

## **Meridian City Council Work Session**

**December 2, 2025.**

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 4:32 p.m. Tuesday, December 2, 2025, by Mayor Robert Simison.

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

Other Present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Caleb Hood, Tracy Basterrechea and Dean Willis.

### **ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Liz Strader	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brian Whitlock
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anne Little Roberts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Overton
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doug Taylor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Luke Cavener
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Simison: Council, we will call this meeting to order. For the record it is December 2nd, 2025, at -- which clock -- 4:32 p.m. We will go with that one for the day. We will begin this afternoon's work session with roll call attendance.

### **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

Simison: Next item up is adoption of the agenda.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I think a quick addition. I would like to amend the agenda with the following to the Consent Agenda. It would be Item 26, Centerville Subdivision No. 2 Water Main Easement No. 1. We don't typically amend the agenda -- or Consent items, but this was a request and maybe, Mr. Nary, if you can speak to the request real quick and why we think it's appropriate to be added to the Consent Agenda. Thank you.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, thank you. Yes. This particular one came to our attention late. It is related to Item No. 3, the Centerville project. So, there are two easements for this project and they just need to get the final phase of it signed off on by the city engineer and this somehow did not get added at the time, but it is related. It already has been reviewed. The project is ready to move forward and we felt that it was all right with the Council that we would go ahead and request it to be added tonight so we can keep it moving.

Simison: Okay. Thank you for the explanation. Do I have a second to the request?

Overton: Second.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to add item -- new Item 26. Is that the right -- to the agenda. Is there any discussion? If not all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed -- opposed nay? The ayes have it and the agenda is agreed to as amended.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

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

- 1. Approve Minutes of the November 12, 2025 City Council Work Session**
- 2. Approve Minutes of the November 18, 2025 City Council Regular Meeting**
- 3. Centerville Subdivision No. 3 Water Main Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2025-0164)**
- 4. Foldesi Reserve Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2025-0140)**
- 5. Foldesi Reserve Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 2 (ESMT-2025-0141)**
- 6. Freedom Bagel Bakery Water Main Easement No. 2 (ESMT-2025-0158)**
- 7. Luna Hospice Water Main Easement No. 2 (ESMT-2025-0157)**
- 8. Meridian Commerce Park Off-Site Water Extension Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2025-0160)**
- 9. Restaurant for Dong Khahn Water Main Easement (ESMT-2025-0162)**
- 10. Modena Plaza Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement (ESMT-2025-0143)**
- 11. Southridge South Subdivision Phase 2 Sanitary Sewer Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2025-0167)**
- 12. Southridge South Subdivision Phase 2 Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 6 (ESMT-2025-0168)**

13. **TM Crossing Subdivision No. 2 Sanitary Sewer Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2025-0166)**
14. **TM Crossing Subdivision No. 2 Water Main Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2025-0165)**
15. **Una Mas Water Main Easement (ESMT-2025-0163)**
16. **Village at Meridian Partial Release of Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement Inst. #112079721 (ESMT-2025-0147)**
17. **Village at Meridian Ph. 2B Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 2 (ESMT-2025-0148)**
18. **Windrow Subdivision No. 1 Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2025-0159)**
19. **Zenith Subdivision Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 1(ESMT-2025-0155)**
20. **Zenith Subdivision Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 2 (ESMT-2025-0156)**
21. **Final Order for Pollard North No. 2 (FP-2025-0027), by Brighton Development, generally located 1/4 mile north of W. Chinden Blvd. and 1/2 mile west of N. Black Cat Rd.**
22. **Final Plat for Reveille Ridge No. 1 (FP-2025-0007), by Kent Brown Planning Services, located at 7355 S. Eagle Rd.**
23. **Resolution No. 25-2552: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Meridian Directing the City Clerk to Enter in the Minutes of the December 2, 2025 Meridian City Council Meeting the Tabulation of Votes and Certificates of Canvass for the Meridian City Municipal Election and the City of Meridian Levy Election as Required by Idaho Code Section 50-412; and Providing an Effective Date**
24. **Resolution No. 25-2553: 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 Office Equipment to St. Vincent de Paul Thrift Store**
25. **City of Meridian Financial Report - October 2025**
26. **[Amended on to agenda] Centerville Subdivision No. 2 Water Main Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2025-0041).**

Simison: Next up is the Consent Agenda.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: With that, the amendment to the agenda items to be included, move that we approve the Consent Agenda as amended.

Strader: 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: ALL AYES.

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

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

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

#### **27. Destination Downtown Discussion**

Simison: So, we will move on to our Department Reports, which is Item 27, which is Destination Downtown discussion and don't know who is going to -- oh, it looks like Chris is going to come up to continue this conversation. Welcome, Chris.

Danley: New and improved mics I hear. Think we are good? Yeah. If anything dumb comes out of my mouth I'm totally blaming the microphone and technology, so -- okay. Mayor, Council, it's good to see you. I hope everybody enjoyed their Thanksgiving and marshmallow sweet potatoes. I don't know why we eat that once a year, but we do. Appreciate you -- you hanging in there and the invite back. So, today we are going to talk about connectivity. We are going to talk about streets and basically all things transportation and I want to walk through several different things as we go through it with respect to the geography and also conceptual and there is a big issue that I want to get through that's towards the end and I will get through that, as well as describe the subsequent white paper that will be accompanying this conversation that will make it across your desks probably just in the next few weeks as well. So, with that I will jump in. I always do this wrong. Okay. So, these are just the general concepts of -- in the agenda of what I would like to get through today. As I mentioned just some of the -- the specific areas and themes -- the geographic themes that you are all I'm sure very familiar with by now and, then, this 3rd Street discussion. But let's start off with the purpose of connections. Why do we even care? What's the value of a connected street system. There are many and we will start with efficiencies. The bottom line is is that

when a street system is as close to a grid as we can get it, it's hyper efficient. It is why in areas where you have many more connections there is much less pressure to widen, because the congestion is spread out; right? And so when we only have a handful of major arterial roadways or even collector streets, much more pressure is put onto those individual streets and so a grid system is as much as efficiency as you are going to get. Safety. This is something also that comes along with the grid system most typically. When a system is built and it's got many many connections, the risks and the -- and the traffic, because it is sort of diluted, if you will, those risks decline and very often the safety numbers back that up significantly and, then, the graphic in the upper right you can kind of see -- this is research done by one of the nation's leading researchers Wes Marshall out of University of Colorado, who can talk a whole lot more about this stuff than I can, but the bottom line is when you have a system of -- of cul-de-sacs and circuitous routes, that system is not nearly as safe as one that is well connected. So, one of the other parts of it -- and that doesn't go just for vehicular safety, by the way, that is for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, all -- all -- all kinds of things. Motor opportunities. Real simple. You are probably not going to walk if it takes you a heck of a lot of time and a long distance to do it. So, when you have -- going back to high school geometry or, you know, maybe even junior high for the overachievers in the crowd, you know the shortest distance between A and B is a straight line and when you have more connections those lines are shorter and, therefore, so, too, are the distances and so it invites and encourages much more opportunities to do that, to walk, bike, or -- or other routes, even by driving. But when we have more connections -- the lower right is an image -- a company called Transport Group had a product called Via City where they measured connectivities in -- in a street system and the bottom line is where you see in that image is blue is hyper efficient. Where it's red is very very low efficiency. And because of it you see a change and it's mostly exclusive driving trips versus others. Well, again, remember, our whole thing is downtown and it's trying to get people to get around in as many ways as possible. Economic development. Last thing, too, is, again, where we have commercial corridors and we have people and there is activity and you see people out and about, they want to set up businesses and they want to be a part of a downtown environment specifically with regard to the downtown context. So, all of these are -- are some of those things that come along with connections and, then, I guess I do need to hit on this last one. Operational efficiency. I think this is something that would be of interest to you. Trash trucks. Emergency service providers. Snow plowing operations. Even though you don't do that; right? But those types of things come with greater efficiencies when we have a gridded street system. The city of Moscow, for example, has measured this and they have seen that specifically with their snow plowing operations and the cost savings in some neighborhoods versus others. So, something that also comes along with it. What people have said. So, when we went out and we talked with everybody in the different forms that we did, you know, these are just some of the broad general comments that we got. We want to be able to get in and out easier. Okay. Point taken; right? We want to be able to walk around, bike around a little bit more. We would love to be able to just park once in certain places anyway and not have to move around and -- and -- and move the car or, you know, other things and so that comes land use, but also certainly transportation. So, these were -- I guess you would say our North Star when it came to the concepts that

we just talked about when it comes to a system, but also what the folks had to say. So, I'm going to walk through -- these are, again, more recommendations. The alignments are not meant to be exact or precise. In some instances they are more conceptual. So -- and, again, all of these are in the document as -- as you have seen, but recommendations going from north as I make my way towards the south. So, starting at the top probably is no surprise. You have one big huge left -- one parcel left to be developed on that northwest corner. That's difficult to connect, because the streets that are to the west don't really allow it and even north-south. So, what you can do is you can try to go east-west. You might be able to do like a horseshoe type of a road that goes back behind, then, comes back and connects as much as possible. But you are limited in terms of what you can do connectivity wise in that parcel. Bike-ped improvements slated with respect to Fairview or -- and Cherry and, then, I will come back -- there is one more little arrow you will see there, that little connection that spans the Fairview section. I will come back to that towards the end, because that has a lot to do with the 3rd Street discussion. North Main District as -- as we have discussed -- again I will hold off on the 3rd Street in the far right, but a couple things more specifically and I will explain some of these in a little bit more detail in a moment. One of them being the 4th Street connection over there in the northwest and, then, the possibility of another east-west connection, whether it's a street or whether it's a path, that is to be determined. But the right of way is there and it does afford an opportunity to be able to make yet another east-west link that gives greater movement in this part of the downtown and so those opportunities are there and, then, the circles are the possibility and recommendations of pedestrian hybrid beacons, which in this instance is needed in terms of a tool versus some of those rapid flash beacons that you see. That's not the right tool for these corridors. You do have to bring traffic to a stop given the number of lanes, the volume, the speed, it's important that we give that full pause versus just an advisory when it comes to a crosswalk. So, again, I will come back to the 3rd Street in a moment. I do want to show -- show you this though. So, many of you -- you probably already know this, but this 4th Street connection that is in that upper northwest part -- if I go back a graphic, it's -- it's there over by the left-hand side of that -- the North Main District label. That's what it looks like and that is a perfectly good street, but it does not function as a street and it doesn't function as a street because there is 400 feet of missing roadway there. If you read the 2008 3rd Street document, the alignment study, which I will talk about a whole lot more momentarily, they talk about the importance of that corridor and if you use this street synonymously with 3rd Street, the exact same rationale would apply. The only difference is that 4th Street doesn't go over the railroad and continue south. However, it does run parallel to the corridor -- the main Meridian corridor and services the neighborhood. Accesses Cherry. We know there is a school in there and so forth. But this street, which could and in -- in my opinion, my professional opinion, should operate more closely aligned to a collector level street, does not at all, because of this particular section. To me that's an opportunity to increase connectivity, to get some of those trips off the main Meridian couplet that don't necessarily need to be there; right? It does come in the -- and in some documentation you will see with recommendations on speed management. So, as you go into it we shouldn't just -- hey, here is a straightaway, go for it. There is ways to treat the entrance of that, so that people are respectful of the neighborhood. It doesn't prompt cut-through

traffic and that sort of thing, but an opportunity potentially there. As I continue -- so, what we know to be -- what we have been calling the Old Town area, lots of things there. Many in the bike-ped realm. Some -- again, some of the -- the connections east-west and so forth. But the couple of things that I want to showcase are those yellow circles, which I will show you momentarily. The red arrow that's there, what that looks like momentarily and, then, the railroad corridor in a bit. So, the yellow circle. I think I have alluded to this in the past, but the idea here is the potential of simple neighborhood traffic circles. I'm not talking about full-on roundabouts. Those can be consequential in terms of the design and size in the particular intersection. They do take up more volume. There is benefits -- significant benefits, but I'm not talking about that. I am talking about a neighborhood traffic circle and it's going to look like this in the upper right. So, those kind of things. Specifically the picture on the left, something modest like that could take the place of four way stops. Traffic circles and roundabouts are incredibly effective at safety. They reduce vehicle crashes considerably, especially higher speed ones and the like. Why this recommendation? Remember, our whole entire point is to do everything we could to make downtown Meridian pop out and stand out in any way that we possibly could. This particular approach is not done anywhere else in the valley where you have a system of a handful of traffic circles in a residential area, more than just a one off. Okay? The one in the upper right, that picture exists. It is more of that neighborhood traffic circle. It does exist. It's over in Boise. It's over off of Rose Hill if you know it. But it's not done in numerous places. Bend, Oregon, is a great example, but those are more full roundabouts, but they have done them in many places. So, the idea here again is -- is safety based motion -- or mobility based, but also placemaking concepts. Make this area stand out, especially in the neighborhood. I have kind of talked about the pedestrian hybrid beacon, but there is an image there just for your reference in case you are unfamiliar. But the other two things I want to point out. Taylor and, then, this roadway or road -- railroad underpass concept. So, I'm going to go back just, again, for point of reference -- where is Taylor? Oh. There you go. So, if you are not familiar or don't recall off the top of your head, it's that lower left L-shaped arrow. Part of it exists. In fact, the whole thing really does exist. However, if you look at those images, the one that's on the right, that's the more -- that's where it transitions from what is as complete of a Taylor section to where it starts to lose that completeness and, then, it turns into, essentially -- not quite a dirt road, it's paved, but it is -- it's mostly for the trucking operations and so forth. This isn't something that we are suggesting needs to happen tomorrow, but especially as redevelopment may occur, if it does occur or if there is a desire, again, to enhance this connectivity, that street's there, that street's ready to go, but it needs that next level. It needs to be completed and it does that -- it does a lot of things in terms of the benefit for this particular part of Meridian and in downtown. With respect to the railroad and the possibility of an underpass -- I know. I know. That's a tough one. That's a heavy lift. I get it. However, here is the deal. As of right now the only real way to cross those tracks is either through our -- our Meridian main corridor, the couplet, or by the 3rd Street section on the east side of the couplet. There is nothing to the west. So, as things change, as things improve, as you see land use investment occurring, redevelopment occurring, there is going to be a demand, especially for people on foot to be able to get across that railroad, but railroads are notoriously difficult to work with and so we don't know what the future of that's going to

look like. An overpass is also consequential, especially in cost, and when you get into the ADA requirements you can see a 700 foot back-to-back, you know, ramp system to cross a hundred feet and 700 feet down. You are talking, you know, a quarter mile to cross 60 feet of track. But an underpass and a -- and a tunnel is also a challenge admittedly, especially with the water table. So, ultimately what is that decision? Should it move forward? This is our recommendation, but if that's something that, you know, changes over time, so be it, but if that 4th Street connection is made and, then, you make this now we are creating a corridor on the west side of the couplet in downtown that continues the same objectives that we see largely now on the east side. So, that's where that came from. Let me get through this. Okay. The Speedway area. Pretty straightforward really. It's mostly in the world of bike-ped, you know, some of the sidewalk improvements, some PHB height connections, especially -- especially, again, should the -- should the Speedway transition? Well, if it does and it becomes something that's -- that is, you know, desirable by foot, walking people stay, who knows what the future of that site is, if it does change or even if just the parking lot changes. What if it became a hotel and people came specifically for the Speedway, but stayed in a hotel and they want to go eat, right across that street, right, is -- is -- are places to do that. But there might be a reason why a crossing ends up being warranted. So, this is where some of that motivation comes into play. The last thing before I get into the 3rd Street discussion -- so, the southern gateway, again, you all have had this discussion I think a couple of different times and it's a challenging one. The internal section, that's going to be what it's going to be. That's -- that's, you know, going to be with whatever the developer is wanting to do, whatever you all permit, but overall big picture you know that -- Watertower, Waltman, there -- those sections are not complete just yet, need to be completed, need to be polished, it deserves to be that way. Other connections that we -- we recommended be made, even if it's just by pathway, are north-south connections that do get from that -- that path -- or from that parcel up north and south. The only one that might stick out to you is that dashed blue line that goes out towards the west. That street out towards that residential subdivision -- and I thought I highlighted it. I guess I did not. I think I did it in the paper, but, in any case, that's a stub street. So, that residential subdivision that's out there to the west has an existing stub street that has every intention of being extended out towards the west -- or to the east. I will tell you having measured that, if you were in this neighborhood and you wanted to get over towards -- especially, for example, just geographically -- let's say the storage areas, to get there now, the connectivity, it takes almost four miles to go all the way around and connect back in. That is an immediate recipe for drive only, drive only, drive only. That's the only option we are likely giving people when we have connections like that. It's exactly why that recommendation is there is that it helps -- it helps in everything that we just discussed; right? So, at some point if this comes back before you, this is something that we would encourage to take a good hard look at.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Chris --



Danley: Yeah.

Overton: -- interrupt you on this one. This Council -- I'm not sure if everybody in this Council was sitting here, but we have already pounded this section of our city once before and came up with a development that looked a lot like what you are presenting to us.

Danley: Uh-huh.

Overton: -- it wasn't -- it's not new when we look at it now. We approved it, although I think it's gone nowhere --

Danley: Right.

Overton: -- but it included two bridges to cover the areas that needed to be developed for connectivity to the north. It had the residential hookup that went to the west, which the people living to the west, even with the hookup, as you stated, would allow people to come straight across, instead of having to go all the way up to Franklin. But we also had additional exits to the east on Corporate and the connection that made it out to Northwest 5th out to Franklin Road. So, I'm assuming -- I -- I -- the only thing -- I don't want you to feel like you are trying to talk us into something that we actually, as a Council, already approved.

Danley: Yeah.

Overton: We thought it was a good idea the first time we heard it.

Danley: Yeah.

Overton: And, Mr. Mayor and Councilman Overton, so remember that most of these things are coming from a place and time when the document was last touched; right? Which at this point was almost a year and a half ago. And when we were in the process of coming up with these was precisely when you all were dealing with that application and so the timing of where we were in terms of recommendations and, then, it was moving forward through you and now here we are and as you pointed out -- and I think that's exactly why I'm still including this, because should that application die on the vine and I think you might have a one-time extension, I don't recall off the top of my head your code exactly, but at some point if they don't move dirt it's going to die and it will come back in front of you and so at least conceptually this is sort of I think the netting under the highway a little bit and saying, hey, this plan is still calling for at the minimum these connections. You want to go above and beyond, even better. So, that's the timing of this is -- is just a little background there, so -- okay. But point taken for sure. Okay. This is the beast. This is the beast. This is something that me -- for me personally or professionally has been in our radar from the beginning of this project and the more we examine this the more I felt it absolutely imperative to do a deep dive, have the discussions and to present to you I think not only the findings, but I would even go

so far as to -- to -- to suggest a recommendation. Let me give you the background if you don't recall the 3rd Street alignment. Number one came out of a 2008 study. I'm sure conceptually it was discussed much longer than before that, but at least there was an alignment study done in 2008 that formerly looked at the corridor. What came out of it? Specifically -- let me -- let me back up. What started -- when you look at this graphic there were two alignments. The green line, 2 1/2 Street with two curves, one heading towards the west, one coming back to the east before extending up the existing 3rd Street or whatever needed to be constructed up to Fairview. The other one that was in that original alignment study was 3rd Street in maroon. The two that are labeled four, 4A and 4B, resulted after public discussion. So, once the consultant was in the midst of the project and people were talking about these ideas, those two came out of that as well. So, just a little bit of background there. I will say this now, it's -- it's going to be repeated more and more, but why was the only alignment really either 3rd Street or what ultimately, then, came out of the 4B was because the assumption at the time was that that is where a full signal could be located. Okay? So, I'm going to come back to that. But that's the -- that's why this dashed line, the 2 1/2 Street all the way through, was not included in the 2008 alignment and I literally just said assumed signal at Fairview. Never looked at that. There were other assumptions here. One of the other major assumptions at the time -- and who could blame them -- was the presence of Cole Valley Christian; right? This was 2007, 2008. So, it made a lot of sense. You know now there is some question marks. We know -- as far as we know -- maybe you all know more -- there is a desire for them to relocate their campus. When that happens exactly that's to be determined, but the desire is there. That changes a lot of what the 2008 assumptions were, particularly the concerns about traffic flow and kids and -- and -- and kids maybe walking to school and that kind of a thing, but a lot of that is going to change at some point in time with the potential redevelopment of Cole Valley Christian. Let me see. I'm going to go back here. Okay. So, this is not scheduled. The improvement or the alignment, the -- the extension of 3rd Street is not in a plan right now. It is not funded and it is not in ACHD's plans with respect to anything concrete. It is identified in the long range CIP and it does say this is where it's to go. However, it's a great big asterisk that says future consideration. Otherwise it doesn't really exist except for the agreement that's been in place. That's different from the 3rd Street south of Carlton, which is in the five year work plan for pedestrian improvements all the way down to -- I think it's Pine. Or, I'm sorry, Franklin. In the 2008 study there is things that you need to understand and if -- if you are not familiar with it. One is that it looked at, again, these different alignments, all of which span the Cole Valley Christian field that exists today. Okay. Beyond that there are -- every one of the alignments requires the purchasing of private property, i.e., homes and many of them are full takes. In other words, they are having to move. That -- that house is going to be demolished and that's what it's going to be; right? When we -- when we submit the white paper you will see how many units per alignment are in there. But each one of them is at least about a half dozen. Some of them upwards of 12 or 13 in -- you know, homes are gone as a result of the alignment that was picked. Demolition -- and as I mentioned. So, in the lower right those were the right-of-way estimate costs and also in the white paper you will see the actual construction costs, but we bumped those up using the escalators that we know of today, just for the right-of-way alignment we are at least almost two and a half --

we are at close to three and I think those numbers, frankly, are even higher than that. I think because, remember, this is fair to market. When you get into negotiation that's a whole different deal. So, it could very easily be four million or more just for the right-of-way acquisition, which you are paying for, because these are not eligible for impact fees. This -- this -- this road is a collector level road and, therefore, not eligible for impact fees.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Chris, just a -- just a clarification.

Danley: Yeah.

Overton: Because you are right, this has been talked about longer than 20 years ago --

Danley: Yeah.

Overton: -- as different solutions have been presented and the problem we have had is not necessarily this Council, but previous councils is we would identify a best path forward and, then, we did nothing to preserve the land and we allowed additional building to occur under some of these pathways. But just as a clarification, as we are looking at this, so I'm -- it's clear to me --

Danley: Yeah.

Overton: -- when we look at the alignment for 2 1/2 we are not looking at just the simple alignment of 3rd Street to 2 1/2 -- 2 1/2 going all the way to Fairview, we are looking at 3rd Street going to 2 1/2 and, then, 2 1/2 cutting back through the residential area to 3rd as is shown on here. So, we are not talking about the yellow dotted line at all.

Danley: We are talking about both. So, what I'm talking about is in the 2008 study the green line that you see here was what was in the study. The yellow dashed line was never considered and it wasn't considered because at 2 1/2 and Fairview there was never going to be a signal put there. At least in 2008. So, I'm going to come back to that in just a second, however, because I have -- we had discussions with ACHD just a month ago and their opinion in 2025 isn't what may have been in 2020 -- or 2008, which effects this decision. Does that answer the question?

Overton: Mr. Mayor, just clarification.

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: When we are looking at the color code at the bottom --

Danley: Yes.

Overton: -- those color code numbers do not include the yellow dotted line to Fairview, because --

Danley: Oh. Okay. I see what you are saying.

Overton: Because it was never considered because you were never going to get a signal there.

Danley: Right. Right. So, the alignment conceptually in our head would be a blending of partly this green line and the yellow dash line once it goes up towards the north, but not include the eastern swing that then goes back to 3rd Street. So, what I'm introducing to you all tonight would essentially be a fifth -- a fifth alignment if you will, which is partly the 2 1/2 that we did have analyzed in 2008, but not the dashed portion of existing 2 1/2 Street. Does that make sense?

Overton: We are getting there.

Danley: Okay.

Simison: Well, Chris, maybe this would -- would help a little bit.

Danley: Yes.

Simison: You just -- what I heard you say -- all you did was escalate my inflation and, basically, you have not taken into consideration any new development, any new thing else in the original green, red, purple and blue numbers, you know, so -- so, what Council's already approved up in 4B is not taken into consideration --

Danley: Yes.

Simison: -- the row estimate --

Danley: Right.

Simison: -- or anything else.

Danley: Right.

Simison: And the yellow portion is not a reflection of 2 1/2 -- or the green is not a reflection of real cost of 2 1/2 -- to yellow in this context

Danley: That's -- that's much more accurate. Thank you for clarifying that. Yes, we did -- all we did was take a look at what was in the 2008 study, the assumptions of the number of units, the full takes, all of that, because those numbers were clearly marked

in the report and said, okay, if that moves forward -- some of those structures we know are still there. Some of -- you know, there has been some changes here and there, but for the most part it's still pretty much the same where it was in 2008 and just simply escalated that, but the dashed line that you see here north of just where that 2 1/2 Street mark is, that label, there is no -- there are no structures, because the street is there. So, the only right-of-way acquisition for what would be a new potential alignment, would include the field, because you can't get away from that. So, it still has to connect from 3rd swinging out towards the west and, then, one corner of that corner lot that is existing now on the opposite side of the field -- I think that's Washington. Yeah. Washington and 2 1/2. So, there is a little sliver there. But, otherwise, it's smooth sailing all the way to Fairview. Okay. I want to get into the assumptions, because this is a critical component of this. When we met with ACHD and talked about this and said the assumption has been, for the better part of almost 20 years now, that 3rd and Fairview would be fully signalized. Their response to us was nope. Nope, it's not going to be signalized. And neither would 2 1/2. Neither would 4th. Anything in there they have no desire and they are going to lean hard on traffic warrants to say it ain't happening. But the other thing they are leaning on very hard is their policy with respect to signal spacing on arterials. That's what's in front of you here. Okay? So, because of Lake Street and because of Main Street, that space in between they are wanting half mile spacing on arterial roads; right? And so now when you split the difference between 2 1/2 and 3rd, 2 1/2 is only 550 feet or so. 3rd street is only 830 feet from Main. So, they are not interested in putting in a full signal there. They do have interest, however, in an alternative that I threw out to them, which I will go over in just a second. However, I do want to point something out to be fully I think clear and -- and objective about this, there are examples where this policy is not in place and that's what that table in the lower right is showing. There are places throughout Ada county where there are arterial roadways where signal spacing is less than a half mile. So, you should know that, because it's part of a broader discussion potentially to say, wait a minute, that's not over here, not over here and so that's a whole other part of it. But just to be objective about it, there are examples in other places. Okay. So, I have already kind of said what I think. Let me go back. That bottom one. So, what are they open to? They are very interested in access management on whether it would be 2 1/2, whether it be 3rd Street, whatever it is. They are very interested in limiting turning movement on and off of Fairview for safety reasons. What they would be open to potentially is a refuge island on Fairview with 2 1/2 Street and a PHB, a pedestrian hybrid beacon, that spans it to get to the other side of Fairview, because for them their motivation is, okay, that gets us to the access management part of things, but also at least allows some degree of circulation, even if it's by foot or bike. Might not be all by vehicular, but it does allow the north-south component of things. So, that's where they would be open. They didn't come out and say, heck, yeah, sign us up, but they did say we would be open to that conversation. But signal, they are not aboard that train. So, if that assumption were to move forward that's what this graphic is showing and so it's split in two, because of the length of the corridor, but from the north as you span towards the south, just thinking about what that whole corridor would look like, that's what this is trying to depict. You all have been leading the league in the Treasure Valley when it comes to lateral and irrigation canal pathways and so I highly expect that to continue at the very north end of

this and it be official. Now we have a starting point, because now I can connect from there all the way to Storey Park, which I misspelled in the bottom. Don't pay attention to that. I changed it. Someone had to be smart and they put that e in there and it messes me up every time. But now we have a full corridor. Okay? And it goes from that pathway with the possibility of a PHB as I just discussed on Fairview. You have the new gym going in. You have lots of redevelopment and development opportunity between the existing parcels, Cole Valley Christian, you span that field. In the white paper you will see -- you will see also an advantage to that happens with that field by the way. Because likely -- and, again, I had this conversation with the district -- if the 2 1/2 Street segment were to be -- to go forward the existing 2nd 1/2 Street that's already there and been approved would be vacated, because there is no need for it. That would, then, be absorbed potentially to the property owner, which makes that a more developable -- redevelopable parcel. You go out to the west -- or the east, rather, that changes that up. But that's in the white paper. And, then, some of the other things. This aligns with the Festival Street concept. It's -- it's a half block away, right, and it takes you further down to the railroad crossing, which is a very important element of this discussion, because it allows us to continue on north-south in a safe way and there is very few railroad crossings and, then, ultimately, you get to the other end, which is the other PHB on Franklin that allows safe crossing of Franklin to get to the park and all of that 3rd Street section between -- I think it's from Carlton, again, all the way to Franklin, is scheduled in three years from now to be upgraded by ACHD with all of the -- the bike-ped infrastructure that's scheduled to go. So, all of that comes with you not having to bulldoze a house. With you as the City of Meridian saving a lot of money that you probably have needs elsewhere for and, again, none of this would be impact fee eligible. So, that's the overview. I just said all of this. Don't you hate it when you make these pretty cool things and, then, you just say it. I'm not going to get into all of this. This is in the document and I'm sure it's going to be subject to change with any of the revisions that we do. But, yes, there is some implementation components of it that provides at least some directive generally speaking on specific improvements, who might be responsible for what. But, again, with -- for the sake of time I will save you on that. So, I wanted to hit on that 3rd Street, because it's an important one. To me it's worth maybe rehashing a bit, because it's really ready to go and I will add one thing, too. When you go on to ACHD's website last year's five year work plan is still on it, which can be very confusing, but in this case was helpful. Why? Because there was a project on that five year work plan that is no longer there. That project was a resurfacing an ADA ramp upgrade on 2 1/2 Street from Fairview all the way down to where essentially the improvements began to the south. That was on their schedule. But I'm sure because of budgets or whatever their decision making was, that project not only was not just delayed, it was pulled out of the entire five year work plan. But it was on their radar, right, and so the only thing left would have been the sidewalk gaps, probably some stormwater considerations, but, otherwise, that same section with the dashed line would have been pretty much ready to rock and, then, all that would have been left is the -- the track section and the potential of the island and PHB at Fairview and everything else is coming on down the pipe. Okay. I will be happy to stand for questions.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Just a comment. I can't tell you how many times I have spoke on that in the past 20 years, because it should have been 2 1/2 to 3rd Street, 2 1/2 a long time ago. The reason it never happened -- and, Caleb, you can correct me if I'm wrong, was because we -- we -- previous councils wanted to see a signal at Fairview and back in the day, if you go back 20 years and the traffic counts were low enough, it was still a possibility. But planning for today -- and you showed a lot of intersections down there where they don't follow the rule. Unfortunately some of those intersections where they don't follow the rule are some they probably use as examples of why we don't do this.

Danley: Fair enough.

Overton: I understand and agree with the no signal at 2nd, 3rd or the 4th. But it still would have allowed us and still can allow us with the least expensive option to take 3rd from Franklin all the way to 2 1/2 at Fairview, get people across. Anybody who spends anytime at all when that school is in session, at the end of the day and sees what that mess is coming on 2 1/2, coming on 3rd and coming up Carlton, it's pretty scary. It's a mess, because -- that's simply just because the roads don't align. There is a lot of things we could take care of by doing that. It's been talked about for an awful long time and if the signal is off the table I think it's a really good opportunity for this Council moving forward to look at finally going ahead with a solution that would alleviate all of that and I appreciate you guys doing such a good job bringing that up and --

Danley: Thank you. And -- and -- and I -- just real quick. Also it's really important -- and I did not say this. I neglected. Your comp plan flat out calls for this; right? The 3rd Street section, the alignment, the -- the -- the parallel route to Main and Meridian, which it's not going to solve all the -- any congestion issues on Main and Meridian, but it will take some pressure off and it does allow other mobility. One last thing I did not point out -- and, again, to your point, Councilman Overton, 3rd Street from Fairview going across, you are going right into the drive through of Burger King. So, if you want a Whopper it's perfect. But if you want to go to the pathway that will eventually I'm sure be on the canal, that's where the 2 1/2 Street section takes you and the right of way is already there. You go out and look at the utility corridor and it's right on the right hand-side, which is a great indicator that it's ready to go, too. So, sorry about that.

Simison: No problem. Chris -- and I do love me a good whopper, so I don't want to disparage that --

Danley: Nearly 200 feet over.

Simison: Two hundred feet over. I -- I guess the -- you know. And I'm not looking for an answer. I think it's just more of a comment in the larger scheme of things. It's like I understand, you know, ACHD's arterial street viewpoint and policy. I also understand

that Front and Myrtle are state highways and you have got signals every block. So, I guess I would -- in some -- in some part. I don't know if a light makes sense at 2 1/2 Street. I don't know if a light makes sense on 4th Street on the other side. I -- I understand the policies. I understand the reasons. But I'm -- I guess I would say I think that, you know, when you are looking down the future, you know, does this area need to have more stop lights that -- just as a general rule? I don't know the answer to that, because I don't know how the downtown redevelops and if, you know, we become very successful. If 2 1/2 street redevelops from Fairview all the way up to Cole Valley, you know, a lot of that could just be like boom, boom, something completely different, a light may be very very important to access at that location compared to the way you currently get across at Main Street. So, I guess I -- just from a conceptual standpoint I'm open to whatever makes sense long term, irregardless of ACHD policies. Even though this is a main arterial, it's also the entering into our downtown area and maybe we want people to go 25 miles per hour through several lights and have several different left-hand turn movements through here. But the Burger King doesn't make sense, but -- but, honestly, if you look at redevelopment opportunities where 2 1/2 Street comes into that other property, frankly, it could be part of a larger redevelopment of the entire Albertsons and everything in between long term and so it may be the perfect place to have a full access if you want to do something different than the current -- what -- I'm going to say it -- kind of coming out of the Albertsons thing up that hill through -- with no -- we could do a lot better of an access point on the north side of Fairview than that one and it might be a better long term location with a left -- with a left-hand turn movement only compared to a north-south connection through that area. So, I just don't want to throw out things, because they are not in ACHD's policy, if they are not in the best transportation interest of this area as it redevelops, so --

Danley: Well said and my only -- my only response is that I don't disagree with that at all and I think that this buys you time, because as of right now there is -- they are not even close to a warrant that would get them closer to that. There are exceptions in their policy manual that can -- and on a white paper you will see this. I didn't hit them here, because I didn't want to hit you with everything, but they do have some exceptions on the distance and -- of signals. Some of them you meet. Not all of them. And so I agree that if this goes through, which can go way faster than waiting for 3rd Street to come up with millions and millions and millions and kick people out of homes to get to a warrant. So, you might be right there. It could very well be where that gets built and that it does trigger that and now there is a different discussion that could be made. A hundred percent.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Chris -- excuse me. Really great presentation. Probably one of the more thought provoking kind of interesting and sort of taking a holistic view about what we want to see. Just a couple of really quick questions. On the corner of Carlton and 2 1/2



there is that little house on the corner, then, there is the mobile class trailers -- yeah, if you want to pull it up.

Danley: Oh. I lost the presentation. I don't know what happened. Probably me.

Taylor: Well, it's the -- it's the field across from the school. Yep. Would we need to move that home that's on the corner or would it route kind of through the field and around it?

Danley: So, let me make sure I understand what you are asking for, Councilman Taylor. So, let me see if I can pull this up real quick, because I think there is two different ways I think you are going with this. Hold on just a second. I'm trying to get the best angle. It's probably going to be -- I thought you were going to say that Taylor Avenue ought to be named after you.

Taylor: Well, we can do that, too.

Danley: Oh. For sure. That was where you are going with that.

Taylor: Yeah. Right there.

Danley: Okay. That works. So, there -- with respect to the field as we speak there are four structures. I'm sorry. Five structures. Four of them I believe are portables, so they can be technically moved. I would probably sell them I would imagine, but that's their decision. So, fortunately, you don't have to go bulldozing them in that respect. Then there is the other structure, which I don't remember what it is, but it's certainly affiliated with the school on the very corner. Well, when they move, then, it's not in the way exactly. I think it can go around it if the redevelopment were to occur and they would want to keep that for some reason, but that structure I don't think would be a problem at least being in the way and the city wouldn't have to buy it.

Taylor: Okay.

Danley: The opposite side where that green line comes into that one corner, that's the only one, but it's not a full take, it is probably taken some, you know, price area or something like that, but that's -- that's one corner quadrant of a lot that would have to be. But that's very different than an entire multi-family unit that would have to go away and -- and a lot of other things and homes that are on the other side of the -- the track that are right in the middle of it.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor, just a quick follow up.

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: So, yeah, the -- the reason I -- I asked the question -- and keep this slide up, please. So, let me start with options 4A and 4B. Those I don't think would work

anymore, because two and a half years ago the Council approved a development with that trailer park there where they are actually going to be -- they are required to extend 3rd Street down into that kind of open vacant lot now, but there is a brand new development that's going to go there. So, there would be no reason why that is even a logical reason to have that. Extending 3rd Street through -- through there, again, 3rd Street is going to be extended already and be improved from Fairview to about Bradley there, but, then, it stops and so you would have all that from Bradley to -- through Washington with all the homes there that you would have to figure out what to do. 2 1/2 Street -- if -- if 2 1/2 Street, including the yellow dotted line, was your connection and, then, it came over, very few -- actually almost no purchasing a full lots and demolition. So, you can imagine if we are buying homes to demolish them -- like that -- that's -- we are talking years and years and years of actually just getting -- and millions of dollars. If we are looking at trying to have something that seems tangible that we could do, I like your suggestion of -- of 2 1/2 Street, the yellow dotted line and, then, just kind of at the very very bottom that -- how it kind of swoops back over to 3rd Street, clearly seems like a very reasonable recommendation that is the most cost efficient and the -- the -- the one that's closest to us on the time horizon of actually being able to get it done. So, I -- I -- I did want to kind of point out and remind Council of the development that we have there. So, that for the option 4A and 4B just -- I don't think are very good options at all. So, I appreciate that. Do you -- and I will just kind of finish with this, Mr. Mayor, real quick. Quick question. When it comes to the other side of Meridian Road, on the west side, that little 4th Street connection -- I haven't actually been there. I didn't even realize it was -- that, you know, a few hundred feet of lacking a connection. But was 4th Street that connection all the way -- yeah. Right there. Who owns that land? Is that right of way already owned by ACHD or is that private land?

Danley: My understanding -- and you all might know or -- or maybe even -- Caleb still here? Yeah. I -- I believe that's actually still privately held. I don't think that that is in the public right of way. If it was I would imagine it would have been done. But my understanding -- unless you -- unless I'm wrong -- was that that sliver is owned by a private entity.

Hood: So, Mr. Mayor, Councilman Taylor, Council Members, Chris isn't wrong. There is right of way actually that is through there, but there is one property owner that owns essentially a spite strip that prevents the entire width of the right of way from building the road. So, there is one property owner that owns half of the road if you will or what would be half of the road today.

Taylor: Okay.

Danley: So, you can walk through it and I think you can maybe even off road it through there, but it's not a functional street. And I -- if I can real quick to -- going back to the other piece, I would imagine that given that the -- the 2 1/2 Street be resurfacing and the curb ramp project was in there -- it was supposed to go to design this year and, then, be built in two years from now. It's still floating out there. If it was of interest to the city it wouldn't shock me if it was an ask of the city and if you all said, hey, we can do the curb

-- or the -- the sidewalk gap there to bring that back in and get it delivered sooner. That's just my opinion. But it wouldn't surprise me if -- if that was something that could happen if -- again, if it was of interest to the Council.

Simison: So, I -- I know our good friends at Cole Valley are watching online tonight this conversation. They -- I -- I did reach out to them and share with them what I thought would be -- I didn't know what you were exactly going to be presenting, but just other conversations. They did reply back that their preferred choice would actually be 4A and 4B, not knowing that there was approved development already in that location. But I guess, you know, what I shared with them, that there were to be no decisions made tonight about the future of this road. But I guess I would ask you, Chris, the question as you continue to do some work and -- what -- what is the public conversation as you see it both from what you are going to be doing and the city before a decision would be made about if to leave the current 3rd Street alignment?

Danley: I -- my -- my -- my professional opinion after hearing from hundreds of Meridian residents would they would prefer you not to spend probably eight to ten million dollars on that roadway and have to take homes in order to do it. That this is the city that prides itself on the fiscal management of tax money, tax dollars and if there is another way of getting what is ultimately really the same exact thing there is really no major difference here in terms of -- of the resulting project, I -- I would be stunned if that was a -- a differing opinion based on what I have heard and based on what I know of already having spent a lot of time out here for the last, you know, four years and -- and getting to know everybody. With respect to the Cole Valley folks who are watching -- and, again, as I mentioned, Mayor, in our white paper I break down what the parcel would look like on all three of those particular alignments after the fact and what the advantages and disadvantages would be and what you see, again, with the green line -- I will just walk you through this real quick. That sliver in the southwest and the existing 2 1/2 Street as per ACHD, that road would be vacated, because there is no need for it to go through anymore and that sliver could all be consolidated to the existing school property, increasing its footprint, making it more valuable. The opposite side of the road would still have three acres of developable land that would be flanked by three streets. That's very enticing and the shape of that lot is still usable. If you go to the 3rd Street section -- and I do the same thing and I just bifurcate it, well, now that section to the west there is no need for the district to vacate 2 1/2 Street, because now I have got two streets -- this one's just off center, but that's not a guarantee. So, now I have got this funky little sliver that would be between 2 1/2 and 3rd Street that's not all that developable. It still could be, but not as developable as the alternative and now I have the section to the east, which still would be developable, but it's now starting to take a different shape and your -- your setback law respects that is in your zone, now starts to change what could happen there just because of the geometry and parking and all of that. 4th is the one that's the most challenging, because what is left, especially to the east, that little corner is -- doesn't have a road to the east. It only would have the 4th Street and, then, Carlton, which makes it pretty problematic, plus the shape of it makes it very difficult to develop. So, for what that's worth.

Simison: Sorry. Maybe my question wasn't clear. What's the public process you see moving forward? Is it going to be done through your white paper or once your white paper is done is that when the city should go talk to the people where this would impact along this corridor, if it -- if the Council wants to look at an alternative. That's -- okay. Sorry. But are you doing it or are we doing it after you do a paper. That's kind of the question. And is your paper going to talk to the existing land owners in that area to get their feedback and input, or, again, is that a separate process?

Danley: Okay. Great question. So, let me clarify. So, my -- our white paper was not -- didn't include public outreach. It was conceptual, technical, it was an analysis document. So, that will be presented to you. In the 2008 alignment study I noted that the MMDC, as well as city, were both on that, as well as ACHD. However, I would assume that this is something that the city would -- if there is a desire to change it, this is the agreement that would have to occur between the city and ACHD. But with the Urban Renewal District there is certainly the opportunity with respect to funding the potential for some degree of infrastructure -- whole other discussion. But that's I think how that relationship would work. I think for you all it would have to be -- it would have -- I don't know if it would result in a change of the comp plan or -- okay. So, you would have to have a comp plan amendment to identify that and, then, with respect to ACHD it's on their maps and stuff like that. But, again, nothing's funded and, frankly, when I had the conversation with them, honestly, they were puzzled as to what the importance of this was. It was the beginning of the conversation and like why is this important? And I'm like, well, because, again, it backs up and -- and parallels the couplet and goes into residential and all the reasons that -- you know. But that's the process as far as I know. And if you wanted to do public involvement that's another discussion to go out and to canvas, you know, the -- the community and get feedback and I think you would also want to make sure to -- to truly get a better feel of exactly what Cole Valley is thinking, because that is an important part of the discussion.

Simison: And -- and we would need to have a public process to make this change and that's really where I was trying to get to. If it -- you deliver a white paper next week and Council says, yes, we want that -- it's not that --

Danley: Right.

Simison: -- that component. Okay. Thank you. Only one other quick question. Do you know the going rate for an overpass or an underpass of this magnitude? I mean --

Danley: Yeah.

Simison: -- is one twice as much as the other and --

Danley: I -- I can't -- I can't give you a price on an underpass because of the -- the unknowns with, you know, the water table and -- and the geotechnical stuff and all of that kind of stuff. But I will tell you that overpasses nowadays over a span like that, I wouldn't be surprised if you saw a price tag of about 20 million or more. It wouldn't

shock me at all. We talked about this in -- people think on surface at grade pedestrian crossings are -- oh, why not just do an overpass. Yes, because they can be tens of millions of dollars and are really great straight -- shade structures. A lot of people just like, forget it, I'm not going to do it and, then, you know, at street level anyway.

Simison: Okay. All right. Just trying to get a little perspective, so --

Danley: Yeah.

Simison: Ashley, Caleb, Dave, Sean, anything else from you all at this point? Mr. Hood.

Hood: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. Just real quickly I wanted to update you all that the Transportation -- Meridian Transportation Commission did discuss this pretty briefly yesterday. I kind of -- I didn't give him a whole lot of -- I certainly didn't give him Chris' presentation, because I -- we didn't go into that much detail. But I did at least put that before them and gave him some of the background from 2007, '8 and when this was adopted in 2009 and they seemed generally appreciative, but they are like I don't know what you are asking, because we don't have updated information. So, the white paper. So, I guess I'm here just to tell you they are at the ready if you want them to be involved in anything moving forward, if there is a revaluation. They kind of said, you know, let's see. It's not ready for prime time was one of the comments, because they -- again they didn't feel comfortable with having all the information and -- and sending a recommendation to you if you want to do that. But I'm just here again to let you know that if you want them to be part of this reevaluation, look at new data, white papers, those types of things they are -- they are available, so --

Danley: And I would just offer I would be happy to come out and talk with them if they -- if you would like me to and just kind of walk through this.

Simison: Okay.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thanks for the presentation. I -- I think having the white paper will be really helpful, just because I think it will be a little more detailed. It will kind of lay everything out. I would be a proponent of, you know, having the Transportation Commission take a look at it once that's all ready for them.

Hood: Sure. That makes sense. That's why you have them; right? They are -- they are a sounding board for transportation decisions. So, yeah.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Maybe if I can just -- as we are wrapping up here just make a couple of comments and observations and sort of kind of where this whole conversation -- series of conversations is going. We have been breaking down this the Destination Downtown plan in sort of more digestible topics. I think we are really close to almost being done with that. I think we might have a couple of more that we need to do beginning of next year to sort of finish out sort of the topical ones and, then, after that as well Council Woman Strader kind of mentioned this in the last one -- in terms of the feedback for MDC and it opened up to a little bit of some thoughts here and Councilman Cavener and I visited a little bit before the meeting, but at some point we need to sort of pull our feedback and ideas together as actual feedback. I know they have listened to some of our comments and our concerns, but we all have different comments and concerns that I mentioned, so at some point we need to start figuring out how we are going to funnel some of those comments and look at them as sort of a packages as a Council to say here is some of our feedback that we want to give to MDC to incorporate whatever changes may or may not be approved by MDC as they are working on finalizing that. I don't want to -- I'm not sure exactly how we want to dictate how that would look like. I'm -- obviously I'm happy to be helpful in facilitating any of that discussion, but just wanted to kind of -- getting that feedback to the -- to MDC for their consideration. I think we are going to get close to where we need to -- want to be able to do that from -- as -- as Council, so -- Councilman Cavener, I don't know if you had any other thoughts about how that process would look like.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I think, Council, it's -- it's important for us -- we have -- I have really appreciated the dialogue, Chris, and I think Council's asked some good questions and recognize some of that feedback has come from just a particular council member who offered that feedback and that may be Luke's particular feelings, but the rest of the Council may not agree. I can -- I appreciate how challenging that might be. Like how do we decipher all of that. So, what I would like is -- I -- I do think there is a couple of additional topics. I also think it's important for us to probably go back and maybe revisit or at least close the loop on parking, maybe finish how we started and, then, from there I -- I would encourage all of us, you know, over maybe the next month, let's think about how we want to provide that feedback, whether it's sometimes with like budgetary decisions, we have all just -- here is the question, Council takes a vote, we move forward. If it is, hey, we are open to kind of letting staff determine or we want to weigh in here, but we don't want to weigh in on that, I just think -- start thinking about how -- how you want to best provide that feedback to MDC, because the goal of this is not to have a series of presentations, but they are looking for some action. I think we have committed to -- to some action. What that is I think that remains to be seen. But rather than us trying to figure that out a month from now or two months from now, we have got a little bit of a lower agenda this month. Spend some of that bonus time thinking about how

you think is best for us to provide that and, then, we can reassess what that may be in January or February.

Simison: Okay. Thank you very much, everybody.

Danley: Have a good Merry Christmas.

Simison: Merry Christmas.

Cavener: Merry Christmas. Happy holidays, Chris, Ashley, team. Thanks.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION per Idaho Code 74-206(1)(a) To consider hiring a public officer, employee, staff member or individual agent, wherein the respective qualities of individuals are to be evaluated in order to fill a particular vacancy or need. [Action Item]**

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I know we have got an Executive Session on the agenda we will try and -- and get through. We have got a short timeline, but if not we will -- we will continue with it after our main meeting. So, Mr. Mayor, I move that we move into Executive Session pursuant to Idaho State Code 74-206(1)(a).

Strader: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to go into Executive Session. Is there discussion? If not clerk call the roll.

Roll Call: Cavener, yea; Strader, yea; Overton, yea; Little Roberts, yea; Taylor, yea; Whitlock, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and we will go into Executive Session.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: (5:37 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.)

Simison: Council, do I have a motion?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I move we come out of Executive Session.

Strader: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Simison: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Cavener.

Cavener: I move we adjourn our work session.

Strader: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 6:00 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

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

ATTEST:

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