

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:03 p.m., Tuesday, January 25, 2022, by Mayor Robert Simison.

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

Also present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Bruce Freckleton, Sonya Allen, Scott Colaiani, Joe Bongiorno and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

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

Simison: Council, we will call the meeting to order. For the record it is January 25th, 2022. It's 6:03 p.m. We will begin this evenings regular City Council meeting with roll call attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Simison: Next item is the Pledge of Allegiance. If you would all, please, rise and join us in the pledge.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Simison: Our next item is our community invocation, which this evening will be given by Pastor Troy Drake. If you would all, please, join us in the community invocation or take this as a moment of silence and reflection. Pastor.

Drake: Council Members, Mr. Mayor. If you would join me. Well, Lord God, thank you so much that we can gather here tonight with city business and I know it's important to you. All matters of life are important to you. God, I just wanted to ask for a special prayer for the -- our citizens tonight, anybody in particular who is frightened or hungry or cold, Lord, that they would find their way to a friend or a relative, some kind of a service, a church, Lord, that our citizens would be protected tonight from harm. Lord, we are also thinking of the first responders, the paramedics, firefighters, our police officers, we are so grateful for them and we pray that you keep them out of harm's way as they protect us. And, of course, God, just gathering here with these servants here, we just pray that you would give them much wisdom as they consider the matters at hand and, Lord, you said that all wisdom comes from above. So, we just pray that you would impart that to them,

an extra measure of grace for, you know, serving their fellow citizens in our city. So, God, we just thank you for this great country and this great state and great city that we have and we -- you know, just bless your name as you bless us and it's your name we pray, amen. Okay. Thank you.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: Thank you. Next up is the adoption of the agenda.

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

Borton: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

PUBLIC FORUM – Future Meeting Topics

Simison: Mr. Clerk, anyone signed up under public forum?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, nobody signed up.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Public Hearing for Proposed Fire Alarm Communication Devices

Simison: Okay. Then we will move on to action items. First item up is a public hearing for the proposed fire alarm communication devices fee update and we will open this public hearing was staff comments. Sam.

Zahorka: Good evening, Mr. Mayor and City Council. Thank you for providing this opportunity to answer any questions or concerns regarding the new and updated fees for permitting of installation and replacement of fire alarm systems. The memorandum was provided to you a few weeks ago, but, in summary, the fee changes for the replacement of fire alarm communication devices relates to the limited electrical licensed contractors. This was enacted through the Idaho legislature House Bill 292. We as a city cannot charge a fee of more than 125 dollars. This update to our fee schedule will bring us into compliance with the new statutory language. Stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you, Sam. Council, any questions for staff? Okay. Thank you.

Zahorka: Thank you.

Simison: This is a public hearing. Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to provide testimony?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did not.

Simison: Okay. There is no one signed up. Is there anybody in the audience who would like to provide testimony or anybody online, if you would like to provide testimony, please, use the raise your hand feature. Seeing no one wishing to provide testimony, do I have a motion to close the public hearing?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I move we close the public hearing on the proposed fire alarm communication device fees.

Cavener: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

2. Resolution No. 22-2306: Adopting New Building Division Fees; Authorizing Building Division of the Community Development Department to Collect Such Fees; and Providing an Effective Date

Simison: Next item up is Item 2, Resolution No. 22-2306.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I move that we approve Resolution 22-2306 adopting a new building fee -- new building division fees, authorizing Building Division at the Community Development Department to collect such fees and providing an effective date.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Resolution No. 22-2306. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the resolution is agreed to you. Thank you, Sam.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

3. Public Hearing to Convey Real Property to Ada County Highway District for Right of Way Purposes

Simison: Our next item up is a public hearing to convey real property to Ada County Highway District for right-of-way purposes. I will open this public hearing with staff comments from Mr. Nary.

Nary: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. Oh, this is much better. I feel like a talk show host. Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, this is a conveyance of property for the roadway that is going to be adjacent to the east side of Discovery Park. This is the new roadway that goes to the south section of the park. This also is the road that will abut the fire station and police station, as well as a new entry to the park. So, this is merely the action to convey that right of way to the highway district.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for staff? This is a public hearing. Is there anybody from the audience who would like to provide testimony on this item or anybody online that would like to provide testimony? Seeing no one coming forward, Council, do I have a motion to close the public hearing?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Move we close the public hearing on the real property -- the conveyance of real property to the Ada County Highway District for right-of-way purposes.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

4. Public Hearing Continued from December 14, 2021 for Aviator Springs (H-2021-0065) by The Land Group, Inc., Located at 3235 N. McDermott Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation of 40 acres of land with R-8 (27.63 acres), L-O (1.64 acres) and M-E (10.72 acres) zoning districts.
- B. Request: A Preliminary Plat containing a total of 112 lots consisting of (93) buildable lots and (13) common open space lots on 27.63 acres of land in the R-8 zoning district, (2) buildable lots on 1.64

acres of land in the L-O zoning district, (1) buildable lot on 10.72 acres of land in the M-E zoning district, and (3) future right-of-way lots on 40 acres of land.

Simison: We will now move on to Item 4, which is a public hearing continued from December 14th, '21, for Aviator Springs, H-2021-0065. We will continue this public hearing with any comments from staff.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. The only comments is just a reminder that this meeting was continued to tonight's meeting in order to hold a community workshop to discuss development impacts and enrollment on area schools and transportation. The school board met yesterday, but ended up continuing the discussion pertaining to this matter to February 14th. The applicant's representative Hethe Clark met with the West Ada School District on January 11th and did submit a letter summarizing that meeting, which has been included in the public record and he is here tonight to speak to that if you like. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for staff at this time? Okay. Would the applicant like to come forward? If you could state your name and address for the record, Matt.

Adams: Good evening. Matthew Adams. 462 East Shore Drive, Eagle, Idaho. Thank you. Hethe Clark is also here presenting with me this evening. He will need some time. I'm hoping we can get a full 15 minutes.

Simison: Yeah. Your time is counting down, but, yes, you have --

Adams: All right. The continuance on December 14th honestly caught us off guard and left me frustrated. Time, energy, and creativity has been invested into an excellent project, a project that we as designers, along with the developer and the city, can be proud of. On December 15th we requested a meeting with West Ada School District to gain a thorough understanding of their planning process and we are better for that meeting. Time, listening and understanding, have eased my frustration. I want to say thank you to this Council. Thank you for asking a tough question and seeking what is best for the City of Meridian. Because you asked the tough question on school enrollment, we have gained a clearer understanding of the district's planning process. Because you asked the tough question on school enrollment, we come before you tonight confident that West Ada is positioned to serve the students of this project. So, I would like to talk specifics. Our team met -- Hethe, myself, a couple other members, met with West Ada staff on January 11th. The goal of this meeting was to gain an understanding of their process. The takeaway from that meeting. Student capacity does exist for this development. West Ada is ready to respond to growth in the City of Meridian. West Ada has a data driven process and works diligently to stay current. Based on this process they have issued a revised enrollment projection for Aviator Springs. They are projecting 40 students, rather than the original 67. The process is intentional. It's a planning approach that is efficient and fiscally responsible. When school capacity is exceeded they implement the school

capacity toolkit. I will go over that in a moment. When new schools are, in fact, necessary future school sites are available and bonds do pass. The district currently owns ten future school sites in the area depicted on this map. I would like to note that within the service areas analyzed in West Ada's updated letter that was sent to Planning staff on the 11th, there are three elementary school sites, one middle school site and one high school site. When capacity is reached in the study area and West Ada needs to build a new building, they have the sites to do it on. West Ada issued the revised letter I mentioned on January 11th to Planning staff. I believe that you have the complete letter in your packet. I'm showing just a small portion of it on the screen. We have discussed that West Ada reissued the letter with the new 40 projected students. I want to emphasize some specific language from this letter. West Ada School District supports economic growth. Assuming the area's student generation rates remain the same and the developments build out as projected, the capacity of the elementary schools identified are projected to be at a maximum capacity upon completion of the 3,089 approved lots. The high school is also projected to be operating at or above building capacity upon the completion of the currently approved 6,559 lots. These projections do not take into account the impact of additional seats provided by education organizations outside of the West Ada School District, such as charter schools, private schools, home schools. We understand -- our understanding of this letter is that it clearly states West Ada School District is ready to serve all the students from all approved lots in the attendance area. It is true at some point in the future these schools will reach capacity. West Ada School District has tools available to manage this outcome. Transporting students to alternative schools with available classrooms, attendance area adjustments, passage of a bond to build new schools to fit the enrollment needs and portable classrooms placed on the property. It is in fact there -- it is true that these toolkit strategies are currently being successfully utilized today in the West Ada School District. Student capacity is available for students from Aviator Springs and the neighboring developments. West Ada School District has a planning process in place that is working. West Ada School District will enroll all students that register for school. Other educational opportunities do exist that will relieve enrollment to these schools as well. We are, again, requesting approval of annexation, rezone, preliminary plat. Now, I just quickly want to mention -- or tell a brief story. In 2018 enrollment at Rocky Mountain High School -- 2018 seems like ages ago. Pre-pandemic. Rocky Mountain High School was at 2,400 students. Capacity of Rocky Mountain High School is 1,800. So, it's 600 over capacity. In 2018 my daughter Abby graduated after four successful years with the incredible support of teachers, coaches, staff and administrators. On May 7th, 2022, Abby will graduate from Idaho State University with two bachelor's degrees, one minor, and plans to continue with a masters in genetic counseling. I acknowledge the many challenges faced by City Council. That said, school capacity is not an issue that is unique to now or to this Council. As this story illustrates, a Council formed around 2002 approved Brighton Corps' Quenzer Commons Subdivision and a home was built on Legacy View Drive. That Council's foresight allowed my family to grow and learn in Meridian, Idaho. It allowed my daughter to attend community schools. Abby was a Prospect Panther, a Heritage Husky and a Rocky Mountain Grizzly. It allowed Abby to benefit from amazing -- amazing educators and dedicated professionals. I ask that you take my experience, Abby's success, as the precedent for

the dedication and adaptability of West Ada School District. Approve this project. Let the professionals of West Ada School District continue their excellent work. Thank you.

Clark: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, Hethe Clark, 251 East Front Street in Boise. I'm on a cold streak. I haven't been here for a couple months. It feels -- I'm sure everybody missed me. I am -- I appreciate Matt's comments and I wanted to add a couple of different thoughts, kind of a different take on it. You know, given who I am you can probably imagine where some of that's going to come from. I did really enjoy meeting with West Ada School District when we -- when we had our discussion. We spent a little bit over an hour. They went over in great detail the granular level of detail that they use with this new methodology that was -- resulted in the revised letter. They are tracking every pre-app, they are tracking every application that comes in, they are tracking every preliminary plat application approval, they are tracking the final plat recording. They are looking at the average amount of time that -- between applications coming in and when homes are actually coming online to be able to identify within each one of their attendance areas the actual student generation and they are doing it within each quadrant now, rather than all the way across the city. It's -- it was pretty remarkable and I look forward to when -- I know they are going to come to the Council and present all that to you and I'm looking forward to that. It was clear from that meeting that they understand what is happening in this attendance area and that they are ready to address that growth and there is a couple of things I really want to stress, that in this attendance area, per the letter, there are two elementary school sites. So, in other words, they can triple the capacity if you look at the -- at the -- the numbers that are on the -- on the -- the letter. They have one middle school site and one high school site already acquired. Each of those sites are there, they are ready to go, they are not searching for them, they don't have to acquire them, they are ready to go when a bond is ready to be issued. So, that stage is set, but their perspective is that they have to be good stewards of the taxpayer money and they are not going to run those bonds until they know that the capacity is being completely used up and so that's why we see the -- the toolkit and all of these efforts that are being taken to make sure that the capacity is there and they are not building schools that are going to be unused. So, where does that leave us? And where does that leave you; right? You know, we as the applicants are feeling a little bit worried about it and the city obviously feels concerned about it and we want to make sure that you are not getting ahead of what West Ada is doing. So, again, the -- there is a couple of points that I would make. The sites are there. West Ada is ready to run the bonds when they determine that the time is right for that and it has done so in the past with great success. I mentioned in my letter that, you know, it's five of the six since 2000 that have approved. Everyone that is tied -- that we could find that was tied to a specific proposal has -- has been approved, but -- so, what that tells me is that stopping development, unless there is a bond -- there is like one hundred percent ironclad certainty that a bond is going to be approved, it's not only unnecessary, given, you know, West Ada School District's planning and strategy, but for us as an applicant it places us in -- under an impossible condition, because it's not something that we can control now, it's something that will happen in the future when the capacity is -- is there and West Ada makes that determination and that's not even a determination that you all can make. It also raises questions of, you know, whether the city is going to have to impose a moratorium if we are going to decide that we can't

approve development unless we know for sure that five years from now that bonds are going to be approved and that's a -- that's also a very significant question. Now, with regard to this application in particular, it also raises some real significant planning questions; right? Because if we are going to say we can't approve this application because of student capacity, really, what we are saying is that, well, what it could be approved with is a -- maybe a 55 plus or something that's not going to have student generation and, you know, I look at that and that would just be a terrible outcome for this site. This site is immediately next to a Owyhee High School and it's immediately next to a future elementary school site. It will provide safe routes to schools, easy pathways, and as you have heard in the past it's going to have an LDS seminary site in it and a Boys and Girls Club side in it and it's teed up for residential development for families to be able to enjoy this. So, you know, our -- our overall point is, yeah, we -- you know, the lawyer needs to come here and talk about scary things, like impossible conditions and moratoria, but, really, what we are talking about here is a situation where West Ada has done the planning, they have the sites -- again, two elementary school sites, a high school site and a middle school site in the area and just has to pull the trigger on the bonding when -- when the time comes. So, we would ask for approval on that and we hope that we have answered the question as -- to the extent that it was asked by the Council. So, we are happy to answer any questions at this point.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for the applicant?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I wasn't present at the last hearing, but I did watch the video, read the minutes, read through the -- read through the entire project folder, so I think I'm up to speed. But I would like to ask some questions, because I didn't get an opportunity to do that. Before I asked those questions -- and I will ask the Mayor if I may ask my questions in succession. They will go fairly quickly.

Simison: You are recognized for three minutes.

Perreault: Too funny.

Simison: Three minutes. Go for it.

Perreault: First -- go Bengals. No. So, thank you for going through that process yourselves with the district. Everything that you presented this evening I was already aware of. Most of it Council's already aware of. What we are not aware of is what triggers the district to start utilizing some of these options. They haven't shared with us that they have made a policy as to what level of enrollment they have to reach to -- to start putting these in place. Each one of these would require a minimum of two school years to get actually implemented. So, while they are constantly tracking their enrollment numbers, they haven't said, okay, this is what's going to trigger any one of these solutions and that's

something that, hopefully, we will hear from them when we have our conversation. That's a missing piece for me as a Council Member. I have been reading these letters for five years. Nearly every hearing have we had conversations about this. So, this is not new to us. We have already -- West Ada has already shared with us their -- all of this information. So, we -- we do not -- I mean we would love to have the confidence that -- that Matt shared in the district's -- I'm speaking for myself in this regard. I would love to have the confidence that the district is sharing with you, but in my years of history now on this with Planning and Zoning Commission and with Council I haven't seen the follow through and so that's -- just to share, that's where I'm coming from. But let's get to the actual questions. So, Achievement Avenue. These are specifics now of the project. Is that a public road? What is that going to look like? Are there sidewalks on either side? Is there a curb? You know, I'm thinking -- I have in my mind's eye the road -- if you are familiar with Compass Charter School, there is a road that runs from Black Cat into the school that's very undeveloped and I don't want that to be a similar situation where we have students from two schools using that road, in addition to residents coming in. So, I'm curious what the -- what the -- that road is going to look like and function like. Secondly, the road on the south side, is that a private road? It goes to the high school, so is it -- what -- how is that going to function? Third question relates to the -- the Mayor's concern in the last hearing, which is the Boys and Girls Club and the seminary having homes that are facing the road, where the public is going to be coming through and accessing those businesses. Have you had anymore thought put into whether you would change the -- change the layout, so that that wouldn't be the case? And, then, fourth question is how are you going to set up the HOA to be successful to deal with these issues. There is going to be obvious overflow from the high school. You are planning for that from a parking standpoint, but the HOA is going to be the one that's going to be most immediately affected by issues with interaction from students coming over and trying to use the pool, students coming over and trying to use the play area. You know, trash. They are -- they are the ones that are going to be the first crew that's going to have to deal with those issues that it's going to bring having this very interactive community. So, that's my set of questions. Thank you for hearing me out.

Adams: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Perreault, thank you. First of all, I hear what you are saying about action from the school district. I have a different perspective as someone who works for the school district and I have done dozens of projects for them. So, we feel like they are a district of action. So, it's an interesting conversation to have. Multiple perspectives. I think yours is valid. The -- the roads. Achievement and -- Sonya, I don't know if you have a site plan, something you might be able to find? Achievement Avenue, which is on the north, is a public roadway, an ACHD roadway. It is a -- I think they call it a local collector, but it's one lane each direction, sidewalks both sides and all of the roadways within the community are public and have sidewalks as well. So, we feel like we have excellent access. I believe when you say the south road -- there is a stub road to the south that will continue in the future when the south neighbor develops, but we had showed a -- shown a secondary emergency access connection through the high school site that will be gated and only accessible by fire, police, and emergency responders. Seminary access. The Mayor did bring up a perception or concern that there could be traffic coming by seven or eight homes. It's interesting -- you know, the parking lot at a

seminary has six parking stalls based on the square footage of the building. ACHD considers it to be a zero traffic generator. So, I really personally -- I have no personal experience with a seminary and I do not know how much traffic that creates and if that would create a conflict. The Boys and Girls Clubs certainly would have people picking up, dropping off children potentially, so there will be traffic generated by those uses. As we looked at potential other locations and the relationship to the high school, this location still feels best from our planning perspective and, then, last, HOA and the parking. Trash. Students coming into the community, parking, will all be issues and they will work on those issues until the end of time I believe. I think maybe the lesson there would be we do pay attention to what happens at Mountain View, Meridian High, Rocky, and we just try to do better; right? So, on this community we have roadways with extra parking capacity. So, we have almost doubled the parking requirement of the city code. We are working with ACHD and Meridian Police Department on signage, which signage is great within -- it has to be enforced and that puts a burden on police. But we are working with those groups, those partners, to develop a signage strategy, because parking truly is the greatest burden on the community next to a high school. You know, the pool -- I'm not sure; right? Those are gated and you have to have access cards to get in. People can get around that. I don't know exactly how that would play out. That would be interesting. I think you bring up some valid points. I think these are issues faced by all communities, especially those next to schools, and I think that the -- what we have done in terms of design, spatial configuration, dimensional standards, exceeds code and is thoughtful toward all of those concerns, but I would not stand here and say that they are all solved. I think humans are going to have to work at being good neighbors to each other. Thank you.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for the applicant? Just one question. I don't want to spread rumors, but I heard yesterday that there may be a -- ITD may be looking at a slight realignment of this roadway. How does that impact this application this evening and to what extent? And I have no idea if they are looking to going, left, right, elevated -- I have no idea. But if that were to be the case would you request additional time until we figured that out or -- and it -- just from the planning from the process up here, I don't know what happens if we approve something and, oh, they are moving over 50 feet to the left into your property or more.

Adams: Mr. Mayor, thank you for that. We are not aware of that.

Simison: I haven't heard from anyone official, but --

Adams: As recently as last week we have been coordinating with the engineer on -- over some different things in this area. So, we haven't heard from their consultants. However, if this alignment were to change here, it would be highly impactful on Chukar Ridge Subdivision, which is nearly completed to the north of this, but on our development we have exceeded the buffer width by such a great dimension we could actually absorb a pretty tremendous encroachment. The buffer requirement is 35 feet and we have as much as a hundred in many locations. So, at a pre-plat level I'm actually not too concerned, because I think we could adjust and, then, what we -- the issue would be staying compliant with the DA and making sure we have the right number of lots and

things. But I -- I think we could remain code compliance, even with a pretty significant shift. That is said not knowing what that -- if the rumor is true and how much the shift might be. If I'm -- it's my understanding that ITD closed on this property. So, it could be that the roadway could shift within the right of way. It could have no impact at all and the asphalt moves a bit, so -- yeah. They would be buying lots instead of farm ground and it could be a lot more lucrative.

Simison: So, ITD currently owns the right of way that's on this line, it's not being reserved for them?

Adams: My understanding is they closed on that about two weeks ago.

Simison: Okay. All right. Thank you.

Adams: Thank you.

Simison: This is a public hearing. Is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony on this item? Mr. Clark, anyone sign up?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we do. Travis Hunter.

Hunter: Yes. Just a couple paper exhibits and a USB.

Simison: State your name and address for the record, please. Be recognized for three minutes.

Hunter: Yes. My name is Travis Hunter. 2628 South Wise Way. I'm in favor of the Aviator Springs project. I don't have any issues with it. I'm just here before you seeking some help with a future road alignment. A gentleman that works for us, Todd Tucker, he presented I believe at the last City Council hearing and I was just coming to bring some exhibits that would illustrate the request that we are having. So, I'm asking for Meridian to waive the 30 foot buffer requirement on the southeast corner of the property where the road intersects at our property, Woodside Avenue Investors, just south of there. So, this -- it -- it seems like the -- the idea of this waiver is contemplated more for a scenario where there's residential lots or -- or buildings that are close to the highway, such as the northern portion where you see the buffer in Aviator Springs next to those three lots, but in -- in our future land plan that we have not yet submitted, but we will, we are going to be having a road that is going to act as the buffer along Highway 16 there. So, it -- the -- the area that -- that we are going to be seeking the variance on the buffer, if you could -- so, this first slide shows how it would be if we didn't get a variance on our application. The second slide, Sonya, if you could flip to that, shows what we would like it to look like if we do get a variance or a waiver on our application. And the third slide just shows the reason why a buffer could be waived in this scenario. So, as you can see this is a scenario -- this is showing a cross-section of what it would look like with a 30 foot buffer. So, on the right you see the Highway 16 right of way, a 35 foot landscape buffer, two foot for utilities, five foot sidewalk, 33 feet between curb to curb, a sidewalk, another two foot space for utilities,

a setback and, then, in our contemplated plan we are looking at putting multi-family there, which would have a parking lot that's 75 feet and then -- and, then, structure. So, you could see there would be a total of 237 feet between like a structure and the future highway. So, it's just -- having a road act as the -- as the buffer I think would satisfy the concept behind the buffer that you guys currently require with a road going here and our property is kind of unique, because it gets pinched as -- as Highway 16 has the intersection -- or has the off ramp there. It -- our usable space has -- it will be significantly diminished and, then, also the last thing to note is that's going to be an off ramp there, a decel lane, so there won't be the same high speed on that section as there would be on, you know, a main stretch of the highway. So, just for all those reasons I figured I would show it to you and graphically maybe you could understand it a little bit better. We would just ask that you could give Aviator Springs a waiver on their 30 foot buffer, just on that southeast corner where the road might intersect with a future road of ours.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Just to clarify, you -- you are proposing the -- the rendering that shows that road to run completely flush with the right of way, not -- not the one that shows green space in between?

Hunter: That is correct.

Simison: Okay. Thank you.

Simison: Just I guess as a second question is -- on the maps you show a realignment of their pathway as well. In the first one it looks like it would continue down -- that a pathway would connect on the west side -- east side of the roadway.

Hunter: Uh-huh.

Simison: This one it looks like it's going to cross the road into some other location in theory?

Hunter: Yeah. I think there it would go on to -- it would go onto a sidewalk. It's an interesting concept, because I don't know who would want to walk between a road and a highway where that path might continue on to our property. So, having a path between a road and a highway just seems less likely. Someone might want to walk on the sidewalk instead.

Simison: So, the top -- this is a design element for them, Not a continuation of something that's required from the city in a pathway -- not part of our master pathway plan that is

somehow being altered because of this proposal. I know it's generally -- they are not specific. Just want to make sure that that's -- I think that's what that is, but --

Hunter: Yeah. I'm not -- I'm not sure what the master pathway plan is or what the impact on that would be.

Simison: Okay.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Just to comment. From when this came up last time what -- what seemed to make the most sense, quite frankly, was to -- if this project were to proceed forward is to keep that road as designed with the 30 foot setback. It's a future Council and a future application that would determine whether or not what you are requesting is appropriate. Maybe none of us up here. Who knows. So, your argument I think is for a later date and if it was as originally designed with the setback as required today, it wouldn't prevent you from making that request in the future to have it still go south straight to be adjacent to the right of way. It leaves a little more gap on the east side. But I don't think you will be precluded from making the request at a future date when that property comes forward. I understand where you are coming from, but the -- the project before us today as designed, still having it go directly south --

Hunter: Yeah. I --

Hoaglund: -- seems to make sense.

Hunter: I understand what you are saying on the -- on the process. If -- if they didn't move the road slightly to the east it will end up eating up usable area of our real estate if we can't align the road properly, if we have to bring it straight and, then, move it over, so it would impact us a little bit and if the applicant -- if the applicant would be welcoming to that idea, which we have spoken to them and I think they would be, I would request that.

Borton: Sure. And -- Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: The concern I guess would be the -- at that future application that it creates some implication that that future council is okay with the waiver and realignment of the road as you presented. It may, but it may not. So, if we -- we open the door, so to speak, by doing what's requested, it kind of indirectly ties the hand of that future application to permit this. So, I don't know whether or not that's going to be appropriate. That's the future. So, that's just some thought of -- I understand the request, but it might not be appropriate to adjust this application to that future one. Just a thought.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Travis, what is your timing of moving forward with your application?

Hunter: Soon. It will -- it will definitely be in -- we will submit definitely in the next six months. Waiting on some other moving pieces. Oh. Mayor Simison, as well. So, by the way, I called Merrill Sharp, he is the project manager for ITD for the Garvey -- the Garvey projects and I asked him what have you heard about the alignment moving, because this -- you know, that would be -- we heard the same rumor and -- and he -- he said the alignment wouldn't be moving to his knowledge, but they might be asking for some additional easements. So, the core alignment moving to that question -- I don't know if that's -- I haven't heard official word from them, but I don't think that's the concern, but --

Hoaglun: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, follow up?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: So, what you are asking is is to allow that -- provide that waiver for Aviator Springs in the event when you come forward it at least allows them to plan that alignment to match yours if yours goes forward?

Hunter: Correct.

Hoaglun: Okay.

Hunter: And our application will come forth in the next few months.

Hoaglun: Okay. Thank you.

Simison: Council, any additional questions?

Hunter: Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Not a question, just to comment, similar to Council Woman Perreault. I was absent when this original hearing took place, but I did review all the information in the previous hearing. I just wanted to make that comment and, then, I will reserve my comments for the end.

Simison: Okay. Thank you. All right. Thank you.

Hunter: Thank you, Mr. Mayor and Council.

Simison: Mr. Clerk, anybody else signed up?

Johnson: That was everyone who indicated they wished to testify.

Simison: Okay. Is there anyone present who would like to provide testimony on this item, if you would like to come forward and state your name and address for the record and be recognized for three minutes?

Wagner: Thank you, Mr. Mayor and Council. My name is Sue Waggoner. W-a-g-g-o-n-e-r. And I reside at 6096 West Becky Drive, right at the intersection there of McDermott. So, we are pretty much across the road from the new project and I just wanted to state that I oppose the project.

Simison: Okay. Anything else you would like to add on that for Council?

Waggoner: Just generally speaking, because of traffic and just a -- just the quality of life where we live has just diminished over the six years that we have been there and we are constantly under construction with roads and -- and traffic and noise and most recently we are right across from the new high school. So, it's just -- I would like to invite anyone on the Council, Mr. Mayor, if you would like to come and visit us on West Becky Drive. We are a small subdivision of 16 homes we are close knit neighborhood. Very nice people. And perhaps someone would at some point like to hear what we have to say.

Simison: Okay.

Waggoner: Thank you, sir.

Simison: Council, any questions? Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thanks -- thanks for coming. I think we do want to hear what you have to say. That's why we have these -- these public hearings. It's -- I know from a -- from a citizen standpoint it's kind of frustrating. You want the whole Council to come and sit in your living room and -- and see that and we are prohibited from doing that unless we all come together, which is a frustration, but that's why we have these -- this process in place is because I think it's important for all of us to hear from you and hear how this -- this project would impact you. So, if -- if nothing else, know that we do want to hear and I think that we get e-mails on applications every day and I know, because I get cc'd, Council Members reply and they follow up with phone calls when legally they can. We are under some really strict guidelines about when and how we can talk about an application, just like you wouldn't want me going to -- to meet with the applicant privately to talk about his project. We also can't meet with the public privately to talk about that. But, nevertheless, if you have got more context to share about how this application is impacting you and your family and your fellow neighbors' lives, I think we are all open to hearing that.

Bernt: Agree.

Waggoner: Thank you.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor, Becky --

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Sue. I mean -- sorry. Sue. Sue. You live on West Becky Drive. So -- sorry. So, I just want to ask you -- West Becky Drive, I think we see it here on the map.

Waggoner: You see it --

Hoaglun: Yeah.

Waggoner: -- on the last gentleman's map.

Hoaglun: Right. So, that -- State Highway 16, it sounds like, will shift traffic off McDermott Road, which may become a -- just a local road -- access road and shift the traffic, because you are on the east side of McDermott Road, is that -- do I have that understanding correct?

Waggoner: Uh-huh.

Hoaglun: Okay. So, that will be the -- McDermott Road becomes kind of an access road and, then, Highway 16 becomes -- I have heard it termed an expressway, if you will. So, yeah, your quality of life no matter what happens is going to be impacted by that road. Even if we approve nothing out there, everything that's approved to the north and to the south will be going on that road. So, it's one of those things that I -- there is no win here for you, unfortunately, I don't think. It's just -- and I understand it. Live in north Meridian and it was a rural place and a dairy farm and it's not there anymore and we are in the middle of a subdivision, so I -- I sympathize. But, yeah, I just wanted to make sure I understood where you were in relationship and -- and in some ways, though, with McDermott being a -- more of a private, you know, road for just access, hopefully, that would -- and if they do the berming and the walls and what they say they are going to do, then, that -- that should help somewhat take the traffic off McDermott, move that, and, hopefully, with sound barriers and whatnot that would make it a little more palatable. So, we shall see. But I just wanted to confirm where you were, so --

Waggoner: Thank you.

Hoaglun: Great. Thank you, Sue.

Waggoner: Anyone else?

Simison: I think we are good.

Waggoner: Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Is there anybody else that would like to provide -- come -- state your name and address for the record and be recognized for three minutes.

M.Waggoner: Mark Waggoner. Same last name. Same address. Just to share if there is any frustration it's the density that's being approved. The home to the north of us was on seven acres. They are putting 24 homes in there. We purposefully moved to the edge of the county thinking that, you know, the sprawl would -- would open up as we got to the edge and, you know, quarter acre homes or half acre homes or maybe one acre homes, but time after time after time it's like, well, we could have put in 29 homes and it's like, yeah, I guess. So, that's my frustration is -- I have got neighbors that were Emmett cowboys that are -- they are done. They are out. With that many homes behind them when they are running horses and cattle, they are worried that kids are going to throw rocks at them, that kind of thing, because it's just another neighborhood. So, I would say my frustration that I think to myself is what are the city planners thinking when they are just packing them in, because we moved from a place where everybody was packed in. I mean the neighbor sneezed and you feel like you had to say gesundheit. You know, you could smell the neighbor's cigarette smoke. It's like, okay, well, we will move out here to the edge and that way even as it gets built, at least it will be bigger, you know, it will be more space and, yet, we are seeing the opposite of that. So, if you would keep that in mind I think that's -- that's the only thing I ask, you know. Questions?

Simison: Council, any questions? Thank you.

M.Waggoner: Thank you for hearing me.

Simison: Is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony on this item this evening? Okay. Would the applicant like to come forward for any final comments?

Adams: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Thanks for the opportunity. So, first of all, to the Waggoners, they are right, there are impacts in west Meridian and if you drive down McMillan Road and if you drove down it ten years ago it's -- it's shocking. It's dramatic. I think that there is good planning happening and the land development is occurring in a predictable and positive way. That does not mean it does not impact people who have lived there over time. So, I hear what they are saying. I still remember we had a pasture behind our house for 12 years and, then, I have four neighbors along my back fence and, you know, it took getting used to, but just like me people want to live here and so I accepted that that would happen. Our project, being on the west side of the roadway, the freeway, should have less impact to them than -- than other projects may have. I will say -- I do want to address quickly the -- the mixed use nature. So, this -- the land use designation on the future land use map is mixed use neighborhood. The planning for this area does require that we have multiple uses. We cannot do just residential. We have done a residential product and, then, we looked really hard to bring in complementary uses that could be school, residential -- in -- with that new highway edge it's kind of backed up it's not really -- it's not like a hard corner, like Ten Mile and McMillan. So, the use of

the seminary, the use of Boys and Girls Club, feels as complimentary as possible in that area. And, then, finally, I do want to just speak to Mr. Hunter's comments. We are also supportive of their project once it comes before you, because access to the south helps everybody in this area have a more successful community. We are not opposed to what they are asking. We think it's implied that you are conditioned without it being a condition that you need to coordinate with your neighbors and create connectivity with roadways. That is a code requirement. We definitely will work with them to get that alignment so it works for us and it sets them up for success in the future. We are not asking for a variance at this time on that roadway, but we certainly are interested in working with them and making their project successful as well. I think that's it.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Question for Matt then. To that point on -- on that request for waiver and asking them on the timing of that matter and the timing of your -- your development if this were to move forward, is it such that if the waiver is granted in their -- for their project that that road can be shifted appropriately? Is that normal? I think if we were to approve an application tonight, then, I don't know how we would do that. So, I don't know if that's -- that's doable. So, that's -- that's kind of a conundrum is don't know what's going to happen with this one, let alone the next one, so it's kind of hard to make decisions on -- on these types of things when they are -- they are in this order, so -- any thoughts on how -- how that can be adjusted if everything were to be approved? And, again, no idea if it will be.

Adams: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglund, that is an excellent question. So, our -- our timing -- let's talk about our timing. We feel pretty good, but, you know, I don't know what's going to happen, but I feel pretty good that we will get approval. If we move forward we are immediately into construction documents to move toward with permit submittal. Immediately. Right now with the workload, it's months; right? So, there is time before we submit to ACHD and the city for permit, construction permit to do that coordination. What I do not know, because I have never saw it in this type of variance, I do not know the timing of when it's appropriate for that to be granted. If it's a final plat, construction document, or pre-plat I do not know.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: If I might ask whether it's development staff or Bill Nary. This is -- this is kind of unusual. I mean I have no idea -- I would think if we were to approve this, it would have to be with that waiver to allow that alignment to occur, because I don't think we could go back if this were approved and Hunter Homes development comes before us and if we were to approve that, to go back and say, oh, by the way, you now have a waiver, because there is no application before us. Is that -- my thinking correct on that or are you going to be like my wife and tell me I'm wrong?

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, I guess -- I have been uncomfortable with the request for the same reason that Councilman Borton raised. One, the applicant hasn't asked for that. It's not in the application. There has been no notice of that. It is a request. And I get it and I get why they are making the request and I get that -- that Mr. Adams isn't opposed to it, but no one's asked for it anywhere, except here in testimony. I mean there is no writing for that. So, that's a little concerning to me. Secondly, as Mr. Borton stated, I mean you are, essentially, tacitly approving the waiver on the project below without having it in front of you. It may not make sense to either this Council or a future Council, because of where the roadway alignment is or what it looks like or -- you know, again, I -- I get they want to meet their neighbors and they would like to work with their neighbors and do that and certainly if it were to be as quick as possible certainly at the preliminary plat stage I think Mr. Adams could design that and to be in general conformance with what's being requested. I think that may be okay. I don't know if planning has a different perspective on that. But I am a little more troubled with just approving it, when it's not really been requested, it's not really been thought as part of this application, but it's really a part of a future application. I think that can be problematic, because, again, the future application isn't here and it may not make sense when it is.

Adams: And Mr. Mayor --

Allen: Sorry.

Simison: Yes, Sonya.

Allen: If I may just add to what Mr. Nary said, a variance isn't applicable in this situation. The code actually reads that in the event of a hardship applicants can request alternative compliance to the standard, which is a director level approved application staff level. So, if it's something that we deem may be appropriate in the future, we could handle at a staff level. But it's -- having no -- no street buffer -- and this -- this isn't the subject of our application tonight, so we really probably shouldn't be going there. But it appears from the drawing that the applicant -- or the developer to the south is not wanting to provide a street buffer and if that's the case we don't have a variance for that. Thank you.

Adams: Mr. Mayor, Council, I do want to be a good developer, neighbor to the -- neighbor to the south. However, I'm satisfied with my code compliant road alignment and I'm not requesting a variance on that this evening.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for the applicant?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: So, we have spent most of the evening discussing the residential piece. Can you talk with us a little bit about the mixed employment area and how you are expecting that that will be accessed off of McDermott Road? Just give us a flavor for -- I don't know

whether there is going to be a requirement for -- I think there is a concept plan requirement, but I don't know if there is going to be a requirement for a CUP for individual portions of the project or how exactly that's going to work or -- or what. So, can you share with us -- I know you may not have end users yet, but just give us an idea of what your concept plan is -- you know, what you are expecting to have happen.

Adams: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Perreault -- and, Sonya, I don't know if you have a site plan that shows the Acclima parcel or the east most parcel. Good question. So, to meet the requirement of the multiple uses for mixed use neighborhood we did include a mixed employment -- ME zone parcel on the east side between the future highway and the McDermott Road. We are showing -- we are showing two access points -- drive approaches, basically, to a single commercial parcel to access that property. The -- that owner in our concept plan that was in the packet indicates a 20,000 square foot research and development building with office space and some storage and a greenhouse building. and, then, on the remaining acreage it would be test plots for testing moisture sensors for agriculture. So, it's plots of grass. Blueberries. Raspberries. Grapes. Apple trees. Those kinds of things. So, I think what you would see is you would see a 25 -- a 20,000 square foot building. Sounds big. It depends on what it's next to I suppose. And, then, you would see a lot of landscape and moisture sensing, which is equipment about the size of a deck of cards that gets buried in the ground. So, it would look very agricultural in nature and would be very appropriate for the current kind of character of that area. And I did not bring a graphic of that today. I think you have it in your previous packet. Does that -- I hope that answers your question. But I'm willing to talk more if you have more questions.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Yes, it does. I -- I thought I looked through the whole packet. I didn't see it. But I will review it again. I will look again and see what I can see. One more quick question. Construction. What is going to be your primary construction access and will there be rules around that -- that access if it's going through near the school and whatnot?

Adams: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Perreault, that's a great question as well. Primary access for construction of this development would be Achievement Street. So, it would be Owyhee Storm Ave. and Achievement Street and, then, we would enter from the northwest corner of the property and, of course, we have to meet -- we would meet all city code for time of construction -- time of day trash collection, those kinds of things. There will not be access through the high school site for our construction. That access agreement is limited to emergency vehicles only of the City of Meridian that actually can move through that high school parcel. If we are successful here tonight we will be required to get the two landowners to sign a City of Meridian emergency access agreement and we will submit an application for that agreement to the city.

Simison: Council, any additional questions?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I have got to challenge you and -- and utilize your -- you and Hethe, get some information from you. The last topic one of the items was school capacity. So, the first question is -- and I think Hethe used the word granular detail. I think he did. So, what's your understanding of what happened in your conversations with West Ada at the October 14th letter says it generates 93 kids and the January 12th one says 40. So, some of these are some of the questions we don't have answers to. So, share with us what you know that West Ada determined it's less than half than originally thought for student generation.

Adams: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Borton, I will ask Hethe to jump in if I get off track. It was 67 in the original letter. Revised to 40. They use a multiplier of .7 I believe, which is the old method. So, it was 93 lots times .7 gave us 67 projected students that would be housed in the development. The -- Marcy Horner, which has been with the district a couple of years now, they are using what Hethe described as the more granular approach. So, they are tracking every application. Once it gets built they track how many kids actually live in those houses based on the zoning, based on the size of the home. They project actual information onto this and they have come up with a different multiplier. So, it's a more accurate multiplier that they are using. Do you want to add to that?

Simison: If I could just supplement. Part of what they are -- what you will hear from them is they are looking at like -- like type neighborhoods and seeing what the actuals are and trying to apply those to projections in the future. What they choose in that process that's on them, but that's part of this new direction that has not been yet -- I don't really know if it needs to be approved by the board, but that is part of the conversation that they are looking at sharing with us.

Borton: Could I ask a few more?

Simison: Go ahead. Councilman Borton.

Borton: I mean the reason I said 90 -- the letter says 93. That's why I said 93. It says 93 students will be generated. Yeah. I'm looking at it. The letter of October 14th. Nonetheless, the new letter says 40. So, I mean it's -- the burden doesn't all fall on this application. I get it. But I mean the -- I think the confusion is only compounded by the new letter. I mean I have no idea what they are talking about with determining and extrapolating some similar neighborhood. What does that mean? I mean a 50 -- I have no idea. So -- and the reason that's just kind of -- is -- is somewhat relevant is we are -- we are looking for data that alleviates concern that there is not capacity. So, I just don't know how to utilize the January 12th letter either, because if it's not, you know, .43 students per household, for example, with the new letter if it's some other, I don't know what to make of, you know, 5,700 approved plats in Owyhee High School and is that a -- utilizing the new unknown formula, is that a big number, is that a really small number?

The letter doesn't provide a lot of context. So, what I was getting at is if you -- if you knew and could just describe any granular detail of how they are going to determine student generation that would be super helpful.

Clark: Yeah. I would be happy to do my best. Obviously we are the messenger and not even the messenger, we are just the third party. You know, we -- that's kind of trapped here between two agencies that are deciding how they are going to do their future planning. So, we are asking the city to -- to be reticent -- or to acknowledge that in the sense that we are trying to portray that information for you and -- and -- but, you know, we have a project that we -- based on that discussion believe will be adequately served. And here is -- here is I think the -- a little bit more information to help answer that and, you know, if Marcy is watching, you know, and I get any of this wrong, I'm hoping that she will -- she will send smoke signals up or something to make sure you guys understand that. But as I understood it, what they are doing now is rather than the .7, you know, student generation that applies across the board, what they are doing is that they are -- they have -- they have created spreadsheets that apply throughout the district and take data that includes types of zones, densities, types of uses and, then, they overlay that with PowerSchool and they can actually tell how many students are coming out of each different type of zone. They, then, take that data and within a grid that applies to the entirety of the city, they look within each of those grids and say, okay, these are the types of uses that are there. These are the types of generations that we are experiencing based on this type of zoning throughout the district and so if you have that zoning, these types of subdivisions, we anticipate that the student generation rate is going to be X. So, it -- it actually allows for a lot more nuance. So, you can have student generation in parts of the district that is .3. You could have student generation in parts of the district that's .9, you know, higher than what it was before and so I -- to me it gave a lot of comfort, because it was like, okay, the city has looked at this, they put together a comprehensive plan, they have said these uses are going to be there. The West Ada is following all those applications. They are tracking the pre-app meetings. They are tracking the approvals. They are actually averaging out the amount of time it takes to go from approval to actually having building permits and, then, to having kids show up on PowerSchool and, then, being able to plug that into their model and say, okay, you know, we overshot here with a .7, where if we continue with a .7 we are going to be building the school too early. So, we are going to go look at this, we are going to use actual data and we are going to say, okay, it's actually a .43 or whatever the number might be. So, unless you think I got anything wrong there, Matt, I think that -- like I said, I thought it was a great meeting and I was very impressed with this new methodology. I mean it's -- the tough part about it for you and for us is that it is somewhat reactive in nature. Right? You know, they are -- they are going to push the bond when they hit the threshold and we don't know exactly what the threshold is. But we -- you know, we as an applicant look at this and say, okay, we are proposing a project in an area that has an attendance area, we know what the attendance area is, we know that within that attendance area there is two elementary school sites, a middle school -- middle school site and a high school site, so -- and we know that they have compared areas that are very similar to this with zoning that it's like this and they understand what the trip generation rates are -- not trip generation. I'm used to saying trip generation, because that's what we are usually dealing with. They know what the

student generation rates are, so they can -- you know, we had to have some idea of when it's coming Meridian voters have been very -- very supportive of these bonds when they have been required and so, you know, from our perspective, you know, what we are asking for and -- is don't -- don't saddled us with an impossible condition, because we can't control when West Ada is going to -- going to push that bond, but we are very comfortable that they are in a position to run the bond when it's necessary, you know, especially given that we have the extra school sites that are already available in this location and they have provided with -- you all with this additional data.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I had a similar conversation with our own staff Miranda -- our own planning staff. She shared with me that although they are reviewing this data and they have been consistently reviewing data -- not to this level, so they have -- they are stepping up to how they are managing their data and reviewing it. They typically have not made any decisions about what they are going to do with that information until they do a facilities plan, which they have not done on an annual basis. They are going to start doing that, but that's not going to be for a while yet this year. So, we really don't -- we know that they are in -- in the process of gathering data for themselves. We still don't know when they are actually going to do anything with it and I don't know what their new facilities plan review is going to look like. I don't know what the timing of it is. I don't know how long it will take them to actually take that information and act on it and they can't tell us that yet until the -- until the plan -- you know, until their facilities plan is reviewed. They can't say, hey, we are going to take Meridian's information and our information and here is what our capacity is and here is our building capacity, here is our programming capacity and we are not saying we are going to wait until we have all those nuts and bolts to make these decisions. We can't. We have to have some level of trust; right? But we -- we really do want and are seeking some more confirmation from them that -- that -- that they are really -- they really do have a plan to do this and so I just want to share that, because it's my understanding that, yes, they are -- you are correct, they are reviewing this. They are not going to do anything with it until they do a facilities plan review and we don't know yet when that -- what that's going to look like or when that's going to be. So, I'm not sure if they shared that timing element of it with you.

Clark: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Perreault, no, they haven't. As I understand it, it is going to be more regular than -- than in the past, which I think is a good thing, too. You know, we are all living in an environment that's a lot different than eight or ten years ago. We are all trying to understand how to keep up with this. You know, for purposes of this Council's review, you know, I would just say that you -- there is a lot of fair questions that you are asking. Not all of them do I have the answers for, because those are the eternal -- internal machinations of West Ada School District that none of us have control over. But you do have a letter from West Ada that says exactly what the situation is, all the data that they have and they are not saying we don't have capacity for this, what they are saying is is that once we start reaching build out of the lots that are approved in this area

we are going to have to do those four things that Matt described, we are going to have to look at redistrict -- or moving boundaries, we are going to have to look at temporaries, we are going to have to look at busing and, then, we are going to going to bond once we know that the capacity is taken up and as I understand it what West Ada is asking for, which I think you are asking for from your constituents, is that everybody just be patient with them, that they are going to have to go through all of that at that point before they get to the point where they feel comfortable that they need to build a new facility. Council, any additional questions for the applicant? Okay. Thank you very much.

Clark: Thank you.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: We are going to have some discussion I presume before we close the public hearing, just -- I said it before, it's not this applicant's burden to solve this problem and at this particular time. This is step 32 of their 32 step process. So, I appreciate the added context with the school district. I do -- I just have a different take on the magnitude of the concern. I don't have a problem with this particular application by itself. I wouldn't suggest we move the roadway if we were to go forward 45 feet as the request -- just for the reasons stated. I don't think that would be appropriate. But what I do think exists, even in the January 12th letter, is you have so many -- we have so many approved parcels within the city that is far more than ever could be transferred to another school without capacity. Not this applicant's concern. But there is -- and you could run that model today that there is not available capacity in all the schools to bus them around. For example, the average -- or the approved lots in attendance area, these are two to three thousand kids and if you have got 9,000 lots in one middle school attendance area, assuming it's .3 per -- I mean it's thousands. At least that's the data we have. If that's all wrong let's get it figured out. But it's thousands of kids. There is not thousands of seats in current schools. What, are schools in portables -- our kids -- thousands of kids in portables of 45 in a classroom or double shift, I'm just saying the same thing again, if those are the -- those are the solutions I don't like that. Hethe is going to be -- if I misspoke on a statistic let me know.

Clark: Mr. Mayor, if I may, you know, the -- Council Member Borton, the -- the letter on January 11th actually gives you the numbers in terms of the projected students from the approved development. So, the projected students from improved development for the Pleasant View Elementary area is 680. That's approximately the same as Pleasant View and there are two existing acquired elementary school sites within the attendance area. So, there is potentially three times the capacity at that point and in terms of acquired sites you are actually beyond what the approved numbers are. So, the numbers are there. We are not -- we are not speculating and I understand that there is -- that -- I think -- I get the impression that you don't necessarily -- I don't want to put words in your mouth. You don't necessarily trust the methodology is what I'm hearing, but the methodology is the one that's being provided by the provider and we have to -- we as an applicant need to know that we can -- you know, this is the agency that's providing you the comments and I -- I'm

having a hard time with the -- the idea that we are -- we are looking at the agency providing the comments and saying we don't trust the data. That -- that puts us in an impossible position.

Borton: It -- Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: If I could respond. And this is the bigger conversation we have to have with West Ada. But, for example, if there is now some new formulation that says they have taken this application, they have compared it to like subdivisions and, for example, determined that this subdivision generates middle schoolers at a -- at a teeny fraction of the magnitude that it generates high school students, how in the world is there any data set that can do that, because they are saying 9,000 approved middle school lots generates 913 kids, but 6,500 approved lots within a high school zone generates more high schoolers. It just -- I have got a thousand questions for them. Again, it's not your burden to answer, but what happens and the reason why I have these concerns is if this letter provides any value to us, I need to feel comfortable that the underlying analysis makes sense, because I have this discomfort by philosophy and the school district will certainly service these kids -- and put kids -- they will put them somewhere. They are not going to put them on the street. So, of course, there is always a way to get around it. I'm not comfortable and this is why this is -- this topic is going to get pressed this spring with a solution that kids can get packed in or bused around and ship them off or 2,400 kids in Rocky Mountain is atrocious then. It's not fair to the kids. I don't know if there is a public resource that's more important that we have some indirect responsibility for. So, again, I love the debate and challenge, but their letter has created more questions for their methodology. If we are supposed to look at it and say, okay, I feel comfortable that these schools can fill all of these students and in light of the bond tolerance, so --

Clark: Let me ask -- let me just point out a couple of things. First of all, when they do the analysis they actually generate student generation figures for elementary, middle, and high school that are different. So, they actually have a specific number for what they expect from elementary, middle, and high school. It's not a -- just toss it out there and those numbers can shift between the three. The larger question and -- and I appreciate you saying that, you know, this isn't, you know, our job to solve it on this one and I, again, feel like I'm suddenly been knighted as West Ada's spokesperson on all of this. But I -- you know, the questions that you are raising, Councilman Borton, I think are -- raise a lot of pretty difficult implications for the Council's relationship with agencies. Like for examples, so do we, then, say we don't trust the trip generation rates on an ACHD report and so, therefore, we are not going to -- we are not going to -- I mean -- but I think it's -- I think it's a fair point, Council Member Borton, because that's -- it's almost the exact same point you are making here and I'm looking at this and saying that, you know, these are -- these are agencies that have provided -- the agencies that are directly responsible for providing the service, that they have provided the letter, I'm having a -- having difficulty with saying that the letter is not trustworthy and can't be relied upon by the Council, because, then, what can you rely upon and what could we bring before you? Because,

you know, obviously, we -- you know, as a due process matter we need to be able to have the Council relay to us, you know, what are the standards that you are applying to this application? What are the actions, if any, that we could take in order to get an approval? And what I'm hearing is that -- that you don't trust the agency and so, therefore, there is -- I don't know what the standard is. Now, I appreciate that sounds --

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: So, let me be crystal clear. This has nothing to do with trust. This is understanding the methodology. If it is to have any import on whether we make a discretionary annexation decision and whether, amongst all of the things we consider -- and school capacity being one of 30 different things -- if there is any weight that we can give the data it's helpful to understand the methodology behind it, because what's happened in the last 90 days and, hopefully, for the better, but there has been a drastic shift, as if the prior data must have been wildly inaccurate or have less value than we had originally thought, because perhaps this new formula is of much greater value, perhaps it's more accurate. I can't wait for that discussion with them. But it's just really different. The bigger question is a broader policy consideration or it could be spot on. Maybe 67 was spot on. That broader consideration is everything presumes that bonds get passed and -- and we will talk about ability to bus, ability to change district boundaries in light of existing school capacity. You know, these other -- how broad are these other solutions to find space for 900, to 1,100 kids if there is not another school? Again, not your problem to solve. I would love the discussion. I really appreciate it. But to you and anyone from West Ada that's listening, this has nothing to do with trust. This is just trying to understand and it provides value and weight to what they are sharing, so we can make a good decision. That's all. Appreciate the discussion.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Hethe, do you know -- you know, Star Middle School shows big numbers for the approved lots per attendance area and whatnot, but do you know -- happen to know -- and, again, you might not and that's fine, but I have a sneaking suspicion that the bulk of Star Middle School is located in Star, which is a growing community, and they are moving forward with their growth. Do you have any idea what -- by chance what that might be? They are the majority of the lots in that particular attendance area.

Clark: Council Member Hoaglund, I don't have the specific dimensions for that. You know, whenever we are doing this it's a snapshot in time and so, you know, that's the -- that's the data that exists as of now.

Hoaglund: Yeah. And, Mr. Mayor, I guess --

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: -- it's difficult to ferret that out I realize, but at the same time we look at doing one thing and the communities that surround us that are in West Ada do another, we are going to feel the impacts, we are going to have to approve bonds for growing schools for -- if we are not approving any growth it's their growth and yet our taxpayers will still -- still -- still be paying for that and so it's just this interesting dilemma that we find ourselves in and -- and I think your application was a victim of timing of when -- when this came forward following a discussion of an application in south Meridian and that's -- that's an unfortunate part of this, but it's a good project. So, now we have to figure out what we are going to do with this information and do we say, okay, West Ada, you provided us with this updated letter, this is what you say it's going to generate, there is no trust issue here, then, okay, then we make that decision based on that information and, again, I have talked about this before, this has been a priority growth area for our community. We are invested -- we are investing in a fire station, we are investing in a police precinct, with ACHD on the roads and maximizing and expanding those -- those roads to handle that -- the traffic loads that are out there. So, it's hard for me to step back and say, okay, we are -- we are going to have to disregard this to some degree and I just -- I just can't go there. So, that's -- that's -- that's -- that's the dilemma with this and I know it's a struggle with a lot of Council Members and it's something we have given a lot of thought to and we will probably come down on different sides of a conclusion, but, you know, we all have to reach that point of what we find acceptable or not and -- and to me this is what the school district says, then, okay, that's what we have before us and that's what we base our decision on. So, I'm comfortable with that.

Clark: And, Mr. Mayor, if I could just quickly. You know, in addition to it being a priority growth area, it is right next to Owyhee High School. It is right next to a proposed elementary school. You know, that's -- that's where we want kids to be living and walking -- walking to school, so -- and this is the evidence that's in the record before you is the January 11th letter from West Ada School District. That's the evidence that's in the record that should be considered for purposes of this -- of this decision.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Hethe, in your conversations with West Ada did they share with you their priority plan for when these elementary schools will build out? And the reason I ask that is two reasons. One, I know that the bond that they were ready to put on the ballot in March of 2020 was only going to include an elementary school that was in the south side -- southeast Meridian. To my knowledge that priority hasn't changed. So, the next bond that will come will not include either of these elementary schools, which is still another -- if we pass the bond next year, best case scenario, and it gets built in two years from then, you are at least three or four years out before you are going to build the school they do intend to build. No idea what their plans are for bonding for the two that are in northwest. So, that's why I asked if there is some information they shared with you that we are not aware of. As you are saying to us, hey, you should trust this, because they are -- they have real estate for two schools, but the difference in your analogy between something

that ACHD does and something that West Ada does is I have a five year plan with ACHD that says here is how much revenue we are bringing in, here -- here is how much we think it's going to cost, here is the time frame for when we want to build it. Do they have the right to modify that every year? They do. But at least we have a plan to look at that says here is how we got to these -- here is how we got to these determinations and why. We don't have that with the school district. So, yeah, they are two different things. We can't lump them all in the same group and say, hey, they are another government agency, are you going to trust them or not trust them. So, yeah, I'm just curious if you -- if you have heard anymore about what their plans are, because it's not my understanding that they had any plans to bond and -- and, truthfully, if we are going to talk about bonds, I will share this with anyone who asks me, I feel like they missed -- missed a good window of not running the bond in 2020 that they were planning on running in '19 and at the time, at the end of 2019. They were one hundred percent convinced that that bond was immediately necessary and they chose to hold off, not because they don't think it's still not necessary, it's because they -- they were concerned that COVID would create an unnecessary burden on taxpayers, that there would be tax implications for people as they lost their jobs and potentially lost their homes. It had nothing to do with their enrollment going down or not having a need for that bond to be passed and they still yet haven't decided when it's going to get passed and we are three years later. So, I just -- these are the kinds of things as -- you know, we -- these are the kinds of things we are needing and seeking to understand, so --

Clark: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Perreault, I -- I don't have an answer for that. Ada -- when we talked to West Ada one of the things they said to us is that we can't promise a school site too far in advance or we just catch heck from everyone forever, because we didn't end up building the school that we promised and that the realtor told us was coming and so that's a lot of the reason why they don't do that, as I understand it. Again, I'm not West Ada's spokesperson here. With regard to the ACHD versus West Ada comparison, I wasn't suggesting that they are one and the same and totally the same, but they do have technical analyses that's based on formulas that they internally understand and that we defer to, because they are the expert agency that provides all those -- that provides those services and, again, that's the evidence that's in the record and, you know, obviously, all of our decisions have to be based on evidence that's in the record.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Unless anybody has further questions and I would like to spare Hethe the duty of responding on behalf of West Ada on a lot of these things, I would move to close the public hearing on H-2021-0065.

Cavener: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Hoaglund: Well, Mr. Mayor, just to kick off conversation and --

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: -- and see if we can move something forward here. We have had this discussion, it's been dominating in our conversations in a lot of developments. Each one is different and -- but one of the arguments is based on -- on school capacity and for me on this one it -- it just turns to the fact that Ada -- West Ada has indicated that this -- they find it acceptable, that the 40 school aged children from that is not burdensome. We know down the road that there might be issues. I -- no doubt about that. Councilman Borton, you -- you are looking at data that is correct and how they handle that is in their court and their timing and I just -- until we hear from them that -- with absolute certainty they have imminent peril, to use the words used earlier today, for -- for students in the district, I just don't feel comfortable turning -- turning down a development application that meets everything that we are asking and so I guess to just kick things off and see where it goes, I would move to approve -- after considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to approve file number H-2021-0065 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of January 25th, 2022.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Do I have a second?

Bernt: I will second for discussion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second and recognize Councilman Bernt for discussion.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor, I -- my thoughts haven't changed on this development from the last time. I -- you know, I -- again, I sat with Matt on the -- different committees with regard to the Planning Department and Comprehensive Plan committee and open space committee and -- and -- and many others and -- and looking at this application I think there is a lot of really good things about it that get me excited. I thought it was very well planned out, some unique amenities for the kiddos and some passive open area that I think that a lot of folks are looking for in development. I think that it's in our priority growth area. Sitting right next to a high school and other potential school sites. At the end of the day I'm only able to -- and this is my opinion and no disrespect to my fellow Council Members. I have an enormous respect for their opinions as well. Just this is mine. I feel like it's -- it's important for us to make decisions based upon what's in the packet and what's -- the information that's in front of us. I don't think it's fair to -- to deliberate on what West Ada may or may have said in conversations. I echo the words of Council Member

Borton -- and I'm really excited -- I think we are all really excited to sit down with West Ada and to hash this out. I'm grateful for Marcy. I'm grateful for Miranda and for the continued dialogue between our two bodies. I think that's extremely important. I think that we have never -- as long as I have been on Council we have never had such great information regarding schools and school enrollment. So, with that said, until we sit down and chat with West Ada and -- and hear from the horse's mouth what this information looks like, how did they get there, why are they recommending it, I have to go with -- with what's in the packet. I have to go with what's in front of me and those are the decisions that I -- that I will make and so this evening I'm -- I'm in favor of this application this evening and I -- with the caveat of very excited to sit down with West Ada and to figure out once and for all what this looks like going forward.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I have a lot of thoughts, but I think there is a lot of merit to the idea of batching annexations going forward to help with planning discussions. This was continued specifically to hear directly from West Ada and I think the disconnect is caused by West Ada, because they have had representatives of West Ada in their personal capacity not share the same commitment to the action items that could alleviate capacity issues and they themselves have said that they have a looming issue. So, for me I need to hear from them. I'm super glad that the applicant has been proactive in meeting with them, but a letter about a meeting that I wasn't part of doesn't help me with my overall concern with the data, with their commitment as an agency to maximize their capacity and, in fact, as they said, we are in alignment and our philosophy is to maximize capacity and here are the steps we are going to take, that's the exact kind of information I'm looking for, but in the absence of that I see a huge pipeline of potential development, I see a pretty robust amount of deliveries that are coming -- I better wrap this up before my voice goes away. But there have been a lot of issues I think with what are their steps going to be going forward and the commitment of that board to redrawing boundaries. I also feel like this isn't the right time for this annexation. I think that this application would benefit greatly from a delay, not only so we can discuss with the West Ada School District that would put this applicant on the same timetable as other applications that have been continued for that same conversation and I also think that the potential for Highway 16 to move around is a pretty big point and we would benefit from figuring out if that's going to happen. That's where I'm at. I'm in favor of a continuance. I don't expect the applicant to solve the school district's problems, but I do think there is enough of a concern that we need to get to the answer and that a continuance for a few months to do that is the way to go, particularly -- I understand this is next to a high school, but it is in a priority growth area that is on the edge of town currently. Those are my thoughts.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I was pretty much in favor of this project when we saw it a month and a half ago. I think it's location, amenities, density -- I think we have got 93 buildable lots in about 40 acres seems to really fit well with the area. I was really supportive of the continuance, because I wanted to hear from West Ada and, Councilman Borton, I appreciate -- it's not an issue of trust at all. I think that it's because we trust them so much that I think there are some concerns, but the fact of the matter is we have received inconsistent data. The data that we received this month is different than the data we received last month, which is different than the data we received a year ago on projects that come from West Ada and so I'm concerned about the inconsistency of data that we are getting. Council Member Strader did an excellent job of summarizing some of the public testimony that we heard and why that's so important, particularly from folks who work in -- in West Ada. So, it's hard, because I wanted that conversation so I could feel really confident in moving forward. I think that we need to get some consistent information from them and we need to hear some better communication from them. It's not just to know -- they can't turn students away; right? They don't get to put up a closed sign. So, the amount of students that any project generates they have got to accommodate. I really want to hear from them that not only will they continue to do that, because they have to, but they have got a plan in place to be able to do that and Council Member, to your comments, what does that look like over a ten year period? Because we do -- we have this as a priority growth area. It's one of the reasons I have been resistant and reluctant to priority growth areas is I think when we start driving traffic we start to create some of these problems, but I don't have enough information to feel like a denial is warranted. We had a significant amount of testimony with public in favor of it. It is right next to a school. It's a high quality development. I think more than anything it reinforces that we have got to be more selective in annexations and whether that means batching or more deliberative in our -- in our denial process, but there is not enough of a threshold for me to be supportive of a denial tonight. So, if the motion was for approval I'm certainly supportive of that.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I agree with Council Woman Strader and Councilman Cavener. I really would like to hear from the district and don't have a comfort level of approving really personally in any area of our city where we are having conversations about school capacity until we have that meeting and I am sympathetic very much to the applicant's feeling of being caught between two agencies, but certainly is not purposeful, but our duty is to really make sure that we are doing what's best for our city as a whole and sometimes factors come into play that aren't specific to the individual application and design and so the only thing I would add in addition to Council Woman Strader, who I thought did an excellent job with her explanation, is that Councilman Borton expresses concern about the considerable decrease in students proposed. From a common sense standpoint you have a 93 lot development next to a high school, with a pool and a lot of green space. You are going to sell these homes to people with children and 40 students are -- is less than -- it's like half a student per home. Less than that. So, the real -- realistically 40 students just doesn't even make common sense, whether they use the student generation

rate or not. It -- I mean it doesn't. So, that's another reason why I just really want to hear from the district before I make a decision. I had two respected developers call me this week and ask me why -- you know, is the city going to -- going to share their thoughts with us? Are we going to hear some consistent messaging from the Council Members. They are feeling this pull that you are feeling now, which is that we all have different thoughts and opinions on these things and they asked me to, please, start working on a consistent message. So, since we recently continued an application for this exact same purpose in a different area of the city, I'm in favor of doing the same with this.

Simison: Anybody else like to make any comments?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I do have one comment. I just wanted to make sure people understood my motion. I did not include anything about that waiver of the 30 foot buffer in the southeast corner. I think Councilman Burton made a very good point that that's a future application and that the applicant is not requesting that and, you know, Mr. Nary's comments helped solidify that for me. So, that -- that's not part of this at all. So, just wanted to make that clear.

Simison: Ask the Clerk to call the roll.

Roll call: Burton, yea; Cavener, yea; Bernt, yea; Perreault, nay; Hoaglund, yea; Strader, nay.

Simison: Four ayes. Two nays. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO NAYS.

Simison: Thank you and much more conversation to come.

ORDINANCES [Action Item]

- 5. Ordinance No. 22-1964: An Ordinance Authorizing the Conveyance of Certain City-Owned Real Property to the Ada County Highway District for Right of Way Purposes Consisting of Approximately 1.66 Acres Located at Discovery Park, 2121 E. Lake Hazel Road; Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to Execute and Attest on Behalf of the City of Meridian the Deed and Other Documents Necessary to Complete the Transaction; Providing for a Waiver of the Reading Rules; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: Next item up is No. 5, which is Ordinance No. 22-1964.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's an ordinance authorizing the conveyance of certain city-owned real property to the Ada County Highway District for right-of-way purposes consisting of approximately 1.66 acres located at Discovery Park, 2121 E. Lake Hazel Road; authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute and attest on behalf of the City of Meridian the deed and other documents necessary to complete the transaction; providing for a waiver of the reading rules; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Thank you. Council, you have heard this ordinance read by title. Would anyone like it read in its entirety? If not, do I have a motion?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 22-1964 with the suspension of rules.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance 22-1964 under suspension of the rules. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the ordinance is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

Simison: Council, anything under future meeting topics?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I think there was -- there was remarks of ways that we might manage our applications and be creative and try and craft solutions. Some of the issues we have confronted -- this is just another example of -- of -- of confronting capacity concerns that are incremental and bits by bits where individual applicants have individual incremental impact and we are -- we struggle with perhaps recognizing the compounding effect and having an effective way to deal with it. So, let's put on a future meeting topic perhaps a workshop discussion amongst the seven of us of some creative tools we might utilize and just for illustration purposes, the comment about batching annexation applications, hearing them as they come in and, then, continuing them to a date certain and, then, deciding them on an aggregated date is just an illustrative example of let's try and be creative. Help ourselves make more -- I guess informed decisions based on aggregated data and compounding impact, so --

Simison: Duly noted.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: At the Mayor and President -- Council President's pleasure, I would like to have a conversation at some point about whether we still believe our priority growth areas to be what we would like them to be in relationship to all the concerns that we have been discussing in the last few applications. I'm not necessarily suggesting a proposal that we change them, just -- just as I'm -- I'm hearing, you know, we -- we have stated that there are areas that we would like to grow and yet we continue to run into challenges that cause us to -- to question whether we are going to annex and I think that I feel a personal desire to have that conversation, so the public can understand where we are coming from, because there is confusion being had and -- and I would just like to see what we can do about that. See how we can clear that up I suppose.

Simison: Duly noted. Anything else? Okay. Do I have a motion to adjourn?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, I move we adjourn.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:51 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON

DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK