

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 4:31 p.m., Tuesday, July 19, 2022, by Mayor Robert Simison.

Members Present: Robert Simison, Joe Borton, Luke Cavener, Treg Bernt, Jessica Perreault and Brad Hoaglund.

Members Absent: Joe Borton and Liz Strader.

Also present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Dave Miles, Dave Tiede, Bruce Freckleton, Todd Lavoie, Berle Stokes, Joe Bongiorno and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

<input type="checkbox"/> Liz Strader	<input type="checkbox"/> Joe Borton
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brad Hoaglund	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Treg Bernt
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jessica Perreault	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Luke Cavener
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Simison: Council, we will go ahead and call the meeting to order. For the record it is July 19th, 2022, at 4:31 p.m. We will begin this afternoon's work session with roll call attendance.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: Next item up is adoption of the agenda.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I move adoption of the agenda as published.

Bernt: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to adopt the agenda. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the agenda is adopted.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

- 1. Amity Storage Water Main Easement**

- 2. Aviator Springs Subdivision Emergency Access Easement Agreement No. 1**
- 3. Aviator Springs Subdivision Emergency Access Easement Agreement No. 2**
- 4. Elsinore Daycare Lots 12 and 13, Block 2 of Paramount Square Subdivision Water Main Easement**
- 5. Horse Meadows Emergency Access Easement Agreement No. 1**
- 6. Horse Meadows Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement**
- 7. Timberline North Subdivision No. 2 Water Main Easement No. 1**
- 8. Final Plat for Briar Ridge No. 1 by Kent Brown Planning Services, located on the West side of S. Meridian Rd., between W. Lake Hazel Rd. and W. Amity Rd., near the mid-mile point**
- 9. Final Plat for Oaks North No. 12 (FP-2022-0019) by Toll Southwest LLC, Located at W. Burnt Sage Dr. (Parcel Number S0428325460)**
- 10. Development Agreement (Alamar Subdivision - H-2022-0004) Between the City of Meridian and Marala Investments, LLC for Property Located at 4380 W. Franklin Rd., Parcel S1210346603**
- 11. Water Distribution System Interconnect Agreement Between City of Meridian and Veolia (f.k.a. United Water)**
- 12. Memorandum of Agreement with Meridian Development Corporation for Contribution toward 2022 Concerts On Broadway Series**
- 13. Memorandum of Agreement with Meridian Development Corporation for Contribution to Traffic Box Community Art Project**
- 14. Parks and Recreation Department: Fiscal Year 2022 Net-Zero Budget Amendment in the Amount of \$12,500.00 for Meridian Development Corporation Sponsorship of Concerts on Broadway and Traffic Box Wraps**
- 15. Resolution 22-2336: A Resolution of the Mayor and the City Council of the City of Meridian Authorizing the City Clerk to Destroy Certain Paper Originals of Permanent Records Retained in a Non-Paper Medium of The City of Meridian; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: Next item up is the Consent Agenda.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I move we approve the Consent Agenda and for the Mayor to sign and Clerk to attest.

Bernt: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve the Consent Agenda. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the Consent Agenda is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

DEPARTMENT / COMMISSION REPORTS [Action Item]

16. Mayor's Office: American Rescue Plan Act Discussion

Simison: Item 16 on the agenda is the Mayor's Office, the American Rescue Plan Act discussion. I will turn this over to Mr. Miles.

Miles: Good afternoon, Council and Mayor. Today I think my role is really just a little bit of an intro and summary of where we have been. Really this is a lot of discussion for you all to -- to take on regarding the ARPA funding. If you recall we were last proposed to be in front of you during the budget workshop and I had sent out -- because we got rescheduled from that to today I sent out a sheet and so I just passed that around what you have got in front of you. Really looking at the right-hand column, budget workshop number one is sort of the status of where we stand today and primarily what I'm looking for is direction for that first phase one box, so that we can ensure that we are on the right path with those projects, so that we can get Public Works moving on those larger capital projects. That said, there is also the phase two bucket, which during the budget discussions in June there was discussion about moving funds around, talking about the larger capital projects in the fire station and the police stations and funding those with ARPA dollars, as well as IT had presented to you some fiber connectivity projects, two of which you will actually see here later on budget amendment requests from Dave and, then, there is sort of a -- a change category of the benefits, repayments, SCADA upgrades and energy efficiency studies that are what I would call off the list at the moment and, then, there is also conversations that you have all been having around housing affordability. There has been a request from the Woodrose Apartments, The Housing Company as well, for a capital housing affordability project and so with that maybe I will stop there, see if there is any questions that you have for me at the moment and, then, turn it all over to you and I'm here for questions as well.

Simison: Council, any questions for Dave?

Bernt: I got one question, Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Thanks, Dave. Got a quick question. Are we -- are we -- has it been confirmed that the biosolids drying and the bio gas construction projects fit within the parameters of the ARPA funding?

Miles: Public Works has looked at that and as well as Finance. It does meet the guidance under the Clean Water and Safe Water Drinking Acts.

Bernt: But as far as having those projects done and completed earliest does it fit within the phasing of when those dollars have to be spent is what I was asking.

Miles: The timeline?

Bernt: Yeah. Timeline.

Miles: So, Mr. Mayor, Councilman Bernt, that's something that this next step helps them attain. They are trying to get the -- the design estimates, which would include your construction schedule and your closer budget analysis. What they have right now in my understanding is an engineering analysis. So, there is more work to be done and that's why they need to get the project going to get those things moving down the road in order to determine, yep, we can finish these things, we can do them. This is what it's going to cost hard line. Having an engineer estimate is a good rough assurance, but these are large capital projects. Without putting pencil to paper you can't really say emphatically. So, I don't want to give you an absolute yes or no.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor, follow up?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: So, what does that look like with regard to -- well, I guess what does that look like when -- when -- when will those figures be in hand and when will we know if these projects are going to work or not?

Miles: And we can verify with Public Works, Mr. Mayor and Councilman Bernt, but I would certainly say by the end of the calendar year you will know where those projects are. You know, is there a major roadblock or an off ramp needed for those projects.

Bernt: Okay.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Question for Dave. We have the fiber connectivity for a half a million dollars in -- in ARPA funds and, then, in the action items we have two items that are related to fiber from information technology. Those are not the same. Those -- those are budget amendments we are going to decide coming up and the fiber connectivity in ARPA funds are -- there are other projects they can do.

Miles: Mr. Mayor and Councilman Hoaglund, I will let Dave Tiede, because he is here, speak to those two, but those are two of the projects that were on that original list of needs and I think it really comes down to what bucket of money does the city want to fund those projects, the needs today that have to get done. That's why they are here for a budget amendment. Regardless of whether a budget amendment is approved, they can also be funded by ARPA dollars. But I believe they are --

Simison: This is 210 of the five hundred thousand is on your budget afterwards. I was just like -- you know, it's -- these are projects that are moving forward, so if you -- it's a way to fund for something that's, again, authorized under ARPA.

Hoaglund: Thank you, Dave.

Miles: Okay. I'm here for questions if you guys want to --

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I will just kick things off just to -- I -- I think there has been agreement about biosolids. Councilman Borton -- or I mean Bernt asked good questions about that for biosolids at the five million, the bio gas. We have, of course, compliance consulting and, then, the police-fire station cost. I think we have agreed to put that into these funds and, then, we have the fiber connectivity and -- and that left a few dollars, so I -- I just thought I would throw out a couple things just for discussion purposes and -- and see where we want to go with them. One of the things we have been educating ourselves on and -- and wrestling with a bit is affordable housing and I want to make sure I make the distinction. There is affordable housing and, then, there is housing assistance, so -- and sometimes I notice in the media that kind of gets put together. We had a request with Woodrose Apartments and for -- from assistance and it is affordable housing. It is housing that is for people who are -- they are working folks, they are just -- our rents have risen so fast and so quickly they may not be able to afford what's out there in the marketplace right now and -- and I view this -- I'm going to throw out a number, but I view this as -- as a one off. One time we are educating ourselves on what is affordable housing, how do we participate. I know Council Woman Perreault has been doing some work and is going to be educating us further down the road on some -- on some things. We will probably have a process set up to do affordable housing items. So, this is not how we are going to do it in the future, this is just a one off for right now if this is what Council wants to do. So,

Woodrose for the nine percent tax credit for 46 units, they are looking for 552,401 dollars from the City of Meridian to go into that and we have seen a calculation -- development manager for the housing company has sent a sheet that showed how that all works, how they make that project work and that gets them four points on the tax credit application. Those things are competitive. That would give them the maximum four percent. There is no three percent. I asked, because the contribution of 259 gets two points. Now is that enough to get them to win one -- of those grants or not? You know, that's -- that's the unknown. So, looking at this we did have -- from what we have already identified in phase one and phase two, we had 1.37 million left over. So, at 552 that leaves us 817,000, roughly, and, then, I want to talk about housing assistance for that. So, I -- I'm just thinking for this project that's ready to go we -- we do the 552. Now, whether -- and -- and this would be for -- would go to the impact fees. Yeah. We are waiving impact fees in that amount, but those impact fees still have to be paid. So, one time deal for that and these are ARPA funds, it's not General Fund dollars as well, because General Fund dollars, that becomes a whole other different ball game and -- and so since we have these funds available that we would use 552,401 for -- for that. Then for housing assistance, again, the number to throw out there -- we have talked about budget wise for one institution is 250,000 dollars of -- for the next budget year. 250,000. What I'm interested in doing is we allocate 250 dollar -- 250,000 from these ARPA funds for housing assistance, but, then, there would be an RFP process for those funds for housing assistance. Now, is it Jesse Tree? Is it someone else who wants to use those funds? Mayor, I -- I would assume your departments could set up a process to -- to make that happen.

Simison: I -- I do. You know, using the same process we used for CDBG, we can go through and -- and take in proposals for whatever specific purpose that we want to do. If it's assistance and I have told other Council Members that, you know, we would work with staff to make that happen and do it expeditiously.

Hoaglund: Okay. And so that would leave us -- if -- if we were to go down that route, 567,000 dollars -- so, just over half a million, we know as -- as Dave pointed out, when the engineers have an estimate and, then, once design comes back and there might be an estimate, we have to be prepared to have some wiggle room I think for -- if it's going to be a little bit more than what was anticipated. I don't know. But, anyway, that's just to kick off discussions. I think we agree on phase one. Phase two I think we have to address the Woodrose Apartments by August -- I want to say 5th. I could be wrong. At least make sure they know what they are getting, if anything. So, that would be the 552,401 and, then, the -- for housing assistance, instead of General Fund we would use ARPA funds in the amount of 250,000 dollars for -- for housing assistance through an RFP process.

Simison: Councilman -- and just to be -- your recommendation would be to remove that from the budget when it comes forward in our August meeting, so that reduce that by 250?

Hoaglund: Yes, Mayor, that -- that would be my intention.

Simison: At least for the purpose of --

Hoaglund: Yes.

Simison: -- we won't decide until then, but that would be your intention?

Hoaglund: Yep. Thank you.

Simison: Councilman Cavener, it looks like you were --

Cavener: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Council President Hoaglund. Thanks. This is bringing up a new wrinkle in the brain, so I appreciate it. I have been, as you all know, very reluctant to move forth on -- on anything related to housing affordability, housing attainment, affordable housing and I appreciate the -- the nuanced distinctions between those. But your request that you brought forth today, Council President Hoaglund, I think is -- is worthy of -- of merit and it -- for me I -- I look at it a lot how when we have businesses that come before us with, you know, they are creating jobs or other nonprofits that have come before us, we, as a Council, said let's consider that. I think couching it around impact fees is probably an appropriate step one that I could get behind and I don't -- what I like is that it -- it also gives us some freedom to develop a program long term and who is to say that not -- a year from now some other organization comes that's doing housing, maybe make a similar request and we would take that up whether we would do this or not. So, I -- I -- I like what you are proposing. I think I could support it. My only question would be, then, with the -- with the impact fee waiver for the Woodrose Apartments and, then, taking 250 and using it with an RFP process, what would be a -- you know, if Mayor or Council President, if you have a proposal for the remaining funds I would almost say maybe instead of 250 making it 500,000 dollars for the RFP and that's something that, Council, we could look at on an annual basis how we would want to fund that, but I don't know if there is plans or thoughts or suggestions about the remaining fund balance.

Simison: So, I will give you my two -- two cents in this context. What was kind of mentioned before. Some of these projects may come in more --

Cavener: Okay.

Simison: And so it leaves a little bit. But if you recall, just using Jesse Tree as the example, they were asking for 250,000 for consecutive years. So, if the -- once we start to get the project costs, we may know the next year we could run another RFP for additional funding through that process. If that's what Council decides they want to do from there. But it -- to me it's first wiggle, but we also have, if we need to, the Police and Fire wiggle. Like if -- if the biosolids come back seven million dollars more than we anticipated, as an example, do we still want to do that project. Well, maybe it eats up the rest of this and a little bit of the -- what we put aside Police and Fire, so that's a little less. So, I see that as a big area where we can do it, but that would be my suggestion. Do what Council suggested for the year and, then, whatever is left over we still have next year, FY-24, to apply those funds, because we really have to FY-26 to have everything expended.

Cavener: Maybe Mr. -- one just --

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I appreciate your willingness to have staff kind of support this -- at least it is a conceptual plan at this point, but I think that's -- that's such an integral piece is that you feel confident that our staff can manage like we manage the CDBG and that you are supportive of that -- to me that gives me greater confidence in wanting to move forth with at least what Council President is -- is suggesting.

Simison: And I will ask Mr. Miles to respond to that, because I'm pretty sure -- I know he's had the conversations.

Miles: Yeah, Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener. It's like anything else, we can make it work. We would use the -- the Neighborly software system, which I think would streamline a lot of the effort. We can easily identify who has got the interest and access and the time to evaluate the applications that come through. I have talked with Crystal in the past. The system can be utilized for that purpose.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: So, a couple of questions in the details and the numbers. I know that The Housing Company is planning on adjusting their project some, lowering the units down a little bit. Is that -- is that the difference between the -- the ask of the entire cost of permits, which I think is in the high 600,000 range and the 552 that they recently requested? Is the change from lowering the number of units or is -- is it because they found other funding that that's -- you know, that's kind of the final amount that they are looking for? Do you know whether -- you know, what the situation is with that?

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Yeah, Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Perreault, yes, they did go from 52 units down to 46 units. They took out one six-plex building and it -- according to the information I saw was due to funding limitations on the tax credits. There is a per max -- per project max that we are exceeding with the 52 units. So, that keeps them within the compliance for the -- in -- in the running for the nine percent tax credits, so -- and -- and -- and they were aware -- the 1.35 million dollars for their original request, they -- they knew that was -- that was out of reach for us. It was -- it was a stretch. So, this way the 552 number generates that four points on the credit application and that's I think important, that we could at least go there and, then, see what happens and it could be -- and it's so much competition, if they don't get it and, then, they are at 552, then, that comes back to the

city -- again, to Councilman Cavener's item, that, okay, we can move around and -- and do some things with. So, that's -- that's my understanding of it.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor, a follow-up question on that?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. So, I know when I had -- had spoken with Erin -- or maybe during one of her presentations she had said that, obviously, impact fees need -- need to stay whole. We can't waive those. But we can waive possibly some of the building permit fees. So, is that -- is that 552 waiving what we can or is that a credit to them and -- and, then, they just take that and go through the -- the normal process? I just wanted to make sure I understood how that will play out.

Hoaglund: We can waive impact fees, but not permit fees. That's my understanding. And Bruce Freckleton is here and he's -- he knows -- is that right?

Simison: Just the opposite.

Hoaglund: Oh, the opposite. Okay. Okay. We can waive permit fees, not impact fees. Okay. There we go. Got it. I knew -- yeah. I was close. We can waive one of the fees and not the other one. I should have said it that way, but -- so that -- there was some calculations done and I think that -- if it -- it may not waive all of them. I'm trying to remember the conversation, but for purposes of the application that gets them the four points with the 552 and Bruce and Erin are here, so if you guys -- I wouldn't mind having you weigh in on that to answer that question, because I am -- I don't have the ultra details on that.

Freckleton: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglund, Council, historically when we have waived permit fees it's been the -- the soft cost. As you know, we have hybrid models where we have outside consultants that we pay to do plan review and -- and some inspection services and those are hard costs that we -- we don't waive and so I -- I think we did put together an estimate early on in this process. I don't remember the number off the top of my head, but that is something that we can dig up and -- and come up with that number again.

Simison: Kind of related. So, the overall project valuation, that's what impact fees are based upon is on the valuation of the project.

Freckleton: Correct.

Simison: Lumber prices are crashing. The housing market is going down. I assume that will have an impact on the valuation. When we get to the point of time of pulling a permit, you know, we could be three months from a permit, six months from a permit, you know, we don't know what the valuation will be at the time the permit is pulled. So, I guess one of the questions I wanted to ask from a practical standpoint is if Council just wants to

waive whatever the impact fee number is. That could be 350. That could be 850. Whatever at the time of application -- or if you want a hard number in -- in the impact fee side of the conversation I think that's an important distinction for everybody in the room to know and hear.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Good point on that and I guess for me I would be comfortable with a not to exceed amount. So, perhaps a -- a ceiling of some sort and whether it's 552 or -- or some other number -- so that way if it's lower, great, those that are receiving have full clarity. Hey, we are here to cover these specific costs up to whatever the -- the cap that we as -- as a body establish.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor and Erin, I know that one of the numbers I saw early on, the total was 679,048, but it was -- I think that was with the other building in there. So, by going to the 46 unit it came down to the permit fee cost was -- the calculation came out to 552. Is that correct? Okay. She's in the audience and saying yes, so -- the 552 number seems to be the correct one. I -- I kind of like your suggestion, you know, of -- I don't know if we do like 600,000 not to exceed and that way there is -- if it came to 558 we don't have to make changes or anything, but 575 -- I -- I don't know. But anyway --

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: If it's a 552 number and if they can't come up with eight grand I think that's, you know, a little bit of a problem on their part, so that's --

Simison: Okay.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I agree. Sounds like a plan. I think that makes a lot of sense and super excited to see this move forward and, hopefully, be an awesome addition to City of Meridian. So, I'm looking forward to seeing how this goes. And it's possible, I suppose, that there will be cost adjustments and we might see -- you know, we are not going to see that much of a lower number on our side, but it may mean that it will be more beneficial for them and the overall cost by the time they get started with the construction. So, my one other

question on this -- not specifically related to Woodrose, but to our other conversation regarding running the applications through -- similar to our CDBG process -- obviously, the criteria for that program comes from the federal government. Are we going to be designing our own criteria for those applications and what does the time frame possibly look like for that? I know that Jesse Tree is going to run out of their federal funding for the program, the emergency rental assistance program that we discussed about at the end of September. So, I didn't know if there was a plan of trying to get that in place that quickly or what the -- the timing would look like on the application process and kind of who or how will the criteria be designed.

Miles: Mr. Mayor and Council Woman Perreault -- sorry. Hadn't thought about that, to be honest with you. It was sort of an open conversation to you all. I think certainly there is what I will call security in following existing guidelines. It always helps when something's built in place. So, if the program is falling federal guidelines and you are all comfortable with those, which we can pull up and share and certainly discuss if you want -- that's an avenue to go and it would in my mind be quicker and easier to follow something that's already in existence, rather than designing something on the fly or on our own. That's an opinion only though.

Simison: Yeah. And -- and we have not had conversations with staff to say that we want to -- you know, the only conversation I have had is about limiting it to rental assistance programs and that we would try to move as expeditiously as -- as well as we can. So, not opening it up to anything eligible under CDBG, we are just going to focus on the housing rental assistance element that I was -- you know, we -- we can have that for a future conversation with Crystal. We can bring it back and if this is the direction Council wants to go, if there is any input into this, because, obviously, we don't have to follow the CDBG guidelines based upon what those are, but we can, then, know if this is the desire of Council to do this we can have Crystal come and have a conversation about what that would look like and make a proposal and get feedback on it.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. I -- I hope to stay involved in that process with the Mayor and Council President's, you know willingness. The -- there are only a few organizations that offer specifically emergency rental assistance in the valley, which is where you call up and say, hey, you know, I'm going to be kicked out of my place or I lost my job or something and I have two weeks to find -- there -- there is another part of assistance that is like I need to move, because my -- the owner of my building is selling the building and I can't come up with a security deposit to get into another location. That's not technically considered emergency assistance, but it's a similar type of concept and so those are the sort of things that I'm hoping to chat with Crystal about and kind of see -- it is still an assistance based thing, it is still something that's somewhat of a short term, one time help and it's my understanding of my conversation with Jesse Tree that that's a -- about 90 percent of their requests is really just like one time stuff. They don't have a lot of -- of

multi-month type of support. So, yeah, I -- I -- I would love to be involved with that with staff if there is an agreement to do that and kind of help put some guidelines together for it and, then, maybe present to Council some options for how we make that decision. This isn't the time I know to decide that, but --

Simison: Yeah. And I -- and the question will become -- if Council is going to be the ultimate arbitrator on what is selected, do we want to have you building the toolkit? I think I want feedback. But I think that's -- that's part of the question, as compared to leaving it. CDBG is a little bit more -- other people make that decision. So, I think we can have that conversation, but, yes, we definitely want that feedback one way or the other, just was not -- you are actually in the weeds per se.

Miles: And, Mr. Mayor, one comment to add on the -- what threshold -- what dollar value to -- to fund. Is it 250,000? Is it 500,000? I think one of the components -- if you -- if you use Jesse Tree as an example where they ask for multiple years of funding, that model -- there have been instances of agencies that are struggling to spend COVID money quick enough under the CDBG guidelines. So, certainly, taking a year-by-year approach could help us in that regard to see what's performing, what's working, what's not and, then, consider future years if that's the desire.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I wouldn't mind hearing from Erin from The Housing Company, just to make sure we are on track and we don't get numbers out of -- out of whack here before we charge forward.

Anderson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members, Chair. Thank you very much for the opportunity. I appreciate that, because I'm just kind of trying to follow as -- as closely as possible to what's been discussed so far. But I -- what I'm tracking is the -- we -- we did remove one six-plex building and that actually brought the building permit fees and impact fee total down to 591,000, not 516,000 -- or 560,000. The gap was the 560,000 once we had reduced the unit count. So, I wanted to clarify that. The other thing is that of that 590,000 permits and fees, I don't have a breakdown of the hard costs versus the soft cost that was described by Mr. Freckleton. So, I'm not sure what the amount is that qualifies for a reduction. So, that's something that is a question I still have, because that hasn't been conveyed to me what that amount might be. But we know it's a portion of the 591,000 and our gap being the 560,000 could comprise of a combination of waiver of fees and other capital contributions, depending on how you see fit. And so I'm trying to follow exactly kind of where you are sitting, but you were talking about waivers of fees and that's certainly one avenue to go, but I think knowing that not all the 591,000 would qualify because we can only request a waiver of permits, not impact fees, my guess is we wouldn't get to 561. I don't know what the number is. But just -- so, it sounds like we need to -- there is still some stuff we have to work out on how that -- what that amount is

on the impact fee -- or rather the permit fee waiver. But the 560 is what we needed to get the four points.

Simison: So, Erin, what I -- what I have heard from Council is not a waiver of -- the city's going to cover the impact fee portion using ARPA dollars. That is the only thing that's being discussed at this point in time up to 552,000 dollars, if that's what they end up being. So, not a waiver of building costs at this time.

Anderson: Okay.

Simison: That's what I have heard to this point. Just make it very clear. So, it's that one number, whatever that number ends up being up to a certain level in the process.

Anderson: Okay. So, I will work with city staff to verify which portion of the total fee estimation qualify for that.

Simison: It's just the impact fee number.

Anderson: Okay.

Hoaglun: Erin, you -- you mentioned the 560 number, as opposed to 552, and I guess it's one of those -- it's going to Councilman Cavener's suggestion that we go not to exceed. So, if we go to a not-to-exceed amount, is it 560? Is it 591? After you work with the development department it may come down that -- maybe it's only 500,000 that meets the four percent and that we can cover the costs on and whatnot. Is that -- which number is it? Is it 560? Is it 591? Or is it 552?

Anderson: It's 552 was -- was the accurate amount based on the construction estimates, with the building permits based on current construction costs.

Hoaglun: Okay. So, if we go 552,401 that -- and, then, you continue to work with the department and see what we can --

Anderson: Yes. Thank you.

Hoaglun: Okay.

Anderson: Okay. So, I will -- I appreciate that. Thank you very much for your consideration.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: And just as we are -- you know, we are kind of -- we are work -- we are in a workshop and we are workshopping.

Anderson: Yeah.

Cavener: So, I know when you guys first came through with the annexation, there was a lot of confidence, you felt you would be able to do the project as is. I get market conditions have made it really challenging, which is why you are back asking for additional funds. So, in terms of -- of timing, if -- if other conditions play out that makes it more challenging or prohibitive for your organization to move forth with construction, at what point do you feel would be appropriate for the city, then, to ask if -- if those funds aren't going to be spent for whatever reason, to request that they are either -- we -- we don't spend them in that manner, we spend them on something else or that they are being returned to us. Help us understand kind of from your perspective what you think is appropriate, because this is -- this is kind of Council President Hoaglund's kind of initial comments. This is kind of a one off for us.

Anderson: Yeah.

Cavener: But it's really important for me that if we are doing this that it's successful.

Anderson: Right. Right. So, the -- the timeline would be November is when IHFA makes the selections -- the project selections. At that point we would -- we would need to come forth before you and either request your consideration for us to reapply next year or -- you know. And, then, have you make a decision. Our intent would be to purchase -- purchase the property in October either way and our actual goal would -- if we aren't successful this year would be to reapply next year. So, we would have to come before you again and -- and you would have to consider that. But that's the -- that's the time frame. We will know if we are successful this year by November.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: And apologies, I was under the impression you guys already owned the land. You have not purchased it yet?

Anderson: No. Not yet.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: One more question, Erin. We take this action in that amount, I think you have got to submit paperwork and applications. I think you had mentioned a letter would suffice in one of our meetings that -- if the city submits a letter saying this is what we would cover the costs on that would suffice for the time being for your application.

Anderson: Yes. A letter would be great with conditions about -- you know, about us being successful in receiving the funding, et cetera.

Hoaglund: I'm sure the Mayor's office would be happy to guide you in that work.

Simison: Thank you.

Anderson: Any other questions for me? And thank you for your time. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. So -- so, Council, as --

Miles: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Oh. Go ahead.

Miles: Sorry. I do think it's worthwhile hearing from The Housing Company to ensure that the timeline of the ARPA funding program can be met with the project, which was December 2026. We just -- that's a component to consider.

Simison: And I think that's -- Erin, this is where I was -- where I was generally going. Ultimately my goal was not to bring this back in front of you anymore. We have got projects. You are going to see them as they come forward for funding. That we will track and monitor the process of these, look at the dollar figures, and, if necessary, make adjustments if they -- if The Housing Company drops out and it's no longer there, it's not going to happen or if for any reason we can't do the biosolids drying and, then, we are going to come back to you in that -- in those regards. So, that would be my intention is moving forward and the only one is if we need to do a resolution or an actual motion, Mr. Nary, if we are going to make a commitment to such as -- such as the -- for the housing fund commitment through a letter or is the letter contingent like we do on other things to the Council at the time, making that final decision, because that's ultimately -- they may not have the one on the far -- over here to be part of that vote in the -- in the future and it could change our dynamics. So, that would be my plan is from -- moving forward we are going to bring these back one at a time as they are ready for budget amendments or authorization and we will try to get through as much as we can and -- and leave the Police and -- we already know what the Police and Fire Station number is, but, ultimately, whatever we assign, it doesn't need spending authority. It has been authorized, it's just applying the appropriate number to the ARPA control -- the ARPA reporting process as we move forward with our compliance related to that. But the rest of them we will try to get real numbers. Does that work for you all? I don't feel like I need a resolution or a vote or a motion, because you will all vote on each one of these one way or the other.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: The only -- the only -- the only thing that caused -- that pauses me for -- for concern on this -- on this project is just it needs to get done. We need guarantees and assurances that it's going to get done guaranteed by 2026 and -- I mean, yeah, I mean that's a really big deal. I mean like we all know that and so -- I was under the impression there was land purchased as well. I -- I -- it makes me a little nervous that this whole project is done and approved and ready to roll and complete by, you know, that time if --

Simison: I assume that they have a contingency to purchase the property, so that should not be delayed. But to your point, absolutely, the good part is is the impact fees aren't collected until they are in for an application. So, there -- there will be no money -- the -- and if at that point in time if we don't think it can be fulfilled we will have to -- we will have that conversation, so --

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: To that point, then, if a letter gets going out, I assume you or staff will send it to Council before it gets mailed out, so that we have got a chance to review and make sure the things that I think have been kind of captured today that have been formalized in the letters, so there aren't any surprises for -- for --

Simison: If you would like to review it. Typically we just have legal prepare it to cover all our bases based on the conversation, but I'm happy to send it to Council for review.

Cavener: Well, I have no doubts about the capacity or the competency of our Legal Department, they are way better than me. I think because this is kind of a unique situation I would like to maybe just see it before it goes out. It just would make me feel a little bit better.

Simison: Okay.

Hoaglun: So, Dave, you have the numbers. Any -- any other numbers that we need?

Miles: Got it all and I got YouTube to help me, so --

Simison: I -- I think we have got a path forward, knowing this -- this may not be the end We -- we -- we very well may be back in three months, six months, or a year on any individual item, but if we can start moving it forward.

Bernt: At least we know we have fire stations, police stations and a golf course that would gobble up this money in two seconds if it was there.

17. Information Technology: Fiscal Year 2022 Budget Amendment in the Amount of \$62,000.00 for Fire Safety Center Fiber and Conduit

Simison: Amen. And in some cases we got fiber projects, which are up next and they are ready to -- they are ready to go to work as well, so -- okay. Thank you, Council. Next item up is Item 17, which is Information Technology fiscal year 2022 budget amendment in the amount of 62,000 for fire safety center fiber and conduit. Mr. Tiede.

Tiede: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. Yes, I am coming here before you today with a budget amendment in the amount of 62,000 dollars for fiber and conduit for connectivity to the Fire Safety Center. That is the location off of Locust Grove in Meridian close to Fire Station 3. That is where our fire prevention and education division reside and they have been out there for roughly 17 years and over that time we have gone through a number of connectivity mediums to try to provide them the services that they need to be able to function and to do their jobs effectively and over that time we have gone through so many iterations of different ways of connecting and none of them provide the services that they need. So, we are at the point where we are providing this amendment as an option and a solution to the issues that they have and feel strongly this is the direction we need to move forward for them to continue to function at that facility. So, with that I will stand for any questions. You, obviously, have a memo in front of you and the budget amendment itself, but that's where we are at.

Simison: Council, any questions?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Seeing no questions, I move approval of the fiscal year 2022 budget amendment in the amount of 62,000 dollars for the Fire Center Safety -- Fire Safety Center fiber and conduit project.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve the budget amendment in the amount of 62,000 dollars. Is there discussion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

Roll call: Borton, absent; Cavener, yea; Bernt, yea; Perreault, yea; Hoaglund, yea; Strader, absent.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries. The item is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

18. Information Technology: Fiscal Year 2022 Budget Amendment in the Amount of \$150,000.00 for Lakeview Golf Course Fiber and Conduit

Simison: Next item up is Information Technology Fiscal Year 2022 budget amendment in the amount of 150,000 for Lakeview Golf Course fiber and conduit. Mr. Tiede.

Tiede: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I'm back again if you didn't notice. So, this budget amendment is also to provide fiber and conduit, but to the Lakeview Golf Course, which the City of Meridian will be taking over operations this fall. We feel like this is needed due to the various services that are needed at the golf course. Currently they have a mash-up of services they have been working with over the years. We went through and vetted these with them and talked about options about a year ago -- just over a year ago and found that there was a lot of deficiencies. They ended up outsourcing and hiring an IT firm to go in and address some of those, but many of the issues still exist, because it simply needs connectivity. So, we feel like this is key to providing services out there for IT, Finance, and the staff that will continue to manage the golf course. I believe that also the restaurant that will be going there will also be using the connectivity that we provide for their point of sale systems, even though the city doesn't provide that directly, they need this connectivity as well. So, again, all this is in your memo and the budget amendment, but that's what we are here to request, to provide regular -- basically regular city services that we would provide to all -- at all other city facilities to this new location, so I will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Dave, appreciate you bringing both of these to us. I think it's important to provide consistency, same level of service to all of our city-owned assets and resources. I know I kind of gulped a little bit when I saw the dollar amount, but I appreciate Dave kind of walking me through the whys on some of that. So, with that I'm happy to move that we approve the budget amendment for fiscal year 2022 in the amount of 150,000 dollars for Lakeview Golf Course fiber and conduit.

Hoaglun: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve the budget amendment in the amount of 150,000 dollars. Is there any discussion on the amendment -- or on the -- on the motion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

Roll call: Borton, absent; Cavener, yea; Bernt, yea; Perreault, yea; Hoaglun, yea; Strader, absent.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Tiede: Thank you.

19. Mayor's Office: Districting Update

Simison: Best of luck. So, item -- Council, next item is the Mayor's Office districting update. I'm going to go ahead and read my notes on this. I -- I tend to like to go a little bit more off -- off the cuff, but don't want to screw anything up in my comments, so bear with me from that standpoint. But early in 2022 the City of Meridian created a process for the establishment of city council districts in accordance with the Idaho State Code. That process included the appointment of a districting committee to create six city council districts. The districting committee performed their job in a way that they were asked to and put together boundaries of districts and did not take into consideration locations of current city council members or the terms of people elected. This enabled them to so -- be solely focused on creating equitable boundary of the districts. I knew once we -- once we created the districting commission that once completed it may be necessary to align their work with the recent city council election, so as to best fully implement city council districts in the City of Meridian from the recent election to reflect the will of -- of the people from that election. In choosing how district numbers were assigned on the map and existing City Council Members were assigned to those districts, it created a situation where the city would not be able to fully implement city council districts until the 2025 election. However, by redesignating City Council Seat One to Seat Two and Seat Two to Seat One, the city can fully implement the new districting beginning in 2023 where every district would have someone who lives in that area be represented on City Council. If we were to make this change it would align all three of the City Council Members who were just elected in November 2021 to the districts in which they currently reside, providing the residents of those districts with a sitting City Council Member who would be their Council Member. Further, it allows the remaining three districts to elect their City Council Members in the 2023 election, so each district in the city will have an elected City Council Member in their district which meets the intention of the Idaho State Code. If this change is not made it will create a situation where at least one district would not have an elected City Council representation until 2025 and potentially have two City Council Members elected who both live in District One. Making this change in no way alters the terms of the current City Council Members or boundaries of the six districts as established by the districting committee. It only redesignates the numbers assigned to two seats. There is no other substance of change. I appreciate the fact that this -- this issue was not addressed by the districting committee, because it tells me they did their job correctly. As Mayor, however, it is my responsibility to ensure that we are implementing the laws of the state of Idaho and this change does that in my opinion and allows us to -- to be in compliance with the spirit of the law as quickly as possible. Further, this change takes into consideration the realities of the November 2020 election and aligns that election to our reality moving forward. Council, I will be happy to answer any questions and we have Legal here as well, but it would be my intention to bring forward a change to our ordinance next week and take public comment and have a second reading on August 9th and a third reading with public comment on August 16th regarding this proposal. This would complete our process and allow us to implement our districts one year before the filing period, which was my goal, and, then, we can -- and, then, we can begin communicating the map, the changes, and districts to the community, as well as who their assigned Council Member is through this process. So, with that I would be happy to take -- answer

any questions or Mr. Nary can also do that, but I -- I think that this is the best way moving forward, so we can fully implement this process as soon as possible.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Just to confirm, did you say that we would open up this to a public hearing just to make sure that there was a -- okay. Good.

Simison: Yeah. And I would intend to have two public comment period --

Bernt: That's good.

Simison: -- on this option.

Bernt: Right. That's -- I -- you know, I -- I can speak for I -- I believe every Council Member on the Meridian City Council saying that we purposefully were, you know, way far away from this and this is probably a direct result of -- of -- of us not probably paying close enough attention to the details prior to us passing the resolution and I don't know, I -- it is what it is. I -- I -- Mayor, I want you to know that you have my support in this. I -- I think that doing this is -- we are not -- we are not gerrymandering any -- any lines. The lines are exactly the same. The process is exactly the same. The only difference is we are -- we are just -- I'm taking two district numbers and swapping them and -- and -- and I don't know, is it -- it -- was it a perfect process? Probably not. But I believe it was completely above board and the process going forward will continue to be above board. So, I understand the intent. I understand the reasoning. You have my full support and thank you for bringing this to Council today.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I would like to reiterate what I thought you were communicating, because it's the first I have heard of this potential change. So, my understanding is this -- that the intention of this is to make sure that currently every district, since the districts have been approved, is -- has a representative in that district. That's kind of -- so, that -- that -- that starts now versus waiting until 2025 to have a representative in each district. Is that what the intention is?

Simison: The intention is to -- because we just had an election and when -- when the -- the seats were assigned it's aligning the Council Members who are just elected to the terms which will not be on the ballot in the 2023 election. So, the three seats that just happened would -- would be in that and it would allow all the other three seats to be on the ballot in the 2023 election. If we don't take this action not all the seats -- we -- we will have some seats in the city where nobody is on the ballot in 2025 and we will run an

election and, then, I will assign somebody to go represent that area, because they are -- there won't -- there won't be an election in -- right now under the current situation -- under the current scenario District Two will not be on the ballot until 2025 and so no one in that -- no one would be able to be elected in 2025 from that area because of how the seats are staggered. But if we make this change it -- and I know this -- your first just hearing about this. I think that this is a -- a great conversation moving forward and it may require a little bit more explanation. You just heard my words from that standpoint, but we have two options. We can either fully implement districts by 2023 by switching the numbers -- just the numbers on two districts or we won't be able to fully implement elected representation by the people to districts until 2025. Otherwise, we could accomplish that by 2023.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Council Member Perreault -- again, digesting this in -- in real time, so I appreciate you being thoughtful, though, that even in proposing this to build a good framework to allow public feedback, I think that's really really important, even for this to even be considered to be proposed. This would be one that I would want to spend a lot of time really contemplating. I would want to hear a lot from our citizens about their thought. To Council Member Bernt's point, we all collectively said we are way more than an arm's length away, which was appropriate. I think many of us said -- whether it helps me or hurts me, however it's going to be rolled out, we are going to support what the committee brings forth and -- and I know that was a commitment that I made. Whatever the committee brings forth I'm going to support. This is a small change, but a substantive change I think from the public standpoint. So, I -- I -- I'm supportive of moving forth with the public hearing process, but also trying to be forthright that I'm -- I'm not quite sure that I'm going to be in support of the recommended change until I have an opportunity to really digest and hear from our citizens.

Simison: And I appreciate that and there was -- there was comments made that they had -- Council didn't want me near this process either. Had I invested myself this would have been something I would have said, please, go address our last -- but it -- it didn't. We all stayed away. We let them do their process. I have conveyed this to at least one member of -- of -- of the committee and -- and let them know and -- and he said he appreciated that. He thinks it's appropriate from his standpoint, but he doesn't -- he doesn't speak for the committee from that standpoint and I would invite them to -- I don't -- I don't know that they had a process, other than starting in one corner and going around when they assigned -- assigned numbers to the map. So, it -- if they would have started in a different direction we would be -- who knows what conversation we would be having. We could have three people and -- that were just elected that were assigned to seats that they -- they would be up -- they would have to choose to run in a different district next year, you know, by luck of the -- by luck of the numbering and that's what it was, it was a numbering process that got us here, not a -- what is the reality that we are currently in related to that. But I appreciate it and I -- I'm glad that the press is here, because I -- I -- this was one of

those things after we had this conversation I had planned to reach out to the media and have the conversation, because I -- I do think that this is the right way for the city to approach this, because it reflects the will of our last election and it implements districts fully by the 2023 election. Otherwise, we will -- you will have a situation where I -- I will probably be assigning people to districts. You may have a position where I'm appointing people based on how people decide to run and if we leave it the way it is and I would much rather have the citizens elect City Council Members than me appointing Council Members with your consent, but that's not to -- when you have an opportunity to rectify that situation I would much prefer we move forward with that from that standpoint. But I'm happy to have conversations with you all if you have questions. Legal can -- can help explain any questions and we will have public comment on this as well.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I think what would help me is to have a presentation on what -- what it looks like now and, then, what it will look like -- I -- maybe I just need a visual or something. It's just not clicking in my head exactly how this is all going to play out, because I thought I understood kind of how it will play out with the elections with -- with how we have approved the district. So, perhaps -- I don't know if this is the appropriate time or -- or later -- just an explanation of what was expected to happen the way we have it now and, then, how that would look different with the seats and, then, the years that this would be elected in.

Simison: It looks like Mr. Nary wants to speak.

Nary: Oh. Mr. Mayor, maybe I -- maybe I can help -- I don't know, but I'm going to try. Let's see if I can do this. Okay. So -- so, here is the districts as they were approved. So, this is how they were approved and the committee -- in speaking with Kurt Starman, who is the deputy that handled this for our office, the committee did not choose -- did not know where any Council Member lived, did not look at that at all. Did not concern themselves with that. But also did not specifically pick the direction of this. I mean it was simply they started on the left and went one, two, three, four, five, six. They just went around in a circle.

Simison: Or did -- or did they? It doesn't look like they followed a specific pattern to me either.

Nary: Yeah. I mean it -- it goes this way -- the only thing that -- and if you remember the Chair Woman Greer stated the only thing that she felt was really important that she sort of pressed forward is to be sure that two of the districts covered the south. That's -- that's her only real desire in how they work. But whether it went one, two, three, four -- one, two, three, four -- I mean there really wasn't an intention on it had to be this way. This is the lines based on the math of the population. So, you are all elected by seats, not by districts. So, you all have seats assigned one through six. Normally our election cycles have been one, three and five in one cycle, two, four and six in the other cycle. So, when

we did this all the assumption was is we will just put all the Council Members in the corresponding districts that match the seats that they already have. What the Mayor is proposing is none of this map changes at all. So, it doesn't change any of the lines. The only difference is Seat Two is the currently incumbent Council Member that's election -- it doesn't go up until '25, would now be in the District One that would correspond with the same election cycle, because that was the intent. So, we are switching the seats, not the districts. State law contemplates that you can assign seats to Council Members. So -- so, a Council Member that is currently in Seat Two would come to Seat One. Seat One would go to Seat Two. The only change, then, would be in the 2023 election. Seats Two, Three, and Five would be up for election, because that would be the expiration of their term. Then in 2025 Seats One, Four and Six would be up for election, because that's when their terms would expire. This doesn't pick any winners. It -- it does put existing Council Members in the districts where they reside and the other districts have -- some have Council Members that live there that can run or not and they have some don't have any Council Members that live in them currently at all. So, it -- it was intentional to stay out of that business at the front end. This does rectify it and actually, as the Mayor stated, fully implements districting as intended by state law by the '23 election.

Simison: Again there will be time to digest and ask questions and hear from the public on it and I'm happy to spend more time directly with anybody if necessary and as is Legal, but that's been my -- you know, I -- I -- I think this process will -- when -- when you -- when you see it you will understand that it -- it reflects the will of the people from the election. It aligns Council Members with the districts that they live in and it lets the other districts that don't have Council Members -- the ability to elect people that will represent them in the next election, as compared to having people not be able to run in that area and not being able to elect somebody and someone just being assigned to represent them for two more years. Yeah. That -- that will be -- that's some of the outcome. So, it's my intention that this will come back, like I say -- did I say next week? Is that what was -- what our -- our process? I -- I want to be -- you know, just because of -- we -- where we have National Night Out, we are missing meetings, I am not here on the 9th, but that's why we did not do public hearing -- or public comment on that day. That way Council can take public comment if they want, but I won't be here. I just didn't know, you know, as the -- as someone that this does not impact I want this to be the one -- me leading this, me hearing -- having the conversation with the public. It is my recommendation. It's not your all's. I don't expect you to support -- you know, have that conversation back and forth with the community if necessary, but you are more than welcome to. So, that's why we -- the dates that were selected with the public's comments as well on the 16th, so -- more -- more to come. Or if it doesn't show up next week you will -- you will -- you will -- I guess we will have a different conversation then. But that would be the intention is to bring it back next week and, Mr. Nary, I'm sure we can have a more -- information shared in the presentation to Council and the public at that time. Okay.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

20. Per Idaho Code 74-206(1)(d) To consider records that are exempt from disclosure as provided in chapter 1, title 74, Idaho Code

Simison: So, with that Item 20, Executive Session.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: I move we go into Executive Session per Idaho Code 74-206(1)(d).

Cavener: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to go into Executive Session. Is there discussion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

Roll call: Borton, absent; Cavener, yea; Bernt, yea; Perreault, yea; Hoaglun, yea; Strader, absent.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and we will move into Executive Session.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: (5:31 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.)

Simison: Council, do I have a motion?

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: I move that we come out of Executive Session.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to come out of Executive Session. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. We are out of Executive Session.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Move we adjourn our work session.

Simison: I have a motion to adjourn. All those in favor to adjourn the work session, please, signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and we are adjourned.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 6:00 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

MAYOR ROBERT E. SIMISON

_____/_____/_____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK