

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 4:30 p.m., Tuesday, July 6, 2021, by Mayor Robert Simison.

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

Also present: Chris Johnson, Ted Baird, Cameron Arial, Tori Cleary, Dave Miles, Crystal Campbell, Jeff Brown, 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 Hoaglun	<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 this meeting to order. For the record it is July 6, 2021, at 4:30 p.m. We will begin this afternoon's City Council Work Session with roll call attendance.

**ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

Simison: Next item is adoption of the agenda.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: There are no changes to the agenda this evening, so I move that we adopt the agenda as published.

Hoaglun: Second the motion.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

**CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]**

- 1. Approve Minutes of the June 22, 2021 City Council Work Session**
- 2. Approve Minutes of the June 22, 2021 City Council Regular Meeting**

- 3. Bainbridge Subdivision No. 12 Water Main Easement No. 2**
- 4. Idaho Central Credit Union - Ten Mile Branch Water Main Easement No. 1**
- 5. Impressive East Ridge Subdivision No. 2 Sanitary Sewer Easement No. 1**
- 6. Impressive East Ridge Subdivision No. 2 Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 1**
- 7. Impressive East Ridge Subdivision No. 2 Water Main Easement No. 1**
- 8. Lost Rapids Subdivision Water Main Easement No. 2**
- 9. Millbrae Subdivision Pedestrian Pathway Easement No. 1**
- 10. Final Order for Aegean Estates No. 3 (FP-2021-0031) by Engineering Solutions, LLP, Located at 4306 N. McDermott Rd.**
- 11. Final Order for Oaks North Subdivision No. 10 (FP-2021-0035) by Toll Southwest, LLC, Generally Located at 6180 W. McMillan Rd.**
- 12. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Prevail North Subdivision (H-2021-0021) by Schultz Development, LLC, Located at 5150 S. Meridian Rd.**
- 13. Development Agreement Between the City of Meridian and Shafer View North, LLC (Owner/Developer) for Shafer View Terrace (H-2020-0117) Located at the East Side of S. Meridian Rd./SH 69, Midway Between E. Amity Rd. and E. Lake Hazel Rd.**
- 14. Addendum to Development Agreement (Instrument #2019-0028376 recorded April 10, 2019) Between the City of Meridian and High Desert Development Linder Village, LLC (Owner/Developer) Located at 6308 N. Linder Rd, at the Northeast Corner of N. Linder Road and W. Chinden Blvd.**
- 15. Second Addendum to Development Agreement Between the City of Meridian and William Bienapfl (Owner) and Flexspace, LLC (Developer) for Movado Mixed Use (H-2020-0123), Generally Located on the South Side of E. Overland Rd. Between S. Eagle Rd. and S. Cloverdale Rd.**

- 16. Agreement Between City of Meridian and Nampa and Meridian Irrigation District for Five Mile Pathway along Five Mile Drain at Quartet Subdivision Northeast No. 1**
- 17. Artwork License Agreements for the Traffic Box Community Art Project 2021 Series**
- 18. First Addendum to Professional Services Agreement Between the City of Meridian and Sensus USA Inc. for Monitoring and Data Collection**
- 19. Professional Service Agreements for West Ada School District Student Artwork for Traffic Box Community Art Project 2021 Series**
- 20. Subrecipient Agreement Between City of Meridian and NeighborWorks Boise for Program Year 2019 Community Development Block Grant Funds**
- 21. Task Order #3 for February 2, 2010 Professional Services Agreement with Idaho Information Consortium, LLC, dba Access Idaho, for Electronic Transactions and Access for Transaction Payments to Meridian Police Department**
- 22. Resolution No. 21-2272: A Resolution Vacating a 5-Foot Drainage, Utility Construction and Maintenance Easement Within a Portion of Lots 2 and 3 as Shown on Heritage Subdivision No. 2, Book 23, Page 1453, Within the Southwest ¼ of the Northwest ¼ of Section 32, Township 4 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, City of Meridian, Ada County, Idaho; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: Next item is the Consent Agenda.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I move that we approve the Consent Agenda, for the -- for the Mayor to sign and for the Clerk to attest.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

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

**MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.**

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

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

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

- 23. Resolution No. 21-2273: A Resolution of the Mayor and the City Council of the City of Meridian, Idaho, Accepting that Certain Report on Eligibility for the Northern Gateway Area as an Urban Renewal Area and Revenue Allocation Area and Justification for Designating the Area as Appropriate for an Urban Renewal Project; Determining the Area Identified in the Report to be a Deteriorated Area or a Deteriorating Area, or a Combination Thereof, as Defined by Idaho Code Sections 50-2018(9) and 50-2903(8); Directing the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Meridian, Idaho, also Known as the Meridian Development Corporation, to Commence the Preparation of an Urban Renewal Plan for the Area Subject to Certain Conditions, which Plan May Include Revenue Allocation Provisions For All or Part of the Area; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: So, we will move on to Item 23 under Department/Commission Reports. So, the first item up is Resolution No. 21-2273. Turn this over to Mr. Arial.

Arial: Oh. Thank you, Chris. Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. It's a pleasure to be with you. I'm also joined by our economic development administrator Tori Cleary and our team. So, two consultants. Phil Kushlan, who is a professional and a former executive director of CCDC in Boise, who helped us with the eligibility reports before you and, then, also Meghan Conrad, who is our specialty legal counsel in the urban renewal space. So, just real quick, a couple of points of clarification just on process. What you have before you are two resolutions. First for the Northern Gateway and, then, also for the -- the Union District and so we will take --- we will take them in stride. First the Northern Gateway one and as you will recall this is for just the eligibility reports that are kind of the step in the process that, then, kick us off to actually go and create specific plans for these areas. So, to the Northern Gateway one. Really, this kind of the -- the main point to consider here is the timing. The original district or the -- better known as the Meridian Revitalization District, the original downtown district is going to be sunseting soon here in 2026 and there is a number of things that, quite frankly, still need to be -- to be done in this area and so these two new proposed eligibility areas -- or that -- these areas that were studied by Mr. Kushlan really are areas that we want to focus on and as you -- as you know, the -- these two areas have challenges. There is some older buildings and other things that make redevelopment and funding of redevelopment less feasible, if you will, and, therefore, you know, the engagement of Mr. Kushlan to do these eligibility studies was -- was a move forward. So, wanted to kind of just highlight the Northern Gateway area. Hopefully -- let me just pull up the -- hopefully it will show the -- so, here is the -- the area for -- for your viewing. This is -- as you can see the northwest here is the Meridian and Cherry Lane intersections. It includes that -- that big field up there

owned by Doug Tamara and, then, move to the -- to the east there and, then, down into the -- into the downtown and, again, this -- this area was chosen primarily because of -- not only redevelopment opportunity, but also opportunity to do pretty significant public infrastructure improvements as well that will help accomplish the -- the downtown -- Destination Downtown plan of MDC. The -- I would focus you now on the -- the report itself and these are the -- again, you will -- you will note there are ten specific code sections that qualify an urban renewal area for -- or an urban renewal district for eligibility and as you can see the Northern Gateway includes eight of those and so the -- the ones that I want to kind of point out are, number one, just the -- the number of deteriorated or deteriorating structures and in my mind this really is the key element of a redevelopment opportunity and, then, just to kind of point out another one that I think will -- will be addressed via the plan as we get into that, but, really, it's just the -- the subsequently impaired or rest of this sound growth of the municipality. So, number ten. As you know, there is -- there is a lot of pathways or roadways that don't quite intersect, there is connectivity issues, and, really, in order to get the downtown in -- in an oriented infrastructure path, not -- not only in the roadways, but also in the underground utilities. This is a -- this is one that I think is -- will be a focus of the plan going forward. So, really, that is a -- that is the -- the meat of -- of this resolution is to seek your approval of the report and, then, also to move forward with the plan creation in the Northern Gateway and with that, Mr. Mayor, I will stand for any questions on -- on this one.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Maybe just worth repeating a couple of questions I asked earlier, but process wise just for the record I wanted to make sure that this allows us to move forward on creating a plan, but that Council will be reviewing and voting on the adoption of that future plan.

Arial: Yes. Mr. Mayor and Council Woman Strader, that's correct. So, this -- this adoption of this eligibility report just kicks off that formal plan -- planning process and we really do anticipate a robust process there and look forward to the input of Council throughout that. We do have scheduled opportunities for your input and, then, ultimately, Council's discretion to -- to adopt the plan.

Strader: Mr. Mayor, one more.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: And, then, the Northern Gateway District is -- the success of this feels very dependent on one particular large property. Do you feel like you will have buy in at that point in the process when we have a plan from that property owner that makes it more likely that this area will redevelop?

Arial: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, great -- great question. So, yeah, you have highlighted a lot of the strategy well in that question. So, you will -- you will note that -- that far northwest property there, that's Doug Tamara's property and he's been very proactive with us in, essentially, annexing into the city and is in the process of doing his public outreach right now to do so. So, we anticipate a formal submittal from him to develop that property.

Strader: Thank you.

Simison: Council, any additional questions? Okay. Thank you very much. Are we doing the readings at this point in time or are we looking for action on the resolution?

Baird: Mr. Mayor, we are hoping that you will take action on the resolution tonight so we can move forward. With that, Council, do I have any motions?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I think -- and maybe I'm misunderstanding what Ted said. But taking action on that this evening at our 6:00 o'clock meeting? You are looking to have action at that --

Baird: Actually, let me back up a minute. I don't want there to be any confusion about the -- the item that's the second reading of the de-annexation, which is on the 6:00 o'clock meeting. That is actually a precursor to forming these districts that the de-annexation has to take place. So, I would consider your action at that -- at 6:00 o'clock is totally separate from these two and what you are doing -- and, of course, you have only heard the presentation on Item 23 and not yet 24, but we are looking to have you take action so that if, indeed, you wish to go forward that the consultant can start with the -- the plans.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, thanks, I appreciate it.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: It sounded like we can take action on Item 23.

Simison: Correct.

Strader: So, I would move that we approve Resolution No. 21-2273, resolution of the Mayor and City Council of the City of Meridian accepting the report on eligibility for the Northern Gateway area as an urban renewal area, revenue allocation area, and justification for designating the area as appropriate for an urban renewal project. Do I need to read this whole thing or -- that would be okay? Okay. Thanks, Ted.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: I will second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: For the record I will be continuing to -- to abstain from any consideration or discussion of both Items 23 and Items 24 on this agenda.

Simison: Okay. With that any further discussion? Do we need a roll call or -- on one, Mr. Baird?

Baird: In the interest of thoroughness, let's go ahead and do a roll call.

Simison: Okay. Ask the Clerk to call the roll.

Roll call: Borton, abstain; Cavener, yea; Bernt, yea; Perreault, yea; Hoaglun, yea; Strader, yea.

Simison: Five ayes. One abstain. Motion passes. Or resolution passes.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSTAIN.

- 24. Resolution No. 21-2274: A Resolution of the Mayor and the City Council of the City of Meridian, Idaho, Accepting that Certain Report on Eligibility for the Idaho Block Annexation Area as an Urban Renewal Area and Revenue Allocation Area and Justification for Designating the Area as Appropriate for an Urban Renewal Project; Determining that the Area Identified in the Report as the Proposed Amendment Area Adjacent and Contiguous to the Existing Union District Revenue Allocation Area Within the City of Meridian, to be a Deteriorated Area or a Deteriorating Area, or a Combination Thereof, as Defined by Idaho Code Sections 50-2018(9) and 50- 2903(8); Directing the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Meridian, Idaho, also Known as the Meridian Development Corporation, to Commence the Preparation of an Urban Renewal Plan Amendment, which Plan Amendment May Include Revenue Allocation Provisions For All or Part of the Area; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: Next up will be Item No. 24, which is Resolution No. 21-2274.

Arial: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council. So, just continuing right on. This is -- as you know this is another area of downtown, which we feel is appropriate for eligibility review, as well as continued work in the interest of our downtown revitalization efforts. This is going to be annexed into the existing Union District that was formed last year and this study area, as you can see, is -- is only just a few parcels and the reason for this is that because it will be annexed into the existing Union District, which is small in and of itself, code only allows us to annex an additional ten percent of the existing district. So, that being said, this is a perfect alignment for an urban renewal project. That's, as we understand it, is already underway with some of these property owners and so I will kind of point out, just going back to the eligibility criteria, number one where it says the presence of substantial number of deteriorating -- deteriorating structures. We don't have a substantial number of them just by virtue of the fact that there is only a few properties here and a few buildings, but it is safe to say that this area that will be part of the Union District does represent this -- this criteria and as you can see there is four additional criteria that were met and as you recall only one is necessary to be considered for an urban renewal plan -- planning process. We do look forward to additional growth and opportunity in this area in particular, since its proximity to City Hall and what we consider the -- you know, the heart of downtown and we are looking forward to continued efforts in this -- in this regard. And with this, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, this is also, again, seeking your approval of the eligibility report, so we can kick off the -- the additional planning effort to include this in the Union District. With that I will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions? If not, do I have a motion?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I move that we approve Resolution No. 21-2274.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: I second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Resolution No. 21-2274. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

Roll call: Borton, abstain; Cavener, yea; Bernt, yea; Perreault, yea; Hoaglun, yea; Strader, yea.

Simison: Five ayes, one abstain, and the resolution passes.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.



Arial: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council.

**25. Mayor's Office: Budget Amendment in the Amount of \$4500.00 for Production Room Computer Replacement, Software and Equipment**

Simison: Cameron, thank you. Next item on our agenda, Item 25, is a Mayor's Office budget amendment in the amount of 4,500 dollars. Turn this over to Mr. Miles.

Miles: Good afternoon, Mayor and Council. Hope you are doing well. Quick budget amendment request for you all to consider. As you know the city maintains a video production room right over here. We have got a video production computer that, unfortunately, just recently blew up, which is unfortunate, but it's kind of serendipitous, I guess, as we have learned all the technology needs through COVID. We need a new computer to replace that one. New piece of software to run the video production behind the scenes, develop -- and through the communications program they have also been working to account for various equipment that we haven't had that we have had a need for. Most recent example was the Lakeview Golf Course -- is it still on? Lakeview Golf Course town hall that we held, we actually borrowed a bunch of electronic equipment from the chamber. Just looking at our operations, looking at an opportune time to say what do we really need and we were in that process, figured we would come to you tonight because of the computer replacement and put them all before you for a 4,500 dollar amendment. With that I will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you. And for the record this technically is in other government. Mr. Miles just is here from that standpoint from the Mayor's Office. Any questions? Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor, I move that we approve the budget amendment in the amount of 4,500 for production room computer replacement software and equipment.

Cavener: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

**26. Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program Year 2021 Action Plan Presentation**

Simison: Next up is Item 26, which is our Community Development Block Grant program year 2021 Action Plan presentation and we will turn this over to Crystal.

Campbell: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. So, I'm here for the fifth and final year for this current consolidated plan -- action plan. It's the PY-21 and it starts October 1st, 2021, and will go through September 30th, 2022. So, every year we have to submit the action plan and it's basically an application for the next year's funding. So, with this, the process to do it, we -- I mentioned that we have the Consolidated Plan, which is a five year plan. We take into consideration the analysis of impediments to fair housing and the market analysis for this and, then, the goals are developed while we work with stakeholders in the community to see what's needed. So, this plan will set up the framework for what we want to do for the next five years and, then, the action plan is what we are going to do each individual year to meet those goals at the end. The -- one of the core pieces of the CDBG program is citizen participation. So, that's what part of this is. We do two public presentations, a public comment period, and, then, a public hearing. So, this is the first of the two public presentations where we ask the public to give us feedback on how they feel we are doing with the goals that we have identified. We also consult with stakeholders. We have regular involvement with them and we also send our action plan to them for feedback. This year we have our PY-21 funds. HUD has said that they are planning on giving us 501,559 dollars and we will also be reallocating about 95,000 dollars from the current year's funding. The chart that's on there gives you kind of a breakdown of the activities that we have identified. Admin and fair housing, there is a federal cap of 20 percent and we are only using about 7.5 percent towards that. For public services there is a 15 percent cap and we are using about 7.5 percent for that as well. For housing activities it's around 29 percent and accessibility is 56 percent. For admin and fair housing we are looking at allocating 45,000 dollars and the majority of that is going to go towards our next five year plan. We have to do the housing market analysis and -- and we will also be putting some towards the Fair Housing campaign and we have just regular administration that we do. As far as public services, we have identified two projects that will be a total of 45,000 dollars. Both of these we have worked with before. The first one is emergency rental assistance through the Jesse Tree for households that are at risk of homelessness. The second one is with the Boys and Girls Club scholarships for extended care programs. For housing we are proposing allocating 171,000 dollars toward the homeowner repair program. This -- our current year is the first that we have done it and they have got one -- one home that they have almost completed and another one that's underway, so it's going really well and this will look more like what we are anticipating it to be going forward what we would need. We do have homebuyer assistance as a backup project, because it's just not viable in the housing market right now to put the funds toward this. We have had a hard time spending those funds the past -- past couple of years for that project. For accessibility we have identified the Chateau Park playground and pathway. With this we would be replacing the current playground with an all abilities playground and also developing a pathway that would connect the playground to the LMI areas that are right there. We also have a couple of backup projects. They are both streetlight projects. One is near Peregrine Elementary and the other one is near Meridian Middle. So, moving forward we are in the middle of our public comment period. That will conclude on July 20th at the public hearing. The following

week, then, I will submit the final report and resolution on the Consent Agenda and, then, as soon as that's approved, then, I will submit it to HUD. So, if there is any questions or comments people can contact me. I'm Crystal Campbell and this is my contact information. So, with that I will stand for comments.

Simison: Thank you, Crystal. Council, any questions or comments?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Just a quick question. When you were talking about housing, Crystal, you mentioned the housing market analysis. Can you describe, fairly high level, what that entails?

Campbell: So, we are actually working with a consultant who will go in and kind of do an analysis of what we have right now, what's affordable, what kind of -- just where it falls.

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. On the section that has 20,000 allocated for rental assistance, that strikes me as maybe a little bit low for the need that's out there. So, can you help us understand how that number came to be. Was that the request that was made by the organization that's utilizing the funds or was there a limitation on how much could be contributed to that?

Campbell: So, it was -- they actually requested a little bit more, but they have not been able to spend their funds as much. There is a lot of -- there is a lot of funds on the market right now for rental assistance and it's -- it's been hard for them to identify Meridian households. They are just barely getting to their PY-19 CARES Act funds and they will be done with those in September. So, the group did suggest that they get a lower amount than what they had originally requested, but we will still have CARES Act funds if they do need more.

Perreault: One more question, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: If I understand correctly with the homebuyer assistance, one of the challenges is that -- is -- is that the -- the amount of downpayment assistance, for example, that can be utilized just isn't enough to really help that homebuyer and so, you know, perhaps the program is permitted to use a 25,000 contribution towards down payment. That's not enough to -- to qualify for the loan types that they are seeking. Is that a general understanding or maybe one of the issues we are running into with a market?

Campbell: That and maybe -- I think it's more around the fact that the housing costs are so high that they are not affordable to the people who qualify with the income eligibility requirements.

Perreault: Okay.

Campbell: So, the houses that are on the lower price point, then, they can't get in there and get the offers on the house quick enough before somebody else comes in and bids higher than that and has cash. So, it just takes longer for our clients to potentially get into those homes.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: With those assistance programs there is -- the assistance -- the individuals who are applying for them have income limitations that have to be abided by; is that correct? And so, therefore, the housing market is, essentially, priced them out even with the assistance that can be provided; is that generally what --

Campbell: Yes.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thanks, Crystal. I was curious actually if CDBG funds could be used for affordable housing projects in Meridian in other ways going forward. Just maybe a follow-up, but just what the options are and if there are other HUD funds available that we might be able to utilize toward building affordable housing, because to Council Woman Perreault's point, unfortunately, the housing market is so overheated here that these programs won't be effective.

Campbell: Right. Absolutely. And that's a great question. We are kind of limited as far as CDBG specific funds go towards affordable housing. We can't actually build any. We could help with the soft costs, but we couldn't actually build it. However, if we were to work with some of the home programs, then, we may be able to and we are trying to create a consortium with the local communities -- the other entitlement communities, but we have to have all of our borders touching before we can do that and, then, we have talked about once that happens, then, we would be able to do the bigger projects and kind of rotate them throughout the Treasure Valley or whichever city it is. But also during our next Consolidated Plan we are really focusing on what we can do with CDBG, because it's -- it's going to be a few years before we can use the home funds in Meridian. So, we are going to try to get some viable projects that we can actually complete with CDBG funds.

Strader: Thanks a lot.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: If I may address Council Woman Strader's question. It's my understanding that some of the organizations that have applied for the funds they do have the ability to build projects here in Meridian with a different source of funds. So, our allocating what we have to provide other services for homebuyer assistance and whatnot allows them to free up some of the funds that they can use to build with and so that's part of -- Neighborworks Boise specifically is looking to do some of those projects here in Meridian, looking for property to do that. So, since they have applied for CDBG funds for other parts of those services they provide, I think that that's kind of indirectly helping using those funds, so --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you. Yeah. It may be worth a future discussion, like a broader discussion at a later date, just on more direct -- direct efforts on affordable housing, as opposed to indirect efforts was my -- what my question was getting at. Thanks.

Campbell: So, coming soon to a Council meeting near you, then, we will be presenting the housing market analysis. So, there will definitely be opportunities to comment on it and have a bigger discussion then.

Simison: Council, any further questions or comments? Okay. Thank you, Crystal.

## **27. Transportation Commission: Pathway Crossing Concerns**

Simison: Next item on the agenda is Item 27, which is Transportation Commission pathway crossing concerns. I understand, Mr. Steed, you are going to introduce the topic or the next person who is going to talk about the topic. I will turn this over to you.

Steed: Or both as the case may be. Mr. Mayor, Council Members, good to be here. I'm Walter Steed, president -- I mean chairman, rather, of the Meridian Transportation Commission. We have an issue that we would like to bring before you to see if we could possibly have some impact on a new pathway intersection design that ACHD has started using. The Transportation Commission looks at transportation budgets, plans, changes and development. We also listen to citizens, the police department, and staff regarding their concerns. This one is one brought to us by staff. The staff has met with ACHD on a couple of designs that have come through with a new way to have pathways cross intersections and they have concerns, talked to ACHD staff, and pretty much we were told we are doing what we have been told to do. It's got to go up another level before we

can change anything. So, with that the Transportation Commission wrote the memorandum that's in your packet to explain to you what we are attempting to bring forward. We have looked at this at a couple of different meetings since May and currently talking about Eagle Road in two places, at Lake Hazel and at East Levin. Our understanding is this change is going to be a permanent way of doing these intersections and it -- it concerns us. It pulls the crossing of pedestrians and bicycles, who are using the sidewalk, back from the intersection. Ron Lancaster, a member of the commission, would like to present you with some details on the situation and look forward to your assistance. Thank you.

Lancaster: Mr. Mayor, Council Members, it's a pleasure to be with you again. It's nice to see you all in person. Thanks for the introduction, Chairman Steed. So, I have a couple thoughts to share. I think Chairman Steed already addressed the topics pretty well. I will -- I will dive into a little bit more detail. So, I -- I titled this side path crossing concerns. It turns out a multi-use path or a shared use path is kind of a path on its own alignment, like the Boise Greenbelt, for instance, a path that parallels another alignment, like a road, is usually called a side path, so -- so, what -- what I'm asking -- or what we are asking of you today is to express to ACHD city preferences on these side path crossings. What we would like to see. And I will get into what our commission recommends here in a minute. As a matter of background, you may remember about a year ago last March all of you elected officials sent ACHD a letter stating your preferences for multi-use facilities that are preferred over bike lanes and narrower sidewalks. You may remember that letter. So, I took a few snips from it. So, your recommendation is -- is great, but it does present a few operational challenges. So, here on the screen at the moment is a conventional bike lane layout, for instance, where there is a lane on each side of the road that -- where the bicycle traffic runs parallel to the vehicular traffic next to it. Contrast that with -- oh. And where -- where there is right turning movements or -- or where there is conflicts between vehicles and bicycles, bicycles are moved away from that conflict. So, in this case moved to the left of the right turning vehicle. So, contrast that with a side path where, essentially, there is a new parallel two lane road next to the road and so on the left here with Driver A, a driver turning right from a minor street onto a major street was typically looking left; right? So, looking for vehicles on the left that -- that are going to be in conflict and won't see the bicyclist on the right traveling the opposite direction. Similar with Driver B. If Driver B's making a left turn from the major road to the minor road, they are typically looking down the road looking for a vehicle coming the opposite direction that will be in conflict and, therefore, can't see the bicyclist coming up behind their shoulder. Or Driver C making a right turn from the major road to the minor road is looking ahead for vehicles turning left in front of them or to the minor road for vehicles turning from the minor road, but isn't necessarily looking for the bicyclist again over their shoulder. Or this bottom figure, you know, a vehicle might block the path of a bicyclist or a pedestrian on this side path. So, those are some of the challenges. That's kind of the background of why this is even a topic. So, this is ACHD's solution. This is from their plans. This is what we have discussed in the Transportation Commission. So, their solution was to make a -- kind of a kink in the side path where it moves away from the intersection and, then, comes back tighter to the road. The idea here is that a vehicle can pull up to the intersection without blocking the path. That's the big reason for it. Or a vehicle turning from the major road

potentially has more time to see a user of the side path before crossing the side path. So, identify those conflicts. In your memo -- here is a couple of quotes from the memo in your packet that Chairman Steed has already summarized. So, Meridian staff has expressed concerns with ACHD staff about the new designs and the visibility conflicts it creates. ACHD staff are acting as they have been directed and any changes will have to come from the executive level. A little bit of information on where we think this design for ACHD came from. It appears to have originated from a Federal Highway Administration -- that's what FHWA stands for. So, an FHWA document entitled small town and rural multi-modal network. So, the title of that document, you know, sets off a few red flags immediately and that, you know, this -- this may not be applicable in an urban area. A second source for this is the Massachusetts Department of Transportation. They have a document called Separated Bike Lane Planning and Design Guide. So, this is a figure from the FHWA document showing this sort of treatment. I will note that in this treatment they -- they show a -- an elevated crosswalk. So, a speed table of sorts where the crosswalk is elevated to make it different than the -- the road that it intersects. Here is a figure from Massachusetts DOT, so very similar. This one showing a left turning vehicle has about a car's length before crossing the path. That brings us to this document from the American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials. So, the acronym for that is AASHTO. So, this is a consortium of the State Departments of Transportation. So, for instance, ITD is part of AASHTO and UDOT is part of AASHTO and Oregon and on and on. So, they develop these guides -- and -- and often these AASHTO documents are sort of the source documents for roadway design and so this is sort of the Bible of bicycle facilities and it admittedly probably lags a bit behind some of the other guidance documents. The AASHTO documents are usually a bit more conservative based more on research and experience, rather than trying out some new method or device. So, a few quotes of note from that document. On roads with speed limits of 50 miles per hour or greater, increasing the separation from roadway is recommended to improve path user comfort and potentially reduce crashes. So, that's for high speed facilities like a highway. These roads that we are talking about here in Meridian are not high speed facilities. That plan that I showed earlier was for Eagle Road where the speed limit is proposed to be 40 miles per hour with that project. So, it would fall into this next paragraph of lower speeds. So, this -- this one's important to note in that at lower speeds greater separation does not reduce crashes. I will stop there for a second. This is based on a study from the Florida Department of Transportation. So, if -- when we are having a conversation about safety or what's safest, you know, certainly crashes is what's of utmost importance. You know, near misses may be uncomfortable, but don't necessarily result in -- or they don't result in a loss of property or life; right? So, really, we are talking about crashes here. What -- what contributes to crashes or what prevents crashes. But they say at lower speeds greater separation does not reduce crashes. Therefore, the side path should be located in close proximity to the parallel roadway at intersections. So, motorists turning off the roadway can better detect side path riders. It's kind of the opposite approach as this FHWA document or the Massachusetts DOT document and that it's recommending to keep the path close to the parallel roadway to keep the side path users in the driver's direct view, rather than off to the side. Some additional concerns that are in the memo. You know, there is no urban examples of this or at least local urban examples and I have had some contact with Massachusetts DOT in preparation for this and they have sprinkled

this throughout their state where it makes sense. So, they may have some urban examples, but we certainly don't hear. So, this is kind of new for here. We are concerned about items that might impede either the view of side path users or the sight lines of drivers, you know, some -- some object that will obstruct the view in either direction, such as landscaping, fences, utility poles, signs, human behavior. There is potential concerns about -- we tend to like to take the shortest path if we are creating -- intentionally creating a longer path that may not be used. There is some concern that the design incorporates some of the elements that were shown in those -- those guides, but not all of them. For instance, the elevated crosswalk, that's not present in the ACHD design. I don't know why really. You know, perhaps it's snow removal, but it's -- it's something different; right? So, we are not quite comparing apples and apples. And some conflicting or -- or inappropriately used signs. And here is an example of this. So, this is back to that -- that engineering plan. This is a plan view. Noticeably absent from this is the stop sign. So, I added that. I don't know if that was an omission from the document or -- or what. But I would certainly hope there is a stop sign. But that kind of conflicts with the sign immediately upstream of it, the bicycle and pedestrian crossing warning sign. It may, you know, as designed here shield the stop sign, which is probably the more important of the -- the two signs. The sign circled there on the left is a sign that's reserved for traffic signal use and here it's used at a uncontrolled -- or at least a two way stop controlled intersection. So, admittedly, signs, markings, that sort of thing, that's -- that's my specialty as a traffic engineer by education, experience, and employment. So, you know, those -- those things stand out to me. There is just a couple things that are a little weird, you know, that are a result of trying something new. And, then, finally, there is this concern about who yields to who. So, by law motorists must yield to pedestrians in a crosswalk. I chuckle or cringe a little bit every time I see the signs in the road that say stop for pedestrians, because that's not the law in Idaho. In Idaho it's yield to. So, there is law concerning what vehicles and pedestrians do, but not necessarily vehicles and bicycles, because they are both considered vehicles. So, presumably, we have created this new intersection where the rules of the road at intersections apply as far as whoever gets there first is served first or if arriving at the same time the vehicle on the right. So, driver's ed stuff. So, that -- that starts to come into play here, because there is no control at this crossing, because the control at the intersection is beyond where the crossing is. Okay. So, this brings us back to the action requested of this group. Provide a follow-up to the March 3rd, 2020, letter that I paraphrased earlier with city preferences for side path crossing. So, this -- I'm seeing this as less of a brand new document, but sort of a continuation of the letter that this body sent before to address further specific topics, meaning the side path crossings. So, it's the Transportation Commission's recommendation to essentially follow the AASHTO guidance, that the side path should be located in close proximity to the parallel roadway at intersections. So, the opposite of -- of the ACHD approach. But to keep the -- the side path crossing close to the road, rather than pull it back. And with that, Mr. Mayor, that is the end of my presentation.

Simison: Thank you, Ryan. I'm going to start by just asking a couple questions. All in good fun, since we are here today. Does this type of experience happen when say roundabouts -- or does this happen anywhere in our city right now where roundabouts are not at play; to your knowledge? I mean that's the kind of the place where a roundabout



is, but it doesn't -- it doesn't go all the way through on the other side. So, I'm not exactly sure what that's looking like.

Lancaster: Mr. Mayor, are you referring to the similarity of -- where at a roundabout the pedestrian crossing is a vehicle car back?

Simison: Correct. Because that's really where this first came out, probably, was from -- from that element. So, I'm trying to get a better understanding about how this really -- is this all a function of design that is been spurned by roundabouts or is this -- is this separate from roundabouts, a new way that they are going to be looking at any crossing at any intersection, as a general rule, to your knowledge.

Lancaster: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, I will answer that the best I can. I think they are -- they are separate topics. We have seen them come together in the same project, these two topics, but I think they are separate. It's my understanding that this is the way Ada County Highway District will be approaching these side path crossings now and in the future.

Simison: So, any intersection, whether it's a roundabout or standard that's signalized, you would, essentially, put the pathway crosswalk behind all turning vehicle movements is how you would interpret their direction?

Lancaster: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, that's a good clarification. I wouldn't think that we would see a difference in how crossings are treated at signalized intersections, but specifically at two way stop controlled intersections like this where one way is not controlled and the minor road has stopped. I understand that that's where they are applying this.

Simison: So, one way could be to always just have regular standardized intersections to avoid these altogether as one option. Just an option. Not the option. Just say it for me. Just say it. I won't force you. I won't force you to do it. I won't force you to do it. I'm not going to put you on the record, but --

Lancaster: Mr. Mayor --

Simison: -- I could have gotten you there if I would have -- if I would have pushed it the right way. I'm not going to.

Lancaster: I will say this. You know that I'm an advocate of roundabouts having designed and -- and, yeah, certainly I'm an advocate. You know, this -- this is a different topic and I'm, you know, frankly here representing the Transportation Commission.

Simison: Yeah. I said it with some fun. But there are some similarities to the roundabout, which is kind of where this -- you know, trying to bring this into the larger context for Council to even consider from that standpoint.

Lancaster: Yeah.

Simison: So, Council, now that I'm done with my fun, any other questions?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: It would be really helpful if you could share a little more context as to how ACHD he came to want to make this change in the first place. Did this come out of public concerns? Did this come out of changing standards nationally? Can you give me a little bit of history on that?

Lancaster: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, Council Member Perreault, so I can't speak for ACHD, but I can give you a couple of guesses is probably the best I can do. You know, I think it's reasonable to say that ACHD is trying to be proactive in some of these bicycle and pedestrian design issues. They have their own pedestrian and bicycle committees. In fact, Commissioner Lewis from our commission is on the pedestrian advisory commission, whatever they call it, so it does seem like they are trying to be proactive there and they are probably seeking out some of these new documents and new guidance and trying them out. That's kind of the best guess that I have. The AASHTO document is dated 2012. So, it's getting a little bit dated now. You know, nine years old. These other documents are newer and so they are probably just seeing if they are any better.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Mr. Lancaster, appreciate you being here. Commissioners, appreciate you being here. The action that's being requested by the Commission, as I understand, comes with some encouragement from staff I guess. This is kind of a weird process that is playing out. I guess my question for you as kind of the Commissioner liaison to this particular project is a recommendation strong enough for the Commission to be satisfied that -- our staff, I guess, to be satisfied that the intended outcome will be achieved. Or do we need more stronger language in our request?

Lancaster: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, I think we are approaching this from three different ways. You know, I have heard commentary from this body. Certainly our commission has had discussions about this, some of which -- or all of which you have been present for and I -- I understand that staff has concerns also. So, it's not one -- one body alone, it seems to be all three. As far as, you know, strength of wording, we all know that ACHD owns the roads and eventually -- or they can make their own decisions without our input and they, you know, fortunately, asked for our input on -- on a lot of things and for the most part they seem to be very good partners. So, as far as strength of wording, I don't know exactly how to answer that, Councilman, other than to say I do think it appropriate for the city to state its preference at this time and -- and at least formally make it known to the Ada County Highway District.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, if other Council Members have questions, then, maybe I have got a comment at the end.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Maybe a comment or question. I'm not sure. But, yeah, one thing I want to say -- I appreciate that I think ACHD is moving in a direction of being more considerate of pedestrians and bicyclists. I can tell that they are working on that through their endeavors to have these protected bike lanes and which I think actually moves closer to our philosophy of having these detached pathways. So, I want to make sure we are giving them credit for some of the positive changes that they are making and I actually wonder if -- yeah, I think sending a letter is fine, but I guess there are several new ACHD commissioners and I'm kind of just thinking out loud. Would it be better to have some sort of a workshop or more of a meeting where we can understand what direction they are going in? Why they are recommending these changes. Maybe bring up some of our concerns, similar to how we have done recently with -- you know, with the West Ada School District, just so we can get better alignment between our two institutions. I'm a little bit leery of sending a blank recommendation about side paths coming from our perspective if I don't have the context of why they made that change coming from their perspective a little bit more. So, I just think of more of a dialogue approach might be better.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Just to bring a little historical approach to this discussion, we did have a pretty frank discussion on the public record with regard to this issue. I brought it up and I don't remember who the gentleman was I was speaking toward at -- at ACHD, but I got some ACHD commissioners involved and -- and for some reason they just -- they just disagree and I don't know how more blunt we could have been speaking to them about this particular issue, but the response at that time was that they needed to get -- what was it, like a -- like a -- like a VPO or something like -- did get a new PO or -- to change the -- the design and they said they were going to work on that. I don't know that ever came to fruition or not. But as a Council we -- we definitely let them know our opinion on this -- on this -- on this look. It was -- we were pretty frank.

Simison: I would agree. I mean the conversation was there on Eagle Road. Again, similar. A little different, but same general concept, so --

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Bernt: I'm curious if the Commission has had conversations with any of the other cities that are part of ACHD and if there is similar concerns, if they are having similar conversations on their commissions and councils and if this is going to become a joint effort on the various cities' parts or if you can give us some idea if that's going, how that's going.

Lancaster: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, Councilman -- or Council Member Perreault, as a commission we have not had any conversations outside of this room. I think Mr. Baird would probably slap our hands if we did; right? We -- we, essentially, follow the same rules you do; right? And that we talk about what's on our agenda. I don't know if city staff has or not, but as a commission we have not.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I know Brian's here. Brian, quick question. Maybe you can address it. Maybe you can state, you know, what formal communication we have had with the staff over at ACHD and what the response has been toward this -- this design aspect.

McClure: Mr. Mayor, Commissioner Bernt, you have been part of -- most of those formal communications. We have exchanged many e-mails with other staff persons over there. Miranda has been most recently coordinating with them on the design, which is where this comes from, for Eagle Road from Amity to Lake Hazel. Her understanding of their direction was they are not interested in staff's opinion. Well, I shouldn't say it like that. They have been directed that they are going to do this and unless something else changes that this is what they have decided. To your earlier question regarding some of the other intersection treatments, they are looking into doing some -- they are actively working on some designs for signalized intersections and how they bring together turn lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks in different configurations, but they are not doing that work for these multi-use pathways. This is what they are doing.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Do we need to send another letter? Do we need to have a Zoom meeting? What would -- what would -- what would be your recommendation going forward with regard to this?

Simison: Send the letter saying no more roundabouts and make everything straight the way it used to be?

Bernt: That's not what my question was, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: I think that would achieve a similar topic. Yeah. Because -- and I say this all honestly, at least where they are doing this now is where they are putting in their segment of roundabouts. So, from a treatment standpoint they are being consistent. That's the way I view this is that section along Eagle Road where you start having other turning movements where the vehicle is going to be in front of that turning movement, they are at least being consistent, which for drivers in that area I can actually support that concept. I don't support the larger concept, but I understand the reason why they are getting there from that element. But I'm here for the will of the Council on this one, because I feel like, you know, honestly, we can send a letter, we can have a joint meeting, I don't have a lot of positive hopes for the outcome for -- if the direction is we just want to go straight.

McClure: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yes.

McClure: And if it helps at all, this configuration that they are doing now is the result of the city's desire to do multi-use pathways. A lot of this, as was indicated earlier, comes down to sort of definitions. If we want multi-use pathways, at least in these residential corridors, we can continue to see this -- this -- this intersection treatment at nonsignalized section -- cross-sections, regardless of whether it's a roundabout or a signal. This -- we will see this more on these residential corridors if we want to use the multi-use pathway. The alternative would be to do bike lanes. ACHD's isn't doing traditional bike lanes on these type of arterials anymore, they are doing raised or buffered bike lanes. I think their preference is raised. But for multi-use pathways this is what we will see.

Simison: Brian, can we call them a template sidewalk without saying multi-use pathway to -- I mean it's really semantics at this point in time. I mean -- but in this part of our community people are going to ride on the sidewalk with their bikes. They are not going to get on Eagle Road with their kids. So, is it semantics?

McClure: Mr. Mayor, from staff's perspective we have thrown every dart we can. Naming hasn't seemed to sway that. I have appreciated some of the dialogue on side streets or side -- side pathways today. You know, maybe a direct reference to AASHTO would help, but using a terminology just sidewalks doesn't seem to work, because it is also a bike lane at that point and they have some additional criteria they feel they have to meet when you have integrated the bike way into the sidewalk.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: A lot -- a lot has changed since March of 2020. Most particular their position on bike lanes and what you just referenced. That was not an element in consideration when we elected to go towards the multi-use pathway option. I don't think any of us ever

contemplated that option would sacrifice public safety by any means. But the fact that they now have support for a different manner of providing bike -- bike lane design, does that necessitate us revisiting our preference for the multi-use pathway?

McClure: Mr. Mayor and Councilman Borton, it's really up to Council. That letter was Council's request for Council's preference. If you guys have a new preference given the conditions and the constraints they are placing on us, then, that's certainly entirely up to you guys.

Borton: Mr. Mayor, the reason for the question is the options I recall considering was that bike lanes adjacent to the roadway, which would seem to have real safety challenges, so the detached sidewalk was the -- the lesser of two evils. But the more safe manner of providing the pedestrian and bike corridor now that we have a -- we have a different option available to us. But I'm supportive of staff and what the Commission is presenting. It makes great sense and the reasoning behind it is sound and I'm fully supportive of sending a letter in support of what you are all requesting, because, again, you have got a good basis for making the request, but the analysis has changed somewhat with their rates pretty monumental pivot in their policy, so -- does that necessitate us giving it a second look?

McClure: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Borton, their design currently -- I don't know that they are unwilling to change it, they have just not heard from us a compelling reason to do so at the levels those decisions are being made. So, I don't know that you have to give up requesting that, if you would prefer them to use multi-use pathways, but if you feel you have reached the end of that limit, then, certainly, yes, you could -- you could go for a safer approach if you are of the mind that you are okay with certain demographics riding in the street with a buffered or raised condition, instead of just attached.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Brian, just said something that was interesting, you know, and that was, you know, our compelling reason. The issue to me is we haven't heard a compelling reason why that is necessary. There is going to be conflicts no matter how you do it and maybe -- I was trying to wrap my brain around why would -- why would they do this and maybe it's because a bicyclist coming 20 miles an hour and you are going to make a right turn, you are not looking that far down and there is signs and all those issues that you bring up, Commissioner Lancaster, that if it's not detached there will be a crash and if it's detached there might be a crash. I -- but it would be nice to at least try to get an understanding of where they are coming from. I mean that's their business. You know, I think we ought to send a letter and with a note that -- let's kind of continue the dialogue and let's see if there is some understanding hear of each other's perspectives. It's just -- I'm thinking that it's just a situation we need to hear from them a little more than what we have heard and I think our approach is sound. We are -- we are about pedestrian safety and bicycle safety and it doesn't look safe and maybe they have some reasons for that,

that it is safe, but I haven't heard them. I'm not -- I haven't heard anything that would convince me, so --

Simison: Well, maybe what we could do -- it's kind of back to what was discussed is we could invite ACHD staff here to come explain the rationale. Is this -- is where, again, you know, from a practical standpoint of having a commission to council discussion on design -- I mean they are not the experts either from that standpoint. I think it would be good for us to at least hear before having an engaged conversation by having a staff member in a joint meeting trying to explain to us and, then, having everyone give their difference of opinions. I mean, honestly, I go either way on this, because, you know, I go up to -- just think about every time I leave my subdivision currently there is a T intersection, how often do I have a conflict with someone trying to cross. It's frequent, no matter where you put your car, whether you inch up to get out or you leave it back, there is always potential conflict with somebody. So, it's just a matter of what our community knows or expects at that point in time. So, my bigger concern is that is this a one off, you know, we are creating unicorns in our community that the other people if they visit won't be knowledgeable about it. But that's what I would maybe recommend if we want to next step is let's hear from ACHD staff before we take any direction towards the commission officially, if people will be -- if people want to hear more information.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I appreciate the information given to us by the Commission. I appreciate their insight. I would agree that we need to speak to ACHD and to resolve this issue. I remember one of the reasons why they were thinking about not providing that, you know, change in design was because they were so far along in the process. But I know for a fact that there are other places in the City of Meridian where -- where they are already using this design and wanting to use this pathway type connection that could have been avoided, you know, if maybe there was better communication between the bodies and maybe that's what we are lacking, but I thought I was pretty crystal clear when we spoke to the -- to ACHD last year and it's just not -- the pedestrian connection isn't safe. It flat out isn't safe. It's not tried and true in this valley and what -- what -- what Councilman Hoaglund mentioned is that we are not hearing compelling evidence of why from them and I grilled that guy -- I don't know -- I wish I could remember his name. But I asked him multiple questions and he did not give me a response and so I say we do this really quick before we get another response from ACHD saying they are too far along in the process that they can't change it. This needs to change now in -- in every inch of our city. It's just not safe. So, I don't know what we need to do, Mr. Mayor, to make this meeting, but in my opinion it needed -- like it needed to happen sooner than later.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Very well might be some of the content of the letter that gets sent asking to -- to stop consideration of this change until a discussion happens. You articulated a lot of the reason why. The commission and our staff has articulated the reason why, so if that's the blunt ask and the follow up immediately with an invitation to staff or whatever data we might need to see if it justifies their position --

Bernt: We will even buy lunch.

Borton: -- we are there. Whatever they want.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I tend to agree with the comments from -- from Council. I do not want to have the -- the opportunity pass and I kind of pinged on a comment from Council Member Strader about -- we got a new body and some of those commissioners may also not understand the why behind it and here is a -- I think two birds with one stone scenario. One they can learn, but, moreover, they can hear what cities are being told by their staff, so that everyone has a clear picture of how both staff are engaging with each other and how electeds are engaging with each other. So, yes, let's invite staff's presentation, but I will go halvesies on -- on cheeseburgers if Council President Bernt goes halvesies on cheeseburgers and let's invite them for lunch. Let's also make sure that we can get it on our commissioners agenda or radar, so if they want to be able to sit and watch we can -- we can open this up and I think that there can be some good from it and, then, from that very well may come a subsequent follow-up letter with some specific asks that we talked to -- talked about as a body in that meeting.

Bernt: Perfect.

Cavener: And, then, Mr. Mayor, if I may?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I just -- I didn't want the moment to pass. I know we all sit as ex-officios on various commissions and I'm sure you all think that yours are -- are good and well, but I'm here to tell you the Transportation Commission is the GOAT of commissions in Meridian right now. I have been able to sit as an ex-officio I think now for almost four years and a couple of years ago they said we want to start getting our hands dirty. We want to start doing. And we have seen a lot of the results of their good work and so at least with three of those commissioners here I want to say good job. Keep it up. You are keeping us busy. You are bringing forth good ideas that cause us to wrestle and noodle and we appreciate your service to the commission.

Bernt: Amen.



Simison: Agreed. Well said. Mr. -- Chairman Steed, if you want to come forward, since you are raising your hand.

Steed: Thank you, Mr. -- Mr. Mayor, Council Members. Remembering the memo, it said that staff to staff, your staff to their staff. Your staff was told by their staff it's above their pay grade. So, I'm not sure that you meeting with their staff is going to get you much more. Our request was that this elected body comment, meet with whatever you wish to do -- their elected body, because that's where their staff has kicked it and which is why we brought it up to you. Thank you.

Simison: Just -- just speaking for myself, if you can't get their staff to come, though, I just asked you all to think about the direction you get to take from the staff here at the city that you value and you trust and take that into consideration, depending on how hard charging you want to go, if you expect us to want to see real results from that standpoint. I do think that there are -- that this will -- this will take time and conversation. It's not going to be a letter and we are going to solve this, so -- and, honestly, I don't think they are going to stop designing things if they are designing things, no matter what our letter says. If it's on -- on projects. So, we will take whatever action you want. But we need to be informed before we just take action. Otherwise, we are just going to get there and they are going to say, well, we have talked our staff and they agree and it's their decision and so we need to at least understand what their staff is saying and why in order to have decent arguments to make, in my humble opinion. So, with that I will do whatever direction Council wants. Letter, joint meeting, et cetera, and we can follow up tomorrow if we want. But I think we should at least --

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yeah. Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Can we send them a letter asking them to cease design of these -- of these projects until we sit down and speak with them and we can schedule a meeting to -- to get to the bottom of this and come to an agreement and in that letter if we could ask that, you know, the decision makers are involved in the decision -- you know, the conversation that would help out, too.

Simison: Well, we can if we understand what our ask is. I would ask staff to at least provide that, if what they believe our ask would be doing to what projects when and for how long. So, that's -- it's just -- it's as we learn it's more complex.

Bernt: Sure. And it's a process. I get it.

Simison: Yeah. But I will look to Brian to provide that information of what he is aware of where else this is being designed and impacted and moving forward, so we have a better understanding about what our ask would entail.

McClure: Mr. Mayor, I know that this is currently a topic for Miranda on Eagle Road. The section that hasn't been built yet between Eagle and -- between Amity and Lake Hazel. I'm not aware of any other corridors currently under design for multi-use corridors. I could be wrong, but I'm not aware of any. But I can -- I can make sure Miranda follows up and understands any other potential opportunities where that may -- or issues where that may be coming up.

Simison: Thank you.

McClure: Mr. Mayor, just so I'm absolutely clear and potentially Miranda understands completely, but I'm not. So, you guys are looking for a letter with some staff suggestion, direction, as to how we could potentially move forward with next steps? Or are you looking for a letter that more specifically asks them to do or stop doing something or would you like to have someone above project team staff come speak to you about why they are doing what they are doing?

Simison: Yeah. I was going to say the answer is yes, Brian. I would ask -- Council President and I will discuss appropriate next steps tomorrow morning to figure out the best approach and timing.

McClure: Thank you.

Simison: All right. With that do I have a motion?

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I move that we adjourn the meeting.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.  
MEETING ADJOURNED AT 5:44 P.M.  
(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON

\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

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