



# Memo

To: Mayor Davis and Members of the Council

From: Donna Phillips, Community Development Director

Date: April 17, 2026

**Agenda Item: PZE-25-0080 Sycamore Valley Subdivision Preliminary Plat Request**

---

## **Agenda Item Location**

Public Hearing

## **Recommended Action or Motion**

### **Possible Motions of City Council:**

- **Motion to Approve** – I move to approve PZE-25-0080 Sycamore Valley Subdivision request with recommended conditions of approval, finding the request IS in accord with the standards of Hayden City Code, based upon testimony received at the City Council public hearing and the record of the request.
- **Motion to Continue** – I move to continue this hearing to {date specific} to address concerns related to \_\_\_\_\_.
- **Motion to Deny** – I move to deny the PZE-25-0080 Sycamore Valley Subdivision request, based upon testimony received at the City Council public hearing and the record of the request for the following reasons: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **Summary**

Olson Engineering, Inc., on behalf of the owner, Kulka Land, LLC is requesting approval to subdivide the 13.06 (+/-) acre property into 37 single family residential lots to be known as Sycamore Valley Subdivision. At the conclusion of the public hearing, the Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approving the request with conditions as amended. The Staff Analysis, Written Recommendation and Minutes of the Planning and Zoning Commission, and the comments received as a result of noticing for this public hearing are included in Boardbook.

## **Fiscal Impact**

NA

**Budget Funding Source / Transfer Request**

NA

**Attachment**

Staff Analysis

Planning and Zoning Commission Written Recommendations

Planning and Zoning Commissions Minutes of the Public Hearing

Comments received due to City Council public hearing noticing

## WRITTEN RECOMMENDATION

### Preliminary Plat Request

#### PZE-25-0080 Sycamore Valley Subdivision Preliminary Plat

The application of **Olson Engineering, Inc. on behalf of the owner, Kulka Land, LLC**, requesting approval to subdivide the 13.06(+/-) acre property into 37 single family residential lots to be known as Sycamore Valley Subdivision was recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commission to the City Council to **APPROVE** with Conditions as amended.

**Planning and Zoning Commission Motions on March 16, 2026:** At the conclusion of the public hearing, the Planning and Zoning Commission deliberated the proposal and Vice-Chair Morris moved and Commissioner Grano seconded the motion, to recommend approval of the file PZE-25-0080 Sycamore Valley Subdivision with staff recommended conditions of approval as amended, and adding two conditions related to 1) future connectivity to parkland and 2) historical interpretative signage, finding the request **IS** in accord with the standards of Hayden City Code, based upon testimony received at the Planning and Zoning Commission hearing and the record of the request.

#### FINDINGS:

12-3-4(F) Standards of Approval: The applicant has demonstrated that all existing and proposed infrastructures meets or can be constructed prior to final plat or within the approval duration identified in 12-3-4(G) from the date of City Council approval of the master development agreement which approves the preliminary plat to meet the following standards:

HCC §12-3-4 (F) (1): Infrastructure can/cannot be constructed to function in a manner that promotes the public health, safety, and welfare.

HCC §12-3-4 (F) (2): Infrastructure can/cannot be constructed and located in an orderly manner that accommodates ongoing maintenance needs when taking into consideration collocation of other infrastructure.

**Applicant:** See applicant's narrative on page 35.

**Staff:** See Staff Analysis page 2.

HCC §12-3-4 (F) (3): Infrastructure is/is not or will/will not be in compliance with applicable city, state, and federal policies and regulations as follows:

- a) Provisions have/have not been made for a water supply system that satisfies city, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (IDEQ), and NLFPD requirements.

**Applicant:** See applicant's narrative on page 39. Avondale Irrigation District (AID) has provided a will serve letter. Water plans and fire hydrant spacing are subject to review and approval of AID, NLFPD, and IDEQ.

**Staff:** Avondale Irrigation District (AID) provided a Will Serve Letter dated October 30, 2024. See Staff Analysis beginning on page 3.

**PZC Hearing (Staff):** AID Will Serve letter was update on March 16, 2026.

**Applicant:** District has requested some updated redundancy and upsizing of pipes which are reflected or will be in the construction plans of the project. Fire flows will be adequate for the subdivision.

b) Provisions have/have not been made for a public sewage system in accordance with the city and Hayden Area Regional Sewer Board's (HARSB) adopted sewer master plans, as amended, that satisfied city, HARSB, and IDEQ requirements and that the existing or proposed systems can accommodate the proposed sewer flows.

**Applicant:** See applicant's narrative on page 39.

**Staff:** City of Hayden provided a Will Serve Letter dated September 3, 2025. The project site is wholly within the H-1 basin. See Staff Analysis beginning on page 3.

**PZC Hearing:**

**Applicant:** This proposed subdivision is in a previously unserved area of the City. Service of sewer to this part of the City has required the extension of sewer in both Miles Avenue and in Maple Street to Dana Court. The Will Serve identifies that as of right now there is capacity to serve this project; however, there is no guarantee that sewer capacity will be available at the time of building construction.

**PZC Hearing (Staff):** The residence located at 385 E Miles Avenue shall be connected to the City sewer in accordance with Hayden City Code resulting from the boundary line adjustment.

c) Provisions have/have not been made for snow storage that satisfies the City Public Works Department as the design relates to snow storage and removal practices. If snow storage is proposed to be collocated with stormwater, it shall only be in roadside swale areas and not in regional detention basins unless approved administratively by the City Engineer who shall determine that the likelihood of flooding is minimal.

d) Provisions have/have not been made for stormwater systems that satisfy the City and IDEQ requirements.

e) Provisions have/have not been made for streets that are consistent with the adopted transportation plan, as amended, and the transportation element of the adopted comprehensive plan, as amended and that satisfies the City, ITD, adjacent jurisdictions, and local highway district requirements. Where cul-de-sacs are proposed, they are required to be approved administratively by the City Engineer who

shall determine that they are limited to portions of developments in which street continuity is not foreseeable due to property configurations and/or that they are needed to address site-specific conditions. A cul-de-sac shall be limited to 400' in length measured from the edge of adjacent street right-of-way to the back of the cul-de-sac, unless an exception to this standard is allowed by the City Engineer.

**Applicant:** See applicant's narrative on page 39.

**Staff:** See staff analysis beginning on page 4.

**PZC Hearing:**

**Applicant:** All proposed internal streets are in accordance with city standard. Stormwater/snow storage in street side swales. The lots are very large and nearly 10,000 square feet which will enable accommodation of driveway placement on these large lot frontages. Multiple mailbox locations have been reserved within the subdivision. Right-of-way dedication and frontage improvements will be required on both Miles Avenue and Maple Street. Mr. Terzulli went on to explain the standard width of the typical section to include the pavement section, curb, swale, sidewalk and the dry utility easements for both the streets on the external part of the subdivision and within the subdivision itself.

**PZC Hearing (Staff):** No cul-de-sacs or eyebrows as proposed for road design at the request of the public works department. Road connectivity is possible to larger lots to the east (Pearl Avenue) and to the south. Maple Street has a Class II bike lane or Share the Road lane. Dana Court was built between 1992 & 1993 with a dry line within the street for future connectivity to sewer when it was within Maple Street. Each home is on a septic system today, and paid capitalization fees at the time of building permit. Therefore, when sewer is connected in Maple, and those homes make the connections from septic to sewer those capitalization fees of today won't be required because they have already been paid. Extension of the sewer beyond the subdivision's northern boundary is because it is consistent with the City's Sewer Master Plan as required.

**PZC Hearing Chair Taylor:** What are the requirements for Maple Street and Miles Avenue? Ms. Phillips noted the requirements are the same as for the internal street, meaning the ½ width would be constructed in accordance with the adopted typical section to include pavement widening, curbs, swale, and sidewalk. Chair Taylor asked if any of the required improvements would be extended down to North Government Way and Miles Avenue. Ms. Phillips identified that there would not.

**Commissioner Johnson** asked if there would be any lighting for the subdivision? Ms. Phillips identified that generally the streetlights would be where the new roads met the existing roads and then at intersections within the subdivision. The final placement of those lights is reviewed at the time of construction plan review.

**Chair Taylor** asked what the timeline is for the placement of a signal at Miles Avenue and North Government Way? Ms. Phillips identified the Transportation Master Plan identified a signal at this intersection, and she was aware of construction plans in process, but that she did not have a definitive timeline for the construction of that signal.

**Commissioner Morris** identified that no signal is being looked at for this intersection. What about a roundabout? Ms. Phillips identified that was not the case today.

**Commissioner Johnson** asked when the sidewalk for 385 E Miles Avenue. Ms. Phillips identified that all the frontage improvements and sewer connection would occur for this property due to the boundary line adjustment which was recently completed. This means the road improvements would continue from west of this property within the subdivision east to Maple Street. Commissioner Johnson had a follow up regarding the internal public street typical section of the road would be constructed along the western boundary of this property. Ms. Phillips concurred that sidewalk would be placed here as well.

**Public Comment R. Stoker (For)** – Non-resident: One of two owners of the project. He wanted to give some general background about other projects with respect to this project. Identified that if the City can get the right-of-way, he will build the roundabout.

**Rebuttal (Applicant):** Mr. Terzulli identified the development of this project was anticipated in the adopted transportation plan and he acknowledged that Maple Street is narrow and there is no right-of-way to make it a wider road. Widen it and then narrow it and then widen it as development occurs, he acknowledged that Maple Street on this side and Reed Road on the West are never going to be a North Government Way. A transportation impact analysis was not required by the City Codes or policies for this project.

**Chair Taylor** asked if there was some way the Developer could help in-lieu of with the light at Miles Avenue and Government Way as an owner of one of the properties on the corner. Mr. Terzulli identified that he would like it there sooner than later but thought that Urban Renewal dollars would be participating with that intersection. He went on to say that Mr. Stoker was always interested in helping the community and would be willing to sit down and try to figure out a way to be of assistance.

**Chair Taylor** asked about the Developer constructing or helping to construct the intersection of Miles Avenue and Government Way. Ms. Phillips identified the City has adopted a policy of when a transportation impact analysis would be required. In this case, with the number of lots proposed, it did not reach the level of development which would require a transportation impact analysis (TIA). In a TIA is where the Commission would have seen mitigation requirements related to an off-site improvement in this location should they have been required.

f) Provisions have/have not been made for parks and open space that are consistent with the adopted parks master plan, as amended, and that satisfies the city's requirement.

**Staff:** See Staff Analysis beginning on page 5.

**PZC Hearing:**

**Applicant:** All lots exceed the minimum lot size required in the Single Family Residential (R-1) zone designation. Proposal is consistent with adjacent neighborhoods, most notably to the north and the west which are the 1/5 to ¼ acre lots. There are some larger lots, but for the most part the surrounding neighborhoods are smaller. During the noticing, something slid through the cracks and the Northern Lakes Fire review did not occur. It will occur prior to construction plan approval most notably related to fire hydrants, turning radii, and no more than 30 homes without a second entrance. Plans will be reviewed by city engineer and other agencies (Panhandle Health District, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality, Avondale Irrigation District, Northern Lakes Fire District, etc.). Engineer of Record will provide oversight and observation during the construction in accordance with the City's requirements. No additional studies were requested by the agencies. Fees will be assessed at the time of building permit for impact on traffic and parks.

Provided background regarding parkland which is usually done at the time of annexation agreement; however, in this case property is already within the City with no designation of annexed area to become the third planned park in the northeast quarter of the City. 2040 Parks Master Plan identifies that property should be purchased for the park. Mr. Terzulli gave some history regarding discussion about how to meet this requirement and possible opportunities regarding this property and other properties in the near area.

**PZC Hearing (Staff):** Staff gave a recap of excerpts in the staff analysis from the sewer master plan, transportation master plan, and also the parks master plan. Ms. Phillips also identified a diagram in the staff analysis which provided about a ½ mile radius from the park as identified in the parks master plan near this site to show what other possible land could be used for a park in this more immediate area. She went on to say that the City was exploring possibilities.

**Commissioner Morris** asked about the park. Ms. Phillips identified the project site is about 13 acres. The City had the first right of refusal to purchase the corner property and chose not to purchase the property for a variety of reasons. The City has been and is looking at other opportunities.

**Public Comment K. Schneider (Opposed)** – Resident: Really hoped that the property would become a park.

**Rebuttal (Applicant):** Mr. Terzulli identified the City did not choose to purchase the property. Then again, the applicant asked how much park land the City would want out of this property. The City is looking at other opportunities. Mr. Terzulli identified that should someone want to move the structure to another location; they are open to those possibilities. The Historic Preservation Commission has been on site for photos of the site. Mr. Terzulli addressed the possibility for the plants to be removed by Ms. Eichelberger and asked that she coordinate that effort with the owner.

**Commissioner Johnson** asked why they didn't provide a park in the six-lots in the middle. The discussion was centered more on the existing structure and up Maple Street. Commissioner Johnson followed up with the question about a location for interpretative signage. Mr. Terzulli identified that proposal hadn't been brought up.

**Commissioner Johnson** if Hayden Code required subdivisions at the time of development to dedicate "X" acres as park land. She said that requirement was part of old code and not a part of the code today. What the City ended up with were these small puddles of park for the City to maintain and that was expensive and difficult. She reiterated that connectivity with future parkland. Commissioner Johnson asked if the City would have to purchase property for a park. Ms. Phillips confirmed that assumption. Commissioner Morris identified the taxpayers would have to buy that property. Ms. Phillips confirmed that was correct.

HCC §12-3-4 (F) (4): Provisions have/have not been made for erosion controls and geo-hazards stabilization both during construction and as needed for permanent controls to the satisfaction of the city.

HCC §12-3-4 (F) (5): Provisions have/have not been made for gas, power, telecommunications, mailboxes, and similar infrastructure.

HCC §12-3-4 (F) (6): Provisions have/have not been made for driveway locations that take into consideration the width and location of the driveway in relation to the location of snow storage, utility boxes, crosswalks, adjacent roads, mailboxes and the like.

**Applicant:** See applicant's narrative on page 40.

**Staff:** See Staff Analysis page 9.

**PZC Hearing (Applicant):** Water and sewer are available to or near the site and will be extended. Dry utility coordination will occur during the final stages of construction plan development. Mailbox locations shall be placed on the internal streets. Large lots will give ample location for driveways to not be in conflict with other items of the road typical. Engineer oversight will ensure soil stabilization and erosion control are addressed with best management practices.

**PZC Hearing (Staff):** No individual access will be allowed from Maple Street or Miles Avenue.

HCC §12-3-4 (F) (7): The area proposed for subdivision is/is not zoned for the proposed use and the use conforms to other requirements found in this code.

**Applicant:** See applicant's narrative on page 38.

**Staff:** See Staff Analysis beginning on page 9. As the purpose of the zoning ordinance is made in accordance with a comprehensive plan, the analysis includes much of the comprehensive plan. This analysis begins on page 10 of the staff analysis. Additionally, as always, the full Goals and Policies may be found in the Appendix beginning on page 28.

**PZC Hearing (Applicant):** As shown on the previous exhibits, the proposed uses conform to the underlying zones and meet all the performance standards of those zoning districts.

**Public Comment K. White (Neutral)** – Resident: Concern about what kind of houses are going to be built? One or two stories, how much are they going to block my view.

**Public Comment K. Scheider (Against)** – Resident: Would hope that the lots match the lots to the north and reduce the number of lots. Too many.

**Public Comment L. Cardinas (Against)** – Resident: Across the street with a 2.5-acre lot and the neighbor with a 3-acre lot. She made the assertion that noticing was not done properly for the public hearing because neighbor did not receive the notice. [Staff provided publication dates in the CDA Press, the notices posted on the property, and the notice mailed to the property. No mailed notice for this address was received back to the City.] “Local planning affects our lives every day.” She read the full letter into the record regarding a variety of ideas – not fully comparable to all of the surrounding properties, transportation concerns, and ideas. Ms. Cardinas then provided her testimony regarding the following concerns: density, project out of context, loss of historic property, loss of open space, impact fees instead of providing the open space, single story homes with basements instead of two-story homes, increase in traffic on surrounding streets, signal at Government Way and Miles Ave, KCSO response time, and length of time for development of future lots. The question for proper notice was restated Ms. Phillips discussed the noticing in the CDA Press was published twice as the noticing requirements for a meeting last week were not completed in their entirety. Additionally, the public noticeboards were updated as required with the change in the meeting date as well. Nick Peterson, City Attorney, confirmed the noticing was completed in accordance with requirements.

**Rebuttal (Applicant):** The underlying zone will dictate what will be able to be constructed, and the lots sizes are similar to the lots to the north, northeast, and the south. Well under the density cap for an R-1 subdivision. Idaho Statutes recognizes the rights of a private property owner.

HCC §12-3-4 (F) (8): The developer has made adequate plans to ensure that the community will bear no more than its fair share of costs to provide services by paying fees, furnishing land, or providing other mitigation measures for off-site impacts to streets, parks, and other public facilities within the community. It is the expectation that in most cases, off-site improvements will be dealt with through the agreements.

**Applicant:** See Applicant’s narrative beginning on page 39

**Staff:** All on-site and off-site improvements shall be required of the Developer to include various agreements, infrastructure per the adopted City Code, standards, and plans.

**PZC Hearing (Applicant):** Provisions have been made such that all infrastructure required to serve this project will be provided by the developer and that any off-site impacts will be mitigated through impact fees as is typical in the City of Hayden.

**Commissioner Johnson** asked what would be built at the intersection of Miles Avenue and Maple Street – would it be a four way stop or would it have a temporary hanging signal? Mr. Terzulli identified that a 4-way stop is all that is being proposed at this time.

**PZC Hearing (Staff):** Ms. Phillips requested that should the City Council find a suitable area of land in the near vicinity of this subdivision, she would hope the Planning & Zoning Commission would add a condition that required the applicant to provide connectivity from this subdivision to that area so the residents of the subdivision could enjoy the park amenity.

Two sets of public comments were provided in your packet from the noticing in the fall, the noticing for the hearing tonight, and then about 3 pm this afternoon we received the attached comment. Staff strives to get all the comments received into the hands of the Commission for the public hearing.

**Public Comment J. Eichelberger (Neutral)** – Non-resident: She wears two hats: History and Horticulture. She provide a brief history of the property from the original owners to present time. She would like the opportunity to rescue some of the plants that are growing on the property with the caveat that those who took the plant would get the Miles/Hanson story with the plant.

**Public Comment B. Brizee (Neutral)** – Non-resident: Is a member of the Historic Preservation Commission but is not here in that capacity. We don't want to lose the history of the City. We are always looking at possibilities to save the history by a Historical sign or by using the various pieces of the property and structures in the future buildings and structures to tie the past to the present. We hope the developer will not oppose these ideas.

**Deliberations Commissioner Morris:** Driven by this property for many years and understand the concerns; however, the Developer has made most of the lots larger than the minimum lot sizes. The concerns regarding the traffic are real. Working on a solution for the parks plan. Looks like it meets the Standards of Approval.

**Commissioner Vargas:** Just don't like the design. Don't think that it fits the neighborhood.

**Commissioner Grano:** Nothing to add, agree with Commissioner Morris.

**Commissioner Johnson:** Doesn't match the neighborhood character. Don't like there is no park and no land. Increase in traffic. Like connection of Dana Court. He appreciates these lots are bigger and think it can be done a bit better. Agree that it doesn't need sidewalks, because it doesn't have the rural feel. He doesn't need a park but rather preserve the open space. Preserve the property in the southeast corner. In favor of infill but believe that this could be revised.

**Chair Taylor** identified the connection of those lots on Dana Court is a good thing. He doesn't see how the intersection at Miles Ave and Government Way would not be impacted by this subdivision. He would like a condition that would not allow for building permits until the signal was put in place. The only way to get a park in this area is through a conservation easement or a purchase. The City had the opportunity and chose not to. Add a condition regarding connectivity from this subdivision to a future park.

**Commissioner Morris** liked the idea about having the timing of the signal as a condition prior to building permit issuance. Mr. Peterson identified the timing may be beyond the PZC purview.

**Commissioner Johnson** asked if a condition could be added where we would require two lots to be donated. Mr. Peterson identified that condition could not be added.

**Staff Recommended Conditions of Approval (begins on page 13 of the staff analysis):**

**General Conditions of Approval:**

1. The Developer shall be required to reflect all necessary permanent dedications and/or easements (to include but not be limited to avigation, odor, sewer, stormwater, water, utilities, etc.) on the face of the final plat of the subdivision and to record as a separate document all necessary temporary easements and to identify to whom the dedication and/or easement is to be granted and for what purpose.
2. All permits from outside agencies (ie. CDA Airport, HARSB, AID, IDEQ, IDWR, NLFPD, and PHD) shall be obtained prior to construction of any future development or building permit issuance.
3. This approval shall run with the land for the term approved herein regardless of whether the property ownership, applicant and/or design professionals noted herein remain the same, whether collectively or individually.

**Access Conditions of Approval:**

4. All lots shall be accessed from the internal roads of the subdivision. No lot shall have any form (primary, secondary, for accessory buildings, etc.) of direct individual access onto Miles Avenue or Maple Street. The final location of all driveway locations shall be subject to the review and approval of the City. Particular attention will be paid to location of utility pedestals in relation to driveway and snow storage needs and to those lots at intersections to avoid conflict with the required traffic flow.

**Construction Plan Requirements:**

5. The construction plan submittal shall include those requirements as identified in Hayden City Code §12-6 and more specifically as follows:
  - a. The Developer shall be required to construct the internal streets to a local street section per ST-111 and ST-111A. As proposed the Internal road typical section shall be 36' face of curb to face of curb to allow for parking on both sides of the road, 10' swales to include Type Iv landscaping, 5' sidewalks for a right-of-way width of 68'.
  - b. The site topography is relatively flat; however, erosion control measures shall be addressed with Best Management Practices (BMP).
  - c. The Developer shall use the City of Hayden Sanitary Sewer sytem to serve future development in accordance with the adopted Sewer Master Plan. No cross country sewer alignments are allowed.
  - d. A letter (e-mail) from the US Postal Service with respect to mailbox locations shall be provided with the intent to place the mailboxes within the subdivision on the internal street and not on the collectors or arterials.
6. Landscape Plans: Detailed landscaping plans conforming to the requirements of City Code, shall be submitted for the entire development with construction plans for required subdivision

improvements for review and approval by the City. All disturbed areas shall be stabilized with dryland grass or other approved BMP.

- a. Individual Lots: The landscape plans shall include a dryland grass mix shall be applied until individual lots are constructed and the hydro-seeding, installation of the irrigation system and required landscaping are completed.
- b. Street Frontage: Along all street frontages shall be included within the landscaping plan submittal, with actual street tree placement to be completed at the time of building permit for all lots, with the exception of landscaping required with the Greenway tracts and/or multi-modal pathways.

**Requirements of the Final Plat:**

7. All public road right-of-way shall either be dedicated on the plat or by separate document at the time of the final plat.
8. All utility easements required and/or as identified on the typical section shall be granted on the plat or by separate document at the time of final plat.

**Requirements requested by other Agencies:**

9. The Developer shall comply with the requirements from the Northern Lakes Fire Protection District agency comments.
10. The aviation easement requested by the Coeur d'Alene Airport shall be recorded and shall be referenced on the final plat of the subdivision.

**Additional Requirements per the Planning and Zoning Commission:**

11. Should the City acquire parkland in the near vicinity of the Sycamore Valley Subdivision then connectivity to that property to become parkland shall be required as a condition of this approval in conformance with the Parks Master Plan and Transportation Master Plan.
12. A historical interpretative sign structure shall be constructed in accordance with the adopted sign structure type with the sign content to be provided by the City Historical Preservation Commission and the sign shall not be placed within the City's right-of-way, but shall be placed within a dedicated easement or tract at the corner of Maple Street and Miles Avenue.

With this recommendation, there are a number of conditions with specific components. The specificity does not preclude the City from exercising its right to require compliance, or demonstrate compliance, with any condition at any time, as well as any other applicable requirements whether or not specifically articulated herein.

The City shall notify the developer, in writing, of the recommendation of the commission and any recommended conditions or changes requested and shall advise the developer that the subdivision will be placed on the agenda of the City Council at the earliest practicable date, upon the developer's written request.

Should the applicant wish to contest the recommendations of the Planning and Zoning Commission, the applicant may provide a written statement of its objections regarding the Planning and Zoning Commission recommendations for inclusion in the City Council deliberations on the subdivision request. Such written statements must be received at least five (5) days prior to the scheduled City Council meeting.

A Recommendation for Approval of the subdivision application shall not constitute a variance or approval for deviation from said Code, standards and policies.

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL on the 6<sup>th</sup> day of April 2026, by the City of Hayden Planning and Zoning Commission.

CITY OF HAYDEN, IDAHO

By: 

~~Shawn Taylor, Chair~~

*Chavis Morris*

*Vice-Chair*

ATTEST:

*Sadie Roe*

Sadie Roe, Clerk