

Meridian City Council Work Session

December 20, 2022.

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 4:35 p.m., Tuesday, December 20, 2022, by President Brad Hoaglund.

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

Members Absent: Robert Simison and Treg Bernt.

Also present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Caleb Hood, Joe Bongiorno and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

☒ Liz Strader	☒ Joe Borton (4:37 p.m.)
☒ Brad Hoaglund	☐ Treg Bernt
☒ Jessica Perreault	☒ Luke Cavener
☐ Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Hoaglund: All right. Well, Council, let's call this Council work session to order. Today is Tuesday, December 20th. It's 4:35 p.m. and at this time, Mr. Clerk, would you, please, call the roll.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Hoaglund: Our next item on the agenda is adoption of the agenda.

Strader: Mr. President?

Hoaglund: Yes, Council Woman Strader.

Strader: It looks like we need to vacate Item 13 and with that I move that we adopt the agenda.

Hoaglund: Do we have a second? Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Mr. President. If I can get my microphone to work. Yes. Second that motion.

Hoaglund: We have a motion to adopt the agenda as published with the vacation of Item 13. All those in favor of adopting the agenda, please, say aye. Any opposed? The ayes have it and the agenda is adopted.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

- 1. Approve Minutes of the December 6, 2022 City Council Work Session Meeting**
- 2. Approve Minutes of the December 6, 2022 City Council Regular Meeting**
- 3. Request for Contingent Approval of Beer and Wine License for The Happy Hour Homemaker, located at 132 E. Idaho Ave.**
- 4. Acceptance of Withdraw of Land Use Application (H-2022-0051), Klein Huis at Victory and Meridian**
- 5. Final Order for Gander Creek South No. 3 (FP-2022-0026) by Kent Brown Planning Services, generally located south of W. McMillan Rd. on the south side of the Five Mile Creek, west of N. McDermott Rd.**
- 6. Final Order for Prescott Ridge Subdivision No. 3 (FP-2022-0033) by KM Engineering, LLP., located at the west side of N. Rustic Oak Way, approximately 1/4 mile south of W. Chinden Blvd./State Highway 20-26**
- 7. Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law for Prairiefire Subdivision (H-2022-0053) by Patrick Conner, located at 3539 N. Locust Grove. Rd., near the northwest corner of E. Ustick Rd. and N. Locust Grove Rd.**
- 8. Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law for McDermott Village (H-2022-0056) by Boise Hunter Homes, located at 3235 N. McDermott Rd., at the northwest corner of W. Ustick Rd. and N. McDermott Rd.**
- 9. Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law for McDermott Village Variance (VAR-2022-0004) by Boise Hunter Homes, located at 3235 N. McDermott Rd., at the northwest corner of W. Ustick Rd. and N. McDermott Rd.**
- 10. Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law for Turin Plaza (H-2022-0063) by 12.15 Design, located at 3169 W. Belltower Dr.**
- 11. Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law for Turin Plaza (SHP-2022-0013) by 12.15 Design, located at 3169 Belltower Dr.**
- 12. Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law for West Valley Emergency Center (H-2022-0065) by Fulmer Lucas Engineering, LLC., located at the Southwest Corner of N. Levi Ln. and N. Rustic Oak Way**

Strader: Mr. President?

Hoaglund: Yes, Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Now, that we have adopted the agenda, I move that we -- I move that we approve the Consent Agenda, for the Council President to sign and the Clerk to attest.

Perreault: Second that motion.

Hoaglun: Have a motion and a second to approve the Consent Agenda. Any discussion on that? If not, all those in favor signify saying aye. Any opposed? The ayes have it and the Consent Agenda is adopted.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

Hoaglun: There were no items moved from the Consent Agenda that needed to be discussed.

DEPARTMENT / COMMISSION REPORTS [Action Item]

14. Community Development: Analysis of Housing Code

Hoaglun: Next up we have Department/Commission Reports and tonight we have the -- finally the Community Development analysis of the housing code with Mr. Hood. So, Caleb, go ahead.

Hood: Thank you, Mr. President, Members of Council. First of all, Merry Christmas, Happy Hanukkah to you all. Thank you. And I apologize at the same time for having this special meeting. We didn't get to it the first couple of times. The third time is the charm is what they say, so, you know, this has been in your packet now for -- for three different meetings over the last couple of months. I'm going to make an assumption there. I know what people say about assuming things, too, but that you have had a chance to at least look at it one of those three times it was on your agenda. So, I'm not going to read it to you, but I do want to highlight some things in kind of an overall approach to -- to what we are doing here. I'm going to share the second page of the memo. So, the first page is just a little bit of that background talking about how we have talked about this over the last several months. In April we had a little more targeted discussion and, then, I'm back now to -- to really emphasize working on a housing mix and attainability in what we can do to improve that situation in our community. So, the -- the list that -- that is on the screen now, there are a few more pages of that -- that list, but it really focuses around our city code. It doesn't include housing programs and funding mechanisms or partnerships with developers or nonprofit organizations and things like that. We have had some other conversations about that. I have been talking with Council Woman Perreault about that a little bit through our CDBG program. I know Council's had some other conversations about that. That is not this. This really is -- my next step was to really look at the code and what we can do maybe in that realm to positively affect the housing dynamic in our community. So, again, I'm going to run through the list. Feel free to interrupt as needed. I will pause for some feedback. Also for a little bit of effect, you know, there will be some

drama here. But, no, feel free to jump in with any comments you have. Also think about it, too. I can take comments after the fact. Again, this has been in your packet. I will assume you have looked at it. But if you have some comments over the next several days, too, I will -- I will still take them. So, this isn't your only bite at this apple. We will be vetting whatever direction I get this evening -- this afternoon through the UDC focus group. I guess that's kind of a question. That's my approach is to use the UDC focus group, because, again, we are talking code and maybe even a subcommittee of that group, because we are going to get pretty specialized into at least one, if not two or more of these topics that really can do a deeper dive, rather than just code with architects and things like that. Really get some folks that are focused in on providing residential units and get some feedback from them and make sure they are part of developing whatever solutions there are. Just kind of my last precursor before, again, we really jump into the meat. Unless I hear otherwise, this is kind of my approach. So, tell me if I'm off base, but, if not, don't be surprised if I move forward with what you see in this memo. So, again, this is sort of your opportunity to steer me in a little bit different direction as we move forward. I don't know the outcome of all these, but these are at least the thing that staff -- the -- the -- the elements that staff at least proposes to evaluate further and -- and really modify in our code. So, with that, unless you have any questions, I'm going to just kind of run through these. And, again, I'm not going to read it to you necessarily, but I will highlight each one of the -- the codes, the standards, the policies as -- as they -- they appear in the -- in your memo.

Hoaglund: Okay. Council, any questions? Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you, Mr. President. Caleb, one thing that -- it just -- it came up as I was reading this and it's just an overarching question. As you are running through these -- if you know -- and if you don't it's okay. But on each one a big question in my mind was -- are we proposing this citywide to encourage a certain type of housing or are we -- are we thinking of adopting different standards for people providing affordable housing? So, that was kind of a big overarching question that I had as I was kind of reading through this. So, just something to plant, I guess, as you are -- as you are running through it.

Hood: So, Mr. President and Council Woman Strader, it's a great comment and it's a little bit of both and so I think for the most part a lot of these are citywide, but there are some things -- or there is a policy discussion in there. You could potentially modify setbacks or have leniency on parking requirements if it's an affordable housing project. So, there are kind of -- there -- there are those elements. And, again, I'm glad you brought up the question slash comment, because you can mix and match these a little bit; right? It's not a one-size-fits-all and there is overlap certainly and some of that I hope came through in the matrix a little bit. So, you can -- hey, I like this concept over there. What about if we apply it to this for a, quote, unquote, affordable housing project? And even defining that is -- is TBD. So, again, I think the general rule is this is meant citywide at least at the start, where it would be staff's recommendation that this one give maybe more weight to potentially implementing that for an affordable housing project I tried to call that out. But you could do it in more places.

Strader: Mr. President?

Hoaglun: Yes, Council Woman Strader.

Strader: That's super helpful, because -- right. Actually your exact example. You know, pretty much every one of them as I was going through there was a real question in my mind like is our philosophy, you know, changing citywide to promote a certain type of housing we want to see more of or are we really getting more targeted and saying, okay, you know what, if you come in with an affordable housing project you could have different setbacks, different parking, you know, and the -- many items on the list I thought could -- could actually be applied either way. So, anyway, we will go through it and, then, chat. But thank you. That's helpful clarification. So, assume it's citywide unless called out specifically.

Hood: Generally speaking. And that's my approach to this entire exercise, really, is, you know, looking at the problem as a community. Not for just affordable housing or people -- you know, just, again, providing a mix of housing options for all and so where are some of those hang-ups and we will see that in the second one on the screen. That's really not -- you know, there is no one targeted demographic for that, that's just -- and I'm not going to even call it a barrier, but it is a code requirement you have a minimum house size. Well, I won't get into it now, because that's number two. But, yes, your comments are -- are spot on. So, let's jump in then, unless there is any other initial comments.

Hoaglun: Council, any other questions before Caleb gets started? All right. Caleb, go ahead.

Hood: Okay. So, the first one is ADUs and I -- and I do think this one -- it's at the -- it's at the top, not because it's the easiest to do, but I do think maybe this -- this is something that has some legs. We have done some work internally to look at -- basically at the request of Council Woman Perreault, an inventory of our lots in Meridian and -- and feasibly, realistically -- I kind of use those words a little loosely there, but how many of our existing lots could you actually fit an ADU on and it's really not that many. Most lots you are maximizing your -- your pad site for the most part. Now, with some tweaks, though, and depending on how we define these, you could actually add either additions or detached structures that are -- are more traditional accessory structures or accessory dwelling units, but there are multiple types of ADUs. Some of them could be above a garage. Some of them could be totally detached. Attached. So, there is a lot of different ways that even that word accessory dwelling unit -- people in their mind's eye envision those differently. So, it could even be a remodel of an existing structure to -- to create a secondary dwelling unit. So, I guess some of the things I have highlighted or need some feedback on from you, if you have any, are the bolded parts in staff recommendation. So, I do think we move forward with something here. We did just amend -- slightly tweak in August to allow the ADUs to be a little bit larger. We went up to 900 square feet and allow two bedrooms now, not just one and 700 square feet. But one of the things in doing that analysis of our lot inventory was if there was some relief to rear setbacks, that's where most lots have a lot of -- that's your backyard, so that's where you have a yard really. Not

just a setback, but a yard. So, if you -- there was some exception to that. That's where you could fit more ADUs on your -- again standard lot -- six, seven, eight, ten thousand square foot lot in Meridian. The parking requirements. This is a fairly controversial one, so, you know, I don't know how much you have thought about it. But, again, you -- you could do a lot more of these if you either relaxed or removed a -- a parking requirement. We need to think that through. Some communities have done that and been burned and it doesn't work. Some it's not been as bad. Do they -- you know, it's kind of a give and a take. You get the housing unit, but now parking maybe is an issue for that -- that subdivision or that area anyways where -- where you get more ADUs. But just throwing that out there as an option. Do we even want to have that as an option or are we like, no, it should be self parked and -- and we don't want to force whoever is living in that ADU to the street. And, again, I'm not -- if you have feedback now I will take it, but that -- those are kind of some of the ones where we could open up the potential for more accessory -- accessory dwelling units in Meridian. One other one I will just throw out there and this isn't -- wouldn't technically be an accessory dwelling unit, but this is something that, again, Councilman Perreault and I talked about a little bit in passing -- is a lot split option. So, you could even technically -- you know, if we allowed some variance to our standard lot sizes or whatever to do something -- so, it's actually not accessory to that primary structure, you could do an administrative one time division that wouldn't meet the minimum dimensional standards of the zone for an ADU. So, again, a little bit of give and take with some of our current standards, but maybe, then, it's a set aside dwelling that's on a smaller lot -- a smaller home on a smaller lot in an otherwise R-8 or R-4 community. So, not advocating for that necessarily, but there is some version or an option of that that may help with financing, it may help with, you know, obviously, homeownership and those types of things. So, just a few things to think about as we look at further amending our accessory dwelling units.

Perreault: Mr. President?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Just for the sake of efficiency I'm wanting to understand if Caleb is going to present one code change and, then, we discuss or are we going to go through the whole list and you will describe them and, then, we will go back?

Hood: Mr. President, your meeting. I would prefer we do them one at a time though. I don't know if we had a goal of what time to get out of here. I'm not certainly trying to take all evening, but I would like to -- it's fresh in our minds, we talked about it, let's -- let me get -- get some direction. If you want to go a different direction I'm open to that, too.

Hoaglund: Yeah. I think we can talk about each one as we go through to get comments on. I think staff -- just hearing -- overhearing conversation, they -- they want to be out by 9:00 o'clock tonight, so --

Hood: Or a little sooner. Yeah.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Hoaglund: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I will stay with one on this first topic. Is it -- is the -- is the concept designed to encourage a new development that would be, you know, an R-2 zone that is built out with ADUs all over it or is it to try and encourage the one off existing homeowner to add a unit on his property? In which case if it's the latter I would think that would only occur when I'm adding it, because I have got somebody -- my mother-in-law is going to move in. So, I'm really not creating any housing stock at all. It's a wash. In the -- in the latter example, so --

Hood: Yeah.

Borton: -- what's -- who is the user of it?

Hood: Just to confirm your -- your suspicion or your statement, yeah. And if you look down on -- it's on the next page. The kind of what you described there, Councilman Borton, I think, is more in the tiny home area where I see there -- see there could be a way where we can -- for new subdivisions, new projects, create maybe these nodes of tiny home -- mini communities within a larger subdivision or something. So, yeah, the tiny home is more -- or the -- excuse me -- the ADU is more of a granny flat. Maybe got a kid at college and they need their own space or -- or that type of a thing. So, I guess I would -- I don't say push back, but it does -- it does provide housing stock, though. They are -- they are moving from somewhere else that maybe they are not self-sufficient now. So, it is adding another dwelling unit to the inventory, but it's not the same targeted family, if you will. I mean that single person is still technically a family, but it's not -- yeah.

Perreault: Mr. President?

Hoaglund: Yes, Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Caleb and I had chatted about this -- you know, we looked -- went and looked through what -- what's going to create the most -- what -- what's going to create the most number of units without having to build new projects? What can we do with what we currently have? What's going to benefit our residents? So, if you have -- need a mother-in-law suite or you have a -- a student in college, that's going to benefit our residents, not only financially in that regard, but also if they have the opportunity for some income generation that helps with housing prices as well. If you are able to purchase a home and generate some rent, so that you can help afford that mortgage there is an element to that, too. But we really wanted to at first dig into how do we create units, how do we create additional places for folks to live out of what we currently have before discussing any new, because we think there is a lot of opportunity there and so Caleb did go through and try to actually generate numbers that would help us figure out how many new units we could create in the subdivisions that we have based on the lot sizes and -- and had --

put together a -- somewhat of a -- a list or possible -- I don't want to say individuals, but possible living -- living -- new living locations of out of each zone.

Hood: I will say I don't have that actually. So, Brian McClure helped me with that. He is great with stuff in GIS and can map and -- and do all that stuff. No surprise. Your R-2 lots, which are generally half acre lots, most of those you can accommodate it and in an R-4 and, then, when you really get down to R-8 it's -- it's almost impossible for most lots. I mean there is a small percentage where you could, but it's still very very difficult. So, for a vast majority of our lots it's just not even possible to retrofit.

Hoaglund: Caleb, I go back and forth on this one, because when you thought about owner occupied requirement, I thought, you know, that's good, because you don't want it to be an Airbnb. That doesn't help. It's -- yeah, revenue for them, but it's not what this is about. But, then, I thought, okay, how do you distinguish that room -- and let's say it's an ICON student and they get out of college, they go right into that, they need a place to live, they want to rent something, well, you know, it's -- we don't have a lot of rental stock, if -- if -- and the prices and you go, well, they wouldn't be owner occupied, I mean that would be someone renting that -- that -- that room or that -- let's say it's 900 square feet that they build on their -- their property and go, okay, that doesn't quite meet the requirements. So, I kind of go back and forth on that. Owner occupied, yes. Well, but, then, there are those situations where someone's going to -- you need housing stock and at a lower rate of -- of rental in this case, that -- that would qualify. So, I -- I don't know how to do that, other than, you know, approach it from an Airbnb, as an example type of situation. But any -- any thoughts on that approach, Caleb?

Hood: So, I will -- and I should have probably mentioned this at the beginning. I really am impressed by the -- this little handout that AARP put together. It's the ABC's of ADUs and they have questions like that basically answered in here. Best practices. And so I'm planning on using this as we talk about this some more with the UDC focus group. Some of them are questions more than answers, but things to think about in your community. I -- I do like -- and -- and that is one of them, they -- they bring up, Councilman Hoaglund, is should you have at least one of the two. I mean that's the idea. One of the two being owner occupied, not both. So, it doesn't have to be a child or a mother or something that lives in the secondary unit, but at least one of the two have to -- has to be occupied by an owner; right? You can rent out or whatever else you -- and it wouldn't technically prohibit you from doing Airbnb or something like that, but at least the owner would be on site. So, again, pros and cons to that. I -- I do -- I would want to refresh that. I -- I remember reading that in here. That's my thought though. I think they -- they strongly recommended you think about that if you currently have a requirement for -- for a unit to be owner occupied that you leave that. But it's not a one-size-fits-all.

Hoaglund: Thanks, Caleb. Yeah. That's interesting. Owner on site does change the dynamic of a --

Hood: So, if granny wants to live in the granny flat and still own the main house, too, she -- she -- and, then, have her grandkids with family run -- you know, she's -- so, that could work.

Hoaglund: And as far as the parking requirements go, boy, you know, parking, that -- that that would be a tough one. I mean that's a -- that's a little harder. We -- we understand the parking problems we have in -- in neighborhoods and whatnot to -- to a degree. But if it's going to be in these larger lots would there be a need? I mean -- yeah, that one we would have to look at a little deeper just to make sure I would be satisfied with reducing that requirement. We -- we don't have great public transportation, you know, in the valley yet. So, it's -- it's one of those things that you can't rely on -- to a great degree, so that one probably takes more thought.

Perreault: Mr. President?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: As you probably know what we are currently seeing are folks that have four bedroom homes that are renting two or three of the rooms out for seven or eight hundred dollars a month and the assumption is at least each of those rooms will have a vehicle. So, now you have four vehicles on that four bedroom home and there is no way for us to track parking in that scenario, but if -- but if they apply for the ability to have an accessory dwelling unit, then, we have a way to gather numbers for that and that does help our planning. If you get on Facebook marketplace, Craigslist, or any of those places, you see a lot of rooms for rent, they are all over town, and we just don't have any way to really track those numbers. Just the same conversation that Boise had in the North End. But when you go through these kinds of scenarios where you have folks that want to have other -- other individuals living with them, then, it certainly doesn't stop somebody with a four bedroom home from renting out two of their rooms, but it might help with us tracking how many occupants are in each home or in each subdivision.

Strader: Mr. President?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I think I'm open to this, but probably the piece that sticks out to me as a potential issue would be changing the setbacks. It's precisely because it affects our existing housing stock and so I feel like we had set the rules of the road on what the setbacks are going to be throughout Meridian. People purchased homes, built homes on that basis. If I was a neighbor and, then, setbacks -- especially the rear setbacks got changed and, then, two weeks later I heard about somebody applying to build a -- you know, a granny flat ten feet from my home, I think I would absolutely flip. I -- I just -- I think where it's something that has to do -- I think really important in this conversation are the things that would apply to new developments versus existing development and I think we have to be really thoughtful and maybe as this goes through the UDC focus group that could be part of how they tackle this, because it does seem like, you know, you have the rules of the

road, the way that it's been done, everyone's been following kind of the same playing field on the existing development. Then if you have a new development, you know, that -- that's different, I feel like you are setting a new precedent, but to -- to go through and give people the ability to change the setbacks, I think that could be really problematic. Also the parking I -- I do think could be problematic, but I don't know if I'm as -- like allergic to that. Maybe that could be thought through. But definitely the setbacks for me would be a big sticking point on this one.

Perreault: Mr. President?

Hoaglund: Let me -- let me go to Deputy Chief Bongiorno. I think he has his hand raised. He might shed some light on this.

Bongiorno: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. President. I just wanted to add on to what Council Woman Strader was saying. She -- all of this is great ideas. Love it. I mean I'm -- I -- I understand the need. There is a lot of code dependent things -- and I'm sure Caleb has gone through a lot of this. There is a lot of this that will be code dependent as well, because you can't just throw a building in the back of a house and -- and it would be okay. I mean there is a lot of stuff that would have to go along with that as far as addressing goes, as far as access goes, as far as, you know, can -- can we get a -- a fire line to it if it's on fire. I mean that's kind of the -- the concern with the safety of the tiny home thing, you know, where -- that we are currently dealing with right now. So, there is -- there is a lot of things in the building code and the fire code that we also have to pay attention to, you know, as we move forward, can -- can we do this and what are the ramifications, but I just want to make sure that, you know, all of this has code implications that we need to make sure that we include and just say, yeah, we are just going to do this, because, you know, there is problems if we do that.

Hood: Mr. President?

Hoaglund: Yes.

Hood: If I can just piggyback on that comment and I appreciate you bringing that up, Joe. The building department is also another, you know, not EMS, but building codes I think are also something we will want to think through a little bit. So, again, I appreciate the comments. We will definitely coordinate with fire, with building, with others -- kind of depending on where this goes and maybe just -- I'm not trying to wrap this first one up necessarily, but I do want to kind of tell you what I just heard a little bit and if there is more comments I -- I can take that as well. But it does sound like having at least one of the two --

Hoaglund: Caleb, real quick.

Hood: Yeah.

Hoaglund: Council Woman Strader -- I mean Perreault wants to comment.

Perreault: Thank you. So, that brings up another thought and my assumption -- and I haven't voiced this, because it was an assumption -- was that the person -- excuse me -- the person making the application to do that would go through some sort of process where that application is reviewed by our staff and, then, if Council Woman Strader thinks it's a great idea maybe they could also be required to have neighborhood meetings in which they were to -- I want to give folks the ability to do it and I don't want to weigh down our Council on these -- on, you know, one by one lot meetings, but I -- I -- I don't know that they necessarily would need to be a public hearing per se, but perhaps a neighborhood meeting might be a good idea and, then, it can go through a staff level approval process and so I would really like to hear Caleb's thoughts on, you know, how much we standardize these or do we set a base standard and, then, allow each individual application to be kind of reviewed on its own merits?

Hood: Mr. President, Council Woman Perreault, I think I'm tracking most of that. I got confused there for a minute just on the -- well, let me start backwards. Standards. Yes, I think we -- we -- we -- we set the standards, here is the rules we play by and maybe there is a variance process and if you want to -- you know, I agree, I don't think we want to gum up Council's agendas with a bunch of variances to setbacks. But maybe there is an option in there. What -- the part I got confused about a little bit was the neighborhood meeting and -- and I guess are you saying that at least in your mind you are open to having a conversation about setbacks or that has to do with something different?

Perreault: Mr. President?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I'm sorry. Let me clarify. Councilman Strader -- Council Woman Strader had mentioned concerns that the neighbors might have. If we give an individual an opportunity to apply to do this with their lot and they don't need to go to the neighbors and say this is what I'm planning on doing, there doesn't need to be a conversation, which is a very fair concern. Absolutely a fair concern from home values, from -- you know, absolutely a direct concern. So, I think there is a couple of ways we could potentially go about it. It's impossible for us to ask every resident that has a lot large enough and get that feedback before we were to make this decision. So, we could -- we could send out letters and say here is what we are considering doing and ask for feedback. Or we can have anyone who is applying to maybe do that lot split that you mentioned, for example, send a letter to the neighbors that says here is what we are applying for, feel free to send your feedback, and that way the -- the neighborhood has notice and they -- they -- they are not left out of that decision, but also doesn't just throw the baby out with the bathwater and say, no, this isn't a good idea, because a neighbor might be upset. So, finding that balance is kind of what -- I'm just trying to think through solutions to that balance, which might be requiring them to notify neighbors or -- you know, I don't know exactly how that will look, but --

Hood: So, Mr. President, if I -- if I can. So, a couple of thoughts on that and I think some of this, you know, we will have a lot to think about over the weeks and days and really

months go on. It's -- it's two things there. One I think are these initial standards that we are looking to change to and, then, it's the process by which someone applies to use those standards that we have adopted. So, I think we -- we talk about what we -- you know, I haven't even gotten to the point of how do we get these potential changes we are going to make to code in front of the public. Are we doing coffee with the Mayor? Are we doing -- you know, getting that feedback from R-2 lots -- I haven't even gone there yet to say how do we get feedback from our community on if this is the right thing or not. I want to have a better idea of what we are asking them -- you know, put in -- at least narrow it down a little bit for what we are proposing and, then, get some public input. I think the process, though -- let me just throw this out there -- when you are talking I'm thinking we could do something like what we do with our neighborhood daycares. So, they are allowed. So, you meet with your -- you have a neighborhood meeting, you meet with them, you kind of know; right? And most reasonable people go, okay, my neighbors don't really like me doing this, it's done. I'm not going to -- I'm not going to push that button. But you don't have to. They could all come up and pitch pitchforks and you can still apply and we permit you, but we send a letter to all the neighbors saying we just approved the daycare next to you, you have 15 days to appeal it. So, now the onus is back on the adjacent property owners to say why that doesn't meet the intent or why they don't like it; right. So, it's a little bit different than our typical process, but it is a -- sort of a buy right with a veto sort of option. I could see something similar for ADUs. You go talk to your neighbors, see if they have concerns. If you can work things out just amongst yourselves -- we still have standards of the city and if you meet the setbacks, you meet the parking, you do whatever we decide those are, we still approve it, but we send a letter to everybody and saying, hey, we are approving this. Before we issue a permit, though, you have 15 days and you can go talk to Council about it. If you really have a beef for how we have implied -- you know, whatever that is. So, maybe that is somewhat of a compromise. Anyways, I think more on that. So, I will make that -- put that down as a, you know, a thought anyways. But, again, just to kind of summarize and -- and we can add to this list, too. But on-site ownership seemed important. Parking generally seemed important. Focusing this more on new lots, though, than existing. So, we were more talking about existing lots just most recently, but maybe focusing -- and, then, Councilman Borton had -- you know, I think maybe even require a certain percentage of lots to be able to accommodate these in the future, right, with the new subdivision. Say, hey, you need to have ten percent of your lots have an extra wide setback on the side, so, you -- you know, you predesignate ADU lots potentially. And, again, I'm not saying that's what it's going to end up being, but maybe that's part of our conversation is designating lots where you have an area and, then, if someone's interested in that in the future they can go, yeah, that lot -- because in the future I'm going to have my mother-in-law live with me.

Hoaglund: Caleb, on that -- on that setbacks type of thing, I think we need to have at least for existing current -- I -- I get it, you know, that you buy your house and that -- you have got certain setbacks, it's in place, but at the same time it might be the neighbors go, yeah, I'm fine with that. So, at least have a process. It might be a very difficult -- not difficult, but neighbors may not agree, but if your neighbors agree that -- that changes the dynamic. You know, I mean there are long-term neighbors in the neighborhood who go, yeah, yeah, I see why you want your mom to move in and what happens after that. Yeah. You are

far enough we can make this work and -- okay. We -- we could do that. Because I don't want to tell anybody -- well, if you are already here and it's already a house you can't do that, so -- but it has to be --

Hood: Hear you.

Hoaglun: -- geared toward -- I think Council Woman Strader, you are looking at protecting what's already there, because that's what people bought into, so --

Strader: Mr. President?

Hoaglun: Go ahead.

Strader: Yeah. I think we are thinking along the same lines. I was looking at it like -- I don't think we should change the setbacks for ADUs, but maybe the standard for a variance -- if it still meets the fire department and building code requirements -- you know, if you get the consent of all of your surrounding property owners that are affected by the change, that to me seems like a fair sort of a standard or something like that. I think we are thinking along the same lines, like don't change the setbacks, but make it possible for people to get their neighbors to agree. I don't know. I feel like we are getting into a lot of -- it's hard, because we sort of have to -- you have to get into the detail to -- yeah. I mean and -- and maybe the committee will be able to flush out some of -- some of these things, too, because there is a -- I mean these are just initial things that we are thinking of. There are probably a lot of other angles we haven't, so the more eyes on it the -- the better.

Hood: But to summarize just at least initially, setbacks of the smallest that's on the screen, that one seems to have the most initial momentum from -- from Council. So, that's kind of how I would summarize. The options to make it more feasible to do ADUs on a -- an existing lot in Meridian.

Perreault: Mr. President?

Hoaglun: Yes, Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I think now I'm tracking a little bit better. Council Woman Strader was getting at the idea of let's -- let's not change setbacks for all lots that are of a certain size. Now, I completely agree with that. If we -- if we -- if we -- you talked about the difference between the code -- the code and, then, the implementation or the process, I would -- I would think that the applicant would have to go through a variance process on an existing -- well, even on an -- in a -- on a new property to some extent. If all we are doing is asking for larger lots, they are still going to have to go through the same process than an existing homeowner would need to go through -- go through, which I think is fair.

Hood: We will have our base setbacks. We won't change those. But maybe we will have a process then for when someone wants to encroach with an ADU that -- I don't know if

variance is the right word. I don't know if that's allowed or not, but we will come up with some -- we will explore some process that's similar to that.

Hoaglun: So, Caleb, go ahead. We are a half hour in after the first box with a number of boxes. Let's see. 8:00 o'clock. So, we will be out before 9:00.

Hood: No. We are -- we are going to, you know motor right along. That one -- there is a lot to that one. So, I have -- I have titled this one small houses and that's somewhat intentional. This isn't tiny houses. We will talk about those a little bit later, but these in our current code -- and this one should go pretty quick -- we require in the R-2 and R-4 a minimum house size. There really isn't a reason for that. Well, there was a reason for that. It -- it can look out of place if you have a half acre lot and a 700 square foot home. But that -- if that's their choice and that's how they want to live, then, who are we to say your house needs to be 14 or 15 hundred square feet is my thought. So, to me -- and I don't want to assume, again, too much, but this is a fairly straightforward change to just say single family home, single family home, if it's 700 square feet, as long as you are on a foundation and hooked up to sewer and water, you know, have your -- have the -- the -- the garage that's required per code meet the setbacks. We are -- we are okay with that. So, again, I don't know -- as I kind of started to say earlier, I don't know this is really a barrier to any type of housing or encourage anything necessarily, but you -- but it is -- it's a requirement. It's a standard that we have and we don't really need one. So, it's kind of -- I wanted almost say check a box and say, look, you can build whatever size home you want in Meridian in any zone. There isn't a minimum or a maximum house size.

Hoaglun: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: As a former resident of the city of New York I do have thoughts about this. You know, I think the building code should help us a lot with this, but -- right? But there is -- there -- there is kind of just a livability factor of humans deserve a certain amount of light and air and a certain amount of space to have I think an adequate dwelling. So, I -- I understand maybe relaxing the requirements or changing them, but I'm not sure it makes sense to completely eliminate the minimum. I don't know. We would have to think about this. Like we don't see -- so, like what I would see before -- so, just to give you a funny personal example. I used to live in like a railroad apartment that was so narrow and we had a fold out couch that couldn't fold out, so it would hit the wall in one of my -- in my first apartment in Brooklyn and so, you know, now you are seeing things like micro units that are like 500 square feet or less with common areas and I actually think we could probably get into more trouble with an apartment multi-family situation on this issue than on the single family home. A single family home, if you are putting in the foundation and -- and -- and the hookups you are going to reach some certain minimum, but -- I don't know.

Hood: So, I'm -- I'm sorry, Mr. President, if I can just -- so, the -- the full context isn't there in -- in the column here, but these are the only two zones in our city that we currently have a minimum housing size for. So, if you want we can go the other way and add minimum

house sizes to all of our districts. But these are the only two right now that we actually have a minimum requirement dwelling size.

Hoaglund: And, Caleb, I think something like this is something -- we can consider and I think it would be interesting to have public comment on that, because you might get people saying, hey, I'm in R-2, I got my 3,000 square foot home and if somebody is going to build a 700 square foot home, that's going to lower my property value.

Hood: Yep.

Hoaglund: I don't know if it will or not, but I -- I think it's worth considering, but, you know, to have public comment on that and get some additional thinking and -- from developers and others, you know, would be --

Hood: Fair enough. Yep. We will definitely leave that to you, too, so -- any other -- any other concerns with just going -- going through that process, essentially, and letting -- hearing from our community and see if they have concerns with that?

Perreault: Mr. President?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Who did you say?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Oh, my goodness.

Hoaglund: What did --

Perreault: I totally heard you wrong. So, we require the new developments to have -- typically they have to have some sort of covenants and so nearly every set of covenants I have seen has a minimum in there for the protection and benefit of the residents. So, I think it's kind of -- I mean it's kind of not necessary in that sense. They are all required to have covenants. Nearly every developer is going to put that minimum in there for the protection of the community. So, why have it. On the other hand, if it's not negatively affecting anything why take it out? You know, I -- I think -- I feel a little bit neutral on it, since it's only in those two zones. However, I -- I'm not opposed to Council Woman Strader's idea about putting in some minimums in some more dense, you know, types of properties and that's a conversation we don't have to have tonight.

Hood: I was going to say, it's a little off topic, but I will make a note. We can -- we can talk about putting studio apartments and how big they at least need to be as a minimum. So, I will make a note.

Strader: Council President?

Hoaglun: Yes, Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. Just thinking through this; right. So, we are talking house size, but not lot size. So, that -- so, that -- that's where it's kind of like -- I think like we saw with the application the other night, it's really the lot size I feel like that drives the economic decision. I mean most developers are trying to maximize -- like the -- the biggest impact is going to be on lot size, not -- not really the house size. So, I feel like if we are -- you know, if we are -- if we are trying to tackle it more through lot size I think we might end up in the same -- or where -- whatever destination we want to arrive at, I think we would do it through that, because I -- I don't think that the house size is going to drive the decision making. I mean if whatever the land you purchase for is a sunk overhead cost, you are going to try to maximize -- I think if you are trying to put density and really get the most out of it, you would be trying to maximize the house, you know, based on the lot size; right?

Hood: So -- and -- and, again, not saying this is the solution, but some of the reasons to get out of the way, if you will, on this one is, you know, with the cost of materials and construction maybe I just sunk our entire life savings into the lot, because it's a nice big lot and I can only build -- I'm starting with a tiny home, because I just had to buy the property --

Strader: Got it.

Hood: -- and construction materials and labor right now are through the roof, but I need to have somewhere to live, so I'm going to build my 700 square foot to start and I will do additions over time maybe and now it becomes a 5,000 square foot home, but right now I -- so, that was kind of one of the -- the levers and that, again right now, you know, labor and lumber are high and so if we say you have to use so much lumber and labor, maybe we just priced somebody out of -- probably not, but that -- that's at least some of the thought process here. And, then, to Council Woman Perreault, it's probably already covered in some other covenants, because you probably can't buy that lot unless you construct something that's of a certain size anyway. So, this one is like just something we as a city staff don't have to check a box and if we miss it and we approve a 1,399 square foot lot -- or home on a lot, we are not liable for something -- for missing something, because our code says it need to be 1,400.

Hoaglun: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: It makes sense to me. I think we go get feedback on it, because it feels like, honestly, removing a piece of red tape in the sense that this is a -- this is really a standard that people are meeting that doesn't actually really drive the decision. So, let's see what people say. I mean, you know, and see --

Hoaglun: Okay. Sounds good. Caleb, what do you got next?

Hood: Development fee waivers and credits. So, this one we -- I think are -- actually already -- yeah. If you look in the far right-hand column in Title 10, we do -- and this is now back to kind of the -- the opening question, comments. This is for affordable housing projects. But it wouldn't necessarily have to be, but this is certainly in the vein of this -- this tool is for really those projects that are targeted towards affordability. So, what -- again, however we define that. Twenty percent of a project, a hundred percent of a project, eighty percent of LMI, whatever that looks like. That's kind of what this is. But this would be a reduction of fees related to basically services that the city provides. There is really kind of two things, so -- and I have got it listed in the title there. Waivers and credits or deferrals. So, a little different to waive a fee versus having the General Fund offset or supplement that fee. Someone still pays the fee, maybe it's just not the developer. So, we are going to have 500,000 dollars set aside and we will cover your cost for this versus, magic wand, we aren't going to charge our -- you know, you don't have to pay our application fee. It's waived. So, we would think through some of those things, but these are kind of some incentives that would maybe offset the costs for, again, just thinking about affordable housing projects in this one and what that could look like. So, non-market rate projects. If you have other eligibility requirements that you -- you know, if you are really like, boy, we need more studios and if you bring a studio we are willing to consider those things, too, even if it's -- if it's market rate, you know, you could apply it that way, too. I don't know why we couldn't necessarily, but, again, this was brought up in the -- the guise of -- for -- to see more affordability.

Hoaglund: And just for Council consideration, you know, looking ahead, if you want to go down this path and -- and look at defining what is affordable and, then, what would qualify and -- and they can use, that does have budget implications, so over the next budget cycle we would have to look at say, okay, if someone comes forward how do we pay for that -- those costs, so --

Cavener: Mr. President?

Hoaglund: Yes, Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Yeah. I think -- I think to that point, you know, the -- I appreciate you, Caleb, kind of deviating between waiving and deferral. I think deferral is a tool in our tool box that we can use on the -- you know, on an as-needed basis for a project. When it comes to wavering on fees, I think that we should plan for our -- our budget for next year to whether it's X amount -- a hundred thousand dollars that we want to set aside, so that we are budgeting and thinking about this and -- and having that available, just like with Incentives that exist for economic development, you know, look to the committee and staff to help us kind of forge some, you know, criteria on which that we would evaluate a potential project for waiving of those impact fees, but, then, having a -- a budget set aside to be able to pay for that. I think that's the right approach.

Perreault: Council President?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I wonder if -- and -- and I have no idea the answer to this question. If there could be an application for that through CDBG funds. I don't know if that's -- I mean -- I don't know. Federal government has pretty strict regulation on CDBG funding. But I -- I see it as not that terribly dissimilar to any other housing assistance. It's not -- it's just not an individual that's applying, whether it's a -- a developer that's applying to get assistance for the -- for the payment of fees.

Cavener: Mr. President?

Perreault: And just to -- yeah, just thinking through, I think --

Cavener: I can answer that I think for you, Council Member.

Perreault: Thank you.

Cavener: It's something that Council has explored in the past and if we use CDBG, then, the recipients have to pay Davis Bacon wages and it -- it -- the juice isn't worth the squeeze. It costs so much more that -- that you don't get a lot of interest and, then, there is no net benefit.

Perreault: Council President?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you, Councilman Cavener. I really appreciate that. That's exceptionally -- exceptionally helpful. I didn't realize that that was the case. I agree and -- with the -- the thought of and conversation about setting aside a specific amount that we would budget for and my anticipation is is that it would be very unlikely we would have more than two, possibly three of these types of projects in one year for quite some time. I just don't anticipate it being a -- a massive amount that would be needed necessarily. At least not for the next five, six years, if not more.

Strader: Council President?

Hoaglund: Yes, Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I think to me it makes sense that -- that someone could apply and, then, the Council has the discretion to do so and I think it would be a good practical consideration and the right way to do it to put something aside in the budget for that. I -- I -- I definitely don't think it should be -- like if you meet certain criteria, like XX percent of the AMI on your project, we are going to automatically approve. I -- I don't really think that's how we should get started. I think we need a lot of discretion at first while we look at projects, again, kind of get used to what we are looking for, because it feels like we haven't really narrowed in quite on what -- what we want to see yet. So, I just think if we have full discretion and we set something aside in the budget, maybe that would be a

good way to tackle it initially and see who applies, you know. I mean we have seen one recently, but is that going to be the normal cadence for this? I don't know.

Hood: So, Mr. President, if I can respond or comment --

Hoaglund: Go ahead, Caleb.

Hood: -- on that. If that's where Council wants to go that it may be premature to do what this topic is talking about, because it still talks about discretion for you, so it would be a case-by-case basis. But I kind of envisioned having some bar you have to clear -- not just an application, but some bar you have to clear to get before Council; right? There is some minimal -- even if it's minimal criteria, not just the -- well, bring us your thing and we will, you know, gut feeling and Council approve you or not. If you want to do the first year or two or whatever that way, that's fine. I just don't know that I'm going to be much help in code to do what you just described; right? Because that is more about standards and processes and there is still discretion in that, too, but it's -- there is some things that -- at least -- you know, you need to be a nonprofit, you need to have 20 percent meeting 80 percent LMI -- you know, something that just says here is some -- you know, at least some basic criteria before you will be considered by Council or everybody is going to be coming before you with, oh, you -- I heard you got a hundred thousand dollars in your budget, I would like some of that. So, correct me, but the way I just heard you was more, you know, we will know it when we know it and I can't develop that in code to say go talk to them and --

Strader: So, President?

Hoaglund: Go ahead, Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I -- I don't -- I mean I think there are some no brainer requirements if we wanted to that we could set forth that we would all agree. Like I do think it should be a nonprofit. I think it -- there should be a component of nonmarket rate units as part of the project, but I don't know what that percentage should be. I don't know what percentage of the median income we should target, for example. So, I think what I'm saying is it would be -- if we -- if we -- I -- there are some just basics of what makes an affordable housing project that we could put forth to apply, but I just don't know if we are going to be really narrowed in specifically on -- on those criteria I just mentioned.

Cavener: Mr. President?

Hoaglund: Yes, Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thanks. And I don't want us to get into a back and forth on, you know, all of these. We will be here until like 8:00 p.m. three weeks from now. But I agree largely with what Council Member Strader said, although I actually wouldn't support it that it would have to be a nonprofit. I think if the private sector says we want to do something creative, we should -- we should incentivize that. We should reward that. And so certainly it

wouldn't preclude a nonprofit, but if a builder says, hey, this is our thought for a master planned community and we want to -- we want this to be a place for everybody regardless of income, man, I don't want to be turning them away, I want to invite that and incentivize that as best we can.

Hoaglund: Okay. And --

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Hoaglund: Yes, Councilman Borton, go ahead.

Borton: Just to comment on this topic, I think philosophically for me it's more appropriate to waive development fees, rather than impact fees. Impact fees are collected, one percent of which are allocated to capital costs we know we are going to incur. Development fees year over year exceed development costs, we return the surplus to our capital improvement fund every year and there already exists wiggle room, for lack of a better term, with our development fees that are charged and with our impact fees. So, that -- I would be interested in exploring that avenue and, then, have staff try to answer the question what's the best type of product to incentivize and I don't know if location is another area, but the type of product that you think we would want to incentivize to accomplish that goal.

Hood: So, Mr. President, maybe just to summarize that real -- real quick. I think what I -- what I would propose is that we come up with kind of two different lists, if you will. One that's sort of modeled after existing code with some very basic criteria of, some nonmarket rate eligibility that gets you before Council to request something. Also just say, then, we would limit that and -- and I do need to work with Public Works primarily, even like hookup fees potentially could be eligible. So, what are -- what are some of those things that we could still have to be paid for to some degree, but some are hard cost, soft cost, but develop that list, then, of things that could be otherwise offset through General Fund or whatever the funding mechanism is and, then, bring that back to Council and see what -- where the discussion goes from there. It sounds like there is some -- again just even a basic foundation for Council to think about these things in the future.

Hoaglund: I think that's a good approach, Caleb. At the same time, you know, these impact fees -- that's -- and it allows us to say growth is paying for itself and, then, if we waive the fee and, then, we use our General Fund dollars to put that to -- you know, we are -- we are using existing property tax for the most part -- property tax dollars to go back into paying for the impact of that development, so their growth is not paying for itself. But it is, but it isn't, so just one of those weird things. So, Caleb, what else you got?

Hood: Okay. So, onto the next one then and this is tiny homes and so this is how I'm -- you know, first of all we need to define a lot of these -- these terms that we -- we use, but aren't maybe in our code already. So, this is related to ADUs. I already kind of mentioned that, too, and, again, there is a lot of interrelationships between some of these concepts we will talk about this afternoon and this evening. Small houses, missing middle

standards, a lot of overlap. There really is a -- a foundational -- and that's not just a play on words -- difference between what a lot of tiny homes are and, again, what a dwelling in Meridian as defined is. You have to be on a foundation and you have to be hooked up to our sewer and water basically by definition. If you are not, then, you are, essentially, an RV and that's -- it's a little more than that, but that's, essentially, the -- the difference. So, we realize there is a market -- staff realizes there is a market and people that want to be mobile and, again, kind of -- I -- we talked about this or I mentioned it a little bit earlier, there may be an opportunity to build some of those -- I don't know. I haven't come up with a great term, but, you know, subdivision within a subdivision, a pod, a subcommunity of lots that are available for tiny homes on wheels. They could be there long term and people could make them quasi permanent, but by definition they are still not, again, on a foundation, may or may not be hooked up to services, but the -- it's set up as kind of this -- their own little, you know, block or two or whatever of tiny homes in our code that would allow that. My initial feedback -- and this is just me and I have not gone through, again, the public involvement process, but just some of the things I have heard from others in the community -- I put it right there -- staff does not believe that the answer for Meridian is RVs to serve as dwellings on residentially zoned lots. So, to just take your Jayco, put it next to your home and live out of it or have someone else live out of it, that is not what this is. This is almost back to our ADU discussion. This isn't retrofitting our current lots to accommodate RVs to make another dwelling unit. This is intentionally creating areas where a couple -- two, three, four, six, seven, nine hundred square foot homes on wheels congregate like other single family dwellings would. So, that's kind of the concept here. There is a market for that. There is just nowhere for people to -- to park them, to place them, and so if we even create the hookups for them and, again, maybe skirt it, we can have some requirements for that, so it doesn't really feel more -- you know, still some requirements so it fits in with the bigger subdivision, but that's kind of staff's -- not in and of itself, but this is one of the things that we would at least pursue further with our community and the UDC focus group to see what additional thoughts are there.

Hoaglund: Councilman Borton.

Borton: A question. Caleb, is there an example in Boise or elsewhere in the valley where something like this has been approved and built that we could go drive through and take a look?

Hood: Mr. President, Councilman Borton -- Councilman Borton, I do not know that. I didn't actually look that up. I don't think we just invented it, though. I don't remember me being like the brainchild of this or something. So, it's got to exist somewhere. I don't know -- yeah. I'm not sure. I -- I really don't know. If I do find one, though, I will e-mail Council and say, hey, here is one I have either seen or ran across in the internet or whatever.

Hoaglund: And -- and I think, Caleb, I have -- and Councilman Borton, for some reason I think McCall has approved one. I don't know if it's built. I know there is one in southwestern Idaho somewhere that's been approved and -- and I can see value where someone comes in -- a developer says, you know, I -- and -- and for us to have a zone

that it's allowed, there might be a parcel. That is -- they do a development and, then, there is this awkward piece that could have some tiny homes that would be workable. So, you know, I -- I think it's something we need to explore.

Hood: I will also say some of the market is there -- a couple different example we already mentioned. You know, maybe kids going to school, they could still be in the same subdivision, but not be under your roof or adjacent; right? They are still in your subdivision, but -- but -- but they have a little arm's length. There are also people that are building homes and a lot of those people it takes six months, a year or more, and they need somewhere to stay instead of an apartment. You could stay in your subdivision, still start to develop community with your neighbors while your house is being built. So, it is somewhat transitory in nature. Can be. But instead of having to stay in an RV park or a hotel or something else, you could stay here. Or, again, you have long-term family members that come into town, there is an option for them to be close. They don't have to go to a hotel or -- or rent an apartment or something for whatever things life may throw their way. So, I think there is multiple reasons why this could work or be a -- you know, meet a need in providing housing stock in our community.

Cavener: Mr. President?

Hoaglund: Yes, is that --

Cavener: It's Cavener. Sorry.

Hoaglund: Oh, Councilman Cavener. I -- I saw you and Deputy Chief Bongiorno and I wasn't sure who -- who -- who spoke there, so --

Cavener: You know, I -- I appreciate where -- where Caleb's coming from, but the thought of -- that you are going to live in a tiny home while you are building your new home, that makes a lot of sense in the county. We are not going to be seeing that type of usage in Meridian for the most part. I -- I think I would be really supportive of reviewing and amending and adding some definitions to address this. Certainly if the development community wanted to kind of develop a tiny home community, that to me is of some interest, but I just think that we are going to encounter a lot of conflict points on this particular issue if we don't -- if we force tiny homes to kind of integrate with traditional single family homes.

Hood: And Mr. President?

Hoaglund: Go ahead, Caleb.

Hood: If I can just clarify. I -- and I don't know that that's where the UDC focus group would go. I wasn't planning to force this on anyone. I was just proposing to potentially allow it as an option. So, if you have a master planned community and you have got 80 acres and you want to include a pod or two of this as an option, I guess. So, I wasn't

trying to require that some percentage of lots be set aside for tiny homes or anything like that. So, just to clarify.

Hoaglund: And we might start with Gem county. According to Tiny House Builders website, Gem county is particularly accommodating to owners of tiny homes. They have established their own ordinance to address the influx of people who want to live in tiny homes, which is otherwise limited by statewide regulations in Idaho. So, that's the other caveat is depending on what the state's going to regulate as well. So, definitely something we can explore and, you know, I hate to preclude a developer from coming forward with an idea, but, yeah, we will have to wrap our arms around it and make sure it is workable for our community.

Perreault: Council President?

Hoaglund: Yes, Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I'm going to send you all an article on 15 tiny homes that have a lot of photos and very different styles. Many of them are in the western U.S. and you can kind of get a feel for -- doesn't -- not the same as driving through, but you can get a feel for kind of how it would look proportionately. I have concerns about, you know, how do you have a -- obviously, people are not going to park in front of their homes. That doesn't work, because it's -- you know, the home is as wide as the vehicle. So, maybe they maybe park on the side and you have a 20 foot by a 40 foot lot. How does -- how do we make that proportional to, you know, a 33 foot street? You know, I wanted to -- you have to have it look proportional, not just -- here is a tiny home on -- and everything else is the size that we would have with a 1,400 square foot home. So, those are all things that I had asked Caleb is it even possible for us to do that -- not only can we get city services into those tiny lots, can we get -- you know, can the fire department get in there or can we get -- actually get water and sewer to lots that are a third of the size that we normally agree to on a plat and Caleb seemed to think that that was sort of the least of our challenge, that the challenge would be more about really I guess making it -- what's the word I can say -- acceptable to our community as a lifestyle. If -- am I -- am I stating that correctly, Caleb? I don't want to speak for you.

Hoaglund: Go ahead, Caleb.

Hood: I will just say yes. I -- I don't disagree with anything you just said, so --

Strader: Council President Hoaglund?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I don't have an issue with exploring it, but I'm much more interested in development that's intentional around it and permanent, as opposed to -- you know, I think a lot of the reason that tiny homes are on wheels is that it's to avoid, you know, a foundation and hooking up to -- and existing housing regulations across the country. So,

I think if -- if a developer came and had like a pod of these and the way it was set up where they were all on a foundation and they were hooked up to services and stuff, that to me would just make more sense. I think the -- when it becomes more transitory I think we should treat it like an RV personally. I think there should be a difference in terms of how we sort of treat these. If it's purposely built on a foundation and -- and already planned to be part of a subdivision, I think I'm a lot more open to it. I would like to see examples of where it's gone well in other cities and how it's been successful. That's just some feedback. But open to it -- open to talking about it.

Perreault: Council President?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I agree with Council Woman Strader. When I first started thinking about this I never had in my mind units that would be movable. It always was a permanent type of setup. The challenge with creating it such that it's movable is if you have a neighborhood to maintain and you have folks that can literally drive off with their home, how do you require folks to pay their monthly fee? You know, it's -- it's difficult to drive off with a manufactured home, but not difficult to try it off with a tiny home. So, how, then, do you enforce the cost that would be collected for everything else the community needs, like the road, like the landscaping and whatnot. So, that would be -- that's my biggest concern and -- and that's not something that the city would do, but it's certainly something that would be -- that wouldn't be beneficial to a resident that was trying to run one of those communities.

Hoaglund: All right. Good -- good comments. Caleb, are you good with that?

Hood: Yep. Definitions will definitely be key in that one, too, so -- okay. Density bonuses and what -- TDRs, transfer of development rights. So, this is something that so far in Meridian's history we really just haven't had a market for this. A lot of times density will be left on the table even. You get them from time to time now or -- or a developer comes in right at the top of the maximum allowed density, but this concept allows you to take density from one part of town or across the street or whatever and use that up and not apply it over there. So, a lot of places outside of Idaho use this as -- as stated in the memo. Again, like the last one, this would be more a volunteer program. It's not something staff envisioned us requiring to set aside a certain percentage, but what you could do -- this concept would be say just, you know, eight dwelling units per -- per acre is the maximum. You could potentially say, well, we want to incentivize affordable housing, so we will give you two more dwelling units per acre -- we will give you up to ten, provided those two, then, are set aside for affordable -- again, however you define affordable. So, that's kind of the idea here is you allow something in addition to the buy right, because they are providing something that your community has said is important that's above and beyond and supersedes the kind of base zoning or density requirement. So, just a thought. I kind of put it in there. You got to read between the line a little bit. It works in some places and doesn't work as well in others, so it -- kind of even back to the point of, you know, there is a lot of savvy folks in Meridian, they have bought into our

community, understanding the rules and now you could potentially change the rules and said, well, I thought that was going to be three to eight dwelling units per acre, now you are going to allow ten there, that's not what I signed up for. So, it is sort of a -- I'm not saying it's a bait and switch, but this would potentially open that up to go above and beyond what our comp plan shows for an area and those types of things if you do allow something like this, but that's the concept anyways.

Borton: Mr. President?

Hoaglund: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I had big reservations of that for that very reason. Look at all the tools. All the tools don't -- aren't of equal value and I thought that one was very concerning for that policy reason.

Strader: President Hoaglund?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I am more open to this only in the context of multi-family. I think if it was specific to multi-family in certain areas where we want density and if we felt it was consistent with the comp plan, like if we had targeted like a couple of corridors maybe near the interstate, maybe Eagle Road and we said, okay, for multi-family developers that want to set aside ten percent of their units as affordable, you know, maybe we change the height restriction, for example, or something like that to allow them to put more units. I don't know. I'm more -- I'm really only open to it in the context of a multi-family apartment context. I don't think it fits well for the comp plan reasons in any other kind of housing type.

Hoaglund: Go ahead --

Cavener: Oh, sorry, Caleb.

Hood: I was just going to say one more -- sorry, Mr. President, if that's okay.

Hoaglund: Yeah. Go ahead, Caleb.

Hood: And Councilman Cavener. Sorry. One of the notes I had was if there is any legs behind this was to really stand up any kind of a sub committee, this is one of the ones I mentioned in the beginning to Bill and we talked about maybe having like a Caleb Roope, somebody that does this type of thing, you know, in other places and even here -- develops here to say, hey, this will and won't work or likely to work or won't in your community, so talk with some of the Clay Clarleys and the Caleb Roopes and some of the others that kind of do -- this is their world that they live in and kind of get some of that feedback. I guess it's not explicitly stated here. I used maybe a bad example of R-8 to ten. I think most of us probably would be in the more multi-family realm than just a standard single family subdivision in R-8. So, I apologize if I kind of got us off on the

wrong track there. I did envision more -- higher density anyways. I don't know about multi-family, but higher density.

Perreault: Council President?

Hoaglund: Mr. Cavener, did you have a comment?

Cavener: Yes. Thanks, Mr. President. This one, again, I think is -- is created and nothing is guaranteed, this is something that comes before the Council, volunteer base by -- I agree would largely fall into the multi-family piece. Certainly I think that this Council would be open to at least a conversation about that if was, you know, happening in single family resident zoning. So, this is -- I guess this is a lever that I wouldn't want to restrict, but it's not necessarily the first one that I think that we should be running to hold.

Hoaglund: Council Woman Perreault, did you have a comment?

Perreault: Thank you. I have had conversations with developers and builders in our area that have approached me and asked would it be helpful if we considered doing that and the question that always comes to my mind is I don't know how we -- how we regulate it in the sense of, okay, we have allowed you this benefit, now we are just going to trust that you will always have those set aside in perpetuity, because you have this benefit, that's -- that's my only hesitation with it. I really don't love the idea of -- I like the idea, I just -- I don't know how we -- you know, with -- with -- with federal housing programs, you know, they -- there have to be -- there has to be documentation that's sent in for the approval of -- of rents; right? Or rent or rent discounts. But in this kind of situation it just -- I -- I guess you can -- can you do a deed restriction for that? I don't know how that would work.

Hood: Yeah. Mr. President. I don't know that we will figure that out today, but it can be done. So, not to say that there might not be some investment, you know, to have staff up and have somebody that checks, you know, income verification and that you are whatever you say you were going to be in perpetuity or 15 or 20 years. A lot of them are set up that way, too. Hey, kind of like CDBG, the first ten years as long as you are doing it for, you know -- then, you know, they can be at market rate after that, you know, or whatever. I mean you can structure it different ways I think is what I'm trying to say and I think we can overcome that hurdle if this is a concept -- again, it may take additional resources, but we would need to -- we can't just bluff, we will have to have some type of income verification that you are renting to who you said we were if we are going to give the densities, but it -- it -- it is done. I think the model is some of those federal programs; right. And we will probably use that to say, yeah, provide us with similar things and we will verify it, instead of sending it off to DC, but -- so, it sounds like there is some -- at least some initial -- we will see where it goes. I know Councilman Barton had some more initial concerns, but at least we will put something together. Nothing's going to happen overnight, but at least have some more conversations on that one. Okay. Missing middle. So, this one again is just kind of a definition. So, I put it in there a little bit, you know, on the slide. You know, a lot of times these are your -- your triplexes, your duplexes, your four-plexes, those types of -- of things and I put it -- this is kind of interesting, right, like 80 percent of our housing

stock is single family and roughly the other 20 percent is multi-family. We really don't have a whole lot of duplexes, triplexes and those other kind of -- again, what's commonly now referred to as middle -- missing middle housing. Our PUD ordinance is vastly underutilized these days and so that's one of the things that we are already looking to do is -- in fact, Mr. Nary and some others on his -- his team have been having meetings with a developer that wants to add another -- a PDD ordinance and we are talking about the PUD ordinance kind of at the same time, because I -- I just -- we don't get them anymore and so it's outdated and needs to be expanded. So, this may be a way to further that conversation through an updated PUD ordinance. Again, cluster housing is one of those things where -- and this goes back to everything that was -- what we said before still stands. The fire marshal needs to still be able to pull hose and get to those units. But maybe you can cluster some of these units together, provide amenities and open space and in nontraditional kind of layouts with streets and those types of things to create a different housing choice. So, this is really about providing more options and housing. Don't know how much they may cost. They may be more than your -- your average -- a single family home. Probably less depending on what it is. But, again, this one's mostly about options, because we don't have a lot of options and I guess maybe you can read the rest of it on the slide. I don't have any other notes to call it on this one, but this is something to at least come up with. Oh, I did have one more -- so, COMPASS did generate a report earlier this year, too, that -- that looked at missing middle and some things that communities could do. So, that's one of the resources here that we will be looking at further as we -- for this conversation, as long as there is some interest in Council of staff spending some more time on this.

Hoaglun: Okay. I don't think there is any objection.

Hood: Okay. Waivers or exceptions for affordable housing. So, again, this is affordable housing projects, not just every project, but this would be a project that has some affordability element to it. So, again, this could be relief from the standard code. And, again, that relief could be talked about in any of -- a lot of the other categories as well. We have talked about parking already. Density already. Haven't really talked about lot size so much or height or some of those other standards and, then, I have got it written in there as case-by-case negotiation likely with the Council being ultimately the -- the decider on that. But, again, this is a way to -- to -- to maybe encourage affordable dwelling units is to have some other waivers or exceptions to, again, those standards and this would be, again, for new subdivisions, obviously. Not -- not -- not existing subdivisions, but new projects.

Perreault: Council President?

Hoaglun: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Caleb, I probably haven't seen a PUD application since the beginning of my time at Planning and Zoning, so would you remind me of how that operates differently than what we do with the DA? Is it because -- is it because they are requesting elements

in the development that are technically a variance to our current standards? Is that why it's done that way? You don't typically do that with the DA contract, but --

Hood: Yeah. It's -- I don't know that I would quite phrase it that way. So, here is how I will say it. In some of the original intent with the PUD was to preserve or protect an existing natural -- could even be man-made amenity on a site. So, you have got wetlands or something and you say, well, okay, we -- we will keep that, but that's at a cost. I could just go fill it in and build houses over it, but we recognize that. So, if you give me some relief from some of the other dimensional standards, I would like to build my homes up around that. So, yeah, a variance or an exception, alternative compliance. So, instead of having the description for the project say relief from this, relief from that, relief from the other thing and a variance, it is a PUD. So, it's essentially what you said, but there should be some -- at the -- at the heart of it there should be some -- something they are trying to preserve, protect on the site that sort of says, yeah, consider that, instead of just your standard 8,000 square foot lot, 8,000 square foot lot, 8,000 square foot lot with 60 foot of street frontage, because we are -- we are building this thing that, again, still within the -- the overarching rules of our code, just there is some relief from some of those things. So, yes. And, then, again, this one is -- yeah. So, you wouldn't necessarily have anything you are protecting, but you are providing the affordability aspect potentially is kind of a thought here. It kind of kicks you into PUD. The purpose of it would be to allow exceptions to some standards when you are coming forward with an affordable housing project.

Strader: Council President?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I'm -- I'm open to this one generally. But, again, I think it works better on multi-family. Not that we couldn't I guess in theory, I just -- I think it get -- there is -- there is -- there is a real issue with the comp plan I think to some extent of -- and I don't think we would really see a lot of affordable housing projects in a single family space, but we could. I -- I just -- I think we get into more comp plan issues when we stray from multi-family for affordable housing. But I don't know. I mean it's kind of a really open idea. It's case by case. Involves a lot of discretion, so -- I don't know. It would be interesting to get feedback from developers on what they think and see what the -- you know, what they are -- if they are thinking that there is something here or not.

Hood: I will just say I haven't talked to our developers necessarily -- Mr. President, if that's okay. Parking is one of the things; right? I mean that takes up a fair amount of land to park and so that is one of the standards listed here and I'm trying to not talk about the ADUs, because I heard the concerns there. But with a new project and having, you know, two cars in a garage and another 20 by 20 pad, boy, you just ate up a third of my lot, you know, with just -- just the parked cars. So, that's one of the things that I think is really kind of an emerging trend, if you will. Maybe not in Meridian. Maybe not even in Idaho. But in the nation is really looking at your parking standard. So, if there is something with an affordability component that you give them some land area back to maybe two or three lots, now I can build the fourth unit, instead of having garage, garage, garage, driveway

-- yeah, there is still maybe a garage, but maybe it's only a one car. So, I will just say that and I -- and this is me, again, not polling all developers, but parking and the area that it takes to -- in our code to park is a concern, because that eats up the land area of a lot.

Strader: Council President?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. No, that's actually really helpful example to try to think about it. Okay.

Hood: But I didn't hear any major -- I mean we will think about it; right? Again, nothing -- I'm not doing underlying and strike through tomorrow and coming back to you right away, but at least we will see what other feedback we get from others and you can change your mind later. If that's something we don't want to do at all, then, we can say, well, we -- we talked about it and that doesn't fit. So, this one -- and I don't know how I got into -- I didn't call it out as tier two, but there is -- I'm in tier three now. So, longer term. So, this is -- this -- these are some things I'm not really -- we can maybe even talk about them, but these are something that I don't think is even this next year. I mean this is something I think we continue to evaluate and, again, track, but I'm not proposing right now, unless I hear otherwise from -- from Council. So, there is a big push -- in fact, there is -- I don't think I brought it, but -- oh, maybe I did. If you guys have seen this. Kicking the S out of SR FFRS FR zoning. So, single family residential zoning, a lot of communities -- Boise talked about it; right? They are kind of taking some steps back now. But single family -- you know, just residential is residential. I don't think that's right for us now, but something to track. There is definitely places in the country that are saying homes, town homes and apartments -- a dwelling is a dwelling. So, why are you saying single family? Why can't it be two, three, four. So, again, I'm not going to spend more time on that unless you guys want to. So, it's something to keep tracking, but there are several communities -- a lot of them mostly more metro than we are currently that are removing that from their zoning codes and, then, state code and some of the stuff there we have talked about this before, too. There is some things that are -- that are happening in the legislature and maybe some more things ahead. So, this is one, again, that maybe isn't even our code related, but depending on what happens at the state -- State House, maybe they do -- I think we talked about this in the spring when I was here, but in Idaho it's -- it is illegal for us to require that a developer set aside a certain percentage of affordable housing units. We are one of the few states where you -- you just can't require that. They could offer it and they can propose it and we can memorialize that, but we can't require that. Maybe that changes. I'm not holding my breath. But, again, just something to kind of track and see what other tools may come online. There is the housing -- what was that? The bill that was passed this last year? There was 70 million dollars for the Housing Trust Fund and just things like that that maybe there is some other things that we can do over time. So, I'm not going to spend a whole lot of time on those tier threes, just letting you know that there may be some more things in the future. And, then, I think someone asked -- maybe even at one of our last UDC -- or our last code amendments for the UDC focus group. So, I thought I would just include that in the -- and, then, you -- you know who actually is passively making some recommendations to you. We try to gain consensus from this

group. It's not always a hundred percent. Usually you will see a developer or two that are like, hey, yeah, we participated. This one didn't quite go our way, but -- or we would like more changes or whatever. But, anyways, just thought I would show you -- and appreciate the volunteers that -- that help us have these conversations and vet them. To Planning and Zoning and, then, back to you. So, I'm -- I'm open to maybe another member or two or subbing a couple people out if -- if they are done. We have had -- several of these members have been with us for a long time and I appreciate that institutional knowledge, too. I don't want this to get too big, though, because it gets a little unwieldy with too many members. I think that's about the right number. But if you want to e-mail me or whatever -- another member or two, we would probably stand to have another --

Cavener: Caleb? Or, sorry, Mr. President?

Hoaglund: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thank you, Mr. President. Caleb, looking at this, you know, obviously, the names are -- are largely industry driven. Are there any -- were there any citizens, you know, past Planning and Zoning Commissioners, current Planning and Zoning Commissioners -- was there anyone that was -- I guess maybe not fall under maybe the industry category that expressed some interest in participating, but just didn't for any reason?

Hood: So, I have -- Councilman -- or Mr. President. Sorry. Councilman Cavener. So, Annette Alonzo is a citizen rep. That is her role, if you will. So, kind of two things. So, this is our UDC focus group. I need subject matter experts on this. I do not need or want someone that doesn't play in our code, if you will. So, I need people there. This is a technical review group. For the housing component I will kind of back off from that statement; right? So, if there is someone else from just the community that you want to include on a shorter term to -- to jump into this, I'm totally open to that and I think that makes some sense. We get into the weeds on this and you need to have a baseline understanding. We can't wait and bring somebody up to speed on, you know, our parking requirements for multi-family if they don't know and -- and that's -- honestly that's what happens is it's a lot of education for new members. So, past P&Z members looking at this. No, I don't believe -- although Kent Brown may have volunteered at one point in time as a P&Z commissioner, so -- but -- but, yes, they are largely engineers, architects, developers -- good cross-section there, but, yes, special -- certainly specialized within development community codes, architecture, engineering.

Cavener: And, Mr. President, if I may? Caleb, I -- I completely get -- it's not necessarily your job or this committee's job to educate our citizens on this process. That's not what this committee is for. I -- I do think there is maybe a missed opportunity, though, to do some baseline leveling up with some of our citizens who are really active and engaged in these issues and, you know, to have one, quote, unquote, citizen member and, you know, you can make the case, you know, Ashley Squyres has a unique perspective. I mean all of these members have a unique perspective, but what it could easily feel like to our,

quote, unquote, citizen member is that it's them versus industry and I think that's not something that we intend for this committee to be, but I think if we could add some additional citizen voices and recognizing that that's a little bit more work for you and probably a little bit more frustration for this committee, I do think that the end work product would likely be better. So, just food for thought. I -- I -- I think we would be better served with a little bit more citizen input in some of this.

Strader: Council President Hoaglund?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Perreault -- Strader.

Strader: Yep. I agree with Councilman Cavener. I understand the -- the issues that that creates, but I -- I think it's unfair -- like I feel like expecting one member of a committee this size to sort of carry the water for, quote, unquote, representing the citizens is not fair. I -- I don't think one person is enough. I -- we have several community members that although they are self educated and they may not develop property on a regular basis, they definitely have delved into our Comprehensive Plan and really -- I mean I hate to volunteer one of them, but I'm thinking of people like Melissa Bernard or other folks like that that have really gone through and done the work to understand our -- our Comprehensive Plan and our code. So, I -- I think there are -- I think there is an opportunity. I think there are folks who could do it. Not to clog it up, but just to add, you know, a little more balance to this I think would be a good thing. I don't think it needs to be 50-50, but just having one -- you know, one or two. I don't know. One person especially doesn't feel like a lot. Maybe former P&Z commissioners. I think that's a great idea. You know, that -- that could really bring you some people that are qualified that -- I don't know. I -- I just -- I think it's good to get diverse perspectives on -- on the different angles of looking at these topics. I think that ends up serving us better in the long run. So, I agree with his comment that there might be an opportunity there.

Perreault: Council President?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: As we mentioned at the beginning of the meeting, the big picture topics and, then, we have really specific detailed code topics and so maybe there is -- there are two groups. We leave our UDC group and -- and they kind of tackle what we know will be specific code changes and, then, we have another committee -- citizen committee that talks about the big picture effects of changing our housing code. Waiving fees. All -- all of the things that don't require industry knowledge, but could be, you know, discussed. So, not that we -- not that we want to go out and have a project as big as our comp plan, but I know we had a lot of different types of groups that were reviewing that on the city's behalf and this is a big topic and it is a long term topic. So, just a thought there.

Hood: Okay. So, just, Mr. President, I guess in conclusion, then, again, I just heard one name or two. But send me those. If you have a couple of other folks and, then, we will talk some more maybe logistically how that works, but -- some of this group that merges

with the new group and new committee, because I do think standing up -- these people -- a lot of the folks on this list probably aren't even interested in what we just talked about. This is our standing committee that talks about all things UDC. So, everything in the code that ever changes we vet through this group. This is a little more specialized and so I would like to have some -- for some consistency some folks that are interested in that, merging them with two, three, four names that you give me or whatever and just kind of standing up on an interim basis this group and, then, maybe one or two of them or whatever, you know, stays on as -- as this group continues to meet. I'm not totally opposed to that. And, again, the couple's names and faces. I think they would be fine, but I just want to be careful with that a little bit. There is -- there is a time and a place for the public involvement and I could get it. That's not just general public, those are people that are engaged and know what's going on. So, I got some -- some direction. I think that's largely, though, what you are going to see or hear from me in the next several months is just working with this group to kind of put some more meat on the bones you gave me tonight and bring something back. We haven't even talked timeline. I don't know what that looks like. But sometime in 2023 for sure some initial take on what -- where this is going and go from there. Unless, there is any other finer points you want to give me in that or an expectation. Sooner rather than later. I just don't know where this is going to go. So, I hate to commit to something more than that.

Hoaglund: Okay. Any -- Caleb, appreciate your work on that. Glad we finally got to you and went through this. Any -- any other final comment by Council Members? I -- I did want to enter into the record -- I failed to do so at the time, but I do want to do it now, and that is Councilman Joe Borton joined us at 4:37 p.m. So, he was here.

Perreault: Council President?

Hoaglund: Yes, Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Actually, I would like to say thank you very much to Caleb for all the time he has spent on this. To Council for being here on the week of Christmas to have this special meeting. I really appreciate the time investment, the interest, the conversation. I think it is doing a good service and a justice to our community, who is having these conversations in the media and on social media and in their homes. I think it's really beneficial for them to also see their elected officials doing the same. So, thank you very much.

Cavener: Mr. President?

Hoaglund: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I just -- just maybe two things to add. One, Council Member Perreault, I want to thank you. You have kind of kept this on simmer for us and have kept our eye on the ball on this, as well as staff, and so appreciate your good work and I guess, you know, kind of when Caleb was talking, he's got to put together some timelines and figure that out. My hope would be is that maybe at least at a bare minimum that we are talking about this maybe a month before we start jumping into our budget hearings. So, that way if

there are any budget impacts that we have at least had the opportunity to consider some of that before we go into that. I know the Mayor is not here tonight, but I know he is, obviously, watching and paying attention and so making sure that this gets routed to him as well, so that there aren't any surprises for him about some things that we may want to see in the future budget.

Hoaglund: Thank you, Councilman Cavener. Anything else related to this subject? If not, do we have a motion to adjourn?

Cavener: So moved.

Perreault: Second.

Hoaglund: We have a motion to adjourn. All those in favor of signify by saying aye. Any opposed? Happy holidays. We are adjourned.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. ONE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 6:09 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

_____ PRESIDENT BRAD HOAGLUN	_____ DATE APPROVED
---------------------------------	------------------------

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK