View Assisted Living. As a longstanding resident of our neighborhood, we feel that promoting expansion of this business, especially when there is another similar business in such close proximity, detracts from the appeal and character of our neighborhood. If Great Falls is interested in maintaining desirable neighborhoods, which are necessary to preserve and attract valuable community members, we should be very careful about promoting development of businesses in our neighborhoods. We worry about the precedent this would establish for our community.

It appears that the permit application fulfills, or plans to fulfill conditions, required for approval. Please keep in mind that Park View Assisted Living does not appear to be substantially larger than the other single family homes in the neighborhood. We question the wisdom and safety of housing the proposed 17 residents in that home. I could not imagine trying to live comfortably with half that many people in my home. Moreover, in the case of an emergency one or two staff members would not be able to evacuate 17 residents, many of which are mobility-impaired, from the two story home in a timely fashion.

Thank you for considering our concerns regarding this permit application.

Sincerely,
Bradford and Billi Bergman

From: Cory P. Moran <cory@cobbmechanical.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 12, 2023 10:05 PM
To: Jamie Nygard <jnygard@greatfallsmt.net>
Subject: Parkview Assisted Living - 11.14.23

Dear distinguished Members of the Council,

45-5-513. Geographic restrictions applicable to high-risk sexual offenders. (1) A high-risk sexual offender as provided in this section may not:

(a) establish a residence within 300 feet of a school, day-care center, playground, developed or improved park, athletic field or facility that primarily serves minors, or business or facility having a principal purpose of caring for, educating, or entertaining minors. This subsection (1)(a) does not apply if the residence was established on or before May 5, 2015.

The intent of my writing you today is in order to memorialize my family's staunch protest of the proposed expansion of the Parkview Assisted Living Facility located at 2201 11th St SW that is scheduled for vote of approval on November 14, 2023 by our Council. The aforementioned Section of Montana Code (annotated 2021) should represent substantial cause for a vote denying the requested expansion of the facility. As of this writing, a convicted sexual offender resides in the Facility.

I believe this letter's impact would be best served by starting with our family's background, as I'm certain no reasonable vote in support of the request could be cast whilst having this information. My wife, Lacie, was born at the Columbus Hospital on 2nd Ave N. She attended Montana State University Great Falls receiving her degree in Surgical Technology. She worked at Great Falls Clinic as a surgical technician for five years. Our first daughter, Payslie, 8, was born in Great Falls and is currently a second grader at Meadowlark Elementary that abuts the Parkview Facility. Our daughter Charlotte, 2, was born while we were temporarily relocated to Bozeman, and will be attending Meadowlark Elementary in a few short years. We are a family with whose roots run deep in our beloved Town.

I began this letter with Section of Montana Code. There is a convicted sexual predator (male) living as a patient in a *mental health facility* directly next door to where my wife and I are raising two young girls. He is living in a facility that directly backs up to the playground of Meadowlark Elementary, as well as Montana Park where families from throughout our Town bring their children on weekends. There is never a shortage of children playing with one another any day of the week. The idea that a convicted sexual offender, who has already demonstrated a compromised ability to rationalize right from wrong, is living next door to my children keeps me awake at night. I am fully able to appreciate the need for help for individuals requiring assistance navigating life, but that assistance should not be rendered in a family neighborhood. The fact that this facility is able to exist in its current locale is unfathomable to Lacie and me. Furthermore, the Facility is only listed as *assisted living* and not licensed as specializing in *mental health*, which should be specifically noted by the determining Board in their vote.

Based on past policies voted on by this Council, it is evident that you support the growth of this Town we all love so deeply. Growth is not a bad thing- it benefits our local economy and helps improve the resources and facilities that our families are able to use. Benefits not known here in Great Falls prior. It's a wonderful time to live here, and my family and neighbors do not take this privilege for granted. However, growth with universal benefit can not subsist without a logical separation between residential and commercial entities. A common sense understanding of zoning areas particular to Great Falls must be applied and followed. I trust the permit for a single-family home in the retail center between Target and Albertson's would not be granted- why is this situation any different? This is the only commercial entity within five blocks of its location, and, as mentioned earlier, we are at a loss that it is able to exist at all.

Living next door to the Facility has not been a pleasant experience for my family. There are ambulances responding to calls on a weekly basis, often times in the middle of the night. Explaining to a skittish 8-year old with a blossoming imagination why the police are trying to come to our home at 2:00 AM because she heard sirens and saw red and blue strobing lights illuminate her bedroom is impossibly difficult- let alone trying to get her back to sleep after. The infrastructure of the neighborhood was simply not planned and built to accommodate the level of traffic the Facility creates. When the number of residents coupled with the number of staff coupled with the support required to run the Facility are totaled it creates a completely unreasonable sum of traffic that puts undue burden on the Facility's neighbors. Additionally, the path adjacent to the Facility is a heavily trafficked thoroughfare for the *children* who attend the elementary school. On a myriad of occasions my wife and I have witnessed resident acquaintances and staff commute to and from the Facility with complete disregard for the children who are ever-present on their bikes and on sidewalks. Whether driven by naivety or a lack of regard for common courtesy, the speeds by which many visitors have exhibited while traveling to and from the Facility are dangerous and, with the fear of having young children playing in the neighborhood always on my mind, could end up being deadly. Bottomline: the family neighborhood (lots of children) along the presence of the school (hundreds of children) means that the only prudent decision that should be made in this vote is that of denial of expansion. The street is well beyond traffic capacity as it is, the Facility accommodates residents of compromised mental capacity, and there is a sexual offender amongst the resident roster (could more become residents?). If anything, the real decision should be that of whether to introduce an article toward eliminating the Facility altogether.

I appreciate your time in reading this and the genuine consideration of what your vote means to the residents of this neighborhood- most importantly the children.

Most sincerely,

Cory, Lacie, Payslie, and Charlotte Moran

2205 11th St SW

To whom it may concern,

I am writing this letter in opposition to Park View Assisted living facility being granted the conditional use permit and being changed to a Type 2 facility. Our house lies between Park View and Bluebird assisted living facilities which are roughly 100 yards apart.

I want to share some first hand perspectives that address some of the impact this facility has on the immediate neighborhood. Per Sara at the planning department this impact is not written into the guidelines of the code, so it was not of consideration by the planning department.

The home has 2 off street parking spaces, which is mostly sufficient for the staff parking, and none of the residents require parking spaces. The issue that was not considered is the impact from the 13 current residents needing the support services brought to them. Some of these services include; medication delivery, oxygen delivery, home health, hospice nurses, nurse practitioners, mobile lab/imaging, and Great Falls transit services. The higher the occupancy at this facility, the greater the impact there will be in the immediate neighborhood from these service providers. This is compounded by the frequency of fire trucks and ambulances at the facility, per Mike at GF Fire Department, 154 calls since 2018.

The facility also lies right next to the walking path leading to Meadowlark Elementary. There is oftentimes a lot of congestion at this location when kids are going to and from school, or during events at the school. Often we see the support services trying to back out of the driveway at these same times, or emergency vehicles are trying to get to, or leave this residence. This creates a lot of traffic congestion and a potentially very dangerous situation for the kids and parents. Not to mention the potential delay in response time to the home.

I also found it interesting that Brian Patrick at GFPS provided a letter saying this has no impact on Meadowlark Elementary, but I question what research may have done before giving his statement. This change would not impact the school by adding any children, but it does affect a very high traffic location that is very important to the school. It was also brought to my attention that this home currently has a registered sexual offender with charges that were related to children.

I do believe Great Falls has a need for assisted living facilities, but I feel the proximity to the school and how close it is to the other assisted living facility (which uses the same supporting services) already puts a lot of strain on the neighborhood. It is my opinion that an approval of this request would compromise the integrity and character of this well established neighborhood. I ask that you deny this request.

Sincerely,

Kevin Taggart
1100 23rd ave sw
Great Falls, MT

From: sldurkin@bresnan.net <sldurkin@bresnan.net>

Sent: Monday, November 13, 2023 10:42 AM

To: Jamie Nygard <jnygard@greatfallsmt.net>

Subject: Parkview Assisted Living Facility

To: All Planning Board/Zoning Commission and Staff

ie: Conditional use Permit Meeting for 2201 11th st SW GF, Mt

I am aware that the Board likes to see Public involvement and Public participation in there meetings. I believe the 6 homes that received the notice have all submitted a letter as opponents. All six cannot attend the meeting due to work schedules and I am in Arizona. There is Two Drs that couldn't change there appointment schedule, one pharmacist who cant leave work, one school teacher, stockbroker that has to be in Minneapolis, and the Electrical engineer that works in Wyoming. Our retired lady got in a small fender bender today so now she cant show up either and then there is me in Az. Please consider this as to why nobody showed up.

Sincerely, Steve and Lynne Durkin
1101 23rd Ave SW
Great Falls Mt. 59404
406-788-7104

November 13, 2023 (Monday)

This response is to the Notice of Public Hearing at the Great Falls Planning Advisory Board/Zoning Commission on Tuesday, November 14, 2023 at 3:00 pm in the Commission Chambers, Room 206, Civic Center, 2 Part Drive, Great Falls, Montana. Said hearing is to consider a request from Annaliza Koczur, Park View Assisted Living.

My name is Jane Mart and I own my home/property located at 2209 11th St SW, Great Falls, MT 59404. I have resided here since December 7, 1978, which will be 45 years next month. My children, now adults, attended Meadowlark School from K-6.

I am opposed to this request for the following reason: the safety of elementary students attending Meadowlark Elementary School.

1. Monday through Friday during the school year and for other activities at the park adjacent to Meadowlark School, there is a line-up of vehicles to pick up and drop off students. Students – some not as tall as the vehicles, dart out to try to get to the vehicle that is there waiting for them. Vehicles are lined up on both sides of 11th St SW.
2. Many vehicles are not driving 30mph and less! There are no speed limit signs on 11 St SW.
3. There is no designated crosswalk; no attendants.
4. Weather is nice now. There are days when visibility is very low due to blowing snow, high wind, etc. Not good for children trying to get in/out of vehicles and off to school, on a very busy street.
5. Parking for picking up students is not adequate now, nor will it be adequate in the future if additional parking is required for the Park View Assisted Living facility.
6. Employee parking, vehicles picking up and/or delivering residents, medical supplies, etc., vehicles transporting the residents to/from medical and therapy appointments, are frequent. Ambulances and fire trucks are often required, 24/7. More residents and staff --more vehicles.
7. Employee smoking takes place alongside the southside of the building.
8. Visitor parking is not adequate for families and friends visiting residents, times of moving residents into or out of the facility, groups visiting for memorial services, relatives from out-of-town, etc. The groups may be small and/or the time of parking short; however, when students are being picked up or dropped off, the street becomes overcrowded and dangerous.

We need facilities like Park View Assisted Living. The Park View Assisted Living building and the attractive fencing, deck and the yard area, and the inside as well, is being kept up nicely; however, I believe that the Park View Assisted Living, with the additional traffic and considering the safety of elementary school children, would not be safe for the elementary school children.

Thank you.

Jane Mart 406-750-9247
2209 11 St SW
Great Falls, MT 59404

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

From: Kevin Johnson <kskejohnson@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, November 13, 2023 2:43 PM

To: Jamie Nygard <jnygard@greatfallsmt.net>

Subject: Conditional Use Permit - Type II Assisted Living Facility 2201 11th St SW

My name is Kevin Johnson, 1100 24th Ave SW, and have lived in the neighborhood that will be affected by an increase in occupancy of the Park View assisted living facility. The following are questions that I have regarding the CUP:

1. I notice that Park View Assisted Living is not registered with the Secretary of State in Montana. What is the legal name of the business? Should a formal approval for a change in use require the legal name of the entity that is applying for the CUP?
2. It was stated in the documents presented for the upcoming CUP that Park View was previously approved for an increase in occupancy to a Type II facility 12 residents and then to current occupancy of 14. When were these approvals granted? I've lived in the same home for 32 years and don't recall seeing a notice of a Planning Advisory Board meeting for these changes.
3. I noticed that there is a registered sexual offender - William Lauren Kitto - that lists the 2201 11th St SW address as his home. Is there any special training that is required to manage a high risk individual within the assisted living community? Given that the facility has a Type A license that requires minimal supervision, I am curious as to what measures have been undertaken regarding this situation. The letter written by the manager of the property indicates that they take in no violent individuals.
4. It is difficult to understand how a single family home in an area of Great Falls zoned R2 can handle the proposed 17 individuals that will be living in this home. Do all of the bedrooms in this home have more than one occupant? If so, what is the occupancy per bedroom? Are there any private rooms? How does this commercial property comply with the Americans With Disabilities (ADA) act? It appears that the majority of living space is on the second floor. Are there elevators located in the home? Because changes to the building are being made to accommodate additional residents, would the property require compliance with ADA? If there are barriers to access should these now be addressed?
5. I notice that a sprinkler system must be installed when the occupancy increases to 17. What is the City code for fire suppression? I'm surprised that a sprinkler system was not required when the occupancy increased to 14 or even 12.
6. I understand that currently none of the residents drive. Is it a requirement of the assisted living facility that no residents can drive?
7. Are CUP approvals grandfathered or would a new owner have to reapply upon a purchase of the business?
8. In a Type A assisted living facility there are no minimum staffing levels other than there must be one person on site 24 hours per day. At a minimum there could be just one staff member responsible for all residents. The application letter indicates that there are 8 employed for this facility. What are Park View's staffing requirements? What if the property were sold and the new owner had less stringent requirements?

9. When I looked on the State of Montana DPHHS site I noticed a more recent Administrative Rule of Montana Healthcare Facilities 37.106 sub chapter 28 -Assisted Living Facilities dated 9/24/2022. The document included in the package is from 2015. It seems that there are differences in the two documents. For example, there must be at least one toilet for every 4 residents. How many bathroom's will there be with 17 proposed residents? According to the 9/24/22 document this would indicate 5 separate toilet facilities. I see the appraisal for property tax purposes indicates only 3 baths and 6 bedrooms.

10. Changes in the number of facility beds requires the approval of DPHHS. Is there a formal approval in place?

Thank you for your time In reviewing these questions and my concerns regarding the business.