WELCOME
To a Regular Meeting of the
Coeur d’Alene City Council
Held in the Library Community Room

AGENDA

VISION STATEMENT
Our vision of Coeur d’Alene is of a beautiful, safe city that promotes a high quality of life and sound economy through excellence in government.

NOTE: A Proclamation by Governor Little, clarified the open meeting laws during this state of emergency, in which no more than 10 people shall physically gather at a time, includes an option for the community to hear the meeting timely through telecommunication devices. Public comment will be taken during that section of the meeting by indicating a raised hand through the Zoom meeting application. Public comments will not be acknowledged during any other time in the meeting. In regards to the Public Hearing item, please sign up in advance of the meeting to be acknowledged to give testimony here: https://www.cdaid.org/signinpublic/Signinformlist and participate through the zoom meeting link. Additionally, you may provide public comments to the City Clerk by 4:00 p.m. the day of the hearing at renata@cdaid.org

The meeting will be aired on Zoom meeting network with the following options:
https://zoom.us/s/99918005838 Password: 522103 or Dial: US: +1 346 248 7799 or +1 646 518 9805 or 877 853 5257 (Toll Free) or 888 475 4499 (Toll Free)

The purpose of the Agenda is to assist the Council and interested citizens in the conduct of the public meeting. Careful review of the Agenda is encouraged. Testimony from the public will be solicited for any item or issue listed under the category of Public Hearings. Any individual who wishes to address the Council on any other subject should plan to speak when Item E - Public Comments is identified by the Mayor. The Mayor and Council will not normally allow audience participation at any other time.

June 16, 2020: 6:00 p.m.

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

B. INVOCATION: Pastor Steve Massey with Hayden Bible Church

C. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

D. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA: Any items added less than forty-eight (48) hours prior to the meeting are added by Council motion at this time.

E. PUBLIC COMMENTS: (Each speaker will be allowed a maximum of 3 minutes to address the City Council on matters that relate to City government business. Please be advised that the City Council can only take official action this evening for those items listed on the agenda.)
F. ANNOUNCEMENTS:
   1. City Council
   2. Mayor

G. CONSENT CALENDAR: Being considered routine by the City Council, these items will be enacted by one motion unless requested by a Councilmember that one or more items be removed for later discussion.
   1. Approval of Council Minutes for the June 2, 2020 and June 8, 2020 Council Meetings.
   2. Approval of Bills as Submitted.
   4. Setting of General Services/Public Works Committee meeting for Monday, June 22, 2020 at 12:00 noon.
   5. Resolution No. 20-035 -
      a. Approval of S-1-19 - District at Riverstone: Final plat and acceptance of improvements and a Landscape Agreement with security
         As Recommended by the Community Planning Director and City Engineer

H. OTHER BUSINESS:
   1. Parking Revenue from the 4th of July to be dedicated to City Public Safety expenses.
      Staff Report by: Troy Tymesen, City Administrator
   2. Resolution No. 20-036 - Approving an agreement to transfer property at Atlas Mill to ignite cda.
      Staff Report by: Mike Gridley, City Attorney
   3. Resolution No. 20-037 – Approving an amendment to the Civil Service to allow relatives of current fire employees to apply, test, and be eligible for hire within the Fire Department.
      Staff Report by: Melissa Tosi, Human Resources Director
   4. Appeal Hearing of Urban Forestry Committee Denial of a tree removal request at 3702 E. Sky Harbor Drive by Tom McCain and Twee Hoang
      Staff Report by Nick Goodwin, Urban Forestry Coordinator

I. ADJOURNMENT

This meeting is aired live on CDA TV Spectrum Cable Channel 1301 and on Facebook live through the City’s Facebook page.
Coeur d'Alene
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
June 16, 2020

MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL:
Steve Widmyer, Mayor
Council Members McEvers, English, Evans, Gookin, Miller, Wood
CONSENT CALENDAR
The Mayor and Council of the City of Coeur d’Alene met in a regular session of said Council at the Coeur d’Alene City Library Community Room June 2, 2020 at 6:00 p.m., there being present upon roll call the following members:

Steve Widmyer, Mayor

Dan Gookin   )  Members of Council Present
Woody McEvers
Christie Wood
Dan English
Amy Evans
Kiki Miller

CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Widmyer called the meeting to order.

INVOCATION: Pastor J.O. Owens with Heart of the City Church provided the invocation.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Councilmember McEvers led the Pledge of Allegiance.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Jennifer Drake, Coeur d’Alene, thanked the Council for reviewing the Rebound Downtown proposal. She noted that everyone is living in a pandemic, which has caused difficulty to the businesses and society. Businesses are closing and those that are staying open are doing so with great losses. This is happening everywhere but she believes our community is in a unique position to do something about it with the proposal. The current social distancing restricts many businesses into using half the seating and they have no idea how long it will last. If they could expand into the street capacity would come to 100% and they would be better able to be successful. She noted that under the proposal each business would have control of their own space and the parking garage would accommodate vehicles. Additionally, she believes the increased foot traffic would increase sales. She noted that other cities have already come up with this decision. Ms. Drake said that she felt that a business must adapt or die, and that the proposal does not benefit any individual business, but would benefit all. She requested the Council vote for Option A.

Ian Smith, Coeur d’Alene, noted that he lives in downtown on Indiana and 7th, and he likes the ideas of creating of parklets and expanded sidewalks. He is in favor of the ideas proposed for Sherman Avenue, except keeping vehicle traffic on Sherman, and believes that the current proposal is a compromise on a street closure and it doesn’t address the problem. He wants to visit restaurants and local coffee shops, but is reluctant unless he can be outside so it would
lower the risk of COVID. He noted that sidewalks are already packed so he avoids downtown. He thinks expanding sidewalks will increase people density so they should not have vehicles. He offered additional options to include allowing a couple blocks for parklets and couple blocks closed to vehicle traffic, which would allow the City to see what would work and bring back the best options next year. Additionally, he offered that a compromise would be to make Sherman Avenue one-way for the summer with an extra lane as a pedestrian lane, with 2-way pedestrian traffic. Mr. Smith noted that if COVID infections get worse, businesses may lose the summer, so keeping sidewalks for customers and the road for pedestrians would be his recommendation.

Jim Riley, Coeur d’Alene, congratulated all and law enforcement for their work last night. He suggested Council close Sherman Avenue for the summer. As a citizen, he is serious about being safe from the COVID virus and is within a high-risk age group. As he looks downtown, he finds it difficult to walk at a 6’ separation and if he visits a venue it will be outside in order to stay 6’ away from others. He noted he was in support of Option A.

Jack Riggs, Coeur d’Alene, thanked the Mayor and Council for considering the item and said that he agrees with previous comments made. He noted that he got involved with brainstorming ideas about how to help small businesses, especially those with a small foot print, and practicing safe social distancing guidelines. He has lived here his entire life and had an office on Sherman Avenue for the past 15 years. The idea to close Sherman Avenue is to address social distancing in a creative manner. It would be a temporary three-month response for businesses and patrons. Option B keeps vehicles and all foot traffic on existing sidewalks and would not allow 6’ social distancing and would, therefore, be a dysfunctional compromise as cars and people in close proximately are not a safe mix. If Option B is considered, Sherman Avenue traffic should be one-way single lane with reduced speed limited to 20 mph. No concept for change is supported 100%, but the downtown should be a place of welcome gathering. It would beneficial in the adversity of the COVID virus.

Lacy Moen, Coeur d’Alene, noted that she sent an e-mail requesting the Council reconsider the request to close Sherman Avenue. She believes it is time to think about the whole business community and not the few, and that she would prefer to leave the street alone. She has owned the Beauty Bar for nine years on Front Avenue, and believes the frustration with parking will slow businesses down. She noted that cars were backed up all the way to Northwest Boulevard last weekend, and that is normal for the summer. Ms. Moen noted that the idea has been discussed and denied for the past four-years, and there are business are beyond 2nd to 6th Street. She reiterated that business is hard and does not want to make it more difficult. Soon they will be at capacity within Stage 4 of the Idaho Rebound Act. She requested the Council to keep things consistent over the next few months.

Dan Schnatter, Coeur d’Alene, noted that he owns the Piano Bar and is concerned about citizens with COVID, and that closing Sherman Avenue would cause more groups to gather in one space. He expressed concern that the action of closing the street would require greater police foot presence at night. Other cities that have closed streets have problems with open containers and an increase in crime. Mr. Schnatter also felt that closing the street would cut visibility. He did feel there were a few benefits for outside seating, which would help a lot of businesses, but would mostly steer people away from the downtown area as they would not want to walk blocks.
Mr. Schnatter said that the Governor's restrictions will be lifted on June 16 and reiterated that he is against the closure. He encouraged more events downtown.

**SEPTIC TANK ABATEMENT PROGRAM** – Wastewater Superintendent Mike Anderson noted that the septic abatement program is a long-standing program for the City. He explained how a septic tank is a tank that allows solids to sink to the bottom and that the top fluids flow to a drain field, then into the ground over the aquifer. The job of the Wastewater Utility is to protect the aquifer. Panhandle Health allows for septic on 5 acres or more, not less. Mr. Anderson noted that two city ordinances are specific to septic tanks. One code states no one in the city can have a septic tank if the property is within 200 feet of a sewer. The other code states that once the City acknowledges a citizen is not connected to the sewer, they must connect within 365 days. He noted that there are 1708 parcels that come up as possibly not connected to the City sewer. The department lowered that number by removing undeveloped land, City-owned property, etc., which left 490 parcels remaining as unknown. The project is not a high priority item for the department as 99% of the City parcels are connected. The issue is most often dealt with when the septic tank fails, as Panhandle Health District will not allow replacement of the tank within the City limits. Mr. Anderson noted that in this past year 43 letters have gone out notifying owners they need to connect. Councilmember McEvers said that he understands the first rule was approved in the 1970’s, and thought he read that if a homeowner cannot afford the connection the City could lien the property, and wondered if that is allowed. Mr. Anderson noted that the connection is an expensive undertaking, and legally it is still possible for the City to lien the property. Councilmember McEvers noted that CDBG funds can help low income people, and that it certainly adds value to the property to be connected to the City sewer. Mr. Anderson explained that some people don’t realize they aren’t connected. Councilmember English said that the City would have to front the money for connection in the case of a lien and does not believe they want to be in the business.

**COUNCIL COMMENTS:**

Councilmember Gookin noted that the Chamber of Commerce has canceled the 4th of July fireworks, in which the City normally agrees to provide parking revenue to help pay for show. This year he would like to place an item on the agenda for next meeting to take funding from that day and direct it to the general fund to cover City public safety costs associated with the 4th of July.

Mayor Widmyer requested the appointment of Alivia Metts to the ignite cda Board and Chris Pfeiffer and Michael Drobnock to the CDATV Committee.

**MOTION:** Motion by Evans, seconded by English to appoint Alivia Metts to the ignite cda board and Chris Pfeiffer and Michael Drobnock to the CDATV Committee. **Motion carried.**

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

1. Approval of Council Minutes for the May 19, 2020 Council Meeting.
2. Approval of Bills as Submitted.

4. Approval of ten (10) fireworks stand permits

5. Approval of SS-19-07, Oberholzer Estates: Final Plat


**MOTION**: Motion by McEvers, seconded by Miller, to approve the Consent Calendar as presented, including **Resolution No. 20-034**.

**ROLL CALL**: Miller Aye; McEvers Aye; Gookin Aye; English Aye; Wood Aye; Evans Aye. Motion carried.

**CONSIDERATION OF THE WAIVER OF OUTDOOR SEATING PERMIT SEWER FEE FOR THE 2020 SEASON.**

**STAFF REPORT**: Kelley Setters, Deputy City Clerk, requested a waiver of the outdoor sewer seating fee for this year, which is a season from March 17 through November 1. The permit is required for use of the City sidewalk for additional outdoor seating for a bar and/or restaurant. Last year the City issued 39 permits, which provided $16,119.00 in sewer fee revenue and $2,875.00 in encroachment permit fees. Ms. Setters noted that the Wastewater Superintendent is in support of the waiver for this season. It was determined by the Governor’s Idaho Rebounds protocols that restaurants could open on May 16th, provided they comply with the physical distancing requirements. This change could reduce the number of seats within the restaurant by approximately 50%, which results in a reduction in sewer usage. Prior to the COVID shut down, sixteen (16) permits were issued and paid in full. At this point in time staff has not collected the outdoor sewer seating fees, in hopes of a final determination by Council to continue to waive the sewer fee for the rest of the season. Staff recommends that the $125.00 encroachment permit still be required, as well as the filing of an outdoor seating permit application so staff can ensure ADA placement of tables and chairs and provide the regulations related to the encroachment on City property, pursuant to previously adopted City policies.

**DISCUSSION**: Councilmember Gookin noted that he was in support of the request as it is within the City’s authority to show appreciation to businesses that have suffered. This is one way to help, and he noted that some businesses had asked about waiving the liquor license fee. He noted that those businesses were not allowed to be open for 2 months; however, the City closure was only responsible for three days before the State shut down. As he calculated it, the reimbursement would an average $4.00 a day. Councilmember Gookin said that he felt that the businesses affected could go forward to the State with a request for reimbursement. Councilmember English concurred that the request makes sense and supports it. He expressed concerns that other fees could be requested to be waived, and the City would need to watch what made sense going forward. Councilmember McEvers asked what the cost of liquor license fees for the two-month period would be. Councilmember Gookin noted that he estimated that for a 10-week period it would be an average of $270.00 each for a total of $11,000.00, and noted that
they also pay County and State fees. Councilmember McEvers said that he felt the $270.00 would be more beneficial and would come from the right place.

**MOTION:** Motion by Miller, seconded by Evans, to waive the outdoor seating permit sewer fee for the 2020 season. **Motion carried.**

**DISCUSSION REGARDING THE REBOUND DOWNTOWN COEUR D'ALENE PROPOSAL THAT INCLUDES THE POSSIBILITY OF CLOSING OFF PORTIONS OF SHERMAN AVENUE AND ALLOWING MORE PARKLETS TO HELP RESPOND TO COVID-19 BY ALLOWING THE LOCAL BUSINESSES TO EXPAND OUTDOORS ONTO SIDEWALKS AND/OR THE STREET IN FRONT OF THEIR BUSINESS.**

**STAFF REPORT:** Hilary Anderson, Community Planning Director, noted that two options are being proposed for businesses in response to COVID – 19: Option A would close Sherman Avenue from 2nd to 6th Avenues to vehicular traffic but keep the center lane open for emergency vehicles, allowing businesses to expand out onto the sidewalks and street in front of their businesses with temporary ADA ramps to accommodate disabled community members, and allowing parklets (constructed platforms, like the one in front of Moon Time, that are typically the size of one or two vehicles next to the sidewalk that create a place for expanded outdoor restaurant seating, and public space in some communities) and temporary sidewalk extensions/raised pedestrian detours on north-south streets, Lakeside, Coeur d’Alene and Front Avenues for businesses who would like to participate. The north-south streets would remain open for vehicular traffic. The program could start as early as June, with Council approval, and go through Labor Day. Option B would keep Sherman Avenue open to vehicular traffic and allow businesses to have parklets and expanded sidewalk usage with sidewalk extensions on Sherman, Lakeside, Coeur d’Alene and Front Avenues, and north-south streets for businesses who would like to participate in the Downtown. The program would require the construction of parklets and temporary sidewalk extensions/raised pedestrian detours for all participating businesses, which would delay the start date until July, with Council approval, and go through Labor Day.

Ms. Anderson said that the City and Downtown Association were approached by several community members in early May asking the City to consider closing off portions of Sherman Avenue and/or to allowing parklets so that restaurants could have additional outdoor seating. The City Council and staff then received a written proposal from downtown property owner Jack Riggs, M.D. on May 13. A few days later, Gynii Gilliam, President & CEO of the Coeur d’Alene Area Economic Development Corporation (CDA-EDC), emailed the cities of Coeur d’Alene, Post Falls, Hayden and Rathdrum encouraging them to allow businesses to expand outside and possibly close off portions of Sherman Avenue in the Downtown to assist businesses to recover and respond to COVID-19. In initial discussions between City staff and the Downtown Association in early May, the thought was to wait until spring 2021 to allow more time to come up with design standards for parklets in the downtown and other business districts. That would also allow time for staff to draft a code amendment to the Zoning Code to formalize parklets in the City’s business districts. (It should be noted, that there is already an action item in the DRAFT East Sherman Revitalization Plan and an action item in the draft policy document of the Envision Coeur d’Alene project – Comprehensive Plan Update – to amend the Zoning Code...
to formally allow parklets in the City’s business districts and to come up with design standards.) Ms. Anderson noted that other communities across the country are opening up their sidewalks and streets, and allowing parklets to allow businesses more room to provide social distancing to help them rebound and respond to COVID-19. Examples include Boise, Spokane, New York, Tampa, Cincinnati, West Chester, St. Petersburg, and Sacramento. There are other examples of communities globally who convert streets to pedestrian zones during various seasons, and some have done so year-round. The proposal is to provide relief to businesses this summer. But the idea was left open that it may be beneficial in future years on a seasonal basis – which would require additional discussions and approval by the City Council. Ms. Anderson noted that the parklet at Moontime is successful and she would like to include it in the Envision CDA Comprehensive Plan update. She also noted that events downtown have full and partial events with street closure regularly. There have been mixed responses of emails, letters and survey results. She provided highlights of the survey results, noting that most responses were from the business owners along Sherman Avenue. One of the survey questions included was if the use of the parklet with alcohol service should be allowed. Most survey responders marked yes to allow alcohol, but with food service. She reviewed some of the performance standards that would be required such as hours of operation, mandatory compliance, best practices of clean up, and securing merchandise. She also requested Council consider items such as the amount of food service with alcohol, should there be social distancing required, and hours of use.

Ms. Anderson explained that the parklet would not extend out as far as a car, but would use two car stalls, and if car stops are on either end it would need to have a curb stop and reflective stands. Temporary sidewalk extensions and pedestrian detours would have to meet ADA standards with railings and slip resistant surfaces, with a midblock ramp. She noted that Option A would be treated like a special event, and that parklets would be paid for by the participating businesses. Option B would include that the businesses would pay for material and labor for sidewalk extensions and ramps. Signage would be needed to direct people to the public parking areas and they would include social distancing signs at intersections and parklets. Ms. Anderson noted that staff recommends Option B because it has the least impact on the non-participating businesses, and allows two options for businesses to participate without the need to close Sherman Avenue. That option is also in support of other efforts by staff to allow parklets in business districts throughout the City, which would be beneficial even beyond COVID-19. She noted that costs may be prohibitive to some businesses.

**DISCUSSION:** Mayor Widmyer wanted it noted that he owns businesses on Sherman Avenue; however, he can legally participate in the discussions. Councilmember Wood asked to hear input from the Police, Fire, and Streets Departments. Fire Chief Gabriel stated that access to the businesses from the street is the most important item for his department. The ladder truck is the largest vehicle at 18’ wide and downtown is the highest risk factor. If there is access through the middle of the street, they would need 21’ down the center with a 25’ swing around at the corners and would need a clear path to the doorway of the building. Street Superintendent Tim Martin noted that closing Sherman Avenue is a big challenge as it pushes traffic to Lakeside Avenue, which was not built to take the number of vehicles used by Sherman Avenue and does not have turn bays. He noted that many special events cause bottle necks at 2nd Avenue and Lakeside Avenue, and since there are no signals, he would have to put in temporary four-way stops. Additionally, pedestrians tend to walk into traffic if the street is partially closed, and patrol
would be needed to ensure crosswalks are used. Mr. Martin noted that he has worked with the Police Department over the years to determine signage and if Option A is used it should have one-way travel west to east as it is the oversized load route. Currently, ITD has determined that any vehicle over 13’ has to use the over height/width route which is Sherman Avenue.

Councilmember Miller asked that if Sherman Avenue were closed what would be the impact be to the surrounding residential neighborhoods. Mr. Martin noted that everything that goes on downtown in the summer impacts the neighborhoods and it would be an additional impact. Councilmember McEvers noted that the idea has come around before and wondered if it was different. Mr. Martin said that he remembers some conversation of closing Sherman Avenue in the past; however, at that time ITD had a significant issue with closing it as they maintained and controlled it. When it was rebuilt, the City narrowed Lakeside Avenue down and it would now be a challenge and would take some time to work out the bugs. He also noted that Front Avenue has changed due to the 2nd Street access removal.

Councilmember Miller asked about conflicts with garbage service and delivery services within the alley in that corridor. Mr. Martin confirmed there were some conflicts, but the larger deliveries take place on Sherman Avenue early in the morning.

Mayor Widmyer noted that Saturday traffic was backed up the Mobile gas station entering into town. He said that if Sherman Avenue is closed and Lakeside Avenue is used, the problem would be bigger. Mr. Martin concurred that it would be a bigger problem; for example, big boats would need to go over to 3rd Street and down. Police Chief White noted that he personally thinks it’s a cool idea, but he has professional concerns with both options. First, is the traffic concern such as the back-up that occurred yesterday afternoon. He noted that Lakeside Avenue is a street that is not set up to handle traffic. Partial opening is a concern because traffic already pushes toward the center line due to vehicles parked along the sidewalks. Chief White noted that accidents already happen with parked cars, so that would be a concern with pedestrians and tables in parking stalls. He noted that he does not have the staff to do the enforcement during the summer months, and expressed concern with the additional areas being used for solely alcohol service and commented that if food is required, it needs to be clear as to what is meant by that, as drinking heavily would contribute to downtown bar problems which already take a huge amount of resources. Mayor Widmyer suggested that the City look at the proposal as a Citywide concern, and not just for downtown.

Councilmember Miller asked how many businesses are a part of the downtown BID. Terry Cooper, Executive Director of the Downtown Association, stated that all businesses are a part of the BID, and there are 225 separate businesses. Councilmember Miller questioned how many of the businesses responded to the survey. Mr. Cooper noted that the survey was sent to those they have emails for and they received approximately 50 responses. Councilmember Gookin said that the Council has heard similar requests in the past, and thought the past impression was that it would kill the downtown, and asked Mr. Cooper what he thought. Mr. Cooper said that they represent all businesses, and he understands the businesses were coming out of winter, and then COVID hit and they are all struggling and business is fragile. The concern is what would the change be and how it would affect everybody. The survey showed retail businesses are
concerned with the street closure and restaurants are excited about the concept. He felt it was concerning because the downtown is fragile at this time.

Councilmember McEvers asked staff if the idea is just for downtown. Ms. Anderson noted that Option A is for the downtown, but Option B may work at other places around town such as Riverstone and Midtown. Some businesses may not have the same type of frontage, such as those on Appleway and U.S. 95. Councilmember McEvers said that the one parklet was a pilot project but it is still there. Ms. Anderson said that they have been waiting to finish the East Sherman Revitalization Plan and, ideally, the parklet would be seasonal. Councilmember McEvers noted that the parklet would take an 8’x20’ parking space and it seems the investment for an area with 6’ social distancing doesn’t make financial sense and is focused on restaurants. Ms. Anderson said that it would be also be charged the sewer fee and encroachment and that the parklets and sidewalk extensions would be a long-term investment and once businesses no longer have to accommodate the social distancing it could be more beneficial as people love to sit outside in the summer months.

Councilmember Wood said that she would like the inclusion of public safety in future staff reports. She noted that both proposals are problematic and she would like to look beyond those proposals and offer the use of the McEuen Park Plaza area for street fairs or other City-owned property throughout the City. If it needs to be on the street, she would be in favor of weekends only. She also commented that the parklets seem expensive and difficult to get a return on the investment unless it’s a long-term proposal. Ms. Anderson noted they did talk about shorter period of time and would require more mobilization time, but they can look at that. If parklets are not approved beyond this summer, the businesses should know that, but it would like to seem they would want them as a long-term solution.

Mayor Widmyer said that Council received a letter from Blair Williams about the challenges of the sidewalks and streets while being wheelchair bound and the potential challenges caused by the ideas. He felt that the City should plan more to include Ms. Williams’ points. Councilmember Miller said that the proposal has a lot of future merit, but would entail more details than what is available at the current time; however, she felt that Option A is off the table for her. She commented that the parklets could also work in other areas of town, not just downtown. Likewise, the sidewalk extension could solve current issues like pedestrian traffic with street furniture and more physical distancing and could be removed in winter and used by all businesses, quickly and inexpensively.

MOTION: Motion by Miller, seconded by Wood, to have staff put together a proposal for sidewalk extensions in the downtown core and a parklet design for all parts of the City, and to study the one-way traffic design on Sherman Avenue for the future.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Martin reminded the Council that they previously authorized staff to seek a grant for signal changes downtown and he has it in the impact fee budget for $100,000 for design. Councilmember Miller clarified that she was recommending the idea of one-way traffic be studied, not to do any projects yet. Councilmember Gookin asked what the intended timeline was. Councilmember Miller said she felt that staff could easily revamp Option B for options on sidewalk extensions and parklets in other parts of City in response to COVID as soon as
possible. Councilmember Gookin expressed concern with government speeding through projects, then making mistakes. He felt that there would be a lot of steps and research to be done and noted that staff is burdened by the COVID virus and he does not think it has been vetted enough. He said that he does not think staff should devote energy to get it done in time, and would not want it to be rushed. He did note that the parklets will be included in the Comprehensive Plan. Councilmember McEvers said that in the 1980’s, when the bulb outs were added to Sherman Avenue corners, the businesses were in a different cycle and weren’t making it and were not wild about the idea of closing off Sherman Avenue. He thinks it needs to be in the Comprehensive Plan and doesn’t see the business support but he understands that restaurants want more seating. Councilmember Miller said that if there was a time to try something it would be now; however, there is not a large amount of input. She said that the sidewalk extension seems to be the simplest and most cost-effective way to help people that are concerned with social distancing, wheelchairs, strollers, etc. She noted that mid-June would be a good time to bring information back, as part of the research has already been done, and it could still be responsive enough for COVID concerns this summer.

Councilmember Evans thanked Ms. Anderson for her work and for answering her questions prior to the meeting. She noted that she liked the creative ideas in response to this time; however, the underlying struggle with both proposals is the unintended consequences to other businesses. She said that she has talked to several shop owners and some are doing better than others and some are within days of closure, and that the unintentional negative impact frightens her. She questioned how it would impact parking in the front of the businesses, and how it is for only those that choose to participate. Ms. Anderson clarified that the sidewalk extension might be safer for downtown as it is about half the width of a parklet but still takes up at least one parking space. They could also work out something for abutting businesses with shared sidewalk and field fit the area to those that want to participate. Councilmember Evans stated that currently it is unknown how many would want to participate in the model. Councilmember Wood expressed concern that the businesses would accept the solution and the City still has to cure the public safety issues and she believes the City needs to spend more time on it and get it right. Councilmember English noted that his prime concern is safety and from what they have heard from staff, Option A is off the table, and he doesn’t feel that the City can restrict public safety and divert traffic to smaller streets. He expressed concern about having different downtown core treatment different than other places in town, and agreed they need more time.

Motion failed unanimously.

MOTION: Motion by Gookin, seconded by McEvers to table the item to a date uncertain.

DISCUSSION CONTINUED: Mayor Widmyer noted that Council wants more time to study the idea. Councilmember Miller said that the Council has an opportunity to help business during this time and felt tabling the time to a date uncertain was unfair. Councilmember Gookin noted that the Council helped businesses earlier this evening by waiving the outdoor seating sewer fees, which shows support. He said he felt that if there are other things the City could do, it should be look at as well; however, the proposal needs more study to do things right. Ms. Anderson said that they will modify the Comprehensive Plan to include expanded sidewalks and one-way traffic. Councilmember Wood said that she would be open to allow use of the plaza for
events, McEuen Park, and other public spaces. Councilmember McEvers stated he was sorry about Sherman Avenue and commented that he is having a hard time going down the path and spending time, energy, and money reviewing the closure and does not want to give up parking.

**Motion carried with Miller voting in opposition.**

**RECESS:** The Mayor called for a 7-minute recess at 8:12 p.m. The meeting resumed at 8:20 p.m.

**APPROVAL TO INCLUDE LAKESIDE REAL ESTATE HOLDINGS, LLC PROPERTIES (COMMONLY KNOWN AS THE ROY ARMSTRONG PROPERTY) IN THE CITY’S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE, ENVISION COEUR D’ALENE.**

**STAFF REPORT:** Hilary Anderson, Community Planning Director, explained that the City of Coeur d’Alene was approached in the fall of 2019 by consultants for the Lakeside Capital Group, Connie Krueger and Gabe Gallinger, to meet to discuss their recent acquisition of the Roy Armstrong property and their vision for its development. The property encompasses 1,100 acres and lies between the cities of Coeur d’Alene and Post Falls. It is north of I-90 and it is bisected by Huetter Road. The initial meeting included the City of Post Falls and KMPO, and subsequent meetings were with City of Coeur d’Alene staff only. The group also had separate meetings with the Coeur d’Alene and Post Falls School Districts. The meetings extended from the fall of 2019 into the spring of 2020. Subsequent to the last meeting with Coeur d’Alene staff, the consultant inquired about the possibility of annexing the full property into the City. In looking further into the Idaho State statutes related to annexations, it was determined that it could be possible if the property was analyzed in the Comprehensive Plan. On May 22, 2020, the City received a letter of intent from the Lakeside Capital Group, LLC, Chairman, Founder and Manager, John Hemmingson, requesting that the City of Coeur d’Alene include the full 1,100 acres formerly owned by Roy Armstrong in the City of Coeur d’Alene’s Comprehensive Planning process. The letter cites the following reasons for the request: It is most logical to be served by the City of Coeur d’Alene’s sewer infrastructure as one master planned development, and it is desirable in terms of sense of place for the future residents to live in one city and not various jurisdictions. They also noted that working with one jurisdiction is desirable both for the development and the agencies, to be developed under the standards and regulations of one agency and that it may be desirable for the development to be fully located in one city such that the city providing the services would be the full beneficiary of the full range of tax revenues from the commercial offerings in the development. Analyzing the additional approximately 500 acres of land that is outside of the City’s Area of City Impact through land use scenarios and traffic modeling will increase the cost of the consultants’ work. MIG would charge an additional $2,000 to update the model. The traffic subconsultant has indicated that it would charge $3,000-5,000 per scenario to do the modeling. They are scoped to run up to three scenarios, which could be an additional $9,000-$15,000 for traffic modeling. It would be reasonable for Lakeside Real Estate Holdings, LLC, to incur those additional costs since it was not included in the original scope of work or budget for the Envision Coeur d’Alene project and would be done solely for its benefit. Similarly, if sewer modeling is done by the City, it would be reasonable to require the property owner to pay for the modeling costs. If water modeling is required to evaluate a change in service areas and possible redistricting, that cost should also be paid for by the property owner.
Conversely, the property owner could pay the consultants directly for the increased costs of modeling required by the City, which might be preferable to having to modify existing agreements, but might be less efficient and the City would lose some control. Annexation discussions can occur in the future and all additional costs can be paid by the property owner. They will be proposing mixed uses of residential and commercial and it would be fair to bring into one city for property tax collection.

**DISCUSSION:** Councilmember McEvers asked about sewer going to Post Falls. Ms. Anderson noted that it does not have to go to Post Falls, which started the conversation about the original Area of City Impact (ACI) boundaries and infrastructure. The alignment of the Huetter bi-pass was also considered. Wastewater was reviewed by the property owner consultant and they thought it might be easier to connect to the city of Coeur d’Alene based on gravity flow. She clarified that the property developer would pay for any of the additional costs of modeling and analysis. Councilmember McEvers noted that this was the last piece of property discussed in the planning game used earlier in the year and it is twice as big as estimated. Mayor Widmyer clarified that this is not a decision on land use, it is just a request to include it in the Comprehensive Plan and to be studied. Ms. Anderson confirmed the request would take the conceptual vision and land use alternatives for the modeling, and in no way does it bind the City to agree to annex property in the future. Councilmember McEvers asked if it would include sewer and water modeling. Ms. Anderson confirmed it would include both modelings and that the property owner would cover those costs. Councilmember Gookin asked what the density of the property would be. Ms. Anderson said that it is estimated at 4 units per acre. Wastewater Superintendent Mike Anderson said that the capacity ratings are done by gallons and there are pinch points in the plant and 5 million gallons in the tertiary system. Councilmember Gookin asked if the City could handle that size of property. Mr. Anderson said there is no way that it would come in and not impact wastewater; however, they would require the property owner to model and they would work to determine if upgrades were needed. Councilmember Wood said she felt it sounded like good planning and it will not lock the City into anything and is the point of the Comprehensive Plan.

**MOTION:** Motion by Wood, seconded by English to direct staff to include the Roy Armstrong property in the updated Comprehensive Plan and have the land owner pay for additional studies and modeling needed. **Motion carried.**

**FIRE BOAT GARAGE AT THE 3RD STREET MOORING DOCK, KNOWN AS FIRE STATION 5, AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF IMPACT FEES FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, AND AUTHORITY TO MOVE FORWARD WITH BIDS.**

**STAFF REPORT:** Lucas Pichette, Deputy Fire Chief noted that in 2015 the Fire Department purchased a State-of-the-Art Marine Firefighting Vessel to provide Fire, Rescue and EMS services to the North end of the lake. The City entered into an agreement with Kootenai County Fire &Rescue (KCFR) to provide the service they had provided in the past. The Fire Department had an annual lease since 2016. They were informed last fall that they would not be able to continue using that boat house as the County will be using it going forward. In conversation with City Parks Director Bill Greenwood and City Administrator Tymesen, it became clear that the only viable location for the garage would be at the Third Street Marina. It is estimated that
the boat garage would cost approximately Two Hundred Thousand dollars ($220,000) and they are requesting a Two Hundred Fifty Thousand ($250,000) budget for unforeseeable expenses. The current direction is to use impact fees, which has a balance of Two Hundred Eighty-Three Thousand ($283,000). The Third Street dock area is the best possible solution for the project. A majority of calls for service are on or around Tubbs Hill and the channel leading boats to the south end of the lake. It allows for a quicker response time as it is closer to Fire Station #1 and they are already in the vicinity of the majority of their calls for service.

DISCUSSION: Councilmember Gookin asked Mr. Tymesen if the impact fees were only for fire. Mr. Tymesen confirmed that it is just the fire line item.

MOTION: Motion by Gookin, seconded by Wood, to authorize the use of impact fees for the construction, and authority to move forward with bids for the Fire Boat Garage at the 3rd Street Mooring Dock, known as Fire Station 5.

ROLL CALL: English Aye; Wood Aye; Evans Aye; Miller Aye; McEvers Aye; Gookin Aye. Motion carried.

AUTHORITY FOR THE DRAINAGE UTILITY TO PURCHASE HEATED STORAGE FACILITY FROM THE WATER UTILITY FOR $46,000.

STAFF REPORT: Tim Martin, Streets and Engineering Director presented a request for council authorization of the purchase of a 40-foot by 50-foot climate-controlled heated steel building for the Drainage Utility. He noted that the Water Department is preparing to move off the general fund-owned campus at Ramsey Road. As part of those preparations, the Water Department asked the Drainage Utility if it would be interested in purchasing a heated storage facility located on the Ramsey Road campus from the Water Department at its depreciated value. By purchasing the building, the Drainage Utility would no longer need to rent as much storage space for specific emergency units such as sweepers and TV trucks during the winter. Currently, the Drainage Utility rents storage units for much of that equipment during the winter for $350 - $500 per month to avoid leaving it outside covered by snow. The storage facility will allow the utility to anticipate spring-like rains, Chinook winds and thaws in order to rapidly respond as flooding occurs. The depreciated value of the building is $42,297. With considerable additions such as controlled access doors and a mezzanine for above-ground storage, the utility and Water Department have agreed to a price of $46,000. He clarified it is not budgeted but there are available funds within the Drainage Utility.

MOTION: Motion by Gookin, seconded by McEvers to approve the Drainage Utility to purchase a heated storage facility from the Water Utility for $1.00.

DISCUSSION: Councilmember McEvers asked why the water utility can’t gift the building to the drainage utility. Mr. Gridley explained that they need to pay the asset back into the Water budget as they are a fee-for-service utility. Mr. Tymesen noted that they will be requesting to build a new building for the same amount on their new property. Councilmember McEvers asked if they are selling their old office building. Mr. Tymesen explained that they analyzed the value versus who owns the land and the depreciated value. Councilmember Gookin noted that it
is all public money, and there will be a saving from no longer needing to rent a space, so he does not understand the $46,000 charge. City Attorney Mike Gridley, commented that he appreciates the sentiment, but they are both separate legal entities and the general fund needs to put money back into the original fund. Councilmember Gookin asked if it would be illegal. Mr. Gridley explained that a rate payer could challenge the City, and noted that they would be giving away an asset purchased by the rate payer. Councilmember Gookin stated that the structure is depreciated and they don’t need it. Councilmember Wood concurred that the utility should be able to gift it and/or depreciate it for zero value. Mr. Gridley noted that there is a distinction between general fund departments and enterprise funds and their rates are based on their cost to do business. Councilmember English agreed that common sense would say that the City could transfer between departments; however, enterprise funds transfers are common but that is the process that keeps things clear.

**ROLL CALL:** Wood Aye; Evans No; Miller No; McEvers Aye; Gookin Aye; English No. **Motion carried with the Mayor voting in the affirmative.**

**J. RECESS:** Motion by Gookin, seconded by McEvers to recess to June 8, 2020 at noon in the Library Community Room, located at 702 E. Front Avenue for a workshop regarding budget priorities. **Motion carried.**

The meeting recessed at 8:56 p.m.

__________________________________________
Steve Widmyer, Mayor

**ATTEST:**

__________________________
Renata McLeod, CMC
City Clerk
MINUTES OF A CONTINUED MEETING OF THE
COEUR D’ALENE CITY COUNCIL
HELD IN THE LIBRARY COMMUNITY ROOM
ON JUNE 8, 2020 AT 12:00 NOON

The City Council of the City of Coeur d’Alene met in continued session in the Library
Community Room held at 12:00 NOON on June 8, 2020, there being present upon roll call a
quorum.

Steve Widmyer, Mayor

Woody McEvers ) Members of Council Present
Dan Gookin )
Dan English )
Kiki Miller )
Amy Evans )
Christie Wood )

STAFF PRESENT: Troy Tymesen, City Administrator; Mike Gridley, City Attorney; Randy
Adams, Deputy City Attorney; Renata McLeod, Municipal Services Director/City Clerk; Ted
Lantzy, Building Official; Vonnie Jensen, Comptroller; Kenny Gabriel, Fire Chief; Melissa Tosi,
Human Resource Director; Bette Ammon, Library Director; Bill Greenwood, Parks &
Recreation Director; Hilary Anderson, Community Planning Director; Lee White, Police Chief;
Tim Martin, Streets & Engineering Director; Mike Anderson, Wastewater Superintendent; Kyle
Marine, Assistant Water Superintendent; Lee Brainard, Police Captain; Sean Phillips, Municipal
Services; Brandon Jank, Municipal Services; Chris Bosley, City Engineer; Sean Holm, Senior
Planner; Mike Becker, Capital Program Manager; Tom Greif, Deputy Fire Chief; Katie Hirst,
Executive Assistant; Amy Ferguson, Executive Assistant; Juanita Knight, Senior Legal
Assistant.

CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Widmyer called the meeting to order and noted that the purpose of
the meeting was to kick-off the budget meetings for the year. He encouraged the Council to ask
questions.

BUDGET OVERVIEW:
City Administrator Troy Tymesen commented that the meeting was strategic and ties into the
financial plan. He noted that the Finance Department and Comptroller Vonnie Jensen have done
a great job preparing the Preliminary Budget, and that it is council’s opportunity to look at the
year head, and then a few more years down the road. Council is not scheduled to get back
together until July where most of the changes will tie into revenues. They are still working on
medical insurance. The Council’s discussion at these meetings will help them firm up the
financial plan, with the goal of having a balanced plan the first meeting in September.

Councilmember Wood asked about revenues. Mr. Tymesen responded that revenues are always
a “crystal ball” look.
Councilmember Gookin asked about an email that Council received this morning from Governor Little’s office regarding property tax relief. Mayor Widmyer said that plan is that city and county governments will submit their public safety budgets for a potential relief for property taxpayers. The commitment on the part of the government agencies is that they will not take a property tax increase and there will be funding coming back to the City to supplement public safety. There will be a line item on the property tax bills with the credit. The Mayor confirmed that the property tax credit would be for just one year.

**DEPARTMENT HEAD PRESENTATIONS:**

**Administration:** Mr. Tymesen said that one of their big and ongoing benefits is the City’s medical benefit trust. He noted that they don’t have the exact numbers yet, but his goal is to be no more than a 2.5% increase annually. The City spends about $5M on medical insurance, so keeping costs down is important. Mr. Tymesen said that the trust is performing well, and they are proposing a 1.8% increase for this next full fiscal year. Normally, that would be a great number, but they want it less than that and are negotiating. The other goals are to carry out the goals that Council has. As the Lake Urban Renewal District closes down, they will look at the income stream, projects to be done, and fund balances to be restored.

Mr. Tymesen said that they would like to bring a two-year budget forward so they can make sure that their capital for certain areas isn’t too high in the next year and there aren’t any big roadblocks. Councilmember Gookin asked if other cities do that. Mr. Tymesen said that they do, and noted that the hard part is that the second year can be quite change-worthy depending on what revenues have done.

Councilmember Wood said that she would like to see the Council have a workshop where they can be part of the discussion on what they would like to have happen with the Lake District funds and how it can impact the three-to-five-year plan. She commented that if the City recovers all of those funds, she would like to plan for IT, vehicle replacement, acquisitions, and possibly look at some commitment for relief for property tax in the future as well. Mr. Tymesen said that the Preliminary Financial Plan has capital replacement for all departments for five years. Councilmember Miller agreed with Councilmember Wood’s request for a workshop.

Councilmember McEvers asked when the URD will close. Mr. Tymesen said that it closes in 2021, and the City will see funding in 2022.

Councilmember McEvers asked about the difference between a COLA and a Merit Increase. Mr. Tymesen said that a COLA is a cost-of-living allowance and is a contracted dollar amount in the contracts with the employee groups. A Merit Increase is based on performance. Merits increases end when an employee is maxed out in their pay grade.

Councilmember Wood said that, overall, she sees some trimming in certain areas, and noted that it looks like most of the departments have taken a trim to training, but she didn’t notice a trim for training from the Administration department. She commented that, from her perspective, she thinks that professional development is incredibly important and she would want to restore those funds and look at increasing proportionately as needed as they move forward in the future. She
further commented that she thinks there are ways to be more efficient with training, such as working with the college, bringing in experts and sharing some of that cost with other cities.

Councilmember McEvers said that training is time away from work and in some areas it means the City is paying overtime to have the position covered. When things get lean, he looks to training as taking a year or two off. He further commented that the training budgets have blown up over the years, and that he is not against training, but is concerned about the economics and thinks that training should be the most flexible thing. Mr. Tymesen said that the Human Resources Department has a great program they have been working on, which provides electronic training across the board.

Councilmember English said that he strongly agrees that in the long term, training is not something that you want to go backwards on. Mayor Widmyer said that the lack of training can lead to not staying up-to-date and doing the best job, and that he thinks the City needs to be wise in regard to training.

**Finance:** Comptroller Vonnie Jensen reviewed the mission and functions of the Finance Department. She noted that they have interactions with the majority of City citizens and all of the departments. They have two goals for this upcoming year – to upgrade the financial software, and implementation of utility payments for customers. The Springbrook software upgrade will be completed in July. Once the upgrade is completed, they will pick up with the credit card company to implement recurring payments. The goal will be to provide the service at very little cost.

Ms. Jensen said that the proposed budget for Finance includes merit increases and a 2.5% COLA. Due to the turnover of one position, the expenses came in lower than anticipated last year, and Ms. Jensen anticipates the health insurance increase being less than $1,500 for the department.

Ms. Jensen reviewed the proposed budget increases and noted that the total increase to the Finance Department budget is $21,250.

Councilmember Wood commented that she appreciates the Council being provided with a packet and wanted everyone to understand that it is not a critique when she asks questions. She asked Ms. Jensen about the interfund transfer study. Ms. Jensen responded that the interfund transfer study was done to get the costs for departments that do things for enterprise fund departments. The consultant came in and reviewed the costs and determined how much each of the funds should contribute to the general fund.

Ms. Jensen explained that they have to get through the upgrade to the software before they can work on the recurring payments, and she doesn’t anticipate it being complete until the next fiscal year as it has taken longer than anticipated. She confirmed that it will be a budget item next fiscal year.

Councilmember Miller asked if the recurring payments function would result in any savings in staff time. Ms. Jensen said not at first, but hopefully as they get it finalized it will be better, but
it depends on how many people sign up for it. She further commented that she doesn’t know if there will be a cost, but the cost will be very minimal. 2.5% would be charged up front to the customer. Ms. Jensen noted that, right now, it is about $10-$11,000 to absorb credit card fees for online utility payments.

Ms. Jensen explained that the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) has a very good list of policies and procedures that she would like to set up and have approved by the Council. She noted that the City has some policies, but there are a few that definitely need to get done, including a grants policy.

**Municipal Services**: Municipal Services Director Renata McLeod said that the Municipal Services Department houses a lot of services for the benefit of all of the departments, including customer service, business licensing, and IT. They are proposing a little bit of staff reorganization this year. There was one retirement and they would like to take that position and rework it to a Deputy Network IT position. They would also like to bring in a Division Head so they can get more management resources over IT, which would bring the internal database administrator person up one pay grade. Another goal is the Five-Year Plan for IT.

Ms. McLeod said that they have a very small IT staff, who are monitoring over 600 computers and laptops. They have moved most of the permitting and licensing for businesses online, but still have some improvements to be made.

Ms. McLeod discussed the proposed budget increases and noted that in about two weeks they should have some information from the State in regard to preauthorizing COVID funds. If they can get some of those funds approved, they can delete them from the budget. She also noted that they have a few staffing cost savings this year, so whatever they can purchase from this year’s budget they will remove it from next year’s request. They did install another 1 Gigabyte internet line, which increased the monthly cost but has sped up the system greatly. They are hoping for reimbursement from COVID funds for that.

Councilmember Gookin asked if they could wait a year on the new Network Specialist position. Ms. McLeod responded that they can wait a year, but this year they have funding from the GIS position they are not filling and it would be a bigger expense the following year. They found with COVID that if their Network Administrator gets sick, they have no network backup. This was a low-cost fix to a pretty big issue they see in IT.

Councilmember Gookin asked what is the current policy in regard to replacing computers. Ms. McLeod said that the current policy is to replace them as they break. She noted that some hard drives are pretty old, and some have “gremlins.” Replacement of the hard drives at $750 each is a pretty low cost. They are trying to create some sort of maintenance schedule and are hoping to get as many upgrades as they can this fiscal year. Ms. McLeod confirmed that they have no written replacement policy.

Councilmember Gookin asked how many copier contracts the City has. Ms. McLeod said that there could be different contracts for different buildings, but City Hall has just one. Councilmember Gookin confirmed that Wastewater, Water, FD, and PD have their own copier
contracts. He commented that he thinks the City could look into saving some money by having one copier contract for the whole city. Councilmember English said that, in the County, there were doing exactly that – centralizing copier contracts – and by maximizing they received better contract pricing and it was more efficient. Councilmember Gookin said that he thinks it is something that the City can look into.

Councilmember Gookin asked about Jobs Plus and asked what the City is getting for its $25,000 contribution. Mayor Widmyer said that it is a program that they have had for a long time and suggested having Gynni Gilliam come and speak to the effectiveness of the program at a future Council meeting. He further noted that Mr. Tymesen attends all of the Jobs Plus meetings.

Councilmember McEvers asked about replacement of city phones and the upgrade of the camera and asked if that would be a trade-off for the network solutions. Ms. McLeod said that they don’t have a replacement policy for phones either, but as they are looking at moving the phone service to an internet-based service provider, there will be some phones that will no longer work. They will have to look at how many phones absolutely have to be replaced to be functional, and can slow the project down as needed. In regard to the camera equipment, Ms. McLeod said that right now they have about six cameras that they think are not functioning correctly and they are trying to diagnose the issues. If the repairs are low cost, they will fix them this year. They do need some maintenance money for next year, or they can come back with an emergency request.

Councilmember Wood commented that she really likes seeing the five-year plan for IT and thinks it is critical city-wide. She would also like to see the requested position filled, and commented that she would be supportive of finishing the five-year plan. She further noted that she thinks the IT division will be critical in council’s workshop when they talk about the URD funds.

Councilmember Miller asked about the Dues and Subscriptions line item and asked to consider if they need to do it just because they’ve always done it in regard to CDA 2030, Panhandle Area Council, Jobs Plus, and the Downtown Association. She said that she wants the partnerships to exist but it might be time to look at all of them.

Councilmember Miller said that during COVID they have learned a lot, and she asked Ms. McLeod if they have had discussions with IT regarding things that might provide savings to departments. Ms. McLeod said that they have learned a lot of lessons, made good improvements, and found a lot of weaknesses in systems. There are some services that they can replace and a Five-Year Plan will enable them to go through and look at each device, including more security for the network. They will be looking at software companies and will come back when they figure out the right methodology moving forward. Ms. McLeod commented that it is not cheap to have an outside agency locking down the networks. She also noted that they will be implementing a new tape backup system. If the State will reimburse them on Zoom and Splashtop purchases, it is about $18,000.

**Human Resources:** Human Resources Director Melissa Tosi said that the HR Department has three full-time employees. Many of the HR goals can be accomplished without extra budget with the staffing that they have. In regard to City-wide training, they are currently using
ThinkZoom. It is the first year they are using the web-based e-learning software, which has hundreds of different tracks that employees can be part of. Currently, Ms. Tosi said that she has $8,500 set aside for the City-wide training. In the past they have utilized it by bringing some professional speakers in on different topics, etc., but what would end up happening is she would get a group of individuals that could make it for the training. The training was great, but it was expensive to bring somebody in so it wasn’t ideal. They weren’t really reaching City-wide staff, so they decided to go with ThinkZoom training. Ms. Tosi said that last year she was able to pay for the training in last year’s budget and able to pay for the rest of it through the current year’s budget. The cost is $53 per employee per year. Coming into this next fiscal year, they won’t have enough to fund the entire amount. Ms. Tosi noted that Wastewater and Water were very helpful in paying for their employees out of the Enterprise Fund. This year they have been able to utilize it by having some training during the Executive Team meetings, and different departments have utilized some of the training in their own staff meetings. They have the ability to assign training to specific persons, departments, or supervisors. They can also upload policy information and get it out to everyone. Ms. Tosi noted that when they had ICRMP mandatory training, they were able to create a Powerpoint and put it through ThinkZoom. They have a couple featured topics every month.

Ms. Tosi said that, looking forward, they are trying to enhance their onboarding process. They have an orientation process that they do with all new employees, but are bringing them together. They would like to be able to send employees a couple of training videos when they are hired and do more online. They should be able to do some additional compliance training.

Councilmember Evans asked if the training is utilized by public safety as well. Ms. Tosi said that public safety already has a lot of training that they already do, but they can work with them.

Councilmember Gookin said that he is not a fan of ThinkZoom, and asked what the compliance rate is of employees using it. Ms. Tosi said that she can check on that, but all the employees used it when they required it. They have the ability to see what employees are taking optional trainings.

Councilmember Gookin asked about sick leave repurchase. Ms. Tosi said that when employees reach a certain number of hours of accrued sick leave, they have a couple of options. In October, they can either choose to bank their hours moving forward if their contract allows, or they can choose to get paid a third of the hours that they are over, at their hourly rate. She noted that 720 hours is the threshold, and once the employee gets to 720 in that fiscal year, whatever they are over at that point they have to choose an option. Then it brings them back down to 720 at the beginning of the fiscal year. The only way an employee gets paid for their sick leave is at the end of the year for the sick leave repurchase, or if they retire. Sick leave has to be an approved absence. There are also employees that have banked their sick leave so that when they retire they might have 1,000 hours on the books.

Councilmember Gookin asked if vacation time is “use it or lose it?” Ms. Tosi said that at the end of the fiscal year, based on the employee group, they have to utilize the hours that they are over by January 15th or they will lose what they were told to use. Councilmember Gookin asked if there has been a study done to determine if having other people cover shifts and paying overtime
is more expensive than having the City pay them for their vacation time rather than having the absence covered. He asked if there has been a study done and if it is contractual. Ms. Tosi confirmed that it was contractual.

Councilmember McEvers asked about alcohol and drug testing. Ms. Tosi said that they have certain safety sensitive positions and new hires that require a CDL license, etc. Testing is based on a percentage that they test every month. They have to pay a little bit more depending on shifts, but it doesn’t fluctuate too much.

Councilmember Wood said that she would like to strongly encourage Police and Fire to do a study on what the cost is for filing vacation and to work with HR and come back to the Council. If there is a huge savings there and everyone thinks it is a good way to go, they should be doing that.

Ms. Tosi said that this year will be an interesting year to look at vacation overages because there are a lot of employees that had plans that were canceled by COVID. She would anticipate that the vacation balances will be higher than usual.

Councilmember Wood said that she would like to see tangible goals for HR, as in how could they really look three to five years down the road to make employment at the City even more attractive. They might want to look at a way to do a childcare center which is not on site, but is something that employees would pay for, with employees of the City. She suggested that they could offer something like the NIC Childcare Center, only open to City employees. She would love to see some collaboration with departments that have open positions to help with the screening of the applications. Ms. Tosi said that their recruitment tracking software, NEOGov has opened up their ability to accept online applications. They use the program and have hiring managers set up in every department so when they get applications online, the software program shoots them directly to the hiring manager that is able to go through them as well.

Councilmember Miller asked if there is an ongoing look at mutually beneficial early retirements with different departments. Ms. Tosi said they look at it every few years and the last time they did an incentive it ended in 2017. They pulled the numbers a month or so ago and looked at different departments, but when you do retirement incentives too often, employees tend to wait to retiree, wanting an incentive or a payout as they leave. She commented that she did a spreadsheet and at this point there isn’t enough significant savings to justify offering it, knowing that many of the departments would potentially refill the position.

Councilmember Miller asked about the Cityfit and risk programs, and if the vendor gives the City a study to say what the success rate is and how it affects premiums, risk, etc. Ms. Tosi responded no, and said that they don’t have enough funds to really do a substantial wellness plan. The City covers flu shots, and they do a walking program and a few programs throughout the year. She commented that it is important that staff look at some of the high exposures and things that are critical to staff independence, and look at how they tailor the benefits trust to the employees and their dependents. She further noted that the Cityfit budget went from $4,000 to $3,000, and covers the general cost of some of the wellness programs they do. She also noted that the Employee Assistance Program (EAP) is very well-utilized.
Councilmember Wood said that she thinks the employee retirement depends on how it is structure and commented that there seems to be a lot of room for bartering. She suggested that they could hold positions open for six months to a year, and doesn’t think that it is off the table. There may also be positions that are not refilled, and the City would see some cost savings.

Mayor Widmyer asked if there was a limit to how much a person can put in their VEBA. Ms. Tosi said that it is completely employer-funded and there is no limit, but an employee can’t contribute on their own.

Councilmember McEvers commented that it seems like when the City has done buyouts, there were a lot of maxed-out department heads who retired, and part of that is they would lose some corporate knowledge and historical perspective. Ms. Tosi responded that they have had people that aren’t maxed out leave, and when you offer it up you are always going to get people who are planning to leave anyway. It can also create positive movement in the department.

**Legal:** Mike Gridley, City Attorney, reviewed the department’s mission. He noted that folks that work in the department do a great job being as cost-effective as possible. Part of the credit goes to IT, who have done a great job supporting them. They would like to look at leveling the Chief Deputy Attorneys from pay grade 18 to pay grade 19. That would give them 12% more headroom that they could grow into. Mr. Gridley noted that he was not asking for it this budget cycle, but they would be available to get a merit increase next year and they would budget for that.

Mr. Gridley said that as the City grows, they will need more people. They are not asking for more people this year, but as time goes on and the City grows, there are going to be more requests for services. The Prosecution Office is part of the law enforcement team, but are often overlooked. They support the Police on all misdemeanor offenses in the city of Coeur d’Alene. One of the priorities for their department is domestic violence, and there is a lot of dealing with victims and witnesses. The magistrate courts are going to add two more judges so they can handle more volume, so the Prosecution Office will have to run a little faster to keep up with that. Under their court system they have treatment courts, and they support staffing those courts but it does require time and effort. Ms. Gridley said that there was no specific request in this budget but looking forward as they grow, they will probably need more bodies.

Councilmember McEvers asked about District Court traffic fines. Mr. Gridley said they have declined but it is not that they are handling less. He commented that he thinks the courts have decided who gets what share of the fines/court costs.

Councilmember Wood suggested that the Council may want to ask the Civil team look at reviewing the City ordinances next year. She suggested putting together a team, and noted that bringing the changes forward on a continual basis educates the Council. Mr. Gridley said that it is something that they can work on and that a lot of it can be driven by departments. He noted that it is a big project.
Councilmember Wood commented on Legal’s goal of enhancing legal guidance to law enforcement regarding ever-changing laws and noted that some of the things that she did when she worked for the Police Department is they would have Wes Somerton come in and speak with a small group to form that relationship, and also provide education about changing City laws. Another thing that she used to do is invite Mr. Somerton to the community block watch meetings. Mr. Somerton gave back a tremendous amount of correct, accurate information and people were able to take that back to their neighborhoods. Councilmember Wood commented that she thought it was valuable and would like to see that coordination and community education happening again.

Councilmember Wood said that she would have loved to have the cell phone numbers of the prosecuting attorneys and asked if that is happening. Mr. Gridley said that, if not, they can certainly make that happen.

Councilmember Miller suggested that the pay grades should be leveled through the rate study, and at what other department heads are making. Mr. Gridley commented that the folks are licensed attorneys and have a lot of responsibility for what they do.

Councilmember Miller asked if they still have a Volunteer Victims Advocate program and how it affects hours. Mr. Gridley said that they have a part-time volunteer person who works in Criminal. She does a good job contacting victims and witnesses. Their thinking is that maybe as they have retirements or other savings, that it would probably be their first “ask” to bring on a full-time paid legal assistant to do more of that.

**Planning:** Hilary Anderson, Community Planning Director, said that the Planning Department has seven members, and the department is small and nimble. She discussed the services they provide under two pillars – long range planning and visioning, and day-to-day operations. She discussed their strategic goals. One goal is to continue priority projects such as Envision CDA and Historic Planning & Preservation, infill and missing middle housing, and continuing collaboration on special projects and economic development. Another objective is to support business leaders. Another goal is community development and livability, and how to maximize funds and City resources.

Their three-year goals include zoning code updates, East Sherman zoning code, the health corridor, and a focus on livability and preserving the quality of life.

In regard to the Planning budget, Ms. Anderson said that they shaved some costs on travel/training and official representation. They were also able to have their professional services budget go down quite a bit.

Councilmember Wood asked Ms. Anderson to come back and provide education on council in regard to CDA 2030, including what the City is getting from the partnership. She also noted that with the amount of projects going on, she would like to see the official representation reduction be put back into the budget.
Councilmember Miller said that the City made a huge investment with their direction on the healthcare corridor and noted that it is the fastest growing demographic of people moving into town. She noted that Planning gets spread pretty thin and that if more of the focus moved the Planning Department’s attention to those items under the health care program versus spending too much time with ongoing projects with East Sherman and other places that already have momentum on their own.

Councilmember Gookin commented that one of his concerns is that the Council overextends Planning. He noted that the Comp Plan is top priority, and does want to go back to East Sherman and at some point, would want for a presentation to Council on infill and middle housing. He wants Council to be able to weigh in.

Councilmember McEvers said that he would like Planning to look at CDA 2030 and see if it is worth the money and what the City gets.

In regard to the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program, Ms. Anderson said that they have tried to reorganize how they present information to show how dollar amounts align with the different funding areas for the block grants.

The council took a break at 1:43 p.m., and reconvened at 1:50 p.m.

**Building Maintenance**: Bill Greenwood, Parks & Recreation Director, said that Building Maintenance is one of the five Parks divisions, and there is not much change in the budget. He noted that there is a chiller at the Police Department and rather than trying to budget for replacement, they spent some money to get it repaired. It may or may not go out. He noted that the building is an older building so they keep sinking money into it and upgrading.

There is no additional capital this year in all five divisions and they have been creative in some savings. They have had all divisions push all capital purchase out for another fiscal year.

**Police**: Police Chief Lee White said that the majority of the differences in the budget are contract costs, and there are some positions they have included in the budget proposal. They are asking for two sergeants for the reason that over the past six years they have added a host of positions, largely through grants, but have not added a single supervisor in over 20 positions that the department has added over the last ten years. They don’t have an adequate amount of supervision on the streets some days. Last year they used 1,684 hours of overtime just for staffing for sergeants who were out due to injuries, vacations, and illnesses.

They have also requested a code enforcement officer. In addition, they have only one person working evidence right now and are asking for the part-time position to be upgraded to a full-time position.

Chief White said that they are requesting a total of three police cars – one for a canine vehicle, and the other two are for spares. The normal replacement schedule is between five and seven vehicles a year, and this year they are only asking for three vehicles. He noted that $50,000 of the request is offset by a donation they received from a church a number of years ago that was to
go specifically for the canine program. Chief White noted that K-9 “Peko” is long overdue to retire and they need to get a new dog. A patrol dog costs $15,000 and you have to get a vehicle to go along with it. The $50,000 would offset the cost of the vehicle and the dog.

Councilmember McEvers asked about SWAT equipment in the budget. Chief White noted that the biggest increase is that two members do not have bullet proof vests. SWAT vests are significantly different and must stop rifle rounds and provide more protect. The cost is $8-9,000 each and they are only good for five years pursuant to industry standards.

Councilmember McEvers asked about training and asked why the PD is sending people so far pretty consistently. Chief White responded that, right now, they have 117 members and spend $90,000 a year for training in that they have a number of certifications that have to be renewed every year, including taser certifications, child forensic interview training, computer forensic training, firearms certifications, and drug recognition training. Most of the training is just for maintaining certifications. Chief White noted that the PD has done a number of things to reduce costs. Last year they brought in training on search & seizure, which was cost effective. He also commented that there is not a lot of locally-offered training, but they will send people out for training and then have them come back and train other officers.

Councilmember Wood commended the PD on their efforts to keep the peace the last couple of weeks. She said that she agrees that public safety is the number one priority and, as far as needing two sergeants goes, she understands the need for that. Lack of supervision and accountability is like asking to write a big check.

Councilmember Wood said that, in regard to code enforcement, that part of her job description was going out into the neighborhoods. She commented that if you tend to little things, you won’t get big things, and that in a city of this size, one code enforcement officer is not sustainable. She encouraged Council to invest back into the code enforcement program and noted that there are a lot of issues in the City and one person cannot get to all of them. When you deal with the small issues, you won’t have big issues.

Councilmember Wood said that, in regard to the canine unit, it is an obvious expense that they City has to take care of, along with the vehicle that goes with it. She also commented that, in regard to the evidence tech, the technician does much more than just preserve evidence – they try to go out to the crime scene. She encouraged the Council to remember the public safety priority they set in previous years and if they have to talk about a tax increase this year, that they do a small tax increase with 100% going to public safety – police and fire. She also commented that the City needs to have a strategic plan for vehicle replacement.

Councilmember Wood said that the crime reduction overall by the PD is incredibly impressive. She asked Chief White what he was going to do to work with the community to reduce the fear of crime. Chief White said that it is subjective, but they get feedback from the crime prevention specialist and victim advocate. The raw numbers show that Coeur d’Alene is far safer per capita than in the last 50 years. He noted that you can show people numbers all day long but all that it takes is a provocative incident to make people not feel safe. They try to have a continual
dialogue with the community and community leaders. It is difficult to quantify and most of it is
how people feel when they are walking the streets.

Councilmember Wood asked if they were still doing “Coffee with the Chief.” Chief White said
that they still plan those on a pretty regular basis.

Councilmember Miller asked about the $10,000 in the budget for the East Sherman substation,
and commented that she thought the substation was closed. Chief White said they were planning
on a Station 2 somewhere, and there was some impact fee money going toward the Third Street
garage, which was killed due to high bids. They are still looking for a Station 2 someplace, but it
won’t be on East Sherman.

Councilmember asked if the drug task force had been phased out. Chief White said that it
has shifted gears. They had a drug task force in the early 2000’s and it went to the North Idaho
Violent Crimes Task Force. Now it is a joint task force with ISP, KC, etc. There was never any
funding since he has been with the City for the drug task force, but they occasionally put money
into it.

Councilmember asked about Fuels and Lubes in the budget being up by $20,000, while everyone
else’s budget was down. Chief White said that “EIA” predicts that fuel prices will average $2.33
a gallon next year and that is how they came up with the number. Streets & Engineering
Director Tim Martin said that the City will have to go out and bid a new contract this summer.

Chief White said that the PD will blow the overtime budget out of the water like they do every
year. Over the past three days last week alone, they spent $80,000 on overtime. He noted that
they can’t really predict what will come up but the majority of their overtime is for minimum
staffing coverage.

Councilmember Miller asked if the PD had any plans based on recent events in the last few
weeks, and if the department has had discussions on things that may be upcoming in the next six
months to a year. Chief White said that he has no idea of what the future holds, and noted that
the 4th of July event this year will be staffed significantly different than last year. The Car
d’Lane event will also be significantly different than it was last year. The conversation they
have been having is that they are adequately staffed during the winter months, but they are
nowhere near adequately staffed during the summer months.

Councilmember McEvers commented that Council does not receive a report on code
enforcement and it would be interesting to see what code enforcement does. Chief White said
they can absolutely provide that to Council.

Councilmember McEvers asked about the request for two sergeants and asked if it creates a hole
for two people to take their spots. Chief White said they are asking for two new positions, so
they would have two existing people promoted to sergeant, and then would hire two additional
officers. They have a current sergeant’s list, so filling the positions wouldn’t take too much time
at all.
Councilmember McEvers asked about the PD’s philosophy on traffic stops and whether it is a priority. Chief White said that they have three tenets – engineering (working with Streets to determine if there are engineering fixes), enforcement, and education. How they handle a traffic stop is based on the behavior they saw and if the person is doing it repetitively, or if their behavior is so egregious, they need a ticket the first time out. He noted that traffic tickets have gone down over the last several years.

Councilmember McEvers asked about assignment pay. Chief White said that in their contract there are certain dollar amounts associated with certain positions. Councilmember McEvers asked about walkabouts and if they were still in the picture. Chief White responded that during their summertime their School Resource Officers fulfill that function.

Governor Brad Little and Senator Pro Tem Brent Hill and staff members briefly joined the meeting and were introduced. Governor Little said that they were bringing forward a program to produce some nice property tax relief. Under any scenario, it is going to be a good thing for all of Idaho and will take a lot of pressure off of property taxes. He commented that “we are all in this together,” and said that he didn’t know what was going to happen on the Corona virus, but if the people of Idaho continued their good behavior, the State will be better off than anywhere else.

Fire: Fire Chief Kenny Gabriel said that the Fire Department prides themselves on being an all hazard fire department. The beauty of the job is you “don’t know what you don’t know.” Four months ago they had no idea they would be dealing with a pandemic. He further commented that he looks at the budget like it is his own. They try hard to scrutinize every dime that they spend, and noted that they are not coming to the Council with wants, but needs. What they learned through the pandemic is there was a hole when it came to infection control. They are proud of their partnerships with the EMS system, NIC, and surrounding departments. He noted that they have needed an EMS position for quite some time and it is their number one priority and the biggest part of what they do. It would be a new position – an EMS officer for the Fire Department but also an infection control officer for the entire city. Chief Gabriel commented that Scott Dietrich has been doing an amazing job and has the knowledge and background to help the City get through the pandemic. Firefighter Dietrich is going around talking to department heads already regarding COVID response. The department prides itself on customer service – internally and externally, and they want to move their front office position to full-time. They also need to send another one of their firefighters to paramedic school. They will be promoting an engineer or two this year, and a paramedic may test out of their position.

Chief Gabriel said that their most important goal is planning, planning, planning. They would like to plan where the next fire station will go, and will also start planning for the next G.O. bond, with council approval.

Councilmember Wood said that she appreciated the work of the Fire Department this week, and supports the EMS position. She also noted that the goals and accomplishments of the Fire Department were impressive. Councilmember Wood asked about the requested $8,000 for flooring. Chief Gabriel said that they are trying to get rid of carpet in the fire stations because different infectious diseases can
stay in the carpet. They will try to get the money through the CARES act, or have talked to Mr. Tymesen about maybe doing one a year for three years. He noted that it is part of the “healthy in, healthy out” concept that is being done throughout the country.

**Streets & Engineering:** Streets & Engineering Director Tim Martin said that the department is 35 people strong. One of their goals is to continue to cross-train on street ratings, inspections, public vacations and development review. Other goals including street inspection rating, and finishing the design and construction of the second lane eastbound on Kathleen between 95 and Government Way, and continuing to use and strengthen the used equipment line, which has been very successful for their department.

Mr. Martin commented that their three-year vision is probably a 20-year vision, which includes mobility planning (bicycles, pedestrians, sidewalk, vehicle) and chip seal. Funding has always been a challenge and Mr. Martin commented that they need to put more funding into chip seal and overlay. Another goal is to evaluate fleet services and make improvements, including hiring a full-time in-depth coordinator who manages the Fire Department fleet. Mr. Martin noted that the Fleet is increasing and they don’t have room in the shop as they can only put six vehicles in the shop at a time. They are managing 1,500 assets with five people, and Mr. Martin said that it is worthy of a conversation looking long term.

In regard to the signal grads on Northwest Boulevard, Mr. Martin said that the company is highlighting this area for future sales all over the county so they are going to want to make it work. The City has pulled the fiber and wire, and final install starts tonight and will go through Wednesday. They should have it up and running by Thursday if all goes well.

They are working to coordinate corridors. The strategic three-year vision is a campus plan out at the Street shop, covered storage and shelter.

Councilmember McEvers asked if they have ever looked into contracting out maintenance on particular pieces of equipment. Mr. Martin said that in their leases, it calls for service and they provide space for the vendors to come in and maintain the vehicles. On this last go around, they put in the contract that the vendor is only going to provide the filters and oils and the City is going to do the work. Councilmember asked about cars and fire trucks. Mr. Martin said that their fleet supervisor is incredible, and that Chiefs White and Gabriel would probably say they would rather have the City do service than to take the vehicles somewhere else.

Councilmember McEvers asked Mr. Martin if they have ever run the economics of what the City pays outside firms to do design work, and was it ever done in-house? Mr. Martin said that to his knowledge, he doesn’t think that there has ever been design work done in house, but other cities do it.

Councilmember Gookin commented that the City increased its funding for public transportation (Citylink and KMPO) last year and what is the City’s return on investment. Mayor Widmyer said that they don’t have any numbers, but it is certainly something they can look at and ask for.
Councilmember Wood said that there is a theme she keeps hearing from department heads, and that is long range plans. She suggested looking at a coordinator to work with the departments to pull a plan together and that she thinks it is worth the small investment to have someone coordinate with the departments and help them. She also commended Mr. Martin and the Streets & Engineering Department for the help that they provide to other departments.

Councilmember Mill said that curing the COVID pandemic, a lot of people were working from home. She asked Mr. Martin if they were able to relieve some of the tension in the Streets parking lot by doing some ongoing working-at-home programs. Mr. Martin said that it helped, but they also started taking on part-time help. They are continuing to have some staff working from home because the back room is too tight of a space.

Councilmember Miller asked about the coordinator mechanic position. Mr. Martin confirmed that the person would coordinate and actually do the work on the Fire fleet.

Councilmember Miller asked about sweeping expenses. Mr. Martin said that over the last two or three years the Drainage Utility is paying for the initial sweep every spring and then in the fall the last sweep of the year. In conversation with Kim Harrington and Mr. Tymesen, one of their biggest permit pieces is the sweeping so they are looking at now potentially having the Drainage Utility cover not only the spring and the fall, but also to pay for all the sweeping which is in the hard pipe system (everything south of I-90) to keep it out of the lake.

**Drainage Utility:** City Engineer Chris Bosley said that there are not too many changes to the budget this year. They have a full-time employee that they are moving over to the Drainage Utility, and a smaller equipment purchase. They are building up some capital which they want to use on some projects. One of their goals is a stormwater discharge reduction program. They also have a couple of projects that they are teaming up with ITD on. They also want to address inadequate draining areas, and currently have two agreements in progress with some private property owners to utilize some unused areas of their property to build a swale that would handle the overflow of stormwater.

Their last goal is discharge permit compliance. The Department of Environment Quality (DEQ) will be taking over their MS4 permit next year from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and so they are hoping to up their game a little bit to make sure that contractors understand the rules so the City can reduce the amount of pollutants going into the lake and river.

Mr. Bosley said that they are working on a potential pilot project on Ramsey for lower maintenance, and if that works, they can work up and down the boulevard on Ramsey Road, which will reduce water usage and the amount of mowing.

Councilmember Gookin stated that he views the Drainage Utility as the City’s “rich uncle,” which leads him to believe that perhaps the Drainage Utility is overcharging the ratepayers. He would favor looking at the utility to make sure that the City is not overcharging and get it in line with what it should be. Mr. Martin responded that in the five-year capital plan there are two big projects coming up for which the utility has to have some dollars set aside. They have a very large output on Kathleen Avenue in which they will be removing swale on the east side in front
of Home Depot. They have to find a place to put the stormwater, and will create a project underneath the sidewalk. In addition, Ms. Harrington has ideas to bring forward a big project on East Sherman where they will take some stormwater off the outfall site and create a big swale near where the tree public art is. Ms. Harrington wants to look at the 11th Street outfall that drops into Sanders Beach. Mr. Martin said that the utility can show every dollar that the utility has ever spent because they are accountable for all of the hours and supplies and have been very diligent. He further noted that it takes a few years to get money ahead to do some of those projects. Councilmember Gookin asked to be provided with details on the office supplies budget.

Councilmember Wood asked if the city of Coeur d’Alene was comparable to other cities with its fees. Mr. Bosley said that the City is the only city in the State with a drainage utility. If it isn’t paid as a user fee, it is going to be paid in taxes, because the job has to be done.

Parks & Recreation: Parks & Recreation Director Bill Greenwood said that this year’s budget is about Atlas. The City has a $6M investment in the park and they are going to be asking for one lead worker. They have been able to find $55,000 in savings from their budget to help offset that cost. Mr. Greenwood said that Parks manages some things that are non-park areas. Some years ago, they started subcontracting those out with some savings that they had in their seasonal budget. The new position would offset some of the workload for the people at Ramsey Park, and they can go back and do the non-park areas. They are also requesting a 5% increase in operating costs, with a larger increase in the cost of “chips.” There is no capital replacement budgeted in any of their divisions. Mr. Greenwood commented that Mr. Wolf in Streets saved them money by finding the bucket truck, which saved them about $40,000, and he has done the same thing for them on some trucks. With the money they are saving on equipment purchases, they are beginning to outfit Atlas already.

Councilmember Miller asked about a parks master plan. Mr. Greenwood said that it is currently being reviewed and will go to the Parks & Recreation Commission first, hopefully within the next month, and then on to Council.

Councilmember Miller asked if the parks master plan includes an audit on what services in the Recreation Department which are maybe being duplicated elsewhere in the community. Mr. Greenwood said yes, but they are also looking at new things, and last year started a “Strider” program.

Councilmember Wood said that it is quite impressive that the extra personnel in Atlas was whittled down to one, and she thinks that the City is going to have to find the funds. Mr. Greenwood credited Jeff Erickson for the work that he has done.

Councilmember Wood asked what the department would do if a mower breaks. Mr. Greenwood said they would get creative, and buy parts if they can. If they can’t repair or replace, they just get by without it. They have to move things and personnel around to cover the gap.

Building: Building Official Ted Lantzy reviewed the departments mission statement and said that a lot of their goals over the years have been primarily enforcement, but they are trying to
change the image of the department and focus more on training. He noted that a lot of their builders, developers and designers don’t attend a lot of code trainings so they are continually trying to expand on their personal education and training. Mr. Lantzy said they have partnered with the North Idaho Code Enforcers to bring in local training, which has saved them quite a bit of money, and actually dropped the training budget by about a third. He further commented that due to COVID, they are not sure how they are going to make it work this year, so a lot of the money in the budget is for training online.

They are currently looking at creating an online permit access for residential customers and want to keep it simple. They are also looking at improvements to the website and need to make information more easily found. Mr. Lantzy noted that it is a code adoption year and they are looking at adopting the 2018 International Building Codes in January 1, 2021. They have some outdated codes and the City is currently operating on the 1994 code for abatement of dangerous buildings.

Mr. Lantzy said that he keeps getting approached by people wanting affordable housing. There is a plan to move forward with tiny homes.

Mr. Lantzy said that permits are still steady. He confirmed that revenues come from building and inspection permits, along with mechanical inspections.

Councilmember McEvers asked how the video inspections worked out. Mr. Lantzy said that it was kind of hit and miss, and that it works for some things.

Councilmember Gookin said that permits are supposed to pay for services and if there is extra money coming in they have to be cautious. He asked if Mr. Lantzy was comfortable with charging so much for permits. Mr. Lantzy said that the permit fees were probably one of the lowest in the area.

**Library:** Library Director Bette Ammon said that the budget proposal this year is pretty flat, with no new expenditures. They are keeping the materials budget at the same level as last year. The only new proposal is a new position for the branch public library at the Nexus school that will be completed in September. The facility will have an outside entrance and restroom facility, but they need personnel to staff it. Ms. Ammon said that it does not reflect a big change in their personnel budget because they will have retirement savings, and other projected retirement as well.

Councilmember McEvers asked if it was the City’s job to provide library services to everyone, and questioned having libraries at schools. Ms. Ammon said that it would be a shared facility where the school library would be in operation during the day, and the public library would be in operation when the school library is not open. Councilmember McEvers asked about IT, music, etc. Ms. Ammon said that the school provides the computers, the heat, lights, restroom, etc. The program at Lake City High School has been a model for other potential partnerships across the State. It is a savings for the City and a benefit for the school district. She further noted that a library is a cultural entity and provides a community gathering place, as well as humanities and literacy.
Councilmember Miller explained that the satellite library program has been a model program and will save the City exponential amount of money in the future and allows citizens of all ages to use the library when they might not normally get to use it. She asked if the library does an audit on the measurable reach of some of their programs, and whether they are duplicating services. Ms. Ammon said that they are doing that all the time. They look at how far their119 programs go, how many people attend, and what people are asking them to do.

Mayor Widmyer asked about the Library Foundation. Ms. Ammon said that they make the cultural events available and use their funding to make the building and services better.

**Water:** Assistant Water Superintendent Kyle Marine discussed the 2021 goals, including continuing to move forward with projects such as the well on Huetter Road. They will also be running a transmission line along the Prairie Trail. They have selected a consultant for the Huetter well building and hope to bring the agreement to the Council soon. Welch Comer is in the design phase for next year’s project on the transmission line to move water to the downtown area. The Atlas well will be rehabilitated in 2021, and they will continue to work on the water infrastructure replacement program. They are also continuing their quest for acquisition of property for two future storage facilities. In addition, they are working with a developer on Blackwell Island to acquire an easement and lot for a future booster station.

Mr. Marine explained that once they exceed 50,000 people in Coeur d’Alene, according to the Census, it will become a Class Four city. As a result, they will have requirements to stay within compliance.

Future goals include the acquisition of additional water rights to keep up with the City’s growth, including the NE storage facility construction and the Orchards well.

Councilmember McEvers asked if the rate studies have covered these projects and Mr. Marine responded that it did, and it is also included in their comp plan. They do the comp plan every 10 years to make sure they are staying on top of future projects. The life span of the rate study is 5 years, and Mr. Marine said that the next turn around they will do a rate study and a comp plan update.

Councilmember McEvers asked about the impact of going to a Class Four. Mr. Marine said that they are required by the State to take a certain amount of samples every year, and that will go up, including more reports, stricter rules, and a higher license category. Time, materials and manpower would be involved.

Councilmember McEvers asked about conservation. Mr. Marine said that water conservation is always on their minds and they are trying to figure out ideas to work with it. He commented that Mr. Pickel is involved on a couple of committees regarding education, and is working with the Parks Department regarding timers. As water conservation grows in different parts of the country, they have very strict rules. Mr. Marine noted that the City is fortunate to be on the aquifer. They have a certain amount of money set aside for water conservation and are always looking for different ideas.
**Wastewater:** Wastewater Superintendent Mike Anderson said that the utility is anticipating reduced revenue this year. They will be bringing over about $3.3M from their cash balance this year to help pay for projects. The biggest ticket items are replacement of a belt press from 1990 with a centrifuge, which was planned for this year but they are not getting it done until next year. They have almost $2M in projects anticipated for this year that will be rolling over into next year.

The other important items is the collection systems master plan, which they will begin next year. They are waiting to incorporate information from the Envision CDA comp plan and plan to wrap up the plan master plan in fiscal year 2022.

Councilmember McEvers asked about the operations building. Mr. Anderson said it is a two-year project. The building was built in 1972 and housed building, admin, collection operators, etc. The building is in need of replacement and currently the plant operators are the only ones who occupy the building. They get a design done this year and are working on finalizing it. The total cost is $2.2M - $1.1M next year, and $1.1M the year after. The operations building will have a garage, but will also have computer bank, and offices for staff.

Councilmember McEvers asked about the master plan coming before the rate study. Mr. Anderson said that they did their rate study a couple of years ago and they do them every five years. The master plan was last updated in 2013.

Councilmember Miller asked about the septic tank abatement program and if there was a way to coordinate with Streets and potential savings for homeowners. Mr. Anderson said that he thought that would be possible and would anticipate that it could save money for the homeowner, and would definitely save money in general. Councilmember Miller asked if there is a way to coordinate the plan. Mr. Anderson said that it could be done if known far enough in advance.

Councilmember Gookin asked about the street light utility, and said that he thinks it would be better if rate payers paid the full cost rather than having property tax payers supplement from the General Fund when the utility is short.

Councilmember Wood asked about the sanitation budget and whether fees match expenditures. Mr. Tymesen said that the fund was in the red when he started with the City. It is variable based on a contract and there is no guarantee on the haulers. Councilmember Gookin commented that when the City renegotiated the contract, they didn’t adjust the rates to account for the new lower contract cost. Mr. Tymesen said that there is an annual escalator in the contract, and the recycling portion of the contract is up for renewal now.

**COUNCIL PRIORITY DISCUSSION:**

Mayor Widmyer said that Governor Little’s CARES Act is not a huge game changer as far as the City budget goes, but it is a huge game changer for property tax payers. The amount is $2.5M, but to get that money, the City would have to take a 0% property tax increase. It would probably
be about $100,000 to the General Fund, and $2.5M to the property tax payers. It would probably result in a 12 to 14% decrease off of the City of Coeur d’Alene line item on the property tax bill.

Councilmember Wood said that Mr. Tymesen will bring forward exact figures for a 1%, 1.5%, 2%, etc. increase, and offset those figures with the assessment so that Council can see. She further noted that if Council she would like to see any increases dedicated to public safety.

Mayor Widmyer said there are a lot of things in the budget that still need to be gone through, and there are a lot of things that won’t be in the final draft. Mr. Tymesen noted that 84% of the budget is people and benefits, and they are starting out with a $1.3M deficit.

Troy reviewed the current budget situation and anticipated revenue, and noted that a big decrease is highway user tax.

Councilmember Miller asked about a communications coordinator position. Ms. Tosi will provide information to Councilmember Miller. Councilmember Evans said that this is also her number one priority this year.

Councilmember Wood suggested one additional budget workshop. Councilmember Gookin agreed. Mr. Tymesen said that the next workshop is scheduled for July 8th.

Councilmember McEvers said that he would like to see the return of the General Services/Public Works meetings, and would also like to see the Council attending Executive Team meetings again, and Council liaisons to departments. Mayor Widmyer commented that the feedback on Council’s involvement in Executive Team meetings is that discussion wasn’t as open with a councilperson there. The other feedback was that if a councilmember is a liaison a certain department, they would lobby for that department. Councilmember Wood said that she would like to continue the conversation.

The council was requested to email their thoughts to be brought forward at the next budget workshop on July 8th. Mayor Widmyer asked the Council to review the minutes from the workshop and be prepared for the meeting on July 8th.

**ADJOURN**: Motion by Gookin, seconded by McEvers, that there being no other business, this meeting be adjourned. **Motion carried.**

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

_________________________________

Steve Widmyer, Mayor

ATTEST:
Amy C. Ferguson
Deputy City Clerk
# Treasurer's Report of Cash and Investment Transactions

## General-Designated
- **Balance 4/30/2020**: $1,796,216
- **Receipts**: $1,688
- **Disbursements**: $234,727
- **Balance 5/31/2020**: $1,563,177

## General-Undesignated
- **Balance 4/30/2020**: $10,691,696
- **Receipts**: $3,190,574
- **Disbursements**: $5,086,003
- **Balance 5/31/2020**: $8,796,267

## Special Revenue
- **Library**: $339,438, receipts $15,286, disbursements $105,423, balance 5/31/2020 $249,301
- **CDBG**: $13,902, receipts 0, disbursements 295, balance 5/31/2020 $13,607
- **Cemetery**: $111,629, receipts $33,685, disbursements $38,807, balance 5/31/2020 $106,707
- **Parks Capital Improvements**: $1,205,075, receipts $1,506, disbursements $14,571, balance 5/31/2020 $1,192,010
- **Impact Fees**: $3,832,116, receipts $88,396, disbursements $1,175, balance 5/31/2020 $3,920,512
- **Annexation Fees**: $94,946, receipts 0, disbursements 96, balance 5/31/2020 $95,042
- **Cemetery P/C**: $1,371,307, receipts $10,503, disbursements $1,175, balance 5/31/2020 $1,363,212
- **Jewett House**: $30,196, receipts 0, disbursements 30, balance 5/31/2020 $29,051
- **Reforestation**: $26,736, receipts $1,027, disbursements 0, balance 5/31/2020 $27,763
- **Street Trees**: $194,406, receipts $5,595, disbursements $1,679, balance 5/31/2020 $198,322
- **Community Canopy**: $3,241, receipts 0, disbursements 4, balance 5/31/2020 $3,245
- **Public Art Fund**: $89,915, receipts $141, disbursements 0, balance 5/31/2020 $90,056
- **Public Art Fund - Ignite**: $502,398, receipts $504, disbursements 0, balance 5/31/2020 $502,902
- **Public Art Fund - Maintenance**: $132,038, receipts $132, disbursements 550, balance 5/31/2020 $131,620

## Debt Service

## Capital Projects
- **Street Projects**: $740,037, receipts 743, balance 5/31/2020 $680,157

## Enterprise
- **Street Lights**: $98,941, receipts $47,974, disbursements $54,825, balance 5/31/2020 $92,090
- **Water**: $1,375,965, receipts $300,791, disbursements $914,312, balance 5/31/2020 $762,444
- **Water Capitalization Fees**: $7,590,603, receipts $93,612, disbursements 0, balance 5/31/2020 $7,684,215
- **Wastewater**: $9,325,907, receipts $852,819, disbursements $609,847, balance 5/31/2020 $9,568,879
- **Wastewater - Equip Reserve**: $1,227,712, receipts $27,500, disbursements 0, balance 5/31/2020 $1,255,212
- **Wastewater - Capital Reserve**: $1,500,000, receipts 0, disbursements 0, balance 5/31/2020 $1,500,000
- **WWTP Capitalization Fees**: $2,832,727, receipts $140,923, disbursements 0, balance 5/31/2020 $2,973,650
- **WW Property Mgmt**: $60,668, receipts 0, disbursements 0, balance 5/31/2020 $60,668
- **Sanitation**: $1,711,431, receipts $338,661, disbursements $318,280, balance 5/31/2020 $1,731,812
- **Public Parking**: $255,635, receipts $24,354, disbursements $6,085, balance 5/31/2020 $273,904
- **Drainage**: $1,245,113, receipts $85,473, disbursements $29,279, balance 5/31/2020 $1,301,307
- **Wastewater Debt Service**: $1,077,353, receipts $1,081, disbursements 0, balance 5/31/2020 $1,078,434

## Fiduciary Funds
- **Kootenai County Solid Waste Billing**: $219,031, receipts $200,393, disbursements $224,688, balance 5/31/2020 $194,736
- **Police Retirement**: $860,242, receipts $14,608, disbursements $24,352, balance 5/31/2020 $850,498
- **Sales Tax**: $2,783, receipts 2,527, disbursements 0, balance 5/31/2020 $2,527
- **BID**: $238,067, receipts $3,789, disbursements 0, balance 5/31/2020 $241,858
- **Homeless Trust Fund**: $771, receipts 523, disbursements 771, balance 5/31/2020 $523

**GRAND TOTAL**

- **Balance 4/30/2020**: $51,362,571
- **Receipts**: $5,492,246
- **Disbursements**: $7,747,673
- **Balance 5/31/2020**: $49,107,144

I HEREBY SWear UNDER OATH THAT THE AMOUNTS REPORTED ABOVE, ON THE CASH BASIS ARE TRUE AND CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE.

Vonnie Jensen, Comptroller, City of Coeur d'Alene, Idaho
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND OR DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>TYPE OF EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>TOTAL BUDGETED</th>
<th>SPENT THRU 5/31/2020</th>
<th>PERCENT EXPENDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor/Council</td>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>$254,425</td>
<td>$159,721</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>2,728</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>209,521</td>
<td>139,159</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>679,466</td>
<td>435,010</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>518,050</td>
<td>500,534</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Services</td>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>1,273,999</td>
<td>822,284</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>546,375</td>
<td>412,569</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>328,696</td>
<td>216,527</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>71,823</td>
<td>42,303</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>1,240,704</td>
<td>832,457</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>51,153</td>
<td>33,308</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>675,488</td>
<td>423,740</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>297,800</td>
<td>128,598</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Maintenance</td>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>383,106</td>
<td>224,994</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>172,875</td>
<td>136,648</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>96,400</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>14,216,783</td>
<td>9,081,405</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>1,617,216</td>
<td>762,258</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>140,161</td>
<td>39,748</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>9,911,402</td>
<td>6,849,331</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>641,085</td>
<td>281,571</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>22,224</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>125,750</td>
<td>1,533,758</td>
<td>1220%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td></td>
<td>302,998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Grants</td>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>42,658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CdA Drug Task Force</td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets</td>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>3,086,704</td>
<td>2,074,892</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>1,797,404</td>
<td>765,136</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>173,254</td>
<td>112%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>1,684,388</td>
<td>971,446</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>687,150</td>
<td>305,802</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>85,117</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUND OR DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>TYPE OF EXPENDITURE</td>
<td>TOTAL BUDGETED</td>
<td>SPENT THRU 5/31/2020</td>
<td>PERCENT EXPENDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>556,208</td>
<td>345,995</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>196,280</td>
<td>56,223</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Inspection</td>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>898,321</td>
<td>582,274</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>41,256</td>
<td>14,159</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>24,233</td>
<td>24,089</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total General Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>42,779,932</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,936,742</strong></td>
<td><strong>68%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>1,353,266</td>
<td>822,344</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>252,500</td>
<td>143,273</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>93,341</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>597,467</td>
<td>74,178</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>190,877</td>
<td>114,905</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>105,950</td>
<td>55,248</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>72,800</td>
<td>52,209</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Fees</td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>238,052</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annexation Fees</td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>99,000</td>
<td>99,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Capital Improvements</td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>564,500</td>
<td>958,990</td>
<td>170%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Perpetual Care</td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>191,500</td>
<td>128,245</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewett House</td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>28,853</td>
<td>6,356</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reforestation</td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Trees</td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>104,000</td>
<td>42,344</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Canopy</td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art Fund</td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>369,300</td>
<td>50,805</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4,477,013</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,879,538</strong></td>
<td><strong>64%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>878,932</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,319</strong></td>
<td><strong>6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY OF COEUR D'ALENE
BUDGET STATUS REPORT
EIGHT MONTHS ENDED
May 31, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND OR DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>TYPE OF EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>TOTAL BUDGETED</th>
<th>SPENT THRU 5/31/2020</th>
<th>PERCENT EXPENDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seltice Way</td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>63,986</td>
<td>15,275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seltice Way Sidewalks</td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>8,472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Calming</td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>445,000</td>
<td>29,835</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Avenue Widening</td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>226,839</td>
<td>224,100</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 95 Upgrade</td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>53,015</td>
<td>7,766</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th Street</td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>25,618</td>
<td>256%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Park Loop &amp; Atlas</td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>804,500</td>
<td>482,503</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Signal Improvments</td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>41,452</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlas Waterfront Project</td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>289,189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Blvd Traffic Signals</td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,611,812</td>
<td>1,115,738</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lights</td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>706,000</td>
<td>392,187</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>2,166,893</td>
<td>1,416,676</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>4,778,418</td>
<td>902,225</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>7,676,000</td>
<td>3,299,770</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Capitalization Fees</td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>3,900,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>2,911,298</td>
<td>1,697,107</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>6,874,376</td>
<td>1,575,449</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>4,710,000</td>
<td>1,676,521</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>2,176,363</td>
<td>734,108</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW Capitalization</td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>3,959,644</td>
<td>2,455,732</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Parking</td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>1,351,011</td>
<td>619,431</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>29,125</td>
<td>121%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>118,155</td>
<td>78,335</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services/Supplies</td>
<td>798,391</td>
<td>215,859</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>905,000</td>
<td>259,402</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enterprise Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>44,305,549</td>
<td>15,351,927</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kootenai County Solid Waste</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,885,000</td>
<td>1,618,289</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Retirement</td>
<td></td>
<td>184,241</td>
<td>122,128</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Improvement District</td>
<td></td>
<td>176,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Trust Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>3,743</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fiduciary Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,250,041</td>
<td>1,824,180</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS:</td>
<td></td>
<td>$97,303,279</td>
<td>$50,158,424</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I HEREBY SWEAR UNDER OATH THAT THE AMOUNTS REPORTED ABOVE, ON THE CASH BASIS, ARE TRUE AND CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE.

Vonnie Jensen, Comptroller, City of Coeur d'Alene, Idaho
City of Coeur d'Alene  
Cash and Investments  
5/31/2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>City's Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Bank</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking Account</td>
<td>1,824,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking Account</td>
<td>36,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Account - Police Retirement</td>
<td>837,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Account - Cemetery Perpetual Care Fund</td>
<td>1,360,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idaho Central Credit Union</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Deposit</td>
<td>266,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idaho State Investment Pool</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Investment Pool Account</td>
<td>43,524,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spokane Teacher's Credit Union</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Deposit</td>
<td>254,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Numerica Credit Union</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Deposit</td>
<td>1,001,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash on Hand</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Department Petty Cash</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer's Change Fund</td>
<td>1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Change Fund</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Change fund</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Change Fund</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>49,107,144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I HEREBY SWEAR UNDER OATH THAT THE AMOUNTS REPORTED ABOVE ARE TRUE AND CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE.

Vonnie Jensen, Controller, City of Coeur d'Alene, Idaho
RESOLUTION NO. 20-035

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF COEUR D’ALENE, KOOTENAI COUNTY, IDAHO, APPROVING THE FINAL PLAT OF THE DISTRICT AT RIVERSTONE (S-1-19), AND ACCEPTING IMPROVEMENTS AND A LANDSCAPE AGREEMENT WITH SECURITY.

WHEREAS, it is recommended that the City of Coeur d’Alene approve the Final Plat of the District at Riverstone (S-1-19), and Accept Improvements and a Landscape Agreement with Security, pursuant to terms and conditions set forth in the Agreement, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit “1” and by reference made a part hereof; and

WHEREAS, it is deemed to be in the best interests of the City of Coeur d’Alene and the citizens thereof to enter into such Agreement;

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED by the Mayor and City Council of the City of Coeur d’Alene that the City approve the Final Plat of the District at Riverstone (S-1-19), Accept Improvements and a Landscape Agreement with Security in substantially the form attached hereto as Exhibit “1” and incorporated herein by reference, with the provision that the Mayor, City Administrator, and City Attorney are hereby authorized to modify said Agreement to the extent the substantive provisions of the Agreement remain intact.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mayor and City Clerk be and they are hereby authorized to execute such Agreement on behalf of the City.

DATED this 16th day of June, 2020.

_____________________________
Steve Widmyer, Mayor

ATTEST:

_____________________________
Renata McLeod, City Clerk
Motion by , Seconded by , to adopt the foregoing resolution.

ROLL CALL:

COUNCIL MEMBER ENGLISH  Voted
COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER  Voted
COUNCIL MEMBER GOOKIN  Voted
COUNCIL MEMBER EVANS  Voted
COUNCIL MEMBER MCEVERS  Voted
COUNCIL MEMBER WOOD  Voted
DATE:  June 16, 2020  
FROM:  Hilary Anderson & Mike Behary, Planning Department  
SUBJECT:  [S-1-19] District at Riverstone: Landscape Agreement and Security Approval  

DECISION POINT  
Staff is requesting the following:  

1. Approval of the Landscape Agreement and Security.  

HISTORY  

a. Applicant:  Dennis E. Cunningham II, Member  
   The Unfolding, LLC  
   P.O. Box 3398  
   Coeur d’Alene, ID 83816  

b. Location:  2.23 Acres located at 2744 N. Riviera Parkway  

c. Previous Action:  
   1. Preliminary plat approval, June 11, 2019  

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS  
The developer is furnishing security in the amount of $24,909.00 which covers the outstanding cost of the uninstalled open space landscaping items that are required for this development.  

PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS  
The developer has completed the necessary landscape agreement and is bonding for the outstanding landscape items (Irrigation Pipe System, Landscape Preparation, Hydro seeding, and Landscape Trees). The developer has stated that all open space landscaping installations will be complete by September 30, 2020.  

DECISION POINT RECOMMENDATION  

1. Approve of the Landscape agreement and accompanying security.
DATE:       June 16, 2020
FROM:       Dennis J. Grant, Engineering Project Manager
SUBJECT:    S-1-19 District at Riverstone: Final Plat and Acceptance of Improvements

DECISION POINT

Staff is requesting the following:

1. Approval of the final plat document, a twenty-four (24) lot residential development.
2. Acceptance of the installed public infrastructure improvements for the District at Riverstone

HISTORY

a. Applicant: Dennis E. Cunningham II, Member
   The Unfolding, LLC
   P.O. Box 3398
   Coeur d’Alene, ID 83816

b. Location: 2.23 Acres located at 2744 N. Riviera Parkway

c. Previous Action:
   1. Preliminary plat approval, June 11, 2019

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

There are no financial issues with this development.

PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

The developer has installed all required infrastructure. The responsible City departments have approved the installations and found them ready to accept. Acceptance of the installed improvements will allow the issuance of all available building permits for this development, and, Certificate of Occupancy issuance upon completion.

DECISION POINT RECOMMENDATION

1. Approve the final plat document.
2. Accept the installed public infrastructure improvements.
AGREEMENT TO PERFORM LANDSCAPE WORK

District at Riverstone

THIS AGREEMENT made this 16th day of June, 2020 between The Unfolding, LLC, whose address is P.O. Box 3398, Coeur d'Alene, ID, 83816, with Dennis E. Cunningham, II, Member, hereinafter referred to as the "Developer," and the city of Coeur d'Alene, a municipal corporation and political subdivision of the state of Idaho, whose address is City Hall, 710 E. Mullan Avenue, Coeur d'Alene, ID 83814, hereinafter referred to as the "City";

WHEREAS, the City has approved, subject to completion of the required improvements, the subdivision plat of the District at Riverstone, a twenty-four (24) lot, five (5) tract residential development in Coeur d'Alene, situated in the Northeast Quarter of Section 10, Township 50 North, Range 4 West, Boise Meridian, Kootenai County, Idaho; NOW, THEREFORE,

IT IS AGREED AS FOLLOWS:

The Developer agrees to complete the following public improvements: Open space landscape improvements, as required under Title 17 of the Coeur d'Alene Municipal Code, on or before the 30th day of September, 2020. Said improvements are more particularly described on the submitted estimate dated May 27, 2020 attached as Exhibit 'A', and, shown on the Subdivision Improvement Plans, Page 5, titled "The District at Riverstone", dated August 12, 2019, stamped and signed by Shawn M. Metts, PE, #12378 of HMH Engineering whose address is 3882 N. Schreiber Way, Suite 104, Coeur d'Alene, ID 83815, on file in the City of Coeur d'Alene Planning Department's office and incorporated herein by reference.

The Developer, prior to recording the plat, shall deliver to the City, security in the amount of Twenty-Four Thousand, Nine Hundred Nine and 00/100 Dollars ($24,909.00) securing the obligation of the Developer to complete the landscape open space improvements referred to herein. Should the Developer noted herein fail to complete the improvements within the time herein provided, the City may utilize the funds to complete or have the improvements completed. In the event the City completes the improvements as a result of the Developer's default, the Developer shall be responsible for any costs that exceed the installed security for the public improvements noted herein.

The Parties further agree that the City has utilized substantial staff time to prepare this agreement, which will benefit the Developer. The Parties further agree the City should be reimbursed a reasonable fee for its costs to prepare such agreement. The Parties further agree that such fee should be in the amount of Twenty Five and No/100 Dollars ($25.00).

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have set their hands and seal the day and year first above written.

City of Coeur d'Alene

Steve Widmyer, Mayor

ATTEST:

Renata McLeod, City Clerk

Agreement to Perform Landscape Work Resolution No. 20-035

Exhibit "A"
# Landscape Performance Bond Estimate

## The District at Riverstone

### Item Number | Item Description             | Bid Quantity | Units | Unit Price | Bid Amount |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Irrigation Pipe System</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$24.40</td>
<td>$5,856.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Landscape Preparation</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Hydroseeding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Landscape Trees</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$130.00</td>
<td>$3,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$16,606.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bond level** 150.00%  
**Total** $24,909.00

---

**EXHIBIT 'A'**
THE DISTRICT AT RIVERSTONE
LANDSCAPE PLAN

Design by:
Dennis Cunningham, Owner
Activewest LLC.
PO Box 3398
Coeur d'Alene ID, 83816
208.755.6857

Note: Landscaping to be completed by 9/4/2020.
OTHER BUSINESS
DATE:            June 16, 2020
FROM:           Troy Tymesen, City Administrator
SUBJECT:       Discussion with Council regarding parking lot fees generated on the 4th of July

DECISION POINT:
To discuss the use of funds from parking lot revenue generated by the 4th of July event.

HISTORY:
In the past, the City has leased the publicly owned parking lots to the Chamber of Commerce on the 4th of July for the Chamber to generate revenue to be used exclusively to defray the cost of the community fireworks display. This year, due to the public fireworks display being cancelled, the City will not be leasing the parking spaces to the Chamber. The City’s approved fee schedule provides that the fee for all day parking on the 4th of July is $7 per space. The lease with the Chamber allowed the Chamber to charge $20 per space. Thus, the Chamber received a net of $13 per space, remitting the other $7 per space to the City. Last year, the payment to the City from the Chamber for 4th of July parking was $9,374 net, after labor cost for the lots without pay stations. This amount is included in the FY 2019-20 budget as parking fund revenue under “quarterly rent,” which is the line item used to account for revenue received from all City lots with the exception of McEuen and the 4th St parking garage.

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS:
The Parking Fund financial plan includes the revenue of $7 per space for the 4th of July. There are 1,393 spaces not including the 87 spaces at Independence Point. This year the City’s public safety departments have requested to use a portion of the Independence Point parking lot for a staging area and the rest of the lot will be used for a few amusement rides for children which equates to no revenue from that lot. The Parking Fund financial plan includes a planned expenditure of $210,000 as a transfer to the General Fund for use by the Parks operating department and $190,000 expenditure as a transfer to the Parks Capital Improvement Fund. Furthermore, it is noted that the Police Department and the Fire Department’s anticipated overtime expense for the 4th of July event is included in their respective approved FY 2019-20 budgets.

PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS:
Governmental accounting standards require that a transfer from a proprietary fund (Parking Fund) to the General Fund must be approved by the governing body. This usually happens during the budget process or can be done through the budget amendment process. However, amending a budget requires that there be unbudgeted revenues (new revenues). There will be no unbudgeted or new revenues in this case as the parking revenue from the public parking lots for the 4th of July was already included in the current approved budget. The Parking Fund did start the year with a higher cash balance than anticipated and those funds could be moved to the General Fund at Council’s discretion.

DECISION POINT:
To discuss the use of funds from the parking lot revenue generated by the 4th of July event.
CITY COUNCIL STAFF REPORT

DATE: June 16, 2020
FROM: Mike Gridley – City Attorney
SUBJECT: Atlas Mill Property Transfer Agreement to Coeur d’Alene Urban Renewal Agency, dba ignite cda

DECISION POINT:
Should the City transfer the City’s Atlas Mill Property described in Exhibit A of the Transfer Agreement to the Coeur d’Alene Urban Renewal Agency, dba ignite cda?

HISTORY:
In a strategic effort to increase public access to the Spokane River waterfront and encourage the economic development of a brownfield former mill site, the City purchased a portion of the BNSF railroad right of way in 2015 and the former Stimson Atlas Mill site in 2018. Since that time, the City has worked with the community, ignite cda and consultants to create plans for public waterfront access, including a trail and park, as well as guidelines and plans for development of the remaining property. Ignite cda has funded the construction of the public Atlas Waterfront Project improvements that are nearing completion using urban renewal funds from the Lake District.

City staff and ignite have worked with consultants to establish a format for disposing of the City-owned land that will be used for development. Requests for Proposals were solicited from developers and a scoring system was used to select developers whose projects fit with the community’s goals for development. Agreements to Negotiate Exclusively (ANEs) for the first phase of development, which includes seven development areas, are underway. The transfer of the City-owned land to ignite cda will allow the agency to sell the land and generate revenue to reimburse ignite cda for the Atlas Waterfront Project public improvements and development costs, as well as reimburse the City’s acquisition costs.

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS:
After the City transfers the land, ignite cda will continue with efforts to sell the land for appropriate development. The anticipated revenue from these sales and the subsequent development is described in the Atlas Mill Land Development Cash Flow Projection attached as Exhibit B to the Transfer Agreement. The City’s acquisition costs for the Atlas Mill Property total approximately $9,172,408 ($7,850,000 for the Bad Axe property, $1,016,273 for the BNSF railroad property and $306,135 for fill material to improve the property). The proposals that were received for the first phase of development all came in with land values at or higher than projected, which will help meet the financial goals of the project.

PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS:
Under Idaho law urban renewal agencies have considerable latitude to negotiate land sales and redevelopment projects for the public good. In contrast, cities are usually limited to selling land by sealed bid to the highest bidder without the benefit of evaluating the bids to determine what bid best fits the community’s goals and development standards. Transferring the City’s land to
ignite cda will allow for the most efficient and beneficial sale of the land, and is consistent with the decisions made by the City Council and ignite cda Board to partner together to acquire and develop the Atlas Waterfront project for the public benefit. An ad hoc Steering Committee has been formed to oversee the development process, which includes Councilmember Wood, the City Administrator, Community Planning Director, and ignite cda representatives, one of which also serves on the City’s Planning Commission. The committee will continue to be involved in the process to ensure that the goals of the City and ignite cda are met.

DECISION POINT/RECOMMENDATION:
The City Council should transfer the Atlas Mill Property to ignite cda.
ATLAS MILL
PROPERTY TRANSFER AGREEMENT
FOR MORE INFORMATION VISIT THE CITY’S WEBSITE “ATLAS WATERFRONT PROJECT” PAGE

https://www.cdaid.org/3383/departments/administration/atlaswaterfront
https://www.cdaid.org/4611/departments/administration/atlaslog
RESOLUTION NO. 20-036

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF COEUR D’ALENE, KOOTENAI COUNTY, IDAHO, APPROVING AN AGREEMENT WITH THE COEUR D’ALENE URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY DBA ignite cda FOR THE TRANSFER OF THE CITY’S ATLAS MILL PROPERTY.

WHEREAS, it is recommended that the City of Coeur d’Alene enter into an Agreement with the Coeur d’Alene Urban Renewal Agency dba ignite cda for the transfer of the City’s Atlas Mill Property pursuant to terms and conditions set forth in an Agreement, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit “1” and by reference made a part hereof; and

WHEREAS, it is deemed to be in the best interests of the City of Coeur d’Alene and the citizens thereof to enter into such Agreement;

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED by the Mayor and City Council of the City of Coeur d’Alene that the City enter into an Agreement with the Coeur d’Alene Urban Renewal Agency dba ignite cda for the transfer of the City’s Atlas Mill Property in substantially the form attached hereto as Exhibit “1” and incorporated herein by reference, with the provision that the Mayor, City Administrator, and City Attorney are hereby authorized to modify said Agreement to the extent the substantive provisions of the Agreement remain intact.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mayor and City Clerk be and they are hereby authorized to execute such Agreement on behalf of the City.

DATED this 16th day of June, 2020.

_____________________________
Steve Widmyer, Mayor

ATTEST:

_____________________________
Renata McLeod, City Clerk
Motion by , Seconded by , to adopt the foregoing resolution.

ROLL CALL:

COUNCIL MEMBER ENGLISH  Voted
COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER  Voted
COUNCIL MEMBER GOOKIN  Voted
COUNCIL MEMBER EVANS  Voted
COUNCIL MEMBER MCEVERS  Voted
COUNCIL MEMBER WOOD  Voted
AGREEMENT FOR PROPERTY TRANSFER

THIS AGREEMENT OF PROPERTY TRANSFER ("Agreement") is entered into as of the ___ day of June, 2020, by and between the City of Coeur d’Alene, Kootenai County, Idaho, a body politic and corporate duly organized, operating and existing under the laws of the State of Idaho (the “City”) and the Coeur d’Alene Urban Renewal Agency, dba ignite cda, an independent public body corporate and politic of the State of Idaho (the “Agency”). The Agency and City may be collectively referred to herein as the “Parties” and individually referred to as a “Party.”

A. The City owns certain real property in Kootenai County, State of Idaho, situated within the Agency’s Lake, River and Atlas District areas, which real property (collectively known as the “Atlas Mill Property”) is more particularly described on Exhibit A attached hereto, and includes both the BNSF RR right of way acquired by the City in 2015 and the property the City purchased from Bad Axe, LLC in 2018.

B. As provided in Section 50-2015, Idaho Code, the City desires to transfer the Atlas Mill Property to the Agency to facilitate the development of the Atlas Mill Property for the benefit of the City. The City will retain ownership of the waterfront portion of the property for public access and park use.

C. The Agency intends to reimburse the City for the City’s acquisition costs for the Atlas Mill Property to the extent that the Agency determines its revenues from development of the Atlas Mill Property exceed the Agency’s costs of development in the appropriate district. The City’s acquisition costs that the Agency will consider for reimbursement for the Atlas Mill Property to the extent the Agency determines revenues are available in the appropriate district are approximately $9,172,408 ($7,850,000 for the Bad Axe property, $1,016,273 for the BNSF railroad property and $306,135 for fill material to improve the property). The Agency currently anticipates revenues and expenses as described on the Cash Flow Projection attached as Exhibit B.

D. The Agency desires to accept the transfer of the Atlas Mill Property and to use its best efforts to develop the Atlas Mill Property in accordance with the applicable urban renewal plans.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the above recitals, which are incorporated into this Agreement, the mutual covenants contained herein, and other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, the Parties hereby agree as follows:

1. Effective Date. The effective date of this Agreement shall be the date when this Agreement has been signed by Agency and the City, and shall continue until completion of all obligations hereunder of each Party.
2. **Transfer of Property.** The City agrees to transfer the Atlas Mill Property to the Agency by Warranty Deed.

3. **Successors.** This Agreement shall be binding on the heirs, successors, assigns, and personal representatives of the Parties hereto.

4. **Captions and Headings.** The captions and headings in this Agreement are for reference only and shall not be deemed to define or limit the scope or intent of any of the terms, covenants, conditions, or agreements contained herein.

5. **No Joint Venture or Partnership.** The City and Agency agree that nothing contained in this Agreement or in any document executed in connection with this Agreement shall be construed as making Agency and the City a joint venture or partners.

6. **Applicable Law/Attorney Fees.** This Agreement shall be construed and enforced in accordance with the laws of the State of Idaho. Should any legal action be brought by either Party because of breach of this Agreement or to enforce any provision of this Agreement, the action shall be brought in Kootenai County, Idaho, and the prevailing Party shall be entitled to reasonable attorney fees, court costs, and such other costs as may be found by the court.

7. **Entire Agreement.** This Agreement constitutes the entire understanding and agreement of the Parties with respect to the Property.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto have signed this Agreement the day and year written below, to be effective the day and year first above written.

CITY OF COEUR D’ALENE
KOOTENAI COUNTY, IDAHO

COEUR D’ALENE URBAN RENEWAL
AGENCY dba ignite cda

By: __________________________________
Steve Widmyer, Mayor

By: __________________________________
Scott Hoskins, Chair

ATTEST:

_____________________________________
Renata McLeod, City Clerk
EXHIBIT “A”

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

Those portions of the Atlas Waterfront Plat recorded in Book L of Plats, Page 291, records of Kootenai County, Idaho located within Section 10, Township 50 North, Range 4 West, Boise Meridian, City of Coeur d’Alene, Kootenai County, Idaho and described as follows:

Lot 1, Block 1 and Lot 2, Block 1, of said Atlas Waterfront Plat, together with the following two areas of Lot 3, Block 1 of said Atlas Waterfront Plat described as follows;

AREA 1: Commencing at the southeast corner of said Lot 2; said point being on the North line of said Lot 3; thence westerly along said North line, along a 572.50 foot radius curve to the left through an arc length of 242.34 feet, a central angle of 24˚15’13”, a chord bearing of North 77˚17’18” West and a chord distance of 240.54 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING;

Thence South 10°41’38” West a distance of 261.14 feet to the beginning of a 240.00-foot non-tangent radius curve to the right;

Thence northwesterly along said curve through and arc length of 179.33 feet, a central angle of 42°48’46”, a chord bearing of North 61°02’11” West and a chord distance of 175.19 feet;

Thence North 39°37’48” West a distance of 127.75 feet to the beginning of a 262.00-foot radius curve to the left;

Thence northwesterly along said curve through an arc length of 108.86 feet, a central angle of 23°48’24”, a chord bearing of North 51°32’00” West and a chord distance of 108.08 feet to said North line and the beginning of a 527.50 foot non tangent curve to the left;

Thence easterly along said North line along said curve through an arc length of 220.68 feet, a central angle of 23°58’09”, a chord bearing of South 87°26’52” East and a chord distance of 219.07 feet;

Thence along said North line, North 80°34’04” East a distance of 50.00 feet to the beginning of a 572.50-foot curve to the right;

Thence easterly along said North line along curve through an arc length of 100.09 feet, a central angle of 10°01’02”, a chord bearing of North 85°34’34” East and a chord distance of 99.96 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING:

AREA 2: Commencing at the northwest corner of said Lot 3; thence along the North line of said Lot 3, South 83°14’10” East a distance of 61.64 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING;

Thence along said North line, South 83°14’10” East a distance of 181.74 feet;

Thence South 07°00’33” West a distance of 41.41 feet;
Thence North 82°59′27″ West a distance of 20.00 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent 594.00-foot radius curve to the right;

Thence westerly along said curve through an arc length of 91.99 feet, a central angle of 08°52′22″, a chord bearing of North 85°27′14″ West and a chord distance of 91.89 feet to the beginning of a 77.00-foot radius curve to the right;

Thence northwesterly along said curve through an arc length of 70.78 feet, a central angle of 52°39′57″, a chord bearing of North 54°41′05″ West and a chord distance of 68.31 feet to the beginning of a 131.00-foot radius curve to the left;

Thence northwesterly along said curve through an arc length of 15.64 feet, a central angle of 06°50′26″, a chord bearing of North 31°46′19″ West and a chord distance of 15.63 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING;

TOGETHER WITH AND INCLUDING:

That portion of Lot 4, Block 1 of said Atlas Waterfront Plat lying northerly and westerly of the following described line:

Commencing at the southwest corner of said Lot 4; thence along the south line of said Lot 4 and along a non-tangent 572.50 foot radius curve to the right through an arc length of 321.94 feet, a central angle of 32°13′11″ and a chord distance of 317.71 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent 300.50 foot radius curve to the left, said point being the BEGINNING of said line;

Thence northwesterly along said curve through an arc length of 157.64 feet, a central angle of 30°03′24″, a chord bearing of North 21°26′12″ West and a chord distance of 155.84 feet;

Thence North 62°26′46″ East a distance of 128.35 feet;

Thence North 12°51′01″ East a distance of 258.37 feet;

Thence South 72°15′26″ East a distance of 61.63 feet to the east line of said Lot 4 and the END of said line;

EXCEPT therefrom the following two areas of Lot 2, Block 1, Atlas Waterfront Plat:

EXCEPTION AREA 1: Commencing at the southwest corner of said Lot 2; thence along the South line of said Lot 2, South 83°14′10″ East a distance of 243.38 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING;

Thence North 07°00′33″ East a distance of 43.55 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent 237.00-foot radius curve to the left;

Thence southeasterly along said curve through an arc length of 122.63 feet, a central angle of 29°38′43″, a chord bearing of South 62°11′22″ East and a chord distance of 121.26 feet to the south line of said Lot 2;
EXHIBIT “A”

Thence along said South line, North 83°14’10” West a distance of 113.36 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING;

EXCEPTION AREA 2: BEGINNING at the southwest corner of said Lot 2; thence along the West line of said Lot 2; thence North 00°59’33” East a distance of 39.70 feet to the beginning of a 131.00-foot non-tangent curve to the right;

Thence southeasterly along said curve through an arc length of 77.74 feet, a central angle of 34°00’02”, a chord bearing of South 52°11’33” East and a chord distance of 76.60 feet to the South line of said Lot 2;

Thence along said South line, North 83°14’10” West a distance of 61.64 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING;

Containing 1,981,201 square feet or 45.482 acres more or less.
## EXHIBIT "B"
### Atlas Mill Land Development
Estimated Infrastructure Expense and Land Sale Revenue
Cash Flow Projection

### SOURCES ($)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Sales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 (Atlas)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,735,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 (River)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,264,914</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 (Lake)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 (Atlas)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,533,253</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3 (Atlas) Sales Split 50% in each FY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,212,712</td>
<td>3,212,712</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4 (Atlas) Sales Split 50% in each FY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,026,691</td>
<td>2,026,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Sales Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,499,914</td>
<td>2,533,253</td>
<td>3,212,712</td>
<td>5,239,402</td>
<td>2,026,691</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ignite CDA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake District</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlas District</td>
<td>1,567,000</td>
<td>430,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River District</td>
<td>1,930,000</td>
<td>640,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ignite CDA Total</strong></td>
<td>3,497,000</td>
<td>1,070,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sources</strong></td>
<td>3,497,000</td>
<td>10,569,914</td>
<td>2,533,253</td>
<td>3,212,712</td>
<td>5,239,402</td>
<td>2,026,691</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative Sources</strong></td>
<td>3,497,000</td>
<td>14,066,914</td>
<td>16,600,167</td>
<td>19,812,878</td>
<td>25,052,281</td>
<td>27,078,972</td>
<td>27,078,972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### USES ($)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 Infrastructure (for &quot;wholesale&quot; blocks. See note 1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,310,000</td>
<td>(430,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlas District</td>
<td>(1,310,000)</td>
<td>(430,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River District</td>
<td>(1,930,000)</td>
<td>(640,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 Infrastructure (Atlas) Cost to create retail lots (see note 2) = $580,000.00</td>
<td>(257,000)</td>
<td>(2,313,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3 Earthwork with Partial Processing Onsite Material (Atlas)</td>
<td>(131,000)</td>
<td>(1,179,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3 Infrastructure (Atlas) Cost to create retail lots (see note 2) = $420,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(157,000)</td>
<td>(1,413,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4 Earthwork with Partial Processing Onsite Material (Atlas)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(175,000)</td>
<td>(1,575,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4 Infrastructure (Atlas) Cost to create retail lots (see note 2) = $250,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(102,000)</td>
<td>(918,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reimbursement</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(4,567,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Uses</strong></td>
<td>(3,497,000)</td>
<td>(8,081,000)</td>
<td>(1,336,000)</td>
<td>(1,588,000)</td>
<td>(1,677,000)</td>
<td>(918,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative Uses</strong></td>
<td>(3,497,000)</td>
<td>(11,578,000)</td>
<td>(12,914,000)</td>
<td>(14,502,000)</td>
<td>(16,179,000)</td>
<td>(17,097,000)</td>
<td>(17,097,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NET PROCEEDS ($)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Proceeds, Beginning of Year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,488,914</td>
<td>3,686,167</td>
<td>5,310,878</td>
<td>8,873,281</td>
<td>9,981,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Proceeds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,197,253</td>
<td>1,624,712</td>
<td>3,562,402</td>
<td>1,108,691</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Proceeds, End of Year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,488,914</td>
<td>3,686,167</td>
<td>5,310,878</td>
<td>8,873,281</td>
<td>9,981,972</td>
<td>9,981,972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Phase 1 parcels were sold in blocks and the developers are responsible for funding platting, water and sewer services, alleys and sidewalks necessary to make them "retail" lots.
2. Future phases will are planned to be sold at "retail" level, with developer directed lot sizing, to simplify infrastructure construction and yield higher land sale values. Hard costs to create "retail" lots are noted.
To: City Council
From: Melissa Tosi; Human Resources Director
Re: Civil Service Rule Amendment
Date: June 16, 2020

Decision Point: Should the City Council approve the amendment to the Civil Service Rules as approved by the Civil Service Commission?

History: The general purpose of the Civil Service Rules is to provide information and standards for the Coeur d’Alene Fire Department Local 710 by assuring all persons in the classified service receive fair and impartial treatment.

The fire department would like to enhance the legacy of the fire service families by not automatically disqualifying relatives of current fire employees from applying, testing and being eligible for hire within the fire department.

The current Personnel Rules\(^1\) disqualifies an applicant if related to an employee within the chain of command of the position applied for. Adding this amendment to the Civil Service Rules would allow the fire department to hire within the chain of command. This is a common practice in the fire service with surrounding departments such as City of Boise, City of Spokane, City of Lewiston all allowing hiring of family members within the fire service. Additionally, there is a 3-step testing process for firefighter (written, physical agility, interview) that objectively ranks applicants based on their ability throughout the testing process. Once ranked on the eligibility, there is a rule of 5. Which means, for every one vacancy, the Fire Chief can hire one applicant from the top 5 names on the list. The hiring process for firefighter is extremely competitive, and will remain so for all applicants. The goal is to hire the best applicants for the City of Coeur d'Alene, which may be a family member if their ranking and ability proves to be a good fit for the department.

The proposed amendment will bring the rules up to date regarding the qualifications desired by the Coeur d'Alene Fire Department Local 710, and recommended by the Fire Chief. The Civil Service Rule amendment was reviewed and approved by each of the Civil Service Commission members on May 5, 2020.

Financial Analysis: There are no hard costs associated with this amendment.

Performance Analysis: Authorizing the rule amendment will provide consistent and up to date standards to apply to the Coeur d’Alene Fire Department.

Recommendation: The City Council should approve the amendment to the Civil Service Rules as approved by the Civil Service Commission.

---

\(^1\) Personnel Rules, Rule 6: Applications and Applicants, Section 3. Disqualification, In General, (g).
RESOLUTION NO. 20-037

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF COEUR D’ALENE, KOOTENAI COUNTY, IDAHO, APPROVING AMENDMENTS TO RULE 3 - QUALIFICATIONS OF THE COEUR D’ALENE CIVIL SERVICE RULES.

WHEREAS, Municipal Code Section 2.68.060 authorizes the Civil Service Commission to promulgate all rules and regulations necessary to carry out the provisions of the Civil Service Law; and

WHEREAS, the Civil Service Commission previously adopted “Civil Service Rules of the Fire Departments of Coeur d’Alene, Idaho” and amendments thereto; and

WHEREAS, the Civil Service Commission has reviewed and recommended additional amendments to Rule 3 – Qualifications of the Civil Service Rules as shown on Exhibit “A” hereto and by reference made a part hereof; and

WHEREAS, it is deemed to be in the best interests of the City of Coeur d’Alene and the citizens thereof to approve the amendments to the Civil Service Rules;

NOW THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED by the Mayor and City Council of the City of Coeur d’Alene that the City authorize the amendments in substantially the form attached hereto as Exhibit “A”, and incorporated herein by reference, with the provision that the Mayor, City Administrator, and City Attorney are hereby authorized to modify said Civil Service Rules to the extent the substantive provisions of the amendments to the Civil Service Rules remain intact.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Civil Service Commissioners be, and they hereby are, authorized to execute such amendments on behalf of the City and said amendments to the Coeur d'Alene Civil Service Rules are hereby approved.

DATED this 16th day of June, 2020.

_____________________________
Steve Widmyer, Mayor

ATTEST:

_____________________________
Renata McLeod, City Clerk
Motion by , Seconded by , to adopt the foregoing resolution.

ROLL CALL:

COUNCIL MEMBER EVANS Voted
COUNCIL MEMBER MILLER Voted
COUNCIL MEMBER GOOKIN Voted
COUNCIL MEMBER ENGLISH Voted
COUNCIL MEMBER MCEVERS Voted
COUNCIL MEMBER WOOD Voted

was absent. Motion .
Civil Service Rules
Coeur d'Alene Fire Department

Rule 3
QUALIFICATIONS

Section 1. An applicant not currently covered by these Civil Service Rules must meet the following criteria:

(a) Must be a citizen of the United States of America and must be able to read and write the English language.

(b) Must be a minimum of eighteen (18) years of age at the time of written examination.

(c) Must successfully pass a background check, pre-employment drug and alcohol test, and a physician’s medical/physical examination by the departments designated physician.

Section 2. The Coeur d’Alene Fire Department wants to enhance the legacy of Fire Service families. Notwithstanding any provision of the City’s Personnel Rules, relatives of current working members of the Department will not be automatically disqualified from applying or testing for, being placed on the eligibility list, or accepting appointment within the department. The Department will, to the greatest extent possible, avoid assigning an employee to a position in which a family member is in that employee’s chain of command except in the event of an emergency.

Section 32. DISQUALIFICATIONS: The City may refuse to examine an applicant, or after examination, to certify an eligible and may remove his/her name from the eligible list for any of the following reasons:

(a) Dismissal from the Armed Forces for delinquency or misconduct.

(b) Mental or physical unfitness for the position applied for.

(c) Dishonest, criminal, immoral or notoriously disgraceful conduct.

(d) Intentional false statement in any material fact, deception or fraud in securing examination, certification or appointment.

Section 43. BURDEN OF PROOF: The burden of proof of good character in all cases shall be upon the applicant and the filing of any certification to that effect shall not debar the City from demanding or obtaining further proof of good character to its full satisfaction.
DATE: June 16, 2020  
FROM: Nick Goodwin, Urban Forester  
SUBJECT: Appeal of Denial of Tree Removal Permit – 3702 E. Sky Harbor Dr.

DECISION POINT:
Should the City Council uphold or overturn the denial of a tree removal permit for five (5) Austrian pine trees within the Sky Harbor right-of-way abutting 3702 E. Sky Harbor Dr.?

HISTORY:
The Urban Forestry Ordinance (§ 12.36.305(A)(9)) requires that Urban Forestry Committee members review tree removal permit requests and make recommendations regarding removal of public trees. The City’s tree inspection form prompts the members to evaluate tree health, condition, site, and nuisance factors. Ability to mitigate these concerns is considered. Tree benefits are also taken into account such as environmental benefits, wildlife values, and contributions to the streetscape, neighborhood and overall urban forest. Five committee members inspected this tree and all recommended retention.

Mr. and Mrs. McCain, owners of 3702 E. Sky Harbor Dr., contacted the Urban Forester seeking information regarding the hillside ordinance that applies to their property. The Urban Forester performed an onsite inspection regarding the private trees during which he provided the property owners with the hillside ordinance details. While he was at the property, the homeowner requested removal of 5 (five) Austrian pine street trees, citing the nuisance of falling needles, safety concerns regarding the trees, and a desire to plant deciduous trees that would be more diverse in their neighborhood as reasons for their request. The committee found the trees to be in good condition and that they did not present a hazard. The committee recommended pruning and retention of the trees.

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS:
Care and maintenance of trees in the public right of way is the responsibility of the abutting property owner. If the decision is reversed, tree removal and the required planting of replacement trees is the responsibility of the abutting property owner.

PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS:
Committee members are sympathetic to the desire to plant different trees in the right-of-way. However, they did not feel that there is sufficient reason to remove otherwise healthy trees from the public right-of-way. This home is located in Armstrong park and this area does not have a large population of public trees as most trees in this area are located on private property. Although the trees were inventoried as Ponderosa pine in 2014, while inspecting these trees due to the removal request, the Urban Forester identified them as Austrian pine. There are currently 3,690 Ponderosa pine trees in the public inventory. There are a total of 134 public Austrian pine trees in the public inventory. The trees are not interfering with sidewalks or roads, and do not present any maintenance issues which other street trees do not.

DECISION POINT/RECOMMENDATION:
Council should uphold the denial of a tree removal permit for five (5) Austrian pine trees within the Sky Harbor Drive right-of-way abutting 3702 E. Sky Harbor Drive because they are healthy and there are relatively few Austrian pines in the public inventory.
City of Coeur d’Alene  
Tree Inspection Request / Permit Application

☑ Reported by: Tom McCain

☑ Requested by: Tom McCain

Address/Location: 3702 E SKY HARBOR DR.

Telephone: 480-678-4227 Email: Tom McCain@msn.com

Referred by: N/A Date: 05/08/20

Nature of Request: PERMIT for Pruning Removal Planting

REPORT of Obstruction Hazard Damage Other

INFORMATION re:

Description, including exact location & problems/condition of tree(s):

Removal request of 5 street trees in Public R.O.W.

Tree plotter shows 5 Ponderosa Pine trees, 12.0", 12D", 10.0", 10.0", 10.0" DBH. Request is based on desire to plant different trees other than pine. Also says mess from pine needles is a nuisance.

Committee Referral: YES NO Meeting Date: 08/15/2020

Controller Notification: YES NO Date: 05/19/2020

Results/Action: Committee denied request based on trees being in good healthy condition. Tom McCain contacted the Urban Forestry office 06/01 with a desire to appeal the committee decision.

FILE NO. 20-057
URBAN FORESTRY COMMITTEE MINUTES
MAY 15, 2020 8:05AM
City Hall – City Hall Conference Room 6

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Schwandt, (Chairman)
Gina Davis
Steve Bloedel
Bob Hallock via zoom
Erika Eidson, (Vice Chairman) via zoom

STAFF PRESENT: Nick Goodwin, Urban Forester

GUESTS PRESENT: J.D. Reeves (N.I.C)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bruce Martinek

CALL TO ORDER:
Meeting called to order at 8:10 am by Chairman, John Schwandt.

1) APPROVE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 21, 2020 MEETING-ACTION ITEM
Gina Davis noticed one capitalization error. With that change meeting minutes unanimously approved.
Motion my Gina Davis seconded by John Schwandt.

2) PUBLIC COMMENTS
J.D. Reeves thanked the committee for considering his application to become a Urban Forestry committee member. The committee members did not have any follow up questions for J.D. The Committee as a whole thanked J.D. for his application.

3) INSPECTION REQUESTS
• 1376 Bering Dr.: Removal request, Purple leaf plum tree from public ROW: committee found the tree to be in good health. Considered the request and asked the Urban forester to offer pruning to mitigate the site conflicts with the option of replacing this tree with a large-scale street tree if conflicts continue.
• 215 Kathleen Ave: Removal request two (2) public Purple leaf plum trees from right of way for upcoming city streets and engineering project. The committee would like to retain these trees unless the project make retention impossible. Nick Goodwin said he would work with Chris Bosely to attempt to retain and protect these trees.
• 312 11th street: Removal request, one (1) Horse chestnut tree and one Norway maple tree from public right of way for sidewalk replacement and driveway installation. The committee found that they required more information from applicant in order to approve or deny request. If possible, to complete proposed project the committee would like to see the trees retained. The applicant needs to provide plans, building permit information, contractor information and a timeline for the project.
• 2338 N. Honeysuckle Drive: Removal request of one (1) Norway maple tree from public right of way due to sidewalk/root conflict. The committee found the tree to be in good health and there is a lack of street trees in this area. Asked the Urban Forester to work with the engineering department and attempt to retain this tree if possible while mitigating sidewalk issues.

• 3702 E Sky Harbor Drive: Removal request of five Ponderosa pine trees from the public right of way. Homeowner wished to plant different/more diverse species. The committee found the trees to be in good health and denied this removal request. The committee also suspected the trees may be Austrian pine trees and asked the forester to confirm this and make the homeowner aware if so as they are a much rarer tree and are quite large.

4) UF APPLICANT QA
The committee did not have further questions as they are quite familiar with J.D. from his previous work as an Urban Forestry inventory worker. The committee thanked him for his application and said they were exited he was here.

5) FORESTERS REPORT
Please see the attached report. John Schwandt asked if there was any update on the Arboretum idea from the January meeting. Nick Goodwin stated that he did bring the idea to the director where it was taken into consideration. There may be an opportunity to do a “Trail Side Arboretum” at a later date once atlas park is complete. Where street trees would be on display.

6) TUBBS HILL FUEL MITIGATION PROJECT: UPDATE
Nick Goodwin informed the committee that the burn portion of the Tubbs Hill Fuel mitigation project had been cancelled/postponed due to concerns over respiratory health during the COVID-19 pandemic. Nick said if there is an opportunity to burn this fall the City will try to schedule and perform a burn. Some mechanical fuel reduction and hazard tree felling was performed by IDL and the City of Coeur d’Alene Fire Department under the Urban Foresters supervision. This work was primarily focused around the fire road and loop trail. Gina Davis said she hoped that there would be an opportunity to burn this fall and mentioned that using goats on some areas of the hill may be a good option this spring and summer.

8) ARBOR DAY 2020: UPDATE
Nick Goodwin stated that the Arbor Day 2020 celebration that was scheduled for April 25th 2020 was postponed and likely cancelled for the year. Nick Goodwin had sent an idea for a Virtual Arbor Day called “Arbor Day At Home” to the group for review previously. Gina Davis stated that she would love to see a virtual gallery of some sort for people to view the submissions. Nick Goodwin said that he is working on that with the IT department and it is a possibility. The committee unanimously approved of the idea. Judging of the submissions is scheduled for the next committee meeting June 19th.

8) URBAN FORESTRY MASTER PLAN
The Urban Forester stated that the master plan is complete and has been sent to the team at the parks department to incorporate it into the Parks Master plan as an appendix. Erika Eidson asked if Nick could send the plan out once it is complete so the committee can review how it is incorporated into the plan before it goes to council for review. Nick Goodwin said he would send it to the committee for review once the work was complete.

**) URBAN FORESTRY PROJECT IDEAS**

Gina Davis mentioned that she has concerns over the tree removals due to sidewalk issues as the garden district continues to see so many re models in the area etc. She wondered if reaching out to area real estate agents may be an option for informing people of Urban forestry ordinances and communicating the goals of keeping large scale street trees to homeowners. Nick Goodwin said that he is exploring the getting in touch with real estate agents but stated that due to the amount of real estate agents in the area it may be tough to make an impact. Nick stated that he continues to put out press releases and communicate with different HOA’s and will continue to do so.

**9) ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting ended at 9:51 am. Site inspections followed the meeting in the field.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nick Goodwin, Urban Forester
**CITY OF COEUR D'ALENE**  
**URBAN FORESTRY COMMITTEE**  
**PUBLIC TREE INSPECTION FORM**

**Address:** 3702 Esay Harbor Dr.  
**Tree Location:** Public roadway.

**Species:** Pinus nigra / Pinus sylvestris  
**DBH:** 15” / 9” / 11”  
**Approx. Height:** 28’ / 18’ / 20’

**Reason(s) For Request:** Desire to plant different species, mess, safety concerns

**Inspection Date:** 08/16  
**Inspector(s):** Nick Guenther, Eric Eiden, Gru Paus, John Schwandt, Bob Hallock, Steve Bischof

### TREE STRUCTURE (visual assessment – check those that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Comments/notes as applicable)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trunk: (rot, sweep, lean, cankers, forks)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branches/Wounds: (damage, stubs, rot)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roots:</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total tree assessment:** Good/Fair/Poor

### TREE HEALTH (visual assessment – check those that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Comments/notes as applicable)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crown and Branches: (% live, green)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diseases: (List)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insects: (List)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roots:</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total tree assessment:** Good/Fair/Poor

### SITE CONFLICTS (visual assessment – check those that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Comments/notes as applicable)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interference with overhead/underground utilities:</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roots (sidewalk, driveway, curb):</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstruction: (signs, vision triangle, clearance)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing Trees:</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuisance Factors:</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total tree assessment:** None/Minor/Moderate/Severe

### VALUES PROVIDED (circle any that apply)  
- Environmental (shade, etc.): Visual Screen; Historic; Wildlife; Aesthetic (texture, form, line, color); Desirable Species; Other (describe)

Not a common tree in urban forest.

**Comments, Suggestions, Mitigation Options:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree #</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Retain, could use slight structural pruning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Retain, routine pruning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Retain, prune for structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION:** (Check appropriate box for each tree)  
Remove & Replace  
Retain

*Recommendations are based on inspector's professional judgement*
CITY OF COEUR D'ALENE
URBAN FORESTRY COMMITTEE
PUBLIC TREE INSPECTION FORM

Address: 3702 E Sky Harbor Dr.  
Tree Location: Public R.O.W.
Species: Pinus nigra / Pinus N. /  
DBH: 12.5" / 11" /  
Approx. Height: 22' / 18' /
Reason(s) For Request: Desire to plant different species, mess, safety concerns
Inspection Date: 05/15  
Inspector(s): Sam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TREE STRUCTURE (visual assessment – check those that apply)</th>
<th>Tree#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Comments/notes as applicable)</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trunk: (rot, sweep, lean, cankers, forks)</td>
<td>G F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branches/Wounds: (damage, stubs, rot)</td>
<td>G F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roots:</td>
<td>G F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tree assessment: Good/Fair/Poor</td>
<td>G F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TREE HEALTH (visual assessment – check those that apply)</th>
<th>Tree#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Comments/notes as applicable)</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown and Branches: (% live, green)</td>
<td>G F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diseases: (List)</td>
<td>G F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insects: (List)</td>
<td>G F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roots:</td>
<td>G F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tree assessment: Good/Fair/Poor</td>
<td>G F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE CONFLICTS (visual assessment – check those that apply)</th>
<th>Tree#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Comments/notes as applicable)</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interference with overhead/underground utilities:</td>
<td>N N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roots (sidewalk, driveway, curb):</td>
<td>N N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstruction: (signs, vision triangle, clearance)</td>
<td>N N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing Trees:</td>
<td>Mod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuisance Factors:</td>
<td>min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tree assessment: None/Minor/Moderate/Severe</td>
<td>N N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VALUES PROVIDED (circle any that apply) Environmental (shade, etc.): Visual Screen; Historic; Wildlife; Aesthetic: (texture, form, line, color); Desirable Species; Other (describe)

It is not a common tree in urban forest

Comments, Suggestions, Mitigation Options:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION: (Check appropriate box for each tree)  
Remove & Replace | Retain | 2 | 3 |
Recommendations are based on inspector's professional judgement
May 19, 2020

Tom McCain
3702 E. Sky Harbor Dr.
Coeur d'Alene, ID 83814

Dear Mr. McCain,

I am writing in regard to a tree removal request within the right-of-way abutting your property at the above address. Members of the city’s Urban Forestry Committee have inspected the five (5) Austrian pine trees and considered the removal request. The committee found the trees to be in overall good health and condition.

The city’s tree inspection form prompts inspectors to rate trees by evaluating tree health, condition, site, and nuisance factors. Ability to mitigate these concerns is also considered. Positive tree values are also taken into account such as environmental benefits, wildlife values, and contributions to the streetscape, neighborhood and overall urban forest.

The committee inspected the trees and took into consideration your request to replace the trees with a less plentiful species. Due to the fact that these trees are in good health and condition other than a few common structural defects removal of these trees in the public right of way abutting E. Sky Harbor Dr. at the above location has been denied.

As the abutting property owner, you have the right to a hearing before City Council to appeal the denial of a removal permit. If you would like a hearing, please send a written request within ten days of receipt of this letter. The City Clerk will then put your appeal on the first available City Council hearing date. The appeals procedure is outlined in ordinance section 12.36.245B (enclosed). Denial of the permit now does not preclude re-applying again in the future.

I have contacted the abutting property owner at 3706 E. Sky Harbor Dr. on your behalf regarding your hillside ordinance applicable work and the trees on your shared property line. I asked this owner to contact you regarding these tree removals. Once I receive the information/plan detailing this work I will approve the work so you can get started when ready.

If you have any additional questions regarding the inspection findings or the appeal procedure, please feel free to contact me at 208-769-2266 or send an email to ngoodwin@cdaid.org
Sincerely,

Nick Goodwin  
Urban Forestry Coordinator  

File #20-057
May 25, 2020

City of Coeur d'Alene, Parks and Recreation Dept.
City Hall, 710 E Mullan Avenue
Coeur d'Alene, Idaho 83814

To whom it may concern:

I am asking for a hearing to appeal the denial to replace several Ponderosa pine trees within the right-of-way abutting my property.

I respectfully request the opportunity to personally present the reason why I want to replace these trees as well as present a plan for their replacement.

Please advise me if a hearing is possible.

Sincerely,

Tom McCain
(Property Owner)
June 1, 2020

Tom McCain and Tinee Hoang
3702 E. Sky harbor Dr.
Coeur d'Alene, ID 83814

RE: Appeal Hearing for the Urban Forestry Committee denial of tree removal request

Dear Mr. McCain and Ms. Hoang:

Your request for an appeal hearing before the City Council regarding the denial of your tree removal request at 3702 E. Sky harbor Dr. by the Urban Forestry Committee has been scheduled for June 16, 2020. The Council meeting begins at 6:00 p.m., in the Library Community Room located at 702 E. Front Avenue, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho. Check the agenda for that meeting to determine what order your appeal will be heard.

Generally, the appeal hearings are conducted as follows: The City Clerk will swear in any witnesses who will testify, including you. Next, you will have an opportunity to tell the City Council why they should reverse the tree removal denial. You may also call witnesses to give testimony relevant to the tree removal and you may present evidence, such as photographs, videos, witness statements, etc. The City, through its Urban Forestry Coordinator, will then provide his report to the City Council. He also may provide any relevant evidence and may call witnesses. Finally, you will be provided an opportunity for rebuttal to address anything new that came up during the City’s presentation. You should not use this opportunity to repeat what you have already presented. Following all the testimony, the City Council will render a decision.

If you have any other questions, or if I may be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Renata McLeod,
Municipal Services Director/
City Clerk