

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE  
HAILEY CITY COUNCIL  
HELD APRIL 9, 2018  
IN THE HAILEY TOWN CENTER MEETING ROOM**

The Meeting of the Hailey City Council was called to order at 5:32 P.M. by Mayor Fritz Haemmerle. Present were Council members Colleen Teevin, Kaz Thea, Pat Cooley, and Martha Burke. Staff present included City Attorney Christopher P. Simms, City Administrator Heather Dawson, and City Clerk Mary Cone.

[5:32:52 PM](#) Call to order by Mayor Haemmerle

Open Session for Public Comments:

No public comments

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

- [CA 127](#) Motion to ratify letter of support from City of Hailey for the Chamber’s Idaho Tourism and Commerce (ITC) Grant application, pledging cash support for the grant .....
- [CA 128](#) Motion to approve Resolution 2018-029 authorizing the mayor to sign Amendment No. 1 to the Idaho Water Resource Board Water Conservation Grant Agreement .....
- [CA 129](#) Motion to approve Resolution 2018-030 authorizing city officials to sign a grant agreement with Idaho Commission for Libraries (LSTA funds) for \$900 on Hailey Public Library staff first time conference attendance at the ALA Annual Conference.....
- [CA 130](#) Motion to approve Resolution 2018-031 authorizing city officials to sign a grant agreement with the Idaho STEM Action Center as part of the Early STEM Professional Development Grant .....
- ~~[CA 131](#) Motion to approve Resolution 2018-032 authorizing the Mayor to sign an agreement with Galena Engineering to design the Myrtle Street Connector.....~~
- [CA 132](#) Motion to adopt Resolution 2018-033, authorizing the Mayor to sign an Park Adoption Agreement with CU Next Storm Landscaping for maintenance and mowing at Foxmoor Park during the 2018 park season .....
- [CA 133](#) Motion to approve the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision regarding an amended Final Plat proposal for Colorado Gulch Preserve Subdivision, located at Lot 1A, Block 1, Stevens Family Ranch, LLC (North of 81 Broadford Road, Section 15 & 16, T.2N., R. 18E., B.M., Blaine County, Idaho), comprising of 24.46 acres. Previously, thirty-six (36) lots were proposed. The amended plat proposes twenty-seven (27) residential lots, with an additional 5.77 acres of open space.....
- [CA 134](#) Motion to approve minutes of April 2, 2018 and to suspend reading of them .....
- [CA 135](#) Motion to approve claims for expenses incurred during the month of March, 2018, and claims for expenses due by contract in April, 2018 .....
- [CA 136](#) Motion to approve Treasurer’s report for March 2018.....

[5:33:28 PM](#) Teevin pulls CA 131 for discussion

[5:33:43 PM](#) **Burke moved to approve all consent agenda items minus CA 131, seconded by Teevin, motion passed unanimously.**

[5:34:00 PM](#) CA 131 Teevin asks a question about the process and the other potential firms.

[5:34:29 PM](#) Dawson responds to Teevin’s question, LHTAC specifies, actually “pre-approves” the eligible list of firms that we are able to select from. This is a state grant we received. If the project is under \$100,000, then we present to them our preferred engineer (from the list they provide), which Mariel did last December 2017, using the local engineering firm Galena Engineering. If the project is over \$100,000, we present to them our top 4 firms from the list they provide, then we go through a selection process. With that process you’d see the firms that we selected from. So, this is a different process.

[5:36:37 PM](#) **Burke moves to approve CA 131, seconded by Cooley, motion passed unanimously.**

**MAYOR’S REMARKS:**

[5:37:08 PM](#) Haemmerle asked for Water Smarty program overview since council just approved CA 128, another grant agreement. Dawson, yes this this a 2-year program where we receive \$40,000 to offer back to homeowners for rebates when the retro fit their turf from high water usage to something that is water conservation. Mayor, we have been doing this for a long time? Dawson, affirmed, yes we have. Mayor asked that we put this on our website and Facebook for all to see. Mayor asked for a presentation in the next meeting.

**PROCLAMATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS:**

*PP 137 Proclamation on National Crime Victim’s Rights*

[5:38:10 PM](#) Dawson announced the proposed Proclamation on National Crime Victim’s Rights in Idaho, on page 131 in packet. This is for education and awareness.

[5:38:48 PM](#) Mayor reads Proclamation on National Crime Victim’s Rights

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

*PH 138 Consideration of proposed Ordinance No. \_\_\_\_\_, a City-initiated Text Amendment to Title 17, Section 17.04J, Flood Hazard Overlay Zoning District (FH) and First Reading of Ordinance \_\_\_\_, to update the existing code to meet current standards and recommendations from the State of Idaho Floodplain Coordinator and the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) and to reflect lessons learned in 2017 flooding. The existing code section will be repealed and replaced in its entirety. Proposed changes include new definitions, permit exemptions, limitations on fill and edits intended to streamline administration of the code (Continued from March 12, 2018).....*

[5:41:27 PM](#) Rebecca Bundy presented this item. This was continued from the March 12th meeting. Bundy points to page 3 of the clean copy of the proposed ordinance handed out tonight, which is page 141 in the council packet. We needed to coordinate with the FEMA region 10 coordinator, there is a list of activities allowed without a permit, and what needs a permit. We made an appointment with them, received their input, and struck language presented in the last meeting, they have reviewed this language presented tonight. We removed a few things out of the code, i.e. mowing lawn, prune shrubs, pull weeds, put a new roof on, and have appliances

repaired, all without a permit. [5:43:53 PM](#) But you need permit to replace appliances in the floodplain. What they suggested for diminuous activities, is to create a new permit application, where the applicant describes the work, and staff responds with written letter from City. We can set up an intermediate review. The only other change, [5:45:29 PM](#) listen 17.04J.040B Floodplain Subdistrict Use Regulations number 2; on number 2a, we removed the exception clause, you can see the strikeout on page 156 of your packet. It is on gage 16 of clean copy handed out tonight.

[5:46:39 PM](#) Bundy brought up a discussion she had with the City Attorney and the Mayor regarding the issue of state law granting irrigation districts canals and maintenance of ditches without getting (federal) permits. And according to the state floodplain coordinator, we cannot have language in here which conflicts with the National Floodplain Insurance (NFPI).

[5:47:19 PM](#) Chris Simms, this is walking a fine line between state and fed laws, as we are a political subdivision of the State of Idaho and are mandated by all of its laws. So, what we've done page 2, added a new section 2 Severability Clause of this proposed ordinance. "Nothing herein shall be construed in violation or conflict with any state or federal laws." Simms, noted that what we are doing is acknowledging that we are bound by state laws. This is a housekeeping item and a procedural matter, page 1 of handout, and the old page 139 of packet, we recognize that state statute contains language, we do not have power or authority to regulate districts called out in 46-1022. [5:49:25 PM](#) Haemmerle adds, this goes well beyond irrigation districts. Simms responds.

[5:50:11 PM](#) Mayor Haemmerle lets council know that the language that was struck is in the packet on page 141, subsection c, Activities Exempt from Requiring a Floodplain Development Permit, this is 46-1022 - straight out of state code. We being a political subdivision of the State of Idaho are obligated to follow state statute. The floodplain coordinator didn't like this language as she believes it is inconsistent with federal policy.

[5:51:59 PM](#) Burke asks a question, on page 38 of handout, about fences, when it requires a fence permit, at the bottom of the page. Bundy responds, there is missing language, the intent is that when a fence permit application is received, [5:52:36 PM](#) we would review it with compliance with the floodplain also.

[5:53:09 PM](#) Haemmerle, agrees with Burke, there seems to be a disconnect there. The first part implies that the only thing that applies is the fence standard, and then the next section states that it must comply with the floodplain standards. [5:53:41 PM](#) Bundy responds.

[5:54:33 PM](#) Dawson, refers to handout on page 3, the alphabetical section goes from C Establishment of Floodplain Development Permit to E. Compliance on page 5, and it skips section D, all letters need to be changed to one earlier.

#### Public comments:

[5:55:17 PM](#) Angela Barbre Della View area resident, went to the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting when they were discussing the proposed floodplain ordinance. Barbre asks

for the exact requirements, as a council, what is minimum and what is maximum? As a council, you need to know there is more to this, you should ask what the minimum and maximum requirements.

[5:56:37 PM](#) Bundy asks Barbre a question, is she talking about a specific section or the entire code? Barbre clarified her question. Bundy, that has not changed from the past code. This is a hard process, we have not been able to find an easier way, NFIP makes this a challenge. This proposed code is not much different than what has been in effect since 2003 in Hailey. Bundy describes the floor level change – the bottom of the floor joists need to be 1 foot above flood base elevation, changed it to read that the top of the lowest floor is 2 feet above base flood elevation. This applies to new construction and “substantial improvement” and “substantial damage” [5:59:16 PM](#) the Planning and Zoning Commission suggested to council that the utilities should be elevated to 2 feet above base flood elevation, that is a change from the past. Bundy explained the old code, which allowed for backfill around the foundation and it allowed it for 25 feet away from the building, this code is more restrictive on fill. [6:00:01 PM](#) It allows for fill if a study is done by an engineer, certifying that that fill won’t adversely impact any neighbors. This is more explicit, describing in more detail the NFIP program. There were a lot of definitions that were out of date, Bundy concluded.

[6:02:12 PM](#) Thea refers to Angela Barbre’s question. There aren’t voluntary things in this code, if you are in this area you are bound by the code? Bundy yes, that is correct.

[6:03:00 PM](#) Simms adds, that we do this so that people who live in the floodplain can maintain flood insurance and protect their home in the event of a flood.

[6:03:22 PM](#) Bundy, the City could be sanctioned by FEMA if they didn’t comply with NFIP regulations.

[6:03:49 PM](#) Thea this is for new development and substantial improvement. Thea asks, a question. Bundy, a house is grandfathered in based on the construction date. You would go back to the code in effect at time of house built to meet replacement code.

[6:05:16 PM](#) substantial improvement Bundy explains, greater than or equal to 50% of the home value. Substantial improvement, is on page 15 of new handout, under definitions.

Mayor asks a question [6:06:49 PM](#) about the Establishment of Floodplain Development Permit section. Regarding a repair or improvement to an existing building, he does not see the word substantial anywhere. Bundy responds, you must get a permit for most activities in the floodplain. “substantial improvement” kicks in elevating the structure to the new building code, section 17.04J.060, page 29 on new document.

[6:09:01 PM](#) Horowitz last year’s flood, there were no situations that triggered “substantial improvement.”

[6:09:32 PM](#) Simms refers to Burke’s question about installing an irrigation system, [6:09:58 PM](#) it doesn’t seem to be called out in this permit process. Bundy replied, we had language in there

and the state floodplain coordinator did not like the language so we removed it. Bundy also explains that the City goes through a 10-year audit with FEMA, that time is this August.

[6:11:01 PM](#) Mayor Haemmerle asks page 29, under A. General Standards, number 1, “All new construction, substantial improvements, and development are subject to the following requirements,” are these the same requirements as contain for the development of where it states, “Establishment of Floodplain Development Permit and then it outlines these activities?” Are these the same Standards? Because it talks about repairs or improvements to existing buildings.

[6:11:50 PM](#) Bundy replies yes, that entire list was reviewed by FEMA Region 10

representatives, that list is an example of items that they would consider development. [6:12:12](#)

[PM](#) Haemmerle asks a follow up statement, “the way that is construed is any repairs or

improvements need a permit.” Bundy replies, yes that is correct. [6:12:29 PM](#) Haemmerle

continues, “Then the other section talks about substantial improvement, new construction and

development, including manufactured homes, etc.” [6:13:10 PM](#) Mayor Haemmerle asks what is

development, is it all the things listed on page 6?. “On page 29, we spell out new construction,

means all new development? Bundy, yes, it means “new Development”. Bundy points to

specific standards on page 32, applies to new construction, development of any residential

structure, and substantial improvement. Bundy adds that this language is directly out of the

model code, it can be confusing. [6:14:42 PM](#) Haemmerle asks, Simms do you see what I’m

talking about. It is far broader than that, it is any development.

[6:15:49 PM](#) Mayor Haemmerle, “these activities are subject to a permit, excavation, mining, and drilling, etc. are subject to a permit.” Simms, permit must be applied for and acquired but does not mean that the building needs to be raised.

[6:16:29 PM](#) Haemmerle when he looks at page 29, general standards, The term development on page 29, is confusing when there are terms on page 6 for development there, too.

[6:17:27 PM](#) Haemmerle where are the standards delineated? General standards, are there 2 kinds of development? Bundy, one type of development contained on page 7, she reads definition, the bullets on page 3 of clean code are just given as examples as to what constitutes development. Haemmerle disagrees with broad and examples given.

[6:19:44 PM](#) Bundy clarified, any repair or remodel, is considered development by FEMA.

[6:20:08 PM](#) Haemmerle so the term development is broad definition.

[6:20:23 PM](#) Bundy replies, there are lots of items which require a permit, but they may not trigger bringing the home up to the current building code. If the value of construction is more than 50% of home value, then the remodel would need to be compliant with the new floodplain code – i.e. 2 feet above base flood level. The portions of code that say that are in the A. general standards and B. specific standards, starts on page 29, of clean handout given tonight, Bundy. Bundy continues to discuss code and compares page 29 and 32.

[6:24:48 PM](#) Haemmerle goes to page 29 of new ordinance, so, any development comes under General Standards, and then subsection b has special standards, asks Haemmerle. Pg 33, non-

residential construction, is a chicken coop one of these? Bundy, that means “commercial” structure. Coop is on page 35, considered an accessory.

[6:26:36 PM](#) Horowitz proposed a change to substantial improvements and the order.

[6:26:51 PM](#) Haemmerle, suggests the standards are located – helping one to use the sections appropriately.

[6:27:56 PM](#) Cooley commented, this needs to be understandable to use.

[6:28:15 PM](#) Cooley asks appliance repair, refrigerator or furnace requires a permit? Horowitz, we spoke with them about this and they did not make any progress with this topic. And she adds, people are not going to apply for a permit to get a new refrigerator.

[6:29:34 PM](#) Bundy, speaks about scope of work and value of construction. FEMA feels this is how we deal with this.

[6:30:17 PM](#) Haemmerle, pg 7, “development” and general standards on page 29, looks like refrigerator is subject to a permit. Cooley, how do we deal with this? Bundy, this is not a change to existing code.

Burke affirms, FEMA wants us to have this code.

[6:31:50 PM](#) Bundy, we are asking for compliance, and want an easy way to deal with this. Where is the RAD review, Review Assess and Document is on page 4, number 3, of clean version handed out today.

[6:34:01 PM](#) Thea rephrases question, so one would send an email, when buying a refrigerator? And the City would send an email response, answered Bundy.

[6:34:43 PM](#) Haemmerle wonders on page 3 and 4 is it consistent with page 29, requirements? Horowitz is happy to review them. Simms, but if we make changes, they may not be acceptable to FEMA.

Bundy, can be silent on it, like before. [6:35:54 PM](#)

[6:36:33 PM](#) pg. 30 listen Haemmerle – don’t think entirely true that they are exempted.

Horowitz suggests a few changes, move up section, change order. Haemmerle adds the bullets are broad, a. b. items seem to be broader, and the specifics aren’t until you get to page 29.

[6:37:50 PM](#) Bundy, page 3 alerts you to getting a permit, pg 29, gives details on the permit. Haemmerle adds, one must be able to get their quickly. [6:38:35 PM](#) Bundy will add reference to that section. Haemmerle wants a cross reference to help use the information.

[6:39:32 PM](#) Burke comments, that FEMA is dictating what we need. The language has to stay the same but maybe adding a table of contents can be used to make it easier for us to use.

[6:40:44 PM](#) Haemmerle, bullet points on page 6 are a broad summary, specifics are on page 29, this is a problem in his mind. Each activity has separate and distinct activity.

Horowitz, we are happy to go back and revise.

[6:41:52 PM](#) Thea understands the simple reference.

[6:42:37 PM](#) Haemmerle wants one to be pointed to the requirements page where specifics are set out. Bundy, right now we have 2 levels of permitting, if we get to the Review Assess and Document (RAD) level permitting, we would have 3 levels of permitting.

[6:44:08 PM](#) Cooley asked if staff can revise and bring this back in 2 weeks?

[6:44:33 PM](#) Burke added that directions for use, is what we need.

Mayor suggests to continue this item.

[6:45:02 PM](#) **Cooley moves to continue this item to the April 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting, Burke seconds, motion passed unanimously.**

*PH 139 Consideration of Resolution 2018-\_\_\_\_\_ Draft 5 of the Hailey Greenway Master Plan and various RAS studies related to land uses in the floodplain*

[6:45:48 PM](#) Horowitz connects a phone conference call with Jennifer Zung with Harmony Engineers.

[6:47:23 PM](#) Brian Yeager presents, RAS study done by Harmony Engineers which was intended to explore impacts of different features, in the Hailey Greenway Master Plan area, Jennifer Zung will explain her studies tonight. Yeager goes on to state that these concepts are general in nature, these are not complete projects, further studies are needed on whether to decide to move forward with a project, these are only the beginning steps. Funding does not exist for these projects, any of these options are preliminary in nature – not projects ready to implement. This study does not guarantee city action. Yeager will add this general statement to page 9 of the Greenway Master Plan, second paragraph.

Yeager shows first scenario done by Zung, Lions Park area, we are proposing to lower the elevation of Lions Park, what is the difference between floodplain elevation if lowered? Projected FEMA flow rates, have higher flow rates than what we saw last year. Limits of this study is larger, greater than what you've seen before. If you remove the ballfield and Lions Park, [6:52:27 PM](#) the study shows the change in expected base flood elevation.

Haemmerle, what do you mean remove ballfield. Yeager, explains, lower the ground several feet up to 4-5 feet - level with river. This would be a significant earth work effort, a major

undertaking. If you drop the level, base flood elevations (BFE) are shown in color coded elevations, [6:54:26 PM](#) at a spot on Aspen Drive, the expected BFE drops from .5 feet to .6 feet – if you lower everything in this area. You also have a darker area, that has a larger BFE reduction. The big question is what happens if remove ballfield completely, the BFD changes from .3 to .4 – about 2 tenths of a foot difference or 3 inches difference. For this exhibit, and the previous one shown, we are trying to capture the impact of excavating about 5 feet of land, going through old landfill, and bring in other fill to stabilize the area and reunite the river. Thea asked, this change is reflective of only removing the ballfield? Yeager responds, no, that is doing all of scenario number 1, all the potential projects in the plan; including sediment pond, reconnection to the flood channel. Everything done results in .5 and .6 BFE reductions, if you do all except the ballfield then it is a .3 and .4 BFE reductions.

[6:56:50 PM](#) Horowitz, which number do we look at? Yeager, points to the areas, which see the most reduction, didn't see flooding last year. A little over 1-inch difference in BFE, if ballfield is removed. [6:57:55 PM](#)

[6:58:42 PM](#) Yeager, we also considered 2 other scenarios, removing the tennis courts at Heagle Park, reduced BFE from .1 to .2 feet.

[6:59:42 PM](#) Yeager presents the scenario for removing 3 houses along the river, the BFE changes from .1 feet to .2 feet.

Out of the 3 scenarios, the Lions Park, scenarios this is most telling. [7:00:53 PM](#) Yeager removing the ballfields is approximately \$2 million dollars. Yeager asks Jung about how many feet the ballfield area was lowered in her study?

[7:01:17 PM](#) Jennifer Zung replies, there was a maximum 7-foot reduction and some areas removed 3-4 feet of fill.

[7:02:17 PM](#) Haemmerle, Zung do you want to add anything? Zung did do a 2-dimensional study, a channel model, which included all houses on the model. The changes you see are somewhat localized, only one component to river restoration and, it is important to realize that whatever is done, it needs to be done in a comprehensive manner.

Public comments:

[7:04:24 PM](#) Amy Browning Della Vista area resident asks, can you lower the entire park not just tennis courts? Haemmerle responds.

[7:05:08 PM](#) Sean Guisasola plays softball at Lions Park, we have a large softball family that is interested in seeing a larger softball field. They will do what they can to help this project become reality. Sean wants to get a budget price and a couple of designs, in order to enlarge the field. Guisasola will present the information to council to see what we can do.

[7:06:59 PM](#) Haemmerle, the ballpark, does it stay or go? Is the main question.

[7:07:19 PM](#) Patty Lousen with the Wood River Land Trust (WRLT), speaks about changes in velocity of Lions Park area with these studies. Next Wednesday Blaine County Commissioners will be talking about Colorado Gulch Road, without a bridge, and will be discussing where a new bridge should be located. WRLT are working on this, money is available through FEMA and WRLT will help fund part of the bridge too. WRLT is looking at next steps with this document – Greenway Master Plan. Of all of these items we see, we want to pursue Lions Park area projects, i.e. the sediment pond and channel. [7:09:44 PM](#) Lousen poses solution and question, how do we off-load sediment to decrease the velocity of river? There is grant opportunity; 206 section grant, Army Corps of Engineers, and we are trying to determine the feasibility of the project, Lousen implores, we are in top 3 chance of getting this money. This shows promise and is subject to more studies. Lousen and WRLT is looking at next steps, and whomever will help fund these projects. Heather Dawson and Lousen met with DEQ the other day. Idaho has not received a Brownfield DEQ grant funding ever; but he (DEQ representative) liked the idea. In closing, we are almost at the end of this process, it is very emotional, and a great process.

[7:14:25 PM](#) Haemmerle asks, about a setback barrier on WRLT property. what is your position on this setback barrier? Lousen responds, our priorities on page 39 and 40 of the Greenway Master Plan, is where we have all given our priorities, the Lions Park area was given a high priority by the WRLT and the City. The berm and channel stabilization is given a medium priority. The setback barrier, as they see it, is a band-aid. Haemmerle is on board with that way of thinking, the WRLT is still on board with the setback barrier, right? Lousen, yes as a medium priority. What you do in 1 part in Della View area will impact other areas in Della, a change doesn't benefit everyone. Haemmerle, any change would impact the 3 lots on War Eagle negatively. Lousen, right. It is easier to do nothing based on liability.

[7:18:13 PM](#) Cooley asks what are the velocity changes? Lousen replies, on average 10-11 feet per second at the 100-year floodplain event. Haemmerle what is more relevant number velocity or BFE? Zung, responds, [7:19:34 PM](#) when water is spread out more, then velocity reduces, it changes sediment, and it can't move larger rocks, transporting them down the river. Elevation and velocity are related, Zung ends.

[7:22:01 PM](#) Lousen would like to look at opportunities sooner rather than later. Our goal, WRLT.

[7:22:24 PM](#) Horowitz states the cost is \$100,000 for the feasibility study to be done.

[7:22:55 PM](#) Lousen announced that some of these costs can be absorbed/paid by WRLT.

[7:23:11 PM](#) Kevin Wilson asks, if we have an event this year are there any plans to be done? Haemmerle doubts this much money is available and we won't get permissions necessary to do any work quickly.

[7:23:47 PM](#) Angela Barbre likes Lions Park because she believes it helps off-set the sediment in the river, the issue is how long the flooding is lasting in her area. Barbre states that they are seeing flooding at a River level of 4.6 Feet, that is the river water running down War Eagle Drive.

[7:25:09 PM](#) Bob MacLeod, Hailey resident, comments that the Hailey Greenway Master Plan is a very good document, and you've reached out to the community in varied ways. MacLeod hopes we can get some recreational activities in this area, in the future. MacLeod hopes this will help the City get money, to do things. It may take years to do any other projects. Maybe you could improve the ballpark for a reasonable amount of money. It takes years to do any of the other projects. MacLeod appreciates the effort put into this Master Plan and the opportunity to provide comments.

[7:27:04 PM](#) Horowitz talks, will finalize and present council with these comments in the next meeting.

[7:27:47 PM](#) Mayor these things are not mutually exclusive, he supports the ballfield usage. Haemmerle recounts that Pogie stated that he would help with ballfield improvements and he didn't follow through. If you (Guisasola) are committed – great, Mayor Haemmerle closed.

[7:28:32 PM](#) Burke supports Master Plan and comments that the Champion Ice Center is great for our community. Making the ballfield larger will help us become more diverse, plus this is fun and good for families. This is a shaded and cool area and it makes sense this is a good location. With this Master Plan, Burke doesn't want it to take away from the downtown core, the ballfield isn't used all year long. In the long run, and if money were no object, she'd support lowering the whole area. In the meantime, let's use this area well now. Inclusion of a project in this Master Plan does not guarantee a city project, Burke ended.

[7:31:37 PM](#) Dawson asked what are Burke's thoughts on the tennis court. Burke replies, that is harder to discuss. Other than the fencing material, if you are talking about lowering the area, then that is a project down the road.

[7:32:29 PM](#) Yeager announced that while talking with Jim Keating with BCRD about the fencing of the tennis courts at Heagle Park. Keating suggested there is a netting fencing option for the lower portion of fence around tennis courts, which would allow water to flow.

[7:33:00 PM](#) Cooley, agrees with MacLeod and Burke, let's use the park now. As to concessions and restrooms, maybe just port a potty – Cooley doesn't see extending water and sewer services across the river. Food Trucks are a great, no cost high benefit idea. As for the tennis courts, short-term fence fix solution is a good idea.

[7:34:28 PM](#) Thea asks a priority question, and on the process. Haemmerle, if you don't like something, we can discuss it. Thea doesn't think the ballfield should go away as is, but she is not sure if we should invest in it now. Same comment for the tennis courts. Thea wants to embrace this plan as a restoration plan, for wildlife and a pedestrian use bridge. Thea not excited about expanding the ballfield if in the future we want to restore the area.

[7:37:35 PM](#) Haemmerle, how much to spend, we don't know what the amount is. It could be 5,10, 15 years before you get the opportunity and funding to remove the area of land that WRLT

wants to remove. Being fallow on this area is shortsighted, Mayor Haemmerle implores, we should do this now, if they (softball) are willing to spend money and time.

[7:40:40 PM](#) Teevin agrees with Thea. Should a ballfield be there in the first place? Teevin wants to research more, the habitat in this area and its of great importance to the river. Teevin feels there are reasons to not put the resources towards the ballfield now.

[7:42:37 PM](#) Cooley, staff has mixed input from us they understand the Mayor's direction.

Haemmerle asks if ballfield should be in the plan or not. Burke, yes. Cooley, yes. [7:43:17 PM](#) Cooley, it is important to have. Teevin asks, we are not voting on instituting this ballfield expansion? Right responds, Cooley.

Teevin is not prepared to adopt a decision on the ballfield tonight.

[7:45:30 PM](#) Horowitz gives an overview, currently the ballfield is a high priority in this plan.

[7:46:04 PM](#) Thea wants to lower the priority of the ballfield in this Master Plan.

[7:47:15 PM](#) Haemmerle grew up in Ketchum in the 1960's. we've tried to accommodate sports in this valley. We are now trying to accommodate softball players, to provide a big cross-section of Hailey, certainly, he agrees, if we get money and authority, to remove the garbage underneath Lions Park. It is important to take care of the people.

Haemmerle makes a suggestion.

[7:49:40 PM](#) Burke there are not a lot of free activities in this community.

[7:50:44 PM](#) Haemmerle suggests bringing this back at April 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting for consideration of passing.

[7:51:07 PM](#) **Cooley moves to continue this item to April 23, 2018 meeting, Burke seconds, motion passed unanimously.**

### **OLD BUSINESS:**

*OB 140 3<sup>rd</sup> Reading of Ordinance No. 1231 Amending Title 17, Section 17.02, Definitions, to clarify and amend the definition of: Dwelling Unit. The amendment would include changes to the minimum gross floor area in that every dwelling unit shall not have less than two hundred (200) square feet of gross floor area, instead of one hundred twenty (120) square feet of gross floor area, and to reconsider changes that ensure the primary residential unit on a lot shall not be smaller than the accessory unit*

[7:54:15 PM](#) **Burke moves to approve Ordinance No. 1231 authorize Mayor to sign and conduct the 3<sup>rd</sup> Reading by title only, seconded by Thea, motion passed unanimously.**

[7:54:41 PM](#) Mayor Haemmerle conducts 3<sup>rd</sup> Reading of Ordinance No. 1231 by title only.

*OB 141 3rd Reading of No.1233 amending t Municipal Code Section § 17.05.010 the City of Hailey Zoning District Map. Proposed changes would rezone Hailey Business Park South Condominiums, Units 1-15 located at 1120 Broadford Road from Technological Industry (TI) to SCI- Sales and Offices (SCI-SO)*

[7:55:27 PM](#) Burke moves to adopt Ordinance No. 1233 authorize the 3<sup>rd</sup> Reading by title only and Mayor to sign, seconded by Cooley, motion passed unanimously.

[7:55:48 PM](#) Mayor Haemmerle conducts 3<sup>rd</sup> reading of ordinance no. 1233 by title only.

### **STAFF REPORTS:**

[7:56:19 PM](#) Linda Ries Tree Committee member put together a report on the Emerald Ash Bore, at the request from Council in a recent meeting. The Emerald Ash Bore started in 2002 in Michigan and now it is in 30 states. This memo is for your information and the Tree Committee will remove all ash trees in the Valley tree guide, because this infestation is just a matter of time. City of Boulder is going through this right now, not much for treatment for the bore. Thea asked if all ashes are subject to this? Ries, comments, yes all species of Ash are subject to this. This topic was in the Our Town Newsletter. Ries will contact the local nurseries too to let them know.

Mountain Ash is not a true Ash [8:00:31 PM](#) Ries stated and is not subject to the bore.

[8:00:52 PM](#) Craig Aberbach, last weekend all hoses were tested, and not any hose failed the test.

[8:01:18 PM](#) Dawson, this year's ArborFest is on May 12<sup>th</sup>, which is Mother's Day weekend and also NAMI's Biking for Mental Wellness event day.

[8:01:46 PM](#) Burke is now a NAMI representative for City of Hailey and would like to present soon a Proclamation on a stigma free workplace. Burke would like to put together a bike team, and bike to the ArborFest event.

Simms announced an Executive Session is not needed tonight.

[8:02:56 PM](#) Cooley, Keefer Park was loaded with soccer players last weekend, how do we protect our fields this early in the season, as they are so vulnerable?

[8:03:31 PM](#) Thea commented that the school fields were not open, but the city fields are open. soccer people flocked to city fields, hope the City Parks department is evaluating the condition of the parks.

[8:04:26 PM](#) Burke moves to adjourn meeting, Teevin seconds, motion passed unanimously.

---

Fritz X. Haemmerle, Mayor

---

Mary Cone, City Clerk