

Meridian City Council Work Session

January 27, 2026.

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 4:30 p.m. Tuesday, January 27, 2026, by Mayor Robert Simison.

Members Present: Robert Simison, Luke Cavener, Liz Strader, John Overton, Doug Taylor and Anne Little Roberts.

Members Absent: Brian Whitlock.

Other Present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Carl Anderson, Jeff Brown, Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

☒ Liz Strader	☐ Brian Whitlock
☒ Anne Little Roberts	☒ John Overton
☒ Doug Taylor	☒ Luke Cavener
☒ Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Simison: Council, we will call this meeting to order. For the record it is January 27th, 2026, at 4:30 p.m. We will begin this afternoon's work session with roll call attendance.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: Next item up is adoption of the agenda.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: There are no changes to tonight's agenda. I move we approve as printed.

Little Roberts: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

- 1. Approve Minutes of the January 13, 2026 City Council Joint Meeting with Ada County Highway District**

- 2. Approve Minutes of the January 13, 2026 City Council Regular Meeting**
- 3. McKay Farm Subdivision Water Main Easement (ESMT-2025-0078)**
- 4. Meridian Office at 146 E. Fairview Water Main Easement (ESMT-2025-0049)**
- 5. McDermott Village Sanitary Sewer Easement (ESMT-2026-0007)**
- 6. Final Plat for Hadler Subdivision No. 3, located at the intersection of Locust Grove Rd. and E. Via Roberto St, on the east side of Locust Grove Rd., by Ben Thomas, Civil Innovations, PLLC.**
- 7. Final Order for Adero Park Subdivision No. 1 (FP-2025-0029) by Laren Bailey, Conger Group, located at 5435 N. Ten Mile Rd.**
- 8. Final Order for Adero Park Subdivision No. 2 (FP-2025-0030), by Laren Bailey, Conger Group, located at 5435 N. Ten Mile Rd.**
- 9. Addendum to Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Meridian and the Meridian Library District for use of Meridian City Hall**
- 10. Addendum to Construction Contract for Urban Irrigation System in Cedar Springs Subdivision No. 3**

Simison: Up next is the Consent Agenda.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: There are no changes to the Consent Agenda. I move we approve the Consent Agenda. For the Mayor to sign and Clerk to attest.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Motion and second to approve the Consent Agenda. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the agenda is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

Simison: There were no items moved from the Consent Agenda.

DEPARTMENT REPORTS [Action Item]

11. Request from Mr. Adam Markowich for Connection to the City Sewer System Outside City Limits at 2832 E. Leslie Dr.

Simison: So, we will move on to Department Reports. Item 11 is a request from Mr. Adam Markowich for connection to the city sewer system outside of city limits at 2832 East Leslie Drive. Mr. Radek.

Radek: Mr. Mayor, Council Members, yeah, this is another request to connect outside of city limits. This one's a little different. I have worked here 20 years and it seems like there is always something different coming up. So, I guess that's a good thing. The -- the -- the issues that make this one different are, first of all, the fact that -- I don't have an agreement with me, so this one, provided you approve this -- if you approve it we will come back with an agreement next week and the primary reason I don't have an agreement is because of time. I wanted to get an answer from Mr. Markowich and the second reason -- this one's a little different -- is because of the compelling health or safety reason. Generally when we have these requests they are because a well has failed or a septic system has failed or ACHD has taken out somebody's well or septic and the person's without them. In this case, again, different situation. Mr. Markowich is doing a renovation on his property and he is in the -- on Leslie Drive, which is in the Carol Subdivision, which half of those lots are annexed, half of them are not. Sewer and water were put in in 2004. The city put them in. It was part of an agreement we did to get sewer through that -- that development and water and sewer are both available there. Mr. Markowich intended to connect to the city, but in his renovation project was not aware of our city code requirements and -- and just, you know, found out through Ada county that he was going to have to either connect to the city sewer or expand his septic system and so now he is in a kind of a situation where he is -- he is all permitted and ready to build and needs to move forward one way or the other and we believe that it is a compelling health concern that the only option for Mr. Markowich at this point is to expand the septic system if we don't allow him to connect to city water or sewer and we think that the expansion and continued use of septic systems in an urban environment is a health concern. So, that's the -- that's the difference about this one. It's the -- it's -- that the health concern is kind of -- it's our health concern and the other residents' health concern that we are talking about. I think it's -- the more I think about it the more I think it's legitimate and the request is to hook up the sewer -- now, legal -- legal reviewed this and thought about it and we talked about it this morning. In their opinion is, you know, if Council approves this request Council should approve the request to connect to sewer and water and, then, we will do an agreement to -- to require annexation -- or application for annexation in a certain amount of time, address the well on site. The reason being is that when you are -- you have somebody connect to sewer it's -- it's hard to know what to bill them and it's also hard to control -- water you can turn off and -- and when they are hooked to water and sewer you know how much is going in, so you know how much will be coming out. So -- so, the recommendation at this point is that City Council allow Mr. Markowich to hook up to water and sewer immediately and we will do an agreement to require him to apply for annexation and he

is available to correct anything that I said that wasn't quite right or answer any questions you might have.

Simison: Thank you. Council, questions?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Kyle, so the request that we have here in writing is now changed?

Radek: That's correct, Councilman Overton. I -- I would say the -- maybe the request hasn't changed, but -- but you -- what you will approve I believe -- I'm -- I'm advising Council that Council can change what they approve, I guess, is the -- kind of semantics, but maybe Bill can help me out, but, yeah, he -- the -- the -- the -- Mr. Markowich has requested one thing, but I don't think we are limited to saying we approve that one thing or another. We can alter that and say we are going to approve this with that I think is what we are saying.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, following up.

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I believe in previous conversations that was made clear to me as well what you have stated. I just wanted to make sure, because the request says that Mr. Markowich wants to connect to city sewer and water. I'm assuming we are going to hear from him as well to make the same statement?

Radek: He is available here and he certainly will make that statement.

Overton: Thank you.

Simison: Mr. Nary, do you have anything to add?

Nary: No, you are -- you are right on as to what your recollection is. We recommended both sewer and water for long term of the city trying to manage it. It's much more difficult when there is only one.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for staff? Mr. Markowich, would you like to come and make any comments? I think it's just so Council -- if they have any --

Markowich: Thank you, Council. Thank you, Mayor. As Kyle said I'm just here to request to connect to city services outside of city -- city limits and, basically, what happened is I made an assumption that I could do so without knowing the code. I am a contractor. I have dealt with this before, just not in this jurisdiction. So, I haven't had to

do this exactly. This is going to be my primary residence, so I intended to annex in anyways. So, I guess that's the main gist of it.

Simison: Council, any questions?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Overton.

Overton: Mr. Markowich, just to confirm the item on our agenda said you were just wanting to connect up to sewer, but as you stand here and as we have heard today are you confirming that you would like to change that to hook up to sewer and water?

Markowich: Yes. I -- my understanding is it's required both anyways; right?

Overton: Correct. I just want to hear it from you.

Markowich: Yeah. Connect to sewer and water. Yeah.

Overton: Thank you, sir.

Simison: Thank you.

Markowich: Thank you.

Simison: Kyle, anything additional to add?

Radek: Mr. Mayor, no.

Simison: Council, unless there is objection should we have him bring back that next week, sewer and water?

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Will -- Kyle, will a -- like timeline for annexation -- or I know sometimes we have put a stipulation in the that if it's sold for any reason, then, it has to be annexed at that point.

Radek: Mr. Mayor, Council, Council Woman Little Roberts, we will -- we will require him to apply for annexation within a matter of -- it would be 30 to 60 days, so -- and I don't see any -- the other -- the other departments weighed in on -- on any concerns with annexation. I didn't get any concerns, so I can't imagine anything stopping him from being annexed, you know, in just a few months.

Little Roberts: Great. Thank you.

Simison: All right. Then we will see that back next week.

12. Stratford to Touchmark Transportation Connection Feasibility Report

Simison: Okay. Next item on the agenda is Item 12, Stratford to Touchmark transportation connection feasibility report. Turn this over to Mr. Anderson.

Anderson: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. My name is Carl Anderson, long range associate planner here at the City of Meridian. So, we are here this afternoon to present to you the findings of the Stratford to Touchmark feasibility report. Before we dive in I just want to provide a little bit of background and context on -- on the project area. So, this work is intended to build on the 2019 Comprehensive Plan. My specific area of planning effort which was focused at that time on the Magic View, Woodbridge area. An extract of this summary can be found in today's memorandum through the staff report as Appendix Item B. This specific area was identified for community development beginning with fiscal year 2025 and during which the spring of 2025 the city sought professional services to develop a transportation plan focused on improvements that enhanced local connectivity and efficiency in the project area. Following this process the city selected Kittelson and Associates and Logan Simpson to complete the work, with project kickoff beginning July 31st of 2025, with this study wrapping up in January 2026. Of -- of note, just for clarification as well, this is the final report with the final technical memorandum. I recognize that the draft's technical memorandum is indicated at the heading there. This is the final understanding that there will be some potential corrections throughout -- for technical corrections and with that I will turn it over to Nick Foster and Brooke Green with Kittelson and Associates to present the report.

Foster: Great. Thank you, Carl. Mr. Mayor, Council Members, my name is Nick Foster. I'm a principal planner with Kittelson and Associates and joined here by Brooke Green as well. As Carl said we led this study for the city, along with our partners at Logan Simpson. Carl, I think I'm going to have to have you flip through the slides.

Johnson: You can control with the keyboard on the arrows.

Foster: Oh. That is not working right now. Yep. Thank you. All right. So, today we will go over the project's purpose, generally what we were trying to accomplish with it, what we found in our analysis and a review of, you know, existing conditions, looking at future land use opportunities in the area. We will get into the different connectivity alternatives. We evaluated our assessment of them, opportunities and challenges related to them and, then, we will talk a little bit about potential next steps for the city and its partners. So, again, the goal here was to look at how can we improve connectivity in this area of Meridian to, you know, reduce stress on those major roads, particularly Eagle, Locust Grove, Franklin, to improve emergency response times in this area. You don't have a lot of connectivity through there as we will talk about later.

Generally enhance quality of life in the area. And, then, really, one of the big drivers for this, you know, coming out of that Comprehensive Plan was to support economic development in this area where you have got a lot of similar uses on either side of the area or synergistic uses with your med -- medical facilities on the other side -- you know, with St. Luke's east of Eagle Road. ICOM, ISU on the west side of Locust Grove Road. And, then, you were just talking here a moment ago about water-sewer connections. You know, we are looking at an area right now that is on aging well and septic infrastructure and so city staff have had concerns about public health in the area and so thinking how could development and transportation infrastructure help facilitate the extension of public utilities through this area. On the screen now is the study area for this project. We had two different study areas. Most of this presentation we are going to be focused on this -- or what we called the focus study area, which is really looking between Touchmark and Eagle Road, but we did also look a little bit at opportunities extending further over to Meridian Road and over to Touchmark -- I said Touchmark already. At Stratford to Eagle. But, then, we also looked all the way over to Touchmark on the east side. We engaged stakeholders throughout this process, including ICOM, ISU, West Ada School District, St. Luke's, city staff and some other groups with interest in the area and this figure here sort of summarizes known challenges identified through that process of meeting with those stakeholders, as well as our own previous assessments of this area through the Comprehensive Plan or just examining the area and you can see there is a number of different challenges. On the west side we have circuitous routing going through over to Meridian Road. We had, you know, concerns expressed by the ISU and the schools about traffic calming or pedestrian safety along Central Drive, along their frontage. We have congestion concerns at, you know, major intersections with Locust Grove, with Eagle Road, going between Locust Grove and Eagle, you know, as you are all well aware there is not a great direct connection from Central Drive all the way over to Eagle. That's one of the big focus areas here and people are cutting through Woodbridge to get -- make that connection right now. They have gone through some traffic calming studies in the past with ACHD. They have qualified on technical criteria, but haven't been able to muster the support to -- to actually implement it and, then, St. Luke's has concerns on -- related to their campus as well. Our partners at Logan Simpson did look at the land use analysis. They were the ones who led the Comprehensive Plan about seven years ago when that was done and what they identified -- you know, the Comprehensive Plan really envisions for this area is, you know, on that southern end more greater mix of uses; right? There was talks during the Comprehensive Plan and through some of these discussions in particular about future employment in that area, recognizing that you have got all this -- all this medical and -- and other facilities in the area that they are -- you have this big gap of low -- currently low density residential in between, without much in the way of connectivity and so if you look through the report in the memorandum they have more details on housing and land use projections based on this. All right. We initially developed five different alternatives for that primary connection between Central Drive and Eagle Road and we screened them looking at their impacts on land use or potential to support future redevelopment in the area, how well they might perform from a transportation and utility extension perspective and, then, what might be their impacts be or the feasibility of construction be in terms of right of way impacts, impacts to

existing parcels, housing, et cetera. So, we have this big map here that shows the five different concepts. You can see concept -- the -- going from north to south we had a concept day shown there in green, which uses entirely existing roads. You know, challenges with that. That's what's there today and, you know, there is -- that's not working well in regards to transportation connectivity and doesn't do much to support the economic development or the infrastructure concerns related to public health on the southern section. Concept B is that dashed blue line that runs straight across just south of the Magic View Subdivision area. An improvement on what's there today maybe, but still not quite getting all the way there from a transportation perspective or supporting economic development to the south, but does have fewer impacts in the south and, then, we have concept C, D and E, which are all shown in the southern section in that purple, brown and kind of red -- reddish color, which do run through that existing lower density county enclave area and provide that more direct connection to Central Drive and generally do a better job of supporting potential economic redevelopment area, which I think are some of the key goals of this project. So, we move forward with those. You will also see on the map we have -- on the east side of Eagle Road in blue we have a color that shows what is currently a proposed collector level roadway on the ACHD master street map. It's dashed across the existing St. Luke's Drive, because that does a private road, not an ACHD road today, so for it to become an ACHD collector they would need to take ownership of it. And, then, the north-south connection doesn't exist today and it's just a dashed line on the ACHD master street map. And St. Luke's through this process has expressed, you know, some surprise at seeing that I think, too, and it's I think interested in further engagement with ACHD to talk about their plans there, but that is one of the -- one of the potential next steps here. On the west side you will see we also -- west side of Locust Grove you will also see we evaluated some other potential connections and ways from Central Drive over to Meridian Road as part of this process, too, and so coming out of that screening what you see here on the screen now is where we landed with our three kind of preferred concepts that we spend most of our time on. So, they are C, D and E for the reasons I described in the last slide. They are much more direct from a transportation perspective. They provide new infrastructure through an area that is admitting for redevelopment in the Comprehensive Plan and so, then, we have those -- we will focus primarily, again, on that section between Locust Grove and Eagle. You will also see we do have some other options on the west side to, you know, maybe an extension down on the southern side of Central Drive there around the ISU, ICOM area as a potential way to increase connectivity in that area. Likely expensive to complete that with the connection across Locust Grove, but shown here as something to consider in the future potentially. We also looked at different ways of how could you improve the routing over from Central Drive over to Meridian Road and Main. Ultimately you will see on the next screens we -- we -- we landed on a preferred option of maybe realign Central Drive to create a more direct connection where it comes across Stratford Drive today and, then, routing people still up to -- up through Corporate like is done today where you have two different intersections, one with Main, one with the Meridian. It's a greater capacity to continue handling traffic versus trying to funnel another extension of Central Drive straight through to that existing, you know, multi-legged intersection where the couplet comes back together. So, this figure here shows a more detailed look at Concept C. What's shown in green is what we have identified

as a preferred routing. This concept mostly uses existing roadway through that area between Locust Grove and Eagle Road, which limits the amount of right of way it might need. The flip side is it also means that -- it goes along a lot of -- you know, with a lot of front-on housing; right? So, that has potential impacts, obviously, to the people who currently live there. It's on the northern area there. Again lots of existing homes already. Maybe does limit the potential that redevelopment is going to occur in -- or be as attractive in that area to catalyze the road development, too. So, maybe a little less benefit from that perspective. But if you were doing this as they say a public project, most of that roadway infrastructure is already there. But, yeah, that -- that -- currently it's still a circuitous type of alignment, so not the most direct from a transportation perspective. Does limit development potential and that existing roadway is not up to current ACHD collector standards, so you would have to still widen it out, even though it is an existing road. There would still be impacts even if you were to build this as a public road project. Concept D we call it, the Central Drive extension, is just a straightforward push right on through. This is our most direct concept we evaluated. It provides some good opportunities for potential for a larger scale redevelopment, you know, if someone were to assemble parcels along this corridor and also I believe was the preferred concept in the Comprehensive Plan, too, several years ago. You know, if you were doing this as a public project you would have greater construction challenges, because you have to build more roadway, but, again, there is greater redevelopment potential with D than there is C. A little too far. Comprehensive -- then finally E. This was another alignment evaluated in the Comprehensive Plan. This one our land use consultant believes is attractive for redevelopment purposes, because it runs right through that commercially zoned -- or not -- the commercial area shown in the future land use map. You also have, you know, freeway visibility if you were looking for those types of uses. So, you could see, you know, market driven development potentially, like in this type of alignment because of that visibility, if it's that type of development. It's not quite as direct as that last concept we were just reviewing; right? You have to go south to then go back up north again. But it does also have -- maybe this -- does have lesser impacts to existing parcels than Concept D there, because it does run away from a lot of existing homes. So, some trade-offs there in terms of its transportation connectivity and development potential. So, finally, we did a high level assessment of these all, looking at different criteria and what we found is that generally from the -- what we are trying to accomplish, you know, here what the -- the hopes of the city were for this type of connection really to redevelopment and improving transportation connectivity. We get the best performance from Concepts D and E. Potentially the best overall from D, but, again, E -- depends on type of development coming into the area. Obviously, there is trade-offs, then, within a new roadway required or amount of approved roadway. You know, more significant with D and E than maybe Concept C was, but D and E generally performing better from the -- the stated goals of the project. So, to wrap things up on, you know, next steps from here, then, I think Carl will close it out with some final thoughts here after I do and I would love some questions from the Council, but would be working -- you know, assuming this goes forward with -- as a road to be built through market driven development, which is -- is probably a good likely way. ACHD, as a general rule, doesn't build new collectors itself, it looks for that to happen through the land development process. We will be working with ACHD to get something on their

master street map showing an alignment through here, which will help preserve what the city is trying to accomplish as development comes in or considers the future area here. You know, then, as that goes through there could be more examinations of what does this mean from an intersection perspective, intersection design perspective. What's the best treatment for people walking and biking through here. Traffic calming. Things like that. There will be a lot more other steps if this was to go forward as in a publicly funded project by the city or ACHD, you know, related to actually developing concepts and going through a public engagement process to -- to really vet them. But, again, this type of roadway is typically built in Ada county, you know, through the development process. Yeah. And with that, Carl, you want to close out some thoughts?

Anderson: Yes. Thank you. So, thanks, Nick. So, with that just as a result of this work and the identified next steps staff have ranked and recommend prioritizing the concepts as they are proposed here, C, D and E, in the order above with the preferred concept being Concept D, believing that it accomplishes, you know, most of the objectives for this work, followed by E and C. This ranking is largely informed by the comparative analysis provided in the report and that was also generally consistent with my Meridian specific area plan work from 2019 for the portion of the study area in the Magic View, Woodbridge area as well, though this effort did expand upon that looking further east and west. As indicated in the prior slide, this effort identified several potential next steps that the City of Meridian may undertake to further this work and they may occur in a variety of different options and different areas. It is a large study area and there may be some sections that can move forward while other work occurs. So, for example, looking further west of Locust, maybe one specific portion of the study area and, then, prioritizing areas between Locust and Eagle and, then, east of Eagle as well. So, each of them kind of own -- all have their own potential next steps as well. One point of clarification -- and/or just a note for Council is that there is -- there are multiple -- or at least there were two current development applications within the study area that I just want to touch on briefly just to provide a quick update. So, one of those applications did withdraw just to wait and see how -- what the results of the study were for the area. The other Council is scheduled to hear next month. Staff has worked with the current planner assigned to that -- that application and they provided that applicant with the final report and we do anticipate some additional coordination between now and next month's council meeting. So, I just want Council to know that that applicant team should have the final report in -- yes. But with that I'm happy to -- I would like to turn over for discussion on -- staff would be interested in hearing from Council as far as Council's thoughts related to the concepts, you know, the prioritization of them and the order presented and just, you know, potential next steps. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you, Carl. Council, questions for Nick or Brooke, knowing this is the legislative session. I think she's open for all questions on all topics and all issues. Oh, sorry. I -- I mean -- questions for Nick at this time?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Could we take a look at Concept B again really quick? That's one that I didn't really do a deep dive on, but -- so, maybe a question would be -- talk to me a little bit about B. I know you ruled it out. I think it's -- it's likely because of the right-of-way concerns from what I recall in the report. It's also kind of like a straight shot across that doesn't necessarily disturb some of the existing conditions. I was just curious -- talk to me a little bit about B and why that is not one of their preferred options and, then, my other question was around Concept E it's -- it feels like that's a beautiful option, except for the end of it where it like runs into this one property and kind of does this little like, you know, kind of jets around it.

Foster: Does the jog north there?

Strader: Yeah.

Foster: Yeah. Sure. I will tackle B first. So, B -- some of the key challenges with Concept B is when -- you know, if it's only -- well, no matter how it's built you are still going to have to do a jog north to get to it somehow. If you get, you know, that new alignment through, it's roughly like the post property, you could do it away from Locust Grove, but if you just built the section between Wells and Locust Grove you are still going to have to have traffic use Locust Grove Road to, you know, get off Central, go up and over. So, you still have this kind of circuitous routing using that arterial system that we are -- one of the goals was to get traffic -- not local traffic off of that if possible. Then the second is from a market, you know, development perspective. With that concept, you know, it's up against the subdivision to the north and so you are looking at maybe only development on the south side of the road, instead of both sides, and so our land use consultant didn't feel it was very attractive from a redevelopment of this area perspective. You know, it does go along the back of these homes and, then, you know, you will have some concerns from people obviously of having a road right behind their homes that they didn't have before, too. But just from a potential redevelopment perspective, as well as from a transportation connectivity perspective, it didn't feel it performed very well compared to the other alternatives. And, then, Concept E -- see if I can get a cursor going here. So, I'm assuming the jog you are referring to is this one right here I'm circling with the cursor. Yeah. So, yeah, in a -- we initially looked at this. We looked at having it continue to go along and go up and over to Wells here, just following I-84 the whole way. To do that you would either have to convince ITD to hand over there right of way and allow you to build it right next to their freeway on ramp or you would have to actually blow through this building that's -- the footprints roughly shown here. There just isn't the physical space to get it in without -- and that's a relatively newer building without removing that building. Yeah. Or building directly adjacent to the ITD freeway.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: But technically that it -- there is enough ITD right of way that we could; right? Like is it -- is it workable was kind of one of my questions. Like if -- if -- and, listen, I -- working with ITD we understand it's very involved, but we have successfully worked with ITD on some shared priorities --

Foster: Uh-huh.

Strader: -- and I'm just curious like is it technically feasible to do it that way?

Foster: That's a good question. I think there is technically the space to get it in, but you would -- yeah, you would be right up against their road, too. Yeah. It was -- it's pretty tight. You know, could it be something that was a discussion as you move forward things? Possibly. I think when we look -- you spoke with ITD as part of this; is that correct?

Green: As it pertains to ITD, you certainly could work with them, although you are going to have it but straight to the Interstate and in addition to that I think there is some enhancement opportunities that they are exploring in this space as well that might limit that opportunity to extend that and, then, I also want to add some content to Concept B. So, we did feed -- receive feedback from ACHD, that doesn't --

Cavener: Mr. Mayor? Brooke, I don't mean to interrupt you. Can we -- is there an option that we try to fix the feedback. It is just really hard for me to hear you.

Johnson: Just need to move the microphones away. That's the only --

Green: If I step back is that better?

Cavener: I have no clue. I just -- it's not you, it didn't work with our mics -- I'm seeing maybe separate the microphones apart, is that what that --

Green: Is that better? Okay. Fabulous. Do want to add some additional content to Concept B? What I was highlighting was it doesn't meet ACHD's intersection -- is this just better if I speak out here?

Cavener: I wish I had an answer for you. That is not better.

Simison: Maybe put the computer down.

Green: Something happened when I came up.

Simison: The -- the computer at my house impacts my stuff.

Green: Okay. Maybe that's --

Cavener: My cell phone.

Green: Oh. For the record Brooke Green. So, to what I was trying to add some content related to Concept B is when we met with ACHD and their feedback that they provided, that intersection will not meet their intersection spacing. So, should that concept move forward there would have to be some modifications either to their policy itself or to the actual plan, which could limit -- you wouldn't necessarily have that opportunity to go through. It would probably have to be right-in and right-out. So, I just wanted to add some content to Concept E.

Foster: And based on my quick check again on Google Earth you could fit a road in, but you are going to be directly up against that building and the ITD road, so -- yeah. It would be technically a challenge at that point. Yeah. With no room to spare for utilities or anything.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: One question I have -- in terms of utilizing market forces to bring the redevelopment dollars and interest to this spot, you mentioned that Concept E might be more attractive from a commercial exposure point of view, but from the future land use map and what we want to see there, do you -- outside of that if we went with what staff was recommending with D, does that bring the kind of redevelopment attraction from your experience that people would see this as an attractive sort of connector through here that you would -- you would start to see that? Because I'm kind of curious just thinking through what kind of projects are coming here and I can't remember if the future land use map -- is it commercial? Was it mixed-use? Because I'm trying to think what are we trying to bring here? I know we have got some residential interest here, but are we trying to look for some commercial, some office space? I mean I'm just trying to see like what -- what concept would actually bring us the type of interest and development we are looking for.

Anderson: Sure. I can answer at least a portion of that Mr. Mayor, Council Member Taylor. So, the Comprehensive Plan was updated as a result of the my specific Meridian area planning work from 2019, which designated much of this areas mixed-use neighborhood. So, it does envision some residential, you know, with some employment and neighborhood serving uses through there, envisioned potential linear parkway or park amenities as well in the area. Really looking at, you know, enhancing that connectivity between the east and west portions of the project area.

Foster: Yeah. Yeah. Mr. Mayor, Council Member Taylor, yeah, what you see on the screen here, the green is that mixed-use neighborhood and what's in red is the commercial. Yeah. Our land use consultant felt pretty strongly about both alternatives D and E having their benefits. They are just slightly different with what they might provide in terms of -- yeah. One provides that freeway visibility, which is nice, but with D you get that straight shot through. You could have development on both sides of it. It

runs right through your mixed-use neighborhood. You could create, you know, more of a boulevard type feel even if you wanted to.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor, follow up.

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Is the -- the -- the intersection there on Locust Grove where this is proposing, is that already at a satisfactory level or would that need to be redone; do you know? That might not be a question for you, but --

Foster: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, Council Member Taylor, we did not do an intersection analysis there. I would guess most of it is operating okay, except maybe during some like peak -- of the peak times with that northbound left-in probably during the school -- school times, because you don't have a ton of demand coming from the east right now. You would want to really look at it when you were putting a road through as to what -- how that would need to function. ACHD does have a roundabout there on their master street map in the future, but, again, that would be re-examined as part of any major -- major development in this area.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Nick and Brooke and Carl, thank you for doing the work you have done on this. My concerns are a little more current. I want to come up with a agreed upon -- whether it's one or two or all three preferred routes, but in such a manner that we don't make mistakes that we have made in the past where we decide on a preferred route, but we have current applications that could possibly take one of those preferred routes off the table and I guess my biggest concern is -- I know we are not discussing that project tonight, but I want to make sure that as we do work through this is that idea of what these preferred routes are going to be something that would have to be met by those applicants -- any applicant, so we prefer these preferred routes and don't lose them in the future. Does that make sense?

Foster: Yes, it -- Carl, do you want to -- or Brian.

McClure: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Overton, the -- the best tool to preserve for corridors that align with the city's Comprehensive Plan is to include them on ACHD's master street map. That -- that allows both ACHD staff and city staff to ensure that when the development comes in they are not negatively impacting that or easily removing them as -- as viable options in the future. I do want to note, though, that even -- even when it's on ACHD's master street map decision makers have in the past still allowed alternatives that have sort of done that. I say really the -- the best way to make sure that we aren't undoing potential work in the future is to make investments of some sort

into that corridor. That doesn't necessarily mean infrastructure improvements, but having -- having a leg in the game.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, follow up?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I appreciate that, Brian. Again my concern is I -- I have seen us do it in the past and we didn't do it intentionally, we did it because we had desired routes we wanted to have the city build and, then, we allowed developments to go in and take those off the table and I just want to make sure as we are looking at this that we -- we are doing all the work necessary to make sure that we are preserving these preferred routes, because if all we do is we stop at what we are doing tonight and we haven't got that on the ACHD street map, then, I guess we are still leaving that open for future development to take away our preferred routes; is that what I'm hearing?

McClure: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Overton, yes, in itself. If it's not on ACHD's master street map and we are not actively doing stuff out there, whatever that may be, then -- then, yes, it's -- it's potential that it's all for naught. We should do something even if it's -- we should do something.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, one more follow up.

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I guess this is also the rest of the Council. I love to see us -- I think they have done a fantastic job in giving us alternatives for preferred routes. I really like the looks of D and E. I think I agree with your analysis. I'm not sure if D or E -- I know E doesn't line up with Wells Circle, the stub street that comes back right now, and I don't know that D lines up with Wells Circle. It was a little hard -- with my eyes looking at this screen it was a little difficult for me to see if this preferred route in D is actually going to be north of the current Wells Circle that feeds into the commercial area now and, if so, then, I think it would definitely interfere with the potential application coming before us.

McClure: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Overton, you know, what you are not seeing here is, for example, future intersection configurations. There would have to be an intersection configuration there, just like we know Central and Stratford is an issue, there would have to be intersection improvements there to eliminate conflicts and improve connectivity and flow through there. We have to do something at Wells. That -- that's just not the level of detail that this study went into. It's understood that we aren't -- those things are needed. This study isn't doing that yet.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, one more follow up.

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: So, it sounds like we are not quite done. We have done a great job to this point. We have identified preferred routes, but in order for us to take this all the way home we have to get it to the point of being on the Ada County map to actually make it our official preferred route, so that we don't allow any development to wipe that off the map and put us back to square one.

McClure: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Overton, that's certainly a good way of doing that. It -- it also can be -- we are requiring someone to preserve right of way and that considers intersection improvements where those two lines meet. So, if a developer came in, new one somewhere that hasn't happened out there, and we -- and we talk about this and Council wants to do it, we would say if you want to get a favorable recommendation from the City Council you need to preserve right of way and you need to make sure that intersection works where those public roads meet and, then, considering any driveways or other access points nearby.

Foster: Yeah. And if I may add to that, Mr. Mayor and Council Member Overton, I think -- I do believe C -- D and E both do use Wells Circle as shown on the maps, but as Brian is saying when actually development comes in and it's time to actually fine tune that alignment and how those intersections look, you are -- they are going to want to look at all, right, does that make sense to use Wells Circle after all or do we have -- are we concerned about the site distance or other interactions in that area given its proximity to the bend in Freeway Drive there and so do we actually look at slightly moving alignment a little bit further north and looking at what the intersection configuration looks like then.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Little Roberts: Thank you. Nick.

Foster: Yeah. You are welcome.

Overton: As we have talked about this multiple times over the past few years I think the assumptions always been that Wells Circle would just naturally be that connection coming from Locust Grove. It would come through and connect and I was always a little skeptical that what if that's not and what if that point is actually going to be further to the north and that we need to preserve more of that land to the north for that potential preferred route. So, thank you very much.

Foster: You are welcome. Thank you.

Simison: And I can kind of piggyback on these -- these comments. I will give my two cents on what I think I have heard and what I think I know and what I don't know in the context of this is I think E is going to be an uphill battle. I think until ITD rebuilds Eagle Interchange and decides that they don't need that slip ramp. I don't think that E is a

legitimate concept to consider. Just going to put that out there. I think it could be a secondary concept at some point in time, but if we want to move forward with a concept I don't think we can put our -- our eggs in E and -- if we want a straight route. Yeah. It's -- it's -- it will -- it will bend if that's the -- the one. But I think that a DS route, with an additional E route in the future, might -- might work, but it's going to wait until ITD determines what happens in that area, in my opinion, if we wanted to have the -- the biggest straight thing and then -- and that's my -- my biggest concern with all of this, frankly, is if we don't make this easier than driving through Woodbridge no one's going to use it and we may as well go back to the drawing board or just close off Woodbridge and say -- make it a gated community and don't let people go through there and that -- that's my challenge with every one of the bends in these roads in these locations, because it -- when I look at Concept E I actually say, yeah, we are going to come up on -- we are going to go cut between the hotel and come around the back of the other one and go north of Wells and that's the path that creates a straight route without creating a couple 90 degree turns. But, again, just get us back to what I'm hopeful we are going to get away from over on the other side where we have a 90 degree turn with a left at the end of the school. So, it's like I don't know how I would ever -- could say let's do -- let's do a road that looks just like the one we want to change a mile away. In my opinion. Doesn't mean you couldn't do the one that runs on the back of Woodbridge and swoop it down and take out -- and that's where -- that's where I'm at. I -- I think you have to get beyond the point of following lines of property owners. You have to put in the road that you think works for the long term development of the city and that's uncomfortable. This may not be preferred, but if we don't do that, then, I don't know why we will be doing this. It's going to be enough to get people to come off of -- enter at the McDonald's and take those things just to get them to take on one of these routes, unless it's super fast, because it's not that hard to go through Woodbridge, even with a few of the things they put in there if that's what people want to do. So, that's -- that's to me why I -- you know, I -- I think that the D concept generally has the best straight -- getting people through to avoid a Woodbridge cut through, but where it's located is -- to me it's not on Wells based upon the current configuration of the properties and everything else. It is north of Wells. And if that's not the case, then, we should spend a little bit more time getting very -- very clear on those type of issues before we move forward with any development application in -- in this area. But that's -- that's the feedback I have also given to the team. But I -- if we had to sit down with a couple of people from ACHD and draw these directly on a map and -- and find the -- the solutions with what type of -- are these going to be a roundabout? What is the going to be the treatment? Where is it going to be so we can get to the 95 percent -- so we can actually consider development through this area. I have also expressed at least my personal opinion that, you know, you are -- what's going to be between whatever your road is and the interstate, we know what type of business presence people are going to want. I don't know that that's neighborhood commercial as a land use designation. Frankly, I think the land use designation between whatever -- if we use D use as an example would likely be different between that and the north than to Woodbridge. I think even if we don't put on the map now you have -- a future council is going to see that when people come in to redevelop because the type of people they are going to want to come in and assemble properties and do large scale projects are people that are going to want to have a large footprint that they

want to have showcased and be visible and it may not fit with the -- the -- with respect to the planning team, mixed -- mixed neighborhoods, the field points, because they are like, well, where is -- where is this land use going to be? So, that's just my two cents on -- on -- on this issue, but I think that if we are wanting to move forward with something to look at further, D is the only one I see as a viable option from what's been -- being presented, unless we want to go up along the back of Woodbridge and just circle it down and, then, I don't know what the land use looks like in the future.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Just really quick. I completely agree. I think E is the best alternative. I think Kittelson got it correct. I think our staff got it correct. I appreciate them looking at five different options. I really do. Because that kind of gives us something to base it off of. But before I even read the end of your study I was already sold on D. So, I appreciate the work you have done and that does look like it will be the best one going through.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Yeah. I think -- like how you said, we don't want to create this awkward circuitous sort of route that we are trying to -- that we already kind of have and so I was also thinking something more direct would be -- would be beneficial. I -- I really think that this part of Meridian is going to be -- have a really interesting future with ICOM, the ISU, annexation to the north of that, what do you do there? I think there will be a lot of interest -- there is a lot of opportunity, but I do worry if we kind of mess it up it's just going to be just a mess. It's going to be -- you know, cars are not going to move through easily or quickly. It's going to actually just -- you know, ten or 15 or 20 years from now it's going to -- future councils are going to ask what in the heck were we thinking and I agree with Councilman Overton, I -- I think there is enough interest already that we owe it to -- to them to -- when they are bringing forward applications to know what -- what to expect from us. We have already had some discussion with some applications in the past about whether this is viable or not and just not knowing what the network looked like. So, I do think we have an obligation to make a decision pretty soon and -- and just sort of recognize it's the best decision we have in front of us. I do think that D probably makes some sense given the alternatives that we are looking at. I mean it's not going to be easy. It's not going to be pain free. We are going to -- it's going to be expensive and a lot of, you know, people's properties are going to be disrupted at some point and that's -- you know, we understand that, but I do encourage us -- I think we need to make a decision and kind of stick with that and so we can -- you know. Brian, I appreciate what you said about, you know, making sure that this got into the master street map planning for ACHD is kind of the most important next step we can do, but we have to signal that that's where we want to go, so -- Mr. Mayor, let me ask a follow up if I may.

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: This might be even a question just for ourselves and for the Mayor. What kind of public input do we want to get though? Do we want -- I mean we can make this decision based on the things we have, but is this something where we want to invite some input -- some potential -- some hearings from developers, from the people that live there to say here is our options that we are working through, what feedback do you have? I think it might be significant enough that we might want to consider getting that input and I'm not sure if that input is going to be part of getting this included into the master street plan with ACHD, but I think we might do well to have some opportunity for the public to tell us what they think of a few of these plans.

Foster: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, and I can certainly start that one and, Brian, Mr. Mayor, if you have any further input. You know, as -- as originally envisioned when -- when we started kicking this off, we wanted to do some digital outreach in addition to some of the stakeholder engagement that was conducted for this, you know, but we -- this -- this is really looking at identifying potential high level at the kind of the concept level understanding that we are going to have some next steps that we need to do. One of these first ones is to update the master street map with ACHD. I would envision that when we get -- get to a point here and we received Council's feedback as -- which has been very helpful and thank you for that. I -- I think we would want to do some level of public outreach to -- to gather feedback on -- on some of that. Thank you.

Simison: Yeah. And that's what we envisioned was once we kind of had a preferred that that's where we would engage, because both the question about what is the land use or the land use, is it going to change, what is the preferred route and treatments that we may want to look at through that process.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor, just to kind of close the loop on that, I -- because I'm thinking we may want to reconsider what the appropriate land use is here. I mean it might be a little bit more of a commercial or not. I don't know. So, I -- I kind of -- because I see this as a very unique piece of Meridian with the frontage and the -- and the freeway and kind of what's going on there. I would kind of like to have that discussion a little bit broader on that. So, thank you for that.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Yeah. Thanks, Mr. Mayor. I -- I recognize I think kind of the goal that you are trying to achieve in terms of let's -- let's narrow the path before we present to the public. I -- I think it is really important, though, that we get really strong public buy in on what I think is the preferred option, but I -- I guess I go back -- they have been stakeholders and vocal on this and rather than us saying we have figured it out, here you are, maybe there is an opportunity to say here is the options that we are considering, we -- we like D, but I think to give them the opportunity to weigh in say, no, no, we like D, too, or for whatever reason we would prefer C or, again, we may hear we like E, but we can

certainly lay the case that, you know, A seems -- or E seems unlikely. I -- it will come as no surprise. I -- I'm more supportive of trying to bring those neighbor stakeholders along with us to the conclusion, as opposed to presenting a conclusion to them.

Simison: And I think the challenge throughout all of this is -- and I don't know if there has been much turnover since we went through the -- the comp plan. The people that may implement these roads are not the people they are going to be living there when this happens. It's going to be the development community that -- and it -- if this area ever redevelops. If these people never sell it doesn't matter. We can put all these nice lines on there -- on the -- because we are not talking about going out and asking ACHD to start building these roads. This is -- the future redevelopment of these parcels coming into the city what it is that we want, so I -- I understand it. I also don't think that we are going to get a desire to have any of these roads built by the current residents that live in these properties. I'm sure the residents of Woodbridge would care about which -- and would even give us feedback on whatever options we want. So, I think that become part of the question is are we planning for the future of the city or are we meeting the current inhabitants of these parcels preferred options and -- and it's a balance. It is.

Cavener: You can do both.

Simison: So, I don't think any of this is envisioned if -- unless redevelopment happens that none of this is likely going to occur except for you could make an argument that E is the only one that can -- could potentially occur without redevelopment.

Cavener: Sure.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: I know Council Woman Strader has been trying to get in -- back in to --

Strader: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Thank you. Appreciate it. Just some feedback. I -- I think that D could be the priority if that's kind of what we are deciding. I'm very concerned about not also preserving right of way along E. I understand E is not feasible today and E is probably not feasible even in ten years, but I'm just -- I'm trying to -- if ICOM and ISU end up expanding their campus in like 20 or 30 years and it starts to look like Boise State University and we start to see that kind of a footprint here, I think we need both to make that work. So, I just -- I guess that's one piece of feedback for me. I -- I think, you know, engaging with -- with different bodies to discuss it is great. I think getting it on the master street map is important. If we want to do a public process I'm supportive of that. I'm okay with prioritizing D, but not at the expense of eliminating the preservation of E. I actually think we need to do both. So, that -- that's my feedback.

Simison: I concur with that, that -- if my comments weren't as direct, but yeah. Councilman Overton.

Overton: So, the way I look at this is not that this is the only road, of course, but this is the most direct route that we are trying to preserve initially. I think when we talk about how this would be built out, B, C, D and E all run through that entire subdivision and I'm cognizant of that. All four of those alternatives run through that subdivision. So, it would cause that redevelopment no matter which one of those became the reality and when it was redeveloped I think you would have a preferred route and I think you would have a lot of roads that attach to it and made it -- make it work much like if E ends up being built along with D. I think that's a reality. Now, I have got to tell you that as the prior mayor put me on a task force on this way back in 2017 or '18 and it was Justin Lucas that I sat down with -- with our -- our planning staff. Caleb was there. I remember it. And we talked about what we would do with this area and at that time Justin representing ACHD -- and I'm not going to hold him to it today, but I'm going to keep reminding him he said it, was there is only one route that would work for us and that is signal to signal and that's the signal we have got right there currently and that's the signal at St. Luke's Lane. He says the real trick is going to be doing what we are doing now, the hard work of developing what that preferred route is and how we get there, because we don't know what that's going to look like, but that's eight years ago we knew then it was going to be a ten, 15, 20 year plan at a minimum, because you have got to get the right development to come in and say they want to do it. Since that's happened we have ICOM. Since that's happened now we have Idaho State University with a 30 year build out, already one year down as they are getting ready. So, the urgency is getting greater and we need to start acting to make those preservations and start to put those wheels in motion. But everybody knows I think -- me especially -- that it's been near and dear to my heart that this is a long range development that could be many, many years before we see it come to fruition.

Simison: And while I'm one hundred percent with Justin's comments, I'm also going to say one thing that wasn't listed in here is if you are going -- I was -- if you are going south on Eagle Road and if this road was in, you are not turning at the light, you are turning that out -- you are doing the right-in, right-out, because it's the one that has the -- the -- the -- the straight through that doesn't have the stop, that doesn't have the extra turn in it. So, we can say that in some context, but unless you prevent that movement, that's actually going to be the de facto road that people are going to take to any of these alignments in my humble opinion. Coming that direction. You can't do that going north. Coming -- going north you -- you have got to go to the light. Come the other direction, though, you are not going to go through the light. Sorry. So -- so, Council, I -- I guess the -- the -- the question as we come to the end of this is do you feel at a place where you are comfortable recommending -- examining B -- or D as the primary route, with an E additional concept and forced to continue to work to try to further refine these as best we can, as quickly as we can, with our partner ACHD to actually address these issues and we didn't even talk to the other side of Locust Grove, which I think is going to warrant another conversation as we look down at the connection and with Stratford. Does that help you all -- get you far enough, Carl? Brian? Caleb? Dave?

Anderson: That -- that does, Mr. Mayor. I -- I believe and I -- I believe that gives us some direction. Thank you.

Simison: Okay. Thank you very much. Appreciate it. Council, we are at the end of our agenda. Do I have a motion?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I move that we adjourn.

Little Roberts: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 5:35 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

_____ MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON	_____ DATE APPROVED
-------------------------------	------------------------

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK