

MINUTES

McCall City Council Regular Meeting October 9, 2008

Agenda

Call to Order and Roll Call
Council Work Session
Public Hearing
Public Comment
Consent Agenda
Business Agenda
Committee Minutes
Adjournment

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Mayor Kulesza called the regular meeting of the McCall City Council to order at 5:31 p.m. Council Member Bailey, Mayor Kulesza, and Council Member Witte answered roll call. A quorum was present. Council Member Delaney and Council Member Scott were absent. Council Member Scott joined the meeting at 5:32. Council Member Delaney joined the meeting at 5:35.

In addition to the Council Members, present were Lindley Kirkpatrick, City Manager; City Attorney Bill Nichols; Jerry Summers, Chief of Police; Eric McCormick, Golf Course Superintendent; John Anderson, Airport Manager; Linda Stokes, Acting Treasurer; Michelle Groenevelt, Community Development Director; Brock Heasley, Parks and Recreation Director; David Simmonds, Information Systems Manager; Carol Coyle, Grant Coordinator; Brenna Chaloupka, Acting City Clerk / Administrative Assistant; and BessieJo Wagner, Deputy City Clerk / Administrative Assistant.

COUNCIL WORKSESSION

City Manager Report

Mr. Kirkpatrick stated that the City will be moving ahead on the wastewater facility plan and start the formal discussions with the J-Ditch land owners to determine their interest level in continuing the process. On September 26, 2008, Mr. Kirkpatrick met with one representative from the irrigation district and four irrigators, three property owners and one long term tenant. Discussions took place, but no decisions were made. The discussions were positive and productive; there were some concerns from the irrigators about the need to have a formal DEQ permit for the land application. Currently the City is operating under a consent order; there is no formal permit. The concern from the irrigators was that how would it affect or change how they operate on an ongoing basis. The City will find the answers to their questions and get back to them and continue the discussion. The next step in this process is working with the Cascade Watershed Advisory

Watershed Advisory Group (WAG), to get the TMDL limits changed to allow for additional phosphorus and to create the opportunity for phosphorus trading. The trading language needs to be a part of the language in the management plan prior to coming up with any phosphorus trading proposals. At the next meeting of the Cascade WAG they will consider approving the language for phosphorus trading.

Mr. Kirkpatrick updated the Council on the progress at Legacy Park. Over the next two weeks the project will take a dramatic turn as landscaping starts to go in and the road will get paved. Sod will be put down this fall; it was determined that it was better to put sod down in the fall rather than waiting for the spring. The Rio Vista Waterline project is in the last phase of completion. The overlay of the street was completed earlier in the week. The last thing to do is to install some check valves to allow the City to balance the eastside of the river and the westside of the river, and operate the tanks independent of each other. There has been much positive feedback on the project.

At the Upper Payette River Economic Development Council(UPREDC) meeting there were some discussions on decisions the board needs to make on the direction and focus of the organization. There has not been any consensus at this time. However, there will be more activity and focus from the board level with UPREDC over the next several months, than there has been over the past several years.

The Airport Business Park applicants came to the Planning & Zoning Commission earlier in the week. The Council intends to get out and see the site prior to advancing with the project.

The Consolidated Department Head Report

Council Member Bailey – At the Airport, did all the landscaping make it through the summer? There is an irrigation process to ensure that the landscaping gets sufficient water through the summer. Most of the landscaping has survived and it is being monitored and taken care of.

Council Member Delaney – On the aging report it seems that the same items appear each month. Who works on getting those accounts settled and what are the expectations of getting the money owed? Michelle Groenevelt is the contact person and Linda Stokes works with her. There is some leverage on some of the projects to collect the money; some have not picked up their building permits and will not be allowed to until their account has been settled. Mrs. Stokes will have an accounting of which projects the City has leverage on at the next department report meeting. There is one major project that Ms. Groenevelt will be sending out a letter in an effort to collect the funds.

Mayor Kulesza – On the Samson Trail parcel, at the old dump site, there has been some testing done by DEQ and EPA. Is that a prelude to some proposed project or is it just monitoring of the old dump site? Ms Groenevelt stated that there is no project planned currently. However, originally when the City first started looking at this site it was for a potential community housing project. The City needed to know if it was even possible to develop the site. Mayor Kulesza stated that as a result of the DEQ testing, a group of home owners wrote a letter, asking to be kept informed of the testing and any plans for development.

Council Member Witte – A question on the water rates, that during the budget process, changing the fees was discussed. The City has not made that code change; however the City is working on

some fee increases. The fee increases do not include a code change. There will be a public hearing on November 6, 2008 for the fee changes. There is not a code change scheduled at this time. It was requested that the code change would come before the Council prior to the end of the year.

Mayor Kulesza – A question for Chief Summers on the intersection of Third and Park Street: pedestrians are having trouble crossing there, has the Police Department had many complaints on this issue? Chief Summers has not received any recent complaints on this crossing. Who would be the contact if a citizen were to have this concern? Chief Summers stated he would field those complaints.

Mayor Kulesza – He has received emails and calls with questions on the vacant building over by the bridge wanting to know what the City’s plans are for the building. When does it become a City issue? What does the City have in the City Code about vacant buildings? If they are dangerous, or structurally unsound, then the City can do something about it. Mr. Kirkpatrick stated that he would look to see if there is any recourse the City can take regarding empty, abandoned buildings.

Council Member Scott – When are the stop signs going up at the Roosevelt and Pine Street Intersection? The signs should be up with in the next day or two.

Council Member Bailey – At Legacy Park, there is a lot of trash in the low water level. Who would clean that up? The Parks Department usually cleans it up in October. It was suggested to use some volunteers to help get it cleaned up. (Actually, it has been the MIC not the Parks Dept. The MIC doesn’t plan to do it this year because of the construction.)

Council Member Bailey – The issue of clearing the bike paths of snow so they can be accessed in the winter, are there plans to do more clearing this year? For the Golf Course, fuel price partially dictates how many paths are cleared. Also when there is a lot of snow the street plows pile it right onto the paths and it is difficult to move. The Parks Department intends to keep their part clear. From a fuel cost point, the City needs to be careful not to exceed the budget. The bike path from the school to the Woodlands is in the works to be completed.

Mayor Kulesza led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance at 6:00 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING

AB 08-198 Grand Payette Hotel Subdivision: Approval of Preliminary Plat (SUB-08-04), Preliminary Plan (PUD-08-03) and Conditional Use Permit (CUP-08-05)

Ms. Groenevelt introduced Bob Hunt, the applicant for the Grand Payette Hotel, who gave a brief history of the project. He purchased the property about five years ago with a vision of a special hotel being built on the site. For three years he tried to relay to the community the need for a larger design, however the design was fifteen feet higher than the City Code allowed and was not accepted by the community. His vision for a hotel downtown has not changed, it has only been reduced. The hotel would offer amenities he feels are needed in the downtown area such as retail, restaurant, and lounge all open to the general public. The application does not include any expansion of the dock at this time; however in a future application he envisions an expanded dock

expanded dock with more public slips where people can access the hotel by boat. He also envisions a boardwalk from the east where people can access the restaurant and lounge. His intent is to bring a complete application considering all the agencies working out all the details in advance to make certain that this project is real and can work.

Wayne Ruemmele, an architect with Epikos, gave the power point presentation of the design for the Grand Payette Hotel. The PowerPoint presentation included seven Smart Growth principles:

1. Mixed Land use
2. Take advantage of compact building design
3. Create a range of housing opportunities and choices
4. Create walk-able communities
5. Foster distinctive attractive communities with strong sense of place
6. Strengthen and direct development toward existing communities
7. Provide a variety of transportation choices

The plans include 42 hotel rooms, restaurant and lounge, a vehicle lift to take vehicles underground for parking, a “Green” roof to minimize the effects of storm water run off. It also includes a swimming pool, lawn and sandy beach area.

Jim Fronk, with Secesh engineering, gave a brief description of the traffic projections for the project. Trips per day are projected to be minimal – less than 25 additional during peak hour (390 per day). The intersection and road way in front of the Hotel is projected to be widened enough to accommodate a center lane. From a pedestrian stand point there will be increased safety for crossing.

Mr. Fronk also covered the various ways the project will handle storm water run off. The project has 1.28 acres of drainage area, of which 16,000 square feet of area that will actually receive surface water that will need to be treated. There will be the use of a mechanical separator to treat the storm water run off. The project proposes the use of turf blocks, and heated, non chemical snow melt.

Steve Millemann, the applicant’s attorney, gave a brief overview of how the project is focused on staying within City ordinances. The project has received a unanimous acceptance from Planning & Zoning after much feedback and re-submittals. He clarified the confusion about the condo/hotel concept; the condominium aspect is simply an ownership mechanism, it does not change the use or the feel of the hotel. It will operate in all respects as a hotel. The difference is that instead of a single owner of the hotel there are separate owners of the units. There will be strict restrictions on the amount of time that owners could occupy the units. This is a mechanism used by developers to share the cost of construction.

Mr. Millemann clarified the applicant’s position on the parking issue. The City’s ordinance on the subject of parking is complete and breaks down the amount of parking needed. There are three provisions in the ordinance:

1. A reduction of the requirement when there are over-lapping uses
2. Alternate proposals for parking
3. The Commission may make adjustments to the parking requirements based on evidence of actual parking demand for the proposed use

The question is: what is a reasonable demand for parking on site relative to the 48 spaces provided? Through analysis it was determined that 66 spaces would be adequate as opposed to the 111 spaces suggested by the chart in the parking ordinance. The issue of parking will be resolved satisfactorily for the Council and staff prior to final plat. The burden is on the applicant to make that happen and they are confident that will happen in a responsible way.

Mr. Millemann spoke on the issue of ownership and the two lots, the vacant lot to the west of the Yacht Club and the Yacht Club lot. The applicant currently owns the vacant lot and has an option to purchase the Yacht Club lot. The option to purchase the land requires that the applicant have all preliminary approvals and entitlements in hand by no later than March 2009. This is the purpose of starting the process early. The leases of the Yacht Club building are driving the phasing plan for the project.

Mayor Kulesza clarified that the current proposal is for 48 parking spaces in the basement is sufficient for the hotel rooms. The applicant feels that the overall need is for 66 spaces; however the applicant is waiting to see the result of the downtown parking study to have a better picture as to what is actually needed.

There was some discussion on the public access of the hotel and to what extent that means. The Commission's recommendation envisions a board walk that may be constructed at some point in the future coming from the east side that will then connect to a place on the applicant's property providing public access to the lake. A clarification of how the project fits into the Smart growth concept of providing a strong sense of place? Mr. Ruemmele clarified that without permanent residence, the idea is to develop a strong sense of place within the architecture.

There was clarification made of the ownership of the hotel, it is only the 23 units that will be sold, all the rest of the Hotel will be owned and operated by the hotel owner.

There has been some question as to whether the project is subject to the parks requirement. The condition of approval requires that the applicant present a plan to the Parks and Recreation Committee and that plan needs to be acceptable to the committee, staff and the Council. A proposal will be brought forward prior to final plat.

Ms. Groenevelt gave some insight and clarification of Conditional Use Permits (CUP) that have been extended in the past. A CUP is valid for 12 months after Council approves it, and the City Code states that it can be longer if the Council finds it unreasonable to impose that time limit. This applicant asks that the CUP be approved until June 14, 2015. The Council has to find that the normal 12 month time frame is too short and that a longer time period is needed.

Ms. Groenevelt offered some clarification to the Planned Unit Development (PUD). Once the preliminary plan is approved, the final plan has to be submitted within one year. Also upon submission the applicant has to show that there is substantial construction or development within four years otherwise it goes back to the public hearing process. This applicant is asking for a timeline that is approximately 6.5 years. With a subdivision agreement, once they have preliminary plat approval from Council they have 18 months to submit their application for final plat then after final plat approval they have to have it recorded within 18 months.

Within the City code for parking, the code allows for some reductions. The Commission or the Council is not required to grant those reductions, it is recommended only when it makes sense. The table for calculating parking in the code is more of a suburban model where people are driving from place to place. Part of the purpose of the study is to re-examine at the parking requirements. The downtown parking committee is made up by a diverse group. The first concern from the committee is the project time line and that what is current code may not fit the needs in the future. The parking committee also wanted the Council to know that the parking study and needs assessment is a macro level study, trying to figure out parking as a whole and not just for this one project.

There was some discussion about the width of the road on West Lake Street and the concepts for a turn lane and whether there had been any previous determination for the development of the highway. There were some plans for sidewalks on the north side of the street. There were some concerns expressed that a bike lane should be considered.

Mr. Millemann addressed the reasons behind the request for extended CUP's and PUD's. The applicant has asked for a phasing plan, which will give Mr. Hunt until 2012 to do his first site work. The reason for the 2015 date is that, unknown to Mr. Hunt when he made the purchase option agreement, the owner of the property had just granted five year extensions to the existing leases. Mr. Hunt closed the option with the understanding that no later than 2010 he would be able to start building. Being faced with the fact that the leases had been extended, the phasing plan gives Mr. Hunt the opportunity to honor those lease agreements.

Mayor Kulesza opened the public hearing at 7:48 p.m.

Bill Weida – Chairman of the Big Payette Lake Watershed Advisory Group,–asked in terms of the issue of the vortex separators, why DEQ has issued a letter that indicates that the vortex separators are not adequate machines that work with the type of pollution being talked about. Vortex separators work on centrifugal force, so they tend to spin out the heaviest things to the outside surface. That means that what is left in them are rocks, large pieces of dog feces, and other types of things you would not want in your home. What is not left is anything that is lighter than water, like chemicals, pathogens which are flushed directly through, and for the most part nutrients. Nutrients are not really an issue unless there is some plan to fertilize the roof of the building. He stated that he likes the design of the roof of the building, and to not use chicken fertilizer on it and when it comes down, it goes through the vortex separator.

What the Watershed Advisory Group is concerned about is the parking area, which has snow melt that contains chemicals, salts, heavy metals that come from brake linings that consist of copper and zinc, and other such materials. These materials would drain directly to their storm water plan, that consists of a pipeline that runs across the inside of the parking area, and picks up all these things through drains, and then heads down to the vortex separator and dumps it directly into the lake. It would dump it right up-current from the intake for the City water system. Mr. Weida stated that the bottom line is the City will be drinking it. The vortex separator is not going to take it out. How does the Watershed Group know it is not going to take out nutrients? Nutrients tend to bind up in soil, but vortex separators only work when they are clean, so there would not be any soil in there. If there were rocks in there it is unlikely that the nutrients would bind to them. Even if there was soil in there and it had not been cleaned, as soon as there is a flood of water over the land, even if the nutrients have bound to it, they wash right out into the water. Everything that is

water. Everything that is generated in front of the hotel is coming down that pipe and is being injected directly into the lake upstream of the drinking water source. The Clean Water Act states that everything possible needs to be done to avoid pollution from storm water. The reason is that 50% of water pollution does come from storm water run off. A recent court decision was made last month on the Clean Water Act so that there is no longer any graying degree on the act, it is either clean water or its not.

Mr. Weida stated that he believes the City has no business allowing the use of the City facility, which is the vortex separator, or to cast a kind of cloak over it to say it is ok to use this to handle run off from the property, it is not ok. It is not good engineering and it is not good water quality control. The Watershed Group would be happy to work with Mr. Hunt to try to help him to design something better. Mr. Weida talked with some of the people who were working on this after the August hearing that said they should be using a swale but they do not have room. He feels that they should find the room. After the meeting in August, Mr. Millemann stated that at the end of the meeting, there was no particular storm water plan for the hotel at that time and he went on to say, as a quote “this was not a concern for the Planning and Zoning” and that he would come up with something at the later stage of the project. He would suggest that they come up with something before they get much further with the project. He would also suggest that they, the Watershed Group, would continue to oppose this use of vortex separators for this type of venue.

Mr. Weida also stated that there is a statement at the end of the community impact review, under F – which states that the project will be locally owned and operated, and it is anticipated that essentially all the revenue that is generated by the project will be retained and redirected back into the local community. Mr. Weida stated that is impossible here. In order to do that all the revenue would have to be spent on everything that is used in the hotel and all that would have to be produced in this community. This is not meant as a knock against the hotel it is just that the economic impact of it is going to be nowhere near that great. He would guess from project of this size that during the construction phase one could count on, no more than 10% of the expense to be spent locally. He predicts that it would be closer to 5%. During the operating phase, he would expect no more than 30%.

Dan Krahn –stated that the downtown parking committee wants section I. One of the concerns he has is the overflow parking for the commercial part of the building. They have addressed the parking for the condo/hotel part of the hotel. However, in order to operate something commercially, there needs to be other people coming there and that takes him back to one of the old parking studies and discussions he has had for probably fifteen years; we can park people somewhere else and they will come back to it. It is not a habit they have been able to create in this community. It is a desire to try to change that thinking, but have not done it. They have parking agreements with other businesses, particularly the May Marina and all those users are to park behind City Hall. That same offer has been made to all the other businesses.

Mr. Krahn continued to say that only one vehicle can be counted per one space. There are a lot of agreements out there that say the same thing and so they need to be careful how many times they count sharing, which was put in as a community parking lot even over on First Street. The Parking study will help here, but he does not think that surface parking is the answer.

On the public access point Mr. Krahn stated that there was a discussion the community had and took this option away from Mr. Hunt or any business on that side of the street, of a building of 50 feet. When that came off the community made that decision he does not have to give public access. It is limited to 35 feet, he has done a lot more work and he has agreed to do it. Mr. Krahn does not know if the City would get that from anyone else. It is extremely expensive property and it is hard to make things work commercially over there. He feels that Mr. Hunt is giving a great asset that should be thought of.

On the phasing of the plan, he would ask that the City look at the opportunity, that if he ran the four years, to request the applicant to give an update. Four to eight years is a long time and a lot of changes can happen in the community in that time frame. He understands the time line and it is a nice project. He would like to work with people that are trying to do those things, but if there is a way to have them come back to update the Council, some of the Council will change in that amount of time as well. It needs to be looked at how those things are looked at in the future. Rather than having this Council committing future Councils to events that could change.

Jean Odmak – She is not against the project, she would like to understand, that because of the water situation and the water run off into the lake, wouldn't it be less expensive, than them going down with a lift, to do something with the City parking lot on First Street and go vertical. That would take away the chemicals coming off the vehicles and going into the lake. Maybe it is cost prohibitive but they would have to partner with the City. She is just asking the question if it had been considered. She knows that Mr. Hunt does not own that property however she thinks that the City would like this project and be willing, if they had their surface parking there, and if it made any sense to go vertical, and if Mr. Hunt would build the structure and dedicate a portion of the parking to the City. Then there would be parking for the hotel.

Council Member Bailey agreed with the idea of the parking structure. However it would not address the pollution issue by putting the parking across the street, because they all drain into the same place. He feels that it is a separate City issue that he has brought before the Council. The City needs to address that issue as it is an issue throughout downtown. Anything that gets developed down there will create the same problem as this project is. As a City, storm water run off needs to be addressed. He feels it is a critical area for the City to address.

Hearing no further comments, Mayor Kulesza closed the verbal public hearing at 8:05 p.m. The City will continue the public hearing until the next regular scheduled Council meeting October 23, at 6:00 p.m. to accept written and verbal comment.

Council Member Scott wants a summary from the City Engineer about the storm water run off and the effects. Council Member Bailey stated that the City needs to look at a completely different way to handle storm water in certain parts of the City than what has happened the last ten years.

Rebuttal from Steve Millemann – He stated that the Council does not have a letter from DEQ stating that the system proposed on this property will not work. DEQ assumed that the system will feed into the City's vortex system and that is not the case. The project is proposing to use its own sized at a volume that will be oversized for the very small area of the property that is impervious (this is a real important point that he hopes the Council did not miss). When one looks at the entire piece of property, because of the "green roofs" and because of the fifty foot setback area which in

setback area which in fact has a tremendous amount of pervious area, there is a very small area of the project that is impervious and will run off.

The applicants made the offer at the first hearing to cooperate with the Watershed Advisory Group on any suggestions they have. They have not been invited to do that but they are willing to do that. They are confident that the City will see the best engineering that is available. Their Secesh engineer is going to work with the City's engineer to and collaborate and get any input the Watershed Advisory group wants to offer. The Council's findings require that any technology that for any system that is ultimately designed meet or exceed the highest standards of the Council's and DEQ's requirements.

Mr. Millemann stated that he did not say that there was no plan, he tried to point out the Planning and Zoning is an evolving process. An applicant does not have the final plan at the first level of application. An applicant has a conceptual plan to demonstrate that it is feasible and how it is feasible.

The applicant has no objection to some sort of an annual update. The phasing plan does not contemplate waiting until 2012 to do a development agreement. The conditions of approval assume that the development agreement will be done no later than final plat. The Development agreement is what ties together much of what the Council is relying on as an encumbrance to the property.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mayor Kulesza called for public comment at 8:15 p.m.

Hearing no comments, Mayor Kulesza closed the public comment at 8:16 p.m.

CONSENT AGENDA

Staff recommended approval of the following items:

- Minutes from August 28 & September 11, 2008
- Warrant Register printed on October 3, 2008
- Payroll Report for Period ending September 19, 2008
- AB 08-200 Alcohol Beverage Catering Permits
- AB 08-203 Winter Snow Removal Equipment Rental
- AB 08-202 Contract for construction of Senior Center Carport
- AB 08-204 Payette National Forest Land Purchase

Some discussion took place to clarify the warrant register and correct the minutes.

Council Member Delaney moved to approve the Consent Agenda with the Contract for Construction of the Senior Center Carport be awarded to the Pine Top Builders, and the minutes corrected. Council Member Scott seconded the motion. In a roll call vote, all members voted aye and the motion passed.

BUSINESS AGENDA

AB 08-168 Recycle Center Update

Update by Esther Mulnick and Mary Hart with Recycle Partners on the status of the recycling center. They are waiting for their LOT funding so that they can move forward with the project. Recycle Partners are looking for a used steel building. The size of building needs to be large enough to include the bailer. An additional \$60,000 will be needed to complete the project; they are looking into grants and fund raising for these additional funds. Ms. Mulnick stated that they have received a lot of community support for the Recycle Center. Updated revenue numbers from LOT will be provided at the September 25, 2008 meeting.

Council Member Bailey moved to authorize the City to make the first \$22,000 payment to Recycle Partners from the funds available at this time and to make the second \$22,000 payment to Recycle Partners when those funds become available in October. Council Member Delaney seconded the motion. In a voice vote, all members voted aye and the motion passed.

AB 08-201 Sister City program

Carol Coyle explained that the Sister City program is a broad-based, officially approved, long-term partnership between two communities. If the Council decides to move forward with this program, it is a long term commitment to another community. Participants in this program engage in a wide variety of activities, such as cultural exchanges, information sharing, collaborative projects and involve municipal leaders, as well as members of the business community, health care, education, civic groups, clubs, etc. The sister cities can define the extent of their partnership and examples of interaction are annual "State of The City" letter exchange between mayors; exchanges of city reports and plans by city officials; exchanges of children's artwork/letters from the public schools; sharing of newspaper articles; cultural festivals where representatives of the sister city visit, etc.

Mayor Kulesza stated that the idea of the Sister Cities is great and he would like it to be also an opportunity to make a meaningful impact on another community. There is a website called kiva.org, where they offer micro loans for third world countries to help bring them up. He would like to see if there is a way to combine the idea of a Sister City with impacting a third world community, more like adopt a city.

Council Member Delaney likes the idea of the Sister City concept; however she is concerned that it may not be the right time financially. Is it what the City wants to spend their labor dollars on for staff to pursue this program?

Ms. Coyle did reiterate that it would be a community driven project and not a City driven project. She is asking to start a group within the community for the project and if she is unable to gain community involvement then it would not be worth pursuing.

Council Member Delaney is also concerned with the time it would take even for one staff member to be involved and could that time be spent doing something else that be more pressing for the needs of the City. The general consensus was that the Council would like to know what the time and money commitment would be.

AB 08-191 McCall Avenue Homes update – NHS & VARHA

Lynn Cundick, Neighborhood Housing Services (NHS), and Mike David, Valley Adams Regional Housing Authority (VARHA) Executive Director, did not make it to the Council Meeting. This agenda item was moved to the October 23, 2008 regular Council Meeting Agenda.

Other Discussion

Next week will be the meeting for a work session for the marinas. Council wanted to know if it was noticed in the paper and the answer was unsure. Mr. Kirkpatrick was planning on e-mailing the main constituents for the marinas as a way to get the word out in addition to the newspaper. The format of the meeting would be like a public hearing with presentations by both parties and public comment received. It would be less formal than a public hearing and would give the Council opportunity to gather information acting as the landlord. There was discussion that all of the proponents would need to be notified. Council felt that if it was not in the paper then it needs to be postponed until it can be posted.

Discussion took place of the time for the marinas discussion. It was discussed to go forward with the special meeting on the October 16, 2008 and change the agenda item from the marina discussion to the executive session and the tour of the Historical Museum. The next step would be to advertise for the marina discussion on October 23, 2008, with time specified so that the Grand Payette public hearing will wrap up, then the marinas discussion can happen at a prescheduled time.

A work session for the Impact Fees is planned.. Staff is trying to get a date commitment from either Anne Wescott or Tom Pippin. After the work session a public hearing will be set. There was some discussion about making an effort to make the community to go more “green” and would it be possible to give credit to the fees if they go “green”. The impact fee statute is very narrow and there are some provisions for credit when a builder does something for the community such as a community park then they would get credit towards their park fee.

There may be some thing that the City can do in the building code that would mandate more “green” building. A builder needs to have incentive to build “green” or be mandated to build “green” or they will be complacent to the need to go “green”. Mr. Kirkpatrick stated that there is the financial aspect to think of that is associated with this type of concept. It was suggested that the Environmental Committee, once it established, could be tasked with this concept to see what they can determine.. It was also suggested that it could be interesting to consider a group of developers and architects to head a committee to find incentives to go “green”. They may have some interesting ideas on concepts that have a payback.

COMMITTEE MINUTES

The Council received copies of the following minutes:

- McCall Improvement Committee – September 11, 2008
- McCall Historic Preservation Committee – August 20, 2008

ADJOURNMENT

Council Member Bailey moved to adjourn the meeting Council member Delaney seconded the motion and in a voice vote all members voted aye and the motion carried.

Without further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:27 p.m.


Bert Kulesza, Mayor

ATTEST:


Brenna Chaloupka, Acting City Clerk