MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING
OF THE HAILEY CITY COUNCIL
HELD MONDAY JANUARY 8, 2009
IN HAILEY CITY HALL MEETING ROOM

The special meeting of the Hailey City Council was called to order at 5:32 P.M. by Mayor Rick Davis. Present were Council members Martha Burke, Don Keirn, Carol Brown and Fritz Haemmerle. Staff present included City Administrator Heather Dawson and City Attorney, Ned Williamson.

Mayor Davis opened the meeting for public comment. There were no comments.

STAFF PRESENTATION OF QUIGLEY CANYON

Beth Robrahn, Planning Director explained that staff put together a memo to council that covers all conditions the applicant stated they have issues with. Conditions 10, 28, 33 are in the packet. Robrahn went over additional documents that were handed out in the meeting for the council to add to their packets. Robrahn explained that she, Tom Hellen, Public Works Director, Michael Chapman, Fire Chief, Becki Keefer, President Parks & Lands Board & Kathy Grotto, Blaine County Housing authority will be presenting.

Robrahn explained that the Planning & Zoning Commission recommended that all Community Housing be deed restricted. The Council indicated that they would like to understand how the deed restriction works before approving any kind of deed restrictions. That will take several years before we can see how that actually works, Robrahn indicated. The greatest need for Community Housing is in the lower income categories.

Condition #6 Community Housing – Kathy Grotto presented.
Carol Brown disclosed that she and all council members received an email today from ARCH regarding deed restrictions.

Kathy Grotto explained that the housing authority supports the Quigley Annexation and the plan should be approved in substantially the form that it has been presented to the City. Grotto passed out handouts for council and explained that the workforce for alternative deed restrictions may have a place but the jury is still out on that. The initial affordability, income deed restrictions are the ones that will really help those in the lower income categories that are in the greatest need in the valley. Handouts passed out.

The 1st handout was on Housing affordability in Idaho 1979 – 2000. Graphs in Idaho showing annual housing cost. (Blaine County being the highest) This is showing housing cost as a percentage of household income. 30% of household income is accepted as the norm. Anything over 30% going to housing is considered house burdened for housing. Blaine County is well above 30%.
On page 4 of the second handout, it shows the Blaine County needs assessment. The 2nd table on page 17 shows Hailey is considered mid Valley and in the mid valley 39% of households earn under 80% of the area median income.

Page 34 – 27% of the households in Blaine County are living in houses not affordable to their income.

Pg. 37 – Similar table showing mid-valley 34% of population are living in homes beyond their earning means.

Pg. 79 – bottom table – most people on this survey want to live in Hailey, Idaho.

The final handout shows a report done by the housing authority in June of this year. It summarizes the characteristics of the people in the housing authority’s applicant pool. It reflects very closely what the needs assessment is showing. Income categories 1-4 are in the pool in the lower income categories. These are the majority of applicants looking for housing. The housing authority works to support the provisions of housing for people in the entire spectrum of incomes. That is why they support the recommendation from the Planning & Zoning Commission. Fritz Haemmerle asked how people are doing acquiring loans in categories 1-4. Grotto explained that Ketchum has been doing quite well. The majority of applicants do have 10 to 20% down payment. They have some level of savings and are able to qualify. Some applicants have currently lost their jobs. Haemmerle asked what the inventory for homes in categories 1-4 might be county wide? Grotto pointed out page 3 and the tables that talk about showing the number of homes that were for sale in 2000 – 2008 and the number homes still for sale today.

Condition 24 – Access on North Side of Canyon
Tom Hellen, Public Works Director will present Connectivity, Accessibility & Resilience reduces impact on any one street. Public Safety will be presented by Mike Chapman, Hailey Fire Chief.

Tom Hellen read the memo that was given to council that explained the Connectivity, Accessibility and Resilience etc. Hellen went on to explain that the traffic study was done during the school year as well as over the summer months. The 1st part of the study stated most of the traffic would go out Fox Acres Road. The 2nd study showed a 50/50 split. Their recommendations did not change. There has been a fair amount of concern that traffic would increase through Deerfield. Hellen does not agree. It would be a round about way for traffic to flow. The traffic study was very thorough and revealed that the development will add approximately 4,600 cars a week on the streets. Bike paths, roundabouts and other things were presented. Haemmerle asked how many trips there are down Quigley currently. Hellen said those numbers are in the traffic study and he will get those numbers and get back to him.

Mike Chapman, Fire Chief addressed public safety. Chapman explained that he is presenting as Risk Management for the City of Hailey. His job is to keep things as safe as possible and will be identifying safety concerns. Chapman explained that dual access
can be provided up to the pond. Where we differ is in 3 or 4 places dual access is reduced to a fire lane. We are talking about fire access roads. Chapman would like a public road, not one that is closed to the public. A 24’ wide road verses a 20’ fire lane. (4 feet more) We have had poor success in maintaining fire lanes in this city. There is an enforcement problem we have on a perpetual basis. The primary road is off Fox Acres. All utilities are buried under there. At some point they will break and the road will need to be dug up. That will create delays or closures with one lane. A significant event at the school is a problem. A vehicle accident will shut the road.

Chapman showed slides of avalanches from last year, and recommended no buildings be built in the red zone but it may be possible to build in the blue zone with proper engineering. The bigger problem is shut off of access. An avalanche study showed 20 different places with avalanche shoots. They cut off or block secondary access roads. During a heavy snow some avalanches will cross the road. It will be like cement. He showed roads that will be effected and closed off during the clean up process for an uncertain period of time. City of Ketchum has this problem and they address it with supplying all rescue people with beacons. Other issues with avalanche areas are they are then prone to mudslides and debris slides.

Biggest concern is wildfire. Four years ago the City of Hailey received a grant to do an analysis of wildfire risks in and around the City of Hailey. There were many areas identified as high risks. However, what is lesser known and more common are that wildfires throw off embers that blow 1 to 2 miles away and ignite a home. Quigley is not more than a ½ mile wide.

During the Board Ranch Fire, or the Walnut Street Fire last year, there were 12 homes threatened by fire. All available resources in the County were used and we were able to defend 8 homes at one time. Chapman talked about the Indian Creek Fire 2 years ago. They were able to defend 6 homes at one time. The Oregon Trail fire in Boise used 225 fire fighters 45 fire apparatus. 10 homes were destroyed and 9 homes were damaged. Current thought is to build homes that don’t burn. Not to have more fire fighters and fire apparatus. If we had a fire like this in Quigley, some people will self evacuate and some people will want to go and look. Firefighters will need to get in. For all these reasons we are requiring dual access. The big question is, if it’s a fire lane or a secondary road. Chapman recommends a secondary road. Fire Lanes will have to remain open and a lot of details to worked out.

Chapman went on to present Deadman & Upper Canyon Conditions 1 & 2.

If we were to apply our current standards as they are now, the restrictions would be, no more than 5 homes allowed on a dead end roads, no buildings could be greater that 30’ in height from the lowest point of fire apparatus access to the highest point of the house. Must have fire department turnouts every 500 feet and the maximum road grade would be 6%. If you change the city code requirements it will apply to everything in the city and every where and to all future applicants. If we adopt the urban interface code this would allow buildings to be built where there are not secondary roads. Full fire suppression
sprinkler systems would be required in every house. This also requires houses to have class A roofs. They will also need adequate water supply, (hydrant or sprinkler system), will require ignition resistant siding metal gutter and downspouts, tempered windows and dual paned windows. Chapman explained that we would be looking for a house to protect itself. Bottom line is we can protect houses or we can build houses to resist fires.

Don Keirn asked what the maximum length of the road is before we have to have a secondary road. Chapman said 150 feet is a local code. If it's built under an Urban Interface Road there would be an exception.

Martha Burke asked what the difference is if the homes meet the urban interface construction? Chapman said that they would not need to protect the homes; they could just fight the fires. Brown pointed out the fires in San Diego last year and how the homes that were built to these standards did not burn and the other neighborhoods did.

Chapman advised that the federal government will in the future; send us a bill for their aide. Ketchum currently has a 2 million dollar bill from the Castle Rock Fire.

Haemmerle asked if Chapman has evaluated the applicant’s fire plan for Dead Mans Canyon. Chapman explained the he does feel they have a full fire plan. However, in the applicant’s defense you don’t normally lay out this plan until a later date. Haemmerle asked what would be required if Urban Interface is required. Chapman will get that information for council.

Conditions 1 & 2 also include water issues (This portion will be discussed next Thursday)

**Wild Life**
The commission looked at the Department of Fish & Games Recommendations. No one from Fish & Game could be here tonight but this can be discussed at another time when someone is present to discuss their issues in more detail. Fish & Game’s recommendations were to prohibit development in Dead Man’s Gulch and to significantly reduce the number of lots above the pond and in the mid Canyon area by clustering the development at the mouth of the canyon. The commission recommends prohibiting development in parcel 7. However, a portion of parcel 6 may not be appropriate for development.

**Conditions 4 and 30 – Hillside Areas, Open Space, Dedication** – Becki Keefer presented.

Condition 4 applies to hillside area that is equal or greater than 15%. The Parks & Lands Boards intent to recommend this was to reserve it for non public non motorized use. The proposal gets down to Parcel #6, south of the pond. Private lots extend up the hillside.

RGB zone allows recreational and municipal uses. This gives the city the right to reserve these parcels for unanticipated municipal uses in the future. The contentious part is parcel...
#6. The parcels are not allowed to be fenced and people may not know but they would be trespassing on private property.

Condition #30 – All public parks & open spaces should be dedicated to the city and open to the public except for the community garden which would be dedicated to the homeowners association. The board really wants to have it clear that the city is the owner and responsible for the maintenance of the parks. It is easier to manage and gives the citizen of Hailey ownership in these parcels.

Condition #25 – Active Playing Fields.
Keefer talked about the sizes of all the parks and summed up 14.6 acres of usable acres in 5 parks. Parks & Lands Board wants to be sure that the parks serve the immediate needs to the homes around it. Parks & Lands Board was not prepared to ask the developer to reconfigure these smaller park spaces into fewer larger park spaces. They felt that future review of these individual park spaces could ensure that the park spaces serve community neighborhoods. If we don’t carefully plan parks in the community parks we could have problems. Traffic should be an issue. Foxmoor Park is an example.

The applicant is currently providing community recreation but the trail system is extremely important to the broader community.

Condition 10 – Maximum Lot Size
The main reason the commission addresses the lot size was to maintain distinction between county land use pattern and city land use pattern. Development could be clustered into more appropriate areas and maintain open space beyond area impacted by development. The main purpose was clustering development, keeping lots smaller, more efficient use of land, being able to provide more open space beyond the areas impacted.

Condition 19 – Maintenance of Private streets
- Private streets are the result of PUD application where a waiver of the minimum Right of Way (ROW) width is granted.
- Property owners are responsible for snowplowing and street maintenance on existing Private Streets.
- No credit is given to property owners.

The trade off in granting private streets is a reduction of the right of way. The developer instead of getting a 60 foot right of way, 36 foot right of way is the dimension they usually go with.

Alleys would be privately maintained and plowed. Hellen has concerns because of snow removal. Normally when this happens, the snow is plowed into the city streets and then the city is responsible for hauling and moving the snow away. The rest of the roads would be maintained.
Haemmerle asked what would happen if the roads were not maintained by the homeowner’s association? Do we have any course of action? Hellen said we could try but we struggle with that now.

**Condition 28 - Golf Course Ownership**
Robrahn announced that Ned Williamson, City Attorney would like to brief Mayor and Council on where we are with conversations with the BCRD.

Williamson said that condition 28 states that the Planning & Zoning Commission recommends that the land for the golf course and the Nordic center be deeded to the city or that the city would have sub control of the facility. In addition they state the golf course and Nordic facility will remain for public use in perpetuity but there is also a section that says if operation should cease for any reason it would revert back to open space. Williamson stated that he does not know of an agreement between the applicant and the BCRD. There have been preliminary discussions and talked about how they would do this. It was decided to await the Fiscal Impact Study we are anticipating in late January or early February to see what kind of impact there will be in the City of Hailey. We will have this discussion after the study is completed.

**Condition 33 – Migration Corridor Width**
Planning and Zoning Commission recommended that all migration corridors be a minimum of 500 feet. Based on Idaho Fish and Game (IDFG) letter and recommendations, the applicant is requesting that one of the corridors be 450 feet rather than 500 feet. Robrahn suggested IDFG attend a future meeting to address this with council. Mayor would like them to attend a future meeting.

Hellen said that in answer to Haemmerle’s earlier question regarding the traffic on Quigley, the traffic will double. Carol Brown had a question regarding private streets. Could you access public lands on Deadman’s Gulch? That is a private road but when we plat them, we do mandate access from a public road.

Haemmerle asked if there is any way to discourage use to a secondary road. Chapman said you could make it one way and have clear signage. Haemmerle would like more information on how to discourage traffic and still keep it open. He is requesting information from staff and the applicant. Chapman said he will do further research.

Brown asked about Blaine County School Districts (BCSD) rights in this matter. Mike Chatterton said the BCSD is treated like a government agency. It is involved because of the future school sites because of the growth of citizens. This will impact the school sites. Future growth will be dependant on buying land on the open market.

**The Mayor opened the meeting up to the applicant for public comment.**

Dave Hennessey spoke and advised that they were fine with the Community Housing Condition #6. Caution is that it’s a long term development that could take 10 years.
In regards to Secondary access, Dave Hennessey said he has one other clarification he wanted to note regarding wild land urban interface. All the green areas should be treated as urban interface roads. In addition to that plan they have done a full fuel analysis on Quigley and it has been submitted to Chapman. Hennessey said they also have a list of fire wise criteria that has been imposed. He pointed out where Hellen said they could add single access roads. The roads that are left to single access are restricted typographically in terms of getting the roads to them. With the additional fire access roads they are talking it would give dual access to some of the houses in the green area. 70% to 80% of the homes would be serviced by one public road and one fire access road.

Mayor Davis requested more information for staff and council on the fire wise protection restrictions they want to put on something or talking about dual access that be given in a map form and be outlined for council to review. They will resubmit and Chapman will be turning in his evaluation.

(Beth - Who was talking) some of these real details are maybe better discussed later than at the annexation point. It’s appropriate to talk about these issues but he feels you have another shot to talk about this depending upon what areas Quigley would be allowed to develop and how it’s going to be developed.

(Beth – Who was talking) Approximately 65% of the homes are being served by dual access roads. About 78% – 80% of the homes maybe more if they do the additional emergency exits would be serviced by one public street and one emergency access road. There are very few homes that won’t be served by 2 public street access roads. There are several design techniques which they have used in the past have been very acceptable to a variety of different fire departments discouraging public travel on a fire lane. Haemmerle clarified that he means public streets.

Dave Hennessey said there is room for a U9 soccer field in the central park area. He pointed out that on Condition 19 – in the areas that Planning & Zoning Commission recommended that the roads be private. Hennessey wanted to emphasize that they are not smaller streets. They did not reduce the right of ways in those areas. They were not trying to grab more land. There was a discussion on who requested the private street. Ned Williamson thought Quigley requested the private streets. Quigley thought the City requested them. Hennessey showed the maps for clarification on what everyone was talking about. Williamson talked about condition 23. Robrahn clarified that Williamson was commenting and looking at documents that were presented to the Planning & Zoning Commission. This condition was incorporated into condition 19. Robrahn suggested going back to clarify this condition for Council. Haemmerle clarified a private street would only serve 5 or fewer homes. Brown asked again for clarity on this matter.

Evan Robertson wanted to mention that we all heard tonight that the dedication for everything over 15% can be used for unspecified municipal uses. He said that was the reason they were concerned. The homeowners want to have control over these things that are right next to their homes and development. The concern is that the city would have control over land surrounding homes. Robertson spoke on the lot size restriction to ½
acre. Staff stated that this was to keep the areas urban in character. Again, if they limit
the disturbed area to ½ acre, they could accomplish the same thing.

Robrahn pointed out that all documents handed out tonight will be on web in the next day
or so and asked if all people who didn’t speak on Monday could speak first.

The Mayor opened the meeting up to public hearing.

Jim Keating Executive Director of Blaine County Recreation District. The BCRD’s
goals, in relationship to the golf course, is to use all proceeds to fund the programs and
the Blaine County Aquatic Center. Keating commented on the recreational portfolio.
BCRD sees the overall package and portfolio as being exceptional. He emphasized that
it’s important to look at the whole portfolio. The trail system (paved and single track),
the huge Nordic skiing opportunity. More families are going out there and it’s affordable
and close.

Larry Newton, 601 Beach St, Bellevue. Mr. Newton wanted to address wildlife.
Quigley has the last mule deer in the Big Wood River. You can see at least 200 deer
here. We have to give consideration to the wildlife; it affects the whole eco system.

Richard Stopol 150 6th Avenue, Hailey. Mr. Stopol said the recreational package
sounds great. He feels 2/3rds of the houses in the valley should not have been allowed to
be built. Traffic is an ongoing issue. You can only have so many people in the valley
until is starts to degrade the quality of life. He likes what the Planning & Zoning
Commission has put in their recommendations. He thinks the density is too high.

Nathan Welch, Wood River Land Trust (WRLT) 408 N 1st Ave. WRLT is a non
profit organization. He expresses some areas of concern one of them being the
developments proposed up the canyon in portions of the development. Welch feels that
upper canyon lots enable an automobile dependant society and isolate some residents
from town. It also impacts wildlife. Welch supports the Planning & Zoning, Parks and
Lands Board and Department of Fish and Game’s recommendations. WRLT is in the
business of Long Term land conservation. The WRLT goal is to preserve open spaces
and to protect water and wild life but also provide public access. They think about higher
level’s of protection that are going to last. CCR’s are great, but they can be easily
changed over time. They like to support ideas of dedication, 3rd party enforcement and
conservation easements. They are interested in transfer development rights. It’s also
important to think about Hailey’s West Wing. He is curious about the 400 acres that are
owned by the applicant that are not part of this application. He is submitting written
comments as well as maps.

Eric Rector, 651 Con Virginia. He feels this is a very important summer plan and a
great chance for the city to connect with some summer use out there. This is important to
us and a lot of our kids. You have a chance to put a world class Nordic Center in Hailey
This is a huge opportunity to a lot of us and our kids who are growing up here.
Vanessa Cosgrove-Frye, Visitors for Smart Growth – Regarding community hosting. The County is going through re-writing their community housing in the development overlay. She discussed the phasing of a property the size of Quigley and the importance of having community housing phased. Another area of high concern is regarding the land areas that are 15% engraved. This is to protect the views of the county. We are very fortunate not to look into the hills and see lights at night. She is suggesting a conservation easement or an easement of some sort.

John Miesa, 1141 Buckskin – Traffic is an issue. He talked about primary and secondary designation and the design or structural difference between these 2 roads. Traffic Counts – The traffic counts he feels were diluted. The counter should be at the mouth of Quigley canyon. He had questions regarding the 216 number.

John Delorenzo, 100 Mustang Lane in Bellevue – Mr. Delorenzo thinks the Planning & Zoning Commission has spent a lot of time reviewing this application and wants to reiterate the wildlife, and public access and fish and game recommendations. He spends a lot of time hunting mountain lions from Ketchum south on snow mobiles. Quigley has the largest concentration of Mule Deer and Elk in the area. This is a thriving ecosystem in the winter.

Greg Randolph, 540 Deertrail Dr. Mr. Randolph has concerns with the traffic flow. If Quigley is built out to its 379 lots, it’s going to lead to the same race way that happens at lunch from the high school. The primary access is going to be the North end of the neighborhood. Mr. Randolph said that as far as recreation is concerned, it would be a disservice to the community if you don’t allow BCRD to operate this area. He would like to keep development down in this county. The abundance of wildlife is worth considering.

Andy Harding 416 Mother Lode Loop – The school district is going to need more property. He hasn’t heard of anything being donated to the school district. Wildlife is important and fire protection is interesting. If we only have enough people and equipment to protect 8 houses, the whole canyon should be built to Urban Interface Standards. Size of lots and house is important.

The next Council meeting is scheduled for January 15th. They will be discussing water and waste water.

Mayor Davis adjourned the meeting at 7:45pm.