

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:02 p.m., Tuesday, July 26, 2022, by Mayor Robert Simison.

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

Also present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Joe Dodson, Crystal Campbell, Scott Colaianni, Joe Bongiorno and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Liz Strader	<input checked="" 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, I will call the meeting to order. For the record it is July 26, 2022, at 6:02 p.m. We will begin this regular City Council meeting with roll call attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Simison: Next item is the Pledge of Allegiance. If you would all, please, rise and join us in the pledge.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Simison: We had no one sign up for the community invocation.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: So, we will move on to the adoption of the agenda.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I move adoption of the agenda as published.

Borton: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

PUBLIC FORUM – Future Meeting Topics

Simison: Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up under public forum?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did not.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Request for Reconsideration of Denial of Burnside Ridge Estates (H-2021-0070)

Simison: Okay. Then with that we will move into Action Items. The first item up is a request for reconsideration -- reconsideration of denial of Burnside Ridge Estates, H-2021-0070. Mr. Nary.

Nary: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. So, you have a request for reconsideration of Burnside Ridge. It's in your packet. You have had opportunity to review it. So, tonight, again, it's not a hearing. This is mostly for the public, because I know all of you know this. This is not a hearing time. This is an opportunity to either grant or deny or remand the findings back for further consideration. If the decision is to rehear it, then, we would, then, set it up and notice it up for a future date. We don't have to pick that date today, because we will have to go through the noticing process. If the direction -- the motion is to -- to deny, that would be the motion. We will prepare some findings to that effect and, then, provide that to the applicant. If it's to remand for further -- further action on the findings themselves, we will send that back -- not to a date certain, we will prepare those and we will bring them back. Likely if we were to do that it would be in your first or second meeting in August, depending on what extent there is to changes. But that's what's before you tonight. I do see the applicant is in the audience, so they are here at least to hear what your discussion is.

Simison: Thank you. Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Yes, Mr. Mayor. Thank you. Well, I did review the request by the applicant and looked into that and, of course, reviewed the minutes of our meeting and certainly one of the major issues was there -- are what we refer to as our growth areas and -- and we did refer to our growth areas several times during the deliberations, but it -- it was critical that -- to note that we did not, as a Council, expressly refer to the 2020 priority growth map when it was -- when denying the application and staff had made mention that we are not referring to the growth areas and so it was not -- not part of that. So, I -- I'm leaning towards making the motion to grant the request for consideration, but to limit it to the

purpose of clarifying the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and not delving into that. I have been advised by legal counsel that we can tighten those findings of fact and I think that's probably something that -- that we should do, but just wanted to put that out there for -- for discussion.

Simison: Council, further discussion?

Hoaglun: So, Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: I would move that the City Council grant the applicant's request for reconsideration for the limited purpose of clarifying the findings of fact and conclusions of law concerning adverse impacts on public services.

Strader: I second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second. Is there discussion on the motion?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Was absent on the 7th, so I just feel it appropriate to abstain from the reconsideration request. So, I will abstain from the vote on this motion.

Simison: Council, any other discussion on the motion? Then Clerk will call the roll.

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

Simison: Five ayes, zero no's and one abstain, so motion for reconsideration for the purposes of findings of facts is agreed to. Thank you.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

2. Public Hearing for Community Development Block Grant Program Year 2022-2026 Consolidated Plan

Simison: Next item up is -- is Item 2, public hearing for Community Development Block Grant program year 2022-2026 consolidated plan. We will open this public hearing with staff comments. Ms. Campbell.

Campbell: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. I'm just going to give you guys a quick overview of the consolidated plan that goes from October of this year through September 2026 and, then, I will move into the changes that have been made since the

last time we presented. So, just a quick reminder. The con plan identifies the goals and strategies for the next five years and the action plan identifies the specific projects that we will take in the upcoming year. So, our five year goals, which are basically the different types of projects that we will be funding, are housing, public services, public facilities and infrastructure improvements and program administration. We have identified some projects for this upcoming year. Under housing we identified housing repair and home buyer assistance. For public services there is youth scholarships, emergency rental assistance, senior transportation. And for public facility and infrastructure improvements there is two separate streetlight modernization projects. And, then, just basic program administration and fair housing activities. So, there were some changes to all the documents, but most of it was just wordsmithing basic things. Expansion to discussion items, but I did want to point out a few things. The first one is on the con plan under the citizen participation, we updated the methods of outreach that we used and who we have contacted. Under the number of housing units, there was an analysis from HUD, but we took that out, because it was old and it didn't reflect our current situation and how difficult our housing market is right now. And under barriers to affordable housing, we updated it to include the list of priorities -- of priority policies addressed in the city's comprehensive plan. On the action plan we updated one of the projects. It was Franklin and the street project and we -- we moved the location so that it provides services to a low to mod area, instead of the major thoroughfare, so that the CDBG benefits are directly for the low to moderate income area. And the final change was on the citizen participation plan. We updated the substantial amendment criteria to tie that directly to a project goal, instead of an individual activity. So, the final steps on this -- we have our public hearing and public comment period for the con plan, action plan, and analysis impediment tonight -- that closes and, then, on the August 9th Consent Agenda, then, I will have those final documents and resolution for you. August 15th. The public comment period for the citizen participation plan closes and I will have that final document and the resolution on the August 23rd agenda. Consent Agenda, by the way. And with that I will stand for questions.

Simison: Thank you, Crystal. Council, any questions?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Crystal, can you refresh my memory why the request is to close the public hearing tonight, as opposed to waiting until August 9th?

Campbell: I did not call out the citizen participation plan in the original one and so I just wanted to make sure I noticed it effectively for everyone, instead of giving a shorter time frame.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I guess, Crystal, is there any reason why we couldn't keep the public comment period open through the 9th when we would be taking action -- or be asked to take action?

Campbell: So, I -- I misunderstood your previous question.

Cavener: Okay.

Campbell: Sorry. So, the reason that we are closing that one is because we have to make all the updates and we have to update it in HUD's system, which can take some time and so we just wanted to give ourselves enough time to incorporate all the comments that were in there.

Cavener: Okay. Thank you.

Campbell: So, if you -- if you guys want to, then, we could. It would just take a little bit of extra work to make sure we got it in on time.

Cavener: All right. Thanks, Crystal. I appreciate that.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Crystal, can you go back to the slide that shows the changes -- the major changes? The change that takes some -- let's see. Keep going. Maybe you didn't put it on here, but the 20 percent -- yes. The 20 percent from the -- for the annual funding, if it's being reallocated. Project goal would be an entire category; right? Versus individual activity. Is that something the federal government changes part of like our compliance with the comp plan or is that something that -- that we have just decided to do that the city has decided as part of their criteria?

Campbell: We adjusted it. The federal government doesn't require it to be super strict. The 20 percent we can define what that looks like and in the past, then, we have had it related to a specific activity. But sometimes that makes it a little bit more difficult to respond when maybe a project closes out under budget or something and we have to go out for -- we have to do a substantial amendment, which requires 30 days of public notice and everything to reallocate those funds to a different activity. So, it could be like one streetlight project to another, but because it's a separate activity we can't just move that over. But with this we would be able to do that. But it would only be projects that were previously identified in our action plan.

Simison: Council, any additional questions? Thank you very much. Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to provide testimony on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we do. First is Ralph Chappell.

Simison: Good evening, Ralph. I assume you know the drill.

Chappell: Ralph Chappell. 1899 South Swan. Looking at the first item here where it says public facilities and infrastructure, it says senior center. What -- what is the senior center? We already have one. So, is it going to help do something more with it? The other thing it says neighborhood facilities. What are those? And the last -- another one that says health facilities. What's -- what are those? On the next line down there you have child care. We are getting into the childcare business? It doesn't make any sense. Emergency rental assistance. No. Then the next one that says homeowner -- homeownership assistance. We are going to help people buy their houses? Another one says homeowner repairs. Why? My thing is you are going to get this money from the government. Where does the government get the money at? They get it from China. So, then, we have to pay interest on that stuff. So, now you are going to say, okay, we are going to take that money, which we do have the money here in the -- in the city of Meridian, we can use our own money, but we are going to take it from the federal government. For what reason? It doesn't -- to me it doesn't make any sense. You could do the job, same thing, with the money the city has. With today's dollars, instead of borrowing that money, interest is going to be paid on it and who is going to have to pay it. Not you, you, you. It's going to be your kids or your grandkids. It doesn't make any sense. You -- you just -- all right. The other thing is do you really want to burden your kids and grandkids with this -- with this particular -- I don't know how many hundred thousand dollars it is. It's quite a bit. Whenever you could just do the same thing with -- with the city's money. So, my thing is if you approve this, have a good night's sleep, because your kids and grandkids are going to have to pay for it, not you. That's all I have.

Simison: Thank you. Thank you, Ralph. Council, any questions?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is Kay Baldwin.

Simison: And if you could state your name and address for the record and be recognized for three minutes.

Baldwin: My name is --

Simison: Can you get into one of the microphones.

Baldwin: My name is Tomi Kay Baldwin. I reside at 2938 West Santa Clara Drive and I was one of the recipients of the block grant this year. They came in and they saved my home. They -- two years ago in October of 2019 I was being responsible. I asked the company to come in and fix my furnace -- you know, do the -- do the update that you do in the fall and we had just bought our home. We had -- they discovered a drip -- a single drip and it turned out that we had to remove the entire HVAC, so the -- the water heater, the -- the water softener and at that same time we took in a disabled child from the system and it was a bad week. Bad bad week. While the insurance adjuster was there, one of the repairman popped his head out of the wall and said do you know you have polybutylene piping? I don't even know what that is. And we lost our home insurance

that day as well. We were unable to get home insurance until this grant came in and redid my plumbing. My -- I have three special needs children. They came in and leave my home safe for all three of my little boys and I am now off medication, because I am no longer living in a state of stress. My children are --

Simison: Kay, can you --

Baldwin: Because of this grant.

Simison: Keep saying -- on the microphone. Thank you.

Baldwin: Forgive me.

Simison: Okay.

Baldwin: My children will be grateful to pay in years to come, because they are safe today.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, I'm not sure if the others wanted to testify, but I will call them. Lisa Hansen. Tony Allison. Okay.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony on this item this evening? And do we have any -- I haven't looked to see if we have any online. If you are online and would like to provide testimony, you can use the raise your hand feature. Okay. Seeing no one come forward or raise their hand, Crystal, would you like to make any final comments from the testimony that was provided this evening? Oh. If you would like to come forward. If you -- come -- come up to the mic. Everything has to be said into the mic on the record. So, if you can come forward, state your name and address and you will be recognized for three minutes.

Elam: My name is Paul Elam and my address is 5127 North Asissi Avenue in Meridian. This is my first attempt -- first time of attending a meeting, so I apologize, I don't know the process very well.

Simison: That's okay.

Elam: But just curious is do we get to hear all the details of the funding? Just like that gentleman said, like do we get to hear, you know, all the -- all the, you know, specific amounts of each one of those categories of that money that's going to be spent or do we just get to hear like a balloon number?

Simison: Crystal?

Campbell: So, we have actually presented the exact numbers multiple times over the last several months -- yes. I can definitely get that information to you. I -- I think I have it printed out at my desk, if you would like me to get that for you.

Elam: This is the last time anybody can discuss it then? Is that -- you said this is the date when they close it, so there is no more public comments and nobody else can review it and, then, comment again or you are going to extend it?

Campbell: Are you needing to -- are you needing to have that extended so that you can review it?

Elam: Like I said, it's the first time I have ever attended a meeting, but just like the gentleman said, I would kind of like to know what money is being spent and how it's being allocated and, you know, who it's going to serve, that kind of thing.

Campbell: Yeah. I can definitely provide that information to you and I can also keep your comment and I can put it into the plan as well.

Elam: Okay. Thank you very much.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Strader: Mr. Mayor, I would like to make a comment.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. Just -- Ralph and I didn't catch the gentleman's name who just testified. We had gone through a pretty extensive process in reviewing the plan, but just to give you like a couple of examples, some of the examples for the senior center -- that was like specifically to provide them with transportation. So that they could get needy seniors to their doctor's appointments and so forth. The bus that they use has broken down or the van that they use. And the childcare is -- it's not like Boise where they are giving grants to all childcare providers. That's specific to the Boys and Girls Club in downtown Meridian. But I think your point is well taken in a couple of fronts; right? The federal government's spending is totally out of control. I agree with you. But this money is going to go away if it's not used for positive things in Meridian and a lot of people in these programs depend on it and, then, I guess the other comment I would make is I do think we have the ability to keep the public hearing open tonight and that might be a good thing for us to do, to give folks a chance to review in more detail. So, I would suggest that the Council will consider that.

Simison: Thank you, Council Woman Strader. Is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony on this item at this time? Or, Council, do I have a motion to continue the public hearing?

Cavener: Yeah. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Crystal, appreciate kind of helping to answer that question at the forefront. Kind of leads to where my question was coming from. I always like to give the public as much opportunity to comment and your explanation was spot on. We have had multiple hearings about this. The information has been made public. Oftentimes, though, people don't necessarily have the opportunity to pay attention to it until it's at the last minute. This is their -- was kind of their last chance to -- to provide testimony. So, I recognize it's going to create an extra burden onto you as staff, but I know you can capture the comments that we heard here tonight. If we receive any other communication between now and August 9th I know you will be able to incorporate that as well. So, Mr. Mayor, I would move that we continue the public hearing for the CDBG program year '22 to '26 consolidated plan to August 9th.

Strader: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to continue this item. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? You ayes have it and the public hearing is continued.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

3. Public Hearing and First Reading of Ordinance 22-1988: An Ordinance Amending Meridian City Code Section 1-7-1(C) Concerning City Council Seats; Amending Meridian City Code Section 1-7-1(E) Concerning Staggered Terms; Amending Meridian City Code Section 1-7-11(B) Concerning Duties and Powers of the Meridian Districting Committee; Adding Meridian City Code Section 1-7-11(I) Concerning Modifications to City Council Seat Numbers; Voiding Conflicting Ordinances and Resolutions; and Providing an Effective Date

Simison: Next item up is Item 3, a public hearing and first reading of Ordinance 22-1988. We will open this public hearing with comments from Mr. Nary.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, I have a slide that I know Chris is going to pull up here in a second. Actually, I have two. Here we go. Can we go with the district one first. Thank you. So, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, and for members of the public, so tonight was a first reading of an ordinance change that's being proposed from the Mayor's Office and the Legal Department. So, I do want to clear up the first thing is there was a recent news story published about this exercise that we are going through and it started off -- the title of it was, oops, like we missed something. No one missed anything. The committee that we asked to volunteer their time to create these districts pursuant to state code did exactly what they were asked to do. They were asked to look at the districts and base it all on population and precincts, which is what the state law contemplates. It doesn't contemplate anything else. And so that was their charge. That was their direction and they took it very seriously. You heard the chair -- Chair Jo Greer talk about that and

the only consideration of anything -- and not as to where anyone lives, but where -- it was any consideration beyond population precincts, was the committee discussed on a -- a district that crossed the freeway. The only significant feature we have here, because there is no rivers, there is no mountains, there is nothing of that great of magnitude here, is the freeway and the conversation as -- as Chairwoman Greer stated, was do we have one or two districts that cross the freeway and the decision was ultimately made that one would cross the freeway, because it was inevitable that one had to, but we would try to keep it to just the one. So, that was the only consideration that was made beyond precincts and the population and that was -- what their reaction was and that was what the state law contemplated. So, these districts are what you approved a few weeks ago. They are not being proposed to change and they are not being proposed to go back to the committee to reconsider anything, because that's what their direction was. So, I do want to correct that the impression I got from reading the news story about it was that someone erred and now we are trying to fix an error. We are not trying to fix an error. We are not trying to do that. What we are proposing is to change seat numbers. State code also grants authority to the city clerk to designate the seat numbers, so there is no thought or process that went into the conversation by the committee as to where the numbers would go, whether they would start at the bottom left or the top right or the middle or whatever. There was no conversation. They went basically like a map one, two, three, four, five, six. They just went in a circular pattern. That was it. There was no reason to do it that way. There was no discussion about that pattern works better than this pattern or this direction is better in this location than that one. None of that was being considered. They just went that way just because it looks like a clock. That's about it. So, at the time all of the seats of the Council Members have a seat number. So, in Idaho you can either elect city councils by at large or by seat number. Some cities do at large, like Garden City and Kuna. Some do it by seat numbers, like us. So, we have always just designated numbers. So, for lack of a better way of doing it, they created the districts by the numbers, they just plugged all the Council Members by seats into the same numbers. No rhyme or reason, evaluating election terms or the staggered terms that are inherent in city elections. None of that. So, all of that was done completely blind to anything else and that was exactly what they were asked to do. So, again, there was no oops here. So, now once it was completed, the discussion point we had -- and we have had this prior to them being completed internally with my department, was is there a way to create the districts to be all -- all have representatives that actually reside in those districts and be completed by 2023? Right now -- Chris, could we hop to the next slide? Oh.

Johnson: An arrow.

Nary: Oh, there we go. Thank you. So, right now if we did nothing you would see there that districts one, two, three would change in the general election in 20 -- or excuse me. One, three, five would change in '23. That is the cycle that those seat numbers have been in the past. And then seats two, four and six would change in '25. By happenstance, the current member of seat four, which would be the corresponding District 4, happens to reside in that district today. In District 6 that person happens to reside in that district today. If we make the change, then, District 1 -- to what we are proposing where basically Seat 2 would now become Seat 1. Seat 1 would become Seat 2. The representative in District

1 lives there now. So, there is no -- there is -- so, again, we are meeting the intent of the state law sooner. District 1 would be represented by a person that resides there. District 2 would be represented by a person that resides there. District 3 would come up for the election cycle in the '23 election naturally anyway and currently no Council Members live in that district now. District 4 would be, as I stated before, would already be immediately with a representative. '23 for Seat 5, because, again, no current Council Member lives in Seat 5 today. So, that was -- would normally come up anyway. Seat 6 would, again, be immediate. So, the desire when this law was passed in 2020, our office had a lot of contact and a lot of conversation with Senator Winder, the -- the -- the President Pro Tem of the Senate, who was the one who carried this forward through the Senate and to the House and got approved. His desire in both '20 and '21 when we were trying to create some changes that would make it a little bit cleaner for everybody was the sooner the better. That was his desire. He recognized with staggered terms it can be challenging to do that. Other -- other cities have chosen a different path that we did not choose to go down, because we didn't find the same comfort level of state law support for some other alternative paths. So, when this process concluded, as it was done, we looked at it and said if we make this one change of seat numbers, then, it's done. It's done now for most of them and it's done completely by the next election in '23. So, is that advantageous to the city? In our belief it's advantageous to our citizens. The intent of the code was to have a representative government by districts. The sooner the better. If we do nothing it will happen by 2025. So, three and a half years now -- from now it would be completed anyway. Our desire in bringing this forward to you to consider is that we could have this done here by the end of next year. By the cycle of election in November of '23 every person in every district would be representative and reside in the district as intended. So, one question is asked of me in the last week is do we have to do this? No, you don't have to do this. I mean you are not required to do any of it. But if the objective and desire is to get the representative government done sooner and completed and move on to the next -- the next cycle, which is at the next census, that, hopefully, I'm not standing here having this conversation with you then, it will -- it will be a natural evolution. As I stated last week, it may look odd to people for the next few election cycles that it's no longer one three and five and two, four and six. In ten years they can change that back, too. It doesn't matter. They could do that. We didn't recommend doing that now, because that doesn't seem necessary when the smaller change has support in the code, has a direction in the state law that contemplates a change of seat numbers and allows for that type of change. So, that's what's before you. That, hopefully, explains a little bit better. Hopefully from the public's perspective they understand that this is not trying to correct any error or mistake, it's trying to clear up an issue that could be done sooner than later and we believe as intended by the code, as intended by Senator Winder, this -- this accomplishes that sooner than later and that's a good, positive thing for what the code intends. So, I can answer your questions. And also our intent is so the public understands. This is just the first reading. We had planned on the second reading at your next meeting on the 9th and the third reading with another opportunity for public comment on that one. Obviously, written comments they can submit anytime. But our intent was to bring you back on the third reading on the 16th if the Council is of a mindset to approve it.

Simison: Thank you, Mr. Nary. Yeah. I -- I made my comments last week when -- when this first came forward and I think the newspaper reported on -- on those comments. But to me this is the way to fully implement representative government as quickly as possible in regards to how -- how the legislature had hoped, but also in my opinion it reflects the will of the people from the last election by aligning those who were elected into -- into those seats where they live and gives them that representation as well. So, I'm happy to also answer any questions from Council. From my perspective as well. But, Council, any questions for Mr. Nary?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I would like to make a comment. Can you guys hear me okay?

Simison: Yes.

Strader: Great. You know, I just like to be upfront about things. I do think that this is very positive for the residents of what is currently designated as District 2 to have representation, but I cannot ignore the facts after thinking about this since I viewed the hearing last week, that this change would benefit me directly. It is specific to my seat and the district that I live in and I don't want to ignore that fact. It would specifically allow me to run for office two years earlier. I don't feel that it will be appropriate for me to vote on this and I will be abstaining from voting on it.

Simison: Thank you.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Yeah. I appreciate that comment, Council Woman Strader. I also live in District 2. Again, the commission was blind to where we lived. They didn't take that into consideration when both of us were put in, but I -- I -- I see it completely different. This allows the voters of the district to make that decision right away, instead of having someone who lives out of the district be their representative, they get to vote immediately on who they want, whether it's Council Woman Strader, me, or someone else. That's their decision and, then, they have a representative elected from that district, whatever they decide immediately, instead of waiting two years. So, I -- I just see it from that perspective. It gives them the opportunity to -- made their voice heard right away. So, just -- just a different perspective.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: So, Bill, when a resident sees the chart and it says that they now immediately have a representative in a district, what conclusion should they draw from that?

Nary: I guess, Council Member Perreault, Mr. Mayor, I -- I -- I guess if -- if -- if that's important to them, because that's what the whole purpose of the state code change was, then, it means that, again, they have got somebody who in theory -- and this is very theoretical -- that has a better understanding of what issues face them in where they live. You know, many of the things you hear are very centric to the location, whether it's traffic, whether it's schools, whatever that may be. So, I think if I'm a resident I would at least have the comfort level to know that the person representing me at the City Council probably has a better understanding of what I have to deal with everyday than somebody else who may live in a completely different part of the city and not really feel that, because, again, I know you have all heard that, you don't -- you have heard people say to you, well, you don't get it, you live here, I live there, I'm the one driving over here and you are not driving over here. So, I think that's what -- if -- if -- if -- if you are that into this stuff I think that's what you would think is, okay, how I have got somebody that lives and represents me that kind of gets what I go through every day. That's the way I would think.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Because we -- none of us were elected in these seats and we didn't -- we didn't run with -- with a district specific message or, you know, we are -- we are not -- I don't think any of us would say, hey, we are specialists in the district in which we now currently live that these maps have been drawn. So, to -- to say I just -- I guess I just want to be careful representing to the public that we have some sort of specialized knowledge about our districts when we say that there is an immediate representative, because we weren't elected in that way originally. So, that's kind of what I was trying to get with that question is just to be clear that, you know, we weren't voted in in these districts originally. We may or may not have specialized information about that district currently. So, if somebody looks at this and has no history or understanding of -- of kind of what's gone on, they may look at it and go, oh, okay, so the current representative for District 1 clearly understands the concerns for District 1 right now. And so I would -- just curious, you know, your thoughts on that, because we really haven't had a discussion about how this looks for us in -- in -- in the sense of how we are interacting with members of -- of our districts.

Nary: So, yeah, absolutely fair question, Council Member Perreault. So, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, so the legislature on their own accord -- and -- and I will be honest, I have been in this business a long time. Nobody I have ever dealt with asked about this at this level. Everybody's been used to the state electing people that way and -- and -- but you are right. But the same thing can be said of state representatives. I don't know if this person lives across the street from me or moved here yesterday. I don't know. So, I don't know how -- how engaged everyone is in that conversation, but what I do think is the legislature made their independent choice absent what cities wanted or didn't want and said we are going to choose now that you no longer get elected in this form, you get

elected in this form, knowing full well no one -- no one in the state had a district system in place in 2020. No one. Not -- not Boise. Not us. No one. So, they didn't really ponder that I don't believe very long and hard on whether or not that would be a bother to somebody to say, well, I voted for this person for my seat, because the seat just was a number. It didn't have any meaning to anything, it was just a designation and as I stated earlier, cities could elect people by seats, so you have to run for a specific seat or you could elect them at large. There was no distinction between either one of those systems. And -- and there was never intended to be. So, they changed the rules at the state level, regardless of what cities may have thought, and decided that's going to be the way it goes from now on and now instead of having a choice, as we had before, we don't have a choice. We always had the ability to district before. No city chose to, because of other reasons. Or for whatever reason. But now we don't have a choice. We have to do it that way. So, we have to separate ourselves from the mindset of I voted for this person, because Seat 2 means so much to me -- I'm sorry. Seat 2 is this district if you -- if you -- if you live in a different part of the city that's the way it goes. You are no longer in District 2 and you no longer represent Seat 2, you live in seat -- District 5. So, we are just changing our mindset from what a seat is to a district. Everything is the same.

Simison: There will be time for public comment and questions after we are done with the presentation.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: You know, I -- I -- I felt that this made sense, but I'm really interested to see what the public has to say about this. Like the process that took place before, it was very transparent. Council and the Mayor's Office was a couple arm lengths away from it at all times and will continue to -- to -- to -- to approach it that way for sure, but I'm really excited to see what the public has to say about this and reserve my final thoughts until the -- the final reading, the final public hearing.

Nary: Anyone else?

Simison: Any other questions for Mr. Nary? Okay.

Nary: Thank you.

Simison: Mr. Clerk, do we have anybody signed up in advance to provide testimony?

Johnson: Yes, Mr. Mayor. First is Mike Luis.

Simison: And if you can state your name and address for the record and be recognized for three minutes.

Luis: Mike Luis. 5343 West McMurtrey Street, Meridian. I don't agree with this. I mean you guys selected a redistricting committee. There was five meetings, two public hearings, six drafts. You guys approved it and I think you guys should stick with it and the last election cycle, as a matter of fact, there was a issue Phil McGrain didn't rotate the names correctly and there was a very close race in one of the districts -- or one of the seats, so let it go to vote. It is what it is. It was selected. Let's go to the election.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is Phil Reynolds.

Reynolds: Good evening, Mr. Mayor, Members of the City Council. My name is Phillip Reynolds and I reside at 6423 North Salvia Way, Meridian. And I'm here to speak in opposition of this proposal. I think it gives an appearance of gerrymandering. I think the committee did a great job, they worked hard, they put things in place and all of you approved it and it -- it should remain. I believe the attorney just mentioned that most people don't even know about this. Most people don't care about this. They don't have a clue what's going on. Only the City Council does and a few political junkies that watch your agendas on a regular basis know this is happening. So, I think the ethical and proper thing to do would be just to leave it the way it is. It -- it -- it gives the appearance that it's going to benefit and we just heard from one of the Council Members, it's going to benefit Council Members, but it has no positive or negative impact on the citizens and it's going to give that appearance, it's only for the City Council. So, please, do the right thing. Please do not support this proposition. Thank you.

Simison: Council, questions?

Cavener: Mr. Reynolds? Just a -- a quick question, because I --

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I appreciate your comment about, you know, the public -- your perception the public isn't aware of this and I think it's the -- very much the intention of the Mayor, the Council, our staff to communicate with the public about this, which is why we are having multiple public hearings. I guess I -- I would ask your advice or recommendations on things you think the -- the city should be doing between now and our next scheduled public hearing to better inform the public, so that they have an opportunity to weigh in.

Reynolds: Thank you for asking that. What I would like to see as a citizen is I would like to see our representatives out in the neighborhoods. I would like to see town hall meetings, go out to the HOA meetings, make a presence, inform the citizens of what's happening down here, because when I walk precincts, last year, I learned there is a lot of seniors. They are not on computers. Some of them don't drive. They don't have a clue what's happening down here and they have the right to know and it's -- the City Council and the city staff's job to keep that information going out to them. They don't all have

access. So, please, keep that in mind, too. But they don't know this is happening and I -- I would bet -- if gambling was legal I would bet the majority of them don't have a clue about any of this right now. So, please, give the right appearance, be ethical, and do the right thing. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Question for Phil. Phil --

Reynolds: Sure.

Hoaglun: You know, one thing that this does, as this chart shows, is this would enact the ordinance for the legislature's desire to have us in districts to be representative of the people in 2023. By delaying it to 2025 that means we won't be doing those things, because you will have people in districts that they don't live in representing them and there is no incentive to be there, because they aren't going to be elected there. So, why would we not want to have representation by the people sooner, as opposed to later, as the legislature intended?

Reynolds: Again, the general public -- it doesn't matter to them and, Mr. Attorney, correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe that the mandates for districts started from a lawsuit -- or lawsuits to states and -- and it came from some attorneys in Texas and it started with some discrimination lawsuits requiring cities to break up into districts and now it's kind of making a wave across the United States. Is that -- is that information correct?

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Member of the Council, I have no idea. When the legislature discussed this in 2020 there was not a conversation about another state. All they talked about over and over again was they were elected in districts and they felt that cities over a hundred thousand people that had at large representation, which all cities had at that time, wasn't fair to the public. That the public elects legislators by districts, therefore, cities of the size of a hundred thousand or greater should do it that way. That would be more representative. There was no lawsuit in the state of Idaho over this issue. There was people in public that weighed in about it, but there wasn't a lawsuit and whether or not another state lawsuit -- certainly isn't going to drive anything we are doing in our state. Another state -- laws are different. The requirements are different. The rules are different. So, that wasn't really any conversation at the state level I'm aware of. All of it was they are too large to have one person, essentially, in theory, representing 1/6th of a hundred thousand people, when the legislative districts are nowhere near that size. So, that was their focus. They are elected by districts, then, the city representatives should be districts as well.

Reynolds: Okay. Well, I can't speak for Idaho, but I can speak for the state that I moved from. In the past at large worked out very well and we may find in the future -- I don't -- I'm not going to predict the future, but we may find that what districts create is little mayors. A mayor for this district. A mayor for this district. A lot of fighting over funding. It's -- it was difficult to get along. It -- it created problems from where I came from and -- and these are small towns that -- that had this. So, something that came in -- and -- and that's why the state that I came from was required -- the cities were required to break up into districts. Maybe -- I'm just guessing. Maybe Idaho jumped on board before the lawsuits got here. That -- that's a possibility. But I'm asking the City Council tonight to do the right thing and -- and present an ethical image to the citizens and -- and just go with what you approved the first time, because when you start making changes --

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Reynolds: -- it gives bad appearances.

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Phil, I -- I shared the same thoughts, really with regard to districts. I wasn't a fan. But it's the law, so it's something we have to do. But my -- my question to you is -- you mentioned gerrymandering. Could you provide clarity of why you think that the appearance of doing this would be gerrymandered?

Reynolds: Well, that's -- that's a political term. That's a political term.

Bernt: I know what it is. I know what it is.

Reynolds: And as people find out that -- you know, as citizens find out that's going to be the projected image. I'm not saying this is gerrymandering, but it -- it's a term that the public, as they learn, will -- will toss that term around. Good or bad. It -- it's a term that people know in their heads and it's -- it's -- again, are -- are you projecting a proper image by supporting this, making changes after you have already approved something. So, please, do the right thing and -- and just -- just leave it as it is. We will move forward. It will take some time, but I think it will be better on the long run.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: So, Mr. Reynolds, I appreciate you being here and -- and this is a big part of it. So, to the point of anyone in the public having some misperception on the process, you are one of the folks who is involved and -- and knowledgeable about the process that was utilized in the -- the distance and detachment of the Council and Mayor to it. I think that -- so, one, thanks for being here, but, two, as you go forward and you might -- if you talk to folks in the community and if -- and if they don't have the information that you have, we encourage you to share that about the process utilized to -- to create a fair -- it's not

gerrymandered, it's detached from any of our input. We always struggle trying to get folks involved and informed like you have, so I encourage you to do that and try and share that, so if folks say something with misinformation about how we got this far, that you will be able to speak up and help correct them as you watched it -- early in this process we went to great lengths to try and -- the seven of us discuss how this being forced upon us -- I don't think there is any of us that wanted to do this. None of us -- we have all been here a long time and Meridian is one community; right?

Reynolds: Right.

Borton: And even with -- quite frankly, I don't think districts change a thing for that. The mentality is we represent the city as a whole, each of us. At least that's the way I think for sure. But we were adamant from the start to be detached and to empower this community to go do basically an equal protection math equation and that's it, subject to the rules of the state that they forced upon us, quite frankly. So, I just encourage you to, one, keep involved like you are, but help us share that message to folks in the community. If you hear misinformation we are, obviously, doing the same thing. I thought, quite frankly, I don't want to hear -- I get cautious when you use the word ethical. I -- I don't think anything's unethical, quite frankly, about this. Councilman Hoaglun said it really well. Really, it -- it's a -- one minor change in the process that creates a quicker accountability and quicker voice to the folks within a community to directly elect their representatives. So, I thought what Brad said made good sense as far as the explanation for it. But I appreciate you being here and -- and -- and, hopefully, continuing to communicate with folks about the process.

Reynolds: I will continue my communication and in a positive manner, as I always do. But, again, the public doesn't know. Ninety-eight to ninety-nine percent are not going to be aware of any of this. So, the districts -- at this point and going forward for many of them are irrelevant. They -- they want proper representation and they want -- they want their streets paved. They want their sidewalks free of debris. No graffiti. Safe communities. That's what they want. They -- they don't want politics. They don't want to be involved in politics. They want a beautiful, clean city to live in and a safe city.

Borton: Mr. Mayor, if I could.

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: The conversation fascinates me. A thousand percent agree. Two truths. This -- this legislation that was placed upon us by the legislature zero citizens in Meridian asked for it and anytime you can communicate with any of our state legislators about that concern we encourage all of our citizens to do that, to say you really created a solution for something that wasn't a problem, at least in our community. So, we are still committed to represent the city as a whole. No doubt. I got words for state representatives, too. The public wants to see them, too. The public wants to see their elected officials. They want to know what's going on. A lot of them feel uninformed and I -- I think our elected officials have to do a better job at that.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you very much for what you are sharing. As Councilman Borton just mentioned, we -- we agree. We -- we don't -- we don't want the potential appearance of division that this could create. But in addition to communicating with your elected officials at the state level, always feel free as well to write in editorials to the media. We have -- we have had some pretty frequent articles, pretty -- pretty often articles are being written that aren't accurate as to what is being said, communicated by the city. So, don't hesitate to write those as well and your thoughts on this -- this is a big deal, it's going to affect this entire valley and, you know, Meridian, Boise, and -- and Nampa and I know for me it won't change how I will go about things here, you know, in -- in light of just wanting to make decisions -- good decisions for the city as a whole.

Reynolds: Well, I hope -- even if we -- after we break up into districts that you still take ownership of the city as a whole. I hope that continues, because that's really what the citizens want to see. They -- they don't see lines. They don't see their neighbor living in another district. The streets all connect the entire City of Meridian and that's what they want to see, that continuity. So, thank you very much for your time.

Simison: Mr. Clerk?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, that was everyone.

Simison: Okay. That's everyone who signed up in advance. If anyone would like to provide testimony if you would like to come forward at this time. If you want -- you got to come up here if you want to speak, so -- have you state your name and address for the record again.

Elam: Paul Elam. 5127 North Asissi Avenue. Again, sorry, I'm just still learning the process, but it's been a great learning experience and I'm trying to prepare myself for an upcoming meeting. We expect because of a giant apartment complex that is going to be built near our -- our home, so that's why I wanted to start attending. But I was just wondering -- I think this would be addressed to you, sir, but about the law that was passed by the state -- I have only lived here for a year. Is that final, there is no getting around it, because I agree with a lot of the great points made by that gentleman and for me when I -- when I think about it I think the same kind of thing, that, you know, we could have two amazing council members that live in the same district and I hate to lose one, because they already care so much about the city, because of something that the citizens didn't even know was being voted on. So, is there any flexibility or is it -- we have to make this change automatically?

Nary: So, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, so -- Mr. Elam. There really -- there is no change that we can effectuate at the city level. So, the state does carry the -- carry the -- the weight here. They have made this change. We did propose some changes in the

'21 legislative session and those never got approved, so we don't really have a -- a change -- and I don't know if there is any desire at the state level to revisit this particular issue again.

Elam: It would have to be another vote at the state level to say we don't necessarily need that after all -- after citizens get involved like that gentleman was saying.

Nary: Yeah. It's -- it's certainly difficult to change state law without the legislative support and it is very difficult on a lot of issues that can -- for some reason get really divisive to get the change. So, we are doing the best we can. I mean -- and this is just my own personal editorial comment, not on behalf of the city, but I don't think it was accidental that no city in the state had districts. I -- I don't necessarily think that was a desire that was asked from the city level. It really, truly, was a state conversation.

Elam: Yeah. It's interesting. I think it was you that mentioned nobody had ever requested that in Meridian, which blows my mind, but I'm just curious, how many cities were affected by this new law or requirement?

Nary: Three.

Elam: Three. Okay.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: I -- I -- I just have to speak up. Mr. Elam, I -- I just -- to be truthful, this was done -- and since you are new to the city -- politics occur everywhere.

Elam: Yeah.

Hoaglun: The legislature is conservative. Our capital city is less conservative.

Elam: Yeah.

Hoaglun: And this was aimed at them.

Elam: Oh.

Hoaglun: They had a number of Council Members from the same region of the city. So, that's why it does -- you cannot single out communities by name, so they picked the number, one hundred thousand at that time. Now, Nampa and Meridian have surpassed a hundred thousand. So, just to let you know how it works, that's how it happened, so --

Elam: Wow. That's good information. Thank you very much. I -- being new to the process, but starting to be aware, you know, we -- we love it here. Our family moved here

and we are very thrilled to be in this community and so now we want to kind of learn what goes on and I agree with what many of you have said, so thanks you for your time.

Hoaglund: You're welcome.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Don't run away. Sir? First I want to say thank you very much for coming as a new resident to our community. Much appreciated. I just wanted to say that the residents do have -- if residents decide that they want their city to district they do have a method in which they can go about that. So, that's kind of what's being communicated as it's a little bit challenging to justify this law when none of the residents of any of the three communities that were affected were coming to their own cities and saying, hey, really think we should be districted, because we -- and so just wanted you to know that. I also wanted you to know that conversation about this has been going on for about four years. So, this isn't something that is -- the legislators were talking about this in 2018. They passed a bill that said cities over 150,000. That became an issue, because it, obviously, singled out Boise. Then -- then they -- they amended that bill and it became a hundred thousand and so this has been going on. So, it's not that residents probably aren't aware of it. It's been in the news for a very long time. I just don't know that residents really got why they -- it was necessary, because if we are not understanding why it's necessary, certainly the average person isn't understanding why it's necessary. But other cities have really done their best to communicate with our legislators about how it will affect the cities and the residents and -- and our concerns and thoughts about it and -- and don't know that we were -- were really heard in the manner that we hoped we would be, so I just wanted to give you that history, as well as what Bill had shared.

Elam: Yeah. Thank you for sharing that. It's really fascinating to kind of learn how these things happen and -- you know. And I agree with that gentleman that spoke and that I -- I haven't met any citizens that really keep up with what's going on, even in the city level very many. Where we live in our community I just happened that -- my wife spotted a Facebook group that talked about a new development and that's how I got involved, because I thought does anybody even know in our -- in our community that they are going to put this right next to our area, when there is only one lane each direction on this street that can't accommodate 450 new cars every day and -- and so we asked around the community and nobody had ever even heard that that was even being discussed. So, it -- to -- to the gentleman's point, so many people don't really know what's going on. So, it's good to hear and I hope things -- rules like that don't prohibit having great members across the board, just because of some lines being drawn. So, thank you all.

Simison: Thank you. Is there anybody else present that would like to provide testimony on this item? If so, please, come forward at this time. If you would state your name and address for the record.

Hon: Mike Hon. 2134 East Summerridge Drive.

Bernt: How are you doing?

Hon: Hello. Thank you and good evening. Yeah. You know, to Phil's point, I don't think a lot of people even knew the map was being drawn. Like, boom, it appeared; right? From a committee that was created by the Mayor. So, from my perspective, you know, you chuck the dice, you created the map, it is what it is and I think you should just move forward with the map as it is. So, that's that. Thank you.

Simison: Any questions? No questions. Is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony on this item at this time? Or anybody online that would like to provide testimony, use your raise your hand feature on Zoom. Okay. Seeing no one wishing to provide additional comment, Council, I know the intention is to leave this public hearing open for each of the subsequent readings or decision points or if Council wants an off ramp at any point in time from that standpoint. So, do I have a motion to continue this public hearing? Or do we need -- do we need a motion to continue it, Mr. Nary?

Nary: Pardon me. Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, it would be on your August 9th meeting for a second reading automatically.

Simison: Okay.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Some thoughts maybe to continue to -- maybe take some of the public feedback about public engagement. I'm -- I'm not sure what options exist, but particularly hearing from residents that would be impacted in District 1 and 2, if there is maybe some extra efforts the city could take to promote what's going on in those particular areas and invite public feedback from them would be helpful. I also think it's important -- and I may have misheard you when you first presented this, Mr. Mayor. But I was under the impression there was going to be some direct communication to the redistricting commission about this proposed change. At least when I checked in with one to kind of get their feedback they hadn't heard from anybody, so I just would invite that we reach out to the redistricting commission, make them aware of this, and I think also solicit their feedback as well.

Simison: Okay. All right. Then with that we will go ahead and move on to Item 4 -- or do we -- yeah. We don't need to do an additional first reading action. Okay.

4. Public Hearing for East Ridge Subdivision (H-2022-0037) by Laren Bailey, Located at North of E. Lake Hazel Rd. between S. Locust Grove Rd. and S. Eagle Rd.

- A. Request: A Development Agreement Modification to remove single-level limitation on single family residences within Impressive East Ridge Subdivision No. 2 and No. 3 (Village Product Area).

Simison: All right. Item 4 is a public hearing for East Ridge Subdivision, H-2022-0037, and we will open the public hearing with staff comments.

Dodson: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. The applicant -- it's not my project, so I'm here on behalf of Alan just covering, because -- they are requesting continuance, because the applicant team couldn't -- have their availability tonight, so they are just requesting continuance to the August 9th hearing. Assuming they would have requested next week, but we are not having a meeting next week.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor. This is Chris. Also they did not post for tonight, so it was not legally noticed.

Simison: Okay. So, we can't open the public hearing regarding that. It just -- asked me to continue it. So, with that do I have a motion to vacate the item from the --

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: What's our action, Mr. -- Councilman Cavener, if you know. Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thanks, Mr. Mayor. I -- before any motions are made I -- and perhaps we should have maybe chatted about this before we set the agenda. I don't know if there is people that are here that are able to testify and aren't going to be able to be here --

Simison: We can't open the public hearing.

Cavener: I understand that we can't open the public hearing, but I do think that we could poll the audience about the availability of being here at a future meeting. I think that -- for me, before we set a date, I want to make sure that the folks that if they are here tonight that they are going to be able to come back to provide testimony at a proposed evening.

Simison: Is there anybody here that was here for this item this evening? Or online if you can raise your hand to indicate that that's the case. Seeing no one -- okay. Mr. Nary?

Nary: So, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, what I would suggest to you is simply move this item to your next agenda. Then the noticing will get done appropriately for it, but we can't really take other actions, since, again, it wasn't properly noticed for tonight.

Simison: Okay.

Hoaglun: So, Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Do you need a notice for that or -- I mean a motion for that or --

Nary: Move it to the next available agenda.

Hoaglund: Okay. So, Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I move that we hold a public hearing for East Ridge Subdivision, H-2022-0037, for August 9th.

Bernt: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second. Is there a discussion on the motion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the item is moved to the August 9th meeting.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

5. Public Hearing for Pickleball Court Subdivision (H-2022-0025) by The Land Group, Inc., Located at 4050 W. McMillan Rd. at the northeast corner of N. Joy Street and W. McMillan Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation of 4.96 acres of land to be zoned from RUT in the County to the R-4 zoning district.
- B. Request: A Preliminary Plat consisting of 14 single-family residential building lots and 4 common lots on 4.58 acres of land in the requested R-4 zoning district.

Simison: Next on the agenda is -- is Item 5, which is a public hearing for Pickleball Court Subdivision, H-2022-0025. I will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Dodson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. As noted, this next one is for Pickleball Court. It is a request for annexation of 4.96 acres of land, which is currently zoned RUT. They request the R-4 zoning district. And also a request for a preliminary plat -- preliminary plat consisting of 14 single family homes -- or I should say residential building lots and four common lots on approximately four and a half acres in the requested district. Now, typically, I don't discuss it, but there is about a half an acre difference of the annexation area and the plat area and that's because this abuts two public roads and zoning needs to go to the center line of the road. So, that's where the additional area is. The site is located at the northeast corner of Joy Street and McMillan, as seen in this picture here. Joy Street runs right along their west boundary and is a public road. The subject four and a half acres currently contains a barn or other agriculture building or two. Previous home

appears to have been removed according to the latest imagery. The subject site abuts two public roads as noted. McMillan to the south, Joy Street to the west. But in the north and east are two existing R-4 developments. Vicenza to the east and Summerwood Subdivision No. 2 to the north. The subject property is designated as medium density residential on the future land use map, consistent with existing development to the east and the north. The proposal for 14 building lots on four and a half acres of land constitutes a gross density of just over three units per acre, nearly the minimum density allowed within the medium density residential designation. So, again, not pushing the density on -- per our Comprehensive Plan. Minimum building lot size is 8,000 square feet, which is the minimum lot size for the requested R-4 zoning district. The adjacent developments are similar density and lot size, which make the project consistent with the existing development. With the existence of Joy Street along the west boundary, subject project should act as a transition towards the higher density approved further west at the corner of Black Cat and McMillan and with the underdeveloped properties in between that. Access is proposed via a new local street connection to Joy Street, noted as West Riva Capri. And there is no access proposed to West McMillan. Access to all proposed homes is from the new local street that ends in a cul-de-sac near the north boundary. No opportunity for a stub street exists, because existing development did not provide one to this property. The applicant is required to dedicate additional right of way for McMillan and widen the paved surface area adjacent to this site for McMillan. The applicant is also required to reconstruct Joy Street as half of a 33 foot wide local street section abutting the site. ACHD has approved the proposed road connections and layout and staff also supports the proposed layout. The subject project is less than five acres in size. Therefore, the UDC does not require minimum amount of open space or amenities. However, the applicant is proposing some open space, which staff has analyzed. The applicant shows three main areas of open space. One, the required buffer along McMillan, an open space lot along the north boundary, which is Lot 12, and an additional grassy area in the southeast corner that's noted to hold a future gravity irrigation pond. The applicant should add an exhibit and more detail to the landscape plan that shows how this pond will be constructed and what it will look like to ensure compliance to UDC standards and there is an existing condition of approval regarding that. Within Lot 12, along the north boundary -- so, that would be this one here -- the preliminary plat notes that there is a pickleball court or a sports court. The applicant requested flexibility in the type of the sports court requested there. Therefore, the applicant -- or I should say they did request that. Staff did modify that DA per the Commission recommendation to modify the DA provision. So, I -- originally I specifically stated a pickleball court, because that's what was noted on the plat. The applicant wants flexibility on what kind of sports court, depending on what they end up doing. At the Commission hearing public testimony was only about the dust mitigation, I guess. There was a neighbor that was concerned with just having the dirt out there and not having it wetted. The Commission discussed that. They also discussed the difference of the height proposed of these homes to the existing and whether the applicant had an intention to match. The applicant -- the actual home builder was here for the Commission meeting and stated that they will try to match height where they can. They also asked are there -- are lights planned around the proposed sports court at the north end and the answer was no and, then, there was also a brief discussion on this project's location in relation to a project on the south side of McMillan

that was denied. They -- Commission specifically noted that the differences were pretty large in both its size, density, and that this has no direct access to McMillan Road. Again, Commission did note -- recommend modifying that provision regarding the sports court and these other things that the applicant requested, which were also noted and so this is what's shown here what -- is what's changed in the Commission recs that were sent to Council. There has been no written testimony for the project before the Commission or after. So, I will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you, Joe. Council, any questions for staff? Is the applicant here?

Thompson: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. Tamara Thompson with The Land Group. Our offices are at 462 East Shore Drive in Eagle. I'm here tonight representing the applicant, who is the property owner, and who -- who is also the home builder. I do have a PowerPoint, but Joe pretty much has all the same slides that I would have for you, so I think I will just go through with his and, then, if you have some specific questions I might have him put mine up. So, before you tonight is the annexation of just under five acres and a proposed zoning to R-4. That R-4 is consistent with the surrounding properties. This property is kind of landlocked. It has existing homes to the north and to the east and public streets on the south and the west. As Joe mentioned, the public improvements to those street frontages are required by ACHD, so road widening and sidewalks and landscaping will be constructed with the subdivision. We have 14 residential lots. They all have a minimum lot size of 8,000 square feet. We have aligned two existing homes to the north and to the east where possible. Some of those are kind of pie shaped, so we can't make them exact, but we have tried to line them up one to one and as Joe mentioned there is not opportunity for cross-access or stub roads, as all those homes are already -- all those lots are already developed. This proposed development is consistent with the existing developments to the east and -- and the north as far as lot sizes. This is logical and orderly expansion of the city and it's consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Our proposed zoning is consistent with those surrounding properties as well. We have read the staff report and agree with staff's analysis and the recommended conditions of approval and we respectfully request your approval tonight. I will stand for questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for the applicant?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Hello. Thanks for presenting this. I just wanted to know more detail about the pond. Any kind of irrigation pond I would just worry about like sitting water, mosquitoes, sometimes they are not done well. Could -- could you give us some more detail about what is intended?

Thompson: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, the pond is in this location right here. This property does have surface water rights and the -- with the surface water rights they

only get water once per seven days. So, we have to create a pond in order to have the capacity for the neighbors to be able to -- we will do a pressurized irrigation system and in order to have that storage in order to -- to hold that so that the people can sprinkler their lawns whenever they want to and not just every seven days. So, there is enough capacity, it just doesn't come very often. There is that limitation. So, we will, with the final plat, have the design for that and we -- we have done the calculations as far as the land area that's needed to have that storage, but the design we will do with the final plat. I don't have a design for you tonight for that.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Along those lines is it intended, then, that there is some type of aeration of the water to prevent mosquitoes? And, then, what is kind of your intended plan? We have one of these in our neighborhood, much to the frustration of mothers across our neighborhood, as our young ones like to kind of climb in there and they get muddy and stuff like that when it's empty. What are your plans to kind of, one, manage it as a safety issue and reduce like the impacts of mosquitoes and stuff like that?

Thompson: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, the -- we -- we design these quite often and this one will have fencing around it, so that it won't be easily accessible by children in the neighborhood and as far as aeration, I don't have a good answer for you on that. If -- if it -- it will -- it will depend on if they can and that kind of stuff. I don't -- I don't know exactly how they are going to design that. But that will be something that -- that we can address and I can sure pass that on to them. But staff, with the final plat, will -- we could have them be looking at that as well.

Dodson: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yes, Joe.

Dodson: Sorry. Did Councilman Bernt says something? I just wanted to clarify that the code does require, if there is going to be standing water, the aeration will be required or some form of it in order to help with the mosquito issue. So, that's why I put in the condition that will take care of that and make sure it complies with code once they come back around with the final plat or -- or building a lot.

Cavener: Thanks, Joe.

Dodson: Absolutely.

Simison: Council, any other questions for the applicant? Okay. Thank you very much.

Thompson: Thank you.

Simison: Mr. Clerk, do we have anybody signed up to provide testimony on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did not have anyone sign up in advance.

Simison: Okay. Well, if there is anybody present that would like to sign up, go ahead and come forward at this time and you will state your name and address for the record, be recognized for three minutes. You will always have that opportunity.

Elam: Thank you. Paul Elam. I live at 5127 North Asissi Avenue and this is actually the property that I came here tonight about. It -- it's maybe one block from our community. We are in Bridge Tower West, which is right there a little bit behind the Walmart on Ten Mile Road. Traffic is already a nightmare on that street, McMillan, and -- and it's funny when you talk about districts, it doesn't really matter -- kind of that gentleman said -- we don't really care which district it falls in, as long as the Council Members are kind of hearing our -- our interests in paving or whatever it is. But currently that -- where they have that plan there is only one lane each way on McMillan and -- and it's very congested. Many hours of the day you can barely even take a left or right off of Joy, which is the street that they indicate where that is, so -- I mean I literally -- we rode our bikes right by there. It's -- it's probably 500 yards or so from where we live and -- and it is very congested and so I would ask that -- as well as other areas that they want to build on -- and there is already another giant community going in about maybe one or two blocks west of there that already has paved streets close to Black Cat. I would ask that the city or this company that wants to put in the development, that they do a study on the transportation impact of that area, because already the roads are very crowded and -- and I'm sure there is a lot of other cornfields that people want to build on, but until they widen McMillan and Ustick and other areas nearby, it's going to be a big problem for the existing citizens that have already purchased in that area.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Elam: So, I ask that they would delay this approval of this hearing until a study is done.

Simison: Thank you. Is there anybody else present who would like to provide testimony on this item? Anybody online, use the raise your hand feature. Seeing no one, would the applicant like to come forward?

Thompson: Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, to address the comments about traffic, as you know, ACHD has analyzed the project and has a staff report that they -- and conditions of approval that they have -- that your staff has, then, attached by reference. So, we have to comply with those conditions as well. With this development we are widening the streets in our -- along our frontage, providing sidewalks in those areas and for Joy we are redoing half of that road section, so there is considerable amounts of -- of improvements that are -- that are going on there. But, then, we also pay our impact fees, which is the system that we are in. So, this -- this project is complying fully with the ACHD report.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any -- Councilman Cavener,

Cavener: Tamara, to this point what's McMillan rated by ACHD with this proposed development?

Thompson: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, I'm not sure what you mean by that. Rated? As far as the letter?

Cavener: Yes.

Thompson: Oh, I don't -- I didn't bring that report with me. Do you have that in front of you?

Dodson: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, I do not. I can pull it up, but I'm -- I know McMillan is a constrained corridor, so widening it ain't -- is not going to happen as far as I know.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Tamara, when you talk about why -- are you -- are you -- are they doing a right turn lane in -- from in front of your property onto Joy or is there just an additional lane being put in on the right side?

Thompson: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglun, a right turn lane was -- was not required at that location. What -- but the edge of pavement is getting widened and, then, a detached sidewalk is -- is being continued. It isn't in front of the properties immediately to the east of us, so it will continue to -- to and through our property to Joy Street and, then, turn the corner and it will be the entire length of Joy as well.

Hoaglun: Okay. Thank you.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: For commentary, so I can get back to you, the ACHD staff report has it rated better than E. So, just for Council and for you -- that's not what I expected to see, so I thought it was important to share that with everyone.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Just as someone who lives off of McMillan, just to pipe up, the traffic situation is so out of control on McMillan and the canal makes it so that widening it is just totally not feasible in the near future. I'm happy to see that this is R-4 and not a bunch of apartments. You know, I would have a lot more heartburn if this was a lot higher density. I appreciate that the lot lines, you know, match up with the surrounding neighborhood, et cetera. But, yeah, just felt like I had to say something as someone who experiences McMillan on a daily basis.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for the applicant? Thank you.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I move that we close the public hearing on H-2022-0025.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. Is there discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I think this is a relatively straightforward small project. Sort of tucked in there. I agree with Council Woman Strader, seeing this as an R-4 is -- is refreshing. McMillan is a challenge for this generation and the next generation, no matter what you put on it, unfortunately. But I think it's a -- it's a well designed, thoughtful plat, appropriately zoned. Appreciate the open space and some of the flexibility on the sports court. I think that's well taken as well. So, it just seems to be a pretty clear cut application. I will make a motion that we approve H-2022-0025 as presented in the staff report of July 26th, '22.

Bernt: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve H-2022-0025. Is there discussion?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I'm in support of this request as well. I -- I always try and look at an application and see how it enhances our community and I think this one does. I think it's important,

because we have had a couple of people provide testimony that are newer to Meridian, just a good reminder -- the City of Meridian doesn't oversee our streets and roads. It's -- a personal frustration of mine is that we have to rely on staff reports from another agency. According to ACHD they view McMillan as better than E and E is an acceptable level of service. We are stuck in traffic. We sometimes use words that start with the letter F, maybe not the letter E, when we are stuck in traffic. So, I sympathize with where folks are coming from, but we have to somewhat rely on the traffic engineers for what that road can handle and I agree, I think this is a -- a well thought out project. It's small. The R-4 is a perfect fit for this part of town, so I'm in favor.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Yeah. The impacts on the roads are -- are negligible for a project like this. A person may not be aware that, you know, a few months ago across the road there was a major project planned, but there were certain items that Council did not agree to on ingress, egress, so other impacts that it had that was denied and it was a very large project. So, we just don't go about just any application that comes before us, we look at them thoroughly. And I also saw that the applicant agreed that they will make sure they are doing dust mitigation and will take care of that concern that a neighbor expressed. So, I'm in support of -- support of -- of this project as well.

Simison: Council, any further comments on the motion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

6. Public Hearing for Pinedale Subdivision (H-2022-0001) by Pine Project, LLC, Located at 3275 W. Pine Ave. (Parcel #S1210417400)

- A. Request: Annexation and Zoning of 1.22 acres of land with a request for the R-8 zoning district.
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 7 building lots and 1 common lot on 1.22 acres in the requested R-8 zoning district.

Simison: Next item up on the agenda is a public hearing for Pinedale Subdivision, H-2022-0001. I will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Dodson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Last project tonight is for Pinedale Subdivision, located just east -- I guess the southeast corner of Chesterfield No. 2, just west of Ten Mile Road.

The request before you tonight is for annexation and zoning of 1.2 acres of land, with a request for the R-8 zoning district and a preliminary plat for seven detached single family building lots and one common lot on 1.2 acres. There has been some miscommunication about how many lots, because originally this was proposed with 12. Actually, it was proposed to me at 15 and I said good luck and, then, we got it down to 12 and, then, we got them down to ten and, then, nine and now we are at seven. This was remanded from you back to P&Z with the seven lot subdivision, which is now before you tonight. The -- as I noted, the applicant has revised the plat multiple times to address current concerns voiced by both staff and neighborhood, as well as the Commission previously. The applicant is proposing to construct detached single family dwellings at a gross density of just over 5.7 units per acre and an average lot size of approximately 4,400 square feet, which previously with the nine lots it was approximately 3,200 and a minimum lot size of 4,000 square feet and it was previously 2,250. The proposed use is a permitted use within -- within the requested R-8 zoning district. Further, all of the existing homes to the west are also part of the R-8 zoning district. The access is proposed via extension of West Newland Street, which is an existing residential local street abutting the west property boundary. It is required to terminate within the site as a full cul-de-sac, to our dismay. The existing access is from a private access across from the Ten Mile Creek that goes up to Pine. This access will be terminated upon development. ACHD has previously approved the proposed access with the additional condition that the radius be widened to 50 feet, which the applicant has said can be accomplished and we will verify that with the final plat. Staff is not concerned that it will be able to fit on the site. Ten Mile Creek runs along the entire east boundary and requires a hundred foot total easement, which is shown on this plat here. They are showing 50 feet from the center line of the creek, which is per the irrigation district 50 feet is on each side. It does encumber the buildable area of the property further, so due to the encumbrances on the property, both the irrigation easement and the cul-de-sac, staff has included a DA provision requiring side loaded garages where possible. This type of design can force -- sorry. Can force longer driveways to go deeper into the site, which allows for more off-street parking for the homes. The design also creates an opportunity for the living area of the home to move closer to the street, as the living setback is 20 -- or, sorry, ten feet and the garage setback is 20 feet. So, overall that allows for more buildable area than is shown on the plat, which are -- it's kind of hard to read, but the little dotted lines are the applicant showing what the buildable area of each lot is. Staff does note that the building lots may not be wide enough to accommodate the required parking pad for side loaded garages. The applicant should continue to work with staff to mitigate these issues and revise the plat accordingly, unless Commission or Council removes staff recommended DA provision that require this. That was one of -- is pretty much the only discussion point by the Commission and staff at the Commission hearing was can we make that more flexible and based on Commission's recommendation I did revise that DA provision to allow the applicant and staff to work, instead of requiring it on all lots, which, again, seven divided by two doesn't work, but minimally three. I revised it to make it a little more flexible of just where it's applicable. Some areas just may not need it and may not be able to make it fit dimensionally. My understanding is that the applicant -- the -- the home builder is going to propose smaller-ish homes in order to help with some of these issues. There was one piece of public testimony -- one piece of written testimony submitted after the Commission hearing

and they just noted the same concerns that other neighbors had, which was just parking concerns in the neighborhood that exist already and a question about whether Pinedale will be part of the Chesterfield HOA as future residents will likely use their open space. That I do not have an answer for, but I will leave that to the applicant and I will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you, Joe. Council, questions for staff? Okay. Is the applicant with us this evening? State your name and address for the record, be recognized for 15 minutes.

Conti: Good evening. My name is Antonio Conti. Address 7661 West Riverside in Garden City. What we have in front of you is a perfect in-fill project. This is 1.2 acres, county property, surrounded by city. The project started, like Joe said, with 15 lots, with an R-15 type of zoning and, you know, after going back and forth in a few meetings we realized that that was not feasible. As it is, the lot right now there is a mobile home on site that was going to be removed and it's been a sore spot for the entire neighborhood. I don't know if you had a chance to go out there. It's a really sad looking area. Installing this cul-de-sac would help with fire truck turnaround. Right now it's just a dead-end street. We provided, as requested, a path, a travel -- a walkway that we connect across the bridge that is the current access to this property and we connect to the railroad right of way, which my understanding is going to be a future walkway for the City of Meridian. So, what we are here to ask for is for an R-8 zoning. The R-8 is the same as the property to the west. Seven lots, with a cul-de-sac, and -- and that walkway access to the common space within the right of way of the Ten Mile Creek. The question in regards to the side loaded garage, the challenge is, you know, like you said, small lots. Some we can do it, I don't see a problem on a couple of the lots, but others will be challenging, so we appreciate that you made it a little bit more flexible to allow us to work around this. If you can remove it at all it would be great for the client, but I understand, you know, flexibility is better than a rigid line. Any questions?

Simison: Council, any questions for the applicant?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Real quick, Joe. If we go back one slide to that. So, sir, I just want to make sure -- the access to the parkway looks like it's in that northeast -- about 1:00 o'clock, 1:30, 2:00 o'clock right there.

Conti: Correct.

Hoaglund: That's what you referenced earlier?

Conti: Yes, sir.

Hoaglund: Okay. Thank you.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for the applicant? Okay. Thank you very much.

Conti: Thank you.

Simison: Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to provide testimony?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did not.

Simison: If there is anybody present that would like to provide testimony on this item, if you would like to come forward or use the raise your hand feature on Zoom. Seeing no one coming forward or raising their hand, would the applicant like any final comments?

Conti: That was easier than the last time. Thank you very much. Any further questions, please, let me know. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I am happy to kick it off. I move that we close the public hearing.

Borton: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I'm happy to kick off the discussion. I think it's a big improvement. You know, having followed the -- the different iterations of this, I think it's a much better fit. It is a -- a little bit of a tricky layout as we have seen and with that, after considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move that we approve -- approve file number H-2022-0001 for today's hearing date as outlined in the staff report.

Borton: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Item H-2022-0001. Is there discussion on the motion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

ORDINANCES [Action Item]

- 7. Ordinance No. 22-1986: An Ordinance (Ferney Subdivision – H-2021-0103) for Annexation of a Parcel of Land Located in the Southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of Section 9, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho; and Being More Particularly Described in Exhibit “A” and Annexing Certain Lands and Territory, Situated in Ada County, Idaho, and Adjacent and Contiguous to the Corporate Limits of the City of Meridian, as Requested by the City of Meridian; Establishing and Determining the Land Use Zoning Classification of 6.304 Acres of Land from RUT to the I-L (Light Industrial) Zoning District in the Meridian City Code; Providing that Copies of this Ordinance shall be Filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as Required by Law; and Providing for a Summary of the Ordinance; and Providing for a Waiver of the Reading Rules; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: Next item on the agenda is Item 7, Ordinance No. 22-1986. Ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's an ordinance related to Ferney Subdivision, H-2021-0103, for annexation of a parcel of land located in the Southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of Section 9, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise meridian, Ada county, Idaho; and being more particularly described in Exhibit “A” and annexing certain lands and territory, situated in Ada county, Idaho, and adjacent and contiguous to the corporate limits of the City of Meridian, as requested by the City of Meridian; establishing and determining the land use zoning classification of 6.304 acres of land from RUT to the I-L zoning district in the Meridian City Code; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; and providing for a summary of the ordinance; and providing for a waiver of the reading rules; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Thank you. Council, you have heard this ordinance read by title. Is there anybody that would like it read in its entirety? If not, do I have a motion?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 22-1986 with the suspension of rules.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 22-1986 under suspension of the rules. Is there discussion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

8. **Ordinance No. 22-1987: An Ordinance (Grayson Subdivision – H-2022-0014) for Annexation of a Tract of Land Situated in the Southwest Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of Section 29, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho; and Being More Particularly Described in Exhibit “A” and Annexing Certain Lands and Territory, Situated in Ada County, Idaho, and Adjacent and Contiguous to the Corporate Limits of the City of Meridian as Requested by the City of Meridian; Establishing and Determining the Land Use Zoning Classification of 3.39 Acres of Land From RUT to the R-8 (Medium-Density Residential) Zoning District in the Meridian City Code; Providing that Copies of this Ordinance shall be Filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as Required by Law; and Providing for a Summary of the Ordinance; and Providing for a Waiver of the Reading Rules; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: Next item up is Ordinance No. 22-1987. Ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's an ordinance related to Grayson Subdivision, H-2022-0014, for annexation of a tract of land situated in the Southwest Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of Section 29, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise meridian, Ada county, Idaho; and being more particularly described in Exhibit “A” and annexing certain lands and territory, situated in Ada county, Idaho, and adjacent and contiguous to the corporate limits of the City of Meridian as requested by the City of Meridian; establishing and determining the land use zoning classification of 3.39 acres of land from RUT to R-8 zoning district in the Meridian City Code; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; and providing for a summary of the ordinance; and providing for a waiver of the reading rules; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Thank you. Council, you have heard this ordinance read by title -- title. Is there anybody that would like it read in its entirety? If not, do I have a motion?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 22-1987 with the suspension of rules.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance 22-1987 under suspension of the rules. Is there any discussion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

Simison: Council, anything under future meeting topics? Or do I have a motion to adjourn?

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor, I move we adjourn.

Simison: Motion to adjourn. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. We are adjourned.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:41 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

MAYOR ROBERT E. SIMISON

DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK