

**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE JOINT CITY COUNCIL
AND PUBLIC SAFETY COMMISSION MEETING
FOR THE CITY OF HAYDEN, KOOTENAI COUNTY, IDAHO**

Tuesday, October 7, 2025

Special 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 5:00 PM.

ROLL CALL OF COUNCIL MEMBERS

Present: Ed DePriest, Sandra White, Matthew Roetter, Tom Shafer,

ROLL CALL OF COMMISSION MEMBERS

Present: John Spencer, David Hagar, Brian Harrison, Raleigh Measom, and Shawn Meyer.

1. WORKSHOP

A. Law Enforcement Services

i. Level of Law Enforcement Services

The Council and Commission reviewed law enforcement data available from Kootenai County Sheriff's Office (KCSO): arrests, citations, the number of calls for services and cases referred to detectives. The Commission members recommended including other data in the reports, like clearance codes and crime mapping. Commission members explained call types, response times, and how call assignment times are tracked concurrently rather than consecutively.

Members discussed whether results-driven data are sufficient to assess accountability and service levels, with the Commission agreeing they are. Council President Roetter and Council Member DePriest requested details on how many patrol deputies serve Hayden for the \$600,000 contributed annually through the Justice Fund, and the Commission members agreed that information should be obtained. Legal Counsel Fonda Jovick noted that without a contract for enhanced services, KCSO would provide emergency response only.

The group discussed law enforcement cost calculations and service levels for KCSO policing in Hayden, as presented by the Kootenai County Board of County Commissioners. Ms. Jovick noted that an average payroll burden for deputies was requested to simplify budgeting, those costs vary depending on whether the position is patrol, detective, animal control, or command staff. A significant portion of the discussion focused on how Kootenai County calculates its overhead rate. It was clarified that overhead is based on total administrative costs divided by the number of deputies, not on calls for service. The County Auditor indicated that a precise calculation would place overhead near 62%, but a 40% rate was used to allow flexibility and fairness. Confusion about the 60% overhead cost proposed in Option 3 from the BOCC was expressed by staff, noting no meaningful explanation from the BOCC or Kootenai County Auditor.

The group compared contract options, noting that Option 3 includes four patrol deputies and one detective with a 60% overhead rate, while Options 1 and 2 provide more deputies but at significantly higher costs. It was noted that reducing overhead to 40% in Option 3 could allow funding for an additional deputy. Members also discussed City-funded vehicles, raising concerns that KCSO depreciates these vehicles even though they were purchased with City

funds. Clarification was requested regarding ownership, maintenance, and depreciation, which are currently accounted for in the overhead rate.

Several members emphasized the importance of obtaining citizen input on perceptions of safety and willingness to fund higher service levels, noting that public engagement and data-driven planning are key to future decisions. Concerns were raised about reducing the number of deputies from ten to five, as this could impact officer safety, response times, and coverage. Participants discussed recommended staffing ratios for proactive policing, generally between 1.2 and 2 officers per 1,000 residents, suggesting future increases will likely be necessary as the community grows.

By the end of the discussion, most members supported **Option 3**—maintaining a 40% overhead rate, keeping City-funded vehicles, and using savings to add an additional deputy. They also supported using funds budgeted for a lieutenant vehicle to be reallocated to law enforcement services to add another deputy, for a total of six patrol deputies and one detective. The group agreed that this approach was the most fiscally responsible short-term solution while recognizing that achieving higher staffing levels will require long-term planning and potentially new funding or voter-approved measures.

ii. Contract with Kootenai County for Law Enforcement Services

This item was heard before Item 1Ai.

City Attorney Fonda Jovick opened the session, explaining that the purpose was to identify negotiable items in the contract, focusing on aligning the service level and costs with the city's approved budget for the upcoming year. She clarified that the discussion was limited to the one-year agreement and would not address future law enforcement models.

The conversation covered two main areas: financial terms and service accountability. Staff explained that the County's model provides a base agreement where each city determines its service level and cost. Ms. Jovick emphasized the need to establish accountability metrics, which could be vehicle tracking, hours of service, and/or call data. Council and commission members then reviewed the contract page by page, identifying revisions and discussion points.

Key topics included: ensuring the city has input on deputy performance and possible removal; clarifying terminology to distinguish between the County (financial authority) and the Sheriff (operational authority); defining "assigned" versus "dedicated" deputies; retaining city ownership of vehicles purchased with city funds; and adjusting indemnification language to better protect the city. Members also discussed vehicle usage, data access, and service coverage expectations when deputies are unavailable.

The group agreed to refine Exhibit A, addressing operational details such as deputy coverage, emergency response, and meeting attendance. They supported maintaining a law enforcement presence during council meetings for safety and community engagement, while reserving command staff for scheduled reports. Ms. Jovick concluded by noting the proposed edits would be incorporated into an updated draft for further review.

Mayor Davis called for a recess at 7:00 p.m.

The members of the Public Safety Commission left the meeting.

Mayor Davis called back to order at 7:07 p.m.

2. 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)(b) To consider the evaluation, dismissal or disciplining of, or to hear complaints or charges brought against, a public officer, employee, staff member or individual agent
- B. 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 President Roetter motioned that the meeting enter executive session under Idaho Code 74-206(1)(b) and (f). Council Member DePriest provided the second.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Council Member Shafer	Yes
Council Member White	Yes
Council Member DePriest	Yes
Council President Roetter	Yes

The motion was approved by a unanimous vote in favor. The meeting entered executive session at 7:07 p.m.

MOTION: Council Member DePriest motioned to exit executive session. Council Member Shafer provided the second.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Council President Roetter	Yes
Council Member White	Yes
Council Member Shafer	Yes
Council Member DePriest	Yes

The motion was approved by a unanimous vote in favor. The meeting returned to regular session at 7:52 p.m.

3. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:52 p.m.

Abbi Sanchez, City Clerk

Alan Davis, Mayor