

**KUNA CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
MINUTES  
AUGUST 3, 2010  
KUNA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER, 763 W. AVALON**

**PRE-COUNCIL MEETING**

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Mayor Dowdy called the pre-council meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Mayor Dowdy, Council President Bachman and Council Members Cardoza and Lang. Council Member Hoiland was excused.

**ALSO PRESENT:** City Attorney Richard Roats, Planning & Zoning Director Steven Hasson, City Treasurer John Marsh and City Clerk Lynda Burgess.

**BUDGET DISCUSSIONS**

CT/Marsh – Mayor and City Council, thank you. This is just a review or a finalization if you will of the numbers for the General Fund Budget for fiscal year ending 2011. We have until August 17 until the Public Hearing but this will hopefully at least give you the opportunity to finalize or at least come close to finalizing or at least ask more questions prior to that date arriving. As far as the document you have in front of you, I just wanted to show you what the layout is on it. The first page, second page and third page referring to front and back are the line items that are budgeted for in the General Fund as far as revenue and expenditure. Each one is detailed. The fourth page is a decisions needed list and the fifth page is the General Fund expenditure wish list. All the same format the you have been presented with before.

On the front page, there's two numbers I want to point out, the first one is about half way down under where it says total projected revenue on the left hand side. That number you see there does stand alone at \$2,663,976.50 is the projected revenue at this point. On the third page, the second to last number you see, it says total projected expenses \$2,622,962.22 and the very last line on the third page is the projected surplus with deficit, right now it stands at a surplus of \$41,014.28. with that housekeeping there are a couple of assumptions in this budget that I have that I want to point out to you. Number one is the very first line on the front page and that is the property tax revenue, that's the probably the single largest decision that needs to be made. The number I have in there is \$1,419,871. What that represents is the same process that went on last year and if turn to the decisions needed page which is the second to the last page. That is the decisions need list. It breaks down how this number is derived. What the city levied last year is \$1,374,330. The City Council can levy that amount up to a maximum of \$1,465,412. That is assuming a 3% increase. There is a couple of options, what that \$1,419,871 number is, is a place holder that I put in on the front page for property taxes represents what City Council decided last year. That was to take the, leave the priors year levy in place but increase it by the prior annexation and new construction roles at the prior year levy rate. Which is not necessarily what you would consider a 3% increase, what that allows is for the city to levy on assets that were brought into the city prior

to finalization of the assessment from that prior year. That number represents an increase over the prior year of \$45,541. It represents just the new construction role and annexations for the prior year. The additional options are to increase an additional 3% over the prior year. In that case that would make the levy \$1,415,560 and if the City Council decided to also add that to the annexation and new construction, that would raise it to \$1,465,412 which is the maximum amount that can be levied. That's the decision as far as revenue goes where the City Council would like to be. I didn't know if you wanted to open that up to debate or if you wanted me to move on to the next decision item which is in the expenditure line and that involves the Ada County Sheriff's contract. Any questions on the property tax revenue line?

The next item for consideration is on the expenditure side and that represents the law enforcement services contract with Ada County. As you're aware they presented four options to City Council. One of which is the current contract which is in place at \$1,239,986. The second option is to raise it or increase by \$14,272 to increase the staffing level for their front desk. The next option is to increase it by \$100,988. The last option is to increase it by \$117,624. Those two items are the two items that need City Council decision. As you see with the projected surplus that's in place of \$41,014 that represents a tough call.

The last item that is on the decisions needed list is the information or the proposal put forward as far as the rent of City Hall. There were two options, more information will be presented to you on August 17 but the crux of the option if the rental option is chosen, is the option 1, rent renewal of the existing facility here at Avalon, the anticipated savings is \$5,700 for year one to the General Fund, option 2 rent, alternative location in just rent alone about \$3,240 to the General Fund additional spending not to mention a tentative agreement that would be required. That last item is something that can potentially wait until August 17<sup>th</sup> meeting when more information can be presented to you. Other than that I'll leave it open for discussion.

M/Dowdy asked if the numbers plugged in for the rent, do they reflect the current rent.

CT/Marsh – Yes the current number represents the current contract assuming that it wasn't renewed based on the offer that was provided with the 2% increase that's in the current contract. It's the conservative number.

M/Dowdy further asked if the option would reduce if option 1 was chosen, would it increase the surplus by \$5,700.

CT/Marsh – Yes approximately \$5,700 to the General Fund. It would also help out the other funds.

C/Cardoza said that back on July 12, CT/Marsh gave overview details, under Park Revenue, he shows \$1,400 crossed out and \$400 inserted. C/Cardoza asked for clarification

CT/Marsh – Those numbers were updated and let me tell you where rental income and the RV dump revenue come from. Those two numbers are adjusted based on fiscal year to date numbers. The rental income right now is approaching \$1,400. I anticipate through the end of this fiscal it will blow through that \$1,400 and the RV dump revenue is approaching \$1,500 this. Of course the revenue from the RV dump is donation based so it's kind of dependent upon benevolence if

you will of those who are using it. Those projected revenues have been increased based on current trend. Did that answer your question?

C/Cardoza said it did.

C/Bachman had a question regarding law enforcement services. If the city chose option 1 and remained in this building, wouldn't the expenses for the Kuna Police go down as well and therefore their fee would go down.

CT/Marsh – That's a good question, that's not something that was presented in their numbers that were presented to the city as far as Ada County. That would probably be something that we would have to bring back to the table if they did renew with the current offer that's on the table of this current building. I would assume that Ada County would most likely come back and reduce the amount of that contract by a requisite number. I don't have that number but that is a very good question. The City pays 60% of the rent structure that's in their contract so that number should come down. However you can always make the case too that if that number stayed the same it would go towards a portion of one of the other options they were trying to present as far as Ada County. There is a couple of different ways to look at it.

C/Bachman inquired if it would increase the hours at the front desk.

CT/Marsh – Correct, which is option number 2 which increased the projection to the city by \$14,272.

C/Cardoza commented that looking back at July 12, the General Fund *Unintelligible comments*, looking at this one, there is a difference of about \$222,000.

CT/Marsh – In what? In projected expenditures?

C/Cardoza said it was in projected expenditures and the last worksheet from last month was \$2,401,181 now it's projected at \$2,622,962.

CT/Marsh – I can provide you a line break down but it's more of a refining of the numbers as time goes on. I can tell you the major changes are in the labor and benefits number one is some of the benefits stuff that were in there before they have changed, in the Parks stuff there was an over estimate of PERSI and things of that nature. As these things get refined they change around. I can provide you a change, I can provide you a side by side comparison and let you know which ones changed.

C/Bachman commented regarding the property tax revenue, if the City continues to not take the increase, is the City putting itself in position that revenue will always be behind.

CT/Marsh – The way they structure the formula is, highest of your 3 prior year levy's. It typically is, when you're looking at annexations and new construction like last year the City took, that was the highest of the last 3. Every year it's a small amount as far as an increase that the city could increase year over year. That is a good point, it does limit you on what can be increased year over year.

C/Bachman stated that would be her only concern with forgoing an increase. The city would be taking somewhat of an increase if it was done the same as last year.

CT/Marsh – It represents a fairly small increase. There a lot of variables at play as far as market values and changes in market values on a case by case basis but it's a fairly small increase as far as the overall spread goes.

C/Bachman indicated it would be about a \$40,000 difference between taking the 3% and only taking the new construction and annexation.

CT/Marsh – Yes \$41,230. If you took just the annexation and new construction the increase would be \$45,541 plus or minus a small amount once they finalize the role. If just the 3% was taken it would be a \$41,230. So as you see it's not a big trade off. You can find that on the decisions needed list for property tax revenue.

M/Dowdy asked if CT/Marsh plugged in the option that was taken last year.

CT/Marsh – Yes, assuming that the same presentation was provided. It seems that those are now under the city umbrella and the prior year didn't fall under the levy for the prior years.

C/Bachman addressed the law enforcement request. She would like to consider the same amount as last year but look at getting front desk staffing.

M/Dowdy didn't think there was room in the budget for an increase for what is being asked for.

Council agreed.

C/Bachman addressed option 2 on City Hall, the tenant improvement would be a substantial amount that wouldn't be in the budget. She stated she wasn't sold on the location.

M/Dowdy didn't think the City could move this year. Another year's lease will need to be entered in to at the current location.

P & Z D/Hasson added that staying at the current location would be staffs recommendation.

Council agreed.

C/Bachman asked if they were just discussing revenues at this time.

CT/Marsh – Both are on the table.

C/Bachman addressed Permit & Enforcement Planning & Zoning software. She asked P & Z D/Hasson if he knew what it was.

P & Z D/Hasson answered that it recently came up. It is a software program that provides for better tracking and coordination. Staff has reviewed it and has advised him it is a good product

and will coordinate with CT/Marsh's efforts. It would be a better tracking and accounting system.

CT/Marsh – It is actually the recommended module that goes along with our ERP system which is Caselle Clarity. We went through a demo with Planning & Zoning and Building inspections staff and allow them to ask all the necessary questions. The consensus seemed to be that it was pretty good tool as far as they are concerned. It interfaces directly with Caselle which means interfaces with cash receipting and the general ledger. Lets say a customer comes to the front counter and wants to pay for a permit, that permit is already in the system all they have to do is click a button cash receipt it and process it with cash, check or credit card and then once that finalized sale is done, it's actually booked, its in the system where as now it's a very antiquated process. It just goes along with keeping with controls and customer service.

P & Z D/Hasson added that one of the risks the City has is the potential for fraud, this type of software provides for better controls.

C/Bachman inquired if there was a monthly fee.

CT/Marsh – I think the overall maintenance costs go up by \$160 for this program.

C/Bachman, \$160 a month?

CT/Marsh – No, a year. This initial price includes that, it includes all the initial programming, includes the license as well as the transfer of data into that program. It seemed to be pretty good tool, the other thing it allows is it allows building inspectors to look real time at what they've inspected. If in the future we decide to put lap tops in building inspectors vehicles per se, they can update an inspection immediately from the field, so if they inspect Joe Smith's house, or a past inspection or have this caveat, they update it in real time. Say Tracy Rushlow in the Planning and Zoning Department can see that immediately and find out, this guy just came in to purchase "X" but it didn't pass inspection, it will be real time instead of doing a phone conversation. Those are just little things. It seemed to be a really good tool.

C/Bachman asked if it had the capability of generating reports of permits expiring for example.

CT/Marsh – It is a really functional software, you can actually update the web with it, you can keep it linked to the web, update permitting, update activity, it's got a lot of functionality. If you're interested we could certainly get the gentleman in here or on the phone and you can ask him questions if it's something you're interested in.

C/Bachman asked about the equipment inventory, valuation and tagging.

CT/Marsh – What that is, is a periodic inventory of the city's entire asset structure. What they do is go around to things like printers, things of small tool nature that typically out of site, out of mind that aren't really booked as an overall asset appreciated and they'll tag those with a city bar code number. It's just an identify ownership, it allows you to shore up any inconsistency's you have in your record keeping. It is something that hasn't been done in 2 or 3 years. It's not

something that is absolutely imperative, it's something that will take longer if staff was to do it. It would take considerably longer but it still can be done.

C/Bachman asked if it was required for the audit.

CT/Marsh – No there is no requirement. It's something that would shore up internal controls as well as protect assets but it's not something that is required.

C/Bachman confirmed that all the items on the list are not in the budget currently.

CT/Marsh – Correct, they are an insularly list of items for consideration. I guess I want to back up and say on the \$41,014 surplus that you see right here, that doesn't include any contingency. To refresh your memory, last year the surplus, City Council decided we would take the surplus and move it into contingency and after the Idaho Power Franchise fee went away, that number was reduced to \$39,000 so the City had a \$39,000 contingency in the General Fund for the year. That's pretty consistent with what this number is.

C/Bachman asked if we are showing a contingency.

CT/Marsh – We are not. Not yet.

C/Bachman confirmed that Council needed to establish one.

C/Cardoza stated that on each line item it is assumed it will be used in full by October 1.

CT/Marsh - Yes

C/Cardoza - If a line item has excess funds at the end of the year, does that stay in that line item or is that surplus put back in the general fund.

CT/Marsh – In that particular year, if we want do it to the letter, we can come back and say as long as there's enough revenue of course for that year and then those line items haven't been expended full, city council can move those moneys around and say I'd like to move it from one line to the next ect ect. But technically I think it could just be out of the pool over all.

C/Cardoza asked how much excess money was carried from last fiscal year to this year.

CT/Marsh - As far as fund balance? I think you're meaning reserves. I think you're talking about reserves in the general fund, is that right?

C/Cardoza re-asked how much was carried over from last budget year to this budget year.

CT/Marsh - The contribution of last year, I think was a slight negative. I think it was around 10 or 19 thousand is the number that comes into my head.

C/Cardoza - So we carried nothing forward?

CT/Marsh - Right, well from that year. But there is always a carry forward if things have been done right and so in 2008 there was a \$523,000 carry forward that was accumulative and last year was pretty flush. You still have about that amount, about a \$500,000 carry forward balance.

C/Cardoza - Do you anticipate that this year?

CT/Marsh - The way things are going at the current time, it looks like there may be a surplus. It's really difficult to say until you get a little closer to October. As the final revenue numbers come in, the revenue sources look fairly solid as far as property taxes go, sales tax revenue sharing is right there. The projections were about right, it's just how the unanticipated things come in. We'll know more as we get into September. As of the end of July, on August 17 we'll have a report, budget versus actual report through the end of July and then again the first meeting in September we'll have it through the end of August. We'll be narrowing it down as we come a little closer. The way it's looking and projecting, it's looking fairly good for this fiscal year. Things can change in a heart beat but so far it's positive.

C/Bachman expressed concern about the cost of building cleaning and the 5% increase request from the janitorial services.

CT/Marsh – For here and the Senior Citizen Center. There's a budget in here under general admin for the city hall as well as P & Z, P & Z and Admin split that and the Senior Citizen Center has their own line item for janitorial. As far as bench marking for janitorial, since I've been here, I haven't done any bench marking as far as janitorial is concerned. There may be the ability to get it cheaper but I do believe...

C/Bachman thought the cost was high.

CC/Burgess pointed out that the previous service wasn't a lot lower than this but was poor service.

C/Bachman stated that 25% of the building rent for cleaning seemed like a lot of money.

CC/Burgess indicated she wasn't sure we could get a better price but the service is better than the previous janitorial service.

CT/Marsh – When you look at it in that context, yes. They come here twice a week to City Hall.

C/Bachman said she knew the cleaning service did a good job.

M/Dowdy added we are paying \$15,000 between City Hall and the Senior Center a year.

CT/Marsh – We can certainly put out an RFP and get a benchmark or we don't have to go as far as an RFP, we can just call around and get some ideas of benchmarking without taking an official quote to benchmark.

C/Bachman requested that the current company know and a couple of others.

CT/Marsh – It can't hurt, competition is a good thing.

C/Cardoza explained he added the two figures for janitorial he came up with \$35,900 divided by 12 is \$2991.67.

CT/Marsh – Did you add the Admin, Planning and Zoning and the Senior Center. There should be 3 line items to add together. Did you get all 3? It's a little bit more than that. The Admin, if you understand how I've got this laid out, janitorial under Admin is \$7,545, for Planning and Zoning \$2,006 and the Senior Center is \$5,100.

C/Cardoza asked if it was more than \$35,900 a year.

CT/Marsh – It's \$37,900. Is that what you came up with? We are paying over \$3,000 a month for the two buildings.

M/Dowdy noted the numbers only add up to \$15,000.

CT/Marsh – Oh no, I'm looking at professional services. I apologize. \$7,545. Richard you were looking at professional services not janitorial. \$7,545 is the City Hall.

M/Dowdy added \$15,351 is the total.

CT/Marsh - What happens at the City Hall, once a month they buff the floors at the Senior Center so that adds an additional expenditure on top of what is typically incurred.

CC/Burgess added there is another floor treatment at the Senior Center the janitorial service would like to do but the City has asked them not to. The floor is deteriorating at the Senior Center.

C/Cardoza asked about line item 01-6075, dues and memberships, are there any that can be cut back on.

CT/Marsh – We have a pretty extensive list; you're talking about the general admin side? A lot of it is COMPASS, ACCM. I have a list right here. Let me read you off a list of the items we currently pay. Kuna Chamber of Commerce \$150, Technology dot Net \$60, ACCM \$5,500, COMPASS \$6,900, AIC \$5,500, IIMC \$190, Sage Community Resources \$1,500, APT \$165, Southwest Idaho Resource Conservation and Development Council \$500, Treasure Valley Partnership, \$2,300. That is the brunt of everything that is in there, there's a few other things such as notary renewals.

M/Dowdy explained to C/Cardoza what the dues were used for that the city pays to the Treasure Valley Partnership. In response to Council, he isn't sure of how effective the dues that fund prosecution of gangs are through the Partnership. In some respects he believes it is a good association to have but it could be cut.

CT/Marsh – The organization statement says “It’s a group of elected officials working together to effectively manage growth. Comprised of Mayors and County Commissioners from Ada, Canyon and Owyhee Counties”.

M/Dowdy indicated Owyhee County dropped out.

CT/Marsh – We can certainly let everybody absorb this and take it back up on the 17<sup>th</sup> or which ever you prefer. I’ll look into the side by side comparison for C/Cardoza and the slight comparison for benchmarking the janitorial in the mean time.

C/Bachman addressed the handicap ramp project for \$4,000, she asked if CT/Marsh knew what CE/Law was planning.

CT/Marsh indicated he wasn’t sure.

M/Dowdy asked CT/Marsh about the fourth option on property tax revenue page and taking both for a total increase of \$82,460 over the prior year. The prior year was \$1,374,330. He questioned the \$82,000 increase as his math showed \$91,082.

CT/Marsh indicated the Mayor was correct, the \$82,000 was a typo.

M/Dowdy asked how much was in the current fiscal year contingency fund.

CT/Marsh – There is approximately \$20,000 currently. The only costs expended are the ballpark. It could be carried forward in the carry over fund balance. That would be part of the \$500,000 that C/Cardoza asked about earlier.

C/Bachman thought ultimately it weighs on the tax revenue decision.

M/Dowdy asked Council if they wanted to make any decisions tonight.

C/Lang indicated he would like some options on the 17<sup>th</sup>.

CT/Marsh in response to C/Bachman, the 17<sup>th</sup> is the date of the public hearing. There is a little bit of time between then so City Council wants to increase the budget from what is approved on the 17<sup>th</sup>, there would need to be another public hearing. If it is reduced from the 17<sup>th</sup>, no public hearing is required. We have to certify to the County the levy rate by September 9. There is some time. The date for the August 17 date for the public hearing was designed so that if something falls down there is more time after that to get another public hearing in before we have to certify to the county.

C/Cardoza asked what was the ending date for the worksheet presented by CT/Marsh.

CT/Marsh – Through today. That is why the park revenues changed, today the RV revenue was \$1,500.

C/Bachman stated all the questions had been brought up and asked CT/Marsh to provide the information by the next meeting.

CT/Marsh – I will discuss the janitorial services with Kody and maybe he can get back with the Sheriff on the clarification on if there is a rent reduction if they can come back to the table with a credit on the contract. The last thing to be provided is for C/Cardoza who was looking for a side by side comparison between the numbers presented here and the prior workshop and the numbers were presented.

M/Dowdy asked CT/Marsh if he could speed that up and have those numbers prior to the next meeting because the next meeting is the public hearing that way if the council has questions regarding those finalized items, if you could have them, I would suggest either by next Tuesday or something.

CT/Marsh - I'll have them out this week.

C/Cardoza asked CT/Marsh to print out a finance worksheet budget versus actual.

CT/Marsh - Yes it's fairly simply, the printing process is fairly simple as far as activities go, it's a little bit more difficult because it isn't functioning properly. I can certainly do that.

C/Cardoza asked if he could get one from 10-09 through 7-31.

CT/Marsh that will be presented at the next council meeting as well but I can get you one in the interim. It will probably change a little bit as AP is posted and journal entries are made but it'll probably change a little bit in august from what I give you.

C/Cardoza asked Council would like one also.

C/Bachman stated they just went through one.

CT/Marsh through the end of June. The one through the end of July will be presented at the August 17 council meeting but I can give you one in the interim to show you.

There being no further business to discuss, moved by C/Lang, seconded by C/Bachman to adjourn at 6:23 p.m. Motion carried 3-0-1 (C/Hoiland absent).

## **REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING**

### **1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Mayor Dowdy called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

#### **PRESENT:**

Mayor Dowdy, Council President Bachman and Council Members Cardoza and Lang. Council Member Hoiland was excused.

**ALSO PRESENT:** City Attorney Richard Roats, Planning & Zoning Director Steven Hasson, City Treasurer John Marsh, Senior Planner Troy Behunin and City Clerk Lynda Burgess.

**2. INVOCATION:** Not scheduled

**3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Mayor Dowdy.

Moved by C/Lang, seconded by C/Bachman to amend agenda item 6. "Citizens Reports or Requests" to add A. Introduction of Sherry Hunsaker, new Senior Citizen Service Coordinator and B. Quarterly Sheriff Report by Chief Kody Aldrich. Motion carried 3-0-1 (C/Hoiland absent).

**4. CONSENT AGENDA:**

Moved by C/Cardoza, seconded by C/Bachman to remove items 4C and 4F from the Consent Agenda. Motion carried 3-0-1 (C/Hoiland absent.)

Moved by C/Lang, seconded by C/Bachman to approve the Consent Agenda. Motion carried by the following Roll Call vote:

AYES: Bachman, Cardoza, Lang  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: Hoiland

- A. APPROVED MINUTES OF REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF JULY 20, 2010.
- B. APPROVED ACCOUNTS PAYABLE DATED JULY 29, 2010 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$148,655.73.
- D. APPROVED BUSINESS LICENSE FOR KEITH SEVERY AND JASON ASHBY, "AFFORDABLE TRANSMISSION," 2887 SHORTLINE.
- E. APPROVED BUSINESS LICENSE FOR DAVID BROWN, "VIDEO GALLERY, INC.," 1533 N. LINDER RD.
- G. APPROVED BUSINESS LICENSE FOR RACHELE WILSON, "COLOR ME GREEN SALON," 239 W. 4<sup>TH</sup> ST.
- H. ADOPTED RESOLUTION R26-2010 AUTHORIZING SIGNING OF INFRASTRUC-TURE REIMBURSEMENT AGREEMENTS FOR CRIMSON POINT NO. 3.

- 
- I. ADOPTED RESOLUTION R27-2010 AUTHORIZING SIGNING OF INFRASTRUC-TURE REIMBURSEMENT AGREEMENTS FOR CRIMSON POINT NO. 4.
  - J. ADOPTED RESOLUTION R28-2010 ACCEPTING AND APPROVING SIGNING OF SEWER LINE EASEMENT AGREEMENT WITH MARGARET F. HILL FAMILY PARTNERSHIP.
  - K. ADOPTED RESOLUTION R29-2010 ACCEPTING AND APPROVING SIGNING OF SEWER LINE EASEMENT AGREEMENT WITH SAGEWOOD DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION.
  - L. APPROVED FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW FOR 10-03-ZOA (Text Amendment); KCC 6-2-4 (Final Plat Process); KCC 6-4-2 (Required Public Improvements); KCC 6-4-3 (Financial Guarantee).

**ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA:**

- 4C. APPROVE BUSINESS LICENSE FOR RICHARD McHARGUE, "MAC'S TRACTOR WORKS," 712 MENDI PL. (Continued from June 20, 2010).

Mr. McHargue, 712 Mendi Pl. - In response to C/Cardoza, Mr. McHargue explained that he only uses one tractor for his business and that it is parked in his yard behind a fence. He verified that he does not park the tractor in the street in front of his home.

Moved by C/Lang, seconded by C/Bachman to approve the business license for Richard McHargue "Mac's Tractor Works". Motion carried 3-0-1 (C/Hoiland absent).

- 4F. APPROVE BUSINESS LICENSE FOR JEFFREY P. PATON, "EVER-FRESH CARPET CLEANING," 1772 W. YUKON DR.

C/Cardoza noted tht Mr. Paton had incorrectly completed Page 1 of his application and requested that the matter be continued to the next meeting so that corrections can be made. M/Dowdy directed staff to ask Mr. Paton to be present.

Moved by C/Cardoza, seconded by C/Lang to continue the matter to the August 17, 2010 City Council meeting. Motion carried 3-0-1 (C/Hoiland absent).

**5. OLD BUSINESS:**

- A. APPROVE CATERING PERMIT FOR JERRY FORREY, DBA 4E'S BAR FOR THE KUNA DAYS DANCE ON AUGUST 7, 2010.

Moved by C/Bachman, seconded by C/Lang to approve the Catering Permit for Jerry Forrey, DBA 4E's Bar for the Kuna Days Dance on August 7, 2010 from 8:00 p.m to 1:00 a.m. Motion carried 3-0-1 (C/Hoiland absent).

**B. APPROVE CATERING PERMIT FOR AMERICAN LEGION POST 142 FOR KUNA DAYS ON AUGUST 6 AND 7, 2010.**

M/Dowdy asked Chief Aldrich about some concerns he had with a safety plan and if he'd met with representatives from the American Legion.

C/Aldrich indicated he spoke with Hoss Grigg and he is willing to allow the American Legion to participate in the Street Dance area. It should be fine if the permit has been amended to be in the Kuna Street Dance in lieu of Friday and Saturday nights in the park.

CC/Burgess updated Council that the American Legion came in and applied for new permit for only August 7 for the Kuna Day's Street dance from 9:00 p.m. to 1:00 a.m.

Chief Aldrich indicated 8:00 p.m. would be fine so all the permits are consistent.

Moved by C/Lang, seconded by C/Cardoza to approve the cater permit for the American Legion for the Kuna Days Dance on August 7, 2010 from 8:00 p.m to 1:00 a.m. Motion carried 3-0-1 (C/Hoiland absent).

**6. CITIZEN'S REPORTS OR REQUESTS:**

- A. Sherry Hunsaker – Introduced herself as the new service coordinator at the Senior Center. She takes care of the day to day activities. She help and organize the different classes and groups as well as fund raisers and getting grants. Her schedule is Monday, Wednesday and Fridays.

Council welcomed Sherry Hunsaker.

- B. Chief Aldrich presented the quarterly report. He indicated he had emailed the report to Council as well as a monthly report. The public can access the report at [AdaSheriff.org](http://AdaSheriff.org) under the Kuna tab. The NIBERS report that is given to the FBI show an increase in crime rate in Kuna. Compass population projections came out and with the new formula, they are showing a population decrease in Kuna and coupled with an increase in vehicle burglaries, it makes brings the crime rate to 17%. The actual crime is 22 vehicle burglaries compared to 5 at the same time last year. There is a decrease in residential burglaries and vandalism. The only other increase is under society crimes which is drug related violations. That isn't necessarily bad because there are more drug enforcement efforts being done. Last year when vehicle burglaries spiked a flier was put in the utility bill and would like to consider that again.

Calls for service are continuing to go up. The total response time stayed the same and the code 3 response time is down from 3 minutes 25 seconds to 2 minutes 12 seconds for the entire year. Everything else has held the same as last year. Proactive policing has gone up to 1,193 incidents. Traffic stops are up at 1,659 compared to 1,560 the same time last year. Traffic crashes are down almost by half. Property checks are up significantly by about 200. All in all things are going well.

7. **NEW BUSINESS:**

8. **PUBLIC HEARINGS:** 7 p.m. or as soon thereafter as matters may be heard.

9. **ORDINANCES:**

- A. DISPENSE WITH FULL READING AND THREE CONSECUTIVE READINGS OF ORDINANCE 2010-13: AN ORDINANCE OF CITY OF KUNA, IDAHO, AMENDING TITLE 6, "SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS" CHAPTER 2, "SUBDIVISION APPROVAL PROCEDURE", SECTION 4, "FINAL PLAT", AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Moved by C/Lang, seconded by C/Bachman to dispense with full reading and three consecutive readings of Ordinance 2010-13. Motion carried 3-0-1 (C/Hoiland absent).

Moved by C/Lang, seconded by C/Bachman to adopt Ordinance 2010-13. Motion carried by the following Roll Call vote:

AYES: Bachman, Cardoza, Lang  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: Hoiland

- B. DISPENSE WITH FULL READING AND THREE CONSECUTIVE READINGS OF ORDINANCE 2010-14: AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF KUNA, IDAHO, AMENDING TITLE 6, "SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS", CHAPTER 4, "FINANCIAL GUARANTEE RELATING TO COMPLETION OF SUBDIVISION IMPROVEMENTS", AND PROVIDING EFFECTIVE DATE.

Moved by C/Lang, seconded by C/Bachman to dispense with full reading and three consecutive readings of Ordinance 2010-14. Motion carried 2-1-1 (C/Cardoza voted no; C/Hoiland absent).

Moved by C/Lang, seconded by C/Bachman to adopt Ordinance 2010-14. Motion carried by the following Roll Call vote:

AYES: Bachman, Lang  
NOES: Cardoza  
ABSENT: Hoiland

- C. DISPENSE WITH FULL READING AND THREE CONSECUTIVE READINGS OF ORDINANCE 2010-15: AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF KUNA, IDAHO, AMENDING TITLE 6, "SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS", CHAPTER 4, "IMPROVEMENT STANDARDS", AND PROVIDING EFFECTIVE DATE.

Moved by C/Lang, seconded by C/Bachman to dispense with full reading and three consecutive readings of Ordinance 2010-15. Motion carried 3-0-1 (C/Hoiland absent).

Moved by C/Lang, seconded by C/Bachman to adopt Ordinance 2010-15. Motion carried by the following Roll Call vote:

AYES: Bachman, Cardoza, Lang  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: Hoiland

**10. MAYOR / COUNCIL DISCUSSION:**

C/Lang reminded Council of the Kuna Day's Parade on Saturday.

CT/Marsh agreed to bring hay bale and volunteered to drive.

C/Lang asked P/Behunin to prepare signs for the pickup carrying the Council.

**11. ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

**12. EXECUTIVE SESSION: ADJOURN TO EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO I.C. 67-2345(c), POTENTIAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION AND (f) LITIGATION.**

Moved by C/Lang, seconded by C/Bachman to adjourn to Executive Session per I.C. 67-2345 (f) at 7:27 p.m. Motion carried by the following Roll Call vote:

AYES: Bachman, Cardoza, Lang  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: Hoiland

Adjourned Executive Session at 8:07 p.m.

**13. ADJOURNMENT:** There being no further business to discuss, moved by C/Bachman, seconded by C/Lang to adjourn the meeting at 8:07 p.m. Motion carried 3-0-1 (C/Hoiland absent).

---

J. SCOTT DOWDY, MAYOR

ATTEST:

---

LYNDA BURGESS, CITY CLERK

DATE APPROVED: SEPTEMBER 21, 2010