
advocate against the ordinance. Pick up regarding changes to the ordinance, specifically the grandfathering of existing lighting. Mayor Rob proposed that we look at the ordinance and go line by line. J. Nissula is fully supportive of ordinance and proposes that City can do a better job writing the ordinance and would support an additional hearing to rewrite. R. Huckaby also recommends a new public hearing because there would be major alterations and would like to see a new ordinance written. K. Hull agrees with an additional public hearing. D. Haskins agrees more information would be beneficial. Discussion regarding how to move forward with the existing ordinance. Mayor Rob suggests giving it 15 minutes to see what changes can be made and then decide if it's possible to move forward. Discussion on ordinance and changes followed. Mayor Rob said he has no problem with Astronomical Society using City grant writer to fund changing streetlights if they had a required 20% match for the Idaho Power grant with match not coming from taxpayers. Discussion if this process was really a Council job and that this seems like rushing through it. K. Hull not comfortable with this process. Lori Hunter said that if they redirected it back to P&Z they would need to direct them on what kind of changes Council wanted. Mayor concurred. K. Hull stated that Council seemed together on wanting everything grandfathered in and were conservative on how it was written but wanted an ordinance passed and suggested that committee of Council, community, Astronomical Society, etc. should take this on. Discussion on process.

MOTION BY: Judy Nissula

SECOND BY: Kathy Hull

Motion to table the Outdoor Lighting Ordinance for the purpose of redrafting to bring it all in compliance with grandfathering.

DISCUSSION: Discussion regarding appointing committee or volunteers. Judy Nissula and Debbie Haskins volunteered. Mayor said that when they came back from a committee of both for and against it would require another public hearing.

ROLL CALL:

Debbie Haskins	Yes	Rachel Huckaby	Yes
Kathy Hull	Yes	Judy Nissula	Yes

SEPTAGE ACCEPTANCE TO CITY LAGOONS

DISCUSSION: This is not a public hearing but a discussion regarding moving forwarding with a preliminary engineering report (PER) for moving ahead with lagoons vs facility planning study (FPS) which is more expensive. DEQ requires a facility planning study in order to accept septage. Mayor asked City Engineer and Paul Scoresby of Schiess to provide their recommendations. Paul said that for the City to accept and treat this waste it should be part of the now aging facility plan and would need amending per the wastewater rules to accept it. \$30K-\$40K cost to revise the facility plan to meet the requirements. Should be a thorough process with good cost estimates to see if it makes sense from an economic stand point to move forward. Encouraged the City to

make a definitive determination to either accept or not accept septage. DEQ requires a good business plan to move forward with accepting septage. Discussion regarding financial assistance from the DEQ and timetable. Paul stated he did not think at the end of the day that this would pay out and would cost too much. Discussion regarding cost of updating the lagoons to accept septage, including equipment needed. Discussions regarding direct dumping of septage; aeration; discharge permit; automation; creating problems with lagoons in future; impact of new Riverview Subdivision vs load of septage; and impact of current places accepting septage; chemicals in waste accepted; impact of septage vs. RV or port-a-potty waste; BOD; microbrewery waste; 85% removal rate in EPA discharge permit; need to accurately measure what gets sent to treatment system; Donnelly and McCall facilities' capacities. City took in just under \$14,000 fees last year and about \$3,440 this year so could take 20 years to pay for system. Steve Yamamoto commented and discussion regarding accepting septage and the historical impact.

J. Nissula reiterated her understanding regarding the need to amend the FPS to address septage as cost number one; cost number two could be in excess of \$300,000 for upgrading the system to accept septage. Discussion regarding the aeration requirements changing with septage increasing BOD levels. Discussion of current capacity of lagoons; reduced infiltration; problems regarding monitoring the intakes; BOD capacity; pH testing for accepting septage; problems with automated testing at other locations; controlling septage load contents. Discussion whether limited growth from reduced capacity of treatment plant is more important than the cost of upgrading.

Discussions regarding the concentration of wastes and trash in Forest Service vaults; J. Nissula's opinion not to move forward with septage taking because it doesn't make financial sense; dumping of RV doesn't age like septage does but contains harmful chemical. K. Hull suggested the need to deal with both sources of septage. Discussion on study recommendation to move forward with installing a vertical screen to sit in wet well to help keep out trash, solve a lot of problems and be a good investment. Discussion whether to do screen or aeration first; a PER would be required to even add aeration. Council needs to decide on septage or not to determine if PER or FPS required. Mayor said the discussion came up because of limited capacity to add housing.

Discussions regarding if there are DEQ requirements for taking of septage as condition of loan; options for City moving forward; data we have to support decision; test measurements taken now that should show different results if stop taking septage. J. Nissula wanted to clarify that if continue to take septage from septage haulers (not including RV dumping) than have to comply and start FPS amendment process. Discussion that City is currently noncompliant because we are taking septage; they stopped and started taking again after fixing storm drains and reducing hydraulic loads. Discussion on study

timetable. Discussion that septage haulers have other options but not as favorable as this local option; rates are better here; charges for RV dump stations; RV waste vs. septage impacts. J. Nissula thinks that based on information received is not worth it—especially since the haulers have other alternatives. .

MOTION BY: Judy Nissula

SECOND BY: Rachel Huckaby

Based on information provided to Council from Paul Scoresby of Schiess & Associates and given the costs that he has estimated, motion to decline taking septage effective April 1, 2017 for septage from septage haulers.

DISCUSSION: Clarify that are basically given them a month notice. R. Huckaby suggested to amend the motion to clarify that it applies to septage from septage haulers and motion was so amended and seconded.

ROLL CALL: Debbie Haskins Yes Rachel Huckaby Yes
Kathy Hull Yes Judy Nissula Yes

FACILITY PLANNING STUDY

DISCUSSION: Discussion regarding doing the PER as opposed to a FPS. PER is already budgeted. Discussion regarding time frame to complete the PER and Paul committed to three months. Mayor clarified that PER will tell us the choices to upgrade the lagoons (i.e. what's the capacity now and if we aerate lagoons 1, 2 and 3 what will be the capacity so we can incrementally increase them based on demand). That will allow us to tell new development if they can or cannot be accepted and provide the requirements vs. telling them it will take an FPS and 6 more months for an answer. We can be proactive and know what we want to do 2, 4, 10 and 20 years from now or until exceed capacity. Paul provide background that Mayor initially approached him with FPS question but that effectively nothing has changed from the 2009 study and City has completed most of the improvements, including reducing infiltration. He talked to DEQ and they confirmed. Aeration would be preceded by PER anyway so DEQ bought off. Discussion that screen is already in plan; aerating is preliminarily in FPS and needs final design of PER for DEQ; might actually not need it now based on PER findings. Discussions regarding implementing the screen; aeration; RV waste impact and if there is available information to review. In study RV waste was lumped with sewage flow.

MOTION BY: Judy Nissula

SECOND BY: Rachel Huckaby

Motion to accept the Preliminary Engineering Report from Schiess & Associates to be completed in 12 weeks from March 1st, and authorize the Mayor to sign.

DISCUSSION: Discussion regarding saving money by investigating RV waste situation during this study vs. another study. Paul thought better now. Discussion of State Park fees for RV waste and they are not being charged. Paul thought City should help collect information and wondered what was the hurry now? R. Huckaby said that RV camping

was huge up here and was not willing to discontinue so suggested doing that study now. K. Hull suggests they should all be paying their fair share. Discussions on why are taking on more load from visitors and the cost should be shared; how to measure? Discussions regarding calculating and collecting the cost for an RV dump and BOD element involved; burden on City to subsidize State Parks even though merchants may benefit; Paul would rather take more time than add to current scope; there are no funds currently to add aeration to lagoons. Mayor suggested to go with what's on paper right now and do some independent research on RV waste.

ROLL CALL:	Debbie Haskins	Yes	Rachel Huckaby	Yes
	Kathy Hull	No	Judy Nissula	Yes

NEW BUSINESS

PAL SARTORI – LEASE DISCUSSION

DISCUSSION: Tabled because Pal Sartori did not show. Mayor received an email about the school looking at 3 possible site location for new track/football field and they were reviewing options. Pal questioned if the City would lease them land and what the cost would be so they could factor into their calculations? R. Huckaby wanted to know what other land the City was leasing and the charges before visiting that question. Mayor said some leases were for income generation.

TROY HUCKABY – PUBLIC HEARING POLICY

DISCUSSION: Troy is here to discuss the public hearing policy because of the recent public hearing on the lighting ordinance which he's using for an example. He thanked the Council for their service. Troy states that because it's a land use ordinance public hearings must be held. The Public hearing happened but he was not able to prepare because that was the first time he had seen the ordinance. He would like the opportunity to present more ideas and suggestions if the public hearing was reopened now that he has done more research. Troy referenced several sections in Title 50, Chapter 9 of the Idaho Statutes including that whenever the proposed ordinance contains penalties for real property than it needs to be published in full and not be summarized; the requirements for reading on 3 different dates; and the subject clearly expressed in the title. Real property includes light fixtures so the lighting ordinance is also a land use regulation. Troy wants these requirements to be used for their intent of giving proper advance notice so people can thoughtfully consider and participate. He requests that the City please follow state statutes about publishing in full and recommends that the City make the proponents pay for it. Similarly, subdivision applications have to pay for noticing. Mayor will follow up with City Attorney to clarify process.

PINE STREET SR2S, PROJECT NO. A020 (246)

ROLL CALL: Debbie Haskins Yes Rachel Huckaby Yes
Kathy Hull Yes Judy Nissula Yes

ACTION LIST

DISCUSSION: Discussion regarding the status of the Action List.

T-SHEET COMPLIANCE

DISCUSSION: Discussion regarding directing library and PD to expand job codes. Discussions regarding clarification of what is expected of the Library and that this was initially presented as a tool vs. a direction; helpful as budgeting tool; suggested possible categories. Council determined general consensus was to direct the library that this must be done and that they need to decide categories so Council can determine budgets by looking at pie charts. R. Huckaby said to be specific on the duties because we don't need 50 categories. Mayor will work with Library.

Discussion regarding PD not using SRO (Job Codes). Discussion regarding addressing Chief regarding need to use Job Codes.

Discussion regarding how to address this issue. Mayor will send email.

MAYOR REPORT

Snow Removal ~ Discussion regarding the amount of time and money spent for snow removal.

Grants ~ Update on the Grants that Leslie is researching (i.e. Mini excavator for public works, storm drainage).

DEQ licensing ~ Crew is in compliance.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION TO ADJOURN: Debbie Haskins

ALL IN FAVOR: Debbie Haskins *Aye* Rachel Huckaby *Aye*
Kathy Hull *Aye* Judy Nissula *Aye*

MEETING ADJOURNED: 9:15

Respectfully submitted and Attested by,

Approved

Heather Soelberg, Clerk/Treasurer

Rob Terry, Mayor