

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:05 p.m. Tuesday, April 14, 2026, by Council President John Overton.

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

Members Absent: Robert Simison.

Other Present: Tina Lomeli, Bill Nary, Bill Parsons, Nick Napoli, Dave Miles, Warren Stewart, Chris McGilvery, Steve Taulbee 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
_____ Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Overton: Good evening, Council. The meeting will come to order. For the record it's April 14th, 2026, at 6:05 p.m. and we will begin this evening's regular meeting with roll call attendance. Madam Clerk.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Overton: If you would, please, all rise and join us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Overton: For tonight's community invocation we have Sandra Ramirez.

Ramirez: Well, good evening, Members of the Council. It is a privilege and an honor to stand before you as a minister of Christian Faith Center, but also as an employee here at the City of Meridian and so with that I would just like to open this up in prayer. Father, we come before you, Lord God, and I just thank you, God, for the opportunity, Lord. I thank you, Lord, for each one of these council members and our mayor, Father, for the leadership, Father God, that you have appointed, Father, over this City of Meridian, Father God. I pray, God, that every single decision that they make Lord God, is -- is founded on you based on you, God, that there is unity amongst this council, Father, and, Lord, may their leadership, Father, bring honor and glory to you. May you bless all of the first responders, Lord, that represent the city here in Meridian, Lord God. Every employee, Father, would you bless them. And, Father, may we bring you honor and glory and we say all of this in Jesus' name, amen. Thank you so much.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Overton: Thank you, Sandra. Next up is adoption of the agenda.

Little Roberts: Mr. President, I move we adopt the agenda with the removal of No. 5.

Whitlock: Second.

Overton: We have a motion and a second to adopt the agenda removing Item No. 5 from the Consent Agenda. Is there any other discussion? If not, all signify the approval by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. The agenda is approved.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

PROCLAMATIONS

1. Month of the Military Child Proclamation

Overton: Next up is a proclamation. I will step down to the microphone below. Julie, would you join me up here. Tonight's proclamation is for our children and youth of military members. From the Office of the Mayor. Whereas April is the Month of the Military Child and is an opportunity to recognize military children for their courage, personal sacrifices and resilient spirit and whereas the strength of our armed forces come not just from those who wear the uniform, but from the families who also serve on behalf of our country and whereas military children continue to make significant contributions to family and community as they endure prolonged and repeated absences of one or both parents and adjust to families moving on an average of two to three years and changing schools and whereas these children and youth are a source of pride and honor to us all and it is only fitting that we take time to recognize their contributions and celebrate their spirit and whereas the Month of the Military Child will recognize military children serve to and citizens of Meridian will be afforded the opportunity to dawn the color purple every Friday in April in support of these children. Therefore, I, John Overton, President of Meridian City Council, on behalf of Mayor Robert E. Simison, hereby proclaim April 2026 as Month of the Military Child in the city Meridian and encourage all residents of our community and communities across the country to observe the month for military kids and to wear or display purple to honor and support and thank our military children.

Villagomez: Good evening, everyone. My name is Julia. I am the Idaho National Guard Child and Youth Lead Coordinator out in Gowen Field. I just wanted to thank the City of Meridian for recognizing April as Month of the Military Child. I personally am not a service member, but I have worked in youth development and specifically with military audiences, so getting to see how resilient and how the youth have been able to adapt through adversities is really amazing. We would like to thank you guys again from the program and also to those service members who may currently be deployed and their

children having to navigate how to overcome that and that we hope that their family members come back safe.

Overton: And, Julia, one -- one quick comment. The Mayor is out of town, so I have the opportunity to give this proclamation tonight and I couldn't be happier, because my oldest son's been serving for 22 years and is currently sitting on an aircraft carrier -- can't tell you where. There is a lot of them. But he has been deployed now three deployments in a row and my young granddaughter is sitting in Colorado. So, it's -- it's hard on the families and I watch it happen all the time. So, I'm so glad that this is happening and this is occurring. So, please, join me in a photo.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND RECOGNITION

Overton: Council, that brings us to any announcements or recognitions.

Little Roberts: Mr. President, kind of the last minute here, but I just wanted to make sure that everyone realized that Captain Leslie has announced his retirement and the 23rd is the last day and so just wanted to -- on the record, since I could not do it when he was here last time, our deep appreciation for his service. So, Chris, you have to tell him that this was done from the dais and it's probably a good thing that he is not here or I would be in tears. So, thank you for indulging me.

Overton: Well said. Any other announcements or recognitions?

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

- 2. Adero Park Subdivision No. 2 Sanitary Sewer Easement No. 3 (ESMT-2026-0037)**
- 3. Adero Park Subdivision No. 2 Sanitary Sewer Easement No.5 (ESMT-2026-0039)**
- 4. Adero Park Subdivision No. 2 Sanitary Sewer Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2026-0076)**
- 6. Modena Water Meter Easement (ESMT-2026-0080)**
- 7. Final Order for Newkirk Subdivision No. 2 (FP-2026-0003) by Laren Bailey, Conger Group, located at the corner of N. San Marco Way and N. Zimmerman Way.**
- 8. Final Plat for Apex Zenith Subdivision No. 1 (FP-2026-0006) by Brighton Corporation, located at the southeast corner of Meridian Rd. and Lake Hazel Rd.**

9. **CCTV Camera Agreement between Ada County Highway District (ACHD) and Meridian Police Department (MPD)**
10. **Fields District Well Operations and Cost Sharing Agreement Between Owyhee Holdings, LLC; Endurance Holdings, LLC; and the City of Meridian**
11. **Resolution 26-2582: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Meridian, Adopting the City of Meridian Historic Preservation Plan; and providing an Effective Date**
12. **Resolution No. 26-2583: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Meridian Adding City of Meridian Standard Operating Policy 9.15, Regarding Authorized Signatures; and Providing an Effective Date**

Overton: If not, brings us to tonight's Consent Agenda.

Little Roberts: Mr. President?

Overton: Council Member Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: I move we approve the Consent Agenda, again, with No. -- Item No. 5 having been removed at this point.

Whitlock: Second.

Overton: Consent Agenda has been approved and seconded. Is there any discussion?

Little Roberts: Oh. And amendment, sir. For the Council President to sign and the Clerk to attest.

Whitlock: Second.

Overton: Second agrees. If there is no further discussion, all in favor say aye? Opposed nay. The ayes have it. The Consent Agenda is approved.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

Overton: There are no items moved from the Consent Agenda to be heard tonight.

PUBLIC FORUM

Overton: Madam Clerk, was there anything on the Public Forum?

Lomeli: Thank you, Councilman Overton. No one has signed up.

DEPARTMENT REPORTS [ACTION ITEM]

13. County-wide Impact Fee Update

Overton: Okay. Thank you. Brings us to our Department Reports, Item 13, countywide impact fee update and we have staff Kurt delivering the message tonight.

Starman: Good evening, Council President Overton and Members of Council. Thank you for a few minutes to chat with you about countywide development impact fees. So, this is a topic that you are well familiar with. It's been a few months since we discussed it, but we had several conversations in 2025 and I will just kind of refresh the -- for the Council's benefit -- benefit, but for the audience as well, just kind of briefly recap that. But I think Mayor Simison and the Mayor's office thought it would be a good idea to update the Council on where that stands and perhaps give some additional direction from the Council this evening as to next steps. So, that's where we will kind of go. I will kind of recap where we have been, a snapshot of where -- where we are now, meaning both Meridian, but also our fellow cities and what they have done or not done at this point in time and, then, perhaps talk about next steps and timing and things of that nature. So, as a reminder -- actually, the county when they first came to us was looking at countywide development impact fees in four categories, one of which pertained to the sheriff's office and that was really only for the unincorporated area and I think it was Mayor Simison actually made the recommendation some time ago that that's really within the county's purview today and, you know, that had suggested they may want to push forward that on their own, since they were able to do so and the county did, so to their credit the county has adopted it's sheriff impact fee, which is applicable only in the unincorporated parts of the county, not within the incorporated cities. So, that leaves three other categories, the coroner fee, the emergency medical services or EMS fee and the jail fee and so just by way of reminder in terms of dollar amounts, the -- similar to the city's impact fee program, it differs based upon whether we are talking about single family homes or commercial development or other categories of development. But kind of easy way we often talk about is, well, what is the -- the cost per single family residence is kind of a typical metric. So, just by way of reminder, the county analysis that you have seen and we will talk about more in a moment. The coroner fee was proposed on a countywide level at 59 dollars per single family home. The EMS fee was calculated at 175 dollars per single family home and, then, the jail impact fee was at 516 dollars per single family home and when the Council -- when you first -- let me back up and say this is sort of been a start and stop process for the county. They have actually been at this for about -- I would say three years or perhaps a little bit longer and they started and we had some discussions and they paused and, then, they -- that sort of went to the back burner for a while and now they came back again sort of in earnest in 2025 and the -- so, the City Council had a couple conversations about this topic in the summer of 2025 and, then, later at the end of last calendar year you all adopted the capital improvement plans, as well as amended the city's comprehensive plan to incorporate the -- the county's impact fee studies and the fees that are attached to

those. We didn't approve the fees, just the studies at that point in time. So, when you discussed this as a Council back in the summer of June -- I think to be more precise in June of 2025 we outlined and talked about a four -- have a four part implementation plan. One of the problems or challenges is probably a better word is that under the county's proposal it requires city cooperation -- all of the incorporated cities, as well as the county need to cooperate and adopt local ordinances to put these fees in place. So, to use that -- that adage, sometimes that's like herding cats and so it can be difficult and so at the point -- actually Meridian -- we were one of the first cities to say, yes, we want to be good partners with the county and we are interested in working with you and we do think that growth ought to pay for growth and so we had a, you know, welcoming message from the get go. But we also recognize that other cities need to come to the table and this needs to be a level playing field and everybody needs to participate. So, we developed -- I guess it was simplistic -- a four step -- or four part implementation plan and we have finished the first couple and we are at step three now, but just as by way of reminder we have entered into intergovernment -- pardon me -- intergovernmental agreements with the county and the EMS district. You might recall those are two separate legal entities. The county, of course, is what we are familiar with and, then, for EMS that is -- from a legal perspective is an entity, it stands on its own, so we have an agreement with the EMS district and we have a -- an agreement with the county itself for a total of two. We entered into those -- I will call them a limited intergovernmental agreement that basically said here is what we are prepared to do today. We are going to designate the county advisory committee as the advisory committee for this purpose. We are going to agree to -- to work with you on the adoption of the CIPs and on an amendment to our Comprehensive Plan and so we put all that in writing and enter into a contractual obligation between the county and the city and the EMS district and the city. We subsequently, throughout -- from that time going forward, multiple steps, including public hearings in front of the Planning and Zoning Commission and the City Council and public testimony, but after going through that process required by state law, the City Council did adopt the capital improvement plans for two of the three proposed fee categories. We adopted a CIP for the EMS CIP and we adopted the jail CIP. You will recall -- and I'm going to talk about this a little bit more later in my presentation, but you will recall discussions about the coroner's office and whether that was provided for within state law and there is some ambiguity there. So, the City Council made the decision that we were not prepared yet to adopt the CIP and we had asked the county to seek clarification from the legislature, which they attempted to do during this last session and I will talk more about that in a few minutes. So, we adopted two of the -- two of the three CIPs and, then, we also subsequently amended our Comprehensive Plan as required by state statute and so that's all been accomplished. So, we are, essentially, at -- I will call it step three, which is we said we are going to pause once we finish those tasks and we are going to wait for other cities to catch up with us and so we all want to sort of be on the same -- same place and same playing field and other cities had not quite done as much as -- as that point in time. So, we will talk about that tonight as well. If we get beyond that point -- and, again, for future discussion this evening, the next steps should we decide to proceed, we have -- we said that -- contractually that if we get to that point we would conduct the public hearings necessary to consider the impact fees and that also requires successor

agreements with the county and the EMS district that would replace the initial or original agreements and maybe more complete and talk about fee collection and identification and things of that nature. And, then, also we would need to adopt ordinances that would implement the actual fees and allow the city to collect those fees on behalf of the county essentially. So, that was a game plan or implementation plan that the City Council agreed to back in June and, then, we have been working doing our part and consummated with the adoption of the CIPs and amendment of the Comprehensive Plan in late 2025, about four months ago. So, I will give you a quick status report on where other cities stand and we are sort of all back to this herding cats. It's kind of -- it's going to sound a lot like that. So, that's where we are at. We are -- we are herding cats. And so I'm going to take these out of -- these are in alphabetical order. I'm going to take them a little bit out of order just to kind of put them in categories of, you know, who has made the most progress, who is in between and, then, you know, those that have not made as much progress. So, I will start with both Eagle and Star. My understanding from multiple sources, including from the county, from their chief administrative officer, is that both Eagle and Star have completed the process in its totality and are in the -- are now, after the first of this year, after January 1 of 2026, are now collecting all fees, including the coroner fee, are collecting those fees on behalf of the county and so they have adopted the -- the fees by ordinance. They have agreements with the county. They are collecting the fee on behalf of the county and they are transmitting that revenue periodically to the county and, then, doing the accounting that's behind that. So, again, that is Star and Eagle. The next category is sort of where we are sort of described as maybe halfway -- halfway complete or maybe a smidge more in some cases and that -- and that category is Garden City and Kuna. So, Garden City went as far as -- they actually introduced the necessary ordinances for first reading and they did that I think back in January and, then, I -- I really can't speak to kind of the inner workings of what the thought process was, but they had tabled that item since that time, so they have not pursued it. My understanding they are having some questions now about the coroner fee as well and I think they may have some questions or trying to coordinate better where maybe cities implement this more, you know, together at close in time as opposed to being separated -- you know, more separated in time. So, I don't want -- I really don't have the inside information as to why that has stalled, but Garden City has prepared ordinances, introduced for first reading, they have not proceeded with the second or third reading. They have not adopted the fees and they are gathering additional information. So, I talk with their city attorney fairly frequently and he is still doing some research on things, like the coroner's office and things of that nature. Kuna is in a way not quite as far along as Garden City, but, then, on the other hand they have made good progress. So, in the case of Kuna they were actually going -- they had scheduled a public hearing for earlier this month to consider and that no guarantee they would adopt, but to consider the ordinances and agreements necessary to proceed with the countywide impact fees in Kuna. That public hearing -- there was some discussion still occurring between the city attorney for Kuna and -- and county council and so that was not resolved prior to the hearing and, then, was -- therefore, that hearing was -- I don't know if it was continued or if it was just vacated. It will be rescheduled, but one of the two -- has not yet occurred. My understanding is it may occur before the end of April, but I haven't seen the date yet. In

the case of Kuna, I will note that Kuna had -- and their attorney -- they have a contract counsel. But Kuna has the same concern that you all had and that some others have relative to the coroner's fees. So, Kuna does not intend to adopt the coroner's fee. They are not convinced that it's -- that state law allows for that and so Kuna does not intend to adopt the coroner fee at this point in time, but are receptive -- or at least considering the jail fee and the EMS fee and, then, lastly on the group here is Boise City. So, Boise City -- they did have a joint meeting between the Boise City Council and County Commissioners earlier this year. I want to say it -- I want to say it was February, but plus or minus, but it's been a few weeks ago now. But they did have a joint hearing. I watched the video of an hour discussion. They were actually asking some very high level questions in a sense of just really -- the Boise City Council really asking some fundamental questions. So, my sense is they haven't done a lot of spade work quite yet. They are -- at the end of that meeting. There was an interest amongst -- so, there was a stated interest amongst the party to continue to collaborate. I did talk with the county representative late last week and nothing of substance has occurred yet, but -- so, with the case of Boise City they probably have done -- have not made a lot of progress in the sense that they haven't considered the CIPs in any, you know, formal way. They have not entered into agreements and really have not done a lot of the kind of the initial work that -- that you all have done already and some of the research and questions that you have already asked and we have answered to the best we can. So -- so, I guess a recap real quick. We have -- Eagle and Star have implemented and are collecting. We have Garden City and Kuna that are making progress, but not to the finish line. And we have Boise City who is still kind of in the -- maybe not in the starting blocks, but not far from the starting blocks either. So, there -- they have some work to do on their end. With regards to coroner fee, I mentioned that a few times now. So, that was a topic of interest to the Council. You recall the issue is a state law. You know, impact fees can be used for certain categories of expenses for capital projects or facilities and one of which is public safety facilities and so clearly -- and there is some examples given in the definition of what that means and it talks about police and fire and things of that nature. There is no reference to coroners or coroner facilities either and so when we had -- when you all had your discussion back in June of last year we talked with the county that that's uncomfortable for us. This would be the first -- the first county wide impact fee program that I'm aware of in Idaho. So, when you are on the cutting edge you would like to be a little bit more cautious and be judicious. We weren't convinced that the language covers the coroner's office and even that was the smallest of the three fees provided. So, the county had made a commitment to pursue legislation this session in 2026 to seek clarification and I was told -- and I have every reason to -- to believe this is true and accurate -- is that the county did draft language, which is fairly simplistic or simple, did approach at least one potential author and had some interest, but, then, that author declined to advance the legislation -- or introduce the legislation and they were not able to find a different author, so -- or legislator to carry that bill. So, long story short is that -- that issue has not changed. There was no legislation introduced this past session. It's now concluded and so the county has indicated they will take a look again in 2027, but they have also acknowledged that they -- for that reason they were not able to resolve our concern -- or question and, as I mentioned, Kuna and perhaps others like Boise will have similar concerns. So, my

understanding is the county -- I have been told that the county is willing to just to postpone that idea, that fee altogether until the issue is resolved. They don't want to try to force the issue or -- if it hasn't -- if they haven't been able to get clarification. So, I think as we have our conversation on a going forward basis we are going to be focused on the jail fee and on the EMS fee and we will continue -- I think that would be the Council's desire to continue to table the coroner fee until there is additional clarity around that topic. Other legislation I did want to talk about that did pass out of this past session in 2026 and was signed by the governor recently was House Bill 766 and just by way of introduction to that, you may recall from your discussions in 2025 we all -- you all -- I shouldn't put myself in that category. You all as the decision makers talked about that you want to be supportive of the county and be a good partner and we do believe as -- as a city that growth ought to pay for growth. But there was also -- there was sort of a lament that why can't we just do this. It's so convoluted. It's so difficult. Why can't we do this more like the ACHD model where ACHD adopts its own ordinance. It does all the heavy lifting. The city collect -- by contract we collect the fee as a courtesy to ACHD and redistribute the revenue, but we don't get into the weeds as we are required to do in this instance. We don't adopt ordinances, we don't adopt CIPs, we don't change our Comprehensive Plan. And you remember the answer to that was there is a constitutional prohibition that ascension has been interpreted this way by the courts is that county ordinances have no force or effect within incorporated cities and vice-versa. So, city ordinances have no force or effect within the unincorporated county. ACHD is not a city, nor is it a county. It falls as a district and actually it's not encumbered by that provision. The House -- or excuse me. The legislature passed House Bill 766 this year that sort of did the ACHD model for fire districts -- rural fire districts and for ambulance districts, which is the Ada County EMS District essentially and says -- I'm simplifying greatly here, but essentially -- so it gives them the ACHD wand that says you can do an ordinance and you can adopt your own and so really -- so, I did talk with the county -- my county colleagues about that and that -- you know, that's how I read this legislation is you could do the ACHD model and adopt your own ordinance. You could be done with it in one fell swoop and you are there and we would be happy to talk with you about an agreement to collect that fee at the building permit stage and, you know, collect an account and provide that revenue to you. The response I had from, you know, my counterparts at the county was they preferred to stay with the -- the -- the model we have been talking about. I think for a couple reasons. One is -- I'm trying to do my best to speak to their issues. One is that they are -- they are well into this process and they have some cities that have already agreed to do it this way and are doing it this way and so I think they are reluctant to change course for that. They are halfway there. Not quite there yet. But -- so I think they are reluctant to revisit that issue and kind of do it a whole different way, just -- they are far into the process with all the cities and, then, in the case of Star and Eagle they have actually adopted the fee and are collecting as we speak. So, there is that issue. And, then, their other point is that regardless if they could adopt their own program or not via ordinance, there is no mechanism for collection. So, they don't have a tool, because they are not the ones issuing building permits -- just like ACHD, quite frankly. So, they don't have a tool -- a good tool for collection, because they are not there when the building permit is issued or other points in the development process where it makes sense to collect an impact fee and so the

point is they would need agreements with all the cities regardless and so, you know, if they stick with the model, that they have chosen it still gets us to the same spot and they are -- they have already made progress with many cities down that path, so -- and whether that resonates with you all we can talk more about that later if you have questions and so forth or we can have the county comment more. But I do think that -- just for ease of description that ACHD model is available now for the EMS district. So, in terms of future steps -- I will just recap very quickly. We talked about that four -- four part implementation plan that we would have interim agreements. We adopted the CIP. We amended our Comprehensive Plan. We are pausing until other cities catch up and we are more closer in time and, then, we said we are going to pause. So, that's where we are at today. And so I think for -- I know that Mayor Simison, unfortunately, was not able to be here, but just some discussions that he and Bill Nary and I had, I think, you know, the Mayor is feeling -- he wants to be a good partner, as you all as well, wants to be a good partner with the county, does not want to see this issue languish, does -- does agree with the language. Does not -- and does agree that, you know, growth should pay for itself in impact fees if they are thoughtful and they are well justified they make sense and they serve an important purpose as we grow as a community throughout the entire valley and certainly growth has countywide impacts. So, I know the Mayor is receptive to being a good partner and would like to see this move forward, But we may not be -- may or not -- may or may not be there. So, the thought was it would be good to kind of update you all. Here is where we are at. This is -- this is a staff report. How do you feel about this? And, you know, what -- what does our next steps look like? So, the two obvious ones are number one and number two -- oh. I'm sorry. I skipped ahead. Let me -- let me finish that thought and I will come back to my screen here in a second. So, the question is, you know, how do we go about that? We can sort of stay the course. We can accelerate our process knowing that we -- we would, finish a little earlier than others. So, give that some thoughts. So, I jumped ahead. Let me go back to the screen. But in terms of future steps that I talked about, we have to negotiate new agreements, draft -- all this takes time and effort. So, it's a matter of, you know, putting pen to paper, number one. Secondly, is reaching agreement between the city and the county and as things go back and forth it takes time. So, all this stuff takes -- you know, it doesn't happen in a week, it will take weeks plural and perhaps longer. So, you just -- you know, there is a process involved here. But we need to negotiate new interagency agreements that would replace the existing interim agreements. These would be the more complete agreements, that would talk about how everything works, including, you know, collection and protest and, you know, if we are challenged, identification, who takes the lead on litigation, things of that nature. So, lots of -- lot more detail than what we have in our current interim agreements. We would need to draft the ordinances that are required for the jail fee and the EMS fee. We are required by state law to, you know, published and -- notice and publish and, then, hold -- conduct public hearings on those fees and they would have to adopt those agreements and the necessary ordinances as well. So, all that -- all that takes time, of course, and so that is -- even if we started tomorrow, you know, we are not going to be back in front of you for quite some time. So, it takes a while to get that -- get all that together. So, that's part of the equation as well in terms of our next steps and when do we take action. This is the slide I was talking about prematurely. So, you know, they --

they are kind of fundamental choices or we can stick with the implementation plan that we have outlined, which, you know, the county has accepted this point and they understand that -- our rationale about, you know, basically the Council was interested in a level playing field. We don't want to be, you know, one of the first out of the chute and collect the fee and others ultimately decide not to participate. That puts us in an odd spot. It's an unlevel playing field for our property owners and developers. So, that's -- that's something to consider. So, I think the county understands that and they are prepared to say that's -- if we want to be sort of the last or one of the last to officially approve and they understand that. I'm sure they would love for us to move quicker, but they understand our -- what we are trying to accomplish as well. Secondly, we can accelerate our process knowing that we have a couple other cities that have done so already, Star and Eagle in particular, and others that are somewhere in between. We can accelerate our process. It's all those steps I just talked about a moment ago that will take time and effort and so even if we started that sooner rather than later it will take some time to complete, but we can certainly do that. The two cautions I guess I would just -- you know, just in -- for an -- in the interest in complete disclosure, so you can make good, informed decisions, you know, one is -- I guess in terms of pitfalls one is -- or potential pitfalls. One is the unequal playing field. So, to the extent we adopt before others and others don't adopt timely, then, we have -- you know, we are collecting fees others are not. It's short of an unlevel playing field situation and that's a policy issue that you all can -- that's -- you know, as decision makers, as council members, you know, that's within your purview to decide. The one that has some legal consequences I think is -- I -- I would have some concerns to the extent we adopt the -- the fees -- jail and EMS fees -- let's say -- just say magically today and, then, one or more of the cities don't adopt ever and just decide not to participate and I won't name -- won't name a name here, but just a city -- one or more of the bigger cities let's say -- decide not to participate. In my opinion that puts the validity of the -- the fee into question, because the study was based upon looking at the county as totality that was a service area. The math was all done on the county as totality. All cities participate. To the extent one or two of the large cities don't participate, in my opinion, that -- that analysis is no longer valid. You need to go back and redo the analysis, redo your calculations. The numbers will likely change. And so we may find ourselves -- you could find yourself, you know, we have been collecting a fee, only to learn -- learn later that someone decides not to participate and, then, we might have been collecting the wrong fee. Too -- too little. Too much. I don't know. Just puts us in a -- in a delicate spot. So, I don't want to overstate that point, but we just should be mindful that I think the integrity of the fees that are being proposed rely upon all cities participating. If they don't that analysis needs to be refreshed, so -- and I'm sure -- you know, lots of other permutations and different variations of these ideas. Those are the two basic ones, but you may have some other ideas or questions that might prompt some additional ideas as well. So, the purpose really tonight, as I mentioned, was, one, is just to give you our status report, get you up to speed on what's happening, what we have accomplished, where are we at today, what our potential next steps and, then, to the extent you are comfortable or able to provide some direction going forward do we feel like we -- in order to be good partners we might want to accelerate our process or do we prefer to stick with the floor -- you know to the -- the situation where we pause until others catch up. So, I will -- I will

pause there. Be happy to answer questions you may have and both Bill and I would be happy to answer any of the potential legal issues that might arise because of that last topic I talked about where some cities don't participate.

Overton: Thank you, Kurt. Before I ask the rest of the Council for comments I will confirm that I had those conversations with the Mayor and with the coroner's office. Out of this scenario I think he was interested in seeing what we could do moving forward, rearranging our priorities into these two versus all three and being prepared to move forward. I still think we will let Council discuss the validity of moving forward, not knowing if we are going to be collecting the right fees or what other cities are going to do and with that I would open it up for comment from the rest of the Council.

Taylor: Mr. President?

Overton: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Thank you, Kurt. Appreciate it. So many moving parts. It's good to get a refresher. I have a question on that last issue you brought up. Is there a scenario where the impact fees would need to be remitted back to the developer that are collected if they are found to be done so in a way that it's -- call it illegal or inappropriate or notwithstanding a court ruling? Is that a scenario that is possible?

Starman: Thank you, Council President, and Council Member Taylor. So, I don't want to overstate that concern, but I think the short answer is, yes, that's a possibility. To the extent we implement a fee and it's later -- one or more cities don't participate and we find out the fee was too much in that example, that the fee was -- should have been lower, because the analysis changed because the surface area was not the entire county, but something smaller. I think there is -- there is room for a challenge that the -- we over collected and the fee was too high and, you know, some -- some amount of money would be due back to those that had paid the fee.

Taylor: Council President, just a quick follow up.

Overton: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Just on that note, the liability to pay it back would be the county or would it be the City of Meridian?

Starman: Council President and Council Member Taylor, so we had this -- I'm going to talk a little bit about identification in Idaho law, that you might recall this discussion from June as well. So, we will structure the agreement that puts that burden on the county, number one. The agreement between us and the county will make that a county burden and we will also require the county to indemnify us. There are some big impediments in Idaho law and the Idaho Constitution about whether cities and counties can indemnify any third parties. So, we all have -- use this term of art. We oftentimes we try to avoid identification provisions altogether, because they are questionable. When we can't we

try to insert those magic words to the extent allowed by law -- Idaho law in particular, which is sort of a shorthand saying this may or may not be enforceable. So, identification provisions are a little dicey, just as in -- general in terms of how the courts look at them. There is some constitutional issues there that we don't want to get too far into the weeds, but certainly contractually we would make that a county obligation. Whether we can -- and we would also have an indemnification clause that would require them to defend us if we are sued. But to what extent that that came -- push came to shove, there is some questions here.

Cavener: Council President?

Overton: Council Member Cavener.

Cavener: Thank you, Council President Overton. Kurt, I appreciate your shepherding this thing along. I think like sometimes we are trudging a wagon through peanut butter and sometimes it's doesn't feel like we are making a lot of progress, then, we get these updates, so they are helpful. I will begin conceptually I'm -- I'm very supportive of this. I think it's the right direction for us to be moving, particularly with the coroner's piece being moved out. That was always a little bit of a hang up for me. So, personally I have no issues with starting to begin work on at least crafting language for review. Not maybe quite ready to say let's have a public hearing on this date and time, but I think to get language prepared and shared, but that's where I think some of my -- my questions lie is -- is the ordinance language that Eagle and Star adopted, is it anticipated that's the same language that Kuna, Garden City, Meridian and Boise would also be asked? Is it -- is it the same?

Starman: I think -- Council President and Council Member Cavener, I think this likely that -- because there is some certain requirements that are just statutory in nature that are required of any ordinance, so they will likely have a lot of similarities, but they will not be identical and we will craft our own ordinance, you know, based upon our experience with our program and, then, we will -- you know, as we often do in our profession, we will, you know, look for good ideas elsewhere and borrow good ideas from other people, but I think each jurisdiction will likely have some very -- you know, have their own ordinance so it will vary to some extent, but they will include the same basic elements.

Cavener: Okay. Council President Overton, maybe a follow up.

Overton: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Kurt, if we have the ability to maybe be Meridian specific language, is there a scenario in play where we could enact the ordinance saying, hey, we will collect these impact fees on behalf of the county, but enforce it at a later point in time, meaning we would pass something -- again, let's say we pass -- let's say we pass it tonight, but we wouldn't begin collecting or enforcing that for a 12 month period, with a clause that if by that 12 month period arises if not all municipalities have adopted it, then, this comes

back before the Council and we could retract it. Is -- is there a scenario where we could do that?

Starman: Council President, Council Member Cavener, yes, that's -- that's a very creative and good thought. Yeah. So, we certainly can have -- you know, in terms of implementation data can be delayed, so it does not have to be at the time of adoption, could be six months, 12 months or some other trigger that -- that allows the ordinance to go into effect. So, short answer is, yes, you could have -- you have delayed implementation based upon a particular criteria.

Cavener: Thank you. Council President, just maybe to comment on that. I -- I -- I recognize nobody wants to be -- wants to always be the first one out the gate, but I think that we have an obligation as a -- as a city to lead on this and -- but I think it's important -- it's imperative that all of us, not just all but maybe one move forward and so I want to make sure that we are being equitable to all county residents, particularly those who live in Meridian and our future residents. So, I think that would be -- just in terms of where I would be heading in terms of a recommendation is let's begin working on this, schedule a public hearing at a later point in time, but the language would need to be really clear, regardless when we pass it, we would not begin enforcing until a date certain with the conclusion that all jurisdictions impacted have all signed on collectively.

Strader: Council President?

Overton: Council Member Strader.

Strader: Thank you. I was thinking along those lines as well. I'm not sure about delayed implementation date. I -- I was looking at it more like -- like a condition precedent to effectiveness, that all the other cities are prepared to -- that they have all signed the same ordinance. Like I -- I think we could pass an ordinance that says it's like subject to the other jurisdictions doing the same, then, we will start collecting the fees. The only scenario I really have heartburn about is a scenario where we begin collecting fees and, then, have to refund the fees and the messiness of that. I think if you can negotiate some language that is like a condition precedent to effectiveness or a condition precedent to us collecting the fees or something that kind of protects us, make sure that the other cities have come alongside, I think that's fine. I agree, I think we do need to -- to get it going further. You're kind of on step three of five or whatever. So, I think continuing to do that is fine. I -- the only scenario I'm really worried about is the -- the one where we actually end up collecting some fees, have to refund them and it gets messy. I also want to make sure that if there was partial adoption by like let's say four of the five cities, but maybe one gigantic city that chose not to for whatever reason, I want to make sure that that invalidates -- like conclusively invalidates the study and, then, we all kind of come back and have a discussion. I think that's important, so -- I also will just say I understand the reason that, you know, they have started a process. EMS doesn't want to have to do its own ordinance, but, you know, that -- the legislation did specifically provide for that. It is actually to me an easier mechanism and a more simple mechanism for the EMS districts to just go ahead and pass their own ordinance.

So, I'm not saying that we shouldn't still do it, I just think it's worth having a conversation with them. It seems a little short sighted on their part. Thanks.

Whitlock: Mr. President?

Overton: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Kurt, thanks for updating us on everything that's been done to date and -- and there is significant work that's already gone into this. I guess my question kind of follows up on Council Member Cavener and Council Woman Strader's comments, but it's more in line with -- if we were to give you direction to start drafting or crafting an ordinance to have in your hip pocket, how flexible and nimble can we be as a city in terms of a timeline, so that once others start to adopt or we get critical mass, how quickly can we move through the noticing public hearing and adoption of an ordinance?

Starman: Council President and Council Member Whitlock, so I think if we had sort of on the shelf the -- the ordinance was prepared and ready to -- ready for your consideration and, then, you know, likewise the agreements -- the successor agreements with the county and the EMS district, if those were complete and just sort of waiting for, you know, others to -- or for the time to be correct. I think we can do it pretty quickly. So, you identified the -- the kind of the major time consideration, which is -- it does require, you know, the noticing requirement and a public hearing. I would have to go look at the ord -- at the statute again for what the requirement is. Typically for fees it's -- it's -- I don't -- for normal -- just kind of run-the-mill fees it's two notices and two weeks apart. I think there is specific requirements for development impact fees. I don't have those on my fingertip. But it's not -- it's not months, we are talking about, you know, weeks type of thing or, you know, it's fairly short. And, then, you adopt your ordinance. You could waive second and third week readings if you choose. That's allowed. And, then, we have to publish and there is a -- if I recall correctly in the stat -- development impact statute I think there is a wait time before the fee comes into effect. So, there is a little bit of a wait time between the ordinance and the time you begin collection. So, I don't have a definitive answer for you, but if we had those documents sitting on the shelf and you said let's proceed, I think you will probably talk just in ballpark, you know, probably 60 days or so to get from start to finish.

Whitlock: Thank you.

Taylor: Council President?

Overton: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Thank you. And I -- I ask some questions, but share some thoughts. I agree with what Councilman Cavener said. I think we should be proactively pushing ahead and moving ahead, leaving ourselves with some flexibility with how we might want to handle it when we get to it. But I think we need to be working with the county to try to move it ahead. I think as other municipalities see us actively working on it towards a

solution it's going to be helping the whole process along. So, my inclination is that we are moving actively towards implementing something.

Starman: Correct. That has been fantastic direction. So, I'm happy if you -- some of them if you would like to recap or you want to -- but I think that that's excellent direction. I think it was what the Mayor was looking for as well. So, appreciate the good discussion and I guess we have what we need to proceed. But anything else, Council President?

Overton: I was going to ask you to go back one slide, Kurt.

Starman: Yeah.

Overton: To the steps. So, if what I'm hearing is correct as we are talking majority of the Council anyway is looking at going back and immediately starting on negotiating the new interagency agreements based upon the new information? Drafting the proposed ordinance, but at this point not holding any public hearings until we see what's going to happen -- both things at once and that's what we have been trying to do this whole way along. Does that concur? I think we got the shake of the heads.

Starman: Okay. Very good. Thank you for the direction. Appreciate it.

PUBLIC HEARINGS [Action Item]

14. Public Hearing for Ledges Business Park (H-2026-0008) by Sandee Transtrum, Biltmore Co., located at 4120 and 4096 N. Linder Rd.

- A. Request: Modified Development Agreement to the existing Development Agreement (Instrument No. 106154912) for the existing 2.28 acre to allow additional uses on the parcels within this development.

Overton: Thank you, Kurt. That will complete our department reports for this evening. We will move into public hearings. Will now move to Item 14, which is a public hearing for Ledges Business Park, H-2026-0008, and we will start off with staff comments.

Parsons: Thank you, Councilman -- or Council President and Council. So, Item No. 14, applicant has failed to post that property correctly per the ordinance, so they are asking for continuance to -- to next Tuesday, which is April 21st.

Cavener: Mr. President?

Overton: Council Member Cavener.

Cavener: Before I make a motion is there anybody in the audience that was here tonight planning to testify? Excellent. Okay. Mr. President?

Overton: Council Member Cavener.

Cavener: I would move that we continue Item 14, application H-2026-0008 to April 21st, 2026.

Whitlock: Second.

Overton: I have a motion and a second to move Item H-2026-0008, a continuance until April 21st of 2026. Madam Clerk, roll call vote.

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

Overton: Item 15 is continued.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

15. Public Hearing for CenterCal Expansion Subdivision (SHP-2026-0003) by The Land Group, located at 3395 E. Longwing Ln.

- A. Request: Short Plat consisting of four (4) buildable lots on 14.23 acres of land in the C-G zoning district.

Overton: Next up is Item 15, a public hearing for CenterCal Expansion Subdivision, SHP-2026-0003. We will start with staff comments.

Parsons: Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Council. Next item on the agenda is the CenterCal Expansion Subdivision. This is a short plat request in front of you. It does not require a neighborhood meeting or posting of the site. The site consists of 14.23 acres of land currently zoned C-G and is located near the northeast corner of Eagle Road and East Fairview Avenue. History on this property. The current configuration that you see before you on the screen was approved with the property boundary adjustment in 2022, but when it was originally platted in 2020 -- in 2012 I believe it was Lot 2 -- a portion of Lot 2, Block 2, of the CenterCal Subdivision. If you have driven down Eagle Road recently you have noticed probably three buildings being constructed in the area. Those three buildings sit on these lots. The majority of these lots anyways. The existing landscaping along Eagle Road and Fairview Avenue will remain protected during the site and those two meet current UDC standards, so no requirements for that. As part of the conditions of approval staff has recommended that the applicant grant reciprocal cross-access to all the properties for shared parking, access to utilities easements and, of course, shared aisle -- access to shared drive aisles to the adjacent roadways as well. Had a chance to talk with the applicant before the meeting this evening and they are in agreement with all conditions of approval. Staff is recommending approval and I will stand for any questions you may have.

Overton: Council, any questions for staff? No questions for staff? Thank you, Bill. Would the applicant like to come forward. If you would state your name and address for the record. You have 15 minutes. Thank you.

Densmer: Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Council. My name is Jason Densmer with The Land Group. Our address is 462 East Shore Drive in Eagle. Thank you for the 15 minutes. I'm sure I will not need all of that time. We have been working with staff over the past months as they have reviewed this short plat for CenterCal Expansion Subdivision. We are very thankful for their hard work and are in agreement with all of the conclusions in their staff report. As you know The Village at Meridian is undergoing expansion currently and so I think the name of the subdivision being CenterCal Expansion is a little bit appropriate. This is a resubdivision of one of the lots of the original CenterCal Subdivision from 2012. The largest new lot will be -- will house the three buildings that are currently under construction. The three other lots that are being created provide pads for future buildings that are yet to come within The Village and as Bill said -- he kind of stole my thunder, but we are in agreement with the staff report and all the conclusions and the recommended conditions. Although I'm speaking on behalf of CenterCal tonight, Juan Montoya with CenterCal is actually here and so I would like to hand off to him and, then, when he is done speaking if you have any questions for either of us we will be happy to come back and answer them for you.

Overton: If you would just state your name and address for the record.

Montoya: Yeah. Good evening. My name is Juan Montoya and my address is 4500 Via Marina, Marina Del Rey. I flew out here just for this meeting. I just want to honestly thank the Meridian community and all of you at large for your continued partnership on The Village. I'm coming here on behalf of our CEO John Paul Wardy. He is -- he was kind of here in 2012 when The Village was negotiated with maybe some of you who are still here. So, we just want to thank you all for your continued partnership. We are really really excited about what's happening. The growth of The Village wouldn't be happening if this wasn't a fantastic place to live. Tenants in our business are everything and they see that and that's why they want to be at the center. So, I'm here to answer any questions you might have in relation to the plat, but this is really driven by kind of tenant requests and the demand we are getting there. So, we need to subdivide the parcels to create tax parcels so we can build them appropriately. So, that's it. Thank you all. Appreciate it.

Overton: Thank you.

Densmer: If you have any questions -- if not we can just hand off and let you deliberate.

Overton: Council, any questions for the applicant?

Densmer: Okay. Thank you very much.

Overton: Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up for this?

Lomeli: Thank you, Council President. No one has signed up.

Overton: Is there anyone in the room who wishes to make a comment on this application? Or is there anybody online that would like to speak? You can use the raise your hand feature. Seeing none, would the applicant like to close? He waives that right. Council, what's your action this evening?

Strader: Council President?

Overton: Council Member Strader.

Overton: Sure. I'm happy to make a motion on it. I view this as continued success at an important development that we have already approved, so with that I move that we close public hearing on this item.

Cavener: Second.

Overton: We have a motion and a second to close public hearing. All in favor say aye. Nays? All ayes. The public meeting is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Strader: Okay. After -- Mr. President?

Overton: Council Member Strader.

Strader: Okay. Happy to make a motion. After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to approve File No. SHP-2026-0003 as presented in the staff report for today's hearing date.

Whitlock: Second.

Overton: We have a motion and a second to approve SHP-2026-0003. Madam Clerk, can you call roll.

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

Overton: Item 15 is approved. Thank you.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

- 16. Public Hearing for North Meridian Fields (H-2026-0003) by Emily Mueller, generally located at the southwest corner of State Highway 16 and Chinden Blvd.**

- A. Request: Annexation of 71.445 acres of land with the R-8 and C-N zoning districts.

Overton: Next up on tonight's agenda is Item 16. It's a public hearing for North Meridian Fields, H-2026-0003. We will start this off with staff comments.

Napoli: Good evening, Council President and Council. Next item on the agenda is the annexation for North Meridian Fields. So, the applicant requests annexation of 71.45 acres of land with the R-8 zoning in the C-N zone -- R-8 and C-N zoning districts. The R-8 zone consists of 47.8 acres and the C-N zone consists of 23.6. The site is generally located at the southwest corner of State Highway 16 and Chinden Boulevard. As shown on the screen the existing zoning is RUT in Ada county and the FLUM designation is mixed-use interchange and medium density residential. So, I want to start off by explaining a little bit. The Community Development and Public Works directors made a determination for the subject development -- development allowing for annexation to move forward without sewer service being readily available. As you all are probably aware currently the city is installing a sewer trunk line in McMillan Road that will ultimately serve the site from Star Road just to the west. So, the property is located within The Field Sub Area Plan and is intended to follow the model rural design theme, include cohesive architecture, landscaping, lighting, open space, pathways and other high quality design elements. The applicant has submitted a conceptual plan proposing single family detached residents on the southern two-thirds of the site and a commercial development on the northern one third. At this time the detailed development plans have not been provided. However, the applicant provided a road layout, open space layout for the larger development and has provided some high level information into the integration of the residential and commercial uses. In the applicant's narrative they propose to exclude the following uses, including fuel -- fuel sales facilities, convenience stores, storage facilities and vehicle washing facilities. The mixed-use interchange designation is intended for low traffic generating uses and as a result staff and the Commission recommended further restricting the permitted uses by prohibiting Tier 2 and Tier 3 drive-through establishments, vertically integrated residential uses and retail stores exceeding 10,000 square feet and the primary reason behind the square footage cap on retail stores is to avoid big box retailers that would exceed the traffic count that mixed-use interchange is really envisioning and at this time we don't really have square footages to base traffic on, which I will get into a little bit further in my presentation. This is the building elevations and kind of conceptual plan that they had for the commercial and the residential portion. All right. So, the applicant has depicted the primary access points for the development coming off the future extension of North Owyhee Storm Avenue, a collector roadway, which is located here on the site and will service the future Cole Valley Christian School to the south as well and Owyhee High School. This extension will lead to a signalized intersection with Chinden Boulevard and in addition to this applicant is proposing to construct two east-west collectors that connect North Ersatz Place with North Owyhee Storm Avenue and here is the first collector and the second collector would be down here. Many of the details that would typically be required with an annexation have not been provided, which is why the Commission and staff is requiring a development agreement modification prior

to any future applications or development being submitted. The future DA mod will be required to provide in-depth details from The Field Sub Area Plan, Comprehensive Plan, and UDC, as well as updating the concept plan and any elevations at that time. The staff has had conversations with the applicant before tonight's hearing and they will have some proposed changes to that -- to development agreement provisions for you guys to consider in their application, but these are the ones that Commission has recommended to you for tonight. So, I have to -- at the Planning and Zoning Commission hearing Darcy Hart testified with concerns regarding the lack of detail provided with the application, no traffic impact study, density potentially being too high and designed not adhering to The Field Sub Area Plan. However, the Commission is recommending approval with a development agreement and we have not received any written testimony since the P&Z hearing and I will stand for any questions that you guys have.

Overton: Council, any questions for staff? No questions for staff?

Strader: Council President Overton?

Overton: Council Member Strader.

Strader: Thank you. A couple questions. So, I see the DA provision, but outside of the DA provision about the provision of sewer services generally if we annex a property into the city does that create an obligation for the city to provide services and help me understand how that would play out if there was a delay.

Napoli: President -- Council President Overton, Council Woman Strader, yes. So, you are correct. Typically when we annex a property it does require an obligation to serve, which is why I received a director's determination to essentially move forward with the annexation for this subject development because we are putting the infrastructure in McMillan Road, which will be brought up Star and will serve this project eventually. You are right in the fact that if I didn't have that director determination I probably would not be recommending approval of that tonight, but that is the direction that we have received and this is just kind of show you the conceptual -- this is Star Road. This is where the sewer will eventually lead to this site. That is the future plan and I think something to highlight on this is that there are other properties in the area that are -- would be contiguous if this property was annexed that are also looking to annex that would bring services to this property. So, there is some annexation going on in the event that -- or for future plans that we know that sewer is going to be there and, like I said, that director's determination is really the -- the primary driver here for -- for staff support on the project and, you know, moving forward with the annexation with services potentially, correct, not being available and could be delayed for a future time and I -- the applicant does know that, we have had conversations with them and they would still like to proceed, which is why we are here tonight.

Strader: Couple of follow-ups.

Overton: Council Member Strader.

Strader: Thank you. So, I -- I guess I would be curious as to a status update on where we are at with the sewer, like where -- where have we gotten to on this map? How close is it? What is the time frame? So, I guess that's one follow-up question. And, then, my other follow-up question is just much more general than that, which is this is a huge development, it's at the corner of a critical Infrastructure point with the extension of Highway 16. There is no traffic impact study and I'm looking at the most bubbly of bubble plans that I have seen and this is a real lack of detail. As a control freak I hate all of that. So, how -- how typical is this size of development to come with this kind of a concept plan and a lack of a traffic impact study or detailed plans, even on what the commercial use would be? Help me understand the advantages and pitfalls of where we are at with that.

Napoli: Council President Ca -- Overton. I apologize. Council Woman Strader. So, to start off with your first question, as far as an update on the sewer, the last time I talked with our Public Works Department on it, you know, they were still on schedule for the finish of December. I -- I don't -- if Warren is here -- perfect. I will have Warren come up and speak to that a little bit more. That was a couple months ago. So, things could have changed as far as exactly where we are. Thanks, Warren.

Stewart: So, thank you, Council, Council Woman Strader. The -- the project is under construction. We are putting in the trunk sewer line and the pressure sewer line in McMillan Road between Can-Ada and Star. It's supposed to be the intersection of Star in June and, then, they will continue with the pressure sewer line that will go all the way to The Oaks lift station on McMillan and basically McDermott and that will be completed around December, maybe slightly after the first of the year, January -- December, January of this year. The piece that's going up Star Road, what is anticipated to be built by development at this point, although there has been some discussion about whether to add that to the ten year plan for the Public Works Department, but we haven't received direction to do that yet, so --

Overton: Council Member Strader.

Strader: Thank you. So, if I'm understanding, we -- we have a plan to get to McMillan and Star Road and the -- the further plan, though, to actually make it up to where this development is isn't necessarily something that the city is intending on putting in as a piece of infrastructure, that's something that depends on private development and -- and I guess what -- maybe just to talk out loud, like what's making me nervous -- this just feels very like leapfrog to me. Doesn't it seem logical that we would start approving developments around where the sewer trunk has been extended to and, then, approve, you know, contiguous developments along the sewer line? I have never seen this kind of a scenario and I guess have you or how do you feel about the risks and -- and benefits of approving something like this without the private developments in between here and there being approved?

Stewart: First I think there is -- excuse me. Members of the Council, Council President. I think there is a few things to keep in mind. So, one, water for this particular project will probably first come through the Cole Valley Christian extension and so it's going to have water when the Cole Valley Christian School comes in. We do -- there is a possibility that the city will complete a project or do a project to install a portion of the -- of the sewer line going up Star Road. We know there is a lot of interest with other developers who own property along there. If that was to occur or when that occurs there is other growth that's going to occur and to answer your question have we ever seen that before? The answer is yes. We annexed 1,400 acres in south Meridian. I think it was close to that. Maybe it was 11, 12 hundred acres in south Meridian under a very similar scenario where we annexed thousands of acres of property, put it in kind of a holding zone and we have grown into that and that's kind of what the concept is here, essentially, for this. I think that's why the -- the developer is willing and understands the risk, understands that the -- the services won't be there initially, but is willing to work towards the growth and orderly development of that entire area. You will probably hear from them though.

Overton: Council Member Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Council President. Warren, thank you for being here. And since you and I have had discussions regarding another several parcels, you will probably understand why this is making me very concerned, because we have got a parcel that's waiting to build to get their services that you and I sat down and looked at the map and everything and this is feeling very similar to me. Can you make me feel like it's not the same? Because that has been not a good situation.

Stewart: Yeah. I think that the -- the difference here is the -- the individuals who agreed to the annexation initially eventually sold the property and maybe there was an anticipation -- or at least a belief that things were going to happen faster than -- than what they have out there. But the city was not in control of that. So, in fact, we -- we tried to make it very clear that they were -- they were beholding to other entities to bring that sewer to them. So, I -- although it's possible that this could go the same way, right now it wouldn't because the owner of the property is also the developer of the property

Little Roberts: Follow up. So, Cole -- but you said Cole Valley is how they are going to get water. I have heard through the grapevine that Cole is considering either not building at all or delaying it. That could be rumor, but if --

Stewart: Well, they are -- they know that they have to build this -- the -- the gravity sewer line from the intersection of Star Road and McMillan down McMillan Road to the school. They -- we are going to build it -- in fact, they entertained building at the same time we are doing the pressure sewer line, but their bids came in higher than they had anticipated. Welcome to our world these days. And so they had to delay that until they could raise some more funds. Well, my understanding that that's the process that they are in right now. They are in the process of raising additional money, so that they can

go ahead and complete the project. But I'm certainly not an agent for Cove Valley Christian, so that's just what I have heard.

Little Roberts: Thank you.

Overton: Any other questions for staff? Thank you, Warren. Would the applicant like to come forward? State your name and address for the record. You have 15 minutes.

Mueller: Good evening, Council President and Council Members. My name is Emily Mueller, 839 South Bridgeway Place. I represent Mark Bottles and 5B Holdings and I just want to thank staff for their time in reviewing this project and coordinating on it. As staff mentioned we have talked with them many times and I appreciate that and as mentioned this is an annexation and zoning with a development agreement request tonight I will kind of go quickly through some of these things, because you already got the ground -- groundwork and I want to address some of your questions and concerns. So, quickly, again, the property is approximately 70 acres. The current applications, annexation and zoning with a development agreement. Future applications will include a preliminary plat, will include a development agreement modification and any CUPs that are deemed desirable or necessary at the time. So, there will be many future applications on this property and for this project. As staff mentioned, the future land use map designates this area for mixed-use interchange along Chinden Boulevard and medium density residential. Currently there is a storage site that has been constructed on Chinden, so that this -- the larger picture is looking at the boundary -- the southern boundary of that storage site and that is what has currently been developed out here. We are excited to bring the -- our property into the City of Meridian and see it developed within the City of Meridian's specific area plan and framework for this area. So, again, here is the vicinity map. We have Cole Valley directly to the south as discussed. The city of Star has been annexed just to the north side of Chinden and the City of Meridian is growing into this area -- into this specific area plan area as -- as the sewer is brought out. As discussed we are requesting 23.6 acres of commercial along Chinden and 47.81 acres of R-8 medium density residential, along -- as -- as you move south. That will integrate in with the school. As staff mentioned, we have provided design guidelines for the residential community and in -- and they are consistent with The Field Sub Area Plan. The -- the conceptual elevation show single family detached homes, single and two-story, and which will reflect a modern farmhouse style, gable roof forms, board and batten accents, neutral color patterns. We have also provided a conceptual internal pathways and street network to reduce reliance on arterials and to plan for the connection with the school to the south and future development. This promotes walkability, internal chip -- internal chip capture between the school, residential and commercial. We agree -- and -- and maybe I will just stick with this for a moment, because this is where I want to address Councilman Strader's concerns, Council Woman Little Roberts' concerns and so Councilman -- Council Woman Strader asked, you know, what are the pitfalls of this and I'm here to say that there -- I do not believe there are -- there are any pitfalls and we will be back before you for a development agreement modification for the commercial, where you will have discretion to approve a conceptual lot layout where we will closely follow The Field Sub Area Plan and we are

not ready to develop that commercial yet. Really none of this is ready tomorrow to be developed and to the second question about the pitfalls and the sewer, the -- the development agreement states that we will not be able to develop until -- until sewer is ready. We understand that. And we have been in contact with Cole Valley School. Mr. Bottles has been in close contact with them. They do plan on developing. They are continuing to have to raise more money for their sewer extension, but we understand the timing of this and the reason for an annexation now is because it is -- it's good planning. It's good public planning and good private planning. It helps -- is just the first step of multiple steps where we will be here again, but is the first step in implementing the city's Comprehensive Plan. It materializes and just puts a second layer of skin on it, which creates a more stable environment for investing for when we do do our traffic impact studies. We already -- we know that the city sees this as residential consistent with its Comprehensive Plan. So, when we pay for those traffic impact studies and when we follow those it -- it -- it creates a little more safety in the investment in this area down the road and so I would say that there are no pitfalls in annexing this right now. It is -- it is our commitment to the city that we see this developed within the city's framework, within the very carefully planned out specific area plan and, in fact, there is a risk to the 5B Holdings Group in annexing before studies -- or before services are available. Sewer is available in Star right now, so -- so, it is a risk to say we -- we won't develop in the county, we won't do that and we will wait until sewer gets brought closer or when we invest in bringing it closer. So, with that we agree with all of staff's conditions of approval. We were a part of the future -- or, excuse me, the specific area plan when it was adopted many years ago and we understand staff's desire for this to be a low -- lower traffic impact area. We are voluntarily agreeing with those conditions and so we -- we agree with all of that. As staff mentioned, we would like to amend condition -- the -- the final condition AF, which as written would require us to have a development agreement modification and preliminary plat application for both the commercial and the residential development. We believe that with the submittal of the building elevations, fencing, pathways, conceptual roadways, that a development agreement modification won't be necessary for the residential portion. We will still come through for a preliminary plat, have landscaping plans approved, have design review the conceptual elevations that we have provided and any varying or any offset of those in any substantial form would -- would require development agreement modification. So, with what we have submitted, though, I -- we do not believe a development agreement modification is going to be necessary for the residential portion. We do agree and acknowledge to have a development agreement modification, to put the next layer of skin on this, the next conceptual layout plan for the commercial and we will be back here to discuss that when -- when it's time and when we know exactly what uses will be put in here. So, we do agree with that. So, again, our recommended changes to this conditional of approval would just -- to state that prior to any development of the property within the C-N zone, the owner of the C-N zoned property shall submit a DA modification to provide that concept plan consistent with the design elements in The Fields Sub Area Plan, Comprehensive Plan, and UDC. So, with that we believe that this is a great project integrated under the guidance of the Specific Area Plan and would request your -- approval vote of approval with the condition as amended. So, with that I will stand for any questions.

Overton: Council, any questions for the applicant?

Strader: Council President Overton?

Overton: Council Member Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I appreciate -- appreciate the presentation and you starting to address my concerns. I -- I guess the scenario I would be concerned about, I -- I feel like annexation is the point at which the city has the most discretion to approve or deny a property coming into the city and so we can determine if it's in our best interest. If we have already approved an annexation, then, that discretion goes away and so my concern would be, you know, we have approved basically just the concept that you will put residential on two-thirds of your property and we have not seen a traffic impact study. Any details. You have some examples of elevations, but it just -- it feels like a really low level of control where we are a City Council that often cares about whether kids have a playground, if there are sidewalks -- I can think of a number of items. So just help me get comfortable with your request to -- to only have to come back to modify the development agreement for the C-N zone. That just feels really tough to me. Thanks.

Mueller: Council President and Council Woman Strader, thank you. Yes, the residential development -- you know, I think the -- you are right that the -- any kind of just -- you know, really discretionary nature out of the residential development would be removed. So, at that point we rely on your very well crafted code to -- to provide the type of amenities, the open space requirements, all of those things that make a complete neighborhood and, you know, looking at -- I -- I think the -- the main thing that we think can give you comfort is -- is, again, the elevations. You are not going to get -- I know that this happened elsewhere. You are not going to get a three story -- you are not going to get a three story building. You are going to -- you are going to get what we have shown you and if we want anything else, anything different than what we have presented tonight, and it -- or if you want to see anything else and make that a part of it we would -- I guess what we would have is -- is maybe more specific conditions. If you wanted there to be a specific type of amenity in the -- in the subdivision, but -- so, all that -- all that to say is we have -- I think we have shown what the subdivision will look like and, again, we -- and, then, your discretion remains entirely with -- remains with any of the commercial development,

Strader: Council President?

Overton: Council Member Strader.

Strader: Is that really true though? I -- because I -- I want to give an example. So, my understanding is there has been a change in state law and now like, for example, multi-family is -- is potentially allowed a of right in any commercial zone, for example. So, if I approved this annexation today could I see, for example, a six story multi-family building in the commercial part of your development?

Mueller: Council President and Council Woman Strader, any development, whether it's permitted, whether we want to put in a library, anything will need to come through for a development agreement modification with a concept plan and that is up to your discretion is a development agreement modification is the City Council's discretion. So, even though something is -- and that's my understanding. You can ask staff if they agree with that. But that would be my answer is that anything -- even if it's principally permitted, even it's -- even if it's the most advantageous desired use out here, like, again, a library, would need a development agreement modification and would need your approval in the future.

Strader: Thank you.

Overton: Council Member Cavener.

Cavener: Emily, thanks for the presentation. I -- and I -- I read and watched the Planning and Zoning hearing a couple of times. I know you guys have been working really really hard on this project and I also want to begin, because I have got a lot of questions. But I want to begin -- like I have a lot of confidence that you and your organization could execute on -- on an approval. So, my concern is not there. But as you are well aware Council feels maybe they have been bit a couple of times and we are much more particular about what an annexation is and -- and where we grant it. So, I'm going to ask a real high level question just to gain some insight from where you guys are coming from on this and, then, they may dive into some additional questions. What's the rush?

Mueller: Council President Overton, Councilman Cavener, what I -- as I said earlier, it -- it isn't a rush. This is the first step in a long process. So, as I mentioned it's good public and private planning. It helps -- it helps with the -- knowing where infrastructure is going to come and it helps all of the budgets and -- and everything to see into the future and it helps as a landowner -- I'm representing a landowner -- it creates some shared agreement and some level of confidence. It creates one more level of confidence, one more step, one more level of confidence that this is how the city intends for this area to develop. So, when we work with developers, when we work with commercial developers, particularly your residential developers, they can start seeing this site develop. Like I mentioned, investing -- investing in the area, knowing that it's already annexed into the city and, yes, you have more hoops to jump through. We have got a lot more applications, but it's the next step. It's -- it's a -- it's a level of comfort knowing that, hey, we have seen your Comprehensive Plan. We agree with your Comprehensive Plan and it helps that development process move forward.

Cavener: Council President Overton?

Overton: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Emily, you said -- I -- I wrote it down that, you know, this -- you view this as -- as good planning and I'm just going to share -- I don't see it that way and I kind of want

to lay out why and, then, maybe you can give me some -- again as an expert maybe where my line of thinking has -- is not correct. So, again, what I'm seeing is -- let's just start -- begin with the sewer, which is a -- which is a really really big deal. In addition to your -- if this development be approved it likely would incentivize additional annexation requests that would come before us that may ask us to accelerate a timeline that I'm going to be really uncomfortable with, because you have got schools in that area that are already over capacity with a significant amount of students to come in that area. I don't look at approving an annexation that puts students in an overcapacity school. Good planning. It's also going to put vehicles on roads that the highway district said Star Road is rated F. That -- that's a big struggle for me to overcome and McMillan -- the hits just keep coming -- is I think rated better than E, which is also not great. That's what I see is huge challenges that I hear from -- from my boss, kids in the classroom, cars on the roads, are some of their biggest frustrations in an area that is going to be incredible one day and I'm struggling to understand what the community benefit is for that good planning to approve an annexation tonight without the necessary infrastructure to support our existing neighborhoods that are in that area before we invite more development into that part of Meridian. So, help me understand where I'm wrong and I really mean that, because I am -- this -- this one is a -- is a -- I don't think I -- I'm just being very up front, I don't think I have been more opposed to an annexation in a number of years, not because I don't think this is going to be great, it's because it's -- it's not the right time for something like this. So, educate me. Help me see from your guys' perspective.

Mueller: President Overton, Councilman Cavener, I'm not -- I would never call you wrong, but here is genuinely how I believe it and -- and how I see it. An annexation at this point before a preliminary plat gives all of those -- the school district an opportunity to see what is coming down the road. We will not be -- we will not be developing homes in the next year, in the next two years. It's probably far out from there. So, it gives -- it gives the -- it gives us a further site of vision. It -- it extends the horizon of what the school district can plan for and see and understand. So, I think this is -- you know, in -- in -- in some jurisdictions right now is what they are doing is -- or what they have proposed in some places is once -- if schools are at capacity they put a pause on when the developer can start developing for three years. So, it gives the school district a head start. It gives them a head start to see when development will actually come down the road. So, this is actually -- in my view is actually perfect planning and it's, in fact, some of what other jurisdictions are doing. It extends that horizon and lets them plan even further into the future.

Cavener: Council President Overton, maybe just one more comment.

Overton: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Maybe two comments. One, you are welcome to tell me I'm wrong anytime. I really value a partnership and it's with everybody that's here. You wouldn't be the first to tell me that I'm wrong. Second, you -- you touched on something that I -- I want to make sure that you are comfortable with, which is you -- you are saying condition us

through all the conditions you want and I -- I will tell you as a Council that has tried very hard to not be a heavy-handed Council to design a neighborhood, to say this must be here, that must be here, that is -- that is a slippery slope and -- and if that is true what you are asked for I think we can have a very large conversation, but I think that -- at least the level of conditioning that would need to come from me to satisfy an annexation approval may not be those types of conditions that you are going to be looking for. So, I just -- I -- I just urge some caution about inviting that and I -- I would urge caution for my colleagues on that. I don't think that that's how Meridian intends to function. We try to respond to what development community wants to bring to us with what meets the best interest of our community. So, just -- just I think some food for thought to -- to consider is -- I -- I'm happy to do that, but I -- I -- I worry that that would be a complex and non-beneficial process for you, your client and the Council.

Mueller: Councilman -- or President, thank you. Thank you, Councilman Cavener. Yes, I -- I agree that -- that we don't want to design a full project by conditions. That -- that makes no sense. So, I agree with you completely. My point more narrowed is if there is a specific element that you or a Council Member would like to have a conversation about, I'm happy -- we are happy to discuss that. But as you mentioned, if -- if -- if yours is multiple pages, then, that's not an appropriate way to design a -- a project.

Cavener: Maybe -- Council Member Overton, just maybe a question then --

Overton: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Would -- would you and your client accept a condition that we wouldn't issue a certificate of occupancy to any building until 2035?

Mueller: Councilman -- President, excuse me, Overton. Councilman Cavener, probably not. I would need to ask my client. Eight years to nine years out. That's -- that's a long way away. So, I probably not would be my answer.

Cavener: I figured as much --

Mueller: Yeah.

Cavener: -- but I just -- I think that's just a starting point, where I'm thinking about in terms of the long term impact of this development in that part of Meridian.

Mueller: Yeah. Thank you.

Taylor: Councilman Overton?

Overton: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: This might be a question for staff, too, but is this property in the Meridian area of impact or is it -- where does it fall right now? And I don't -- Emily, I'm not sure if that's a question for you or maybe I'm looking at Nick to answer that question.

Napoli: Council President, Council -- Councilman Taylor, that is correct. So, it is in The Field Sub Area plan. It does fall in our area of impact. Area of impact actually border is Chinden -- north side of Chinden to Star Road. So, this property would be essentially contiguous to Star Road or to -- to the city of Star once this property is annexed up here. But, yes, it is in our city area of impact. It is contiguous to the Cole Valley Christian School to the south and, yes, it is in The Field Sub Area Plan, which is the northwestern most portion of our city and really the -- where our area of impact meets Star and Nampa. So, that is correct.

Taylor: Okay. Councilman Overton, just to follow up.

Overton: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: In your presentation you talked about access to sewer from city of Star that they had sewer there. I'm just curious have you had conversations about getting access to sewer from Star? Has that been part of the discussion before that you have had? I'm just kind of curious why you would bring that up -- up in your presentation.

Mueller: President Overton and Councilman Taylor, no, we have not discussed that with Star. We also manage property in -- directly north of this in the city of Star, which is why we know that that sewer is there and the Star sewer and water district operates separately from Star. So, we just -- we know that and I -- I guess I just bring it up as -- to -- to say that it's -- it's a risk for us at some point to develop not knowing when sewer is going to be available. To the counterpoint of what was discussed earlier with Mr. Warren of -- Mr. Stewart of waiting, if we know -- we know that we are going to have to wait and we won't be forcing the city's hand on that.

Taylor: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Yeah. And I think I'm -- I'm leaning a little bit towards what Councilman Cavener shared and even the concerns that Councilman Strader shared about the lack of detail. I'm not -- I'm probably not as insistent on wanting to see a high level of detail. I know we have looked at applications before where they were kind of -- they were big, they were kind of bubble concepts with the idea of coming back to bring in more clarity and I -- I see this as sort of saying here is sort of how it's going to take shape. But I do agree it's hard to -- I'm actually a little bothered by the idea of not coming back with a development agreement for the residential, like just seems trust but verify is what you are asking of us and I'm not sure I'm there, but I -- I'm not opposed to the idea of -- of approving of concepts, but seems so in some ways hypothetical about what you are suggesting to us, like it -- it could take a lot of different turns, especially because we

know the likelihood of this -- of dirt moving and things being built is -- is down the road a little ways; right? You got to get the infrastructure there and so we are a little ways away from that. How do market conditions change? What kind of interest is there? So, I'm still looking for a little bit more of a compelling argument as to why it does make sense to -- to approve this annexation with such low level of clarity about plans. I'm not opposed to it, because I have voted to approve other sort of bubble concept plans for in the city, but can you -- and I don't think it's a perfect way to plan. I mean we have our future land use map that gives people a sense of what we are looking for and I see this as sort of halfway between future land use map and a more well thought out proposal. So, I see what you are arguing in terms of this helps us get greater clarity, but it doesn't give us the kind of clarity that I'm not -- I'm not sure if Council's quite there. I don't think I'm quite there yet, but I -- maybe I could be. I'm still open to some more thought and input and testimony and discussion. But if you could help me revisit quickly -- and this will be my last question -- why would we not want you to come back with a development agreement on the residential? I -- I know you -- you talked about it. I -- it wasn't clicking in my head. I don't understand why -- why that is a -- is not a good idea. I don't want to give a bunch of conditions today. I think you should come back when you have more clarity of -- of thought about this. So, help me understand why you made that argument.

Mueller: President Overton, Councilman Taylor, the argument is that we have provided enough information for you to know what that development will look like. The types of homes, the pathways, the -- those sorts of things and, then, on top of that we will comply with any and all code and -- and -- and maybe I will also have staff speak to this, because this is a condition that we have discussed a lot and I don't want to put words in staff's mouth, so maybe I will have you say what we talked about on the phone the other day and I know your condition has stayed the same, but there are other opportunities for you to continue to review this for staff to review the preliminary plat and to make sure that there are other avenues to make sure that this complies. The -- the verification as you mentioned. So, I don't know, Nick, if you are -- if -- if there are other opportunities that you can speak to to what you would be reviewing in the future.

Parsons: Mr. President, Member of the -- Members of the Council, I want to help give you some clarity tonight as well. I think there is some things that we should help clear up for you tonight. I think it's important. So, couple things. Right now Nick and I continually meet with applicants waiting for the sewer to get done. So, I was very appreciative that Warren was here this evening giving you a timeline, because they are waiting for that piece to get done and they will have the ability to extend water and sewer to this area. Part two of tonight's discussion -- and I want to thank the applicant for being here. They were also part of The Fields Area -- Sub Area Plan. They were -- they -- they worked in partnership with us in developing in that plan and some of the concepts and goals in that plan speak to the city growing from the east to the west. That was our priority, because we did not want to leapfrog. We didn't -- we knew that the Can-Ada lift station was happening further to the west, but we didn't want to -- we wanted to make sure we didn't start there and, then, grow to the east. We want to make sure that we start from the east and grow west and as part of that plan it says that the city -- here is some of the recommended items that are actually highlighted in the plan

for you and I'm going to read them word for word for you. So, it says favor development that proceeds east to west in approvals and entitlement decisions. The timing for that one to three years. So, the plan's been adopted -- not very long. Here we are a couple years later talking with you. We have pending applications that we are processing currently for that area that will open up additional infrastructure expansion. So, just want to share that with you. And, then, part two of that recommended action was that we would coordinate with developer groups to assist in the creation of community infrastructure district or, alternatively, a local infrastructure district. So, we have been talking with developers, they have been talking with Public Works, they have been talking with our Community Development director on coming up with a plan to facilitate the expansion of those -- that infrastructure sooner rather than later. So, as we are talking about this -- this development tonight, I agree it's -- the R-8 looks -- to me it looks far enough along what we would envision. The roads are there. Open space. We don't have lot sizes, but we can visualize what that could look like. That's why typically when we don't have the -- all the information for the commercial, we have the applicant -- our -- our typical process is come back with a plan when you are ready. Now, the Council -- you still have the ability to say, staff, you are wrong, we don't think the R-8 is far enough. Come back with the DA for all of it. But, again, that is your prerogative for this evening. But for tonight I think we are doing exactly what the plan wants us to do. We are trying to get this annexed. We are working with other developers. We are having those conversations to -- to meet kind of these recommended actions that you set in policy for us to do and though it seems far off in the distance, it's going quicker and going to happen a lot faster than we all realize and so I just want to at least give you that context as you deliberate on this application tonight. We are doing what's expected. The unique piece about this is the sewer for this piece of property is actually coming from the west to the east, even though the plan tells us to go east to west. But I know Emily's group has been talking with that developer. So, again, I -- those -- those are ongoing discussions that we need to have and we will continue to work with our Public Works Department to come up with a solution.

Miles: Council President Overton, Council, just wanted to add a little more clarification as well. Be a little more blunt. I think to some of the comments from Councilman Cavener about traffic in schools, there has been discussions with properties to the west who are interested in developing sooner than -- than this parcel is interested and have had discussions with Star Water and Sewer District and the county and have had pre-applications with the county proposing to go to the county. So, a little bit to the comments and the concerns that I heard expressed. This Council body may not have an option to have input if that were to happen and so to some degree that's another important factor in the proper policy planning, long term outlook for the city as we continue to look at what's best for the city and the community, as well as our development partners. And so I want to thank staff and thank the applicant as well for having that foresight to some degree. But that is a risk that's out there that I think is important to put on the record that we have experienced and heard as well. I'm happy to answer any additional questions.

Overton: Staff, any additional questions? Emily, thank you.

Mueller: Thank you so much.

Overton: Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up on this hearing?

Lomeli: Thank you, Councilman President. I have Josh Leonard.

Overton: Welcome, Josh. If you can state your name and address for the record, please.

Leonard: Thank you very much, Council President, Council Members. Josh Leonard of the Clark Wardell Law Firm. 251 East Front Street, Ste. 310 in Boise. As you probably know, our law firm, as a practice, doesn't oppose applications and that's not what I'm here for tonight. I'm -- I'm here to ask for additional information from this applicant. I'm going to echo a little bit. I'm going to jump off my prepared remarks and -- and echo a little bit about what Council Members Strader, Cavener and -- and Little Roberts have said tonight. This -- this is a large area. This is a very -- I like the term bubbly -- or bubble plan that -- that you used. Without a lot of detail. In one instance in the staff report, Table 4, I would draw your attention to that. It has I believe nine areas of information to be provided and in six of them it says to be determined with a future development agreement modification and preliminary plat. The only information that's provided there is the size of the acreage and the -- the physical features that include the west tap lateral. The best question that was asked tonight in my opinion was what's the rush. It -- it -- it feels a little bit rushed. It feels like I don't know exactly as a -- as a member of the -- the community what -- what is planned for this area and I would like to know a little bit more. I also am concerned about the fact that there is a -- a gap that's development dependent for sewer, even though conversations have been -- been going on, that type of a gap often leads to concerns and -- and -- and problems of the type that Council -- Council Member Little Roberts mentioned. Again, I -- as I stated at the outset, I don't oppose this application by any means. I have clients that I'm sure will benefit from this application and ultimately I think it -- it -- it should be approved. I just don't know that that time is now. Thank you.

Overton: Council, any questions? Thank you, Josh. Madam Clerk.

Lomeli: Councilman President, no one else has signed up.

Overton: Is there anyone else in the room that would like to comment on this application at this time? If not, is there anyone online that would like to comment by using the raise your hand feature? Seeing nobody else wanting to comment, Emily, would you like to close?

Mueller: President Overton and Council, thank you. The first thing that I will say is that I talked with my client and he is happy to do a DA mod for the residential if -- if that, hopefully, I believe would give the Council the continued discretionary approval that they would like in the future. So, the -- the conditional change that I suggested -- we are okay leaving it with -- as written by staff. The second thing that I would like to say is

appreciated Mr. Leonard's comments and I maybe missed at first who he represents. In the past he has represented the storage facility user. The -- the city did oppose that storage facility when it was developed. Again developed totally outside the vision of the specific area plan and part of my clients' hope is to not let that happen again. To see this area develop as it was planned and this is an important first step to implement it, just -- not just for this parcel, but for the entire area and I hope that -- I hope that that's received well and -- and, again, my client's intention to see this area developed as the city staff has -- has prepared. I was in this room when the specific area plan was adopted and we want to see this -- this was, you know, said it -- to be the last best area of the City of Meridian. We want to see that happen and with the development agreement modification on the entire property, we will be back for discretionary approvals and so that's what I will end with and appreciate -- yeah, appreciate the opportunity. If anyone has any other questions.

Overton: Council, any additional questions? Thank you, Emily.

Whitlock: Mr. President?

Overton: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: I don't know if you can go back to that very first slide for me again. When Emily first showed that it jumped off the screen to me that the city of Star is highlighted there and our only connection is from the south through Cole Valley Christian. The rest of the city of Meridian there to the east -- you know we have got a nice highway that's going in there and it's not contiguous yet. City of Meridian with this property to the -- to the east of the property. I appreciate Mr. Miles' comment that there is a risk. I don't know how big of a risk. I don't know how easy it is for the city of Star to reach across Highway 26, Chinden Boulevard there and -- but if conversations have been happening with other developers in this area to me that's a risk. I think this area is too valuable to put it at risk of being serviced by the city of Star or Star Sewer and Water. So, again, I -- I appreciate this depiction that's on the screen. I appreciate the additional conversation that we have had. I -- I consider -- I -- I hope that we as a Council will consider the risk of not doing something and moving forward and that would be my answer to the question of what's the rush. I -- I would like to avoid any risk of losing this -- access to this land and adjacent properties. So, that's -- that's my two cents at this point.

Little Roberts: Council President?

Overton: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mr. President, colleagues, I'm kind of thinking along those lines myself. That's been -- when I saw the map pop up I concur with Councilman Whitlock's kind of assessment regarding that. I have got a friend that recently moved just a little bit north and was given originally a Meridian address to -- only to find out that that is not correct. So, it is definitely some gray area and I think by going ahead and doing the annex it would prevent any gray area in that spot. That's just my concern at this point. But it

does. And it doesn't sound like they are in a rush. I know they would like to get things going, but it doesn't sound like they are in a rush to get things building, because they can't -- they understand they have to wait until they have sewer, water, et cetera. And so I think -- you know. And it sounds like we will have plenty of opportunity to be part of those steps as things go along. So, I would like to see us go ahead with this project.

Overton: Council, I haven't made any comments this evening yet to this point and, quite honestly, one of the issues I have, especially with our legislature just coming to a close, is that I have discovered that my crystal ball is broken and trying to figure out and determine what's going to occur and how it's going to occur for our city is -- is many times not in our own hands. But I can't help but go back to some of the basics of this application, with one of the basic parts being that the landowner is a player at the table helping design how this area was going to be laid out. I don't think we are looking at somebody who is going to sell out to someone else. I don't think we are looking at somebody who is trying to come in from out of state and make a quick buck and get out of town. I think we are talking about somebody who has made major investments in this valley, major investments in our city, and I think you have to remember that as we look at this there is a lot of unanswered questions. There are secondarily -- and I do this a lot, because I put a lot of faith in our subject matter experts whether they are with Public Works or Community Development. To me you guys are -- are our ears and eyes of what's going on and when you guys sit there and tell me how this is going to work, how it's going to play out -- the only thing we don't understand right now is the time it's going to take to get these hookups connected. But this isn't a situation where the applicant's going to come back to us in two years and say, hey, where is my connection? Because you know as of right now that nobody in this room can guarantee the date that that will happen. That date is uncertain. I think this is a very important corner of our city and I surely would like to see it developed and maintained and serviced by the City of Meridian. I think we have talked about this area for a long time. A long time and because of that -- because of many different factors I agree with the unknown. I appreciate the fact that we will be looking at a DA mod on the residential. I think we deserve that. Quite honestly, I think the rest of the city deserves that to be fair with other applications. I would stand on the point I would be supportive of this application moving forward.

Strader: Council President Overton?

Overton: Council Member Strader.

Strader: I have some thoughts and a question actually for Bill Nary, if that's okay. So, I -- I appreciate the dynamic with Star. Had not thought about that too much. But I'm kind of struggling with accelerating a development that in my opinion is not at the stage of application where it should normally be for this step. Because of that dynamic I don't know where I'm going to land on that. I do appreciate the applicant's offer of a DA mod on the residential. I think I would be an absolute no if it wasn't for that potential avenue. I guess my -- my question for Mr. Nary is what is the real risk of annexation by Star into our area of impact under state law? Like what -- what would that look like? How would

that process play out if there was a dispute or if there is a -- a jump ball property that somehow is -- is in between us, how does that work?

Nary: So, Mr. President, Members of Council, Council Member Strader, there is nothing in the state code that prohibits a city from annexing into another city's area of impact. If they are contiguous and consensual it's not only allowed, it's not even actionable by an opposing party or imposing city that would be against that. So, there is nothing that prohibits it.

Strader: Follow up?

Overton: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: And so hypothetically, even with approving this application, properties to the west of us could still annex into Star; right?

Nary: So, Mr. President, Members of Council, I mean, again, contiguity is going to be the key. So, yes, I mean some of those properties that are still adjacent to Star still have that potential. Some of it obviously depends on serviceability as well. But the contiguity is going to be the key for the things below those ones that are below Chinden would be more problematic for those, because you need to get out for that domino of having to get another one and another one to get there, so -- parts of this would be adjacent to some of those.

Strader: Council President?

Overton: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: And I apologize, because this is going to take us down another rabbit hole. Would it be okay if we hear from Warren really quick on a question I have about that?

Overton: Council Woman Strader, absolutely.

Strader: Thank you. So, my question is what is the geographic and functional viability of the City of Star actually extending their sewer line under Chinden Boulevard in your opinion. Just as a subject matter expert will be involved in them actually extending their sewer trunk line below, you know, that major roadway.

Stewart: Council President, Council Woman Strader, it wouldn't be that hard. In fact, there is already a property to the west who has requested it. I think it's important for the City Council to understand that the city of Star and Star Water and Sewer District are not the same entity. They are completely separate. And so Star Water and Sewer District can do what they want, even if the city of Star doesn't follow along. And Star Water and Sewer District has been asked to extend sewer -- or -- yeah, sewer and water underneath Chinden Boulevard to a property west of where we are talking about right now and they have agreed to file an application to make that happen. They would

just have to put a casing -- they bore a casing underneath the roadway and slip the pipes underneath. We have done it multiple times on Chinden and they could do the same thing.

Strader: Okay.

Stewart: And they have already expressed that they would have no problem trying.

Strader: Follow up.

Overton: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: So, what -- you know, anytime that we are planning for a sewer -- and I -- and I know this is a very -- one of the first meetings I had when I was running for City Council is to sit down with the planning director to really understand the importance of sewer trunk lines and what a huge investment it is. So, we have made I think a pretty bold step of extending a sewer trunk line all the way down McMillan and so the -- we are doing that through some partnerships the staff and the city is taking on an enormous infrastructure burden and accelerating a plan that we actually had foreseen a couple of years down the line. What is the risk to us of putting that infrastructure in place and, then, potentially having properties to the west that we expected would be part of that sewer trunk shed not part of it? Like how does that refactor into our modeling and our -- and I'm not expecting you to model it right now today, but like what -- what would that mean for us? What would that scenario be like and how would it play out long term in terms of viability of our sewer infrastructure in this area?

Stewart: Council President, Council Woman Strader, we have already, because of the circumstances that have occurred out there that we have become aware of, we have done a lot of that very exact modeling. So, anytime you reduce or remove parcels from the sewer shed boundary that you set or your -- your master plan boundaries, you remove a portion of that. You are removing a certain amount of flow, because we would have anticipated in our master plan that that would have developed according to the Comprehensive Plan and we would have factored that into the size of the main lines. So, potentially if we lost enough property it would mean that the infrastructure that we have already invested in might be oversized and bigger than we need and you might say, well, that's unfortunate, but the other thing that happens is the pieces of that line that haven't been built that will be extended will also need to be reduced in size and anytime you reduce the size of a mainline you have to increase the slope of the main line in order to keep the -- the effluent flowing correctly, the hydraulics in the pipe working. What that means is we can't reach as far without putting in another lift station. So, if we lose enough property in the right locations -- I can't tell you exact scenario, because I don't know, you know, which parcels it might be, but you could be looking at a situation where we would have to put in additional lift stations, which are extremely expensive, both to build and operate in order to serve areas that now don't have the sewer flows to justify the larger pipes that keep the elevations down and allow us to serve further out.

Strader: Thank you.

Overton: Thank you, Warren.

Taylor: Council President Overton?

Overton: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Some of this discussion reminds me of a couple years ago the boundary battles between Star and Middleton and ultimately the legislature had to get involved to require them to redraw some area of impacts and boundaries and I kind of see that a little bit happening here. I see this really -- this is really the City of Meridian putting its flag down saying this is a property that's important to us, important to how we want to grow and develop and it's a -- it's a high priority area and it's going to grow incredibly quickly once Highway 16 is completed and there is going to be a ton of demand. I'm very concerned about school overcrowding. Usually I'm okay with that because of how West Ada adjusts the boundaries. This area is feeling quite a bit of a pinch. I really struggle with that. But I have also seen our -- our enrollment trends going down and I know West Ada has been continually adjusting that to accommodate as best that they can. I think they have done -- West Ada has done an incredibly good job with that. This is an area that's going to just feel a little bit of pain with -- when it comes to some overcrowding with respect to that. But I can support this tonight, because I do think it's a high priority area, but I would require that the applicant come back with DA modification for the entire property, because I -- I'm not convinced that we know exactly what it's going to look like despite all the input that is required in The Field Sub Area Plan and everything else that we have in city code. So, I'm not thrilled, but I understand why it makes sense as a -- as a strategic move for the City of Meridian, so I think I will be supporting tonight.

Strader: Council President Overton?

Overton: Council Member Strader.

Strader: I think that's where I'm shaking out. It really bothers me though -- it really bothers me to kind of set up a lower bar for what I consider to be appropriate readiness for an annexation. I just think that the public investment in infrastructure that we have already made in our sewer trunk line that we are already extending down McMillan Road is of such a magnitude and I actually was against accelerating some of that infrastructure at the time for some of these similar reasons I just -- it really bothers me to -- to accelerate infrastructure. However, we -- we chose to do that already and I respect that decision and so for that reason, because I feel that the public investment would not be -- let's call it the highest and best use of our taxpayers money and our investment as a city, I will -- I will approve this with the only -- with the condition being we have to have a DA mod on the entire thing. I think that's the only way that I could ever get comfortable and it, again, with a lot of heartburn and I agree that the overcrowding in the schools of this area is quite acute.

Whitlock: Mr. President?

Overton: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Mr. President, I just -- I -- I appreciate that and I -- I would agree as well that we do need to have the applicant come back with a -- a DA and while there may be some heartburn, I -- I have a level of confidence in this. I know that the applicant has been involved in this area for a long long time and has an interest in seeing it developed properly. In fact, we are going to have a regional park in this area thanks to this applicant and partnering with the City of -- of Meridian. So, I don't have as much heartburn. There is some concern, obviously, but also a degree of confidence that this will be developed in time when the infrastructure is there and available and it will be done in a way that -- that we will have a chance to look at it and approve any -- any development agreements moving forward. So, I will be supportive of this tonight.

Overton: Council, if there is no further comments, do we have a motion to close the public hearing?

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor -- Mr. President. Sorry. I just promoted you. Mr. President, I move that we close the public hearing on Agenda Item No. 16.

Little Roberts: Second.

Overton: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. All in favor say aye. Nay? Ayes have it. The public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor -- and I want to make sure I get this right. So, the condition -- so did get it wrong again. Mr. President.

Overton: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: I want to make sure that the conditions that were shown on the screen are included in the motion. Do you need me to read each of those or just -- that are included in the staff report?

Napoli: Council President, Councilman Whitlock, this is as recommended by the Commission and staff at this point. So, this is what's in the report right now. If this is what you guys agree with, which does require the development agreement modification for the entirety of the site, that would be just as presented in the staff report.

Whitlock: Thanks, Nick. Mr. President?

Overton: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to approve File No. H-2026-0003 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of April 14th, 2026.

Little Roberts: Second.

Overton: I have a motion and a second. Madam Clerk, roll call vote.

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

Overton: Five ayes and one nay. The motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE NAY.

17. Public Hearing for VanTrust (H-2025-0052) by VanTrust Real Estate, generally located at the southwest corner of Black Cat Rd. and Franklin Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation of 23.13 acres of land consisting of six (6) buildings that span a total of 340,000 sq.ft. in the I-L zoning district.

18. Public Hearing for VanTrust (ZOA-2025-0002) by VanTrust Real Estate, generally located at the southwest corner of Black Cat Rd. and Franklin Rd.

- A. Request: UDC Text Amendment to adjust the flex space standards to lower the office requirement from 30% to 10% in the I-L zoning district.

Overton: Council, we move on to No. 17 on our list tonight. It's a public hearing for VanTrust, H-2025-0052. Before we open this for staff comments, Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Mr. President, before we go to staff comments, I live a stone's throw from these next two agenda items. I pass through the intersection of Black Cat and Franklin daily, so I'm very familiar with the area. However, I just wanted to disclose I have not had any visits to the applicant site, nor have I had any ex-parte conversations with anybody involved. I'm prepared to participate in the public hearing tonight.

Overton: Thank you, Councilman Whitlock. I will open it for staff comments.

Napoli: Council President, Members of the Council, next item on the agenda is the annexation and UDC text amendment for VanTrust. I'm just a -- it is two separate applications. I will be doing it in my presentation as one, but I will break it up into the annexation first and, then, the UDC text amendment at the end and I will clarify that when I do make that transition. So, the applicant requests annexation of 23.13 acres of

land with a concept plan consisting of six buildings that span a total of approximately 340,000 square feet in the I-L zoning district. In addition, the applicant requests a UDC text amendment to adjust the flex space standards to lower the office requirement from 20 percent to ten percent in the I-L zoning district. The site is generally located at the southwest corner of Black Cat Road and Franklin Road and as shown on the screen the existing zonings for the two properties is RUT in Ada county and the FLUM designation is low density employment and mixed employment. For this application the applicant did request that we view the entirety of the project as a low density employment FLUM designation as it is the majority of the -- the FLUM designation for the two properties. All right. So, the low density employment designation is defined as a low -- as low rise and specialized employment areas. The intended uses for this designation include corporate or business offices, research facilities and laboratories. In addition -- in addition it should be designed to incorporate traditional neighborhood designs, such as pedestrian circulation, connection to open space, enhanced landscaping, tree lined streets and plazas. The intent behind this is to create developments that are more attractive engaging and accessible. So, the applicant -- and this is the Ten Mile Plan. This is straight from the Ten Mile Plan. On the right-hand side is really the low density employment description and, then, here on the left-hand side is one of the zoning compatibility matrix, which in this it does say office and research as the uses that would be envisioned under the low density employment. So, the applicant is proposing 340,000 square feet of industrial uses across six buildings. The applicant's narrative states that the proposed uses include light manufacturing and assembly, flex space and warehousing and distribution. The applicant estimates over 575 jobs or 1.91 jobs per one thousand square feet will be created. In addition, the applicant argues that the project aligns with the low density employment designation due to higher employment density, non-nuisance like uses and enhanced design. Lastly, the narrative notes that the City of Meridian and the general region has vacancy rates under five percent for flex spaces. Let's see. So, staff has met with the applicant multiple times over the past year to review the project and throughout these discussions staff has consistently stated that the annexation cannot be supported without a concurrent Comprehensive Plan map amendment. This position is based on the project's inability to meet the allowable uses within -- and the key -- key design elements of the low density employment designation. The Commission and staff found that the applicant's proposal does not align with the intended uses in the low density employment designation and lacks the traditional neighborhood design that is called for. I would like to add that the applicant did make some changes since the Commission hearing. They are going to highlight that a little bit more in their report to try to address specifically more of the design elements rather than the uses and that the applicant will show that a little bit more in their report as far as in depth. In addition, the Ten Mile Interchange Specific Area Plan envisions a transition from residential uses east of Black Cat Road to an industrial node near State Highway 16. Staff notes that mixed employment and low density employment designations are limited along the Black Cat and Franklin corridors, including the -- including this project. The I-L zoning currently comprises of approximately 54.15 percent of the low density employment FLUM designation and 61.28 percent of the mixed employment FLUM designation. With industrial uses taking over these FLUM designations the area -- staff has concerns that the area will lack key elements of the

plan, including office and employment uses, supporting -- and supporting services. In addition to this it adds a significant amount of truck and freight traffic on the Franklin and Black -- the Franklin, Black Cat and Ten Mile corridors that were not initially contemplated when the plan was adopted. So, here is an image of -- an overlay image of all the approvals that we have had in this area. Anything that's shown on the map is existing, but anything that's actually highlighted -- so pretty much this area is what's been entitled. Anything highlighted in orange is what has been built. Highlighted in yellow is the applicant's proposed site and anything that's not been highlighted is yet to be constructed. So, the -- the overlay depicts approximately two -- 2,284 residential units and 4,318,360 square feet of commercial and industrial space, most of which has not been constructed yet and we have not realized the traffic impact of that yet. So, staff is asking the Council to carefully evaluate whether the continued expansion of the I-L zoning into the low density employment and mixed employment FLUM designations is appropriate. I will go back to their site plan. So, access to the site is proposed from a future collector street near the southern portion of the site and a shared access off Franklin Road with the western neighbor, which is Butte Fence. In addition, the applicant has stubbed a frontage road to the property to the east to allow for cross-access in the future and that would be right here. So, in early February ACHD and -- had indicated to the applicant that they determined the only access to Franklin would be the shared access with Butte. So, that did significantly change the applicant's concept plan. They actually had two small bay industrial buildings up here that would more have met the intent of the plan, but since they didn't have access they felt that the feasibility of those buildings would not be possible and I'm sure that they will go into that a little bit more with theirs. So, when staff learned about this, obviously, the plan changed in February to -- for the applicant and, you know, staff -- staff shared a lot of the same concerns that ACHD did and ultimately with ACHD's recommendation to only allow for that shared access point it did change their concept plan significantly -- significantly. ACHD -- ACHD staff report indicated that the anticipated trip generation is 1,119 vehicles per day for this development. So, staff agrees that there may be a strong market demand for industrial uses, but this Ten Mile Specific Area Plan specifically says the intent of the plan is to create a place that will add long term economic stability for the City of Meridian and not just respond to immediate forces and trends. So, that's the annexation portion and we move on to the UDC text amendment and, then, I will add a summary of the Commission hearing at the end. So, the applicant is proposing to amend the flex space standards to lower the office requirement in the I-I zoning from 20 to ten percent. The applicant asserts that this change would better align with the current market conditions and would remove an existing barrier to leasing flex space in Meridian. Staff is currently working on a broader code change amendment to address the flex space standards, which were most recently adopted by the City Council in June of 2025. Staff has informed the applicant that the comprehensive code change is being developed to address inconsistencies with the newly adopted standards and one of that is that percentages don't add up to a hundred percent in the current standards and that's something staff's working on changing so that there is correct -- a complete code that is cohesive. So, however the applicant did elect to proceed with the proposed amendment. The Commission and staff do not support -- support the proposed UDC text amendment as it would have implications beyond this individual development.

While the applicant notes that flex space vacancy rates in Meridian are critically low, they also contend the current flex -- flex space standards present a barrier to leasing and staff finds this to be a contradictory statement. Additionally, that -- within the I-L zoning district warehousing is a permitted use that already allows an office component up to ten percent. Adoption of the proposed flex space amendment would perpetuate inconsistencies in the code, including percentages that do not total one hundred percent and would effectively flex space to function identically to warehousing in the I-L zone. Staff agrees that revisions to this section of code are warranted. However, the applicant's proposed amendment is narrowly focused on a single development and does not adequately consider citywide impacts. Staff has met with the UDC focus group to discuss proposed revisions for the flex space standards and we will be presenting these changes to the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council later this year. So, at the Planning and Zoning Commission hearing the Commission recommended denial of both applications due to the site not meeting design -- site design standards, the absence of Comprehensive Plan map amendment and wanting staff to lead the UDC text changes, rather than a developer for a single development. We have received written testimony from the Thurston family since the Planning and Zoning Commission hearing and they are in support of the proposed -- the proposal as their property is one of the properties included in the concept plan and they would look to move forward with the sale of their property. In addition, they said the existing home will likely be wiped out with the future expansion of Franklin Road. Overall they are in support of the project and I will stand for any questions that you guys have at this time.

Overton: Council, any questions for staff?

Strader: Council President?

Overton: Council Member Strader.

Strader: Hello. So, with this one would you mind going to the Black Cat map that shows -- yes. Could you just zoom in a little bit on this property and walk me through what we have approved in this area? And part of it is my gut, after reading the application, is like, of course, we should consider a comp plan amendment for this area. If this is a burgeoning industrial corridor, which it appears to be, maybe that -- I mean we -- we have always said we are underweight industrial as a city. Like that -- like just stepping way back. But could you kind of walk me through like what have we approved? Have we approved residential here? Like let me understand what exactly has been approved in these surrounding contexts for this property.

Napoli: Council President, Council Woman Strader, so you just want me to highlight all the projects that are showing on here? Okay. Perfect. I just want to make sure you weren't focusing on one section of it. So, I will start in the -- the northeast corner. So, this is the Gateway at Ten Mile. Mixed-use development. You have multi-family, some vertically integrated and commercial uses. Then it goes into Outer Banks, I believe is what it's called. You have commercial uses, a lot of which that have already been constructed out there with more multi-family behind it. Then you have the District at Ten

Mile, which is a large mixed-use project that does include multi-family, retail, you know, some office and employment. Then you have Vanguard Village, which you will probably see an amendment to that, but this was approved for multi-family. You have an Adler project. I don't remember the name. It was included I think in the District at Ten Mile, which is industrial and, then, you have Farmstone, which is mixed employment, which is industrial uses -- some industrial, with some quasi-industrial uses and, then, you have Avani Subdivision, which is single family homes. I don't have the exact number off the top of my head, but I want to say roughly around 300 single family homes. You have AT Industrial -- or Black Cat Industrial, Meridian Commerce Park, has several different names that's -- over the years. Roughly I think two and a half million square footage of industrial I-L zoning. You have Core & Main, which you guys saw last year, I want to say, which is -- they did a comp plan amendment to be mixed employment, which would allow for some industrial uses and it is an industrial use and, then, you have the VanTrust property and you will see a lot more coming and I -- one thing just to add on to that is we do have a lot of industrial out here. The trunk line for -- in McDermott will be at Ustick at some point, you know, in the next year or so I think. That agreement has been signed and executed and I know Toll Brothers is working on that and there have been other conversations with applications that aren't in the system yet to bring it further down. So, this industrial area is possible to have sewer at it, you know, not in the direct future, but, you know, in -- in the timeline of the next five years I think is realistic and just to give you some backside that there is a lot of general industrial just to the west of this that hasn't developed yet that will develop as general industrial and that's -- yeah.

Strader: Quick follow up?

Overton: Council Member Strader.

Strader: Do you view there being any unique risk to having so much industrial or a certain amount of industrial development in this area? I mean I just -- I would view it as a good thing just generally, but I just want to understand is there something I'm missing? Is there -- besides that, like I -- I totally do not understand why this was the approach and it seems like a comp plan amendment makes way more sense. But help me understand that piece. Like is there something I'm missing where like, you know, besides -- I understand the Ten Mile Plan, believe me, I was a big proponent of it and had -- had held firm to it for a long time, but we have -- we have departed from that anyway and so what is the risk of a comp plan amendment and creating a larger industrial corridor here? Or is there one?

Napoli: Yeah. Council President, Council Woman Strader, you know, for one I think traffic is going to be -- freight traffic in -- in particular -- I know State Highway 16 will connect and have an off -- an on-ramp on Franklin, but a lot of these roadways, especially Ten Mile I think is better than E as it currently sits and when you introduce freight traffic that was not initially intended in the area that does negatively impact, you know, commuter cars, the everyday driver, because freight traffic does slow down the roads. It congests intersections at a rate that -- I don't remember the exact -- I talked with our long range staff. They have a little bit more of the statistics and I can find that

for you if you would like as far as what -- the addition of freight traffic. But I think that's what staff kind of wants to hear from you guys tonight as well. I think if City Council does want to see some more industrial in this area and the Mayor -- I think that's feedback that it -- maybe not with this application, but I think that is something that I want -- I would want to hear as a staff, because the Ten Mile Plan doesn't necessarily contemplate that. But if that is the kind of the direction we want to go in the future I think that not only is it beneficial for staff to know that, I think it's beneficial for the development community, so we can plan as a -- be a good partnership with the city and, you know, the private sector to really do what we want out here -- what you and Mayor has envisioned for this area. So, as far as, you know, long term impacts I think it's, one, not being consistent with the plan is my -- is, obviously, part of staff's recommendation for the deny -- and commission's. I think that traffic is one of the largest ones as far as unintended freight traffic that wasn't initially, you know, contemplated with the plan. You know, in their plan they do have a lot of loading docks. So, there is, obviously, going to be a lot of freight traffic that -- you know, with a mixed employment -- I guess mixed employment and low density employment was kind of envisioned to be Silverstone. That's what it was in the original. I get -- I -- I think when the plan was intended I think it was most -- more of to be a -- more of kind of an office park. Obviously economics have changed, you know, demand has changed. I hear every day when talking with the development community, you know, there is not the demand for office anymore that there once was and I think that, you know, the plan -- it still calls for it and I think that's where we need to find the balance and maybe get feedback from you guys as well to see if this is the direction we still want to go with the Ten Mile Plan and if this is how we still want to interpret the code -- or the plan and the code or if we want to, you know, amend some of that to align better with what we really have envisioned. So, I -- I hope that answers your question. If you have any more I'm happy to -- to answer them. But that's really what -- from staff's perspective that's where we are at at this point. Correct.

Cavener: Mr. President?

Overton: Council Member Cavener,

Cavener: Nick, first, appreciate the report and update. I always recognize always the hard spot for staff to be in recommending denial and I know that's not where you guys like to begin and recognize Council's decision sometimes create some of that push and pull that comes from the development community and I have been responsible for some of that. So, apologies. Appreciate you working with us. Your comment about, you know, the -- the impact on industrial around traffic consideration, I think that's very apropos in that area. It's not the first time that you have heard me rally about the challenges with Black Cat. If I recall, Nick, the -- the Black Cat industrial project that Council approved a year, two years ago, if I recall limited their growth model based on the expansion of Black Cat. Am I remembering that correctly? And -- and I don't expect you have it off the top of your head, but maybe as we get closer to wrapping up if you could give Council a flavor for what the decision was of the -- of the Council when that decision was made, because I -- I do think that it certainly would be unfair and inappropriate to -- to limit one landowner's ability to grow in industrial while granting a

very similar use to -- to go on. So, I think that's an important piece that we need to probably consider before we make a decision. So, that's one. And, then, I think, second, I recognize hypothetically I think that this area does make more sense now for industrial than maybe what has been previously contemplated. So, just one voice to share with that. And, then, maybe a third, just to make sure that I'm tracking this correctly, I don't know where Council is going to land on this. I don't know where I'm going to land on this. But if Council were to want to move forward with an approval this evening we couldn't necessarily take that action this evening, we would need to continue at a later time for staff to draft findings for Council to be able to lean on as part of their approval process. Am I tracking everything correctly?

Napoli: Yeah. Council President -- Councilman Overton. Start with your last question. Yes, it would -- we would need to do findings and we would all -- we need to revise the findings and have conditions of approval. I do have some draft conditions of approval, but I would want to, you know, work with the applicant before the hearing. So, we were on the same page or at least, you know, we were on the same page on one of you -- we were not on the same page about it, so when we go into the hearing -- so, yes, that -- to say that, yes, we would need to I think continue is correct. That would be my first time doing that. But, yes, in this role. But for your first question you are correct, Meridian Commerce Park, AT Industrial I think it was 960,000. I'm very familiar with this area now. I have -- I have done a lot of the industrial projects out here. It was 960,000 was their square footage before it triggered certain improvements and I want to say it was 1.5 million that's triggered additional improvements and I can -- I can pull up that DA and I can read that off for you guys verbatim in a little bit and maybe after we hear from the applicant so you guys are refreshed on that. But they -- correct. In that development agreement there were thresholds that were placed on that development as far as it is a certain occupancy threshold. So, not maybe necessarily construction threshold, it was based on occupancy of those buildings. You have to do certain -- it triggers certain improvements to the roadways. That is correct. And I apologize, your second question was -- I think it was more of a comment.

Cavener: More of a -- Mr. President, just a comment and appreciate it, Nick.

Napoli: Yeah. Thank you.

Overton: Any other questions for staff? Would the applicant like to come forward? If you would state your name and address for the record.

McCluskey: Yes, good evening, Council. My name is Chris McCluskey with VanTrust. Address is 205 North 400 West, Suite 100, Salt Lake City. 84003. Before we begin can I request from the Council to have an additional allotment of time? We have got quite a bit to cover, so we wanted to go to 20 minutes in lieu of the 15. Is that approvable?

Strader: Council President?

Overton: We will do 15 and we will judge it at the 15 mark.

McCluskey: That works. Wonderful. Well, again, my name is Chris McCluskey with VanTrust. I run development for the northwest and will be the lead on this project.

Lomeli: Council President? Sorry to interrupt. I think he is asking for that additional time because it is two applications --

McCluskey: Yes.

Lomeli: -- that were kind of combined. Just to clarify --

McCluskey: Because it is both, a UDC amendment and the --

Lomeli: Sorry.

Overton: Thank you for keeping me straight.

Lomeli: You are welcome.

McCluskey: Thank you, Tina.

Overton: Twenty minutes is approved. Thank you.

McCluskey: Wonderful. Thank you. Again, Chris McCluskey with VanTrust. I think -- I wanted to start out with a little bit of talk about sponsorship. As the Council considers these projects, obviously, that's one of the large components and so since 2010 VanTrust has developed over eight billion dollars' worth of total project cost, of which equals about little over 73 million square feet. This year we are projected to do about 1.2 billion across the country, of which 95 percent is industrial flex products. So, we, obviously, have a little bit of history with the -- with the product type that we are proposing here today and we are excited to be a part of the community. So, we look forward to this being our flag in Idaho and being in this location hopefully barring approval obviously. But with that being said I would want to introduce our land use counsel Deborah Nelson. She is going to give you a little more depth on the project. Thank you.

Nelson: Thank you, Council President, Members of the Council. I will try to keep it as tight as we can to cover all -- everything that we want to cover. I think you have already heard the overview of the applications. I will just note additionally that we are also going to -- oh, excuse me. Deborah Nelson. 601 West Bannock Street for the record. But we are also going to come forward with a preliminary plat and a design review application in the future and we are here on the annexation and zoning and the code amendment in large part because we do need the Council's direction, because we haven't seen eye to eye with staff yet on the use and so before we go through a lot of those detailed designs we do need information from you about whether this is a use that you support in this location. So, Nick already covered the project overview, but I just want to touch on a couple of things that we are going to have these two different product types. Both of

them are -- allow multi-tenant use. So, the medium format shallow bay has sizes that are as small as 18,000 square feet and the micro bay flex will have sizes down to 2,700 square feet. So, this flexibility allows Meridian to attract and keep employers, because these businesses can stay in their space even as they grow. That demisability of space is really what's in demand by employers. We are not providing any of the large cross-bay type warehousing and distribution, such as what you would see with an Amazon that -- that's really going to be located in your general industrial area to the west of this site. We expect that these six buildings will support 30 to 40 small to medium businesses, with clean, quiet, indoor, non-hazardous, light industrial uses that provide that specialized employment. Nick's already noted that the majority of the site is in the LDE designation and we have asked to use that consistent with your Comprehensive Plan that allows you to use the majority of the property. And so next I want to turn to some of the questions and comments that have already come up and why do we believe that the Ten Mile Plan as it is drafted now supports the I-L zoning without a Comprehensive Plan amendment? That amendment from LDE to ME, which are just two different designations within your employment district, isn't necessary to support I-L zoning. Both of these designations could support I-L zoning and that's shown here in the zoning district compatibility matrix. So, it's exactly on point to what we are asking is which zones are compatible with these designations. Both the -- the LDE and the mixed employment support industrial and, importantly, the LDE designation is noted as favorable in this -- for -- for I-L zoning. You can see with the check and the plus that we have highlighted here and it's consistent with that. Also the city has already decided to interpret its plan that way and that's what you did exactly on the 200 acres to our south in the Black Cat industrial project. You interpreted this to allow I-L zoning without a Comprehensive Plan amendment. And so we followed in that same path that you outlined. This -- the type of uses that we are asking for here are the same types of uses that were contemplated there. So, not only from the zoning that we are requesting, but from the end use that we are requesting it's contemplated those are allowed uses in the I-L zone and they are appropriate for this site in this designated area. Fundamentally staff's concern that they have expressed to us throughout a lot of discussions -- and we really appreciate all of their time that they have spent with us on this application. It's been very involved in and the -- the -- the topics that they have been concerned about have really focused on that end use. They have wanted that more traditional office and understood that to be what was originally anticipated here and so they wanted us to pursue a comp plan change to ME to support ME zoning. ME zoning does not work for our uses in the end product that we want similar to the property to the south. It doesn't include warehouse and distribution as allowed uses, which just adds additional hurdles for tenants that makes the project unfeasible. So, again, we want the I-L zoning that is contemplated here in this employment designation. We are also consistent with the description of the LDE area. It's the right conceptual fit. The ME designated area tends to have a little bit more of that traditional office park look, also larger buildings in scale, and we are going to provide that specialized employment that it has that -- the flexible spaces with the convenient circulation without retail. We will have the landscaping. We will have pedestrian circulation and the connection to gathering spaces. We meet the description of the types of buildings that are contemplated in LDE better than the description of the types of buildings that are contemplated in ME. LDE has these lower

profile buildings. They are five to 150 thousand square feet. They have a floor area ratio of under .75 and they are three stories or lower. All of those criteria describe our buildings and contrast that with ME that has up to four stories, up to a million square feet and over the .75 floor area ratio and so we are more compatible with the type of buildings that were anticipated for the LDE designation as well. I'm looking at the design elements in your Ten Mile. We meet the designations whether it's LDE or ME, because they are virtually the same. LDE has one additional design element that we also meet and that's that the buildings are to scale. Again that's consistent with that low rise building that's contemplated, not the taller larger buildings. We -- we meet all of these design elements with architectural and facade and the site will have the cohesive signage and public art and I will describe a little bit more of that. Here are some concepts of the buildings. Now, again, this will be reviewed in more detail during design review, but wanted to -- you to see some concept images of the two medium format shallow bay buildings. These will have multiple points of vertical and horizontal articulation to break up the facades, pedestrian scale entrances to each tenant space and significant glazing along the Franklin and the new collector road to create that inviting appearance. The small loading docks are oriented to the interior of the site, limiting visibility to adjacent properties and here you can see some of those micro bay flex buildings also with significant architectural differentiation in the facades and glazing with that pedestrian scale entrance. On the open space -- as Nick mentioned we have continued to make improvements to add additional details to address staff's questions and concerns about this and -- and some of this has even been updated since the Planning and Zoning Commission, so we appreciate staff's willingness to continue to meet with us and work on that. Each building will have a gathering space for employees with hardscaping, landscaping and seating. There will be public art placed at the site's entrance. A pathway will run along the east side of our site -- this was requested by staff -- to provide that connectivity from Franklin down to the new collector and we will also have ten foot wide multi-use pathways along both sides of that east-west collector and additional sidewalks and crosswalks will be throughout to provide that connectivity between the -- the employment and the users and their gathering spaces and here you can see some of the plaza imagery for concepts of what the plaza and seating area elements may look like here and signs -- we will have cohesive sign guidelines consistent with VanTrust's industrial complexes in other locations and as called for in your Ten Mile Plan. The collector road will have that neighborhood feel that really pulls together some of the elements in the traditional neighborhood and called for in your plan with the landscaping, the detached eight foot landscape buffer, a ten foot multi-use pathway on each side and just two lanes of traffic there. ACHD provided preliminary comments on this. They will provide additional details when there is a detailed development plan. But they commented that we could not take access from Franklin and Nick mentioned that they preferred it to be from a collector. They cite to the Ten Mile plan as one reason, which says it prohibits access onto arterials, so that's part of the city plans. They also look at their own access policies to determine that and they prefer to have access off of the lesser traveled road. That did require us to make some site plan changes, which we had -- which we have done now. But they also noted that the area roadways currently meet ACHD's level of service planning thresholds and ACHD does plan to widen Franklin to five lanes next year, which is before this project

would come online and the site is served by transit. Also wanted to call out that -- some differences between light industrial traffic and office. There -- in general light industrial has slightly lower trip generation than office. But I think the important thing really to call out is that light industrial tends to have dispersed times of -- of operation more so than office. Office workers tend to have that more typical 8:00 to 5:00, which really impacts the peak hour travel times and light industrial has more dispersed times and so has lower impact on those peak -- peak hour intersections. The economic impact of the project is -- is strong and I may, you know, move through these slides pretty quickly and would just take questions, of course, if you have -- if you want more of it, because you are already aware of that and based on the -- the preliminary comments I don't want to spend too much time on this, but we do want you to know that we -- we think that this is a very valuable asset of employment in this employment district as called for in your Ten Mile Plan and is in need in -- in your city. We are attracting the types of businesses that need this flexible space, that need this type of shell, you know, at office or light industrial, it's really all about the type of shell that you are attracting those employers and this is the type of product they really need and the targeted tenants for this type of -- of zoning and this type of product that we are delivering are in some of the valley's top industries that are still growing and need space. Construction, manufacturing, wholesale trade and transportation and warehousing. And unlike office employees these jobs are on -- in hands-on industries. So, they are less susceptible to being replaced by AI. They are more sustainable jobs for the future. The same industry sectors support good wages with average wages ranging from 29 to 38 dollars per hour, exceeding Meridian's current 24 dollar an hour average. City staff has really been pushing more to have a traditional office park here. So, we want to talk a little bit about that. You do have a lot of other office that's developing in the -- in the city around Eagle Road and 84 and also around Ten Mile and 84. But in -- and these locations are serving this new office better, because Class A office -- the demand for it and the locations that they are desiring has really changed. If -- they are not desiring this type of location that we have on our property anymore, they want to be in a mixed use development where they have got commercial, where they have got residential integrated into that same site and they typically want to be at these larger interchange areas and so that's where you are seeing office going that -- the District at Ten Mile and 84 is a great example of those kinds of mixes that are going in there and that's really different from what we have here. We are in an area that is -- has become this light industrial transition between the heavy industrial that's to our west and the mix of uses that's to our east that includes that office, that includes that residential and includes some lighter industrial as well and with the uses that are immediately adjacent to us we have the same types of products that we are providing and we have even some that have outdoor storage. This is a great location for us. We are compatible with those uses. This is not a great location for a traditional office park, but that is not going to be sought after by development or successful in attracting tenants. Meridian Crossing to our south is leasing up very quickly in the same types of product and there continues to be high demand. They are bringing in great employers with St. Luke's, Crescent Electric, Carpenters Union. Those same types of employers are still looking for location in Meridian, particularly as the supply chain industry supporting the Micron expansion are continuing to come to the valley. TOK Commercial did compile existing listings and to look at what's out there and

there is -- there -- there are 24 flex spaces currently available in Meridian in a range of sizes, but 33 percent of these are over 25,000 and that -- that large format product really dominates the available supply. TOK data shows that zero leasing activity in that size category that's available. But contrast that with small bay supply that's being absorbed really fast. The zero to ten thousand square foot is 37.5 percent of the listings, but faces the highest transaction volume. So, this project small bay really does address that demand that's shown in this red box here. This is the size range where Meridian tenants are actively seeking space and I think that's a good opportunity to turn to a question that was raised by Council Member Strader about -- talking about what has been approved in the area. So, of the 4.3 million square feet that Nick highlighted as being approved in this immediate area, much of that is commercial, not industrial. So, that's just looking at the non -- non-residential space. So, just under half of that is commercial. So, if you look at the industrial, these are largely in three projects. You have got Adler's Ten Mile West project, which I would note is zoned ME and it also has a development agreement that says it cannot have flex, warehouse or distribution. So, it does not compete with this site or with the development to our south. That is a -- that's a different project and a different product. Secondly, you have got Farmstone Crossing, which Nick highlighted, also zoned ME. Doesn't have the same development agreement restrictions, but it makes it harder, it adds those additional hurdles, because you don't have warehouse and distribution as allowed uses. And, then, you have got the AT or Black Cat industrial project to our south and that is continuing to lease up very quickly and there continues to be high demand there. I do want to just touch on the code change briefly. We don't need to spend a lot of time on this. I know you guys are already familiar with the change that was passed for the ME zone. We are simply asking for the same change here. We appreciate that staff is working on a larger code change. They didn't have language that they were willing to share with us at this time. So, we just need to make sure that we are also putting before your request for that change that has been made in the ME district to be made in the I-L district, where it's as, if not more important, to have this flexibility in how office space is aligned and -- and, again, we appreciate that they are thinking about how this fits into their large -- your larger code and making adjustments as needed to make sure that all of the uses add up to a hundred percent. We just want to make sure that we have got flexibility in how office is structured and in these types of spaces you could have floor plans that have significant walls that are built to house office type spaces or you could have an open floor plan that has workspaces that have no walls and there isn't really a clear way of defining that. So, what we are looking for is flexibility and how this is -- how these spaces can be built out, because that is driven by the tenant and whether they have walls around their workspaces or not does not change the value of that employer or the number of employees they have and so that's all we are looking for there is -- is flexibility. So, for all of these reasons we really appreciate your consideration of this, your support for industrial that you have offered in the past in this area and really would welcome questions you have for us about this project or how it fits within your Ten Mile Plan. Thank you.

Overton: Council, any questions for the applicant? Council Member Strader.

Strader: Thank you, Council President Overton. I appreciate it. So, just initial thoughts. I -- I think it's -- what I'm struggling with is the -- the method with which you go about annexing in and I think where I'm struggling a little bit is -- I -- I'm sensing this unwillingness -- I mean you said you are unwilling to do a comp plan amendment into the ME zone. Are you open to a comp plan amendment into industrial I guess would be my question to you. And not that -- not that necessarily that should be driven by you, by the way. I mean I think it might make sense for the city to talk and have a discussion about whether we want to amend our Comprehensive Plan to expand our industrial corridor just based on what we are seeing here. The traffic impacts are a big deal. I don't want to gloss over that. That's a big concern for me. But I'm struggling with an annexation request and, then, to make this work you are requesting a UDC text amendment that really specifically is tailored toward your application and I just -- as a city I hate for us to go about any UDC amendments in that manner. It just feels really inefficient and not like the right way to -- to do things. If the city was willing to consider amending our -- our comp plan would you be willing to take a continuance to let that process happen? Are you asking for just this is the only way this works for you today? Like what's your sense of timing? I just want to understand what's your timing and why this specific approach, because it -- it just seems really out of the norm.

Nelson: Yeah. Council President, Council Member Strader, yes, I would be happy to -- to address that. So, we have had a long history of meetings with the staff about this project. In our -- in our early meetings with staff we laid out this product. We haven't changed in what we want to bring forward and what we want to bring to the site. But we did talk to staff about design elements and that they wanted to see -- and also the uses and the process and they did not get supportive of the use; right? They -- they wanted a different use here. They did initially suggest at some of our very earliest meetings that we would need a comp plan amendment to industrial, because that's what we were asking for was industrial. But, then, we would -- we followed that up with a question of but would you support industrial -- a comp plan change to industrial and the answer was no, because that led us to an end use. So, it -- it didn't, you know, facilitate getting us down the path. More recently they have been talking about an amendment to the ME, but, again, coupled with the question and answer, but would you support this and -- and we understood the -- the answer to be, no, that it was still about the use, that -- that staff didn't support the use and so it -- you know, initially we had the time to do that, but now as time has gone on, as you know, to change the comp plan is a six months -- it's only every six months. So, it does create time delays and so when we look at your plan, you know, so we don't have staff support for that process and we just need to find out if the use is going to be allowed here for the developer to move on or try this site. We look at your Ten Mile Plan and we see that I-L zoning is clearly allowed in your zoning metrics and so it doesn't require a comp plan. So, it felt fruitless to us and, really, I guess not -- not even following staff's direction to pursue a comp plan amendment to pursue a use that they didn't support when we can see in the comp plan that it is already part of your designation. I mean you guys have already decided this is an employment district; right? You've put LDE on it. So, if LDE supports I-L zoning why would we ask you for a different designation or ask you to change your vision and plan for the area. So, it didn't feel like a -- fruitful for you or us or staff, because we are still going to come forward with

the same product. So, I do understand that they have continually suggested different paths of -- of this, but not to an end of an approval. So -- and even at the P&Z we had the same conversation and I think, you know, we heard a few different comments from staff that we questioned about, you know, what -- at one point they said, okay, it's really become about design, but by the end of it they circled back to, no, we just fundamentally, you know, don't support this use in this area and so, again, we didn't take a continuance, we wanted -- we need to get the direction on whether this use in this zone is appropriate here as we see it being allowed in your plan and at this point it would be another delay to get there. So, we would -- we would rather not pursue process for process sake. But if -- if -- if it came with, you know, supporting this we certainly would have been aligned with that. We weren't trying to thumb our nose at that opportunity if we knew that was an opportunity. Does that answer your question?

Overton: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: It certainly helps to give some flavor for the discussions. Thank you.

Taylor: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Deb, I appreciate the presentation. Kind of what I'm -- I'm hearing is that as a city in some regards we have lost a little bit of a vision of what this area -- what we want it to look like. We had the Ten Mile Area Specific Plan. I'm probably the most guilty of any Council Member of chipping away at that, because I found it to be a little outdated. But there is a reason we have plans, because it provides us with some understanding about what we want to see and that provides you with some clarity. But what we have created is a sense of you are trying to work within what we have laid out, which is at conflict with itself in a little bit. I'm probably one of the biggest proponents of flex space, because to me that creates a sense of economic diversity where you can tailor a space for a variety of needs. Office space tends to cater to just a certain type of employer. Retail tends to just, obviously, cater to that. I see flex space kind of touching all of the above and a lot of flexibility. I want to kind of get into the -- the UDC changes a little bit and talk about the -- the percent -- the ten percent we have mentioned. I have always felt like requiring a certain percentage of it was an arbitrary number and I always wanted data to kind of confirm it, but I also -- there is a reason we have a -- a minimum standard, because we don't want these places to turn into just warehouses; right? We want employment there. We want people to go there for jobs. We want to see some diversity there. Can you talk a little bit more about the changes that you want to see us make? Why ten percent seems to be the number that you are settling on, if it's just kind of syncing up with what we have already got and I would also say I -- I think that the city needs to have a -- continue this conversation, I know staff is, about what we want to see with the flex space, because I want to see a lot more of it, because we can see it in these industrial spaces, we can also see this in other settings where it -- you know, it -- it fits in really well. We have seen a few other projects that are some small flex space

that are really quite attractive. But can you talk to me a little bit more about that ten percent?

Nelson: Yes. Council President, Council Member Taylor, yes. First of all, I would just comment that the sequence of this -- and this gets to Council Member Strader's comment before, if -- if we weren't ahead of where the city was in that process we would happily weigh in at the city -- when the city is amending their code, but we were ahead of that game and, as I mentioned, we don't know yet if staff is going to address the light industrial zone at that time. So, it is appropriate for this application and needed for this application and supports it and so we wanted to make that request for you. If you want to defer that to have -- have that be a larger discussion within the city, I certainly understand the desire to fix this at a broader level as well. As far as the -- the percentage, it was simply to build on what you had already decided and so it wasn't that we think that ten is the magic number, I think complete flexibility is perfect for this type of owner, but it finds that balance and maybe accomplishes a little bit about what you were saying, Council Member Taylor, that you want there to be some component there. But, yes, it was just building on what you recently did for the ME and trying to bring that into the I-L as well.

Taylor: Councilman Overton, quick follow up?

Overton: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: You know, when I look at it initially it feels like the tail wagging the dog sort of on -- on the changes here, like we are making this change, which I anticipate I would be in favor of moving this direction anyway, but we are not there yet and so this application is sort of forcing this discussion a little bit before maybe staff is ready to present some of their suggestions and recommendations and before we have had a chance to really think about it and tackle it. So, we are being forced to think about a UDC change when we are maybe not ready, but you make a compelling argument for why we are here in this situation. That said, in terms of timing is this application -- you know, I know we have got two of them here before us. Is the land use application completely determined -- or conditional upon the UDC changes as you would like to see them? Because I'm just wondering if we could separate the two and we could say, look, the land use works and I'm okay with that, but, then, the -- the changes -- does it have to come later? I -- I don't know if we can, but I'm just kind of thinking out loud if that is required from your perspective that both need to move together or could we separate this discussion just a little bit?

Nelson: Right. Council President, Council Member Taylor, certainly legally you can separate them and make your own decisions independently, but I think what you are asking me is if -- if we have a preference, if we need this to be able to proceed and -- and that's our ask and I'm going to ask Chris to come up and address that, because that's a business decision.

McCluskey: Thanks, Deborah. Thanks, Council. Council President, Councilman Taylor. You know, I never like to put finite yes or no's draw lines in the sand. Unfortunately, with us, because we have had this site under contract for a year, we are coming to the end of our diligence also with the land seller and also VanTrust's ability to continue through on DD. So, our anticipation would be to put this into production as soon as possible and so separating these two does not allow us to move on to the preliminary plat process. Also with the CZC process and some of the other hurdles we have to get through to get through entitlements. So, unfortunately, yes, it is not separable in our eyes, just because without this flexibility we are not able to lease the product as we think it's going to be leased or could be leased and that limits our leasing ability. Leasing is our bread and butter; right. We don't -- it's not beneficial for the city or for us to have empty buildings set out there. So, unfortunately, yes, these -- these need to go together. Due to the fact that -- I mean can anyone sit here tonight and say when that code change would happen? You know, you could say could be down the road, it could be -- I mean, obviously, it's got to go through a process; right? And so we need that certainty. So, unfortunately, they are tied together.

Taylor: Councilman Overton, quick follow up with Mr. McCluskey while he is here. Talk a little bit about the types of tenants that you are hoping -- or that you have seen in other developments that you are envisioning bringing here or talk to me about like the -- how that flexibility works into attracting what kind of employers. Is it spec space? Is it people come to you and say I want a space, then, you go in and do the tenant improvements as they request? So, talk to me a little bit about the business side of filling up these buildings.

McCluskey: Of course. And I will -- I will give a little flavor for the VanTrust side and what we anticipate, then, I would like to call up Mr. Martin, he is with TOK, could talk a little more about the tenant profiles that he has seen in the Meridian side of it a little more. VanTrust is a spec developer. So, we will develop these building speculatively with no tenants in tow. Our anticipation is to do the whole project, because we think they complement each other just from the factor that we have talked about thus far, kind of that offsetting types of uses. The four buildings I did want to highlight and I think you did a great job, Deb, but just to clarify one more time, those southern four buildings do not have dock high positions. So, their grade level drive-in doors similar to the front buildings on AT Industrial. So, there will be no truck traffic to the south of the collector. The two northern ones -- obviously those truck courts turn on each side -- on their -- onto each other, so they complement each other a little bit there. But from our perspective we will go in -- and just to be full transparency, we will put in a spec office, which will probably be around that ten percent for the first space. What that allows for is a tenant who needs to move quickly. Could take a bay or two. We can move that tenant in and continue to work our way through leasing them. We have seen a lot of variation in those tenant types across the nation. A lot of the points about the types of jobs being actually very well paying jobs, higher tech jobs, and I will see if I could get Mr. Martin up here a second to do a little better job on that -- on the type of tenants. But, you know, to further elaborate on the ten percent a little bit that Deb brought up, you know, for example, an LED manufacturer, we put that in, they made LED signs in

the warehouse, so they would have some of the LED components come in, they would assemble them. They used them in like the high school football games and some of the other locations or wherever you see the LED signage. They were working more employees in the actual construction area, not in a -- what was called office. So, when we permitted it it looked like it had very little office, but they actually had more employees than they would have gotten the density that a normal office would have had in that same space, because they were assembling those products and pushing them out and that's what -- a lot we are seeing in these flex jobs as you were -- as you were mentioning earlier. But maybe if we could get Mr. Martin up here, I would love to have him talk a little more about the actual types.

Martin: President Overton, Members of Council, Tyler Martin. 322 Bacon Drive, Boise. 83712. I want to talk a little bit about -- and can I roll my presentation in here? I was going to talk a little bit later, so don't know about format here, but I want to talk a little bit about the types of jobs we are seeing in these buildings and these are -- I have a lot of -- we did a survey, I presented it to you last summer. We surveyed 800,000 square feet of these spaces, multiple tenants. I have since narrowed that down to just Meridian and so in Meridian we surveyed -- so, these are all very similar buildings to the small bay, mid bay product and the larger buildings that's along Franklin Road. We surveyed 442 -- we -- we got actual results for 443,000 square feet of space. In those spaces there was 945 employees or about one employee for every 468 square feet. We had one, two, three, four -- we had five companies that had employment per square foot, near 250 square feet per employee, which is an historical office number. GSA historically has said that there is supposed to be about 250 square feet per office employee. We now have industrial space in Meridian doing that and it's incredible the number of jobs we see run through these and so when we went and did this survey, the question we asked wasn't how many jobs are here, but how many paychecks flow through this building and so what we found was there is a lot of companies where they have three or four folks working in these buildings, but they have multiple field employees, sales people working from home. So, we have -- so we were really counting the -- the paychecks that flow through those buildings that are all locally based. And, then, I'm just going off my experience of companies I have worked with. Worked with Crescent Electric, who leased space in AT Industrial to the south. They are consolidating four locations across the Treasure Valley into one location for centralized distribution. Twenty-five employees minimum. Many of those employees long time with the company since it was Interstate Electric, you know, 15, 20 years ago. I have also worked with four other contractors or companies who specifically wanted to be in Meridian. Meridian has done a great job. Heart of the valley. Sixteen is coming in. This is where you service a broader valley is right in Meridian. Of those companies -- of those four companies I was able to get one in Meridian. We leased a property before it hit the market. Everyone else ended up in Boise, because that was where we were able to find space further east than they wanted to be and just to kind of follow up on that, I also have a BVEP. BVEP does a wins every year and they release survey data as far as what type of leads they get. Last year 93 percent of the leads they got were somewhat industrially based and so we had 54 percent manufacturing, 17 percent semiconductor, 15 percent food. Only seven percent was warehouse and distribution.

Honestly, we are not a wonderful warehouse and distribution location when you look at transportation networks and to go off Council Person Taylor's comment, I believe the fear of turning these spaces into warehouse and distribution -- quite honestly, in my opinion, Meridian has done an excellent job and the space is now too expensive and so if you want a big space for distribution you are not finding that in Meridian. There are some. So, I mean there is definitely some larger spaces, but if you want a big space you are really looking at economics. Economics is key. You are really focused on a lower rental rate. Meridian right now -- the tenants I'm working with are trying to service the valley -- service the valley, high employee counts, they are paying considerably more to be in Meridian than points further west really have the higher vacancy rates and that is just so they can service the valley with employees moving throughout the valley. A lot of these companies are -- are local to our valley. I think really with -- with that that's -- wanted to leave it open to questions. I guess regarding the office space, I see a huge variation in office as I work with employee -- employers across the valley. You know, right now I'm working with a company that's doing 30,000 square feet. Meridian company looking to expand, consolidate a couple of locations. Right now we might end up in Boise, because there is no space. There is not a 28,000 square foot space available in Meridian right now. Adler's building product, AT Industrial, to the best of my knowledge, has a single 40,000 square foot space left available that they can't demise. Due to the design of the building they can't really make it smaller. But my -- the -- that client is looking at 28,000 square feet roughly, 10,000 square feet of office. High employee count. Worked with other folks that also have high employee counts. Smaller office. And so, really, it feels like -- I say that 10,000 square feet of office would support a higher base level of office, but all I'm really trying to say is let the market decide on that point. There is a lot of folks we work with that still have high employee counts that don't need large office. They have employees in the field, they are coming and going, they don't need an office presence and so, really, it's just -- those baselines are hindrance to development if I have to overbuild office. Just for reference currently right now most folks are quoting office build out at 200 dollars a square foot inside the building. So, the envelopes already established, but it takes -- it's another 200 dollars a square foot and about six months to build out office space. So, it's just a -- another hurdle if you have to reach -- if you have to reach a certain threshold and not just respond to the market. Open to questions.

Overton: Council, any further questions?

Napoli: Council President Cavener -- or Council President Overton. I apologize. I apologize. Can I just chime in real quick? I wanted to clarify something that Chris said and that there might just be a misunderstanding between us and him regarding the separation of the two. So, let's say Council tonight hypothetically approves the annexation, but doesn't want to approve the UDC text amendment, you still -- they are going to be required to subdivide the property, so -- because they have public right of way running through it. So, the preliminary plat is going to be required at a minimum for the next application, which they can do while the code change is being worked on. In addition to that, CDC and design review, which would be the next steps, which administrative at my level, which is really site plan elevation review, could also be in the

process -- even the building permit could be in the process while, you know, that code change is under progress and I also want to highlight that warehousing, if I-L zone is granted, it's -- you know, let's say annexation is approved as presented with the I-L zone, warehousing as it currently sits, office not to exceed 25 percent of the building. So, they could go down to ten percent as with a warehousing use as it currently sits, which a warehouse is a permitted use just like flex space is in I-L. So, it wouldn't actually hinder their ability to have the ten percent office, it would just be a warehousing use instead of a flex space use. So, that's kind of just something I wanted to clarify for you guys that they can still move forward in the progress if that's your guys' prerogative tonight, even without the UDC text amendment. It's not necessarily UDC text amendment's going to hold them up in the process for the rest of the applications that need to come through.

Parsons: Yeah. Mr. President, Members of the Council, just add on to what Nick said. I think all of you understand this and what Tyler has explained to you is very accurate. We don't know the tenants until they come forward, but I think everyone gets it that we have a schedule of use -- allowed use table in our code and so although we are -- it's kind of hyper focused on flex space tonight, there is many other uses that go on these buildings that don't need to meet the flex requirements, because they are different -- defined differently in the code, so they don't need to do any of those things. So, it's -- that's why it's difficult for us to say, please, change our code and help fix it when we are like we don't see this as an immediate issue for us in the city at this time, because we have all these other things. If you want light manufacturing that's a completely different use in our code. Doesn't even apply to flex space. If you want a construction company in there that could be a flex space, but, again, it could be defined as a contractor's yard and we can work with you on those percentages and make you -- make that tenant space work for that particular use, because it's a different use than flex space is. So, as said, the code gives them a lot of flexibility and same thing with the warehouse. Like Nick mentioned. Warehousing is 25 percent or less. Flex space currently is 20 percent or more. So, again, if you want to call yourself distribution or warehousing, then, we will say, okay, that's what -- you are defined as a warehouse and look at your floor plan and say, you know what, you are at 20 percent office you are good to go as a warehouse. We will let you move in there and operate. We don't care who is in there working, as long as you meet those thresholds and those requirements. So, again, it's -- it's kind of that cart before the horse. If we don't know who is going in there it's hard to say if it's the right time to change the code or not and I think Council understands that -- I mean when we changed the code six months ago or eight months ago, I think -- I think you guys were sympathetic to that understanding the needs at the market at the time and you -- you changed one portion of the code, but it kind of -- it didn't go far enough to change the other section of the code and that's why we immediately put it on our list of code changes to fix that and at least have that conversation with you. I also realized the Council is -- they like to follow process. You have kind of established these rules. Staff, what are you bringing forward as code changes? We are like here is what we are changing. Are you good with that? Yes. And, then, we meet with a UDC focus group and we vet that out through all this different committee and, then, bring back forth a recommendation -- recommendation that works. Now, do I think the UDC focus group

would have concerns with us changing the warehouse component? Probably not. I have been on -- I have met with them multiple times and they all agree we have to tweak this and fix this for sure and get that balance right. So, again, I don't have anything to share with you tonight or what's being proposed, but what I can share with you is that we do it -- do have a future code change planned. We have some others that have -- you guys set the policy. So, if you say, Bill, I want that in front of me next month, certainly I will make that happen and bring that forward if that's -- if that's your prerogative. But right now again we think it's okay the way it's working, but just want to let you know that we do know -- we do realize there needs to be a change, we are just not there at this point.

Strader: Council President Overton?

Overton: Council Member Strader.

Strader: Thank you. That was really helpful. What is your sense of timing on those additional code changes? I think that would help me -- it would probably help the applicant quite a bit, too, to wrap their head around what their options are, because I like really feel like this second request is a -- is a tough one for me, but what -- what's our general sense of timing on those changes?

Parsons: Mr. President, Members of the Council, it's -- it's hard to say. I know I have had discussions with our director, we have -- we have had -- we met with the UDC focus group in January. I want to say to go over some of these clean-up items that we want to take forward. I am toying with the idea of maybe assigning a staff member to bring forward those, so that we can get them moving quicker than later in the year. But we will have that discussion as a department. So, currently right now I have two other code changes that I'm working on with some subsets. So, this week -- or actually tomorrow I'm working with code enforcement on our limited duration signage and, then, we are also meeting with a group to talk about our PUD changes and PDD changes. So, a whole other new section to the code. So, those are kind of my two priorities right now. But, again, if you ask staff to give us a time frame or when you would like to see something coming forward I'm happy to take that feedback and start working on that moving forward. But at this time there is no definitive date, but more likely would be fall if I had to guess. Late summer. Early fall.

Strader: Maybe a quick follow up.

Overton: Council Member Strader.

Strader: Okay. But if it was prioritized or even if it was -- if it was that -- that set of code changes that relate to extending what we have already done into these other zones were to become a higher priority, which I don't know, right, like everyone has to have that discussion, but I mean what is the fastest that realistically you could get some suggestions in front of Council? I mean just -- just -- just brainstorming. I mean the art of the possible.

Parsons: Yeah. Mr. President, Members of the Council, probably hearing in mid-May, first part of June and, then, Council in July is probably a realistic time frame.

Strader: Okay.

Parsons: Or we could work with the clerk and go quicker to Council, save a week or two, but you are more likely into June and depending on the holidays and how those fall with Juneteenth and Fourth of July, that always puts a little wrinkle in it.

Taylor: Council President Overton?

Overton: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: So, let me tell you what -- let me restate what I heard. In your opinion -- and I don't mean to put words in your mouth, but you believe from what you have seen and understand that the uses they have envisioned, they can do those without the required changes they are seeking with the UDC code. What I'm hearing from the applicant is it's really helpful for them to market this as flex space, because flex space conveys a certain understanding about what the tenants are looking at, especially if you are building speculative space, then, the ability to lease it. So, that's what they want. I would like to help get them there. You are saying today they -- if we approve this land use application your interpretation is they could probably still do everything that they are asking to do under current code. To Council Woman Strader's line of questioning about timeline, moving May, June, July is extraordinarily fast for a government deliberative body like us and so that would seem to be okay. I would like to move quickly on that, too, because I do think -- I have -- I have thought actually a lot about this since we had the last discussion about other changes, but my understanding -- am I interpreting that correctly if I restate again in my layman words?

Parsons: Councilman Taylor, yes. You are doing that great. And, then, also as part of that, if that is the direction you want staff to -- to take, then, I would also encourage maybe some discussion around if you do want the office space and the warehouse space to align with a hundred percent -- total that hundred percent like it previously did. So, just curious on your take there, because a lot of times -- a lot of times when Nick and I meet with applicants as well they get flex space confused. They think it's a multi-tenant building. So, they are looking at -- I could have multiple tenants in one building and it's like, yeah, that's one way to look at it, but that's just a multi-tenant building in our world. You are going to have one building and demise the wall -- put in demising walls and have multiple people running out of that building. So, that's the other piece of it is sometimes the terminology is a little bit different, but in our code we are very specific as to what flex is. We define the -- the parking ratios, the mix of light industrial versus office and it has to be a -- usually it says it's small scale. So, there -- and it can be either an entire building or only one tenant space. So, for example, an applicant -- or an architect can't come to the city and say, well, I have one of my tenants as an office and I want to do all warehouse, because now in the building I have 50 percent offices in this one end and this is all warehouse and that's flex space. No, that tenant is office and

this other space is warehouse. It's not -- you can't use the -- all the uses within the building to say you are a flex space. It's -- it's either one building or each individual tenant has -- has to meet that requirement is how we interpret the code.

Overton: Council, I have a quick question for our city attorney to clarify. Mr. Nary, from the moment we opened this and discussed it by staff, by the applicant and by our questions from Council, we have been discussing both 17 and 18, but I only opened the public hearing for 17. The correct procedure from this point before would we go forward as we are discussing both, we only vote on 17 and, then, open 18 for any new comments and vote on 18?

Nary: Mr. President, I guess I -- I thought you had opened both, so I apologize. I thought -- I thought you had.

Overton: I'm sorry.

Cavener: Mr. President? Sorry to interrupt Mr. Nary, but I just was agreeing with him that I -- I was under the impression when you opened both -- or when you opened the public hearing it was for both and I think even staff had indicated as part of their staff report that they were speaking to both. Certainly the applicant presented as part of their narrative on both. So, I appreciate the -- the question, but just from my perspective I -- I was under the impression that you had opened the public hearing on both.

Nary: And I guess, Mr. President, Members of the Council, I think when the -- when the first thing the applicant asked was could I have more time, because there is presentations on two and you agreed to that, I think you did open both.

Overton: As long as you agree with that I'm okay with it. Thank you. If there is no more questions for the applicant, Madam Clerk, do we have people signed up for this?

Lomeli: Thank you, President Overton. I have Tyler Martin. He already spoke. Excuse me. I have Gina and Ken Thurston.

Overton: Welcome. You have three minutes. If you can state your name and address and now you can talk about either one of them.

Thurston: Hello. Thank you for letting me speak this evening. My name is Gina Thurston and I'm at 496 East Amalie Court in Meridian. 83642. And we own the property at issue in this application and we are here to speak in support of the project. I'm an Idaho native. When I was born my family lived at the southeast corner of Eagle and Overland, which is now Silverstone. So -- and, then, my husband Kenneth Thurston and family has lived in Idaho for over 58 years. They grew up on the property at 5035 West Franklin and after the children grew -- grew up and moved my father-in-law sold his property and bought the property next door, which is 5201 West Franklin. My family enjoyed -- or the family enjoyed farming these properties for over 50 years and over the years we have watched all the areas that have changed around us. Our

Meridian farms are turning into family homes out here. We are now surrounded by industrial or planned industrial, including Butte Fence, which is right next door and AT Industrial's development to our south. All of this growth also means road widening and, in fact, Franklin Road's planned widening at this property means where my husband grew up the home is going to be demolished. So, encroaching non-ag development has made it harder to farm and widening roads will soon make it less appealing to live. So, when VanTrust reached out to us with this project we decided to sell. This is the right project at the right time for the city. It will allow for a needed employment and tax base for the City of Meridian and will create nearly 600 good jobs for -- for growing local businesses. It will be nicely designed with clean modern buildings as they showed you in their presentation and it won't have lots of emissions or noise. So, the project will also extend the planned connector road from Black Cat past Core & Main property to take pressure off the other roads. VanTrust has been transparent in this process and we have enjoyed working with them. They really do want to create a quality project here and it's a project that makes sense and I know the Council carefully weighs public input and we truly believe this project is a win-win for everyone. The City of Meridian, the community and our family of Idaho of natives that's looking to move on to the next chapter of our lives. This project offers a positive forward thinking outcome and we respectfully ask for your support. Thank you.

Overton: Thank you. Council?

Cavener: Mr. President?

Overton: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Gina?

Thurston: Yeah.

Cavener: I just want to say thank you for your testimony. Sitting here with us all night to get up and provide your perspective is appreciated. We -- I talked about sometime I have lived in Meridian my whole life, too, and it's -- it's weird when you didn't move to Meridian, but Meridian kind of moved to your doorstep and I can understand those frustrations and challenges, but I appreciate you providing kind of a -- a real world perspective about where you live. So, thanks for joining us tonight.

Overton: Madam Clerk.

Lomeli: Council President Overton, no one else has signed up.

Overton: Is there any -- anyone else present in the room that would wish to speak on either one of these applications, the annexation or the UDC text amendment? If you could state your name and address for the record.

Storrs: Greg Storrs. My permanent mailing address is 4925 West Franklin Road here in Meridian. Thanks for that opportunity to -- to visit for just a second. I hadn't anticipated doing this when I first came in. First of all, I want to appreciate each one of you for -- for what you do. I don't envy what you are doing sitting through the -- the meeting this night. Certainly emphasize that. But what I did want to say was I have -- I have lived in Meridian 1975. It was 2,500 people and we have seen a lot of change over the years. I have come and gone since then. I was last -- the last five to seven years I have been in the process of my mother-in-law. My wife Cheryl is -- is Brady Whiting's daughter and she's the one that occupies the land there at the corner of Black Cat and Franklin and she currently lives there. She is now 93, I believe, and just the sweetest little lady you will ever want to meet. I think that as we have gone through this process of watching all of this here and at the county, I think our idea was to just to be able to see what it was that you folks are thinking, both here and on the county level, to be able to also communicate with Nick and Bill several times visiting and each of them -- I appreciate each of them and their willingness to be able to listen and give ideas and thoughts. On the other side of the coin, we have also seen all of the -- the construction, all of the growth that's happening and our major concern in the very beginning was here is this -- this wonderful little lady sitting in the middle of all of this with all the trucks going by, the noise and all the things and it was difficult. The change was difficult, because ACHD came in and took her home and we moved her away for a while, brought her back into a manufactured home there on the property and got approval for that and, then, we have had the opportunity, then, to -- to watch everything that's happening. Sometimes, you know, the term the tail wagging the dog was that -- Birdie was definitely the -- the -- the -- the tail. The dog has been wagging the tail and Birdie has been the tail and what we want to do now is to be able to -- as my -- my wife and her brother there, who are trustees of the trust, want to prevent and help her to have the very best possible life she can during the time that they are there. Now, regarding VanTrust -- is that my time?

Overton: Yes.

Stores: Oh. Okay. VanTrust. Chris -- we have sat and met with Chris. I have had also the people who -- who set up and -- and put together the -- the real estate deal with Chris. Had many conversation. A good friend of mine from way back when he was a friend of my daughter in grade school and we had the opportunity to be able to kind of walk through this whole thing. Also just to let you know -- you see the professionalism they have provided and what a wonderful presentation today. Great. But, anyway, the -- the professionalism with what they have done to help you guys to understand what they are trying to do and you guys have very well eloquently explained what your concerns are. Unfortunately, we have some boxes here that everybody has to live within and we are trying to maneuver those and in the middle of this is all of this -- is this little lady. This sweet little old lady. So, what I would suggest and what I would hope that the Council could do would be able to take it -- take what has been said from each, the positive parts of it for me, from VanTrust, from staff and the questions and -- wonderful questions that have been asked and to go say how can we go back to the center of this whole thing, which is Birdie Whiting and how can we make it possible so

that she and the owners and the -- and the -- the -- the people who help her with her estate to be able to move forward to make the best positive informed decisions. We feel like that having the -- the current proposal approved would be the best possible thing for her to be able to put this thing to bed as she is surrounded already, now it's just a matter of finding out how you folks can work together with them to make it happen. Thanks.

Overton: Thank you. Council, any questions? Is there anyone else in the room that would like to speak on either of these two public hearings? Come forward. State your name and address for the record, please. You will have three minutes.

Meadow: My name is Trina Meadow. I am at 2434 West King Road in Kuna, Idaho. I am also a power of attorney for Mark Choi, who owns the property at 5035 West Franklin Road that is in this project and I wanted to just come in from Mark's perspective and my own. I indicate that I have been utterly amazed at what Meridian has been able to accomplish over the years watching -- as president of the Chamber of Commerce in Kuna, what Kuna has suffered and your realistic look at what is needed and when it is needed has been really amazing. That is something Kuna has never been able to manage. They just like residential. So, anyway, would like to just say, you know, I -- I really am amazed with what you guys have been able to do. The only reason I really wanted to stand today is the -- one of the ironic reasons that we are here today is when VanTrust came to Mark Choi asking if he would sell he did not want to. This was not something he was looking to do. He has a rental property at the -- at this property and it has been sustaining him for his form of retirement forms and selling was not on the table. He actually did tell VanTrust no and went away until we have received a letter from the city that said it was a mandatory that he annex into the city. He had an expansion from the -- ACHD had taken part of his property and in that demolished his septic tank and water source and -- and so they had to put in the city sewer and city water to provide that with ACHD doing that and subject to Mark Choi annexing. I can tell you the only reason we are here today is because of that annexation letter that was required, because Mark lives in Tennessee and is not interested in doing that himself. So, watching what the VanTrust have had to go through, we highly support this project, especially for the annexation, because with Mark gone I'm going to be the one stuck doing it and I don't want to do it. So, I appreciate that. But, anyway, just want to say thank you for that and, then, I will just add another note with the new expansion of Franklin Road they are now going to be taking Mark Choi's home. That will be demolished up to ten feet and the new road will go right through the middle of his living room. So, he will also be losing his form of retirement that he was hoping for. So, this project has been interesting, because it has been subject to ACHD, even with their offer. They offered him 39,000 dollars for his house, because they felt this project would be going forward, which is interesting since they are also are the ones who stopped us from having industrial into office space when they wouldn't allow access to something I thought I -- I thought was ironic. Anyway, I just want to share that. Thank you for your time.

Overton: Thank you. Council, any questions? Is there anyone else in the room that would like to make a comment on either one of these applications? No? Is there anybody online that would like to make a comment, use the raise your hand feature. Seeing no further public comments, would the applicant like to come up and close.

McCluskey: Yes. So, I think we had a few -- probably an inappropriate time, but I just want to kind of circle back on some things that Nick and Bill brought up and some of the closing comments we heard. I feel like we had some great support in the room tonight. So, very appreciative that and not a whole lot I think we can address on -- on many of those, but except that we have tried to accommodate some of that cross-access to the neighbors to the east. So, we are -- we are trying to remember that and take -- take and consider that, as long -- as well as having the pedestrian pathway that we have now added along the east side, gives us a little more buffer from that adjacent property as well. So, hopefully, improving the value and the long-term use as well, pushing us back just a little more. But one of the things that I know Nick brought up and I just wanted to circle back on a little bit was in this UDC amendment kind of context and timing, you know, there is -- there is obviously contracts and there is land sellers and -- and that's not the purview of the Council and that's not your problem to deal with, obviously, but the big thing for us -- our next steps include preliminary plat, CZC. There is a large amount of commitment from VanTrust from a capital perspective, also not the Council's concern, except for we are unable to proceed forward with that. It's a significant amount and probably that, you know, 300 to 400 thousand dollar range to just continue on through those processes due to the plans we have to present, some of the design work that needs to be required. So, to move forward with that we just need that certainty and so that was really the reason for us pushing so hard on the -- on the request for that change right now. Appreciate that we do have time, that we do have to go through those processes, but starting those processes is right now unworkable from the VanTrust perspective as capital out the door without certainty to move forward and that leasing uncertainty kind of presents that challenge to us. So, that was one of the things that I did just want to touch on a little bit. But open to, you know, Council's comments on that a little bit and appreciate the time. Obviously, I want to give Deb a chance here to close a little more as well. I just wanted to address that one specific comment.

Nelson: Yeah. I -- I think Chris covered it very well. I just kind of wrap it up by saying -- and we really appreciate the landowner supports and comments and they are the people that are involved in this as well. But you do have a -- a sophisticated and motivated developer that's here bringing a product that I think is of interest to the city and so we are asking for support of the annexation and zoning that will give them more of that certainty. We are asking for the code change to try to remove some of the hurdles that are in your current code that make it harder to lease up the property. We also appreciate the city's continued efforts to clean up those codes to make sure that it makes sense across all of the sectors. You know, we did just touch on the one that's important to us consistent with the change that was made. We understand you have broader concerns there, but having that certainty is really what they need to continue to make this investment. It is a -- it's a relatively small piece of property, but a significant investment on their front and will bring significant space to the city and because of its

size it does seem like they are able to move forward with it relatively quickly if they get the go ahead from the city to bless it. So, with that we would just stand for any additional questions you have.

Overton: Council, any questions for the applicant? No questions. Thank you.

Nelson: Thank you.

Overton: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Sorry, Dean. I thought I turned it on. My finger just didn't press it hard enough. Thanks. I would maybe encourage us at least deliberating a little bit before maybe a motion is made to close the public hearing, because I -- I do think there was an important element that we haven't discussed as a body that is -- to me is -- is the elephant in the room. So, I spoke earlier. I support more industrial in this area. I think it makes sense. I think we can work through some of the administrative pieces and appreciate staff's efforts and where the applicant's coming from. The -- the -- the biggest hurdle for me in me being in favor of an approval this evening is that -- and District 6, this is the area in which I -- I represent and I know not everybody that's here tonight was a part of this decision, but the Council, again, kind of put the nose under the tent with granting an annexation for some industrial in this area with significant concerns about the traffic impacts of this area and that is very real, that is outlined in ACHD's staff report. You have got an applicant who is saying, hey, this use is going to mirror what is already in existence. I would be really frustrated if I was another applicant, another developer, who has been told you can't grow anymore, only to have somebody who is doing a similar use be granted -- that is your neighbor be granted that access. So, I don't think I can as much -- as I want to see more of this -- and -- and this is the part that is really hard for me is because this Council -- previous councils have been waving their arms about this area for years with the highway district. We saw this coming as representatives of this community. We have sounded the alarms. We have banged our pots and pans and we have asked the highway district to look at this area and even have another applicant who actually went out and sought out right of way to expand Black Cat, only for the highway district to say we are not interested. So, we are in this weird situation where we as a Council knows that this is needed. You have a use that contemplates expanded roadways that is a higher traffic use. Staff voicing concern about approving an annexation, because of traffic impacts and yet we forecasted this as an issue. So, I don't think I can be in support of this application this evening and not because I don't want to, I think this is great, I just think that we have said we are already at our capacity for this part of Meridian when it comes to industrial traffic and until we can get a plan for how -- particularly how Black Cat south of Franklin is going to address this added capacity, I -- I hate saying it, I don't think that we should be voting in favor of -- of an annexation for this type of use right now. So, I -- I recognize not everybody was here that was part of that and opinions can change, but I know that was important to me when I was -- I was supportive of granting that initial annexation knowing that these types of things would come. My hope would be that the highway district would have been our partner and come side by side to address this and until they are we are in a

really hard position where granting something that I think makes sense for Meridian and is good for Meridian long term is going to create significant traffic challenges for our existing residents.

Overton: Council Member Strader.

Strader: Thank you. Question for staff. Could you refresh our memory as to the conditions that we attached to that development and what the milestones are? And, then, also where are we at with Franklin? When will it be widened? Is that a certainty? Help me with all of that. But, yeah, let's -- let's go through those conditions again. I -- I agree that there is an issue my colleagues raise that is a very good point and I struggled a lot with that application and we noodled over it and we really crafted a solution for it. So, maybe you could refresh our memory.

Napoli: Yeah. Council President, Council Woman Strader. So, yes, I was actually surprisingly actually spot on with my last comment about the Black Cat industrial. So, greater than 960,000 square feet of occupied space Black Cat must be widened to five lanes between the east-west collector, Grand -- known as Grand Mogul now and Franklin. The intersection of Black Cat and Franklin must be improved as recommended by ACHD and the intersection of McDermott and Franklin must be improved with a two way left turn lane, unless Franklin has been widened to five lanes. Completion of these improvement -- improvement permits -- wow, that's weird kind of worded. Completion of these above improvements must be done prior to occupancy for up to 1.5 -- or 100 feet -- one million five hundred thousand square feet and, then, the other provision on that was greater than one point -- or one million five hundred thousand square feet. Franklin must be widened to five lanes between Black -- Black Cat and State Highway 16. A traffic signal must be constructed at the intersection of Black Cat and the east-west on-site collector when a signal warrants -- when a signal analysis warrants it, which with the District at Ten Mile probably becoming in the near future. Yeah. East-west collector on site. So, they are -- and I don't -- let me see if I have a better overview. I do on my presentation that -- be able to show you guys. Get a little bit better visual. So, here is that east-west collector known as Grand Mogul right now and, then, that will actually have a north-south collector that's not on their property and will be actually on this property most likely. They will construct a portion of it. It will align somewhere roughly here on Franklin that may be signalized at some point once it hits a certain threshold. But it says the east-west collector will be extended from Black Cat west incrementally as progress, so which they have done, the applicant has done a phasing plan that will dictate when the sections of that east-west collector are constructed, which they already have a good portion of it -- about third of it already constructed and, then, as far as the widening of Franklin Road, Franklin Road is scheduled to be widened five lanes from McDermott Road to Black Cat Road in 2027. So, to answer your questions, you guys set thresholds at 960,000 square feet, one million five hundred thousand square feet. The east-west collector had some conditions on it and, then, Franklin will actually be widened, which is part of the improvements that were required in this in 2027 by ACHD between State Highway 16 and Black Cat. But -- yep. I will stand for any questions if you guys have any.

Overton: Council, any questions for staff?

Strader: Council President?

Overton: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Can you -- realizing that was -- that was our creature that we invented and that was how we were trying to address this like intractable transportation issue for a good project, is there any consistent framework of conditions that you can think of that can be applied to similar projects that you feel like there is a level of consistency there? Because I think that that's the challenge; right? I think instinctually it's like, okay, well, how do we dump more annexations onto this roadway network that don't have those conditions? I agree like that -- that -- that's a real challenge intellectually. But I just -- I'm curious like do you think there is a consistent framework that could be utilized or is it just too tough? Because this one the roadway situations differ. They are not taking access directly off Franklin. Like help -- help me think through that and brainstorm a little bit.

Napoli: Council President and Council Woman Strader, it's a good question. Is there a consistent framework that we have where we know you have improvements that are required when you hit a certain threshold? I think from my knowledge Black Cat industrial, because of the size really, you know, you think it was 2.2 million square feet at full build out. You know, I think that was definitely concerns and I assume -- I know they did traffic study, you know, the size of their project didn't require traffic studies. So, we don't have some of the same information and I'm not going to talk for the VanTrust team, but I did -- we -- I have talked with Chris about, you know, is there possibility of phased -- what -- what the timing of that is? Obviously we don't have a pre-plat in front of us and I don't want to speak for him, but I know it was their intent to do this, you know, pretty -- in one phase essentially.

Strader: Yeah.

Napoli: You know, that -- it would be -- construction would be going on in the whole site is from -- from my knowledge and from the conversations I have had with them. Correct me if I'm wrong. Okay. So, as far as phasing it and putting those same conditions on this site, I -- it's difficult. I see your perspective. It's not something, you know, we -- I would say that's been done on maybe like the district and some of the other large -- probably a little different, non-industrial, commercial, little different, Farmstone even or the -- the -- out of the project. It's -- it is different and it's challenging and I think Black Cat is primarily the main concern. It looks like Franklin -- probably going to have five lanes to Franklin to Highway State -- State Highway 16 and we are going to have that on and off ramp. I think that will function probably pretty well. It's the intersection of Black Cat and Franklin and, to be honest, the east-west collector that this site is going to be building, when Core & Main got approved, you know, and I -- I talked with ACHD about potentially I -- I think a left-hand turn lane would work probably pretty good here. Unfortunately, we don't have the threshold to do the left-hand turn lane. So, it's not

being designed that way and it's not being constructed that way. So, left-hand turns on the Black Cat -- it will get us a left-hand turn lane eventually, but, unfortunately, it's not being constructed right now as it is with Core & Main with a left-hand turn lane, because it didn't warrant it at the time. I had that conversation. Ultimately it was determined what it was. So, there is concerns there as well, you know, freight traffic trying to make a left-hand turn on the two lane road and peak hour of the day is going to be very challenging. So, how we mitigate that and how you guys mitigate that through conditions as a Council and through staff I don't -- I don't have a good I guess -- and maybe Bill does. I will lean on Bill a little bit. I don't necessarily have a good avenue that would mitigate those concerns while also still meeting what the applicant's intent is for the development, because I understand they have a financial aspect that I'm not a part of with it and I want to be sensitive to that as well, so --

Parsons: Mr. President, Members of the Council, just make that a fine job explaining to you what the -- the -- the consistent framework is difficult when you have multiple property owners along the roadway and that's why ACHD is hard to enter into a cooperative development agreement or use that tool when you don't control all the property and so when -- when ACHD has been successful with that tool that's because the property owners controlled a lot of the property and they were able to execute that and get things a bit -- built ahead of time. This -- this -- in this particular situation, although I appreciate those DA provisions, I don't know how realistic they are. But what I can tell you is there is a collector road happening that wasn't there when Black Cat Industrial got approved. So, you see what's happening to the east of this project. Those road -- that road improve -- that road between Black Cat and Ten Mile should be punched through here within the next couple months from -- from my understanding. Sometime in June or July and there will be a light at that intersection. So, again, things will slowly improve over time as these developments come online, because as you know there are conditions of approval on projects and as they hit certain thresholds they are required to do these upgrades. So, I know that the developer to the east is going through a roundabout study some getting their roundabout approved with ACHD and they are also looking at putting in some more lights on Franklin for their development, not necessarily for this one. The other challenge -- and I think that Council understands this and Mr. Nary can probably chime in, it's -- it's hard to put those off-site conditions on this particular development when they are not even fronting on Black Cat, although they will have somewhat of an impact to that. They are on Franklin. So, that's too much of a stretch even with annexation to say, hey, do some improvements on -- on Black Cat to help mitigate this. So, anyways, just wanted to give you that information. Little more information, anyways, to digest. Thank you.

Overton: Thank you, staff. Council, any further comments? If there are no further comments, do I have a motion to close the public hearing?

Cavener: Council President?

Overton: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I will make a motion that we close the public hearing.

Little Roberts: Second.

Overton: I have a motion and a second to close public hearing. All those in favor say aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. The public hearings for both items are closed.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Cavener: Council, I -- I don't want to make a motion for a denial. I know that we have got a recommendation of denial from staff and from the Planning and Zoning Commission. I also understand that time is of the essence. But I can't support this application this evening and even if I wanted to, again, we don't have the findings. So, Council, I -- I guess I would maybe like to hear a little bit more deliberation from where you would want to go. I -- I'm prepared to make a motion to continue this out for 60 to 90 days to give staff an opportunity maybe look at roadway for us to hear from highway district, but I also know that that 90 days may equate to a -- to a denial and I -- and I hate that. If -- if we continue it and, then, the applicant withdraws their application at least gives them a little bit more flexibility to come back, as opposed to wait for a significant period of time. You know, if the -- if the door is closed for this applicant it may be closed. I hate -- because I think we are -- we are going to miss out on a -- on a good opportunity for a good project, but that's at least where I'm -- motion I'm prepared to make this evening barring a -- a better mousetrap that any of you would maybe suggest. Okay. Council, I'm going to move that we continue Item 17, VanTrust, H-2025- 0052 to June the 16th and to request that our planning staff engage with highway district staff on the future development of Black Cat and Franklin and also to have our planning staff connect with the adjacent landowner that has the condition placed on them for roadway improvements to grant their expanded use and for staff to prepare a report from those findings prior to June the 16th. That should also give the staff ample time to prepare conditions of approval for the Council.

Overton: Councilman Cavener, quick question. Clarification. You said Item 17. You mean 17 and 18?

Cavener: I had planned to make the same motion when we got to the next one, but I figured because we are taking action on those separately -- I wouldn't be as verbose with my basis for the continuance for the next one, but just that it would be continued to the same evening.

Strader: Council President Overton?

Overton: Council Member Strader.

Strader: That's a great start to discussion. I -- I think I'm -- I'm in the same place where it's like I -- I -- I don't want to -- you know, sadly I think we may miss out on a fantastic project, just because I think that the level of certainty that the applicant needs from us

tonight is higher than certainly I could give them. My -- I'm struggling a lot with Item 18. I'm struggling with both items, but I'm struggling a lot with Item 18. I don't think it's appropriate for one development to lead wholesale UDC changes, especially when we have them in process and I think our staff's capable of prioritizing that item. My suggestion as one Council Member would be to ask that that become a priority item, but I would love for other people to weigh in on that. I think between now and June it's possible that we could get a lot clarity and I think -- I think there has been a real openness and willingness to expand our -- see the flex space that we are seeing and to like support that use. I think we understand that today's economy has changed in terms of what level of office is fundamentally needed in this remote work AI environment and I -- I think we get all that. I'm very open to a comp plan discussion holistically about our industrial corridor and where that borders with the Ten Mile Plan, because I think that that's a really worthwhile discussion. I -- I don't think I could get there on this tonight for the same reason articulated by Councilman Cavener. That particular project and the acute issues on Black Cat were so severe that we really did craft like this customized approach to the roadway network. I like the idea of the continuance, but understanding that the reality of that may mean that it is -- effectively means that we -- we may not see this project. That's very unfortunate. I -- just that's where my head's at today. I -- I couldn't get there on it. I -- I can't think of a condition that would make sense to -- to get there and I definitely do not agree that Item 18 is the right approach at all. So, that's just where I'm at right now. I will second that that motion. Sorry.

Cavener: Council President, real quick if I may. I -- I specifically picked that date in June based on some of that feedback from staff. So, again, I think there is parallel tracks. Again I think our concern is that probably the clock may be running out for our applicant and I'm sympathetic to that, trying to find the most aggressive timeline to try and be responsive to that, while also recognizing the time it will take for our staff. So, I -- and I don't think that continuing both would preclude any Council Member from voting in favor or against should that be on our agenda.

Taylor: Council President Overton?

Overton: Councilman Taylor. First off, we have a motion for continuance and a second. Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Yeah. For discussion on the motion. I think it would be helpful for the applicant just to kind of get a greater sense of kind of where some of us are thinking. You know, one of the things that I think is -- as much as we can provide certainty to our partners in development it's very helpful. I really -- I'm -- I would support the project going through as it is, but I wouldn't support changes to UDC tonight without a further fuller discussion with staff and recommendations, because I think we have responsibility as a City Council to consider the entirety of the city and I would want to have that kind of feedback and if that were a -- if that makes this a non-starter for the applicant, then, that would -- I would -- that's unfortunate, but I don't see how I could be supportive of both of them tonight. I could support the -- the land use application despite some of the concerns about conditions on other projects. I don't believe that we should hold

hostage some applications because of other applications in their development agreements and any conditions that are in that. I don't think that's fair. But I -- I think right now the best way to possibly see that this project could pass is to vote to support a continuance to the date that the Council -- Councilman Cavener suggested. I -- I see that as really the only pathway to maybe see this project succeed and I think in that time frame count -- or staff can provide us as Council the -- the suggestions and -- and more holistic approach to looking at the UDC changes on flex space that we need to make an informed decision and I agree with Councilman Strader's comments, it's -- it's a mistake for us to approve the UDC changes under the circumstances tonight, though, I do think where the changes are going I think would be helpful to where the applicant wants to see. We just have to -- we have to follow the process. We have to go through what we have to go through to uphold our oath of office and be responsible to the citizens. So, that's kind of where I'm at. I really -- really one of my -- really great application. I do think that this entire area is going to -- should look more industrial. I actually on the traffic -- I get the two lane roads, but I like to see industrial next to a freeway. I don't want to see them driving through neighborhoods. I don't want to see them driving three miles off of the -- and this is a great spot. Once, you know, Franklin Road opens up, Ten Mile -- or the Highway 16, we are going to have great access. This is what this area needs to see and I think, you know, for staff we should have this conversation about what this whole area looks like, but that's a great project. That's where I am. I'm going to support the motion for a continuance, because I think that's the only way that this application could possibly succeed is when we get to that point.

Overton: Council, get a chance to weigh in on this. I think some great thoughts have been brought out on the table tonight. I think this application is an excellent application. It's just the timing is not good. You know, we don't control the roadways. I wish we could approve the project and say, oh, by the way, build me a five lane road on Black Cat as well. But we don't have that authority. We never have. And this particular part of the city, especially Black Cat on both sides of Franklin, is -- well, I heard you talk about being in Idaho back in 1975. That road hasn't changed. That's what it was in 1975. I remember. And it's still the same way. It's one of the last bastions of two lane country roads that we have got running on that west side of town and it's -- it's impossible to try to approve something like this based upon where we are sitting right now. I think we need to have those conversations with the restrictions we put on other applicants before this. It's completely unfair I think if we don't have those conversations and make sure we understand all the ramifications that were applied to them before we approve something else. That's just being fundamentally fair to everyone who comes in front of us as a city. The UDC text amendment, I couldn't agree more. I have worked with Bill in Planning on different text amendments over the past few years and they work just as hard as they can on all the different amendments we have got for all the different parts of text. We spent months working on just drive-throughs. I mean it's -- we -- we need to make sure we get these right when we make these changes, so we don't do them haphazard and we certainly just don't do them quickly to try to get something done and that's what I would hate to see. When it's done it needs to be done right. So, I -- I stand in support of Councilman Cavener's motion for continuance until June 16th. I think it's the right motion and on the address of whether it means it's the end of the

application, you know, I don't want to sound heartless, but at some point we have to look at what's best for the city. I mean that's the reason we are sitting up here and I don't ever want to hurt an applicant. I don't ever want to hurt a homeowner. But in the end we have got to protect the city and how that comes together. Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Councilman President, I just was going to -- deliberation done I was going to call for the question.

Whitlock: Mr. President, let me -- let me deliberate just a second for -- and at the risk of being repetitive of what's been said, I think -- I think it is a good project. I think it fits well. I think traffic from this would flow to the west and catch Highway 16 and off they go and life is good, especially on the Ten Mile corridor. So, I'm -- you know, I -- I don't have any concerns that it will push traffic more towards the other types of developments we are seeing in the Ten Mile area. I'm heartened to hear from Trina and Greg and Gina that they are supportive as homeowners and they think this is probably the right direction to go and so I would like to get to a point where we could approve something like this and I think that the motion that we have on the table of continuing this until June 16th gives us the opportunity to get all the parts and pieces in -- in the right place, so that hopefully we don't have Franklin Road running through a living room and residents displaced and no solution for them to look forward to. So, I will be supporting that motion and hope that we can get to a resolution on June 16th.

Overton: Council, if we have no more comments, roll call vote on the motion to continue until June 16th.

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

Overton: Council, it's six ayes for a continuance until June 16th of 2026 on Item 17 and Item 18.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Cavener: Mr. President?

Overton: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I move that we continue Item 18 VanTrust, Application ZOA-2025-0002 to June 16th.

Strader: Second.

Overton: We have a motion and a second to continue Item 18 until June 16th of 2026. Madam Clerk call roll.

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

Overton: We have all ayes votes on 18. It is also continued to June 16th of 2026.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

Overton: That brings us to the end. Do we have any future meeting topics, Council? If there is no future meeting topics, do I have a motion to adjourn?

Cavener: Council President Overton, move we adjourn.

Little Roberts: Second.

Overton: We are adjourned. Thank you.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 10:09 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON

_____/_____/_____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK