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.

OPENING REMARKS

Mayor McBryant made opening remarks in recognition of Joe Maccarillo, a former Hailey City Council members and community businessman who had recently passed away.

OATH OF OFFICE

Mayor McBryant administered the oath of office to incumbent council members Martha Burke and Don Keirn re-elected to another four-year term of office.

Brown moved to appoint Rick Davis as Council President. Burke seconded; the motion carried unanimously (with Davis having recused himself).

Davis noted that during the years he served on the Hailey City Council with Joe Maccarillo, the office of council president had been held by Maccarillo.

CONSENT AGENDA

The following items were pulled from the consent agenda: CA-3, CA-5, CA-7, CA-8, CA-9, CA-11, CA-14, and CA-16.

Brown then moved to approve the remaining consent agenda items including CA-2, CA-4, CA-6, CA-10, CA-12, CA-13, CA-15. Davis seconded; the motion carried unanimously.

CA  2 Motion to approve lease between City of Hailey and Jim Hill for use of property at 303 2nd Ave So for snow storage.
CA  3 Motion to approve architectural agreement for Woodside Fire Station design
CA  4 Motion to approve update of LYNX Library Consortium Agreement
CA  5 Motion to approve Water Tank Construction Engineering Services Contract (Task Order No. 7) with Carollo Engineers
CA  6 Motion to approve minutes of November 10, 2005 joint city council/planning & Zoning commission meeting and to suspend reading of them.
CA  7 Motion to approve minutes of November 29, 2005 city council meeting and to suspend reading of them
CA  8 Motion to approve minutes of December 12, 2005 regular city council meeting and to suspend reading of them

CA  9 Motion to approve minutes of December 16, 2005 special city council meeting and to suspend reading of them

CA  10 Motion to approve minutes of January 2, 2006 special city council meeting and to suspend reading of them

CA 11 Motion to approve release of $16,000 bond to Thomas Development, and transfer maintenance responsibility for Balmoral Park to the City.

CA 12 Motion to authorize signature of State Historical Preservation Grant Agreement, authorizing expenses of $2500 in grant funds with a matching cash contribution of

CA 13 Motion to approve Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision for Bluebird Subdivision, Final Plat.

CA 14 Motion to approve taxi licenses for 2006

CA 15 Motion to approve claims for expenses paid in December, 2005

CA 16 Motion to approve bid for Quigley Water Storage Tank Construction of $2,692,254 submitted by RSCI, and to authorize city staff to negotiate contract with RSCI

CA 3 – Woodside Fire Station Architectural Agreement
Williamson said he and Fire Chief Mike Chapman had held a conversation with architect Tom Zabala, who was open to the contract changes Williamson had suggested. They are mostly grammatical changes, with only 2 of significance, one use of the term “not to exceed sum” and the other to eliminate some ambiguity regarding construction and administration services, more clearly outlined in another part of the agreement. Brown felt the changes minor and she was comfortable with approving them. She moved and Keirn seconded to approve the Woodside Fire Station contract. The motion carried unanimously.

CA 5 and CA 16 – Water Storage Tank Engineering Contract and Construction Bids
Williamson said these two matters go hand in hand, and he wanted some language added to task No. 7, where subtasks have been added. A major portion of this contract is construction observation. He was comfortable with that language. The bid for Quigley water storage tank is $2,692,254, well over the amount that was budgeted of $2.4 million. When combined with the engineering contract, the water storage tank project amounts to $2.9 million, a full half-million dollars over our starting budget. He advised the council that it can either authorize the bid, and get the remainder of the money through the water fund, or re-bid the matter. This is already the second bid put out on this project. One argument for re-bidding again is that prices may be settling back down after the spike in prices following last fall’s hurricane Katrina.

Hellen said we bid this project in June, 2005 and the bids came in at this same level. This second bid was put out in September, 2005. The low bidder the first time around was now the high bidder. Prices are still inching their way up. He was reluctant to re-bid it because who knows what will happen the second time around. Three bids were received each time. Hellen said there is plenty of money in the water fund to use on this project.
Davis said we are wasting time; we need that water storage tank. Without the tank we’re putting our downtown core in jeopardy. Brown suggested talking to DEQ about more loan money. Hellen said DEQ has no more loan funds to offer. McBryant said in most households you wouldn’t overspend to that degree. Hellen said redesigning the tank would delay the project even more. Burke said if we delay, the bid may be even higher.

Brown moved to approve the water tank construction bid for $2.6 million, and the Carollo Contract for engineer services to oversee the construction of the water storage tank. Davis seconded; the motion carried unanimously.

CA 11 Balmoral Park Bond
Williamson recommended retaining $2500 of the $16,000 Balmoral Park bond until the city is assured that the trees will survive, a proposal agreed to by Tom Manshrek. Davis moved to release $13,500 of the bond to Thomas Development, retaining $2,500 for surety against the trees.

CA 14 Taxi License Renewals
Dawson said completed taxi business license applications have been received from four companies, including Sun Valley Chauffeur, Hailey Taxi, A-1 Taxi, and Airport Cab, with all applications approved by the Hailey Police Department. Burke moved to approve the taxi licenses as submitted by the clerk; Keirn seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

CA 7 Minutes of November 29, 2005
Burke said that Dawson had listed some of the items had been left out of Management Partners’ future capital acquisition plan, and wanted those items included in the minutes. Brown moved and Burke seconded that the minutes be rewritten and brought back to the council for approval.

CA 8 Minutes of December 12, 2005
Burke noted that the minutes show a motion wherein she both moved and seconded its approval. Brown clarified that she had made that motion and Burke seconded. Burke also corrected the minutes to delete the whole sentence about ex parte communication during the animal control discussion. McBryant added the word “proposal” to interim moratorium noticed under LLUPA. Burke moved to approve the minutes of December 12, 2005 as amended. Brown seconded; the motion carried unanimously.

Ca 9 Minutes of December 16, 2005
Mayor McBryant corrected the minutes to show that she had not been present. Brown moved to approve the minutes as amended; Burke seconded; the motion carried unanimously.

SECOND READING ANIMAL CONTROL LEASH LAW – ORD 932

Davis presented letters from Larry Huck and Shar Boyd and a petition to retain the leash law. McBryant read the second reading of proposed Ordinance 932 by title only.
OLD CUTTERS ANNEXATION

City Planning Director Kathy Grotto said the Old Cutters Annexation application was received in August of 2003, and certified as complete in September of 2003. On March 8, 2004 the city council remanded the annexation to the Hailey Planning and Zoning Commission, who made recommendations on August 16, 2004. On August 23, 2004, the city council put annexations on hold for ordinance and process revisions, and a new annexation process ordinance was adopted in November of 2004. The Growth Management component of the Hailey Comprehensive Plan was adopted in January of 2005, after which the council again considered the Old Cutters annexation application in Feb 2005, at which time, following public hearing, the council tabled the application pending completion of a fiscal impact study. Management Partners was chosen by the applicant, and that company’s fiscal report was presented to the council on November 29, 2005. In its information packet for this meeting the council has findings of fact from the Hailey Planning and Zoning Commission, and some public comment letters including one from Bill Schlunegger. A document outlining the benefits of the annexation, dated February 2004, is included as well.

Grotto said finalization of whether the streets and alleys should be public or private, whether the parks and greenspace should be public or privately owned and/or maintained, and some traffic and safety issues still need to occur. The staff report was based on a plan that was submitted last month, in which the unit count was 123 units, but the location of the duplex lots was different. The plan that the applicant will display tonight may have 146 units, with the addition of housing following the adoption of Hailey’s new inclusionary housing ordinance.

Jim Speck displayed the actual plan which was given to Grotto last month. Since then, Hailey adopted a new community housing ordinance. An increase in the number of units was devised to make that new ordinance a part of the plan. Cottage lots are referred to in the plan, and these are sites for townhomes. The plan proposes 24 community housing units, 12 of which would meet the Blaine County/Ketchum Housing Authority deed restriction concept. The other twelve would be location restricted (the Telluride concept); to qualify for buying one a buyer must live and work in the Wood River Valley, and is given first priority if s/he works in emergency services. Because these townhome units are quite small, the population increase over this plan will go from 323 to 350, only an 8 percent increase. He said Hailey doesn’t need a cottage ordinance; this can be done under the PUD provision of the subdivision ordinance. Hailey’s subdivision ordinance allows 10 townhomes per acre, and this proposal is for 14.5 townhomes per acre, one for every 3000 square feet. Each of the cottage lots will be developed with townhomes, with site specific shared common space. This is a subdivision plan that is progressive and environmentally sensitive. The plan uses good community planning concepts. Not all the cottage units would be community housing, 9 of them would be full market units. They would be dispersed among each other, and it won’t be evident which ones are deed-restricted and which ones are not. The added density from the cottage units create a significant separation between existing homes and the new townhome sites. Generally, a 10,000 square foot lot would house 5 people. With only 6 townhome units on the same 20,000 square feet, only 9 people would inhabit these opposed to 10.
John Campbell said the houses will be efficient to live in and will accomplish a sense of community, keeping the houses at a human scale with front porches and open space in which to interact and still have privacy. They will be of high quality construction and affordable, and will create pocket neighborhoods of detached cottages and houses. He presented a bibliography of references of professionals in support of this type of housing. Houses are configured around a common green, with shared parking spaces arranged around a common courtyard, with parking clustered together. Residents will have to walk from their cars to their houses, which encourages the sense of community. The front porches are configured so that you can see other front porches. The units are of quality architecture. A 1200 square foot house would be built on 3000 square feet of land. He displayed a map that had circled areas, where the community housing would be located. A mixture of the three types of cottage uses (deed, Telluride, and market) will be in each circle. The distance from the west of the property line to the first cottage is 96 feet. The setbacks comply with the existing GR setbacks. The floor plans can really be quite livable. The smallest unit would be 600 square feet, and the largest 1200.

Speck said he had submitted a letter to the council on Friday. He proposed a total of 2 million dollars in annexation fees for all units, including the community housing units, a $13,700 per unit average. In addition, the applicant will give the city a site and easement for a water storage tank. The applicant would not ask for a credit for that land. The applicant will provide a park if annexed, and the open space above the 25% slope includes 65 acres that will be deeded to the city, and below the 25% slope, with the park and pond, the area would become the city’s property. The city will get the 24 community housing units. We will provide the water rights necessary to irrigate the project. Management Partners provided revised numbers, which changed the water/wastewater component of the annexation fee to $731,222, and increased the total fee to $2,286,772. If we went to that fee, we would ask for credits, as Airport West did, which would require the city to come up with some sort of mechanism to reimburse the property for funding certain improvements, or otherwise the same property would be asked to do the same thing twice. We wouldn’t be looking for any kind of reimbursement in the future. The city can conclude that this won’t result in any negative fiscal impact to the city. It is correct that under the zoning we could get 181 units for the straight subdivision. If we were develop in the county, we would be entitled to a 20% density bonus, for a total of 220 units in the county. Airport West developed 67 acres of R.1, with a county maximum of 67 units – a tremendous density bonus coming into the city. The way the zoning is recommended and10 acres are identified for a park, Cutters is left with only 34 acres of GR, which normally would allow 170 units in the GR portion of the development. In light of this, a density change in terms of population is not significant at 8%. Speck said the city has the authority to annex subject to arriving at an annexation agreement.

Williamson said the applicant has requested a decision, but Williamson did not feel a final decision should be made tonight. The council and public should consider the new information in this changed application. The public at large would not necessarily know where those units are and where they should be considered. Within this proposal is a request for cottage units, which Hailey can’t consider because the subdivision ordinance does not
allow these types of units. The applicant could propose a waiver of minimum lot sizes through the PUD process. Williamson said if the council is inclined to annex the property, he would need to work on the annexation agreement. Williamson said in his memo he relied on the figures provided by Tom Bergin of the county planning office.

Carol Brown said this has the feel of a different application than what was reviewed by the Hailey Planning and Zoning Commission. She asked about procedure. Grotto said if this were an actual subdivision, it would go back to the commission, but since it’s an annexation, it’s pretty discretionary. Williamson said the commission had determined that the annexation application complied with Hailey’s comprehensive plan provided there wasn’t a negative fiscal impact.

McBryant said the applicant is displaying only an 8% population increase, but an 18% increase in actual units. She said that is a substantial number. She said getting Speck’s letter is appreciated, and will be made part of the annexation application, but it came late in the day. She told the public that we don’t know how many units we are talking about, because we don’t have an agreement that has been debated.

Carol Brown asked how the council can have a meaningful discussion about cottage housing when it can’t consider that option. Speck said the units are stand alone townhouses. Brown said our ordinance does require townhouses to be attached within GR.

Mayor McBryant opened the public hearing.

Wynn Bird of 651 East Myrtle Street said the subdivision as proposed would be beautiful. She asked the council to consider how the people that live in that subdivision are going to get to Main Street. She said she will not allow her daughters to walk down the hill on Myrtle Street because it is already unsafe. We need to consider how we’re going to get the cars to Main Street, and the impact of this annexation on our water and sewer systems.

Gina Lagagren of 215 East Myrtle said her concern is the traffic on Myrtle Street. When she bought her house in 1981, Myrtle Street was a dead-end street. Residents are very sensitive to traffic on Myrtle. Traffic should be distributed onto several streets. There are other slopes further down, such as on Bullion, with a more moderate approach to town. If indeed this represents a smaller density possibility, she is still concerned about getting traffic out of the subdivision to the community.

Tony St George of 308 South First said he loved the cottage buildings. He was concerned about snow storage. He imagined the subdivision full of young people without kids, owning 1.5 cars, hiking up icy sidewalks from their cars to their housing units. Near the Puget Sound and in California that would be great walk, but here there is snow.

Bill Hughes of 241 Eureka Drive wasn’t here when we discussed the county’s density. The applicant wouldn’t be asking for annexation if the same density could be derived in the county. The council needs to consider looking at annexation of lands in between Cutters and Hailey. Hughes said he sat through meetings and heard inventory as a rationale for
approving this type of development, but with everything on the market, it’s a reason not to approve; there’s plenty of inventory.

Matt Furber of 301 N Second Avenue said watching this annexation process has been like watching a dysfunctional relationship. He sees this as an opportunity for the city to make its voice heard on a regional level. Density is something that adds to our community, or it’s all over. Density is like that waking dragon, people fear it, but it might be a friendly dragon. This application should be used as an example, let them have more density, put in a bus system, bury Myrtle Street under Buttercup, do something progressive. Make the trail connected; and use the opportunity to make density a really friendly dragon.

Becki Keefer, speaking on behalf of the Hailey Parks and Lands Board, advocated the recreational interests of the city of Hailey. Water rights and available irrigation should be dedicated to the city for all non-hillside greenspace. Dedication of the hillside lands and park expansion lands and pond should be to the city, to help to offset the impacts of the annexation. The Parks and Trails Master Plan anticipates seeing more details on the trails through subdivision review process, which may or may not happen, so she didn’t know how this would be worked out. The board felt the trail system as depicted is a first good draft which needs additional details.

Andy Harding of 416 Motherlode Loop was opposed to that sort of density, which is not appropriate in the surrounding neighborhoods.

Michael David of 222 Galena commended the applicant on thinking out of the box. He concurred with much of what Matt Furber said. The issue of density is something we are all struggling with. We will have growth until people stop having babies. This is an opportunity; we do need to look at inventory and proper well design, but have an opportunity to provide good homes comprised of smaller units with good space.

Mary Peterson of 711 East Myrtle said she is concerned about the traffic on Myrtle. It is true that our properties are larger in Dove Meadows. She hated to see it going to smaller density in the county.

Chris Shotts concurred with the comments about traffic. He liked the plan; he liked the density, but was concerned with the safety of kids. The change in density from close to town, out to larger lots, then back to density doesn’t seem right; that aspect needs to be facilitated properly.

John Henning of 112 South Hiawatha also was concerned about the traffic, and felt that had been well addressed by many. He was also concerned about water. The area across from his house had nice mature pine trees. He urged the council to look hard at whether this fits with existing housing and existing lots in that area.

Kirk Funkhouser of 1121 Queen of the Hills, said the developer has bent over backwards to appease the city, and still no decision has been made. He would like to see a decision made. He is in favor of the application; the city council is not telling the applicant what to do.
Lisa Lindner of 8 Buttercup said having that density on the periphery is tough on residents there. She is a horse owner and wanted to be able to access the hills and the integrity of the irrigation canal should still stay in tact.

Brad Bjorst of 125 South Hiawatha said he owns a townhouse in Driggs, but the houses are 1300 square feet. He said this project could easily propose this many units on 4 times as much land. He had a problem with the design concept.

Steven Poklemba of 130 South Hiawatha said of the 57 properties that surround that land, 30 or more have horses. As far as putting more density, the amount of fertilizers and pesticides that come from homes or cars are a concern. There are many other applications where they are going to get huge subdivisions. What are we going to look at way down the road, growth is contentious by nature. Doubt has followed this project from the start; when in doubt, don’t. Each increment of expansion can obscure the downside.

Lindy Pockock of Broadway Boulevard in Ketchum said there’s no place for newcomers or young people to go and establish ourselves now. It would be great to have the opportunity to have a place to keep the integrity of people, the way its been in the past.

Kyle Basinger of 413 Warm Springs said this is an opportunity to move somewhere and own a home. He wanted to live here, which, in order to be affordable, he needs to be able to own something.

Denise Thomas of 102 Horshoe Circle said the density that is proposed as contrary to moving out to larger places. When you have the county surrounded by the city without annexing the whole box, you are getting the cart before the horse. How do you get a half a person in a house or a half a car in the parking lot?

Gina Lagagren proposed one possible solution regarding the discrepancy in the lot size. She had some empathy on that subject; and asked if there is any validity to the concept to keeping larger lots at the outside, not close in.

Chris Grahwold of 717 South River Street spoke about the value of different neighborhoods.

Mayor McBryant closed the public hearing. Dawson reminded the council that during its last two meetings, bids had been considered on two projects, both of which came in approximately $500,000 over budget. The city is facing increasing costs daily. She urged that it is unwise to tie an annexation fee agreement to a conceptual plan’s number of lots. The subdivision plan will take on a life of its own through the public hearing processes for the subdivision, and the number of lots as well as the configuration of lots is likely to change in response to public comments. She suggested that the annexation fee be considered in flat terms, and proposed that a starting point be $3 million.

Davis asked Chapman about fire insurance. Chapman said there are ways to get some of the Cutter’s property into an acceptable radius from the fire station, and he has been talking with
WW Rural about shared spaces. If enough houses are built outside that service area, it can result in a lower rating for fire area. Currently Hailey’s fire rating is at a level 4. If it went to a level 5 it would cost roughly a million dollars per year for rate payers of Hailey. He said everything north of McKercher Boulevard and south of Countryside Boulevard is increasing that discrepancy.

Keirn said in comparing Speck’s letter with annexation benefits given a year ago, fire station and fire endowment have come off the table. Speck said they are off the table. Keirn asked Williamson if the 131 units under the county is the maximum. Williamson said he had pulled that number straight from Bergin’s presentation.

McBryant had three key points. The fire issue is now off the table, and that is an issue. Each one here will pay proportionately higher on homeowners insurance. She had a problem leaving an island of county between annexed property and the city. The city has just embarked in pursuit of a local option tax, which is only viable if the city is 10,000 residents or less. Hailey is estimated to have 8500 people now, with a proposal for 400 plus units currently under process within our existing boundaries. We have trouble providing services within our core, bringing new residences into the city diminishes our need to find other funding needs. She hoped to give the applicant enough information tonight for them to know whether they should move on, although we can’t give a final approval tonight.

Keirn said his calculations regarding annexation fees had arrived at 3 million dollars. The island thing has bothered him. The fire station is a must. Water is an issue.

Davis said that land will be developed in the county or in the city, and the city will be impacted either way. Both sides have great points. He is concerned about Myrtle Street. We reap the benefit of the tax base or lose that totally. McBryant urged the council not to be afraid that we’ll have impacts if the property develops in the county. We’ll have to rethink how we do business with the county. We may have to bill back to the county, or the county can step to the plate and do their part in responding to calls. We will have more people shopping in city, there’s a benefit. Don’t be afraid of this project being in the county.

Burke said she is in favor of the annexation because our little community is changing, we need the fire station, we want water to be accessible with pressure downtown. The water rights issue has not been resolved, traffic and safety is a concern she surely understands because she lives on Bullion Street. We do have to mitigate on almost every street. Spread it out. We have to require at least 3 million dollars, and maybe some land for a fire station too. She doesn’t buy any comparison of this development with the Airport West project. The parks stuff seems good, she actually understands this cottage concept - we did it in a different way with the Bunkhouses in Woodside. When Williamson started talking about tools, this is probably the kind of thing we have to be prepared to look at in some way. The irrigation canal and alley, cottage component, road in the form of a driveway, that’s a problem because it almost creates double-fronted lots. If you want to consider cottage housing for the elderly, they will need attached garages. We have to talk about if the parks are donated to the city, with some kind of fund, the elk foundation should own the park lands on the hillside. Density is a huge problem. Burke said if she thought all of these homes were
going to be second homes that would diminish our community, there would be no support for
downtown. She wanted to insure these homes would be inhabited by people who work in the
valley.

Carol Brown felt we have a huge opportunity, and we should look seriously at annexing this.
She is not afraid of this property developing in the county, and yet 2025 says density should
be in and around cities; she has understood clearly what she’s been hearing from the county.
The project as shown contains superb design elements. The mix of density, large and small,
is not the cookie cutter same size repetitive housing. Although we can’t talk about the
cottage housing, she is intrigued. She said Dawson’s advice on fees is good advice. She
concurred with the parks and lands board that water rights should be obtained to be used for
irrigation. On parks, she would take the board’s recommendation. A fire facility is a must,
especially the land for it. She wanted to see a proposal for a sidewalk down to the
intersection of Buttercup and Myrtle, and a left hand turn lane in the county on Buttercup.
We were presented with a plan of 123 units, and our commission reviewed that plan and the
community housing would be within that. She had a level of discomfort that this isn’t what
they reviewed. She said a commuter bus shelter should be constructed, and homeowner’s
fees should assess a tiny percentage monthly to help fund transit.

McBryant said she is hearing interest in pursuing this if the city can get past some big issues.
The council would like to approve the annexation and would like to have the dialogue. It
may make some sense to continue this to a date certain with the instruction that she or one
member of the council meet with the applicant and do some negotiation and let them decide
if they want to continue. She was not comfortable in the council making a motion that in any
way represents a vesting.

**Brown moved to continue the annexation application to the first meeting in February,**
and that the mayor assign a council member of her choice to meet with the applicant.
Burke seconded; the motion carried unanimously.

**HYBRID PRODUCTION FACILITIES TEXT AMENDMENT**

Shay said the Hailey Coffee Company roasts their beans down the block and across the street
from the coffee house. Hybrid production facilities are only permitted in the business
district. The manufacturing has to happen on the same premises it’s sold upon. The text
amendment allows it to happen on one or more sites under the conditional use permit
process.

Mayor McBryant opened the public hearing. There was none.

Brown said with the CUP addressing both sites, she was comfortable. Davis moved that the
city council adopt Ordinance 933, and read the first reading by title only. Brown seconded;
the motion carried unanimously.

**CITY RISK MANAGEMENT and SAFETY/LOSS POLICY**
McBryant said there will be shifts in who is designated as Risk Manager from time to time, and it is important too that annually the city review the policy annually. She presented a revised Policy which expanded the term “risk manager” to “the mayor or designated risk manager”. She has been discussing both safety and risk, which are critical elements, with department heads, and asking that some thought be applied in the smaller departments on what risk is. She had drafted a policy acceptance form for all employees to sign.

Williamson asked this policy is not part of our personnel policy? The acknowledgement that was attached is fine in concept, but there are some things that are added to that acknowledgement that should be part of the personnel manual. McBryant didn’t mind weaving this into the personnel policy. He said we adopted this policy by resolution, and should do so as such again.

Brown moved to support the policy, with instruction to approve it by resolution at the next meeting. Keirn seconded; the motion carried unanimously.

WORKSHOP

Williamson said he had sent a memo about the community housing ordinance, and wondered when the council would deal with it. Keirn and Davis were appointed to work out the solution.

Brown said she attended a leadership training session, and one of the topics that came up after learning new skills was community housing. What came up was to have the cities and county more actively involved in the board.

The council unanimously supported that Brown sign a memorandum in pursuit of this matter.

Brown noted that January 18 is the next KART Board meeting, and she’ll be attending that.

Brown said the highway corridor Draft Environmental Impact Statement is out, and we have 45 days to give our comments. We share a lot of the same concerns as does Bellevue, and we should get Transpo Group to do this as a joint project. Hellen said he will be prepared with public comments at the public hearing which will be held at the senior citizen center. In June or July ITD will do a micro-seal on the highway between Hailey and Ketchum. This is an opportunity before the whole highway goes black to change something about lane widths. The next open house and technical group meeting will focus on that. Brown said politically it is so much stronger if the two communities of Bellevue and Hailey combine their comments.

McBryant asked the council to attend an open house for public comments on January 26th.

Davis said Al Stevenson resigned as the Chamber President. Gary Coates of Marketron is the new Chamber President.
Keirn said the housing board meets tomorrow night. Jim Spinelli, Julie Ingram, and Keirn are going to meet later this week to work out a program to talk to the commissioners about there being no light industrial development in the county.

OPEN SESSION

Al Lindley said he wanted to present an opportunity to the city council, and distributed documents that invited the city to go to a city manager form of government. The biggest benefit is related to growth. He said the city has personnel problems, and the financial issues are not changing; a thousand dollars here, 2 million dollars there. Under that form of government there would be better review of conflicting ordinances. He said the city administrator form didn’t work last time, and he proposed the city manager scenario.

Geoff Moore of 1250 Woodside was concerned about the location of the bus pick up site. There are kids sitting on the snowbank with their feet in the road. McBryant said it is movable, and Brown added that it would be a great idea to put a pull-out there. He asked what the city’s values are in terms of alley way maintenance. McBryant said obstruction of the alleys aren’t allowed, such as creating a wall of snow that’s impassable.

Davis moved to go into executive session for land acquisition and pending litigation. Burke seconded; the motion carried unanimously. The council went into executive session at 9:10 p.m., and emerged to close the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

__________________________
Susan McBryant, Mayor

Heather Dawson, City Clerk