

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
HAILEY CITY COUNCIL
HELD MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2005
IN THE HAILEY TOWN CENTER MEETING ROOM**

The regular meeting of the Hailey City Council was called to order at 5:30 p.m. by Mayor Susan McBryant. Present were Council members Rick Davis, Martha Burke, Don Keirn and Carol Brown. Staff present included City Attorney Ned Williamson and City Clerk Heather Dawson.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Brown moved that the council go into executive session to discuss pending litigation, land acquisition, and personnel issues. Keirn seconded; a roll call vote showed all in favor. The council went into executive session at 5:32 p.m.

Brown moved that the council go out of executive session. Burke seconded; a roll call vote showed all in favor. Council went out of executive session at 5:55 p.m.

OPENING REMARKS

Mayor McBryant reconvened the meeting at 6:00 p.m. She said the Woodside annexation matters would not be conducted as a public hearing. The Old Cutters Annexation public hearing is scheduled for approximately 1.5 hours.

CONSENT AGENDA

Brown pulled CA80, CA81, CA82, and CA84 from the consent agenda. Burke moved to approve the remainder of the consent agenda items as presented. Keirn seconded; the motion carried unanimously.

- CA 78 Motion to approve Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision for approval of Leargulf Condominiums Final Plat
- CA 79 Motion to approve Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision for approval of S&S Condominiums Final Plat
- ~~CA 80 Motion to approve minutes of January 20, 2005 and to suspend reading of them.~~
- ~~CA 81 Motion to approve Resolution 2005-06, amending the 2005 City of Hailey Personnel Handbook to change Hailey's leave time policy from a vacation/sick leave policy to a Paid Time Off (PTO) policy, allowing voluntary conversion of previously earned sick time to PTO at a 2.5 to 1 ratio; and amending the definition of Work Week~~
- ~~CA 82 Motion to approve Resolution 2005-07, adopting a City of Hailey Safety Policy~~

- CA 83 Motion to authorize mayor's signature of BLM Right-of-Way application to allow the Toe of the Hill Trail to cross a ¼ mile section of BLM land east of central Woodside
- ~~CA 84 Motion to approve Fireworks Contract for 4th of July Fireworks event~~
- CA 85 Motion to accept Bid for 3rd Phase (Woodside) of Water Meter Installation Project, submitted by Walton's, Inc. for installation of approximately 400 meters at a cost of \$813 per vault; and authorization for city staff to negotiate contract with Walton's Inc.

CA 80 – MINUTES OF JANUARY 20, 2005. Brown noted that McBryant had not participated in that executive session. Burke moved, and Brown seconded, to approve the minutes with notations that both Davis and McBryant had not been present during the executive session. The motion carried with Davis abstaining

CA 81 – PAID TIME OFF POLICY – The City Attorney wanted to revise the document. It was not approved.

CA 82 - SAFETY POLICY - Brown continued to have concerns that some of the language of the safety policy showed too much detail. Davis said it would be helpful if we were afforded a copy of accident trends in each department. Williamson said he had removed the mandatory language he was worried about. He had not focused on each bullet point, and left words such as "striving to" rather than "will". The council agreed not to change the document.

Davis moved to approve the Safety policy as presented, and authorize Resolution 2005-07. Burke seconded; the motion carried unanimously.

CA 84 - FIREWORKS CONTRACT - Brown asked if the Chamber of Commerce is involved in fireworks. Davis said it is not, and the finance department is tracking time on fireworks issues. Burke moved to approve as presented. Brown seconded; the motion carried unanimously.

OB 86 2nd READING ORDINANCE 897 – FUTURE ACQUISITIONS MAP

Mayor McBryant read the second reading of Ordinance 897 by title only.

PH 87 OLD CUTTER'S ANNEXATION AND REZONE

John Campbell said it is almost exactly a year since he last stood in front of the council with this application. Since then most of the interactions have been with Planning and Zoning. He said the annexation application had been brought before the city shortly after his purchase of the Cutters property in the summer of 2003. He said the traffic study that was conducted for the application was based on a 135 lot development. Since that time, a traffic light has been put in at the intersection of McKercher and Highway 75, which will

further reduce traffic impacts. Water surface rights are intended to be put into an irrigation system for landscaping.

Campbell displayed a map showing how the project would square city boundaries with higher density at the southern end of the subdivision, and lower density at the northern end. He also displayed drawings of the housing lots, showing a community housing option for the development. He indicated openness on the developer's part to gifting lots to the city for community housing. The commission was charged with determining that the project conforms to the comprehensive plan. A recommendation as to zoning designation was made as well, and the commission's recommendations is shown upon the map.

Campbell said he wants to make sure the development doesn't cost the city any money. Tischler gave a proposal to update his report which was quite expensive. He had learned that Ketchum's annexation consultant is interested in Hailey's work, and Campbell and Brown are willing to pay for that study in order to achieve that result. He hoped the council would approve the annexation conditioned upon negotiating the fiscal impact matters. Brown said while the approval is conditioned upon meeting the requirements of the fiscal impact study, he would also be moving forward on the preliminary plat approval.

Grotto said the planning and zoning commission had recommended the community housing option. She noted that the commission made generally positive findings related to most of the elements of the comprehensive plan. They found it was in general conformance with the Natural Resources section, with additional review from Idaho Fish and Game. It was in general conformance with the Avalanche section and man-made hazards, after clean up of agricultural drywells on the property. The Parks and Lands Board had addressed offsite pedestrian improvements to surrounding area. The commission was unable to find conformance in the 6th section, without a study. The Population and Housing sections were okay, with 10% of the units being deed restricted. There was no utility fee structure to guarantee that services would be provided. Offsite pedestrian improvements and a turning lane off Buttercup Road were also conditions. The Commission was unable to find conformance with the old Growth Management section. It did find conformance with the Community Design section. Grotto had given an analyses of the new growth management section of the comprehensive plan. The Growth Management Section talks about the city evaluating the merits and benefits to the city. F and G talk about infrastructure, and insuring new proposals for annexation can be accommodated. Hailey's Policy to maintaining green spaces is met in that a 3.67 acre city park is planned with additional acres available for park expansion. Future growth should pay for itself – that study remains to be completed. There are a variety of lot sizes for community housing. The commission recommend LR-2 at the North, GR at the South, and RGB at the park and hillside areas.

Williamson said he had a conversation today with the applicants, who is suggesting that the council look at annexing the property now, then pursuing the fiscal impact statement, and proceeding at the commission level with preliminary plat. Williamson found that

problematic. The council may, under its ordinance, require a fiscal impact study. Williamson said the council can decide whether to annex and to decide what the zoning districts should be. We can't go beyond that until the property is within Hailey.

Brown said the table that was in the report, asked if that is part of the commission's findings. Grotto said the table was originally part of their staff report, and was incorporated into their original findings of fact.

McBryant opened the public hearing, and noted that letters will not be read out loud, but have been made part of the public record, from Kelly Kipling, Idaho Fish and Game, Steve Poklemba, and Bill Hughes. Grotto noted three additional letters in support of the project from Natham Bingham, Lindy Stark, and Blaine County Citizens for Smart Growth.

Natham Bingham was concerned about sprawl, wanted planning of annexed property to reduce sprawl, and was in favor of Cutter's annexation.

Lindy Stark was in full support of the annexation, seeing the developers as local businessmen working within the valley as an ideal; these developers care about our community. She urged the council to control change by participating in it.

Blaine County Citizens for Smart Growth member Arron Domini was in favor of good planning of growth. He said to manage, not limit growth is part of Hailey's comprehensive plan. The council has decided master planning of infrastructure is important. The city should have a detailed annexation policy or impact fee ordinance.

Jake Lemon, 703 First Avenue North, Hailey, had general comments to make about annexation. He was force annexed into Hailey in 1991. We are in an annexation cycle right now, and forced annexation may become an issue, even though it's not part of this application. Forced annexes have no elected representation. County commissioners are neutral, and the residents have had no opportunity to vote in city elections. He hoped the city will come up with solutions as to how to deal with that situation. Those people's taxes go up, but how much? Their property is reassessed, and the value is immediately doubled. The county continues to collect the same amount of money, as well as the city now taxes them. The taxes end up being quadrupled. He offered to make himself available on forced annexation issues.

Mike Gillman of 127 West Bullion spoke in favor of the application, saying the developers have been through a lot. The developer keeps continuing to come back with more suggestions to make the project better and in conformance with city demands. He, as a young family man, needs somewhere to go, a good place to raise children.

Pat Cooley of Woodside Boulevard said the council is faced with similar considerations as the commission was. The representation tonight was the same as then, he was hoping for more information. The applicant has had the opportunity to participate in financial impact studies and has declined to do so. There is a clear directive here to have the

financial impact statement. The applicant may find it has numbers it is unwilling to afford. The commission was unable to explore financial impacts. Land acquisition is only part of the financial impact of development

Bill Hughes, 241 Eureka, said it is the policy of the city to manage growth due to infill, and to control or limit expansive development, which are annexations. He said it is not good to have to drive through less dense development to more dense development at the southern end of Cutters. There has to be some monumental public benefit to add density. There is 2.5 times more density than what the county would allow. If we continue to annex, we continue to decrease the quality of life. More and more people are here because of the lottery or inheritance, or significant capital gains from selling property in California or Seattle. This development needs to be better scrutinized. If more water is being taken out of the city that is being replenished, then we have a deficit situation.

Tracy Lee, not a city resident, said the City should consider the alternative if the property is developed in the county. Peregrine Ranch has been given a lot of city services, and is a huge density. Cutters is within a mile from downtown, that is near the core. Hailey should not disempower itself by allowing it to be developed in the county. Rinker thinks he will be putting over 300 units at Peregrine Ranch, currently cutters is zoned R.4. It is more important for the city to have an impact on how Cutter's is developed.

Kelly Kipling, a resident of Ketchum, saw herself as someone who would like to buy property in the valley. She asked why Tischler's 2001 report is no longer good, it should have been good for 10 years. The city hasn't kept that report accurate, it is not fair for developers to pay for the cost of that fiscal report. Simple adjustments may be all that's needed. The developers have covered the fiscal issues, and it is being ignored. She didn't want to see another Peregrine Ranch project. Development is good as long as it is done properly.

Lorna Hazelton, 34 Horseshoe Circle said Buttercup Road is not in the city , but is heavily impacted by this development. Who is going to pay for the traffic impacts? The plan looks lovely, and the developer is trying to do all they can to railroad this through the city council. We know that Quigley canyon will develop, as will Peregrine ranch. How do you manage all the people? We can't move the cars. How do you annex the highway, where will the people shop and work, where is the industry to support this kind of development? Don't let the developer push the council into annexing without a fiscal study. Are we going to be another city where no one can get anywhere because there are so many people jammed into a small place? How much is the council going to allow to happen without the whole community. Cutters ranch will affect people down in Della View and all over the city. No one talks about the price of those homes. More people from out of the area will come in to buy them.

Brad Jorsten said he had owned property in Dove Meadows, which he recently sold and is now living in the county. Dove Meadows became less desirable after this application was proposed. This annexation will add 500 people to this corner of town. There is a definite line between city and county plowing; the city can't keep up with what they need

to do now. That's forever. Do we need these kind of density when there will be more places to buy around the city? It would be better if it weren't so dense.

Lilly Simpson, 7 Quigley Lane, said she lives between Cutters and Quigley. The desirable direction is a rural perimeter and dense interior. Dense development on all perimeters create impacts for humans and wildlife. Horse properties are lower density, provide view corridors and benefits wildlife. Ditches provide important access for wintering wildlife. This density is impacting on wildlife already stressed from new uses out Quigley. Developers are lining up at Blaine County's affordable housing door. Does the city have a needs assessment for affordable housing? There are many people making less than 50,000/year, should we building apartments and dormitories for them? Is that truly the affordable housing need, has the city approached this on a systematic basis? As taxes go up to pay for the infrastructure, people in surrounding areas become unable to live here. Why aren't we taking care of our own people? What are the true needs here; what are we looking at systematically?

Michael David of Blaine Ketchum Housing Authority commended the applicants on their efforts. He said a community housing needs assessment was done in 2002. 40% of applicants currently work within the city of Hailey. 6000 commuters are working in Blaine County. The median income is \$50,000 for a single person and \$71,000 for a family of four. A median income owner used to be able to afford low end housing, here they can not. He encouraged the city to look hard at this development.

Chris Grathwol of South River Street was in favor of the application. The city has the power to work with the developer, and make sure it's done right. 113 lots are currently proposed, and over 200 lots would be allowed in the county. He didn't want to see the council lose the ability to work with the developer. City residents will be paying higher taxes for county people using our services. In the short term this development might stabilize the spike in housing costs. In the long term it will help more people get more housing. He urged the council to get going on annexing Cutters into the city.

Jed Sidwell, of 109 South Hiawatha, said forced annexations will result from this project. South Woodside lots are currently at \$200,000. As the town grew his quality of life went down the tubes.

Leah Johnson of South Hiawatha was grateful the process has taken this long. It should be scrutinized and is a big deal. Hailey is bursting at the seams. Growth is happening everywhere. Annexation anywhere is a scary proposition. There is not the infrastructure to make this area pedestrian friendly. The traffic study was done on December 10, a more limited time in terms of use than in the summer. Pedestrian fatalities and near misses are everywhere in Hailey. Huge issue should be well thought out and thoroughly discussed.

Carol Marlow of 120 South Hiawatha said many issues are still not resolved, but encouraged the council to go forward.

Terry Johnson of 103 South Hiawatha did bring up the issue of traffic and pedestrian safety, saying Hailey claims to be a walking town but is really not safe at all.

Jim Philips of 120 Quigley Road favored conditional annexation. Before it is annexed, the city and developer should have an annexation and development agreement worked out in detail and signed. This annexation is no different in its many issues, water, traffic, infrastructure, proposals to dedicate open space to the public, all of which require proper documents. He urged the council to assess all the issues with the developer, have them down in writing. One of the impacts previously discussed has to do with water rights. Requiring the developer to do all their irrigation through existing surface rights will save Hailey's water for true domestic use. It won't change the priority dates of the surface rights, and maintaining water in the canal is important for vegetation and wildlife. He recommended that the water be pumped out of an irrigation pond by the developer for irrigation.

Mathew Luck of Indian Creek said the developments and Peregrine Ranch and Quigley may add 600 homesites, but they are really only conceptual designs now, and this development has been in front of the city bodies to the point that it has been found to be in compliance with the comprehensive plan. It is 18 months into the process, and represents a smaller, responsible development. He commented that Cooley's earlier comment regarding a fiscal impact study was premature; a fiscal impact statement can't be created until the developer receives guidance from the city council as to what the development will look like. A subdivision application should be looked at, and the council owes the developer the guidance of saying what they think a responsible project will look like.

Christopher Simms of Blaine County Citizens for Smart Growth appreciated the council and attorney narrowing the procedural perspective of this meeting; looking at the commission's recommendation. He was generally supportive of the project, and noted Lilly Simpson and Jim Phillip's comments as being wise. He said the council should be specific about what it wants in terms of a fiscal impact study. Growth Management Policy 3 says that Hailey will support infill development, but recognizes that expansion of city boundaries may be necessary to accommodate growth. That is important because there are areas of city impact that already have some density allowances. Consider expansion of area of city impacts to have less traffic on existing neighborhoods. He believed in traditional, pedestrian friendly development, and felt this project offered that.

McBryant said the term entitlement process had been used, and noted there is no entitlement inherent in this process. She invited Steve Brown to answer one of the questions posed.

Steve Brown said at some point we will have to identify what we will base our fiscal impact study upon, and asked how we can achieve that. Williamson said one of the findings that the council needs to make is whether the annexation would have a negative fiscal impact on the existing citizens of Hailey, and says the council can ask for a study to help determine that, and then can ask for more fees than are noted in the study. He

recommended getting that study before annexing in order to have the facts needed for a good decision.

John Campbell said he is asking for conditional annexation simply because of time. He didn't care when the fiscal study is inducted but he would rather not spend \$40,000 on a fiscal impact study unless he had a sense the council favored the project. He would like to go back to Planning and Zoning as soon as possible for subdivision consideration, and look at the configuration of lots. He would like that task to be concurrent with the fiscal impact study. He asked the council to consider a way to send the project on to the commission for platting consideration.

Steve Brown said he was happy to go out and find another consultant other than Tischler, and has been always willing to pursue a study.

Campbell said if the Cutters becomes part of the city, residents could drive into the city without going into the county. We have 78 acres of developable land that is below the 25% grade. The county is entertaining extremely high densities at Peregrine Ranch, and if that same standard applies to Cutters, he could be looking at 240 developable lots within the county.

McBryant then closed the public hearing.

Davis said according to our attorney, we may not have a choice to proceed without a fiscal impact study. He sympathized with the developer, who has been 18 months into this process. He asked if we could charge other annexation applicants the cost of the study. Williamson said we are not paying for the study. There will be a work product from the study that will be available to us; if another applicant gets the full benefit of that study, they may need to get involved in negotiating that matter. He was adverse to the city getting involved with that. Brown said if we did a study for this application, what role would it play in future applications? Davis said this could be the template we will use. Dawson said there are about four different parts to the study, some of which are unique to each application, and some of which could be shared. Keirn was not unwilling to work out a credit system for the future. He said this council is dedicated to covering every single nickel that these annexations cost. We can charge anything we want to, and if we err, we are going to err on the high side, and the applicants may need an opportunity to determine that this annexation may be too expensive for them. He favored doing the study first. Brown agreed, based on the fact that the commission couldn't make certain findings due to the lack of a fiscal study, and in order to make those findings in an informed manner, she needed the study. McBryant said it is not incumbent upon the city to tell the developer what it wants. The city isn't out seeking an annexation, but having had an application presented to us, it is incumbent upon the developer to state the impact of the annexation upon the city as it exists. Brown concurred, and repeated that the fees assessed within the study are just the bare minimum of what the developer should expect.

Davis said he liked what he sees on the plans. Marathon Partners' unplatted land is already in the city. Anything on this land will have an affect on city services. If it is

developed in the county, Hailey won't have any benefits from the impacts. Keirn said the location indicates the property should be under Hailey's control. As far as general approval, he liked the overall picture. Brown said the fiscal impact study should be based on what we're currently looking at; we don't have any other thing to base it upon. Burke said what put the moratorium in place was we had no means by which to analyze the fiscal impact study. We can't go forward without the study. She appreciated a lot of the other comments that were made. We need to start to address what our concept of affordable housing means.

Brown said the consultant's have experience in California, and asked if they have experience in Idaho, too. After learning that they have been working for the City of Ketchum over the past year, she asked if the client is the city. Williamson said the council needs to determine if the firm is qualified, independent, and can do a study in a form acceptable to the council. Williamson said the study is based on an impact fee analyses. He said he and City Engineer Hellen had both spoke with Richard Caplan. All the principals of the firm were formerly city managers.

Dawson indicated she had held several conversations with both partners of Management Consultants, and had met with Richard Caplan earlier that week. She said all parties were unwilling to work for any other client than the city, but the annexation applicant would have to be responsible for payment for the study.

Brown moved that the Cutters application be put on hold until completion of a fiscal impact study, finding Management Consultants an acceptable firm to study and assess the impacts of the annexation to all city services. Keirn seconded. The council then discussed whether the intent of the motion was to table or continue the application. Brown said new information will come from the study, and felt the matter should be tabled so that it is noticed again when the study is complete. The council wanted to delegate the details of the study to staff. The motion carried unanimously.

PH 90 WOODSIDE ELEMENTARY ANNEXATON AGREEMENT

Rand Peebles outlined the components of the Woodside Elementary Annexation Agreement. One significant change in terms was that the school district had offered a second duplex unit as its way of paying the water and sewer component of the annexation fee. The first duplex had been offered for payment for impacts on Echo Hill park. He said the agreement gives the school district the right of first refusal on the duplex units if the city chooses to sell them.

Jim Lewis said Fanny Mae is willing to underwrite the duplex. Neither the school district nor the city need to carry the debt on these. The savings comes from the price of the lot, and that's where it becomes an affordable housing option. Peebles said the right to rescind the PUD is reserved. Gaeddert explained that the offer of lots had increased, in exchange for a reduction in the water and sewer portion of the annexation fees.

McBryant said the annexation will not contribute ongoing taxes to our base. Are we going to be able to respond well to a fire at the school or a nearby home. What does this annexation do to our level of service we are giving to the city at large. This group is not going to be adding taxes that support our own end. What is the value to the city for the community housing component versus our primary responsibility? Can we do that by accepting a fully developed lot, and selling it for a sum of money that would be greater than what the Tischler report required us to pay. Did we decide that Tischler is the study to use, especially since it doesn't address operating costs and there are no operating revenues in terms of taxes? Burke said owning property and having it be available to our employees is one of our goals. That school is a good thing in Hailey's big picture. McBryant said cautioned that this horse-trading is a result of a miscalculation. Brown said we will start to lose employees who need housing. Williamson said there should be an annexation fee on the townhomes as well as the school facilities, for a total of \$168,000 in fees, and compared to the land values, Williamson assured the council that the land would be of higher value than the fees, that the affordable housing would be in perpetuity, and that the constructed duplexes, alone without the land under them, would continue to appreciate rather than depreciate.

Lewis said the cash would be less expensive for the school district than the land. However, he was hoping that the school district and the city would make a statement together that its employees need to be able to live here. Gaeddert said the school district has committed to maintaining the roadway year round to the duplexes. Homeowners would have cross-easements.

Brown and Keirn had some issues with the cost of the sidewalk. Peebles said if this had been annexed, and the district had come up with this idea later, there would be no fees on these duplexes.

Brown liked what's being offered, and she was in favor of splitting the cost of the sidewalk. The School District then offered to split the sidewalk cost, give annexation fees for the PUD units, give Lot 2 and the adjoining two sublots, and \$70,000 in cash.

Brown moved to approve the agreement, modifying it to split the cost to put in the sidewalk that has been agreed upon, and to amending Exhibit D to be updated and reflect our agreements. Burke seconded; the motion carried unanimously.

PH 90 ANNEXATION ORDINANCE

Mayor McBryant opened the matter of the Woodside Elementary Annexation Ordinance for public hearing. There was none. Williamson recommended waiving the three readings. Davis moved to adopt Ordinance 898, read by title only, and waive the three readings and authorize the mayor to sign. Burke seconded; the motion carried unanimously.

PH 91 HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION ORDINANCE

Grotto presented an ordinance that establishes the historic preservation commission. McBryant said the number of commissioners may from time to time be changed by resolution of the council. Burke moved that the council approve Ordinance 899, and read by title only.

NB 92 ENCROACHMENT PERMIT ORDINANCE

The council was presented with a revision to the Encroachment regulations contained within the Municipal Code. Keirn moved to place this matter on the next agenda for public hearing. Davis seconded; the motion carried unanimously.

NB 93 SUBDIVISION INSPECTION FEES

The council was presented with a revision to the subdivision regulations which set new fees. **Keirn moved to place the matter on the next agenda for public hearing.** Burke seconded; the motion carried unanimously.

COUNCIL REPORTS

Brown said she had been contacted by someone from Hailey, England, near Oxford, who had suggested linked websites between the two Hailey towns. She said she would be out of town on April 25, in Puerto Rico

Brown said the county has a lot of enthusiasm right now, in terms of regional planning, and she had communicated to the county that if Hailey doesn't show up it doesn't mean we're not interested. She showed all the citations from Hailey and other jurisdictions' comprehensive plans that says we will cooperate with others. For us to be a successful city, we have to pay well with others. Hailey had the longest list.

Keirn said he will be attending a Table Top meeting on March 10.

Davis said a new Chamber Director, Jim Spinelli, had been hired. .

Mayor said an affordable housing unit will be available soon, and she and Keirn wanted to tour it before it is occupied. The new jail structure plans which were recently submitted to Hailey's Planning Department included a consolidated dispatch center. Ned is looking at whether the county has the authority to build and tax the city; it is looking like they don't have that authority. The Police Chief has indicated it would be beneficial to share a facility. She was disappointed this jail has moved forward at such a rapid pace. McBryant said she doesn't have confidence in the maturity of the Blaine County Commissioners to engage in respectful consideration of separate jurisdictions in joint planning meetings. If the County is promoting this, it's a power grab, and she urged the city to be sharp, do its homework, and not abrogate its powers.

She thanked Brown for pounding out the numbers on the annexation issue. We are a growing city, we compete with the cities to the north. That may change if we ever get

moving on a local option tax. We are still struggling with ways to get extra employees, and implement our capital improvement budget. Every time we bring in some new development that we are responsible for, an entire year passes before we start receiving taxes. If we don't collect every dime due to us from developers, we are not doing our job. She was concerned that the council may give the church annexation a walk as well, simply because it is a church. Keirn said we've been the best buy in Idaho for years, and we're not going to be that anymore. Burke said there are 8 or 9 annexation applications out there.

Davis said he is working with the local option tax issue, and hoped to set a workshop meeting on that matter in the near future.

There being no further business, Mayor McBryant adjourned the meeting at 9: 25 p.m.

Susan McBryant, Mayor

Heather Dawson, City Clerk