

New Business topics on the agenda or other general matters not relevant to the business of the City of Sandpoint.

### Consent Calendar

Mayor Grimm noted for the record the amount of bills for payment approval, and the Consent Calendar was approved by a unanimous vote of Council.

Motion made by Councilor Ruehle, Seconded by Councilor Schreiber.

Voting Yea: Councilor Ruehle, Councilor Aispuro, Councilor Schreiber, Councilor Duquette, Councilor Tate, Councilor Torrez

4. The bills presented were approved for payment in the amount of \$535,176.07 for regular payables.
5. **Resolution 26-007** Approving First Amendment to Custodial Services Contract with ASAP Services, Inc. (City Agreement A25-1940-1)
6. **Resolution 26-008** Approving Purchase Order 26-1740 to Pierce Auto Center for 2026 Ram 3500 Tradesman
7. **Resolution 26-009** Approving Purchase Order 26-1752 to Pierce Auto for City Hall Vehicle

### Old/Unfinished Business

10. Project Update: Downtown Revitalization Phase 3 - Draft Basis of Design

Matthew Gillis, P.E., Vice President of Welch-Comer Engineers & Surveyors, contracted City consultant, provided a presentation on the Downtown Revitalization Phase 3 Project and, along with City Project Manager Erik Bush, fielded questions from Council members. Information only; no Council action.

### Public Hearing

8. New James E. Russell Sports Center Membership Pause and Reactivation Fees

Mayor Grimm announced that the purpose of the hearing was to take testimony from the public as Council considers adding new fees to the City's fee schedule that would allow members of the James E. Russell Sports Center to pause and reactivate their membership.

Community Planning and Development Director Jason Welker provided a presentation and fielded questions from the Councilors.

Mayor Grimm recited rules and procedure and then opened the hearing. No one testified, and the Mayor closed the public hearing.

9. Proposed Resolution: Amending City Fees Schedule to add James E. Russell Sports Center Membership Pause and Reactivation Fees

Following Council deliberation, Councilor Schreiber made a motion to amend the proposed fee for pausing membership to reflect a tiered structure, where City of Sandpoint residents are paying less than those who do not reside within city limits, with the tiers reflecting \$5 for City residents, \$10 for Bonner County residents, and \$15 for members who reside outside Bonner County, and to set the reactivation fee at twice the cost of the monthly charge for an annual membership. The motion was seconded by Councilor Duquette.

Following additional deliberation and input from staff, Councilor Schreiber amended his motion to configure the pause fee tiers as follows: \$10 for City residents, \$15 for Bonner County residents, and \$20 for members who reside outside Bonner County. (No amendment to the portion of the motion setting the reactivation fee at twice the cost of the monthly charge for an annual membership.) Councilor Duquette seconded the amendment to the motion, and, with no vote necessary to approve this amendment, Council voted unanimously to approve these changes to the proposal that had been presented.

Motion made by Councilor Schreiber, Seconded by Councilor Duquette.  
Voting Yea: Councilor Ruehle, Councilor Aispuro, Councilor Schreiber, Councilor Duquette,  
Councilor Tate, Councilor Torrez

On the advice of City Attorney Fonda Jovick, with substantive changes to the resolution that had been provided in the meeting packet, a revised resolution reflecting these fees as modified and approved by Council will be presented for approval at the next meeting.

Following conclusion of this item, Mayor Grimm recessed the meeting for a brief break at 7:04 p.m., reconvening at 7:10 p.m.

### **Old/Unfinished Business - *continued***

#### **11. Ordinance 1436 Residential Zoning**

The Mayor announced that, next, Council would revisit a proposed ordinance repealing and replacing Sandpoint City Code 9-1-3 and Title 9, Chapter 4, Residential Zoning, Sections 1 through 6, where Council approved the amendments during their January 21, 2026, regular meeting but declined to consider the ordinance for codification that was presented at the following meeting on February 4, instead voting to postpone until such time as the City's Stormwater Master Plan is complete and directing staff to prepare a report to explore the opportunity of using the proposed standards as a density bonus for workforce and affordable housing. The Mayor then yielded the floor to Councilor Tate, who requested the addition of this item to the agenda, with the Councilor explaining that he voted to postpone adoption of this ordinance at the February 4 meeting due to procedural confusion and that he supports these code amendments as evidenced by his vote to approve them at the January 21 meeting.

The Mayor then asked the Clerk to read aloud the title of the ordinance as follows:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SANDPOINT, A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF THE STATE OF IDAHO, REPEALING AND REPLACING SANDPOINT CITY CODE TITLE 9, CHAPTER 1, SECTION 3, AND TITLE 9, CHAPTER 4, SECTIONS 1 THROUGH 6; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; AND PROVIDING FOR PUBLICATION AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Councilor Ruehle made a motion that the Ordinance pass its first reading by title only and that the Summary is approved, seconded by Councilor Aispuro.

Prior to a vote on the motion, there were remarks from Councilors Schreiber and Duquette, supporting Council's February 4 decision to postpone adoption of the ordinance. Additionally, Mayor Grimm fielded a question from Councilor Torrez, with information also provided by City Planner Bill Dean.

Ms. Jovick clarified that adoption of the ordinance was simply Council's technical conclusion of the passing of the code changes they already approved on January 21. In order to, in essence, re-litigate the question of whether Council approves of these changes would have required a reconsideration of the underlying action. A Councilor has every right to vote against an ordinance that simply seeks to codify amendments that same Councilor already voted in favor of at a prior meeting, but the reason or reasons for any such change in vote must be stated for the record. In this instance, Councilors Schreiber and Duquette voted against the code amendments when they were presented on January 21 and have a right to continue to make that record to support their "no" vote when the actual ordinance is presented for consideration, but, for the other four Councilors who voted to approve the amendments, absent the articulation of a statement as to the reason for a change in vote, they are obligated to vote "yes" to now adopt the ordinance.

A vote on the motion for passage of the Ordinance's first reading by title only and approval of the Summary resulted as follows: