

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 8:30 a.m., Tuesday, June 29, 2021, by Mayor Robert Simison.

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

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, we will call this meeting to order. For the record it is Tuesday, June 29th at 8:32 a.m. We will begin this -- today's special meeting and budget workshop with roll call attendance.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: Next item is adoption of the agenda.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I move that we adopt the agenda as published.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

- 1. Delano Subdivision No. 1 Emergency Access Easement**
- 2. Edington Place Pedestrian Pathway Easement**
- 3. New Commercial Building for Eckhardt Companies, Inc. Water Main Easement No. 1**
- 4. Shelburne East No. 3 Pedestrian Pathway Easement No. 1**

5. **Shelburne South No. 1 Pedestrian Pathway Easement No. 1**
6. **Shelburne South No. 2 Pedestrian Pathway Easement No. 1**
7. **Final Order for Midgrove Plaza (FP-2021-0033) by Rodney Evans + Partners, PLLC, Located at 1450 E. Franklin Rd.**
8. **Revised Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Gramercy Commons (H-2021-0022) by Intermountain Pacific, LLC, Located at 1873, 1925, and 2069 S. Wells Ave.**
9. **City of Meridian Financial Report - May 2021**

Simison: First item up is the Consent Agenda.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I move that we adopt the Consent Agenda and for the Mayor to sign and the Clerk to attest.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor, second the motion.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

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

DEPARTMENT / COMMISSION REPORTS [Action Item]

10. **Fire Department: Fiscal Year 2021 Budget Amendment in the Amount of \$10,000.00 for Public Education**

Simison: So, we will move on to the Department/Commission Reports and the first item is No. 10, which is a Fire Department fiscal year 2021 budget amount -- amendment in the amount of 10,000 dollars for public education and ask Pam to come forward.

Orr: Good morning. Thank you for having me this morning. My budget amendment this morning is -- you will see that it's 26,495 dollars. Sixteen thousand four hundred and

ninety-five dollars has already been received from donations that we have received from outside organizations. These are from Light My Fire. It's from our smoke alarm program. When we are doing smoke alarms. It's also for car seats. When we are doing car seats people make donations to that as well. We also received a really generous donation of 2,000 dollars from a resident for -- that wanted it to specifically go towards our CPR program as well. We had assisted her husband and he ended up passing on, unfortunately, and -- but she wanted something for that as well. So, with that 26,495 dollars, ten thousand of that that we are requesting is actually from an MOU back in 2018. We signed an MOU between the City of Meridian and the Light My Fire organization and what that basically stated was that for 10,000 -- every 10,000 dollars that they gave to us -- up to 10,000 dollars for their donation, that we would match that and so that's what we are requesting for today.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I move that we approve the Fire Department fiscal year 2021 budget amendment in the amount of 10,000 for public education.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve the budget amendment in the amount of 10,000 dollars. Is there any discussion? 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. Thank you, Pam.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

11. Police Department: Fiscal Year 2021 Budget Amendment in the Amount of \$27,405.00 for Traffic Team Motorcycle Replacement

Simison: Next item is Police Department Fiscal Year 2021 Budget Amendment in the amount of 27,405 dollars, Traffic Team motorcycle replacement, and we will hear from Lieutenant Ford.

Ford: Good morning. So, this is in reference to -- the Traffic Team has a motorcycle that is up for replacement in FY-2022. That motorcycle has -- well, it needs some significant maintenance to the tune of about 7,000 dollars. So, this request is to amend that and purchase a new motorcycle, that replacement one now, versus in October. What that -- what that will do for us is that will give us -- that bike should be ready in September, so

they can actually get out and use that bike before the weather changes and with that I will stand for questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Move we approve the Police Department fiscal year 2021 budget amendment in the amount of 27,405 dollars for a Traffic Team motorcycle replacement.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor, second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Item 11 in the amount of 27,405 dollars. Is there any discussion? 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.

12. Parks and Recreation Department: Fiscal Year 2021 Budget Amendment in the Amount of \$13,360.00 for Homecourt Staffing

Simison: Next up we have Parks and Recreation Department fiscal year 2021 budget amendment in the amount of 13,360 dollars for HomeCourt staffing. Mr. White.

White: Mr. Mayor and Council, thank you for having me this morning. On May 11th -- there we go. Can you hear me now? On May 11th Council approved the conversion of two part-time positions to one full-time position at HomeCourt. At that time we said we would like to come back and do a second set of the conversion of two part-timers to a full timer. Also during the May 11th meeting we noted that we had hired in the last four years 17 people in those positions. Between May 11th and now we actually lost two more part timers to full-time work and now we have two positions that are open and we are asking that that be converted over to a full-time position at this time. So, with that I will stand for questions.

Simison: Council, any --

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I move that we approve the Parks and Recreation Department fiscal year 2021 budget amendment the amount of 13,360 dollars for HomeCourt staffing.

Hoaglun: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second. 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. Thanks, Garrett.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

13. Mayor's Office: Fiscal Year 2021 Budget Amendment in the Amount of \$7000.00 for the Treasure Valley Youth Safety Summit

Simison: Okay. Next item up is Item 13, which is the Mayor's Office fiscal year 2021 budget amendment in the amount of 7,000 dollars for the Treasure Valley Youth Safety Summit. Turn this over to Mr. Miles.

Miles: Good morning, Mr. Mayor and Members of Council. You have got the budget amendment request in your packet to approve fiscal year '21 budget amendment in the amount of 7,000 dollars for the Treasure Valley Youth Safety Summit cost. As you know we received donated revenues for youth programs from various sponsors and in 2020 there was COVID, so a lot of events did not happen and this request is to propose to use some of those donated revenues for 2021 events. So, we are asking for your approval for that.

Simison: Council, any questions?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Just one. When is it? Remind me when it is. The summit.

Miles: When is it?

Borton: Yeah.

Miles: So, it's currently planned for September. I believe the date is the 15th. It will be at Wahooz.

Borton: Okay.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I move that we approve fiscal year 2021 budget amendment in the amount of 7,000 dollars for the Treasure Valley Youth Safety Summit.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Item 14 in the amount of 7,000 dollars. Is there any discussion? 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.

14. City of Meridian Fiscal Year 2022 Budget Presentation and Discussion

Simison: See how much fun these are when we just pull up these budget stuff and just keep voting on all of them? Let's keep going then. With that let's go onto 14.

(Fiscal Year 2021 Budget presentation not transcribed.)

ACTION ITEMS

- 15. AIA B133 Agreement with Rice Fergus Miller, Inc. for the Final Design and Construction Administration for the Northwest Fire Station in the Not-To-Exceed Amount of \$405,925.00**
- 16. AIA B133 Agreement with Rice Fergus Miller, Inc. for the Final Design and Construction Administration for the Northwest Police Substation/Precinct in the Not-To-Exceed Amount of \$423,975.00**
- 17. AIA B133 Agreement with Rice Fergus Miller for the Final Design and Construction Administration for the South Fire Station in the Not-To-Exceed Amount of \$528,971.00**
- 18. AIA B133 Agreement with Rice Fergus Miller, Inc. for the Final Design and Construction Administration for the South Police Substation/Precinct in the Not-To-Exceed Amount of \$505,076.00**

Simison: So, Council, next item is our Action Items. So, we are to Items 15, 16, 17 and 18. Based upon the conversations we just had I really am interested to see what this

looks like and what it means. So, I have got the chiefs and lieutenants, but maybe -- is Mr. Watts in the room? Before we go into these items perhaps you could give Council an understanding of what does it mean when we approve these from a practical and/or obligatory standpoint -- or before they are considered. I don't want to say before they are approved. Before they are considered.

Watts: From a practical standpoint this just takes us through design. That's all this is. It has a provision for services during construction, where the architects and designers also will -- will provide any bidding information or changes to the bid document addendums. So, that's -- that's including that and through any -- any construction related questions that appear during the build. Of course we won't use those -- you know, that -- it's a placeholder, essentially, for any construction service, because we don't know if we are going through construction right now. We are getting through design. So, it's taking us from our -- our concept design through final design and with this -- this is when you will get your hard numbers. They will be able to provide you with a -- a better cost estimate on the four buildings. Right now you have preliminary estimates. Once they get through this thing they will have a much better construction estimate for you to consider when moving forward and from that point, the way the CM process works out -- as you are -- most of you are probably familiar, at that point the CM would go out to bid with those final plans. They get those numbers back and, then, we enter into our GMP with the CM. That's when we know what the buildings truly are going to cost. So, right now you have a -- a preliminary estimate. They will get through final design, they will give you a much more educated estimate at that point. We give them the go at that point, then, they go out and they bid the project. The numbers come in and that's when we bring those final numbers to you and say here is what the construction is actually going to cost us, do you still want to move forward. So, that is the CM process for a 20,000 foot level.

Hoaglun: So, Keith, I was going to ask for that -- when -- when would that take place? I mean --

Watts: Which --

Hoaglun: We need to -- we need to approve the budget. So, once the budget is approved -- so, that decision one or two may move forward. And here is where I'm going with that is take police substations, for example. We may decide that we need to just do one, for example. Someone's trying to call me right now, of course. We want to do one, but is it worthwhile to do design for both? However, if we do one we learn from that and, then, in the future, say a year later, there are going to be some tweaks. It -- do we need to make that decision about one or two before we do an agreement?

Watts: We don't have to make a decision either at this point. Right now we are just doing design. So, we are giving them -- there is four contracts for the four buildings to get through design and it makes sense to me -- especially with the substations. They are extremely similar. So, I would -- you know, it makes sense to move forward with design, so you can get better estimates on the construction. You will always have that opportunity to decide whether you want one or two and I'm -- from the sounds -- I have been watching

today, it sounds like eventually we are going to do them. So, the design work now is not going to hurt you. If you have to do a tweak or two later on they are -- they are very similar. The only difference really is going to be site work on those buildings, because there is different sites, of course.

Simison: And that was going to be one of my questions is what is the -- what is the harm or risk, since we have shared components, if we don't design both at the same time, does that compromise how we look -- or how we would -- how we would do even one site, if we didn't look at the other one, kind of conceptually, even if not the building, but the site. Does that makes sense?

Watts: Yeah. I -- you know, I can't speak for the architect themselves, but I would think it's -- it's probably not that drastic of a difference and, like I said, the buildings are very similar. Site work is always going to be different no matter what you choose to do. Every -- every site is naturally going to have a different set of site work and site plan. So, you are going to -- you are going to have to do different site work for that specific site.

Perreault: So, this is what we categorized last year 600,000 per -- is this coming in under that or is this just a portion of that process and we have had other agreements that have -- you know, so, for example, number 15 is 405,000, are we coming in under or is this not all inclusive of that design process? That's my first question. Second question is in the design process are we considering doing two designs, one in which the structures are designed together, built at the same time, infrastructure is done at the same time, because that -- there is -- not just construction elements to that, but there is design elements to that as well. Landscape, lighting, all of that -- if it's built at the same time it can be designed for the same time. So, are we actually having them do two designs, one where it's -- they are built separately and one where they are built together?

Watts: For the latter question, no, we are only going with two separate buildings. So, there are no plans to move forward with design of a joint facility.

Perreault: I don't mean joint facility as in the same structure, I mean designers are going to have to consider if two structures are built at different times a year apart -- years apart. They are going to have to, then, figure out how to integrate the two -- the two together at a later point in time. It's not just a matter of, you know, oh, well, one -- one is built and the other, there is actual integration that has to happen, but -- so if one -- if one fire station gets built are they designing, then, to build the police station next to it -- a year or two later we have to have -- we have to have a plan for how to integrate those two if they are built at different times rather than at the same time?

Watts: The plan of designing these right now, yes, they would all go together. I mean the idea is the plans will be designed with the intent that we are going to do both of them. It won't make much difference now or later, but you will save some construction costs as you will be tearing stuff up for some of the underground I think if you do it separately. I don't know -- I don't have a percentage or a -- or a dollar amount to give you, but I would assume there is going to be some underground additional work that you would have to

probably rip up and -- and tie in, because your water, sewer and all that is going to tie in together, yes.

Perreault: So, you are saying engineering plans will not change if they are built at the same time or if they are built at separate times, it would be the infrastructure --

Watts: It would probably be at -- that would be some of the tweaking that would have to be done, because right now they are not just -- they are not -- they don't have plans and specs with -- if they get through with this and they do these four buildings for us, they are not going to have plans and specs designed right now to say if you do them at separate times you are going to have to do some tearing up and additional work. That would have to be some additional specs put together.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Watts: Because there is all -- you -- you know, they are not contemplating doing so. They are contemplating doing it all at once. If you do do it twice there is going to be a small percentage of work that would have to be done by the architect. I wouldn't think it would be drastic, but, yeah, there would be some work.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: You know, we are looking at 1.86 million dollars between all of these contracts. I mean that's a significant amount of money. I guess what is the harm in not approving these and waiting until Council has made a final decision about which stations we are moving forward with? What is actually that's negative from your perspective?

Watts: The main thing is -- yeah. The main thing -- the longer we do push bids out, of course, we get later in the bid year. Worst case scenario they could -- if this could push out to the next fiscal year, because you went to bid in winter. It's ideal. The later in the year that you bid typically the best contractors are busy, they have got their work schedules built, now we are picking up what contractors are left. In my opinion that's -- in my opinion what we have seen in the past -- and it's also in this market we just -- we just did the PD admin remodel -- it's hard to get bids. You are begging people to bid on your jobs and so Kreizenbeck, our CM, had to really do a lot of work in order to get that done and so it was -- that's -- that's the difficulty of bidding later in the year. That's -- that's my main concern.

Strader: Sixty days -- just like two months -- two -- there are two months is going to derail this to the point that it would have to be in a different fiscal year. I have a hard time trying to swallow that, just to push back a little bit.

Simison: It may not -- if you are willing to pay more and, then, you could do it this -- that's the point. You are -- you are -- you may not get people to respond to the bid or if they do it could be a higher cost and, then, I think that's their point. Not that we couldn't do it, it is that you may not want to do it. Months may -- may delay you ten months from that

standpoint. I have already been in trouble from these people for -- not until today, so that they can meet --

Watts: That -- that is a real concern, what Robert stated, and we can do this at any time. There is no -- there is no cut-off date says we can't go out to bid this month or any month during the year. We just know the best time to go out for bid and the best time to start construction, when that is. I'm not talking -- even from a financial standpoint, but my concern is also with a quality standpoint, because we want to get the best quality contractor, so we would prefer to do it at the right time during that year.

Butterfield: Mr. Mayor, if I may.

Simison: Sure.

Butterfield: I might share some information. So, with these contracts there was 600,000 dollars per station. We have already gone through the schematics. So, there is three main phases within that money. Schematic design, design development, and, then, construction administration. So, we have already finished the schematic design, which Council approved for that. This is the design development and the construction administration are the amounts that are here. So, that's the phase -- the next phase of getting to design development, gets us in construction documents, gives us that ability to go out to bid and, then, there is some construction administration. One thing about these contracts, though, if -- I think to answer Councilman Hoaglan's question earlier, if at the decision of Council to stop one of the buildings or both or one precinct, we can, then, stop the process at that time. So, they may only be into design development for a month and, then, if Council decides we are not moving forward with the design or the construction of police precinct number two, they will stop all -- there will be no construction administration and, then, whatever they haven't done in the design development would end. So, even though you are going to the contract, we can sever that, if I'm correct. If there -- if the Council decision is not to go with all four buildings, we can change that. To the earlier question as it relates to the site, the site has been done. We do have that designed, because that was part of schematic design. So, the parking lots, the landscaping, all of that has been in -- in design. We have had those designs and that was part of -- to the Mayor's point earlier, if we decide to do one station on one property and not both stations on the same property, there would be a little bit of an increased expensive, because we would have to do fire, for example, if they were to just do one station and not the police precinct building, fire would still be on the hook for all of the landscaping and probably all of the parking lot, but right now those budgets are split on those site pieces. So, that's why there would be that little bit of an increase. If fire were just to go to a loan on one site location and not both buildings. So, hopefully, that provides a little more answers to some of those questions.

Perreault: So, it is a little easier to track when you have something that you are looking at and you are seeing. I guess I'm still trying to understand if the Council decides to do one at a time, I would assume that these agreements with the nature and purpose of the agreements would have to change, because currently we have asked the -- this vendor

to design as if we are building all four at the same time. So, would we, then, need to go -- for the sake of approving these action items today or not, we would need to go and -- and alter those agreements with them with the intention of -- whether we have all the design done now or not, these agreements specify that we are intending on building and the design is done with the intention of building them all. I understand what you are thinking about the differences in construction and infrastructure. That's not what I'm asking. I'm actually -- I'm assuming that even our schematics and our design will have to be altered if we do them at different times. So, then, how does that affect these agreements that have already been made and would they need to be altered if -- and I -- in my opinion -- my sense is that Council is leaning towards staggering this construction, in which case I don't think we approve these if these agreements specify that -- that -- that -- was it the construction management contract and other elements of it, that -- that the anticipation either in the cost or in the purpose of the contract and agreement is that they are being constructed at the same time. Do you understand what I'm saying?

Watts: I think so. So, if we decided -- if we approve all four contracts and you decide to stagger them and do things differently, they would need to alter some -- some of the drawings and everything. So, yes, there would be a change order to the agreement, because they would have to modify the design, because the work still needs to take place, whether or not it's half PD, half fire, now we are going to combine it to whatever is being built on that facility. So, those designs would have to be modified somewhat.

Perreault: So, these agreements can be adjusted -- for the sake of timing and not holding these agreements up, they can be adjusted individually and, then, that would come before Council again? I assume there would be some dollar figure change, but -- then that -- we would need to pre-approve the agreement --

Watts: So, yeah, any agreement can be modified to be a change order at any time. We can decide what we want to do. At any point you can give us direction and any significant change order would be brought to you or if you just want to see everything for these projects -- typically we don't bring every change order to Council, but if you want to see anything, we are more than happy to do so.

Perreault: I guess I'm -- I am concerned about -- when I -- when I hear change order in my industry that means this -- but I am concerned about that and the cost involved, but I'm more concerned about that we -- that we are -- that what we are requesting from the engineering firm that -- up front that our projects that -- you know, that we are clearly identifying what we are doing and that decision, obviously, isn't going to get made yet and so, again, to Council Woman Strader's point, we want to respect the timing, but if we are going to significantly change this, are we not just back in the conversation in August about these agreements?

Watts: I don't see a significant change by doing -- by staggering them. There will be some change. I don't see it being significant. I would have to reach out to the architects to get -- get some kind of percentage or an estimate if we did so. I could do that, but I don't really see a significant change in the plans.

Simison: And at least from my perspective, the change would be twofold. You may increase one, but you are going to decrease another, because that was an expense that was going to be the other one. So, you know, I don't know that you are talking about changing the plans unless we decided to do one precinct and, then, decide that -- that was horrible, let's go redo and redraw the plans. That would be where you would see significant -- but not in -- in the type of work.

Watts: I'm thinking -- my understanding would be that we would combine just some of the underground and the landscape into one bid package. So, instead of having different bid packages they will be bid separately, they will go at the same time, but they will have four different bid schedules. We are going to have to combine some of that into one.

Butterfield: If we just go one building, not --

Watts: Correct.

Butterfield: Mr. Mayor, also if I might add, the timeline -- we have been told by ESI that if we do -- again going to bid in January, February, we will get much more advantageous bids than if we do push that out two months -- I mean from what I have been told. If we try to go out to bid -- a lot of contracts are made with subcontractors -- they already have work planned for the summer. So, they told me that by waiting a couple of months to put off the bids could, in fact, cost thousands -- tens of thousands of more dollars for the projects and, again, we can always stop these, even though these -- and those conversations have been had with our architect firms. Once they start going down and Council does decide that they don't want any further design on any of these four contracts, they will charge us for the work that they have done up to that date, but we can stop it and, then, all further work and expenditures of money related to the contracts would cease.

Strader: I guess just a clarification. I mean are we sure that's how these contracts work? Because I was just looking at one of them, as an example, and there is a section for the architect supporting the bidding and development phase and it's a lump sum. It's not like it's based on hours worked, so -- and I guess my other question would be are they going to immediately be bidding these out or why can't -- I just put it to the architect, like they don't have any wiggle room in their timeline? Like we can't tell them, hey, we think we are moving forward, but it's going to take 60 additional days, we need you to compress your design time frame, so you could bid this out and achieve the same original timeline. Like you don't have any ability to compress their timing?

Watts: Yeah. Those lump sums are actually built as they do the service. It's not -- they don't just bill you a lump sum. It's -- it's the -- it's -- we have their hourly rates in those contracts as well. So, they are -- they bill it as they do it. So, that would possibly be an increase in cost. Now, just to be upfront, if we say we are going to do this at different times, well, now, you are going to have possibly four times or two times the construction service and the bidding service. Now, we are not talking huge dollars there, but it would be an increased cost. Just -- just wanted to be transparent there.

Perreault: If I'm hearing you correct, we come back and say you don't want to do all four structures built at the same time (inaudible) station in the south and the station in the north, for example. We won't have significant redesign costs by the architects and we won't have significant renegotiation of construction management fees, which is included -- that's what these numbers are for. We won't have significant changes to that. They won't have to do significant redesign.

Watts: I would defer to the architect. I could ask that question, but I'm not anticipating that whatsoever and the CMP is totally separate from that, so just to be clear.

Butterfield: If I might add. So, right now they are looking at four tracks of four projects. So, if two of those projects cease, then, the money expended for both of those two projects stops right at that point.

Watts: Yeah. So, the -- the sooner that decision is made the better, of course, but then -- then at the future date when you decide, okay, well, now we are ready, let's move forward, they will pick those plans up and continue and finish.

Perreault: I think I was under the impression as we have talked about the benefit of doing them at the same time from -- from a design -- from a cost standpoint for design for this process, I was under the assumption that -- that everything was more integrated than what you are describing, because if they are just being looked at as four separate projects, where are we -- where do we have any -- do we have any savings, because if they are -- if they are all being designed four of them separately --

Butterfield: The savings are actually within the contracts. So, we did realize --

Perreault: Within the construction contracts, not with the design --

Butterfield: Within the design element. The design of Station 8 was significantly cheaper than the design of Station 7, because they realized that it would be a very similar design. So, within the contracts that we have within Station 8 it's tens of thousands of dollars cheaper than the Station 7, even though it's kind of two projects, one is significantly cheaper in the design, because they knew we would recognize --

Perreault: Then if we stop the design on Station 8, do we -- do we forego our possible savings? Because -- because now we have a contract that is for a limited amount of time.

Butterfield: Correct. We would go -- we would forego that savings, because now we wouldn't be doing both of them.

Watts: But I do -- I do believe we have saved -- a lot of that savings is through schematic design, is where they have designed these -- they have done schematics with that in mind. That's where we have saved a lot of the -- the savings comes from. The construction drawings are going to have to -- they are always separate. But our schematic design and getting us to this point is where we have saved a lot of the funds, I believe,

because we have designed them together. Now, you are going to finish the construction drawings, which has to happen regardless. Now, construction is a whole other ball of wax. I can't -- your -- your -- your guess is as good as mine if we are going to pay more -- I would guess yes. If you do this in a year or two it's going to cost you more money, but I don't have a crystal ball to tell you that.

Borton: Mr. Mayor, on this -- to this point, of the four contracts, 17 -- number 17 is the one that I heard consensus to go forward. I'm comfortable approving 17 and I would table the other three and perhaps they come back in a week or two. I think, Liz, your question about -- can the architect compress the schedule in a manner that allows you to hit the bid window? Let's ask that.

Butterfield: I -- Mr. Mayor, Councilman Borton, I have asked that and there is some area -- they did -- their initial estimates were conservative. I would say in a recent conversation that I had with the architects and with Stacy Redman, they saw that there is potential to compress both the design development and construction document phase by a few weeks, but that was really -- those are two very large phases for these projects. So, really, outside -- and because I know that some of this had already been moved a little bit through a couple of weeks just for this discussion today, but as that compression continues to happen I think two months -- I don't think they have that in their timeline to get through design development and construction documents and the construction documents are what we need to go to bid, I don't think they can compress that all by two months and still meet a January bidding kind of --

Perreault: (Inaudible).

Watts: We would have to have specific questions what exactly you want us to go back to the architect with and will you be ready to make that decision in a week?

Simison: Yeah. I have been trying to put this off as long as I felt like I could and Dale is over there, you know -- they have been giving me the stink eye for three weeks. Like we can't have this conversation until we have least had the previous conversation, because if we would have just turned in the conversation about these -- these items, but, you know, this is a push point of even starting the process on -- on elements that -- I think it's whether you feel like, you know, it's lost dollars if you say no. I don't think it's lost dollars if you say no. I think it's lost dollars if you -- I'm sorry. I think it's lost dollars if you say no. If you say yes I don't think you are losing out, you know, because the work that's going to be done is not going to be work that wouldn't have been done otherwise. There may be a modification that's going to be small, but if you -- if you wait the ramifications could be much larger. That's -- much larger than what that change order may be -- by doing it. At least that's my viewpoint. My conversations with staff of where my understanding of -- of those elements and, then, you get into the -- because what you really get into is, okay, maybe we do one and we put -- the question will be, okay, do we bid one at the right time and, then, let the other ones go. Then we have lost the value of even doing -- considering doing things together at some point in time. That's really -- that will be the challenge.

Perreault: (Inaudible).

Watts: This takes us all through construction for the architect services. All the way through construction.

Perreault: (Inaudible).

Watts: Correct.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor. To your point -- I mean this is work that needs to be done and it doesn't -- it doesn't lock us into anything that says we -- oh, now we have to do all four or two fire stations. We still have that option, because this -- this has to be done and, yes, there might be -- if we decide to alter and stagger and do some things, there might be some tweaks down the road, but this work is done, it's designed, we have got bids, then, we can make informed decisions and decide how we want to move forward. So, I -- I don't see why we wouldn't approve all four, move it forward and, then, act accordingly to how our decisions come in the future. It doesn't -- the design is going to be the design. We know that that's what it's going to be and there -- there will be some construction administration that when that moves forward that's going to be part of the -- their work, so we know that's not going to be lost money. I don't see where we are losing any money. Although we may have to spend a few dollars more if we need to alter it by -- by delaying, by staggering, that sort of thing, where I think, Keith, you had mentioned were different things they have to redesign and can make connections and do this and that. So, it starts us down the path that we are going to go. Now, whether that's one year, two year, six months apart, don't know. That doesn't lock us into it. So, I'm good with going forward with all four to start that process and figure out what we want to do for our community at least the timing of it. We know we need to do it. It's just a matter of when.

Watts: So, in the simplest terms that I can -- for right now, if you want to have the ability to bid in January you would probably want to approve all four of them as soon as you could, even if you are going to still contemplate whether you are going to go through and build them. If you push this out three or four weeks or two months and you approve one of them and, then, they start down that design and now we are going to do it together that's also possibly a little change if we just -- if we only give them the approval to do one, they are going to -- I would assume they are going to design for one and then if you decide in two months, no, we are going to do them together, then, we would probably modify those plans a little bit at that time, but it would probably be too late to bid in January for what you don't approve, you know, right now for design. If you -- if you want to bid in January I would say you would have to get the design started. Now, I'm not saying, yes, no, you should, you shouldn't, I just want you to know if you wanted to bid in January we need to get the plans to the final design.

Borton: Of the labor of -- but you can only bid for what you budget.

Watts: Correct.

Borton: So --

Watts; No. We -- we have often bid -- we have put -- we can put clauses in our bid documents that state that Council is still debating on whether or not we are going to move forward and we have -- and we tell them up front we are budgeted for building one. We are anticipating two and three and four if bids come in good, so --

Borton: So, we can -- we can bid to build a building without having appropriated the money to pay for it?

Watts: As long as we notify the bidders up front, because it -- we often -- we will put bid docs together early on before the budget is approved, just to get things moving for something that we want to start October 1 --

Johnson: I can't turn it any lower than that.

Watts: We often say it earlier, you know, we will bid -- try to wait until October, end of October when you -- when you have -- Council has finally approved the budget, but if we need to get started on a long-term item or long-term procurement, we will put those -- that caveat in our bid documents and state that it's subject to Council's budget approval X date. And so they -- they bid the project knowing that there is a possibility that Council -- and sometimes -- you know, I will be honest, sometimes contractors are a little leery of that, because, you know, they are trying to schedule their jobs out.

Borton: In this case you would know. I mean you will know before end of August what's funded and they won't be anywhere close to pulling bids. That's -- that's helpful context. My only hesitancy is I -- this discussion has been extremely open and productive in light of the concerns and some of the hesitancy and the reality is it just sounds like some portion of these aren't going to go forward even to bid. They are not going to be funded in the budget. Some will. So, as long as it's not wasteful, that there might be the start of design on one of these four, when it really appears that one or more might sit on a shelf and that's still okay and it's going forward years later and it's not wasteful. Go ahead.

Watts; You are going to make your decisions way before we are ready to (inaudible).

Borton: Yeah.

Watts: So, we don't -- we don't have any concern in that area.

Butterfield; Council Member Borton, I can certainly have the conversation if this is approved by Council with our design team of what the next two months look like and some of the discussion that has occurred here today as they do move forward on working on four projects that maybe they put a greater emphasis on two and maybe they can allocate their time a little more appropriately, so that they are not going full bore on four projects all at once, because they are so similar -- the buildings are so similar, especially for a bidding process, if that makes sense. I can certainly pass that on to the design team.

Perreault: That being said, then, would you, though, have to let them know whether that fire station in the south -- I mean would you not need to justify the location because of the additional defined elements of the parking lot from the infrastructure that are unique to these sites?

Butterfield: The buildings themselves are extremely similar. So, the work that they are going to be doing on the buildings -- the two precincts are extremely similar and the two fire stations are extremely similar. So, I think that they can start work on that without -- and there is not a huge disparity, I guess, in the buildings. So, they could start work on one fire station and one precinct -- a load of work without maybe getting too involved in two precincts and two fire stations. A lot of the site work has already been done. That's the schematic design. We have already been through a lot of that. So, there is not a lot -- there is not really anymore work site design wise, it's more the design development phase which would be the next phase they are going into is really building.

Perreault: Thank you.

Watts: But most of that change that would ever take place if we decided one or two, would be in the actual bid documents combining maybe a little bit more site work into one bid package versus two.

Strader: Can we -- is it -- I don't know -- I don't -- I don't want to put people in an awkward position if they are going to vote against something, but, hopefully, it's not wasted work, I guess. The question I would have maybe for Chief Blume -- or just for the group -- if we -- it sounds like there is buy-in on a fire station in the south. I thought -- it sounded like there was openness to a fire -- or police precinct in the northwest. If we try to vote on those two contracts today and try to move that forward and see if there is support of Council. Then, Chief Blume, could you follow up regarding the construction cost, the timeline, that GMP -- all the things that we talked about before our final budget approval in the hopes that we can see if there is consensus or not on the additional fire station and, then, could we, you know, have a similar discussion about the second police precinct -- I guess I'm wondering why do we have to -- maybe there is a way to do this incrementally. If we have buy-in today on one or two of these, we could approve them today and, then, in the subsequent couple weeks could we follow up and have an additional discussion? And maybe this is for the Mayor. Do you want to take that approach or do we want an up or down on these? How do you want to --

Simison: I'm -- you know, honestly, I would ask for an up or down vote, so that we can make a decision and move forward. And I say that, you know, because I heard very different things during the budget process today. I heard the possibility of four buildings being built based upon -- you want to hear from the public and other things. I heard concerns and so it's really kind of a hodgepodge of where everyone is on every single different building, to be honest with you. And I think you heard it. I'm not a rocket science -- scientist. But, you know, for the -- for the clarity, if you -- if there is concern with one of these, you know, don't do a -- I would rather say an up or down and let people move forward on this and that would really take it out of the budget, quite frankly. My -- you

wouldn't even need to put it in the budget and ask the public at that point in time if it doesn't -- if the contract doesn't get approved I would say a lot of the reasons why we would be doing it for -- doing it together at the same time are really lost at that point and, then, you know, you can consider them as you move forward individually. But I do view this as an administrative effort. Yeah, there is -- there is risk with everything, because even if you put it on the shelf you start for -- we are talking about how much work are we doing a month? Maybe a lot? Maybe a little? But that's what we are talking about. How much -- and we can -- we can go back and say, hey, there is concern and you kind of like maybe not start as quickly and work on these other three first and, then, come back around. We can have those conversations and requests, but I do -- I don't view this as wasted dollars, unless we go and redo and decide we don't want to do the police precincts as even proposed. That to me is the bigger risk in this conversation is do we even have the right size, type, or is Council like, no, that's too big, too expensive, I want to see 50 percent size and, then, it's wasted dollars in my opinion, based on where we are in this process.

Strader: Mr. Mayor? Sorry. Just to be clear. So, your -- is your preference to -- for Council to approve all these construction agreements under the principle that this is not wasted money eventually or is your -- is your direction to us -- we would like you to just go ahead and vote how you feel you are falling out on the construction of these four big capital projects at this time?

Simison: The first part. I don't think this is wasted dollars to do it. There may need to be modifications, but that's not wasted dollars, because I think the potential cost savings of doing one, two, or three or four at the same -- two, three, or four at the same time outweighs any minor modifications we might have to make in this process, so --

Strader: So, I guess feedback from -- just from me personally would be -- because I am supportive of likely three of four, I feel comfortable, but if I was in a different seat and I was against possibly half, if not more of the capital projects, I probably would have a really different view. So, I am supportive of it, because I -- personally with the way that I feel I will vote I don't think the amount of money at risk is significant. But I could see someone else taking a different view and I would respect that.

Perreault: So, I'm not quite confident at three yet. Two I am. But I don't -- I'm not lumping the construction piece and the design piece together and -- as I'm thinking through this, so the main thing I think that -- you gentlemen answered my question. The main thing was I want the ability -- I want us to have the ability to bid these in January if we want to. That's critical. So, I see that opportunity cost there in improving these, so long as significant changes that are made -- you know, so long as we have -- in our agreement we have an opportunity to come to the -- to Rice Fergus and say we need you to stop -- I don't want to forego any opportunity that we have created by doing these together, without -- which doesn't sound like -- sound like we will. However, if we choose to pick up that conversation, then, in a year from now I just want to understand that we still have the ability to do that and -- not talking about construction cost, just talking about design cost. I would rather spend funds -- I would rather spend this -- these funds and potentially

alter our design than get to the point of having full construction bids and, then, decide to change the design. So, I want to -- I think we will get enough information in the next few months to get us to a place where we can pause and -- but if we don't do this right now we won't and -- if I'm understanding correctly. And so I would -- I would rather spend these dollars to do the design, have further conversation about whether we are doing the two -- doing two, three, four -- one, two, three, four, than to possibly risk not moving forward if we could or if we decide to go that route upon the information that we find out in the next month or two. So, that's my thoughts on it. So, I -- I mean now that I have clarity -- greater clarity on this I think I would be in favor of approving these agreements.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I was going to say if you want to -- if Council Woman Perreault wants to hear from other Council Members like that's fine with me. I was going to suggest we could also just make some motions on these and see where everybody falls out -- to see and if it's a tie that's going to be awkward.

Perreault: Okay. Go for it Council Woman Strader.

Strader: All right.

Simison: Not for me today.

Strader: Okay. Let's try the first one. On Item 15 I move that we approve the AIA B133 agreement with Rice Fergus Miller for the final design and construction administration for the northwest fire station in the not to exceed amount of 405,925 dollars.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

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

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I will be opposing the motion because I would prefer it to be tabled. Cost benefit. I would rather address it as part of the budget discussion, so -- I think tabling it is the reason why I will be opposing it for right now.

Simison: Any further discussion on the motion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay?

Bernt: Nay.

Borton: Nay.

Simison: The ayes have it. The item is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO NAYS.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: On Item 16 I move that we approve the AIA B133 agreement with Rice Fergus Miller, the final design and construction administration for the northwest police substation precinct in the not to exceed amount of 423,975 dollars.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second on Item 16. Is there any discussion?

Borton: Mr. Mayor, is this site specific?

Simison: Yes. They are site specific.

Borton: It begs the same question. You are now locking yourself into the selection. Perhaps the preliminary work that's done in the first 45 days isn't site specific and can be translated to a different site. If, for example, a precinct in the south is ultimately funded in August and the northwest isn't funded, wouldn't want that work to go to waste. Perhaps that might be --

Butterfield: Council would have a decision at that time to either continue with the design aspect of the northwest precinct or just stop -- stop it at that point that it's not funded. We could certainly contact Rice Fergus that they do no further work on the northwest precinct. We are not -- I mean -- or if this is approved that you go ahead and go all the way through the construction documents and, then, you have a roll of construction documents already purchased, approved, designed and, then, they can bid that maybe some year further down the road that Council decides to fund the project.

Watts: Mr. Mayor, I believe -- or Councilman Borton. I believe Councilman Borton's question was 45 days in if they decide we don't want to do that station, we want to do that station, can some of that work being done on those first 45 days translate to the other station. I think that was the question.

Borton: Right.

Watts: Thank you.

Simison: Any further discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, this is Chris. Was that all ayes?

Simison: Yes.

Johnson: Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I move that we approve item AIA B133 agreement with Rice Fergus Miller for the final design and construction administration for south fire station in the not to exceed amount of 528,971 dollars.

Perreault: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second regarding Item 17. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I move that we approve Item 18, the AIA B133 agreement with Rice Fergus Miller for the final design and construction administration for the south police substation precinct in the not to exceed amount of 505,076 dollars.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second. Is there discussion on this item? If not, all favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay.

Bernt: Nay.

Simison: Five ayes. One nay. The item is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE NAY.

Simison: Thank you. I think if you haven't already -- the architects may not be watching, you see the sensitivity towards that we want -- we want them to meet deadlines, but we also want to be sensitive and do things appropriately and I know that you all communicate that between now and August on this -- on these topics. Okay. Thank you.

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

- 19. Per Idaho Code 74-206(1)(a) To consider hiring a public officer, employee, staff member or individual agent, wherein the respective qualities of individuals are to be evaluated in order to fill a particular vacancy or need.**
- 20. Per Idaho Code 74-206(1)(b) To consider the evaluation, dismissal or disciplining of, or to hear complaints or charges brought against, a public officer, employee, staff member or individual agent, or public school student.**

Simison: With that, Council, we have reached Items 19 and 20.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I move that we go into Executive Session per Idaho Code 74-206(1)(a) and 74-206(1)(b).

Hoaglun: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to go into Executive Session. 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 and we will go into Executive Session.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: (3:12 p.m. to 5:22 p.m.)

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Do I have a motion? Councilman Brent.

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

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, second the motion.

Simison: Motion and second to come out of Executive Session. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I move that we adjourn.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 5:22 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON

_____/_____/_____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK