



---

Council discussed if it was correct process to include information they received today and would it have affected earlier P&Z decision? Concluded that this is a new stand-alone hearing so would not have affected P&Z decision.

**Staff report:** At 10/17/2016 P&Z hearing, owners Dr. Robert and Mrs. Dixie Bloom asked to vacate water pipeline easement in order to sell vacant lot. Easement crosses upper part of Lot 5 and small bottom portion of Lot 6 which they own.

**Findings:** Notice and publication dates. Easement platted since 1975; not currently in use but city does not consider pipeline abandoned. No public comment received. Public works recommends retention of pipeline easement to serve future property development.

**Questions for staff:** Steve discussed wording of “future property development” when they don’t have a water pipeline there right now; could not build house on it because of this easement; why would a waterline be put through the center of building area; waterline installed before subdivision approved this lot.

**Presentation by applicant:** (By Karolyn for Dr. and Mrs. Bloom who could not be there.) The Blooms were one of original landowners since 1975 when county accepted. Blooms want to sell these properties but Lot 5 falls away and only viable building site is where easement exists. Because they contend waterline is no longer in use and there are additional locations available for future waterline easements along boundary line instead of center as has been done in other locations they propose vacation. Propose new developer could be responsible to pay for any new waterline and use lot line easement. If eliminated as building lot is costly ~ \$1200/year tax revenue. House would increase taxes about \$3000.

**Testimony of proponents:** James Zemlika: sees no problem with this; current waterline no longer usable except as chase; new developments would need new larger waterline that could use lot line and this one no longer needed; there is a new 14” line that could be tapped into and other options; very interested in seeing new development; taxes would help for road improvements; property devaluated and owners would contest; tax increase more like \$6000; gorgeous home site. Email from Milt Walker: in favor of vacating waterline easement; further, with no planned use is opportune time to remove waterline easement from all properties affected

**Testimony of uncommitted:** None

**Testimony of opponents:** Letter from Bryan Palfreyman representing Duke Properties, Duke Properties Cascade LLC and Duke Properties Cascade 2 LLC, are opposed because vacation will harm future development and will limit city’s availability to provide water efficiently and economically to their properties; not prudent and would damage their properties.

**Staff Report:** Steve discussed City not in favor of vacating city right-of-way no matter how small for future development; not usable for waterline as exists but as sleeve for smaller pipe to feed Duke Subdivision lots would work and reason to keep; why not feed from up by water tank; want to design into loop system instead of dead end lines; is sleeve worth ruining a tax paying building lot; could it go around lot; what was actually platted for easements. Discussion that plat says dotted lines and straight lines indicate existing 10’ utility and drainage easement and not around each of lots. Explanation that legend shows as demonstration but states 10’ utility and drainage easement along all lot lines and 10’ centered on all interior lot lines. Discussion that waterline interrupted in many locations

---

---

so question if no longer viable sleeve? Only interrupted for Milt Walker sleeve for new water meter. Discussion if are possible alternative routes? Can move line over in road and put another section of waterline? Anything is possibility. Just costs money.

**Rebuttals:** Building site high and falls away. Duke property is even lower and then goes back up so can't see gravity lines working. Is this new information. No.

**Closing public hearing and go into deliberations.**

**Deliberations:** Appreciate tax benefit but more important for public health safety and future use of waterline. Is this setting a precedent? How many more buildable areas will request vacation and how to say no when say yes here? Maybe they pay to move it before city vacates. Hate to see good piece of land that could help city grow because of this waterline especially when not used currently. Can want to see a house there but what if it makes a difference 20 years down the line? Perfect picture would be to relocate the line. Bends make sleeves more difficult. There are two separate things: pipe that could have sleeve put in and the easement. Don't want to turn loose of the easement but the pipeline is different. Don't want to have to get future easement.

**Reopen public hearing** to get more presentation from staff.

**Staff report:** Discussion on main objective, pipe or easement? Discussion of waterline locations and possibilities for rerouting. Discussion of additional lots that would be affected.

**Deliberation:** If existing waterline is within 300' of new development city is responsible for getting water to them?

**Rebuttal:** If Blooms are responsible for new pipe what would this include? City stands to gain taxes and there doesn't seem to be any major expense to city and line is 300 feet away from Duke property and there is a hole. Mainly affects Lot 5 and not Lot 6. If someone were to buy both Lots and built mostly on Lot 6 that is a possibility. Is this the cart before the horse? Do we need the building plans first with site plan? We're asked to abandon something we might not need to do until we have specific plans. Lots are unsellable without this vacation.

**Close public hearing.**

**Deliberations:** Discussion on whether to take action now or after building and site plans. Don't want to commit city to extra expense for future Duke waterlines. Tax dollars will offset the cost. If we already have water line should it be city's expense to redo it. We need to look down the road, not just today. If line is vacated is there another way to run waterline to Duke property and who will pay for it. There is currently not a loop system but the sleeve can be used for loop system so there is no stagnant line.

**Public hearing reopened** for more staff presentation.

**Deliberations:** Discussion on how the 300' affects the pipeline location.

**Public hearing closed.**

**Deliberations:** There is still much uncertainty so application tabled for additional advice from city engineer.

---

**MOTION BY:** Rachel Huckaby

**SECOND BY:** Debbie Haskins



Motion to approve the Gingerich estimate to upgrade the sprinkler system at Armstrong Park for \$7,600.

**DISCUSSION:** Have it done before 100 celebration next year. Schedule in spring. City would put sleeve under sidewalks.

**ROLL CALL:** Debbie Haskins *yes* Rachel Huckaby *yes*  
Kathy Hull *yes* Judy Nissula *yes*

### Personnel Manual updates

**DISCUSSION:** Kathy and Rachel proposed changes to update personnel manual. There are changes that maybe an attorney should review. Outstanding amount of work on this. Most of changes came from ICRMP personnel policy. Someone who knows personnel and payroll should review those sections. Should we change holidays? Heather should combine the two versions so easier to compare rather than go through two documents now. Heather will accept both changes and then compare to be reviewed together at next meeting. Thank you to Kathy and Rachel.

### IRWA – Id WARN

**DISCUSSION:** Free system to sign up for when we need emergency equipment. Protocols are in place for water and sewer disasters. Win-win agreement.

**MOTION BY:** Kathy Hull **SECOND BY:** Judy Nissula

Approve IRWA – Id WARN mutual assistance agreement for the IRWA response network

**DISCUSSION:** None

**ROLL CALL:** Debbie Haskins *yes* Rachel Huckaby *yes*  
Kathy Hull *yes* Judy Nissula *yes*

### Fuel Bid

**DISCUSSION:** Received 2 bids: (1) Shell (Howdy's) \$0.15 discount on pump prices minus the taxes; (2) Kennedys. Both prices minus taxes.

**MOTION BY:** Kathy Hull **SECOND BY:** Judy Nissula

Accept the bid from Howdy's Shell for all unleaded gasoline purchases; and accept bid offer #2 offer of dyed fuel only from Kennedy Fuel and Feed

**DISCUSSION:** Still trying to understand Kennedy Fuel and Feed bid. Discussion on how both will calculate prices. Make sure to get documentation of receipts from gas purchases. Only need off-road dyed fuel from Kennedy.

**ROLL CALL:** Debbie Haskins *yes* Rachel Huckaby *yes*  
Kathy Hull *yes* Judy Nissula *yes*

### TAP Grant for Pine Street SR2S ~ Project No. A020(246).

