

## **Meridian City Council Work Session**

**July 14, 2026.**

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 4:30 p.m. Tuesday, July 14, 2026, by Mayor Robert Simison.

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

Other Present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Garrett White, Brandon Frasier, Kris Blume and Dean Willis.

### **ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE**

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

Simison: Council, we will call the meeting to order. For the record is July 14th, 2026, at 4:30 p.m. We will begin this afternoon's work session with roll call attendance.

### **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

Simison: Next item up is adoption of the agenda.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: There are no changes to tonight's agenda. I move that we adopt the agenda as published.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Motion and a second to adopt the agenda. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the agenda is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

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

- 1. Aviation Subdivision No. 1 Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement (ESMT-2026-0148)**
- 2. Final Order for Windrow Subdivision No. 3, by Conger Group, located at the northeast corner of S. Linder Rd. and W. Amity Rd.**

Simison: Up next is the Consent Agenda.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: There are no changes to tonight's Consent Agenda. I move that we approve it as published, for the Mayor to sign and the Clerk to attest.

Little Roberts: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

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

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

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

#### **3. Parks & Recreation Non-Resident Fee Discussion**

Simison: So, we will move on to Department Reports, which is Item 3, for the Parks and Recreation non-resident fee discussion -- will tonight be presented by Mr. Garrett. White. Who I met your parents -- yes. It's -- they kind of like you. Go figure.

White: All right. Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, thanks for having me tonight. Like the Mayor said, here to talk about non-resident fees and a proposal. Really what I'm looking for tonight is just a thumbs up, head nod, am I going the right direction? Are we all kind of on the same page? Do we want these and so on. So, the reason why I'm here is about a year ago we were asked to -- as we were doing the FY-26 budget we were asked to get some more information about non-resident fees and the logistics behind it and if our software currently -- CivicRec or Rec1 -- has the ability to offer non-resident fees without a ton of staff time. So, with that I will jump right into this. If you guys have questions as we go, please, feel free to stop me, ask questions, happy to answer what I can or we can wait until the end. Either way. So, I presented this to our Commission a month or two ago and kind of got some feedback from them as well. All in all they were in favor of this, but one thing they wanted me to do is -- that when I changed my presentation to kind of talk about the definition to kind of define what non-resident fees are. So, that being said non-resident fees are a fair share fee for services like Parks and Recreation to increase cost for those living outside the city limits of Meridian for programs, shelter reservations, field reservations, facility use, kind of reflecting the additional contribution non-residents would pay towards city funded

amenities and facilities. So, that's kind of that. So, as we started getting into this, the first part of the research was -- is does our CivicRec or Rec1 software actually offer a program like this and have the capability of determining whether you are a resident or non-resident and it turns out it does. It's an integration called ArcGIS. It does cost an additional 1,500 dollars a year annually for that portion of the program or we will put it as a package with the CivicRec, which was reasonable. So, once we found out what the Rec1 capabilities were we kind of wanted to go through and look at, well, what were the numbers? What does this mean? How does this work? So, on my slide -- I don't know if -- can you guys see this on here or, Chris, can you bring that up for me? Sorry, I should have prep'd Chris before this to have this up and done, so --

Johnson: Jared is on his way down to check the audio to YouTube.

White: All right. I think we are good to go. Thanks, Chris, for doing that. I should have prep'd you before, but -- so, this is the slide I'm on right now and just kind of talking about kind of what our findings were and some of the research. Like I mentioned that CivicRec does have the capabilities of doing that. So, we wanted to kind of look at our numbers and the full year that we had at the time was FY-25 or the '25 year and we found that non-residents accounted for about 26 percent of all shelter reservations in 2025. The non-residents accounted for about 40 percent of all adult sports and adult senior programs and classes in 2025 and, then, we kind of looked at our summer camp, because it fills up so fast. We launch it and it fills up within about 15 minutes. Only three percent were non-residents for the youth summer camp. So, it's like -- we had about 900 kids, so three percent of 900 is not very many. But just wanted to throw that out there as well. So, with those numbers we kind of wanted to come up with a policy -- draft policy that you guys -- to give feedback on. Let me see if I can scroll down here.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Can I ask just a quick question?

White: Sure.

Whitlock: What's your confidence level in these numbers if you don't have GIS capabilities yet? Is this self-attestation?

White: Yeah. Mr. Mayor and Council -- Councilman Whitlock, we looked through our Rec1 software and it took some time, but we downloaded a report that basically said who was all registered and whatever address they had on their account we divvied out. So, as us going through and -- it took some time to get it, but out of all of them we kind of export it into Excel and, then, sort through Excel and stuff like that. So, those -- that's how we got those numbers based on their account address. If that makes sense. So, we feel it's pretty accurate, you know, so -- is there a room for error? Sure. But it's pretty close. So, with those numbers we kind of came up with -- with a -- a policy or a

proposed policy and -- and, basically, what it is, in short, is for shelters -- for non-resident shelter fees we would increase it 20 percent. For non-resident programs for adult and senior classes or community education classes we would increase at ten percent. So, we were proposing not to do anything with our youth. We think our youth are vital and it's a huge benefit to our youth to have these kinds of programs to maintain healthy active lifestyles. They play a vital role in our community. So, we wanted to not have non-resident fees for our youth programs and youth as they enter our facilities, because we want a safe and safe place for our kids to come and play and hang out; right? So, that's -- that's our proposal. Twenty percent for shelters. Twenty percent -- or ten percent for adult and senior programs, classes and those -- those -- those such things and, then, a 20 percent increase to our field reservations as well. A lot of our field reservations are youth. We don't have a report in CivicRec or Rec1 that will run our -- who reserved our fields, if that makes sense. So, once we have ArcGIS or the integration of that we will be able to run those reports to determine who is reserving them for youth or adult type of thing. So, that's what we are working on there. The facility day passes, this is for the pool and Home Court. Right now we currently have this program at Home Court. I still included this in the policy, so it's read that way. We don't have it at the pool. And another facility we don't have it as is the golf course; right? So, the golf course right now we kind of looked around -- if we were to implement something there we would be the only one in the Treasure Valley that has non-resident fees, which we -- we didn't like. We didn't want internally. And, then, ForeUP is the program we use at the golf course. It's a completely separate than our CivicRec or Rec1 software. So, there is a lot more that we would have to research and determine with that system. So, with those two reasons I haven't touched the golf course and I don't really necessarily need to or want to because of those reasons, but I'm here to get feedback and direction. So, that's why we don't have it integrated into this proposal at this point. Our adult sports program -- we currently have a resident, non-resident player fee system, so that's already set up and done. What we didn't have, because we just took on the senior wooden bat league, is a non-resident fee for them; right? So, it's a very minimal charge on that. It's about 7.50 added as a non-resident fee if we do the ten percent for that program for adult sports. So, that is the proposal in a nutshell. Pretty quick deal. So, let's talk about costs and what that would bring to us. Revenues as well. So, if we were to -- sorry, this computer is moving slow than fast on my end. So, if we were to implement this proposed proposal, this is kind of on the numbers of what it would be. So, in 2025 there was 2,490 reservations for our shelters. We went through and cut a lot of those out. We realized that 660 of them were non-residents. Using math equations here, based on our total shelter revenues, which was 285,574 dollars, divided by reservations, we found that the average shelter reservation was about \$114.69. With that we multiplied that by the 660 to kind of get our non-resident fee proposal and this is the easiest way we could calculate this. Then we applied the 20 percent increase, which is about 15,000 dollars roughly, just for the shelters. So, obviously, just two shelters would pay for the ArcGIS system of 1,500 bucks. Okay? Now, this is FY-2025 numbers; right? So, we did increase our shelter fees from 2025 to 2026. The 2026 numbers are going to be a little higher than this if we have the same numbers, if that makes sense, because we did increase our fees for our shelters last year. So, I hope that makes sense. The adult and senior programs, running the

numbers on that, if we did the non-resident fees proposal as is, ten percent, we would bring in about four -- a little over 4,000 dollars on that. The senior wooden bat league another 892 dollars on that. For a projected, if the 2025 numbers stay true, about almost 19,000 dollars in increased revenues by adding this system -- this non-resident fee policy. That doesn't account for staff time. I know there is going to be a little bit of staff time with Finance to help us go through some of this reporting and stuff like that and, then, internally, we are actually meeting tomorrow with Rec1, CivicRec, to determine what it looks like on our end and the public side and -- and what it's going to take staff time for us to implement this program into ArcGIS as well. So, staff numbers and staff time is still questionable, but we are finding that out right now. So, projected timeline if we were to implement this today, this is kind of the projected time we have in there. The one thing I didn't have on here was that, you know, we do review fees annually per your request. So, we will continue to look at this. If this proposal were to come true we would run the numbers next year, look at it, evaluate it again and see kind of where we are at and come back with you guys with some feedback and our update. So, that's not on the timeline, but we would do that, so -- with that I will stand for questions if there is any.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for Garrett?

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor. Garrett, great report. Thank you for sending it to us in advance. That's greatly appreciated. Just curious. So, how do our shelter reservations price wise compare? I'm really surprised that we have got that high a percentage of -- out of the area of non-resident.

White: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Little Roberts, good question. If -- when we did the fees last year, if I remember correctly, we were in the average when it came to the shelter reservations. We weren't the lowest shelters. We weren't the highest shelters. Right in the middle when it comes to price point. We take a lot of pride in our parks. We think our parks are pretty cool and pretty nice and we have great amenities at our parks. So, there is some of that factored into, but we did -- if I remember correctly we are right in the middle. We are not highest. We weren't the lowest. But we are kind of in the middle, but kind of the upper middle if that makes sense in price. So, does that answer that question?

Little Roberts: It does. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Just to comment regarding the golf. I think you are spot on on not touching that. A few years ago we brought that discussion up and all the resident golfers were unhappy at the thought of that, too, because they all play -- everybody

plays all over the valley and didn't want to see -- they don't want to go to Warm Springs and get a non-resident and, then, have their buddy that is normally at Warm Springs come here and be a non-resident. So, I think you are spot on with leaving that one alone.

White: Thanks.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Garrett, thanks for this and I actually really appreciate the thought about the kids element. That's not something I initially had thought about and I think that makes a lot of sense. I do have a couple of questions, though, for you. If we were to take this step has the department -- did the Commission talk about what is an acceptable level of loss -- essentially people who maybe are not going to rent from us -- rent a shelter from us, are not going to participate in -- in something in the city of Meridian because we implement that fee and do we have a -- anticipated number, a acceptable number? Is that something you guys have considered?

White: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, we -- we -- we have thought about that internally. It didn't come up when it came with our commission and stuff like that in that discussion, although there is a small chance of that. That's why we kind of wanted to start with a 20 percent and see where we are at, reevaluate it. If our numbers are way down because of that. At that point we would come back to you guys and say, hey, I mean is this okay with you guys or do you want to lower it to ten percent, 20 percent, do we need to increase it to 30? You know, that type of thing. Have that discussion. But it necessarily hasn't came up in particular with -- other than internally us worrying about that.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, if I may follow up. Got a couple more.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Garrett, how -- how will the software work in terms of -- how much lead time does somebody have to be, quote, unquote, a resident before the software is aware that they live in our community? Somebody moves here or they move from, you know, Boise, they move to a new neighborhood, how quickly is the software updating? I assume if it's with our GIS it's probably very quickly after we grant approvals and -- and occupancy and whatnot, but I don't -- I don't know that for sure.

White: Yeah. Great question. So, that can be one of our questions tomorrow, but the way we understand it is once you create your account and you put your address in and it's a -- and we work with our IT, GIS, that's the component, too. We get all of our addresses and input it into the system. It should be immediate once you create your

account, your address gets verified, it might take a minute or two for it to upload and get into the system and, then, it's ready to go.

Cavener: Okay.

White: So, it's almost immediate. So, there is no wait period to become a resident per se, if that makes sense.

Cavener: Yeah, it does.

White: Yeah.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, maybe, then, for a -- for a question tomorrow with the vendor, is there also an ability to implement I guess like a -- an amount to be the ArcGIS fee? I guess the way I look at it is that the increase is to offset, you know, the investment that the taxpayers make that -- an out of resident does. But there is -- because of the added admin fee my assumption would be is that non-resident should be on the hook for covering that as well and I don't know if that's something the software supports and, you know, a quick look at the math of users, you know, you can implement a two dollar, \$2.50 GIS fee that would pay for the software tool. So, again, the taxpayers aren't on the hook for that. So, if that's something that is doable and implementable I'm -- I'm really interested in making sure that we are adding that as well.

White: Yeah. Great feedback. I consider that part of the 20 percent that would be charging, but if -- I mean that's -- that's why in here when I put the numbers there it was, you know, with the cost of the program we would still make about 18 to 20 thousand dollars. So, that's kind of where I added it. But if we needed to increase it or whatever we can. We can look at doing that.

Cavener: Okay.

White: We can -- we can add -- add on fees here and there. I just don't know if the ArcGIS will allow us to do another add on. So, that is a question I will ask tomorrow.

Cavener: And, Mayor, just maybe one more final one.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I think the vast majority of people in the valley are honest people and recognize this. How do you guys plan to audit and make sure that, you know, neighbors aren't registering each other? You know, we are using grandma's address. Again, I recognize you are not going to be able to audit around all bad behavior, but I assume that's also something that you guys have talked about internally is how can we make sure that -- people are verifying, that people are using the right address?

White: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, that's a great question. We -- we know this is not bulletproof per se; right? So, that's the question we are going to ask them tomorrow. But the reality of it is, too, we can always just run, you know, and see how many -- if there is 18 people living under the same address, well, yeah, you know, that's a big house; right? So, we would have to review that and kind of see how we want to deal with that and if ArcGIS has a system to where they allow like ten people at a certain address, we don't know that yet, but that's a great question. We have thought about that internally and the reality of it is if you live in Meridian and I don't, hey, Luke, will you reserve this for me, there is going to be some of that; right? So, that we necessarily can't catch. But that's a great question that we -- we need more information on.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you. Thank you, Garrett. I really appreciate the Parks Department following up on this and researching it. I really think it's a matter of fairness. You know, our taxpayers have paid into a lot of parks infrastructure that we all benefit from and, then, other non-residents benefit from and I think it's more than fair for them to help pay their fair share. I do appreciate some of the nuance, though, around the golf course. That's not really practiced in the market, so I understand that and also I think the kids I understand that as well. One piece where I'm just interested to see how it would play out would be like Home Court and the pool and especially the pool, because we have one facility for a city of -- I think we are probably close to, if not over 150,000 people and that to me is one area where I have more sensitivity to our residents, because I feel like if our pool ever reaches a point that it's so overflowing that we can't even meet the demand from our residents, it seems very fair to try to use that pricing differential to -- to prioritize our residents. So, I just -- I guess my comment is I really appreciate it. I know some of the increases are a little bit of a guess and we don't really know how it would play out, so I think it's a pilot and I'm very supportive of -- of pursuing it and asking those questions of the vendor. But I'm just very appreciative of you guys looking at it, because I think, you know, with the technology it's great that we have this ability.

White: Yeah. Thank you.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Garrett, I think you have done a great job and I think this is a long time coming that we do something like this. It's already been stated, you know, we need to come up with some way that's fundamentally fair for our residents not to hoof a hundred percent of the bill when so many people are using our parks. You know, we pride ourselves on the level of parks that we have and services we provide. I'm okay with the youth getting the free pass. I think that's great. You know, the one thing we got to remember that we

are not able to capture here is just the amount of people that just use our parks. With the numbers you are bringing forward on just -- on the programs, I think the number of people that don't live in our city that use our parks is going to be almost an uncapturable number. So, I'm fully supportive of this. I think this is a great start. I'm actually leaning towards this may not be enough to have a future number where we try to do some sort of cost recovery to benefit our citizens and residents who pay for our park services. So, that it's not all on their shoulders for everyone else in the valley who comes and uses our parks. So, great job.

White: Thank you.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Garrett, is the -- is the Parks Department sort of generally concerned about non-residents participating in our programs and kind of squeezing out Meridianites from being able to use it, if that's the right word? Just -- is that -- is that something you are concerned about at all or does it seem like everything's working, we have capacity, you are not concerned.

White: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Taylor, we have zero concern with that. Right now we -- we have some capacity in our programs -- we are building new programs all the time. We are always welcome type of thing. So, right now we are not necessarily worried about that with our current facilities and our current programs. We are -- yeah. We are bringing this forward, because we were asked and -- yeah.

Taylor: Okay. Thank you. Oh. And one more quick question. You know, as this program goes along -- and I do think it's fair in some sense that, you know, people of Meridian pay property taxes to help pay for parks and I have no problem, really, with charging a higher fee for non-residents to use it. Would it be your goal as you go along -- let's say if the cost for the service -- software service goes up, would you just be -- would you be always trying to recapture the cost by maybe having to adjust the fees on non-residents? Would that be sort of the plan to -- to pay for any increased costs or let's say if we bring in a lot more revenue would you look at a way to use it to offset other costs? You know, let's say maintenance possibly in some of our facilities?

White: Very well could. I think what we would do is bring the information back to you guys and ask us -- or ask you guys for your feedback and, you know, direction on that. What we do -- what we would do is, you know, is the 20 percent or ten percent enough type of thing. Is -- we would start running how often are our -- or our shelters booked for example; right? And if there is a hundred percent capacity are booked all the time and we review it and say, oh, well, 50 percent -- I'm grabbing numbers now. Fifty percent are non-residents, well, maybe we need to increase the non-resident, because of the supply and demand type of thing. So, those are the things we want to review every year and so on and to kind of Councilman Overton's comment on is ten or 20 percent

enough, we don't know yet. We kind of want to dip our toe in that pool a little bit to kind of see where we are at and kind of learn the system and as we go through and that's why we proposed a ten or 20. But I think we would use the data and come back with you guys and say what -- what would you propose? Here is our proposal. Get feedback. Kind of like what I'm doing now, you know. So, I think -- I hope that answers your question, you know, so --

Simison: And maybe just, you know, the broader concept. I don't know how many people here have tried to go book at a state park here in Idaho recently, but it's very difficult and a large portion of that is, you know, we are very -- we like our state parks are very attractive destination and the one thing we -- this does not take into consideration and this could be in the future -- is, you know, we open up to Meridian residents first a certain date and, then, you have a nonresident date secondary. If we are concerned -- want to get concerned about our Meridian residents being squeezed out from participating in certain activities or things, so there is other tools that we can look at and I think that, you know, this basic conversation -- it's been a good conversation, but, you know, is this a revenue recapturing effort or is this a prioritization of Meridian residents to access to the facilities? The answer can be yes. But, you know, is one more important than the other? I think that maybe is a future conversation, but this is a good start to see what impact, if any, this has on either revenue shelter or -- instead of person saying I'm just going to do it, grandma is the one that is doing the rental and it doesn't produce any more revenue for us and our numbers remain the same, then, I think people that just tells us people found a different way to do it if that's the case. But it's a good way to start.

White: Yeah.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Just a comment or an observation. I -- I was thinking, too, how do we capture that additional 1,500 and, then, as I'm looking at this I'm realizing if the total is 19,000 that we get, we are not only capturing that 1,500 we are capturing the 8,000 that we started with. So, potentially those non-residents could be paying for the entire system. I would be a little hesitant to do a non-resident fee and, then, have another \$2.50 add on. It would just be my preference to cover it once.

White: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, Councilman Whitlock, that's kind of what we thought internally. But, you know, we are open to feedback and, you know --

Whitlock: I'm okay nickeling -- I don't want to nickel and dime, so --

White: Okay. Well, thank you for your feedback and the good comments so --

Simison: Okay. Thank you. Anything else, Council? All right. Thank you, Garrett.

White: Appreciate it.

#### **EXECUTIVE SESSION [Action Item]**

- 4. Per Idaho Code section 74-206A(1)(a): Deliberating on a labor contract offer or to formulate a counteroffer and Idaho Code 74-206(1)(c): To acquire an interest in real property not owned by a public agency**

Simison: Okay. With that we will move on to Item 4.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I move that we move into Executive Session per Idaho Code Section 74-206(a), subsection (1)(a) and 74-206, subsection (1)(c).

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to go into Executive Session. Do I have any discussion? If not, Clerk call the roll.

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

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

**MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.**

**EXECUTIVE SESSION: (4:57 p.m. to 6:03 p.m.)**

Simison: Council, do I have a motion?

Overton: Mr. Mayor, I move that we come out of Executive Session.

Whitlock: Second.

Simison: Motion and second come out of Executive Session. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. We are out of Executive Session.

**MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.**

Simison: Do I have another motion?

Overton: Mr. Mayor, I move that we adjourn the work session.

Little Roberts: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 6:03 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

|                               |                        |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| _____<br>MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON | _____<br>DATE APPROVED |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|

ATTEST:

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