

**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
FOR THE CITY OF HAYDEN, KOOTENAI COUNTY, IDAHO**

Tuesday, April 28, 2026

Regular Meeting: 5:00 PM

Hayden City Hall Council Chambers, 8930 N. Government Way, Hayden, ID 83835

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 5:03 PM.

**ROLL CALL OF COUNCIL MEMBERS**

**Present:** Ed DePriest, David Erickson, Matthew Roetter, **Absent:** Tom Shafer.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Mayor Davis led the pledge of allegiance

**ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS**

None

**1. CONSENT CALENDAR** *All items on the Consent Calendar are Action Items*

- A. Approval of April 7, 2026 Special City Council Meeting Minutes
- B. Approval of April 14, 2026 City Council Meeting Minutes
- C. Approval of Welch Comer and Associates, Inc. Engineering Services Agreement to Review Legal Descriptions
- D. Approval of Right-of-Way Purchase from Richard and Trisha Agueros for Hayden/Atlas Roundabout Project
- E. Approval of 2026 Richie's Dawg House Park Concessions Permit Application and Agreement
- F. Approval of Pickleball Lessons Contractual Services Agreement with Tom Darzes
- G. Approval of SafeBuilt On-Call Building Plan Review and/or Inspection Contract
- H. Approval of Contract Renewal with Western States CAT for Generator Maintenance
- I. Approval of Independent Contractor Agreement with Access Unlimited for Honeysuckle Boat Launch
- J. Approval of Bills for Payment

MOTION: Council Member Roetter moved to approve the consent calendar as presented. Council President DePriest provided the second.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Council Member Erickson	Yes
Council President DePriest	Yes
Council Member Roetter	Yes

The motion was approved by a unanimous vote in favor of the members present.

**2. VISITOR/PUBLIC COMMENT** (3-minutes maximum)

Gina Rogers, a Rathdrum resident and Hayden small business owner, spoke in support of future regulation of kratom products within the city. She explained that her business has self-regulated for several years and supports measures such as labeling

requirements, age restrictions, and bans on synthetic or chemically adulterated products that are sometimes sold in gas stations. Ms. Rogers stated that removing synthetic products would improve public safety and noted that potential federal action on those products may be forthcoming.

She provided council members with informational materials, including a sample ordinance and additional resources related to kratom regulation. Mayor Davis referenced information previously submitted by Laura Romney of the Plant and Herbal Alliance. Ms. Rogers stated that she is knowledgeable about the differences between traditional kratom and synthetic products. Ms. Rogers also offered to answer future questions from council regarding the products and regulation options.

### **3. COMMISSION REPORT**

#### **A. Quarterly Reports**

Council had no questions or comments.

### **4. PUBLIC HEARING (Public Testimony will be received for these items)**

#### **A. ACTION ITEM PZE-25-0080 Sycamore Valley Subdivision Preliminary Plat Request Located at the Northwest Corner of North Maple Street and East Miles Avenue**

Mayor Davis read the procedures for an applicant initiated public hearing and opened the hearing at 5:15 p.m.

**STAFF INTRODUCTION:** Community Development Director Donna Phillips introduced the Sycamore Valley subdivision preliminary plat request, explaining that while subdivision applications typically involve a public hearing before the Planning and Zoning Commission followed by a City Council meeting, significant public input and discussion during the commission process led to scheduling a second public hearing before the council. This additional hearing was intended to allow council members to ask questions directly of both the public and the applicant.

Ms. Phillips explained that the applicant and engineer of record are Olson Engineering, representing property owner Kulka Land, LLC. The proposal involves a 37-lot subdivision on approximately 13 acres across two properties, with access planned from North Maple Street and East Miles Avenue. She noted that one of the parcels had recently undergone a boundary line adjustment.

Ms. Phillips also stated that following a public hearing and deliberation, the Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the preliminary plat with staff-recommended conditions, along with two additional conditions added by the commission.

**APPLICANT:** Applicant representative Jeramie Terzulli introduced the Sycamore Valley subdivision proposal on behalf of Olson Engineering and property owner Kulka Land, LLC, explaining that the project has undergone approximately two years of review and coordination with city staff, engineers, utility providers, and other agencies prior to reaching City Council. He emphasized that infrastructure availability, utility service, and compliance issues had already been extensively reviewed through staff-level meetings and the Planning and Zoning Commission process.

Mr. Terzulli stated that Avondale Irrigation District has provided a willingness-to-serve letter and that required water line extensions, looping, fire flow, sewer

service, and dry utility coordination have all been addressed in the preliminary plans. He noted that Northern Lakes Fire District had since provided comments requiring hydrant placement and activation prior to construction. The subdivision will also include sewer line extensions that could allow nearby Dana Court properties currently on septic systems to connect to municipal sewer in the future.

Regarding transportation and infrastructure, Mr. Terzulli said the street layout complies with city standards, includes interconnected roads without dead ends or cul-de-sacs, and provides snow storage, sidewalks, utility easements, and mailbox locations. He described the proposal as a standard subdivision design consistent with surrounding development patterns.

A significant portion of the presentation addressed the existing farmhouse located near the Maple and Miles intersection. Terzulli explained that after hearing public feedback and concerns about the structure's sentimental and historic value, the applicant revised the design to preserve a corner area as a potential memorial or historical feature space. The proposed area could include landscaping, a bench, interpretive signage, and reclaimed materials from the farmhouse while also preserving flexibility for a possible future roundabout at the intersection.

Mr. Terzulli also responded to concerns raised during the Planning and Zoning hearing about neighborhood compatibility. Using aerial imagery, he argued that the proposed lot sizes are generally consistent with nearby residential development, noting that most surrounding lots are similar in size to the approximately 10,000-square-foot lots proposed within the subdivision, which exceed the minimum zoning requirements.

He further stated that agencies reviewing the project did not require additional traffic or environmental studies and that impact fees would be collected at the building permit stage to address impacts on transportation and parks.

On the issue of parks and open space, Mr. Terzulli explained that the city's Parks Master Plan identifies the area for a future neighborhood park but noted that, because the project is an infill subdivision rather than an annexation, the city cannot require parkland dedication in the same way it can for annexation projects. He said the developer discussed potential parkland options with the city, including possible land contributions, but ultimately the city chose to pursue a different direction.

Mr. Terzulli concluded by stating the applicant agrees with the staff-recommended conditions of approval and confirmed that engineering oversight and required infrastructure improvements would be provided during construction. Property owner Ryan Stoker then introduced himself and offered to answer any questions from council regarding the development proposal.

**COUNCIL QUESTIONS:** Council members questioned the applicant primarily about traffic impacts, public safety concerns, and future park connectivity related to the proposed Sycamore Valley subdivision.

Council President DePriest raised concerns about congestion at the Miles Avenue and Government Way intersection, noting that future residents would likely increase traffic through an already heavily traveled area. In response, developer Ryan Stoker clarified that previous discussions had focused on potential participation in

improvements at the Maple and Miles intersection, including a possible future roundabout, rather than Government Way and Miles. Mr. Stoker said no one had approached him regarding improvements at Government Way and Miles but stated he would be willing to discuss ways to assist if a specific project moved toward construction readiness.

Council also questioned comments made during the Planning and Zoning hearing regarding the potential use of urban renewal funding. Mr. Terzulli explained that references to urban renewal related only to potential transportation improvements at the Government Way and Miles intersection because nearby properties, including one he owns, are within the urban renewal district. He emphasized that the subdivision itself was not relying on urban renewal funding and reiterated that the applicant has been willing to participate in discussions about community improvements throughout the review process.

Additional questions focused on whether traffic concerns at Government Way and Miles could legally be tied to subdivision approval conditions. Clarification was provided that the city attorney had advised Planning and Zoning commissioners that requiring a signalized intersection as a condition of approval was not legally supportable under the existing transportation data and city plans.

Council Member Roetter expressed concern about reduced sheriff deputy staffing levels in Hayden and questioned whether the public safety review considered the reduction from ten deputies to five. Mr. Terzulli responded that he relied on agency review comments provided during the application process and interpreted the sheriff's comments as general concerns commonly included in development reviews rather than an indication of a severe public safety issue specific to this project. He acknowledged that reductions in staffing could affect response times but stated he did not believe the subdivision would create significant crime or safety impacts, noting that the proposed development consists of larger, higher-end residential lots.

Council discussion also addressed a Planning and Zoning condition related to future park connectivity if the city acquires nearby parkland. Members discussed the possibility of a future park west or northwest of the subdivision and how pedestrian or roadway access could be accommodated. Mr. Terzulli confirmed the applicant had considered several options, including potential walking path connections or roadway access, depending on whether the city successfully acquires adjacent land currently under contract. He stated the developer is willing to work cooperatively with the city to provide future connectivity but requested that any condition related to park access remain specific to nearby properties rather than broadly applying to future park acquisitions farther away.

STAFF: Ms. Phillips presented the staff analysis for the Sycamore Valley subdivision, explaining that the proposal had been thoroughly reviewed under the city's eight subdivision approval standards. She noted the application materials and staff analysis had been publicly available prior to the hearing and were included in the council packet.

Ms. Phillips explained that the review focused heavily on infrastructure availability and compliance with city, state, and federal regulations. She confirmed that Avondale Irrigation District had issued a conditional will-serve letter for water service and that city sewer service would be provided through the H-1 sewer basin. She also clarified that all lots within the subdivision, including adjacent parcels affected by a previous boundary line adjustment, would ultimately be required to

connect to city sewer, with no septic systems remaining as part of the approved development.

Regarding transportation and street design, Ms. Phillips stated the subdivision complies with city standards and includes interconnected streets without cul-de-sacs. The layout was designed to allow for future roadway connectivity to adjacent undeveloped properties and to align properly with nearby streets. Improvements to Maple and Miles would include widening along the project frontage, sidewalks, curbs, swales, landscaping, and underground utilities.

Council discussion during the presentation addressed neighborhood character and growth patterns. Ms. Phillips noted that several nearby subdivisions with similar lot configurations and cul-de-sac layouts have existed for decades, demonstrating that higher density than 1-2 dwelling units per acre of residential development already exists in the area.

Ms. Phillips also discussed the city's potential acquisition of nearby parkland west of the subdivision and how future connectivity could be incorporated through trails or sidewalks. She clarified that the city's Parks Master Plan identifies areas of park need rather than exact park locations and explained that the city has limited legal authority to require park dedication from infill developments like this one. Instead, park improvements are generally funded through impact fees or negotiated agreements rather than mandatory conditions of approval.

Additional review topics included erosion control, stormwater management, underground utilities, mailbox placement on internal streets to reduce traffic conflicts, and required landscaping and street trees. Ms. Phillips explained that all disturbed areas must be stabilized with dryland grass mix until homes are constructed to reduce dust and erosion.

She also reviewed agency comments received during the process. Panhandle Health District, Avondale Irrigation District, the Coeur d'Alene Airport, Northern Lakes Fire Protection District, and other agencies either provided standard requirements or reported no major concerns. The Sheriff's Office letter noted no specific objections to the project while also outlining broader law enforcement resource considerations.

Ms. Phillips summarized the Planning and Zoning Commission's recommended conditions of approval, including requirements for easements, utility coordination, construction standards, erosion control, sewer extensions, landscaping, and compliance with outside agency requirements. She highlighted two additional conditions added by Planning and Zoning: preserving future connectivity to nearby parkland and incorporating historical interpretive signage or features related to the existing farmhouse at the Maple and Miles intersection. She concluded by noting council could consider refining the wording of the park connectivity condition during deliberations.

**COUNCIL QUESTIONS:** Council questions focused primarily on future land use, zoning potential, and clarification regarding law enforcement staffing information included in the record.

Referring to the city's future land use map, Council Member Erickson noted that portions of the surrounding area are identified as mixed residential within the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. He pointed out that the proposed subdivision's average lot

sizes exceed 11,000 square feet and observed that, if the property were redeveloped in the future under different zoning approvals, a denser project could potentially be proposed. He stated the current proposal was not maximizing the density that could theoretically be allowed. Ms. Phillips clarified that the property is currently zoned single-family residential and that any higher-density development would require a zone map amendment.

During the exchange, City Legal Counsel Fonda Jovick reminded council members that questions to staff at that stage should avoid deliberation or advocacy because the public hearing portion had not yet been opened.

Additional discussion focused on sheriff staffing levels referenced earlier in the meeting. Council Member Roetter asked Ms. Phillips to clarify for the record that the city's current contract with Kootenai County provides five assigned deputies rather than the ten deputies referenced in older materials. Ms. Jovick confirmed that the contract is a public record and acknowledged that the current agreement identifies five deputies assigned to Hayden. She clarified that while the contract itself was not formally part of the hearing record, council could still consider the information discussed during the meeting. She also noted there had been no evidence presented connecting the reduced staffing levels to an inability to serve the proposed subdivision specifically.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**For:** Jeremy Voeller, non-hayden resident, does not wish to speak and indicated he is in favor of the subject case.

**Neutral:** Matt Sullivan, who lives adjacent to the proposed subdivision and potential park site, expressed generally supportive but neutral comments on the Sycamore Valley development. He stated the proposal appears to be a good project for Hayden, noting the lot sizes, anticipated home quality, and overall design are preferable to what could have otherwise been developed on the property.

While acknowledging concerns about continued growth and higher-density development in the area, Mr. Sullivan suggested the city consider locating a future park within the subdivision itself, potentially by purchasing several interior lots from the developer. He said placing a park inside the neighborhood could make more sense from a planning and neighborhood perspective than locating it adjacent to existing townhomes. Overall, he said he appreciated the developer's approach and believed the project would be a positive addition to the community.

**Against:** Lorelle Cardenas, speaking on behalf of nearby residents living along North Maple Street, opposed approval of the Sycamore Valley subdivision and raised several concerns.

She first alleged a potential deficiency in required public noticing, stating that at least one nearby property owner did not receive mailed notification as required by city code, and submitted a notarized statement to support that claim. She requested the city verify compliance with notification requirements before proceeding.

On the substance of the proposal, she objected to the scale and density of the project, describing it as a major increase from the existing rural-residential character of the site. She argued this level of development is inconsistent with

preserving the established neighborhood and expressed concern about loss of long-standing open space and potential impacts on neighborhood character and property values, including building height and view impacts.

She also raised concerns about parks and open space, noting uncertainty about whether park acquisition and development would occur in time to serve the project and questioning whether the proposal satisfies city standards related to parks master planning.

Traffic impacts were another major concern. She argued the project does not adequately address increased traffic on surrounding streets, particularly Maple Street and its connection to Government Way. She requested a traffic impact study, stating that nearby residents already experience congestion and limited safe access to arterials.

Additionally, she cited public safety concerns based on sheriff's office staffing levels and suggested increased development could further strain emergency response times. Finally, she expressed concern that phased development by multiple builders could result in prolonged construction impacts on surrounding residents.

Overall, she urged the council to require additional review, particularly on noticing compliance and traffic analysis, before considering approval, and asked that the project be reconsidered due to density, neighborhood compatibility, and infrastructure concerns.

**APPLICANT REBUTTAL:** Mr. Terzulli addressed concerns raised during public testimony and staff discussion.

On law enforcement and public safety concerns, he acknowledged the sheriff's comments but emphasized that the development would generate additional property tax revenue, which he suggested could help the city fund more law enforcement resources if needed. He reiterated that this was a broader fiscal benefit rather than a direct mitigation requirement.

Regarding public noticing, he stated that the developer's responsibility is limited to compiling property owner lists and working through a licensed title company, while the city handles mailing, publishing, and posting notices. He added that, in his experience working across the region, Hayden is particularly diligent about meeting noticing requirements and ensuring compliance.

On parks and open space, he said the development team has worked extensively with city staff over an extended period to address park-related discussions and believes they have acted in good faith and transparently. He clarified that decisions about how the project satisfies park master plan expectations are ultimately for the city to determine, not the applicant. He also emphasized that discussions with the city were collaborative and ongoing, not coercive, and resulted in the city pursuing off-site park acquisition with planned connectivity from the subdivision.

On neighborhood character, he reiterated that the proposed lot sizes are consistent with surrounding established subdivisions and argued the project aligns with existing residential patterns.

On traffic, he stated he is not a traffic engineer but explained that standard practice relies on trip generation analysis consistent with the city's transportation master plan. He noted the project proposes a density below the maximum allowed under R1 zoning (2.92 units per acre versus a 4 units per acre maximum) and argued that even if a full traffic impact study were required, it would likely confirm that the development would not push nearby intersections to failure levels.

He concluded by reaffirming that the proposal meets all applicable standards of approval, that the project is consistent with zoning and existing infrastructure planning, and respectfully requested approval of the application with the proposed conditions.

**COUNCIL QUESTIONS:** Council questions focused primarily on traffic analysis assumptions and intersection performance, particularly at Maple and Miles and the broader Government Way corridor.

Council Member Roetter questioned the applicant's statement that a simple trip generation letter would demonstrate adequacy and asked how that conclusion could be made without first knowing the current operational rating of the Maple and Miles intersection. Mr. Terzulli responded that, to his understanding, the intersection had not been formally rated in the transportation plan and functioned as a basic four-way stop. He further explained that a trip generation analysis distributes estimated vehicle trips from the 37-lot development across its two access points and surrounding roads and concluded that this level of analysis is typically sufficient unless an intersection is already near a "tipping point" that would require physical improvements such as turn lanes or signalization.

Council followed up by pressing whether it is appropriate to rely on a simplified analysis without a defined baseline performance rating for the intersection. Mr. Terzulli directed those questions back to city staff for clarification of existing conditions.

A second line of questioning addressed whether the nearby Government Way and Miles intersection could be considered at a "tipping point." The applicant said in his personal opinion it is approaching that threshold but it is not there yet, noting that a future signal is anticipated in the area. He added anecdotal observations about personal driving patterns in the area to illustrate congestion but reiterated that traffic evaluation for the project relied on standard trip generation methods and the city's transportation master plan assumptions rather than full traffic impact studies.

He concluded that, since staff did not request a more detailed traffic study during review, the applicant proceeded under the assumption that the project's traffic impact would not require off-site intersection improvements prior to development.

Mayor Davis closed the hearing at 6:41 p.m.

**COUNCIL DISCUSSION:** Council discussion centered on whether to proceed with deliberations that night or postpone the decision to obtain additional information.

Council Member Roetter requested to postpone deliberations, citing two main needs: (1) a transportation/trip generation letter and staff review of the Maple and Miles intersection to better understand current conditions and potential traffic

impacts, and (2) clarification and coordination regarding parkland plans and connectivity associated with the development and a nearby proposed park site.

Council Member Erickson supported delaying action until the parkland escrow process and acquisition timeline are clearer, noting that finalizing that agreement would provide a more complete picture of the project's park and connectivity obligations.

Staff clarified that the park land transaction was in escrow with a potential closing timeline (possibly July or sooner) and confirmed that additional coordination was still in progress.

In response to traffic concerns, staff explained that the 2018 transportation model showed the Maple and Miles intersection operating at a Level of Service "A" and not projected to fail under modeled short (2035)- or long-term (2040) scenarios. They also noted that current growth in Hayden has been lower than the assumptions used in earlier models.

Staff added that a formal traffic impact analysis or trip generation letter was not required under city thresholds, and that preliminary review suggested the project would not trigger additional mitigation requirements.

Some council members questioned whether delaying for further traffic data was necessary, expressing confidence that the proposed trip generation analysis would likely confirm no significant impact, while others emphasized pedestrian safety concerns and the need for current, real-world traffic validation.

The council ultimately remained split between moving forward with deliberations versus continuing the hearing. They recognized that postponing would require reopening the public hearing and could extend the process by at least a month due to noticing requirements.

**MOTION:** Council Member Roetter moved to table deliberations to a future meeting to receive information about park connection and transportation impacts. Council President DePriest provided the second.

**DISCUSSION ON MOTION:** Council discussion on the motion reflected differing views on whether to delay deliberations for additional information or proceed.

Some members supported moving forward, noting staff and applicant explanations that a trip generation letter would likely not change the traffic conclusions and that the project is consistent with adopted planning assumptions. They also referenced that the developer has worked cooperatively with the city and that property rights and long-term land use expectations should be considered.

Other concerns were expressed about traffic and pedestrian safety, particularly on Maple, Miles, and the Government Way corridor. Questions were asked whether additional analysis should be completed to better understand existing conditions and potential impacts, especially given perceived safety issues and increasing use of local streets as alternate routes.

Staff clarified that the Government Way/Miles signal project is in design with right-of-way acquisition underway, with an estimated 3–4 year implementation timeline.

They also reiterated that prior modeling and standards indicated no failing level of service at the Maple and Miles intersection under current assumptions.

ROLL CALL VOTE:  
Council Member Erickson No  
Council President DePriest No  
Council Member Roetter Yes

The motion failed for lack of a majority vote in favor of the members present.

DELIBERATIONS: Council moved into deliberations with general discussion of previously raised topics, including traffic, pedestrian safety, and neighborhood impacts.

Members referenced staff findings that the development would include sidewalks and frontage improvements and would contribute impact fees toward broader transportation infrastructure.

Some discussion noted that existing congestion concerns on major corridors, particularly Government Way and Miles, are part of the city's longer-term transportation planning and are not solely attributable to this project.

Staff reiterated that most project traffic would access Government Way and Miles and that pedestrian improvements are included along adjacent streets, with potential connectivity to a future park site. Staff also confirmed that noticing requirements had been addressed and reminded council to include required findings and conditions in any motion.

Discussion included clarification of a potential condition related to park connectivity, with staff advising that general coordination with the city could be required, while detailed design would be determined later through further review and planning.

Overall, deliberations focused on weighing compliance with city standards and planned infrastructure improvements against ongoing concerns about traffic and safety.

MOTION: Council President DePriest motioned to approve PZE-25-0080 Sycamore Valley Subdivision Preliminary Plat with Planning and Zoning Commission recommended conditions to include amending the condition for park connectivity to the acceptability of the city council. Council Member Erickson provided the second.

ROLL CALL VOTE:  
Council Member Roetter No  
Council Member Erickson Yes  
Council President DePriest Yes

The motion was approved by a majority vote in favor of the members present.

Mayor Davis recessed the meeting for a break from 7:08 - 7:17 p.m.

**5. NEW BUSINESS**

A. **ACTION ITEM** Viking Construction Request for Reconsideration Hearing of the Appeal of Staff Determination for Extraordinary Impact Analysis

Staff clarified that the item was not a rehearing of the original appeal, but only a decision on whether the council would agree to hear a reconsideration request at a later date.

Council reviewed the city code criteria for reconsideration, which include clerical error, fraud or mistake, new evidence, procedural error, tie vote, or violation of substantive law. Members generally agreed that none of these criteria appeared to be met based on their understanding of the record.

Legal staff confirmed those criteria and noted no additional procedural issues. Staff also explained that if reconsideration is denied, the applicant retains other options, including a regulatory takings analysis and the ability to pursue judicial review in district court.

MOTION: Council Member Erickson moved to deny the request for reconsideration. Council Member Roetter provided the second.

ROLL CALL VOTE:  
Council President DePriest Yes  
Council Member Roetter Yes  
Council Member Erickson Yes

The motion was approved by a unanimous vote in favor by the members present.

B. Public Works Initiative Overview

Public Works Director Alan Soderling provided a broad update on current and upcoming department initiatives.

He outlined several 2026 construction projects, including a chip seal street and parking lot maintenance program (with bids received and anticipated council award next meeting) and the Ramsey Road/Honeysuckle Avenue roundabout project, which is expected to proceed to award soon and begin construction as early as June, with significant traffic impacts and detours anticipated.

He also discussed a potential Hayden Avenue/Atlas Road intersection improvement project that would add turn lanes and a temporary signal, with work possibly occurring later this summer depending on right-of-way and design progress.

Mr. Soderling reviewed planned pedestrian safety improvements funded through a community health grant, including rapid-flashing beacon crosswalks at several high-traffic locations such as near the library, Peak Fitness, and City Hall, with a possible additional installation near Zips. These projects were previously identified as medium priority during council goal-setting.

He noted the installation of new "Welcome to Hayden" signage at multiple highway entry points, replacing older or removed signage.

Finally, he introduced a proposed street cut policy intended for public hearing. The policy would standardize how utility cuts in roadways are repaired, requiring larger,

consolidated asphalt patches to reduce long-term maintenance costs and improve pavement quality. The policy would replace existing code language with adoption by a resolution. He also indicated upcoming related items, including a towing enforcement code amendment, would be brought forward at the same public hearing.

## **6. REPORTS**

### **A. City Administrator Report and Calendar Review**

City Administrator Lisa provided a more detailed-than-usual monthly report, noting it was expanded in response to prior council discussion about tracking progress on the city's project prioritization list.

She explained that the report is intended to reflect accountability and ongoing alignment with the prioritization framework developed with council earlier in the year, and that staff will continue providing updates. A more comprehensive update on the full prioritization list is planned for June.

She also reminded council of upcoming special meetings, including a Thursday workshop focused on fiscal year 2027 strategic budget planning and a Friday meeting with the Hayden Urban Renewal Agency Board to coordinate project priorities between organizations.

### **B. Law Enforcement**

Heard following the consent calendar.

Kootenai County Sheriff's Office Lieutenant Sifford reported that overall crime statistics remain consistent with previous trends. A reported rape incident was clarified during discussion as an infidelity-related matter involving adults, with no rape or minors involved, it was stated that there is no ongoing public safety concern. Council members discussed ensuring future reports accurately reflect the final classification of incidents rather than initial reports.

Council also asked about sheriff deputy vehicles purchased by the City, and it was confirmed that Hayden-assigned deputies use the vehicles funded by the City. Additional discussion touched on whether businesses generating frequent law enforcement calls could be encouraged to provide their own security, particularly as the City considers law enforcement costs during budget planning. Lt. Sifford explained that they currently work with high-call locations in other areas of Kootenai County through targeted strategies such as scheduled visits and evidence collection to reduce repeated officer response time.

### **C. Mayor/Council**

Council discussed how to proceed with obtaining accountability reports from the sheriff's office related to the Motorola system.

Council President DePriest shared a recent conversation with Commissioner Matarre, who stated he had met with Motorola and the sheriff's department and was informed that the sheriff's office should be able to produce the requested reports with staff training. Motorola was described as having confirmed the system capability.

Council members discussed whether to seek written confirmation of that information or move forward through other channels. Some supported requesting a written

statement to document the communication, while others questioned the value of continuing to route the issue through the commissioner.

Discussion also included whether the city’s contracted consultant would be able to obtain the necessary data independently as part of their analysis, potentially reducing the need for separate requests.

The group ultimately leaned toward handling the matter administratively by having city staff follow up directly with the sheriff’s office to clarify reporting capabilities and determine next steps, rather than placing the item on a future agenda or relying further on third-party communication.

**7. REQUEST FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

None

**8. EXECUTIVE SESSION **ACTION ITEM** (Action will be taken to enter and exit Executive Session. No action will be taken during the Executive Session)**

- A. Idaho Code 74-206(1)(f) To communicate with legal counsel for the public agency to discuss the legal ramifications of and legal options for pending litigation, or controversies not yet being litigated but imminently likely to be litigated.

MOTION: Council Member Roetter moved to enter executive session under Idaho Code 74-206(1)(f). Council President DePriest provided the second.

ROLL CALL VOTE:  
Council Member Erickson    Yes  
Council President DePriest    Yes  
Council Member Roetter    Yes

The motion was approved by a unanimous vote in favor of the members present and the meeting entered executive session at 7:47 p.m.

MOTION: Council President DePriest moved to exit executive session. Council Member Roetter provided the second.

ROLL CALL VOTE:  
Council Member Erickson    Yes  
Council Member Roetter    Yes  
Council President DePriest    Yes

The motion was approved by a unanimous vote in favor of the members present and the meeting exited executive session at 9:03 p.m.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:03 p.m.

---

Abbi Sanchez, City Clerk

---

Alan Davis, Mayor