



**BLOOMINGTON CITY COUNCIL PROPOSED AREA OF IMPACT
EMERGENCY MEETING MINUTES
BLOOMINGTON CITY OFFICE
45 N 1st West
January 8, 2025, at 7:00 p.m.**

City Council Attendees: Mike Knapp, Dan Porter, Debbie Thomas, Marilyn Wilkes, and Rob Allred. Cindy Piggott and Mayor Bunderson via Zoom.

BADC Attendees: Jane Simpson and Winston joined via Zoom, Wayne Lloyd, Jerry Thornock, and David Bee, Tel Thornock

Community Attendees: Jeff and Janet Johnson, Marilyn Wilkes, Alden Talbot, Glen Bee, Doug Barneck, and Phillip Ward

Community Attendees Joining by Zoom: Mark and Ruth Baker, Sherman Grandy, Larry Hemmert, Marcia Wilson, and Karen Bee.

INVOCATION: Mike

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Cindy

Meeting called to order by Mayor Bunderson at 7:04

DISCUSSION ON COMMISSIONER CHANGE OF BLOOMINGTON'S IMPACT AREA

Mitch Poulsen, the county Planning Administrator, was invited to join the city for this meeting. Mitch joined by Zoom. The county sent out letters to residents of Bloomington showing the old and new impact areas were very different. Bloomington's impact area was significantly reduced.

The map Mitch used did not take into consideration the current city limit boundaries. Mitch was using an old map that did not show any annexations in the city in recent years.

Mitch: The county commissioners tasked Mitch with redefining each city in the county's impact area. A new Idaho State Statute, 676526, gave the county commissioners authority to redefine impact areas. He stated he went off an old map, one he had for a long time, to draw the new impact area.

Roy asked Mitch the criteria he used to define the areas. He used the following:

1. Make areas as small as you can.
2. Current impact area's boundaries in the county often dissected people's property. The statute states that the new boundaries should follow parcel lines.

Mitch: If you feel Bloomington's boundaries are too small, I'm sure the commissioners would be willing to work with the city.

Mitch called the city's impact area oddly large. The area should be land the city could annex and provide sewer and water services to.

Cindy asked exactly what is an impact area is? Mitch: negotiated area between the city and the county that could be easily annexed with city services provided. That statute language has now changed and gives the county more discretion where that line is.

Roy stated, according to Idaho Stature 676526 sub B, an impact area is where growth and development are expected to occur. Roy then asked if an impact area is designed for Bloomington, the plan could be changed or modified in the future.

Mitch: That is correct.

The council needs to discuss what should be protected. Roy expressed that the council is not currently in a position to determine the boundaries and suggested drafting a letter to the county to communicate this. He emphasized the need for more time to define the issue and develop a solution that is agreeable to all parties. Mitch stated that he is willing to collaborate on a solution that works for both the county and the city.

Roy asked Mitch if he would like to stay for the council discussion.

Mitch requested the city to mark on a map where it would like its impact area to be. Roy suggested using roads as boundaries, as they are more clearly defined, rather than relying on property lines.

Roy mentioned that Russell Sorenson, located up Bloomington Canyon, plans to split his lot. Since his property lies within the city's impact area, Roy inquired if the city could be notified in similar situations within this area in the future. Mitch agreed to ensure the city is informed if such instances occur within the city's impact area.

Here are the key points of discussion raised by the city council:

1. Impact Area Boundaries:

- Mitch proposed creating a map to define the city's desired impact area.
- Roy suggested using roads as boundaries instead of property lines for greater clarity.

2. Notification of Impact Area Activities:

- Roy raised concerns about property activities within the city's impact area, such as lot splits.
- The council agreed to ensure the city is notified of such developments in the future.

3. Water Supply and Infrastructure:

- Roy noted that Bloomington uses just over 25% of the water from the city spring, indicating an adequate supply.
- He highlighted the lack of sufficient delivery and storage systems and the potential to expand utility services.

4. Coordination with the County:

- The council discussed the need to determine what areas or resources to protect.
- Roy suggested sending a letter to the county, requesting more time to define boundaries and develop an agreeable solution.
- Mitch expressed his willingness to work collaboratively with the county to reach a mutually beneficial resolution.

5. County's Intent to Reduce Impact Areas:

- Wayne: Questioned why the county wants to reduce impact areas.
- Jane: Explained that the county believes it is mandated by the state.

6. City's Perspective on Impact Areas:

- Mike: Highlighted that having a large impact area benefits the city by giving it influence over decisions without requiring annexation of the land.
- Emphasized that the county must notify the city if something occurs within its impact area.

7. Issues with Notification and Meeting Timeline:

- The city did not receive the required 30-day notice, and residents were not given the mandated two-week notice about the change.
- Mike: Proposed postponing the meeting scheduled for Monday to allow the city more time to determine its approach.

8. Proposed Boundary of Two Miles:

- Jane: Asked if a two-mile impact area would include the city spring.
- Austin: Clarified that the spring, located about 4 ½ miles up the canyon, would not fall within the proposed boundary.

9. Maintaining the Current Impact Area:

- Roy: Stated that the existing impact area has worked well for the city and should remain unchanged.

10. Protection of Water Resources:

- Roy: Asserted that the statute allows impact areas beyond two miles if there is a compelling reason, such as protecting the city's water supply, which is essential to the community.
- All council members agreed that the spring must be included in the city's impact area to safeguard this vital resource.

11. Next Steps:

- Roy: Requested Mike to draft a letter to the county, indicating the city's desire to meet and discuss the issue collaboratively.

Roy: Alden Talbot has contested the deed we have given him, when the deed was issued, it changed the language on any of the property that was within his description, this included 3rd West. The title company and county expressed his concerns are not valid. However, his concerns still remain. Jane explained if he wants to go back and have the title company draw up a quick claim deed that reestablished that language, the city would be amenable to signing the new quick claim deed. Alden has completed this action. Roy asked if any council member had an issue with Roy signing the deed, we could put this in a city council meeting. The council all agreed that they had already given Roy the authority to sign the deed.

The bore and waterline dug on 5th North down to 50 E. He wondered if we violated the code that says if bids for work in the city cost more than \$50,000, they need to have three bids. Roy spoke with AIC and said they said the city did not violate this rule. Three quotes were obtained. The composite cost of the job came in more than Mikes bid. Kyle has these bids and will get them to the city so they can be put in or permanent files.

Rob asked if the payment for this work could be issued. Roy and the council gave permission to make payment for this work.

Roy asked the BADC to join in the next City Council Meeting to work out what we would like to propose to the county concerning the city impact area.

ADJOURNMENT – 8:09 pm

- Motion to adjourn: Dan, Second: Rob, Vote Unanimous, Motion Passes

NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING JANUARY 21, 2025