

## **Meridian City Council Work Session**

**June 14, 2022.**

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 4:30 p.m., Tuesday, June 14, 2022, by Mayor Robert Simison.

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

Also present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Steve Siddoway, Dave Miles, Dave Tiede, Laurelei McVey, Brian Caldwell, Tracy Basterrechea, Joe Bongiorno, and Dean Willis.

### **ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE**

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

Simison: Council, we will call the meeting to order. For the record, it is June 14th, 2022, at 4:31 p.m. We will begin this afternoon's work session with roll call attendance.

### **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

Simison: First item up is adoption of the agenda.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: For our agenda this afternoon we do want to add an Executive Session per Idaho Code 74-206(1)(d) to consider records that are exempt from disclosures provided in Chapter 1, Title 74, Idaho Code. We will place that at the end of Item 11. So, with that change, Mr. Mayor, I move adoption of the agenda as amended.

Borton: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

### **CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]**

#### **1. Aviator Springs Subdivision Pedestrian Pathway Easement**

- 2. Rackham Subdivision Lot 4 Water Main Easement**
- 3. Rackham Subdivision Lot 10 Water Main Easement**
- 4. Rackham Subdivision Water Line Extension Water Main Easement**
- 5. Stapleton Subdivision No. 2 Sanitary Sewer Easement No. 1**
- 6. Victory Commons Subdivision Subdivision No. 2 Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement**
- 7. Restated and Amended Joint Powers Agreement for the Coordinated and Cooperative Provision of Emergency Medical Services in Ada County (EMS JPA) Annual Renewal for Fiscal Year 2022**
- 8. Agreement with Streamliners Swim Team for Use of Meridian Community Swimming Pool Between the Streamliner Aquatic Recreation Inc. and the City of Meridian**

Simison: Next item up is the Consent Agenda.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I move approval of the Consent Agenda and for the Mayor to sign and Clerk to attest.

Borton: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

#### **ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]**

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

#### **DEPARTMENT / COMMISSION REPORTS [Action Item]**

- 9. Police Department: Proposed Ordinance related to Public Intoxication (Potential Meridian City Code 6-3-4)**

Simison: So, we will move on to the Department/Commission Reports. First item up is Item 9, Police Department proposed ordinance related to public intoxication. Turn this over to Lieutenant Caldwell.

Caldwell: Mayor, Members of Council, as we have grown as a city so has our city's nightlife and bar scene. We have noticed some issues in dealing with disruptive, intoxicated individuals and the limitations of the current criminal codes available to our officers. Current codes and relevant case law require a citizen to want to be a victim of disturbing the peace or disorderly conduct. This, in turn, requires them to later appear in court and testify against the suspect. Many people and business owners are reluctant to want to do this for many reasons. A city public intoxication code would allow our officers to issue a citation or effect an arrest with the City of Meridian as the victim, meaning only the officer would typically be required to appear in court and testify against the suspect. The code we would like to adopt is currently what the city of Boise has been using for decades. It is one that has been vetted by our city attorney and has already been accepted by the Boise City Prosecutor's Office and the courts in Ada county. The public intoxication code will help our officers keep Meridian a premier community in which to live, work, and raise a family. With that I will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, questions?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. Wow, I didn't realize that we didn't have one of these in place. So, is there a legal limit requirement? How will it actually work? Is it just something that -- that the officer observes and, then, chooses to -- to, you know, approach the individual and, then, they have a sobriety test or -- can you take us through how that will work?

Caldwell: Mayor, Council Woman Perreault, yes, it's going to be based on the objective signs of intoxication. So, red watery eyes, thick slurred speech. This is for the person that is staggering drunk and the code specifies causing a disturbance, as a threat to themselves or others; right? This is for the -- the, obviously, intoxicated person that's on Main Street out here in front of one of our restaurants screaming and yelling and causing a scene, while being staggeringly drunk, if that makes sense.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: What mechanism do we have in place to address this? If the individual is exhibiting the same issues, they are disturbing the peace, they are loud, they are obnoxious, but they are not intoxicated or they are not visibly intoxicated. How do you -- how do you address those situations?

Caldwell: Mayor, Councilman Cavener, that would be through our disorderly conduct or disturbing the peace code, which those codes would require that a citizen or business owner or somebody want to be a victim of that crime, because as current case law stands we cannot be the victims of disturbing the peace.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: So, the only change is it allows our officers to observe visual signs of intoxication and using that as the -- the threshold, essentially, then, to enforce this new ordinance that's being proposed; is that correct?

Caldwell: Yes. That is correct.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Can you take us through what happens if an individual is then arrested, they are taken to the station and, then, what happens from there?

Caldwell: Mayor, Council Woman Perreault, so if the arrest happens -- I mean they could go -- either a citation could be issued or an arrest and so if we do an arrest we would attempt to get a breath test, because that's the best practice that we learn from the Boise Police Department. But if the person's noncooperative, then, we are just going to have to go off the objective signs that the officer would witness, which is really similar to what they do in a DUI; right? Their first descriptions are when I made contact with Citizen X they had red watery eyes, thick and slurred speech, the odor of alcoholic beverage coming from their breath and person, they had an unsteady gait and those -- those kind of symptoms is what we -- what we would use in that situation.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: No question, just to comment. It's a no brainer. I think it's a great addition. Properly used it -- it proactively prevents problems. The -- the classic example is the stumbling drunk walking towards the parking lot. So, if you have got any opportunity to lawfully intervene and prevent those kind of activities from occurring, it's fantastic.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor, I do have one more question.

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. Does the individual have to be on public property or are you permitted to -- to approach them on private property?

Caldwell: Mayor, Council Woman Perreault, it would be public property or private property open to the public. So, if somebody was at say Walmart causing a disturbance or a scene, then, we would be able to act there as well.

Simison: Council, any additional questions? Okay.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. Just a comment. It sounds like we need this change and, you know, alcohol unfortunately -- when used responsibly is fine, but when used irresponsibly just causes a lot of social ills and I appreciate us -- you know, the Police Department coming forward with this if this is what we need to keep people safe. So, thank you.

Simison: Mr. Nary?

Nary: Mayor, Members of the Council, I -- I do want to take the opportunity to at least commend Ms. Kane, because this, actually, is an improvement over the Boise code, because they were having some court issues in Boise and so Ms. Kane crafted this to basically address those issues and keep it as Constitutional. So, it is ready to move forward when the Council's ready for us to put it on.

Simison: Well, then, we will put this on for consideration by Council at a future date. Okay. Thank you.

Caldwell: Thank you.

## **10. Parks and Recreation Department: Cost Recovery Process Update**

Simison: Next item up is Park and Recreation Department cost recovery process update. Turn this over to Mr. Siddoway first.

Siddoway: Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, we are coming before you tonight to give you an update on our cost recovery process. Teresa Jackson, who you have heard from a couple of times previously, is -- is online and will be making the presentation. I wanted to introduce her and, actually, I just wanted to -- Council Woman Perreault actually came and participated in our public sorting exercise, one of the two that we held and was in one of the small groups that had to put all of our programs and services on the cost recovery pyramid for the public benefit, from most of the individual benefit, to mostly public benefit. I was wondering, Council Woman Perreault, if you would just maybe share a few words about your experience there and what we did.

Perreault: Thank you, Steve. Yeah. It was -- it was really fun, actually, and I was surprised that there was such a variety of thoughts and opinions about what each activity meant to the community. I was in a group of three and pretty much everybody else I think were just volunteers from the community that were there and -- and, then, we had one staff person that was kind of guiding our discussion. But I thought the deliberation that was done was really hugely beneficial to -- to talk out the individual activities and how important they are to the community. So, I learned a lot and I -- but I was really surprised in the presentation that we are going to hear how different the rankings were from the public to the staff, so --

Siddoway: Staff tended to be a little more conservative, meaning a little more cost recovery, kind of anticipating that as a desire of the Council. The public tended to actually weigh things more toward the public benefit, which surprised us. But with that I'm going to turn it over to Teresa and she can give you the -- the full overview and welcome your discussion. So, thank you.

Simison: Thank you, Steve. Teresa.

Jackson: Excuse me. I was having a challenge unmuting there. Good afternoon, Mayor, Council. It's a pleasure to be here with you again. When I was with you back towards the end of May I -- I updated you on the categories that had been developed and we were just about to go into the sorting of services. So, I want to share the outcomes from what we term Workshop II with you today and also queue up what's coming next in the project. So, as the Council Member mentioned, we did a community sorting session. We offered two sessions. One was an in-person morning session and the second was a virtual evening session. We had 24 community members join us for an hour and a half of their time, which equates to really 36 hours of meaningful volunteer deliberation, because this is a challenging exercise. It's fun, but it really -- there is a lot of critical thinking involved and quite often, you know, when you go to a community meeting you are listening. But through this process it's really important for the community members to engage and share their thoughts and opinions. So, not only did we do this with the community, we also did it with the staff. So, we held two staff sessions as well. So, that ultimately we could compare and contrast how the different groups put the various categories on to the pyramid. So, just as a quick refresh, the department developed 21 categories of service leading up to the sorting sessions and those categories represent all the programs and services that the department provides and so they are, essentially, large buckets that are clearly defined. So, you have a category title, you have a description, and, then, some examples as well and this is what the community, as well as the staff, used to place the categories or services onto the pyramid and a refresher of the pyramid -- the foundation of the pyramid is really the programs and services that have the most substantial benefit to the taxpaying community and so those are typically things like your parks and trails, something that even if your community members don't use them they are aesthetically pleasing, they are good for the environment, they can potentially even increase home values and as you go up the pyramid the benefit to the community is reduced and, then, once you are on top the benefit is really very individualized. So, what you see before you is a side-by-side comparison of the staff sorting and the public sorting. So, on the left-

hand side you have the staff and on the right-hand side you have the public and you will see the boxes in red for the public pyramid, those are where we had variations. So, we had 12 mismatched categories and this is not uncommon by any means and so, ultimately, what we do is we sit down with your project team and we have to reconcile these categories and determine where they should live on the pyramid based on what we learned from staff, as well as the public, and a moment ago the Council Member referenced that there was a staff member there at the table with them and that staff member served as a facilitator for the process, but they were also taking notes and trying to gain understanding about why certain selections were made. So, ultimately, that information really feeds into how we reconcile the public score and the staff score. So, what you see before you is just those 12 mismatched categories showing the public score and the staff score and, then, the final score and these scores -- what we look at is we take the collective scoring from each group and we are looking at the average and the mean and the mode and in some cases you could have a couple of groups that are really bringing down an overall score -- score and so that needs to be taken into consideration, as well as exactly, you know, where it was. Was it a 2.5 or was it a 2.7 and looking at those elements. So, ultimately, what -- the green -- what the green represents is what the final score was. So, you can see it's somewhat of a balance between the staff score, the public score and, then, even one situation where it turned out to be a compromise between the two and this is quite common, too, because when we sit down with the project team and we listen to those facilitators about why groups made their selections, something like youth camps, for example, that's something the staff saw as a balanced benefit of three. But the public strongly felt there was value in this, not just to those kiddos who are attending the programs, but also to those parents who have a place to take their children during the summer that's safe and so that's an example where staff heard that messaging loud and clear through both public sessions and ultimately shifted that three to a two. An example where the shift wasn't made is -- excuse me -- merchandise and vending. So, the public had that as a three and what we learned from the facilitators is there seemed to be a concern from the public that it would go away if it ended up on the top of the pyramid. Recognition that it was very individualized, but they value it. They really appreciate having that vending at your parks and so ultimately staff went with a five, because of what they heard was we don't want it to go away. But there is understanding that we don't want to subsidize a candy bar and so staff leaned five in that it really makes sense for the operation. They are not trying to remove the programming, just they don't want to subsidize that vending piece. So, ultimately, this is the final pyramid and you can see it ended up being very balanced once the reconciliation process was done. The bottom of the pyramid, the purple tier, represents your parks and pathways, community special events, arts and culture programs, volunteer opportunities. Considerable benefit. The blue two. You have got your permitted special events. The youth camps that I referenced that the public found a lot of value in. The field rentals. Monitor drop in use. Then as we move up into three this is where a lot of your programming starts to surface. Youth and rec classes and programs, swim lessons, city sports leagues and tournaments and facility rentals. Then continuing up into four, that's where your shelter rentals are, the golf course, concession leases, trips and adult classes. So, we have got some layering there with your classes as well. That's very age based. And, then, up in five is where

your private swim lessons are, admission based rentals, merchandise and vending and your tenant facility leases.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you. Yeah. Just to reflect a little bit. I think this all makes a lot of sense. I'm struggling a little bit with the placement of -- of the Lakeview Golf Club overall. You know, even -- I understand staff scoring was kind of before I -- you know, I -- I will -- I will defer to the group's work, but I guess I want to understand why the final score is more of a four and not like a five. You know, it -- it just doesn't occur to me that golf is an activity that we should subsidize in any way. But maybe I'm off base. I want to be open minded to the group's work. So, if you could just share some more insight on that one specifically that would help me.

Jackson: Sure. So, the public really found a lot of value in the golf course, not just for the golfers, but for the guests that go along with them. They thought it was an affordable opportunity for community members to be exposed to the game of golf. Additionally, I believe -- and, Steve, you will have to help me here. I believe something coming up about -- is the golf course available for individuals to walk on.

Siddoway: Mr. Mayor, Council, if I can add -- yeah, I -- I would be glad to add some additional feedback on this. I think staff was bouncing between the -- the four and the five and part -- and we agreed that in concept we want to get operations to be fully funding. They are not even quite there yet, but it seems that we are even -- we are going to be subsidizing capital for the foreseeable future. We certainly are with the current irrigation program. So, some acknowledgement that it's not a hundred percent cost recovery, but we thought it belonged near the top of the pyramid. A lot of the -- the public ones were three and even two. Council Woman Perreault, I don't know if you -- I mean I think your -- your group was down at a two, if I remember right, for the golf course and what I remember is that just overall with all of the -- the comments that I remember hearing back from the facilitators was there was a lot of -- and they weren't even all golfers, but they just said it's open -- yes, you have to pay to play, but anyone can go, it's a public course, and there is a public benefit to having the course as part of the system. So, we did tend towards the top of the pyramid and I think the public tended toward the lower part of the pyramid. I don't know if you have any other perspective you would add to that.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: So, if I remember correctly when -- when the exercise was presented we were instructed not to consider cost or city investment into the exercise and so I don't think that -- that we were really looking at it from the perspective of cost recovery or from the city's financial investment, it was more of is -- is this an opportunity that's available to the



broadier public or isn't it and is it more individual use or not? So, we were not having any cost recovery discussions whatsoever. So, I think that probably -- if you saw some differences in scores, it -- it probably was more having to do with the ranking of, you know, is this available to the whole community? How many -- how much of the community is going to use it? And it really had nothing to do with the financial part of it.

Siddoway: I think the only part I would -- I think I would add a little bit to that and, Teresa, maybe I will just add a word and, then, you can maybe clarify, but I think we were clear that we were talking about cost recovery as the ultimate goal, but we were focusing in the pyramid on the public benefit, not necessarily what it cost, but trying to analyze what is the benefit to the individual versus to the general public. But I think it was always presented as a cost recovery exercise and maybe we disagree, but --

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Siddoway: Oh, go ahead.

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I wouldn't say that the exercise was presented that way in the -- in the meeting that I was in. I'm not trying to disagree, I'm just saying that -- that at least our group didn't have any discussions about cost recovery as an element of the decision making in placing the activities, so -- but I don't remember what our group scored it as. I do remember us discussing that it was more of an individual benefit in the sense that, you know, it's -- it's not something -- there -- there may be many people in our community that don't golf. There also are a lot of golfers coming from other cities to use it. So, it's -- in that sense it's very much an individual benefit and I -- I agree that it's somewhere between four and five, so --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. Thanks for that feedback. I -- I -- it sounds to me like a lot of the community has an anxiety around something being eliminated or just that -- that they wanted to make sure that, you know, things are still a priority and so I think now it's taking that feedback and just making sure we are getting the appropriate cost recovery for each activity. But I appreciate that insight. Definitely feels like it is between a four and a five to me as well, but that's just one that kind of stood out to me. So, thanks for that feedback and -- and that's okay. I -- I get it where the public's coming from as they reflect and now I think it's directing things if there are tweaks that need to be made.

Simison: And if I could from a -- my perspective a little bit. You know, I think there is a difference between golfing at Lakeview Golf Club and Lake View Golf Club as a facility in certain regards or taking a lesson at Lake View Golf Club or renting the room there for an event at Lakeview Golf Course. You know, there is definitely various levels and I think

that's true for -- quite frankly I think the same thing could be said for the pool in a lot of ways. You know, the -- the -- there are definitely individual versus community at different times throughout these. So, it may not be fully one way or the other when it comes down to it, but it is how you apply it.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Are you recommending that we split those out and look at them separately as cost recovery elements? Because I -- I agree with the use as being different in each location and the revenue will be different.

Simison: I -- I think it's interesting to see that we have only one -- you know, the -- the one -- one entity is listed in this way. You know, you don't see HomeCourt listed on this in this way. You don't see a future community center listed as an entity on here. Is it more based around the type of activity that I'm seeing or what you would do in that space. So, it's just -- it's more interesting to have it called out specifically.

Siddoway: I would agree. And we actually wrestled with this very theme, creating our programs and services for the sorting. Maybe if we can let Teresa give her perspective. I think what we have talked about with her is that within something like Lake View Golf Club there may be certain elements of it that are more or less, but overall what is expected. So, if -- if -- if you would -- if you wouldn't mind letting her maybe add some additional color as someone who deals with this on a regular basis, I think we would all find it helpful and, then, we can decide what we want to do.

Jackson: Thanks, Steve. So, a couple items just to circle back to. When we set the stage for the workshop we do say that this is about the benefit to the community. We encourage participants to take themselves, take the individual out and to not focus about on the fee. It's not about what it costs, it's about what the benefit is to the larger community. So, that is how we set the stage. So, the comment related to the facility rental piece at the golf course. So, the Lakeview Golf Club -- the definition for that is very specific to rounds of golf. It doesn't include the rental. So, facility rentals that's there in Tier 3 would encompass the room rental there at that facility as it stands now and so we really ask departments to look at their budgets differently. So, we -- we all get into the habit of looking at aquatics in a silo or a facility such as HomeCourt in a silo, but we want to dissect that and just look at the youth programs that are at HomeCourt, the adult programs, the rentals and we want to extract all of that out, so that like things are together regardless of where they are occurring. Does that help a bit?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Teresa, can you maybe give Council a little flavor to the -- why the separation of say something like a -- like a shelter rental being viewed as a considerable individual benefit, while a city rental -- a facility rental, excuse me, is viewed as more balanced? Kind of what was the synopsis as to why were the -- the groups kind of separating those out?

Jackson: Sure. So, let's see. I'm going back just to take a look at where public and staff were. So, the public was a three for a shelter rental and the staff was a five and so, ultimately, they had some compromise there with a four and, then, as it relates to indoor we were at a three and a four and staff came down to a four and I remember this was a very tough one that the -- the group wrestled with for quite a bit, because in the public mind they were the same. It was a rental whether it was inside or out. Staff saw a bit of difference in that there is very limited indoor opportunities for rentals and that they can't really serve a large portion of the community.

Siddoway: Mr. Mayor?

Jackson: Did I frame that right?

Simison: Mr. Siddoway.

Siddoway: The additional maybe flavor that I would put on to that is we were seeing picnic shelter rentals as primarily more of a -- an individual family or group -- smaller group benefit. A lot of our facility rentals, like for HomeCourt, they are youth team sports. There is a kind of a greater community benefit to the -- the -- the team aspect of that. So, I mean if -- if there is disagreement with that among Council, that's why we are presenting tonight to look at the consensus pyramid, but, you know, we can -- we did see that the -- we thought the -- the shelter rental was more of an individual benefit than the -- than a sports team renting a facility at HomeCourt as an example.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Jackson: And ultimate -- oh. I apologize. The field rentals and the facility rentals ended up on that same level because of that commonality that Steve referenced.

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. One of the ways that we thought about this and looked at this was kind of the -- the reverse. So, if you -- if you were to take away shelter rentals how would that impact the community? If you were to take away facility rentals how would that impact the community -- would be a larger group of people that would be negatively affected and so that was also one of the ways that we kind of looked at things is like what if it were removed, who is it going to be -- you know, who is -- who is going to lose that benefit and that helped in placing these as well.

Simison: I'm not sure who -- Teresa, do you have more to present?

Jackson: I do and I think the next piece of what comes next will be very helpful as well, because as we start thinking about the golf course and what an appropriate cost recovery is there, as we are looking -- so, as we look at these tiers there will be a range of cost recovery established for each tier and we have had many agencies who are hitting a hundred percent cost recovery in Tier 4 and going beyond that in Tier 5 and this is more common in cases where you are only counting direct cost and that is what we are doing through this process. So, we are in the process presently of counting all of the cost associated at the program level and associating the revenues, so that we can ultimately understand cost recovery for each service, roll that up into the various categories and, then, understand how the tier itself is performing and so this next slide is a sample from another agency, just so you can start to get a sense of -- for example, if you look at that tier one, those are all recovering at zero percent. The tier aggregates get one hundred. You can imagine their ultimate range was very small. As you let's say look at Tier 4, this is an agency that was pricing things in a very similar way and so you don't see a significant increase there, but you can see the cost recovery -- recovery similarities that would assist in ultimately developing that range and so in Tier 4 that tier aggregate was 36 and in this example they were counting indirect cost as well, so they were counting things like their utilities and maintenance and a variety of things associated with each facility. So, right now we are in the process of counting those costs and identifying current cost recovery. So, at the end of this month we can present to the project team what the cost recovery is by category, as well as tier, so that we can develop appropriate cost recovery goals for the future that are based on a range and on what current cost recovery is. It's really important in the process to know where you are at before you start making leaps into where you need to be. We don't want it -- the goal isn't to increase fees and increase revenue by a specific amount, but it's to ensure that cost recovery is similar for like items that have a similar benefit to the community and so that's the next phase in the process and so you could see, for example, here on this Tier 4 this agency their aggregate was 58. They determined a 60 to 100 percent goal for Tier 4 and Tier 5 was 101 plus and, again, so thinking about concessions, for example, saying it may be cost recovery plus a little bit, because we are not counting overhead, we are really just counting the cost of the item and the staff time. So, that's all I had to present to you for this update. After we have identified those cost recovery goals for the future we will be back before the group with another update. I have got some good feedback definitely about the golf course and facility rentals, but are there other questions this evening about the process or diving deeper into where those categories were placed?

Simison: So, Teresa, I don't know if this is you or Council or -- but understanding when you look at the buckets, one thing you don't have in there is -- we talked about is we don't have the cost to build the park. We -- we don't even have capital replacement cost built into these elements. How do other municipalities apply that, you know, or appropriate? Can you set the cost recovery, then, just do a ten percent add-on for future capital needs related to that? Do they build in actual cost? Do most just avoid it altogether and assume that they will pay for that in a different way?

Jackson: I would like to say all look at paying for it another way. I can't think of a project under the GreenPlay or BerryDunn umbrella that included the capital cost piece. Where

you see variations is if agencies want to count their indirect cost or if they want to keep it solely to the direct cost and when we started this process and sat down with your Finance Department and Steve when we talked about what we were going to count, it seemed like with the current cost recovery policy that the city has, which really this process falls in line with very well as far as how there is levels of cost recovery and that policy only direct cost are being accounted for and so we are following what you are doing already in your policy.

Simison: Now, if Council is not -- doesn't like that policy that's something we can look at revisiting as we go through this process. But, Council, any additional questions or comments at this time?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Cavener: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Steve, who eventually, then, establishes the -- the future tier targets in terms of the -- the percentages? Is that something that you guys are going to do in conjunction with the Parks Department and bring a recommendation back to Council? Is it something that Council is determining? What's -- what does that next step process look like?

Jackson: So, the project team will recommend what those tier targets should be for the future and the final study and a recommendation will come to your body for review and adoption.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: And that may be a -- a good conversation about policy for our future Council meeting. To me I think anything that's a Tier 5 needs to be taking into account the capital cost of -- of building that structure. So, if it's even a -- you know, memorial bench or memorial tree, shouldn't have the taxpayer subsidizing for the bench or the tree. Whoever is buying the bench or the tree should be paying the full cost. I think that should also pertain into facilities as well, for building or adding a facility to meet a specific need I would hope that we would make sure that the taxpayers aren't subsidized that, so -- I know that may be a future conversation, but I -- I think any cost recovery model that we do has to at least contemplate reimbursing the taxpayers for certain capital infrastructures if they have a very individualized use.

Simison: Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Maybe just one thing to kind of throw into the mix. So, I think a lot of it, too, kind of depends on what a facility rental is being used for to some extent and that's hard to parse out. But like I view someone, you know, using a facility, for example, for like a wedding or something and that happens more I think in Boise than it does here, has a considerable individual benefit versus, you know, like a 4-H group or something renting a facility. So, I don't know how we could solve for that, but I think that's something we might want to take into consideration.

Jackson: If I may respond to that. The process will ultimately include elements similar to that. So, within a category you can have a sliding scale, so that a nonprofit rate is different than a private party rate and they are collectively recovering within your range and so that real cost recovery might come from that wedding, not that nonprofit, but it's meeting that goal.

Strader: That's really helpful. Thank you. I will stay tuned.

#### **11. Mayor's Office: Use of American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (ARPA) Fund**

Simison: Council, any additional questions or comments? All right. Thank you very much, Teresa. Appreciate it. Steve. Garrett. Okay. With that we will move on to Item 11, which is from the Mayor's office, the use of American Rescue Plan Act of 2021. ARPA funds. Turn this over to Mr. Miles.

Miles: Good afternoon, Council, Mayor. I chalked this up to maybe continuing conversations and lessons learned as we go through the process is more what this conversation is going to be. I have just the one slide for you that I think most of you have seen already. For informational purposes. What's laid out on that slide, just for those watching so they know, it's really laid out on the project basis based on what we have originally talked about -- presented to you on March 15th and, then, some additional information that's come through budget conversations, as well as a proposed column of sort of where -- where do we continue to go? So, if you recall back on March 15th we sort of finalized this phase one list that's in the second column, adding the bio gas project and moving the streetlights projects down into phase two, which we had not talked about any of phase two projects, we just put that there as a placeholder. You can see the figures there at the bottom. Since that time we have had some ongoing discussions, learning more information, primarily around compliance reporting. I know -- in fact, I just got a comment today that purchasing has told us for the Public Works projects we have to use a competitive bidding process, not a roster list process. So, that's going to add time to the -- the extent of those projects, rather than just selecting off the roster. That leads back to the compliance and reporting under ARPA. We are learning every day about what reporting requirements there are. Finance has, rightfully so, some concerns to make sure that we are meeting those requirements and as we dive into those requirements they become what I will call more gray, not as straightforward as it's no problem, we can easily report this, which is what some people were saying early on. So, we are just learning that information and going through that. We are also, as we presented, for example, the facility HVAC filtration project, we are running a pilot test right now up in Public Works to

see what the benefit of that is and how that project works, so that we know as we go through the -- putting together the scope and the design that we are putting together a relevant project. We thought we had that. We are still waiting on the information from the pilot project, but we just don't know what is the effectiveness of that project. So, that's a reason why I suggested striking that project for the moment, utilizing dollars elsewhere and, then, additional to the budget items that are listed in the FY-23 budget column, more conversations with you all between the Mayor and the Council and ideas that are coming and just coming to light and coming to the table, considering should any of those items that maybe are budget items considerations be considered for ARPA funding, which would, then, utilize -- or give you the ability to utilize budget dollars for other things. As you see there you have got Jesse Tree payments listed, Circuit Breaker relief and potentially the Fire and Police cost for the budget amendments that were recently approved in the '22 budget. So, really here for a dialogue. I do provide a proposed suggestion. I am looking for a little bit of guidance and discussion on these -- this proposed column, probably mostly as it pertains to the phase one. We did talk with Public Works on the bio gas project that was added. Laurelei McVey is here to address any questions you have, but she did share that they believe it's feasible to get the project done in the timeline when adding it to the list of the other projects that are there. Additionally we are recommending using some of these funds for compliance reporting. If we have to bring in a consultant to satisfy the reporting needs because we have staffing shortages, staffing resources that we just don't have to get to that level of information, it's probably not a bad idea to do that and I don't know that it would cost the entirety of what's listed at 175,000, but having it there and utilizing it on either a project-by-project basis or a program basis is probably smart. So, maybe I will stop there, let some questions happen, have some conversations and I can certainly provide any flavor or detail on the -- the current phase two projects that are proposed on the far right. We also have -- Dave Tiede is here and, as I said, Laurelei is here as well to address any questions.

Simison: Thank you, Dave. And if I could just add, I mean we wanted to at least get this back in front of you prior to Thursday's budget conversation, so Council could look at the full picture of things that are out there for consideration and discussion, not necessarily asking for any decision tonight on anything, unless you feel so inclined to move forward on anything specifically, but just, again, continue the conversation, see where we are going, what makes sense and go from there. So, Council, any questions, comments or we also have other staff that can come talk about the other projects which are mentioned if you are interested. Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. So, you just mentioned the compliance consulting. Is -- is this just like a general placeholder for consultants we need to hire for any projects that we have coming up in the next couple of years that we may not have otherwise considered in the CFP or is there a specific compliance issue that -- that is being proposed?

Miles: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Perreault, this is more considering the ARPA projects as a bucket to say we have got these projects and I think it's fair to -- you got to think of this in maybe two phases. The Public Works projects that are larger that have

engineering, engines, and staffing behind them where there is going to be consultants that are experienced in grant management, probably have a different level of -- a different threshold of compliance reporting concern to get it right, because they have that experience behind those types of projects and other types of grant programs. The other things that you get into are more the -- the localized program. So, when we are repaying the benefits trust do we have the right paperwork put in place or do we need to hire a consultant to tell us, hey, we need XYZ or the paperwork you submitted meets the reporting requirements of the treasury? That's something that Finance has been suggesting and asking for us, so we are having those conversations about what level of what I will call -- I don't want to say auditing, but I'm going to say auditing. What level of auditing of paperwork is necessary for the comfort level of the Finance team when we are operating under this grant program. So, hopefully, that clarifies.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor, follow up, please.

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: So, if I am understanding correctly, it's once these projects are approved, then, this consulting firm will look at the details and help us comply as a city to the ARPA reporting requirements or are we talking about them consulting -- or them advising us on whether these are -- are projects we should be using ARPA dollars for at all?

Miles: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Perreault, to the compliance reporting requirements. Which certainly if there is concern on their part to say, well, this project doesn't even meet muster, which I will stick my neck out there, I don't believe -- I believe all these meet the muster of the -- of being eligible for funding. The idea is more that they will be looking at the paperwork to say this is what's required to submit to justify your project cost X time Y of the -- the project timeline. It's standard reporting requirements in all grants. We are not ARPA experts in grant funding on this program and that's some of the concerns that Finance has expressed.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: So, is there an expectation that the federal government is going to make ARPA reporting so complicated that we need to hire a consultant for 175,000 dollars to make sure that we are in compliance? I just -- I'm really trying to understand it. I -- maybe I'm just --

Simison: If I could --

Perreault: -- dense this evening.

Simison: The CFO of the city has requested outside assistance to ensure compliance, so we are kept within the guidelines, yes. Whether it's he feels he doesn't have the



resources or the knowledge, he is asking for additional assistance for running any of these projects.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thanks, Dave. Could you just remind us about the timeline constraint of when the money needs to be spent by? And, then, I might have a follow-up comment.

Miles: Sure. Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, so projects have to have funding allocated to them by December of 2024 and project expenses have to be expended by 2026 -- December 2026.

Strader: So, I -- I have a comment. Maybe --

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: And it's just thinking out loud, but, you know, it occurs to me like we are I think moving the police and fire station costs in because we know they would be spent within that time frame and we might want to think about -- I think we have decided that to a pretty good extent already. I think that if that stayed in our original budget we were presented that really leaves us with a pretty clean approach to like chewing what we bit off last year and, then, I think this extraordinary funding could be used potentially for the designing and design plans for the community center. Dave, is there any reason that the community center has been omitted from consideration that we should be aware of?

Miles: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, only in the fact that we had moved the budget items from the budget -- FY-23 budget items over to the proposed. I think it's really all for discussion. You have got the omitted things that are on there, not only the community center, but golf course irrigation, park land, certainly the streetlights as well. So, I think it's all open for discussion and I appreciate your feedback on the -- the fire station comment.

Simison: And one way or the other when you are talking about any of the things that could be funded with General Fund dollars, the net result is the same, honestly, whether you use money for a community center from ARPA or use Fire and Police for ARPA, it's -- on the back end it's going to free up the same dollars for the same -- for any General Fund purposes. Either way. If -- if you use the 4.3 from our Police and Fire, then, you have freed up 4.3 million for community center. It's the same basic principle philosophy, it's just where do you want to apply dollars potentially or not and are we -- what -- are we confident in meeting those thresholds and those time frames which were discussed. And I know that's even why Laurelei is here, is wanting to make sure that -- some of these things we need to move forward on, because they will take significant amount of time and we don't even know how long some of these are going to take based upon the current supply chain and all -- all those wonderful, wonderful issues.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Your comment is spot on. I -- I thought this phase two proposal made sense in that it's allocating this -- in this case 4.3, it's -- it's not additional funds, but it's kind of recharacterizing existing budgeted items for two certainties that will meet the deadlines that you have described. So, I think that makes great sense. The other two as well. I had sent out the note that big proponent of utilizing some portion, an amount to be determined, for one facet of affordable housing solutions utilizing Jesse Tree and another providing some form of Circuit Breaker relief, which I see both of those noted. But the lion's share characterizing to cover the police and fire station existing costs makes great sense to ensure compliance.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I -- I would like to explore a little bit on the affordable housing subject, because we have two things I -- I think two paths that we need to decide on. One is what are we going to do with affordable housing for the future moving forward, if anything. I -- I have no idea. And Council Woman Perreault has been diving into that. And the other one is what do we do, if anything, with our recent request for funding for their project of affordable housing and that can be ARPA funds, that could be budgeted funds in General Fund dollars or it could be nothing at all. But I -- I -- I see whatever we do if -- if anything for -- for the housing company issue, a one off, because I think we need to have a plan in place for affordable housing moving forward, again, if -- if any. If we decide to get into that -- that realm. So, that's one of those things I'm -- I'm not too sure what to -- which direction we want to go on the first item of the immediate request and, then, of course, building that other program and the timing and all those costs, that might be a General Fund item that -- that we rely on moving forward. So, I just want to have that discussion, because I'm -- I'm not sure where -- where we want to go.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: My hope is, as many of you know, that definitely before the end of 2024 that Meridian has an affordable housing policy and plan in place and that we would be able to identify those funds fairly easily. But as you mentioned, Council -- Councilman Hoaglund, you know, that this doesn't have a specific place right at this very moment and so if that -- if that is something that, you know, if -- if Council says one of the criteria or desired elements of these ARPA funds is to have a specific place for the funds to go, like Councilman Borton just mentioned, with police and fire, we know the costs, we know they are there, we know they can be met, then, you know, to stick consistent with the criteria for each of the line items in here I think is a -- is a good idea. One of the original

conversations we had in the first meeting was that Councilman Borton and Councilman Strader. Here we are looking at how many of these will bring a return to the city of some kind or a cost savings to the city of some kind. So, just want to circle around maybe on our big picture criteria for each of these items and see if we want all of them to fit into that criteria or if we want them to -- or if we are comfortable changing some of that criteria and the -- the affordable housing conversation, one of the things I have thought about when I first saw this -- I don't know who -- who had kind of decided to bring this as a proposal, but was to potentially, as we have these conversations about consultants, talk with the Planning Department about the possibility of using some of those funds to have some guidance from specialists on affordable housing that -- that guide municipalities and counties specifically. So, that's another potential item that we could consider under affordable housing is to have somebody who maybe has more knowledge at the national level of what different cities are doing that are in a similar position.

Simison: Council, any additional questions or comments at this time?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Maybe just a comment. I think it's great that we are looking at this and I think it would be fantastic if we could have this conversation alongside the budget conversation over the next month, because they really do go hand in hand. I agree that money is fungible, but I -- I do think that this ARPA funding is a specific opportunity to do things that we might not otherwise be able to accelerate forward and so I -- I think it does make sense to look at it a little bit differently, but I would just appreciate if we could -- if it's possible for us to discuss ARPA projects within our discussions of the budget, I think that would make a lot of sense to talk about them together. But that's just my two cents.

Simison: And, Council Woman Strader, that's why we wanted to get this in front of you before we had the budget discussion, so you could see at least what was being proposed as part of the -- as part of the dialogue. So, yeah, we weren't expecting a decision direction tonight, but with other conversations occurring over the next several weeks it just seemed appropriate To make sure we got this back in front of you for part of your thought process.

Strader: Got it.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: One other item I just want to touch on. Fiber connectivity. I don't know if, Dave, you wanted to handle that. Dave Tiede is here. Just explain a little bit about what -- what would be shovel ready and what this would entail.

Miles: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, Council, Councilman Hoaglund, I -- my wife tells me that I just kill electronics, so I have the Cliff Notes here, but if Dave is here and wants to chat about it, I will let the expert chat about it.

Tiede: Good afternoon, Mayor, Members of the Council, Councilman Hoaglund. We have a number of projects that we are interested in completing at this point in time. Most of them are estimates. We have one that we have an official quote from a vendor on and that is for the Fire Safety Center. That one could be started as early as August where we do get approval. The others would take more time for developing, you know, a contract and whatnot with consultants to do much of the labor, so --

Simison: Can you list the other projects that you have.

Tiede: Yeah. The other projects include Lakeview Golf Course. Fuller Park, which we took ownership from WARD a few years back. Completing some projects that we have done with Public Works in conjunction with ACHD, which includes work along Chinden, Linder to Fire Station 5. At the Meridian pool. Connecting wastewater to that Chinden section that we had -- that I just mentioned. Potentially Tully Park, Settlers Park and Discovery Park phase one.

Hoaglund: Thanks, Mr. Mayor. Thanks, Dave. Yeah. Yeah. That fiber connection is important. Again, to your point, Mayor, doing this will come out of the budget. I mean it's -- it's -- it's all -- all the same to some degree. It can get done, so just one of those things. But I was just curious what kind of your thought process was for where it needed to go. Thanks, Dave.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any other questions or comments at this time? Okay. Well, you have that. Thank you, Dave. And post -- post at least first budget conversation maybe before. We will see about coming back. Because I know some of these we would like to get the official official blessing to move forward in this budget year if we need to bring forward a budget amendment for some of them, so -- all right. Thank you.

**12. EXECUTIVE SESSION per Idaho Code 74-206(1)(d): to Consider Records that are Exempt from Disclosure as Provided in Chapter 1, Title 74, Idaho Code**

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, I move that we go into Executive Session per Idaho Code 74-206(1)(d).

Borton: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: (5:31 p.m. to 5:59 p.m.)

Simison: Council, do I have a motion to come out of Executive Session?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, I move we come out of Executive Session.

Borton: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to come out of Executive Session. All those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. Come out of Executive Session.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, I move we adjourn.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 5:59 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

|                                  |                        |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| _____<br>MAYOR ROBERT E. SIMISON | _____<br>DATE APPROVED |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK