

Meridian City Council Work Session

October 17, 2023.

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 4:31 p.m. Tuesday, October 17, 2023, by Mayor Robert Simison.

Members Present: Robert Simison, Brad Hoaglan, Luke Cavener, Jessica Perreault, Liz Strader and John Overton.

Members Absent: Joe Borton.

Others Present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Brian McClure, Laurelei McVey, Mike Barton, Caleb Hood, Chris, Joe Bongiorno and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

☒ Liz Strader	☐ Joe Borton
☒ Brad Hoaglan	☒ John Overton
☒ Jessica Perreault	☒ Luke Cavener
☒ Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Simison: Council, we will call the meeting to order. For the record it is October 17th, 2023 at 4:36 p.m. We will begin this afternoon's work session with roll call attendance.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: Next item up is adoption of the agenda.

Hoaglan: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglan.

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

Overton: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

- 1. Approve Minutes of the September 26, 2023 City Council Work Session**

- 2. Approve Minutes of the September 26, 2023 City Council Regular Meeting**
- 3. Approve Minutes of the October 3, 2023 City Council Work Session**
- 4. Approve Minutes of the October 3, 2023 City Council Regular Meeting**
- 5. Chipotle Shell (Medina Subdivision) LDIR-2023-0035 Water Main Easement (ESMT-2023-0137)**
- 6. Franklin Parking Expansion Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement (ESMT2023-0133)**
- 7. Meridian Commerce Park Building J Water Main Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2023-0130)**
- 8. Meridian Commerce Park Grand Mougul Drive Phase 1 Water Main Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2023-0141)**
- 9. Meridian Commerce Park Grand Mougul Drive Phase 1 Sanitary Sewer No. 1 (ESMT-2023-0140)**
- 10. Meridian Movado Village Subdivision Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2023-0138)**
- 11. Meridian Movado Village Subdivision Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 2 (ESMT-2023-0139)**
- 12. St. Luke's Consolidated Service Center Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement (ESMT-2023-0112)**
- 13. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Windrow Neighborhood (H-2023-0031) by Conger Group, located at the northeast corner of S. Linder Rd. and W. Amity Rd.**
- 14. License Agreement Between the City of Meridian, Meridian Development Corporation, and Nampa & Meridian Irrigation District**
- 15. License Agreement between the City of Meridian and the Nampa and Meridian Irrigation District for Pathway along the Creason Lateral to be built with the Lennon Pointe Subdivision**
- 16. Memorandum of Understanding Between the City of Meridian and Meridian Firefighters IAFF Local 4627 for Implementation of Certain Provisions of the 2023-2026 Successor Collective Labor Agreement**

- 17. Subrecipient Agreements between the City of Meridian and the Boys and Girls Club of Ada County, Idaho, Inc.; the City of Meridian and Family Advocacy and Education Services; the City of Meridian and Jesse Tree of Idaho; the City of Meridian and Neighborhood Housing Services, Inc.; and a First Amendment to the Subrecipient Agreement between the City of Meridian and Neighborhood Housing Services, Inc.**
- 18. Fiscal Year 2024 Net-Zero Budget Amendment in the Amount of \$482,362.00 to accept the Fiscal Year 2024/Program Year 2023 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Award**
- 19. Resolution No. 23-2419: A resolution vacating a 20-foot by 20-foot Meridian City water easement located along the northeast corner of Lot 5, Block 3 of Gramercy Subdivision No. 1, being more particularly described in Exhibit "A"; and providing an effective date.**
- 20. Resolution No. 23-2420: A resolution of the City Council of the City of Meridian, Idaho, setting forth certain findings and purposes to declare surplus property and authorizing the donation of certain computer and equipment to Computers for Kids and the Ada County Humane Society.**

Simison: Next item up is the Consent Agenda.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

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

Cavener: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

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

DEPARTMENT / COMMISSION REPORTS [Action Item]

21. Biosolids Project Update

Simison: So, next we will go to Department/Commission Reports and first one up is Item 21, the Biosolids project update. Turn this over to Ms. McVey.

McVey: All right. Good afternoon, Mayor and Council. What's more exciting than biosolids? I'm not saying.

Simison: Wait was -- were you starting off with a joke?

McVey: Oh, no. I can't see it on here. Oh. That's easy. All right. It's not moving. Okay. Perfect. All right. So, you may remember back in 2021 we started looking at potential projects that would be eligible for use with the city's allocated ARPA funding. So, when we first started that we looked at really three high level things. So, would the project be eligible under that federal funding? Would the project be designed and constructed by the end of 2026, because that's a hard requirement of this funding and, then, based on what we knew internally would the ROI be a long-term favorable impact to the city. So, with that in mind a couple of the Public Works projects that moved forward were the biosolids dryer and the biogas utilization project. So, we have received more information on both of those and I'm here to present our recommendations for moving forward. So, starting with the biosolids dryer. So, we have a five million dollar placeholder of the ARPA money for this project. So, I know you guys all know what biosolids is, but for anybody listening in it is the solid end product of the wastewater plant. So, it's a really nutrient rich soil like material. So, today we produce a little over 10,000 tons and that is currently hauled to the Ada County Landfill. There is two parts to our disposal of this material. The first is the cost to dispose of it at the landfill. That cost recently just went up from 29 dollars to 32 dollars a ton and we are also charged a fee to haul it up to the landfill. Currently we contract with a third-party hauler and that costs us about 3,000 dollars a week. You may also remember back in the beginning of 2022 I came to you and asked to purchase our own truck and trailer, knowing that it would save us significant money over the long term, but also knowing that those had a really long lead time. Well, I'm really excited to tell you our truck is in the Treasure Valley and our trailer is slotted to be built the end of December. So, we are hopeful that we will start hauling at the beginning of February, but we weren't kidding when we said long lead time on those. Important to know that any ROIs that we did on the dryer we used our -- our in-house hauling as the baseline for that. So, we weren't double dipping on the ROI for that. We looked at -- the types of dryers we looked at -- we wanted to reduce the volume of the biosolids by four to one, so that reduces both the disposal cost of the landfill and, then, also the hauling trips. So, even if we are self-hauling, reducing that volume is important, because it reduces staff time, it reduces travel time, emissions, fuel. So, there were two main types of dryers that we looked at. We wanted to make sure that whatever dryer we chose that it could meet the dryness requirements, that it would fit on our site. We wanted to look at the initial capital costs and, then, also the ongoing operational costs. We looked at the complexity of the equipment and whether or not staffing would be required and we also looked at expandability. So, as we continue to grow in the future could we add on to

this. So, primarily two types of dryers rose to the top. The first is a thermally enhanced solar greenhouse. So, it's just like a greenhouse, but it has a metal floor that you put heat into, which helps accelerate the drying and the other one was a thermal belt dryer and that's where an external heat source, in this case heated air, is passed over the solids as it goes over a belt. Both technologies would work, but the primary distinction that made us turn away from the belt dryer and go towards the solar greenhouse is capital cost. So, the thermal belt dryer has to go inside of a building, so significantly higher capital costs -- about three times as much as the solar greenhouse dryer. The belt dryer is more complex and so would also require additional staffing needs. So, we moved forward with the solar dryer for further analysis. So, it's really a quite simple operation, which is pretty neat. It's very effective. We made sure to look at it in Meridian's climate, so would it work in the winter, the summer, do we get enough solar heat? It's kind of neat. We are looking at a circular design. This would be one of the first in the country versus the rectangular design. It cuts footprint and cost. So, that's pretty cool. You can also see it really easily fits another one in the future. So, that spot on the map is where we currently store our biosolids before it goes to the landfill. So, perfect location, not a lot of material handling and we have several sources of the external heat so the heat that you put in the floor to make it work more efficiently. You can put in solar collectors. You can use the excess bio gas that we flare today. Or you can use natural gas. So, we have plenty of excess bio gas, which we will talk about, and so our recommendation would be to use that. There is no cost for us to use that excess bio gas and it would greatly benefit this -- this process. So, like I mentioned we had an initial estimate of about five million dollars of ARPA funding. This more detailed analysis is putting us right in at the 4.6 million dollar range, so we are right in that -- that bucket where I think that that -- that funding will be sufficient. The ROI on this is very positive, so it will result in a savings of between 250 and 300 thousand dollars a year today. That's what self-hauling, that's with the landfill costs as it is. One of the other benefits is that this technology allows us to produce a higher classification of biosolids and what that means is that in the future if something like compost or land application became beneficial to the city we could utilize our biosolids for that use. Another thing that this does is, you know, with the concerns with landfill life span and landfill -- the landfill filling up, this is a really positive way that we can reduce our volume of what's going to the landfill. So, our recommendation is that we proceed with completion of this project. I think it's a really positive project for not only our operations, our financials, our environmental impact, it's a -- it's a really exciting I think project. So, switching gears a little bit to talk about the biogas project. So, with this one --

Simison: Laurelei, would you mind if we just stop there for any questions Council --

McVey: Sure.

Simison: -- may have specifically about that project.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Laurelei, just one question. Just curious the -- the greenhouse's ability to retain aromas versus the enclosed facility, what's -- what's the difference between the two?

McVey: So, they are -- the -- our consultant actually thinks that the odors will be better than what they are today with the biosolids just out on the pad. So, they are not recommending any auxiliary odor control for this, but it could be added on to either facility in the future if -- if that was deemed, but they anticipate it being an improvement over what we have today.

Cavener: But do we know what the improvement is? Again, I'm supportive of the greenhouse approach from a ROI, but just also trying to understand -- like is it ways and light years better than if it's on the -- on the belt dryer in an enclosed building versus the -- the greenhouse? I mean what's -- what's the difference between the -- the aromas that come from each of those facilities?

McVey: So, Councilman Cavener, I believe they would be similar, because it's similar -- similar drying, similar process, it's just the greenhouse is less mechanically complex.

Cavener: Thank you.

Simison: So, Laurelei, is it from -- when you are showing the -- what the current haul ton -- tonnages? What's the difference in the tonnage post-completion of project estimated to be?

McVey: So -- Mr. Mayor, so it's about a four to one reduction. So, today we haul seven times a week up to the landfill. They expect -- we expect that to decrease to one to two times per week. I don't know off the top of my head what that weight is, but --

Simison: But maybe 20 -- I'm just going by the number 2,500 to 3,000 tons compared to the ten thousand tons roughly.

McVey: Yeah.

Simison: Okay. All right. Thank you. Any other questions on that project? Okay. Thank you.

McVey: Okay. So, switching gears to biogas, still related to our biosolids, but our biogas is the natural byproduct of our digestion process. So, it's primarily methane and today we flare -- or we use about 40 percent of our gas to heat the digesters to make the digestion process work. About 60 percent of our gas is just flared to the atmosphere under our air permit. So, what we looked at was a project that would take the gas -- and digester gas is a really dirty gas as far as the -- the cleanliness of gas goes, so you have to do a lot of pretreatment to it. You have to remove sulfur -- or hydrogen sulfides, moisture, siloxanes, particulates to be able to put it into an engine generator. So, this process would first clean the gas and, then, it would compress it and put it into an

engine to generate power. One of the challenges of this project is that the process is highly mechanically complex and requires a lot of staff time to keep this up and operational and, then, one of our biggest challenges when we looked at this further is the cost of equipment has gone up significantly from what we were anticipating. So, we were estimating about a 1.55 million dollar placeholder for ARPA. The equipment itself was coming in at between 4.9 and 7.4 million dollars. So, that in itself makes the ROI really challenging. The other piece is that because this is mechanically complex it's -- we would anticipate needing another FTE to deal specifically with this piece of equipment, keeping it operational and working. So, between the cost of the building and, then, when we ran the ROI -- power is really cheap in Idaho and that -- that makes the ROI challenging. So, between the operation and maintenance and the FTE, when that's offset with the power savings that you would get, it would cost us about 130,000 dollars annually to operate this equipment. So, it's not recommended that we install it at this point. It doesn't make financial sense for us. That's not to say that in the future it's not a good technology. If electricity costs continue to go up or equipment costs come down, definitely a good use of that excess gas. One of the other things, too, though, so, you know, we are not just going to be flaring all of that excess gas anymore, is -- so, this is the graph for the biosolids dryer that you just saw. So, the -- the green lines represent how much of the gas we need to use to heat the digesters. The blue is what was currently -- or I guess the gray line is what is currently flared off today. So, the -- the blue bars are what is -- would be used by the dryer. After we install the dryer what will be flared is the difference between the blue bars and the gray bar. So, significantly less flaring. Definitely great use of that to make the -- the solar greenhouse work more effectively. So, we are really excited, because by putting in the dryer we still will be able to use -- beneficially reuse much more of the gas than we are using today. So, our recommendation is to commit and continue to the biosolids project with the five million dollar ARPA placeholder and, then, our recommendation would be to cease the bio gas project and return that money back to the ARPA -- the city's ARPA fund for use on another city project. So, I don't think I need official approval from you guys on anything today, but just more looking for your general buy-in that this is a good direction forward, commit to the biosolids project. One of our challenges with the ARPA funding is these projects have to be done and completed and spent by the end of 2026. So, we do have to -- to get it moving to get it constructed in that time frame. So, with that I will stand for any additional questions.

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

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Just some comments. I have spent a lot of time with Laurelei on this and really appreciate the hard work that the team put into understanding these two projects. You know, I think this is what our clean energy resolution is all about is doing the right thing for the environment when it makes financial sense for the city; right? And it's at least neutral, if not positive for the taxpayer. Clearly the bio gas project isn't as fruitful

as we initially thought, but I love that we can use the bio gas to make the biosolids dryer facility even more successful. I think it -- it looks like it's even better than we initially thought and that it will actually accomplish a lot of things for the city. So, I'm really excited about it and I know you were joking about how, you know, maybe it would be a boring topic, but I think this is one of the most exciting topics and I'm really just so enthusiastic about it and appreciate everyone's hard work on it, because it's going to help us so much in the future. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any additional comments, concerns, thumbs up? All right. We look forward to seeing this come forward through budget amendments and contracts and all the fun stuff.

McVey: Thank you.

23. Lakeview Golf Course Fiscal Year 2023 Financial Performance, New Fiscal Year 2024 Fees, and Projected Outcomes

Simison: Thank you. Speaking of budget amendments, next item up is Item 22, which is a fiscal year 2024 budget amendment in the not to exceed amount of 144,900 for Mary McPherson Elementary pathway. Mr. Barton.

Barton: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council. I'm here presenting a budget amendment for 144,000 dollars -- 144,900 dollars, like the Mayor said, that will fund the pathway connection between Mary McPherson Elementary and Reflection Ridge Subdivision. Just as a note on the memo, it says that we have a license agreement to build the pathway across this property. We don't quite have that yet. I thought we would, but there is some final legal edits that we are doing. Just as of today they have been -- they have been finalized, it's a matter of just sending a clean copy back to Simplot and -- so I'm -- I'm confident. We -- we did have a discussion on should we pull this and bring it back, but we are confident enough that the license agreement will be in place shortly, so we would like to move forward with this. We bid the project. We have a contractor on board that's ready to start shortly after Thanksgiving, so we can get this in, the kids can use the pathway going back and forth to school mid-December -- you know, after Christmas break in the spring. So, with that I will stand for questions.

Simison: Thank you, Mr. Barton. Council, questions?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Great job. This is one of the intersections -- well, one of the areas that came out in our intersection safety task force is identified for needing additional ways for kids to get to that school, because around it on both sides we have no sidewalks and this helps greatly up until the time we get those sidewalks and those developments come

through. So, I think it's a fantastic idea and I'm so glad that we got the approvals to make this happen.

Barton: Thank you. We appreciate the opportunity to get it done.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Mike, it sounds like you got a plan. I always get a little nervous when you don't have every last dot on an I and a T crossed.

Barton: Yeah.

Cavener: Council grants the budget amendment, something goes upside down with the license agreement, what happens?

Barton: We won't spend the money, it will be returned to the General Fund.

Cavener: Okay.

Simison: That -- ditto on that. So, without a license agreement we are not going to spend these dollars.

Cavener: Well, I -- I -- I knew that would be the case, I just -- I wanted -- blood pressure goes up just a scosche each time we talk about these things, so -- no concern on my part.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. Mike, I apologize if I missed this, but this is -- this pathway is going along the lateral; correct? And was there any fencing needed or discussed or included in this?

Barton: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, Council Woman, that's a great question. This lateral right there is about eight inches deep and maybe three feet wide. So, if -- if there is -- you know, I mean that would be a concern for sure if there is school-age children walking without fencing next to a -- like a canal, but anybody that would have a problem with that much -- that shallow water shouldn't be out there alone.

Simison: And correct me if I'm wrong, but if there is a desire for a fence that's something that we would approach West Ada about helping I believe were the conversations.

Barton: There is an -- there is one -- one area that's more easily accessible than -- than another and that area was talked about with fencing. I mean the entire -- if -- if West Ada thinks so that would be -- it would be on them, but it's almost a thousand feet of fencing, so I don't know if that's in their plans are not, but I -- but I'm -- I'm confident that it's not an attractive nuisance or a danger to elementary school kids that are walking there. It's -- it's really -- honestly, it's really this deep.

Simison: I would just like to echo -- A, I -- I think Dave's upstairs watching. I know that he was actually talking with Emily right before we came down still trying to work on some of these elements. But I really want to just give him a -- much appreciation for his work with Simplot and the school district and helping -- and the irrigation district. I mean Dave's the -- especially when it comes to irrigation district, the gift that keeps on giving in a lot of ways, but it was also his coordination with Simplot to help get the parties in the room to help make this conversation. So, thank you, Dave, for that and thank you to the team for getting this all put together and ready to go to work and we will get the legal work done and we will get a pathway connected, especially in light of the ongoing dialogue around Brian's favorite intersection of Amity and Locust Grove and not knowing the future, honestly, of when or how that will ever manifest itself. So, this is more important for that reason as well. So, thank you.

Barton: You're welcome.

Simison: All right. If not do I have a motion?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I move that we approve the fiscal year 2024 budget amendment for the not to exceed amount of 144,900 dollars for the Mary McPherson Elementary pathway.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve the budget amendment. Is there any discussion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

Roll Call: Hoaglund, yea; Borton, absent; Cavener, yea; Perreault, yea; Strader, yea; Overton, yea.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Barton: Thank you. Stand here for the next one.

24. Ada County Highway District Capital Roadway Improvement Guide (Matrix)

Simison: All right. Next item up is Item 23, Lakeview Golf Course fiscal year 2023 financial performance, new fiscal year 2024 fees and projected outcomes. Mr. Barton, back to you.

Barton: I'm going to stay right here. Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, thank you. We wanted to give you just a -- a brief preliminary report on the financial outcome of FY-23 at the golf course. These numbers are not final yet. We still have some bills coming in at the end through September that need to be paid. The revenue is final. The bills might not be. So, these numbers will fluctuate a little bit, but overall things are very positive. We had a really good year at the golf course and kind of keeping in that -- keeping with that tone we have developed a proposal for new fees going forward. The new fees that you have in front of you are a -- a four percent to this season passes and then -- and, then, how -- and -- and just a little bit of a back story on how we arrived at these fees. So, it's a four percent increase to the passes to keep up with inflation. What we did to the greens fees is we -- we went and we looked at our competitors, we went to what the full market would suggest we charge and we cut that in half. We didn't want to hit people with that shock, we thought maybe that that would also have maybe a counter effect and have effect negatively on the amount of rounds, the volume of business there, so I think that the fees that we have are a solid proposal. We anticipate some good numbers going forward and I think with that I will stand for questions.

Simison: All right. Thank you, Mike. Council, questions?

Cavener: Great work to the whole team.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Not a question, but a comment. A compliment. I think we are starting to see and reap the rewards of all the hard work that's gone in by all of the park staff at the golf course. So much good inputs come from the neighbors on everything you guys have done and I know that's got to play a part in how much more popular and how much more use it's getting and it's a testament to all the hard work that you guys have put in. Thank you.

Barton: Thank you. And I -- I agree. These men back here are -- do a lot of -- a lot of the heavy lifting. It's -- it's great. So, we will be happy to answer any more questions, but we don't need any formal action tonight. We will notice these fees and come back in a public hearing in a couple of weeks.

Simison: Okay. Thank you. And echo the sentiments of Councilman Overton to the whole team and look forward to the continued improvements investment and also

getting it to a market rate that works great for everybody involved and recovers the cost that we are trying to recover up there.

Barton: Thank you.

25. Black Cat/McMillan Intersection Cost Share Discussion

Simison: Thank you. Okay. With that we will move on to Item 24, Ada County Highway District Capital Roadway Improvement Guide Matrix. Turn this over to Mr. McClure.

McClure: Thank you, Mayor. I'm here to discuss the ACHD Capital Improvement Guide with you tonight. I will likely drift back and forth calling this the guide and the matrix. Habit. So, I'm sorry in advance. Staff have been working on this project with the consultant and ACHD since April of this year. This is a project overview. Cover the background, policy framework, the guide, which is three parts and, then, next steps. Just a little bit of a forewarning. I think Caleb's online, but I'm helping cover the next item as well and since these two relate I will sort of drift to the next item, which is the Black Cat and McMillan roundabout intersection. This is a very brief overview of the city's involvement in ACHD capital improvement projects. This guide is for roadway and intersections only. There is other types of ACHD capital projects that we aren't discussing, such as bridges. Once initiated projects on average are five or so years. That includes concept design, design, right of way and, then, start of construction. In this period a lot of change occurs. There isn't a project that I have been involved with for a decade for a section line mile of roadway that hasn't seen a lot of change. Major changes are sometimes political, sometimes the engineering and there is also smaller changes, like cost, timing, construction materials and there is all sort of interact overlap. There are several interrelated reasons for this matrix. The first is that ACHD will not or cannot install landscaping. There is opportunity to enhance roadways and meaningfully address speed management and user comfort for all users that they can't explore. The cost share allows the city to support enhanced projects by committing to project features that affect project design, construction and bidding. They are willing -- they, being ACHD, are willing to reimburse us for features that don't -- that they don't otherwise have to install. For example, concrete. And -- and that work towards the common goal and otherwise unachievable without a partnership. Maintenance is usually something that the city takes on for soft scape that is not storm water related. Our goal with this project is to enable better communication earlier to establish expectations, to help Council get a better idea of what the commitment is and why and to help address project needs and, importantly, have an agreement with ACHD completed before we get too far along in the -- in these. As mentioned before, the matrix is really three parts. The introduction. This is really documenting the process. You have a copy before you, then, I also sent you a PDF last week and, then, Chris will have it on Laserfiche later. Things get lost and forgotten. The interagency institutional memory is something that we struggle with and, then, also just the process. This also highlights opportunities for the city and ACHD to actually partner, not just towards different goals, but the same one. A lot of focus in this work is how the city can expand tools unavailable to ACHD to improve safety, to create more consistent traffic flow and

generally just to make a better project. Vertical elements in the street are one of the best ways to do these, but the options to ACHD are often limited, ugly, or more costly for less impact. Most of this is really for staff, both city and ACHD. The concepts are both a communication tool for staff and, then, decision makers. That's the second part of this. City Council -- I'm sorry. It just helps with understanding and, then, to better address cost share, which, again, I will be following up with this shortly for the Black Cat and McMillan intersection. The appendix is really something of a white paper. It's why we think this is important and it helps to bridge some gaps that engineering is currently -- kind of struggles to address. But it is things that other disciplines understand, how -- how people interact with their space. So, this here is a matrix. One of two, actually. This one is for the roadway. There is a companion one for the intersection slash roundabouts. The other -- this is really the primary communication tool for staff. What's most helpful for -- for us. Over the years ACHD's changed their standards. Multiple councils and commissions have come and gone and staff have changed. So, this is really intended, again, just to keep hitting this point. Improve consistency. The matrix starts on the left column here. This identifies the general sort of cross-section we are looking at. So, whether there is a median, no median. Broadly speaking here level one is not bad and level four is not good. These are just levels of effort and different conditions may warrant different needs. The second column here is the baseline improvements. This is what ACHD will do for these different cross-sections. These different cross-section project types if the city does not do anything. Typically that is stamped concrete in several different colors and they are also increasingly doing some metal barriers. This one here -- so, levels one through four. These are the levels of participation that the -- that the staff sees the city sort of getting engaged with these projects. The city would receive cost share credits for all of these described in the matrix. Level one represents minimal or immediate cost with cost share covering most of the city's cost and, then, the city covering great -- greater maintenance over a period of time. Level two and three are generally sort of the same level of effort, but different. One focuses more on hardscape and physical improvements, like poles. The other one focuses on landscaping. And, then, level four is more intensive, both initial cost and the maintenance. As an example, most of an HOA landscape buffer for level four, as an example, that might be used as when an HOA's landscape buffer is largely removed from a project when enough right of way isn't preserved. This would provide an opportunity in roundabouts and medians to sort of restore some of that community identity. If it's not clear right now consistency is a big part of this. Design influences are intended to be similar, reflecting constraints, size and, then, speed management across all levels. This here is an example of a cross-section and a cut sheet. A lot of the design influences -- these have been driven by historical influences, such as staff experience and also recent council conversations, such as the Ustick corridor. Rhythm, repetition and spacing and other elements are all important in all of these and they all have a shared sort of thematic. We had good support from ACHD in all of these and they are eager to use these. On the left are basic descriptions. The intent of these is to identify the spacing of the surface treatments. In the middle is a simple CAD perspective rendering and, then, below are some descriptions of the general improvements. Most of these things are on the cut sheets. They are just -- these cut sheets -- or on the matrix these cut sheets just help to sort of depict them. We have

one of these cut sheets for every cell on both of the matrices, so the roadway and the -- the landscape -- I'm sorry -- the intersection roundabouts. In contrast, which staff usually have to discuss with Council, our general ideas, construction drawings and sketches or delineation of responsibilities or the conversation is happening very late in the game, such as the next project with Black Cat and McMillan. Level one is generally what staff is going to be looking towards for standard arterial roadways. Meetings with vertical elements and landscaping have the largest potential to reduce the feeling of -- of massive boulevards, so just lots of asphalt and lots of concrete. More broadly, level one to four all look and feel similar. It's more about the number of things going into a space, the complexity. It's going to be context sensitive and staff recommendation is generally going to come down to what is needed for speed management, rehabilitation of landscaping being removed and, then, other community needs. I -- I will now drift a little bit into the Black -- a lot into the Black Cat and McMillan, which is the next item. Staff brought this project to Council -- specifically, rather, Caleb brought this project to Council on July 25th to discuss potential landscaping elements. Council expressed an interest in including some landscaping, but wanted to hear more about a consistent palette of materials to be used throughout the city. The proposed design here at a very high level includes a multi-lane roundabout with truck apron, multi-use pathways with crosswalks and rectangular rapid flashing beacons for each of the pedestrian crossings. As alluded to earlier, staff is moving towards a level one participation in the matrix for this project. This would provide a consistent thematic for the primary roundabouts, as other new and planned roundabouts are in the city and, then, where possible also provide some additional interest in the buffers. These are low maintenance and low water use designs. Since this project is still living in the past a bit, it's -- it's a -- it's an older project that's just -- just now working its way through. Some of the buffers are smaller and so there is going to be less opportunities here in the splitter islands, the sort of smaller medians and, then, the landscape buffers between the back of curb and the multi-use pathways. We may not be able to do as much here. For contrast, this is a level four level of effort for a roundabout. It's really just more intense landscaping, more rock features. I don't think it does anything less, especially for a smaller roundabout like this. Regardless, the city will also be asking for ACHD to restore and improve areas outside of the roundabout, so it's not bare earth. That will not be part of a cost share or -- or on the city for this. So, there is two projects sort of smashed together -- or two -- two agenda items. The -- the first sort of one was I'm looking for feedback from -- from Council on the matrix, any concerns or tweaks we can make. This is something that staff is going to be using to -- again, just for institutional knowledge if nothing else. And, then, secondly, whether there is any concern that Council has with moving forward with the level one level of effort for a roundabout design at the Black Cat and McMillan intersection.

Simison: Thank you, Brian. So, Council, let's go onto Item 24. Do you have comments, feedback, questions regarding the information that's been provided?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Brian, thank you very much for these worksheets. They are really helpful to understand the differences between the -- between the different sections of the matrix. The one question I have is I can't tell the difference between cut sheet -- excuse me. A series A level one and series B level one. Could you just run through that one more time?

McClure: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Perreault, series A has a -- there is some -- so, series A has no medians with buffer strips that don't allow for trees and, then, a median -- it also doesn't allow for trees, so there is -- there is two there. So, median and no median, both that -- both that do not allow for basically parkway trees and, then, series B is median and no median that allow for parkway trees. Basically if the buffer is less than eight feet the city isn't going to generally want to do trees and if the buffer is more than eight feet we would be open to doing trees and the reason for that is ACHD requires -- for anything less than eight feet -- or anything greater than six feet, but less than eight feet, ACHD requires a root barrier, which protects -- protects a -- the -- the asphalt and the road surface and the concrete for the sidewalk or multi-use pathway from root damage. So, heating, basically, of the surface, if that makes sense. Did I answer your question?

Perreault: Yeah. I think so. Thank you very much.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: What I love about this brand is a -- you took a situation where we are having a new conversation every time and reinventing the wheel and you have standardized it in a scalable way that can be used as a methodology going forward. That is like government excellence to me. That is phenomenal. So, I just want to compliment you, because this is the right approach to take to this sort of thing. I love that it's adaptive. ACHD must love it, because this takes a lot of guesswork out of the equation every single time. So, hats off to you on that. My only question was around the native plants and stuff and these are sort of an opportunity, because I think we -- we definitely didn't want each one to be the same; right? That was a -- a piece of it. We wanted a little bit differentiation, but -- but to sort of standardize it and have you guys thought about, you know, the types of plants that are helpful that -- that will thrive and all that stuff? Have you gotten into it -- you know, Mike or other people into the plants and all that stuff yet or you sort of going to iron out those details later?

McClure: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, that was a conversation -- sorry, I can't see you when I talk on the mic at the same time. That was a -- that was a conversation we had with -- as a team regularly. Native plants, adapted plants, the amount of water necessary to -- to allow plants to grow. There is -- there is a cost there regardless of what we do, where even with adapted or native plants that do work here we have to have an irrigation source to water them occasionally. So, the level of effort there is sort of a wash. It's certainly something we can do. The -- the -- the purpose of this isn't to

specify specific plants every single time. We definitely like the idea of -- of fitting in with, you know, existing neighborhood thematics. So, if they have got a lot of red or yellow or whatever that is, more -- more deciduous, more evergreen, that's -- that's something we can definitely discuss with projects. We are just trying to have a high level awareness and understanding of what we want to do for -- for general massing, general thematic, general scale. I think we are all very much interested in -- in doing adapted plants and low water use plants, even potentially no water plants where possible, but that's a harder conversation.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I just have one more question, which is, you know, we have run into situations where HOA's have installed these like complex, very elaborate roundabouts. Would the intent going forward be in those situations to require them to follow this standard going forward? Have we sort of had those conversations or are we expecting that HOA -- or, you know, if a developer controls all four corners of an intersection and they are putting in improvements, do we expect that they will still be doing something different on their end?

McClure: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, that has -- we have -- we have discussed that. There is certainly some concerns with long-term public maintenance and ownership of those types of projects, you know, when -- when the developer has gone away, but we have not discussed requiring developers to adhere to this particular effort.

Strader: Thank you.

Simison: So, Brian, I assume that you have mentally looked at this, but I guess my question is moving forward where do you actually see this being applied? And, then, just take like Locust Grove as an example, where you have Locust Grove essentially built from Franklin now down to Amity, but they may go back and, you know, the -- the mile from Fairview to Ustick is yet to be improved or the mile from Victory to Amity is yet to be improved. Are we looking at corridor applications where you are going to create this boulevard effect or are we looking at one mile segments? Are we thinking eventually we are going to go back and redo other segments that would have similar stuff? I'm just trying to get a sense of like -- are we going to be a patchwork of this mile gets it, then, we are not going to have it for four miles and, then, this mile gets it based on how we have already developed or otherwise or what -- what's the general thought process?

McClure: Mr. Mayor, that's a really good question. So, we have heard from Council pretty loud and clear that you are interested in -- in -- in consistency, particularly for corridors. Newer corridors are going to be different. Sections of Ustick, for example, have bike lanes and ACHD has completely moved away from that. So, there is -- there is things that have just changed and will change. I think where we have opportunity for

these no matter what, particularly as we get into the new areas of the city, is to see the medians done, which, in my opinion, has the most opportunity for helping with speed management and, then, ACHD's always -- if they are going to -- if they are going to do multi-use pathways they are always going to have a buffer between the -- between the multi pathway and the back of curb or they can't call it a multi-use pathway. So, I think there will always be opportunities for these. The -- the -- the specific landscape improvements we put in there, it would be nice if we adhere to a -- a pallet or ran with something consistent that we have seen elsewhere in the area, but I'm not going to commit anyone to that now, but I -- I do think we can be consistent with projects moving forward as we work our way from sort of existing from -- from Victory south on Locust Grove, for example, I think we can have consistent levels of improvement out there. As I noted, I think staff is generally comfortable with level one, unless there is other -- some other reason why we need to do something else.

Simison: And so -- so corridor consistency may be considered where -- we may have a project comes here to say we shouldn't do this, because it would seem to be awkward in an environment. That could be an outcome.

McClure: Mr. Mayor, definitely. We -- there is -- there is always going to be -- the nature of this is there is every -- everything has an exception; right? So, I think we are going to be working with that constantly. But what we are trying to start for -- start with here is the city saying this is what we want and, then, ACHD will do their best to implement that. But you are right, there is -- there is always exceptions.

Simison: Yeah. Because I can see like Black Cat hasn't been improved. McMillan hasn't been improved. Segments going forward. But if you are going to go back and do one and it's going to be completely out of character, but, you know, there is -- that can work in some situations. That's where I was really kind of going to, like, oh, yeah, we are going to recommend we go to this level, but no other mile segment on that road would have that, too. I would hope it would be justified why we would want to do one specific if we -- if we go that route.

McClure: Mr. Mayor, I think an opportunity for a lot of this is to really help ACHD with speed management. They have been struggling with vertical elements, which is the way you really get there. If you look at the new section of the Locust Grove it's a highway. There is hardly any medians out there. There is no landscape buffers. It's -- it's -- I really appreciate all their effort to go out there, but it's sort of tragic that we missed that, especially when the city requested repeatedly when they were designing that to be involved. Times have changed, but -- but I -- I think that -- that would be the case of -- we can do this even if it's not consistent, because what we want to do here is not necessarily be consistent, but we want to -- we want to find a way to slow traffic down, so that when we sign it 35 police aren't constantly enforcing 45.

Simison: All the residents appear to be putting up vertical barriers on their property, so they are -- they are doing what they can to slow people down, even though it won't

impact traffic speeds. Sorry. Side sidebar. Council, any other questions specifically on Item 24 for Brian?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, one real quickly.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Brian, thanks for this and Council Member Strader I think brought up a good point that at least had my brain spinning and so I'm curious if the department's discussed if a -- you know, a landowner owns all four corners and they are trying to do something -- we have seen some -- the private sector do some things that are kind of creative and different, does that count towards like -- like an amenity point? Is that something that your department has considered as like -- it's not qualified open space, but it does contribute to the -- the character of the community. Definitely I think creates a sense of place. Is that something the department has explored at least recognizing in an amenity point style?

McClure: Mr. Mayor, Council, Councilman Cavener, I -- I don't know. So --

Cavener: Okay.

McClure: -- I -- I don't believe -- I believe there is flexibility in the amenity system. I don't know if we would allow something that's done through a license agreement in the middle of right of way to count or not though.

Cavener: Okay.

Hood: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: The voice from the sky. Mr. Hood.

Hood: It's Caleb. To potential answer Mr. Cavener's question maybe a little more directly. We have thought about it. We have not -- in a couple of instances we have not actually granted the developer any landscape or amenity points for that. In fact, some of the roundabouts that have been constructed the city hasn't even really been part of the conversation. It really is something that is negotiated between the Ada County Highway District and that developer in the right of way. So, it really is sort of outside of the development review process and -- that the city is involved with anyways and something that's, again, negotiated between the developer and ACHD.

Cavener: So -- Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Recognize that the time for debate around roundabouts is not this time and place, I -- I just -- I support when development does these types of things. I do think it

helps to create a -- a sense of place that I think we as a community are always trying to do and if there are opportunities down the way for the department to really explore how we could recognize that it's something that I think would warrant a future conversation.

Simison: Okay. Council, any additional questions on Item 24? Then with that we will move on to Item 25 officially, regarding the Black Cat-McMillan intersection cost share discussion. Mr. Hood, did you have anything to add, since your name was officially listed for myself on this item?

Hood: Mr. Mayor, thank you. Council. And thank you, Brian, for -- for covering that -- integrating that specific project into your presentation on the matrix guide. I don't have anything. There is a memo there. I apologize that I'm not there in person. I am laid up currently at home. So, apologies that I'm not there to present in person, but appreciate Brian covering for me. There are those few areas there that staff recommends. We do partner with ACHD on the level one improvements to take it above the baseline that we would otherwise get, which is, essentially, stamped and colored concrete and the Mayor just used both of these roadways as examples. I think we are setting the stage, then, for that consistency on McMillan and Black Cat both. When those roadway segments are widened adjacent we are starting that pattern down that roadway of what likely will happen in those buffer and media -- center median areas.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions or comments for Caleb, Brian, or generally?

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Yeah. In going through that I -- I think a level one is appropriate for -- for that particular area and a lot of things I think level one is that approach. So, I'm -- I'm pleased with that. I -- I was just thinking through Councilman Cavener's remarks about, you know, credits for that and different things and I was kind of thinking, well, they -- they impact the traffic, they have to have these to make traffic flow, so I wasn't in favor of giving them any credit, but different -- different view of it and we don't have to cross that bridge right now, but --

Cavener: Fight for another night.

Hoaglun: That's right. So, for -- but for -- for -- for this having -- having a -- a level one approach I think will work well and do appreciate the work everyone put into this for the roundabouts and -- and the matrix. It does -- it does help quite a bit I think for everyone involved now and in the future.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I'm in favor of it. I appreciated the pedestrian treatment as well and that seems really important at that roundabout and you said there were enhanced beacons. So, I -- I think that's important in that location. Thank you.

Simison: So, maybe a practical question for legal or for Brian. It's one thing -- it's -- I -- it's one thing to say this is what we want today. It's another thing when a budget amendment comes forward. At what point in time do people envision these decisions actually being made and/or agreed to financially, you know, and this is the consideration that this is what ACHD actually even builds to a certain extent, you know, but I think that there is that component and how you -- how you expect --

Hood: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: -- and when. Yes, Caleb.

Hood: I know you directed that more to Brian or -- or Council. If you don't mind, though, I --

Simison: I forgot you were even on --

Hood: I think I can -- so -- so, Mr. Mayor, it is a good question and Brian pointed it out when he was going through the matrix, but we are trying to get into these projects and our elements incorporated earlier in projects and likely that is two or three, four years before a project actually gets constructed. So, there can be and likely will be some turnover in leadership. There -- there is a level of commitment, though, a cost share agreement that we will enter into with ACHD. It's -- it's sort of a general person's agreement at that point saying we are good for it, but we really aren't committed until we establish the budget. There is a chance that a future council does not approve that item in the budget. If so, though, this cost share agreement that the previous council agreed to we will pay for -- and we are on the hook for redesigning those elements. So, if ACHD has to expend dollars to redesign something because we renege or rethink of something that we wanted to put in, we -- and they made that accommodation and we backtrack, any redesign costs will be billed to the city. So, there is an opportunity to back out, but there is some level of commitment and saying that we are good for it earlier on in the process.

Simison: So, Mr. Nary, is there a preferred approach on this for your -- your office or not, since we are talking about encumbering or not encumbering in any way, shape or form?

Nary: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, I think what we would end up doing is in the agreement -- in our ultimate agreement where -- for the cost share would have a nonappropriation clause to it. So, we would say if we don't fund it in the future I think we would have the conditions that Mr. Hood just talked about, that we would pay for the cost of whatever redesign or whatever if they had to redo it. But I think that -- we would want to have something that says a future council may not fund the project depending

on how what the cost is or when it is and those kinds of things. So, would like to have that anyway.

Simison: Is that the preferred approach as compared to having the Council ask for it, pays for it at the time? I mean it hasn't been bid, so you are never going to get the exact number, but I guess a future council could undo the budget as well. I mean I'm just trying to get through this -- this stuff we experience on Eagle when they were doing that, where we were asking for changes and they weren't willing to accommodate based upon some of those -- just want to make sure that we are trying to make it -- and, again, four years out is a long time to be saying here is what we want, even though it's just landscaping or vertical elements.

Nary: Sure. So, Mr. -- Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, I mean there -- there really is either way, as -- as the Mayor just stated. I'm either if funded -- funded up front, you know, ask for what you want, obviously, funded up front with a -- with a -- basically a number that's a not to exceed, obviously, awaiting a bid or, secondarily, agree to a -- a generalized number as to what that might be. We could put that in the contract. But we would put -- create -- create a clause that would say a future council may not fund the future project based on timing, change, and circumstance, change in situation, whatever that may be. So, either one of those would be compliant with what the law requires. So, either one of those are fine from a legal standpoint.

McClure: Mr. Mayor? Emily would I'm sure love this conversation if she was here, but I -- just if it's helpful, you know, this isn't any different than what we do now. It's not that it's a good process, but we do this now, we have been doing this for years. The only thing that's really changed with this, one, we have a matrix to formalize a little bit better, so that we have greater confidence and -- and greater leverage when we say this is what we are willing to participate in and, two, ACHD only recently decided they are going to be doing the -- the -- the credit system. So, that's really where I -- staff is more interested in this now is because they are willing to give us the money to basically do things that they wouldn't otherwise do. Again, not that -- not that this process is good, but this is what we have been doing for a -- a decade.

Simison: And I know that's what we have been doing and, basically, trying to make it so it's not a conversation in three years where a different council sees this and says what is this? Why are we doing it this way? Now, granted, if you see it every year for every project -- for two or three projects maybe they will -- they will -- it will provide that. That's all. Because it's like -- it's one thing to say this is what we want today. Three years from now it could be completely different. So, that's all. And there is no good answer. That's what I'm going to go with. Okay. Any further comments or feedback on something that we aren't going to make an agreement or decision on for the next three years? Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Just wishing Caleb a speedy recovery. Something we don't have any authority to fix or solve either, but we are hopeful for a speedy recovery as well.

Simison: Thanks. I think he appreciates that, so --

Hood: Thank you.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I move that we adjourn our work session.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to adjourn the work session. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. We are adjourned.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 5:33 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

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

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK