

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:00 p.m. Tuesday, August 20, 2024, by Mayor Robert Simison.

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

Other Present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Sonya Allen, Todd Lavoie, Jenny Fields, Laurelei McVey, Shawn Harper, Kris Blume and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

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

Simison: Okay. Council, we will call the meeting to order. For the record it is August 20th, 2024, at 6:00 p.m. We will begin tonight's regular City Council meeting with roll call attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Simison: It appears our community invocation presenter is not here.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: So, with that we will move on to adoption of the agenda.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: No changes to the agenda, but maybe a preview for people that Item No. 8, the Timbercreek Recycling application, is going to be continued to September 17th. So, if you were here specifically for that, just a heads up that that will be continued. With that I -- I move that we adopt the agenda.

Overton: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Simison: First item for us this evening is a public hearing for the City of Meridian Fiscal Year 2024 Amended Budget. I will turn this over to Jenny.

Fields: Good evening --

PUBLIC FORUM – Future Meeting Topics

Johnson: Mr. Mayor?

Fields: Oh.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor. Sorry. I just want to point out the public forum. There was nobody to sign up, so I just wanted to put that on the record.

Simison: Thank you. I appreciate that.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Public Hearing for City of Meridian Fiscal Year 2024

Simison: Okay.

Fields: Okay. So, for our fiscal year '24 amended budget, our agenda tonight is simple. We are going to go over our high level overview of what our amended budget is at 241.3 million. I'm going to go over our three major reporting funds, Governmental Fund, Capital Improvement Fund and Enterprise Fund. We will need a motion to approve our fiscal year '24 amended budget at the end of this presentation. I wanted to remind everyone that in the following I'm going to present -- I'm going to go total city budget, then, through the individual reporting funds, going to go over what the changes from the original total city budget to our final amended. Now, just a reminder, these budget amendments have come before you the last ten months. These -- this is more of a review of -- and it's a formal process for us to notify our citizens and the state of what our final fiscal year '24 amended budget is. So, our city budget. It is up 3.3 percent from the original -- original budget that was announced this time last year and that is made up of -- or make up of 24 budget amendments that was presented. It equates to about 7.7 million dollars and in our General Fund you will see there these are the changes according to the major reporting funds of the three. I'm going to go over those in detail. In our Governmental Fund we saw an 18.4 percent increase and that equates

to about 20 million dollars. That is made up of 20 total budget amendments. So, I'm going to go over the major ones that you have seen. So, 19 million of that is attributed to our ARPA fund -- most of our grant -- SAFER, Linder Overpass and our CDBG grant. Another ticket item that we amended our budget for is our Community Center property and, then, our HRMS -- our work day software implementation. We did see a carry forward adjustment that was down about 5.4 million. In our Capital Improvement Fund there were no budget amendments that were approved. We did see a carry forward adjustment that is a reduction of 5.6 million and that's attributed to our northwest police station, Fire Station 7 and 8. In our Enterprise Fund we saw a reduction of 5.7. It was down from the original -- the amended budget is at 110 million dollars. That is made up of four budget amendments that were approved. They are listed on the screen. East Idaho project. Well 26, 29 and, then, a 7.9 million dollar carry forward adjustment. That was short and sweet. So, now I sit for a motion to approve our Fiscal Year '24 amended budget.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for staff on the Fiscal Year '24 amended budget?

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: It is a public hearing, so question for staff. Okay. Thank you. This is a public hearing. Is there anybody from the public that would like to testify on the FY-24 amended budget? Mr. Clerk, do we have anybody signed up?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we do not.

Simison: Is there anybody that would like to come forward? And if you are online use the raise your hand function. Seeing no one coming forward or raising their hand -- Council Woman Little-Roberts.

Little Roberts: I would move that we close the public hearing.

Simison: A motion --

Overton: Second.

Simison: -- and a second to close the public hearing on Item 1. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mayor, I move that we approve the amended budget 241,358,900.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve the FY-24 amended budget in the amount of 241,358 -- 358,900 dollars. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, Clerk call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

2. Public Hearing for City of Meridian Fiscal Year 2025 Proposed Budget

Simison: Okay. Next item up is Item 2, which is a public hearing for City of Meridian Fiscal Year 2025 proposed budget. Turn this over to Jenny again.

Fields: Hello again. Our agenda for our Fiscal Year '25 proposed budget -- I'm going to go over our budget process overview and, then, similar to what we just did, I'm going to go high level overview of our proposed budget in the three major reporting funds and, then, there will be a discussion, because this is a public hearing, it will -- there -- we will have a couple items in our -- after we present our proposed budget and, then, I am also seeking an approval -- a motion to approve our Fiscal Year '25 proposed budget. So, with that I am -- there is a lot going on the screen. That's because our budget development process is a very lengthy one. It spans over about nine months long. We began preparing our proposed budget in February and in March each department, along with each Council liaison -- their Council liaison and Mayor, conducts thorough reviews of our base budget that we examine each base budget line items to ensure we are in alignment and at the end of May we -- the proposed budget is, then, presented to Council and the public for review. We held two public budget workshops, one in June and one in July. This is to gather feedback, refine our budget and address any concerns and questions. These feedbacks -- or these workshops play a critical role, because that -- it shapes our budget -- our final budget as it sits today. Again, that gets us to August. So, upon the closure of our tonight's public hearing the annual budget is approved by Council. I just want to make an important recognition. So, this overview doesn't really capture the intense -- internal discussions, the back -- you know, our backroom discussions, our behind the scene work that's involved in this lengthy process. So, each of these processes that you see here involves internal discussion, detail analysis and, then, careful planning goes into each of these processes that is not captured on the screen here. So, for that I want to say a thank you -- a huge thank you to Mayor, each Council Member, department directors and staff on your time invested in this process. So, now I get to the number part. The graph on the left -- left our expenses -- the total -- the personnel budget is about 35 percent of our total budget and

it remains our largest expense category. Now, carry forward, as you can see, equates to about 30 percent of our total budget. These are budgets that will not be finished in our current fiscal year '24 that will be carried into fiscal year '25. The distribution of the budget amongst the different departments are displayed in the graph to the right and our biggest consumer right now is our wastewater department at 41 percent. Now, I'm going to go over our three major reporting funds, starting with our Governmental Fund. This is our revenue sources in our Governmental Fund. We are currently projected about 102.3 million dollars. Majority -- or half of the Governmental Fund is of our property tax. So, 50 percent is our property tax. Now, the proposed budget does take into consideration the three percent allowable option -- property tax option, which calculates on average to the cost of a property homeowner about 48 cents a month per a hundred thousand taxable value. Just as a reminder, the projected -- our projected lower levy rate year over year. So, this year we are projecting a lower levy rate. So, in other words, if the house value does not change, the -- then the property tax paid would be lower.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: If you don't mind, I think this is a really important point maybe, Jenny, we can kind of talk about that. So -- and I think where people get confused a little bit is there is kind of a little bit of a black box, right, when it comes to how property tax increases flow through to the actual homeowner. I think you are making an important point, which is that because the proposal is the maximum three percent allowable property tax increase, plus one percent of our foregone revenue, ultimately, though, if someone for -- in your example if someone's home decreased in value or stayed the same because the levy rate is going down, that individual might not see any increase. They may actually see a decrease in their total property tax; is that right?

Fields: That is correct.

Strader: Yeah. And I -- and I -- so, I think that's important for people to understand, because it -- it doesn't -- it doesn't flow directly through to you when you pay your tax bill, it depends on what's happening with the value of your property and so I -- I just wanted to make sure people kind of understood that piece before we moved on.

Fields: Now, I'm going to switch to our expenditure side of the General Fund -- or Governmental Fund. And our Governmental Fund, the largest component is our personnel expense and that is made up of 67 percent -- or equivalent to 74 million dollars. The distribution of the budget amongst the different departments in the Governmental Fund is displayed to your right. Public safety makes up the majority of our budget at 62 percent. In our Capital Improvement Fund -- in our current proposed budget we didn't have any new budget requests. The entire Capital Improvement Fund is made up of our carry forward and that is attributed to projects, such as Fire Stations 7 and 8. Now, I'm going to move on to our last major reporting fund and that is our

Enterprise Fund. The majority of the revenue is made up of our utility sales revenue and that is 61 percent, following by assessment revenue at 28 percent. Our total expenditures in the Enterprise Fund is about 144.4 million dollars. Now, unlike the Governmental Fund where personnel is the largest expense, Enterprise Fund largest expense is in our capital projects. So, between the new capital funding and the prior year capital projects that were carried forward, you can see 78 percent of the Enterprise Fund budget is in our capital expenditures. Again, the graph on the right depicts the different departments -- the distribution amongst the budget within the different departments. So, that's number talks. I -- we can take public comments right now and, then, get into other discussions.

Simison: Thank you, Jenny. So, Council, per -- from our last budget hearing where we did ask the directors to sit down with their liaisons and go over their base budgets one more time for any possible changes that could result in a recommended reduction of 22,332 over the amount that is being -- was requested in the dollar figure that you previously approved, so if there is a motion to approve this budget we would request that 22,332 dollars and Finance has the information about where those reductions would be set within the budget. With that, Council, any questions for staff?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Maybe just a comment for the public's benefit. I think it might be helpful to them to understand how City Council approved -- or approached the budgeting process. So, in March as part of our role on the City Council we go through every department's base budget and we go line by line through those. Then in addition to that the City Council president and I actually went ourselves a couple months ago line by line through the entire budget, having a discussion about potential items that we could economize on and, then, in addition to that, following our second workshop meeting, every single council member met individually with the departments they cover and went through their base budgets again to try to identify opportunities where we could save money or economize. So, I just think that's helpful at least as I have been speaking with my constituents for them to understand that -- we understand how inflation is hurting people and that we have taken very seriously the idea that we need to tighten our own belts as we go through this process to try to identify those opportunities. We didn't identify a lot of opportunities and I think part of that is that Meridian has always been very fiscally responsible and very conservative in how we have approached our budgeting, but we have taken a really hard look at that through our process. So, I just wanted people to kind of understand as we are going through this that -- that the City Council took this all as kind of our personal mission to try to identify further opportunities, not once, not twice, but three times. So, just so people understand that.

Simison: Thank you.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Question for Jenny. Maybe to remind us when we went through the workshop process, we -- we did turn over every stone and look in every corner and behind every couch cushion for what we could find. A total, as I recall, about 900,000 total out of those three, four different categories?

Fields: From our budget workshops I have -- we can look it up.

Whitlock: It was significant.

Fields: Yes. Yes.

Whitlock: And, Mr. Mayor, while we are looking for that, in addition to what Council Woman Strader said about the extra effort that's gone into tightening our belts, again, I think as a Council we worked pretty well together to -- in those workshops to ask hard questions. We have taken tours and we got around and looked at things and kicked the tires and I think there were some significant savings that -- that we were able to find during those workshops.

Fields: It was a little over a million. So, a million and, then, 5,170 dollars.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any additional questions for staff before we take any public testimony? Okay. Mr. Clerk, do we have anybody signed up to provide testimony?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, yes. Terry Dennington.

Simison: Can you state your name and address for the record and be recognized for three minutes?

Dennington: Terry Dennington. 4581 West Big Creek Street in Meridian and I would like to address Mayor Simison and the Council Members. Thank you so much for having me. My first comment would be to thank the -- Todd's department, the Finance division, Jenny and Ricardo. They are so helpful in getting the budget proposal to me, so that I can go through it and understand it and -- and, then, come to the -- I came to the first workshop. It was very interesting. A long day, but very interesting to see exactly how the process worked and how it all comes together. So, I -- I understand it's -- it's not easy, you know, when you are a resident out here and you don't really have to make the decisions, it's easy to be saying, you know, well, why are they doing this and why aren't they doing that and they are charging this -- all this money is going out, but it's not an easy process. So, I understand that and I see that, so -- but the one comment I did want to make was on the -- the firefighters -- the 18 firefighters. And I know that that's an issue. My -- my issue with that is really when we take federal funds and there is a grant that there is -- they don't -- they -- it's a period of time that they give it to you and, then, it's up to you to make a decision on how you are going to fund that --

either keeping those people in place or having to let them all go, depending on what you do. So, I understand how you were increasing trying to foresee how that was going to happen, how you were going to be able to keep them and maybe not keep them all. So, that's -- that's another part of that process that I wondered about. Like should we have taken all 18 or should we have done 15 or -- I don't know that decision or how it came from fire chief to you guys to make that -- that decision on that. But, again, I'm just not a big fan of federal, because the money -- virtually the money is coming from me even federally; right? So, I have to -- I have to pay for that even though they are washing it through to our city. So, I just wanted to make a comment. I know that it's not an easy process. I understand why you were trying to offset it, because of some of the other things that came into play in the employees part of that and that was a big input of money that you were trying to -- you know, an expense that you weren't expecting and, then, having to try and figure out how to, then, offset that with that. But that's my comments on the firefighters. I know our city is growing and as residents out here we have to kind of weigh when you -- when you are going to increase to cover for safety you have to decide, well, you know, we cannot pay for it and say, okay, well, we don't have the firefighters or the police to be in position for them to help us. They can't be everywhere. The police can't be everywhere all the time. So, that being said it's not an easy process, so thank you so much. I appreciate all that you guys do.

Simison: Thank you, Terry. Council, any questions for Terry? Just -- just as a -- because you may not have heard. At one point in time we originally got the grant for 24 and we did reduce it down to 18. That's still a stretch goal. I think that it's clear that that's -- we -- we all recognize that is what we are hoping for and, you know, it's our intention to keep as many as we can through the process as revenue is created and -- but there are some other mechanisms as well with upcoming retirements to consider whether or not that is. So, we -- but it is a stretch goal one hundred percent. So, thank you, Terry. Appreciate it. Mr. Clerk, do we have anybody else signed up in advance?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did not.

Simison: Is there anybody present that would like to come forward and present testimony either in the room or online you can use the raise your hand function. Seeing no one coming forward or raising their hand, Council, do I have a motion to close the public hearing?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: I move that we close the public hearing.

Overton: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor, I move that we approve this budget as presented with the deductions of 22,332. If my math is correct that gives us a total of 255,501,778 to be corrected by Finance if necessary.

Simison: I have a motion. Do I have a second?

Overton: Second.

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

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Not sure. I think I heard 501,000 and it's 511,000, which is a minor --

Simison: Your -- your ear may have been correct in how it was said. So, the motion maker 255,511,778; correct?

Little Roberts: Correct.

Simison: Second correct?

Overton: Second agrees.

Simison: Okay. Just so it's clearly stated with numbers on the record.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: A question that may be for clarification with our -- with our Finance staff. Not taking -- not -- I know we had conversation for us here in a minute, but because there has been some e-mails going back and forth and some of your comments, I want -- I want to make sure that I'm hearing from Finance correctly and I want to make sure that I'm not mishearing, which is if Council approves this budget and assuming home values

stay flat, our residents wouldn't expect a property tax increase. Is that what I heard from our Finance staff?

Fields: Confirmed. Yes.

Cavener: Okay. I just want to follow up.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I think -- Mr. Mayor, I think many of us saw -- at least in the Cavener household this year the value of our home went down for the first time in a long time, but we have typically seen a two to eight percent increase in home values. So, I guess my follow-up question would be is for our Finance staff if -- if home values appreciated an average of two and a half percent, because of the growth, would our citizens, then, expect to see a property tax increase or would they expect to still see things flat?

Lavoie: Mr. Mayor, Luke, just want to clarify. Did you say 2.75 percent increase? Is that what I heard you say?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor. Thanks, Todd. I said 2.5 percent.

Lavoie: Oh. Thank you. So, in that particular case most likely you will see a .75 percent increase in your total property taxes, because your levy rate is reducing at a projected -- at a projected 1.75 percent reduction. So, if your house went up one -- 2.5 and your levy rate went down 1.75, you would have that gap of an increase and that would be your increase. I think that's where you are trying to go with your math.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor. Thank you, Mr. Lavoie for -- for helping me kind of confirm my -- my understanding of that. I appreciate that.

Lavoie: No problem, Luke. I think you are on the right page.

Cavener: So, Mr. Mayor, couple comments if I may.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Council, Mayor, certainly in our budget hearings we took ample time to thank Mayor, our Finance staff, our directors for -- for really really great work and I want to take just a quick moment before I vote to put out to -- to thank this Council. This is I think my ninth or tenth year doing this. This is the most engaged City Council I have ever worked with when it comes to the budget and I really want to commend you. There is some big highlights that I think that we should be celebrating along with our Mayor; right? I think our very first action -- our very first budget hearing was fixing the -- the COLA inconsistency for our employees. We put our employees first when we started our budget. I think that's a really really big deal. Before we talked about anything else we said we are going to level set that. I think that takes real discipline. I want to thank

the Mayor and Council for that. Second of all, I want to commend Council Vice-President Strader. I think the term that she used in our last budget hearing was good hygiene. While I recognize the timing of it is challenging, I think we owe it to ourselves and to our citizens and to the city every year to continue to look at ongoing expenses and make sure that there is an ongoing need. We know that missions change, technology changes and we owe it to ourselves to take away the hard work to say, hey, if we put dollars in this budget item, you know, for the last five years we need to keep doing that. So, I want to commend our vice-president for leading that. And, then, Council, I want to thank all of you. You all have so many things that are going on your plate and in your life with your family and to go back through kind of another exercise again and relook at the base budget, that takes a lot of extra effort. I know there has been a lot of conversations. I know you have heard some constituents. I have heard from people. We have talked, we have tussled and wrestled with each other as friends and -- and I just want to thank you all. You know, collaboration sometimes is clunky and just because we are not always on the same page with all issues it doesn't mean that we don't all work well together and as I have seen some of the other cities have their budget process play out -- and I don't know how the vote is going to land tonight -- in fact, I still don't quite know how I'm going to vote on this one tonight. I just have such an appreciation for the level of care that you bring to the city. I'm sure many of you have been like me where I have played Devil's advocate. People have called me with concerns about the budget. I said, yeah, but what about A, B and C that are important? For people who come and say, hey, I support the budget, I'm Devil's advocate,, hey what about property tax increases? And so I just think that we are a good example of collaboration in so many senses and before a vote is taken I wanted to make sure on the record to thank you all individually for some tremendous work on this year's budget.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: If I can take just a minute to reiterate where I stood when we had the budget hearings and I said at that time that I never would stand here and approve a budget percentage that was this high. I'm trying to figure out how to explain that and probably the best way is to start out talking about all of our own personal lives, because we have all had to deal with inflation and I will give you my standard. I'm not the polished politician. I spent three decades working for the city before I became a city councilman. So, what you are going to get is a straight shooting response, not necessarily something that's really polished. Over the past years I have received a one percent cost of living increase. That's it. Inflation was way higher than that. During that time I would run to the grocery store and I'm paying five to ten percent more for a bag of groceries. It looks the same as it did two years ago. Getting nothing more. But I'm paying more. Same goes for gas. Same goes for many different things. The difference here as a city is we are asking for that full three percent, but we are delivering a pretty amazing package of new employees, new positions, to continue to deliver the best public safety we can in this city, to continue with the best public services in our wastewater and water department. We are continuing to try to deliver what makes Meridian great. So, when

people talk about when's the appropriate time to pay an increase, it's when you are getting something out of it and when I look at all these bills that we are receiving and contracts that we are receiving as a city and they are going up seven percent and one over 30 percent and all we are getting is exactly what we got last year, but they passed those expenses right on to us. If you think that that's frustrating you have no idea what it's like for the City Council Members to sit up here and try to figure out how on earth we are going to progress as a city, keep all of our levels and standards the same height and pay all those bills. It's extremely frustrating. I loved all the years that I worked for the city and sitting here in City Council when we could provide a budget where I think we are giving the residents of the City of Meridian everything on sale. We never asked for three percent. We could get by on 1.9, we could get by on 1.6 and we could do it successfully, because we had dedicated employees that work hard every day for this city and we work hard to make sure that we keep them. This year is the first year I can remember that we had to not only take the full three percent, but as we get into the next item when we talk about the foregone, because we have to make up for the fact that everybody's increasing what they expect out of us and we have to keep those levels of service as high as we can to our citizens and if you take this all the way back to how you sit in your own personal situation at home, I think that's where it really starts to make sense, because we are delivering something for that increase. Getting the same old thing you got last year. We are going to keep those standards high. We want to make sure that this still is the place you want to live. This is the place when you dial 911 you get officers, whether it's fire or police, and that when you flush that handle and you turn that knob you get the best water service and the best sewer service you can get. So, it wasn't easy. It wasn't easy for a single one of us. Three wasn't one of us as we went through here that jumped up and said this is what we want to do. This was hard decisions and as President Cavener said, there was a lot of work -- a lot of gut wrenching work, because we never thought we would be in this position that we are in this year. But I feel very good about this budget. I think we have made every cut possible wherever we can, but continue to meet our demands. One last point. Another city in this valley approved their budget the other day and they had an issue when it came to their public safety and it came down to they did not know what their public safety needs were. In our case we had a PAM model, a very detailed report on exactly what we needed from our public safety for our city and we have been following that and there is -- most of those new positions you see are in our police department. Besides we get to keep the grant coming in the fire department. But what you don't see is that in order for us to actually be right where we need to be on that PAM model for where we need to be as a city, we would have to somehow pull another million dollars out of our hat to get the remaining number of officers that we simply can't bring on this year that we are going to have to take a serious look at next year as we continue to try to meet the needs of the city and keep it the place that everyone expects it to be. So, thank you for your patience. Trust me, you got a hard working group of people up here all trying to provide the best level of service to you, because we all live here as well. Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I -- I agree with all those comments made by Council Member Overton. I completely agree. I think, you know, also for helpful context -- and the Mayor made this comment in one of our workshop meetings, but I think it's worth reiterating the history of the property tax increases that the City of Meridian has taken in recent years, starting in FY-21, zero percent, 1.9 percent, three percent and, then, 1.6 percent. I think that's really important, because during that same time period the cumulative amount of inflation has been over 20 percent. So, I think it kind of shows you we have been trying to hold the line, but, you know, we have reached a point where we have to prioritize our public safety. I know not everyone agrees with taking a federal grant and there are real challenges with that and it is giving us the ability to surge our hiring in an area that is sorely needed where we have areas of our city that have very long response times and I give people the example of, you know, the Monday after 4th of July where we had three simultaneous fires and we had to have multiple jurisdictions help us respond to that. So, it's a frustration I think shared by City Council and our citizens that growth has brought us to a point we have a lot of challenges in our personnel trying to staff up to accommodate it. It is a reality of where we are at and I think, you know, continuing to prioritize public safety, but finding those common sense cuts where we can is the right approach. So, I just wanted to provide a little more context on the history.

Simison: Council, additional comments?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Yeah. I -- I appreciate all those comments and I do want to publicly thank you, Mr. Mayor, and your staff and all the Council Members for the good work and for your patience as we kind of worked through this. Jenny did a good job highlighting sort of the -- how long these processes take and I think that's okay. I think it's good that it takes a little -- little bit of time. We try to be accountable and transparent with our constituency and allow them to -- to participate as much as we can and so I -- I really appreciate that. I think that's okay. When I consider the budget, it's not to me just setting a number for what we are going to spend that year. Really this is a -- this is a policy statement. This is a document that says these are our priorities. It highlights sort of where we have been, but I think more importantly it's sort of charting a -- a path forward, says here is where we are going. So, I think as we contemplate our votes tonight, I -- I think I just want to highlight a couple items of maybe where we have been; right? And I just some -- taking some of these documents -- or these numbers from the budget document that the -- the public had access to -- since fiscal year 2022 until now we are looking at a budget where the revenue is 39 million dollars higher. We are looking at total expenditures of 136 million dollars higher than they were in fiscal year '22 and I recognize a lot of that is one time capital outlays for a lot of some critical infrastructure. So, it's not an apple-to-apples comparison here, but we do need to recognize that's a significant change from where we were just a few years ago and I think when you break down that -- that -- that -- those expenditures you are looking at, you know, our personnel budget over that same time frame. It's up almost 30 million

dollars a year. The capital outlays this year are up about 93, 94 million more than they were in '22. Our operating costs are up 13 million. So, there is some -- you know, the city has grown a lot, but we have certainly grown a lot with it in terms of where we have -- we have spent and I think when you dig down and you say, well, where -- what are the real drivers of our growth and spending, we -- we saw it tonight, 62 percent is our commitment to public safety and I think when you dig a little deeper you look at the other departments and we see really fairly modest year-over-year growth with the rest of our departments and so I think if our public safety budget is really one of the main drivers to these budget increases, I think we as a City Council should ask ourselves is our commitment to public safety -- is it too much? Is it too little? Or is it just right? And I think each of us can answer that question appropriately. However, you know, our -- whatever our background is in informing us in that decision. So, I think that's kind of where we have been. Now, we look at kind of where we are going with what we have got proposed. There is some good things. I -- I actually have enjoyed this process. I really appreciate the opportunity to take three bites at the apple in terms of finding some savings. I -- I -- I commend everyone. You know, so we have made some cuts. We have kept our commitments to our -- our city staff. We have made some really good investments in some critical infrastructure in our water and wastewater and we continue to find ways to still continue to make some strategic investments in -- in parks and other aspects of the community. So, there is -- I do think there is a lot I really like about the budget, but there is some things I'm a little concerned about; right? Like I have made it clear the three percent and the foregone, that does concern me. I'm also concerned by the fact that we are looking at some departments in the city are having to delay some of their strategic investments or -- or moving ahead with programs or with some personnel hires. That's a fact. We are trading one value for another. Public safety is one of our -- probably our most important priority. So, it deservedly has more of our finances and our -- our attention. But we need to understand really the trade off. There is a real trade off here. Let me speak about the SAFER grant just a little bit. I think from a public safety point of view it was a great decision; right? It was a good decision. When you look at it in terms of just strictly on paper, a budget impact, just in a vacuum -- we recognize the challenges it brought to us in terms of making our budget work and be able to invest in other priorities. What's concerning to me and we heard it a little bit in the public testimony today -- we took the federal grant and now we are looking at how to trim and cut budgets where we can and we are looking at taking the full three percent and the foregone in order to pay for the -- when the federal money ends. I -- I struggle with that. I do. I -- I -- I -- that's not a secret to anybody. I agree with the strategic decision to move to a four person team with the fire department. I do. I think that makes sense. I think that's the right strategic decision. But I -- I wish we could have grown into it a little bit more slowly. So, I just want to kind of put that out there. I -- I wish we could have got there a little bit more slowly, but I also want to emphasize this. I don't fault anybody -- Mayor, anybody on Council, the fire department or anyone who advocated that we take the money. I don't fault anyone for -- for doing it for the wrong reason, because I know the intent behind it was to provide elevated services to our citizens and to provide a higher level of safety to our firefighters and so I -- I applaud that. I applaud the intent behind it. But we recognize it comes at a cost. So, we have to weigh the cost in terms of the other impacts. I know I'm getting long. I will try to wrap this up here. But so

where are we going; right? We are still looking at budget cuts in terms of this -- kind of going through this exercise holding our -- our spending in check as much as we can. We are still looking at three percent and taking foregone in the -- in the future and we are still unclear maybe how this works out and I think when we consider how this impacts our citizens we should consider sort of the -- the holistic approach here; right? Council Woman Strader mentioned inflation is up over 20 percent since February of 2020. We know that -- I was looking at the Bureau of Labor Statistics. They tracked 400 items that people typically fall under your -- you know, consumer items. Only six percent are cheaper, which means 94 percent of the items people buy on a daily basis are up. Housing. The average home price in Ada county is up 72 percent over the last five years. Rent is up 35 percent. So, when you consider the inputs and outputs of a family in Meridian, it's clear we have a larger problem in society. People are being squeezed everywhere they turn around and Councilman Overton did a great job highlighting that. We know that the federal government's fiscal policies are actually causing some real harm to people. So, I asked myself why are we demanding even more from the people of Meridian? Like why are we asking so much from them? And when you view this budget in just a vacuum I think it's a great budget. I actually do. I -- I think it's a good budget when you do it in a vacuum. But I -- you can't do that. You have to consider everything when you are trying to make this decision. So, just, you know, a small leak in a boat will sink a ship. I worry about the small little increases here and there that the people are facing every day and I -- I -- I -- I would be careful if we want to suggest that a couple dollars a month is affordable for people. It's just -- it's like that drip, drip, drip. People are paying more everywhere they turn. So, let me close with this. In summary it's a good -- I -- there is a lot of good things and I'm -- I'm -- I'm grateful for the process. I have learned a lot. I have a lot more respect for everyone and their involvement. There is some things that concern me by voting for this budget and putting my name next to a document that says I think we are going in the right direction, but I can't say with a hundred percent confidence that I would agree with that statement. So, I won't be supporting the budget tonight.

Simison: Council, any additional comments? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

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

Simison: Five ayes. One nay. And the motion to approve in the revised amount of 255,511,778 is approved. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE NAY.

3. Public Hearing to Collect Foregone Revenue Associated with Fiscal Year 2025 Budget

Simison: We will move on to the next item, which is a public hearing to collect foregone revenue associated with fiscal year 2025 budget. I will turn this over to Jenny.

Fields: Okay. Last item for budget we are looking for a motion to collect our foregone in the amount of 504,546 dollars and this is associated specifically for funding our firefighter personnel expenses.

Simison: All right. Thank you, Jenny. Council, any questions for staff? Okay. This is a public hearing. Did we have anybody signed up to provide testimony on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we have Rick Schultz.

Simison: Okay. Good evening. State your name and address for the record.

Schultz: Thank you. My name is Rick Schultz. 998 West Cameron Street, Meridian. Thank you for having me up here tonight and thank you for all you do. So, I'm opposed to any property tax for foregone revenue increases, as not all Meridian residents are rich California transplants here with large bank accounts. Many are elderly on fixed income struggling to pay their grocery taxes. An increase in taxes largely based on greed. I feel especially when our property taxes are based on an artificially inflated property value assessment and we are expected to pay taxes based on those assessed values. We are -- excuse me. We are overtaxed up to and including a grocery tax. Meridian has seen expansive growth and increased revenues in the past few years as more and more people and businesses are moving in here. The last thing folks need is yet another increase on existing tax. Some would argue that we need additional tax revenues for roads and street maintenance. Meridian doesn't have this. Unlike most other cities, including many local ones, Meridian does not have the added expense of maintaining its roadways. Those expenses are borne on ACHD and ITD. These are large expenses that the city doesn't have to budget for. In addition, Meridian doesn't have the expense of abundant crime and homeless issues that many other cities have. We need to ask our city government to be responsible and manage or even reduce its budget, rather than burdening the people with additional taxes that only cost through a hardship. Again, I ask the city not to put more on the backs of its citizens in this time of economic stress. Frankly, I'm saddened, but I do believe that on this matter in particular the good citizens of Meridian will not have any say. On another note, this is off the cuff, but, Ms. Strader, you had mentioned something about the Monday. The fires. I wasn't aware of the fires after 4th of July. This concerns me and I'm sure it concerns you guys. My concern is let's go back to safety. I don't see anything done in this city about fireworks. Are they illegal? From my understanding they are. I invite you all to my neighborhood on any 4th of July. We will have a party. But this really concerns me. We are talking about safety, but those fires -- I will bet you they could have been -- they could have been -- I'm nervous up here, but --

Simison: You are good.

Schultz: We didn't need those. They didn't have to happen. What are we going to do going forward in the future? Is this a police issue or is this a fire issue? Whose issue is it? It's not mine, because I'm paying my taxes, but I got people down the street whose bushes are catching on fire and the neighbors are having to come over and put these

fires out. If you can't tell I'm frustrated, but we are here talking about safety and I'm asking you to consider that. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Strader: Mr. Mayor? Mr. Schultz, do you mind coming back? That's okay. No, you did a great job and it's -- it's nerve wracking coming up in front of a bunch of people. To your -- to your point about the fires, just on that point, so we had a structure fire, a brush fire and a residential fire. From my understanding none of those was related to fireworks --

Schultz: Okay.

Strader: -- but coincidences happen.

Schultz: Okay.

Strader: Those three happened at once. It was just an example. I think it's important -- like one thing I heard from you is you value that we don't have a huge crime issue or a huge homelessness issue and I -- and I just kind of wanted to have a dialogue with you, because I feel like part of our success is our investment and commitment to public safety. You know, it -- I understand you are -- this is a very challenging economic environment for people, so I get -- I get your point. But from your review of the budget -- or do you have the impression that there is something we shouldn't be spending money on I guess would be my question to you. Do you feel like there is something wasteful that you found or do you feel like there is something that shouldn't be as much of a priority. I'm just curious if -- if you have any feedback, you know, more specifically.

Schultz: Not in particular. I mean I'm -- I'm -- I don't know your entire budget, so I will -- you know, stay with that.

Strader: And it's a huge document to go through, so --

Schultz: Right. I mean you folks do, so you know where things can be cut back and where they can't. All I'm saying for the most part is that we as citizens are bearing a brunt of things just like you are -- you are -- every -- your costs are going up as well. So, are ours, all the way to the -- the grocery store. The taxes. We are here tonight talking about possible reduction in property values. That's a possible, yet not probable. I mean we are not guaranteed. So, no one knows whether we are going to get an increase -- or like you said a de -- possible decrease. I don't know that any one of us are comfortable enough out here to say that we are going to see a decrease of any kind, especially when we are taking three percent plus foregone. I -- I mean I think we are digging a little deep. It's kind of -- yeah, I understand your costs are going up, but so are we and if our property -- property values -- it does us no good on paper. That's like a 401(k), it does us no good until we cash out. We are not selling our homes. A lot of us are stuck here, because we want to be. We moved here because we do love it

here. We do appreciate -- I do love Meridian and I'm not -- I don't mean to stand here and come down on you and I apologize if I come off that way.

Strader: This is a group that's not easily offended. We are used to having tough conversations, so --

Schultz: We are all frustrated and I guess this is one of those times where we can -- we can lash out. Nothing -- nothing is personal, but I hope -- I hope you consider -- I don't want you -- I'm not standing here saying that we should cut back on fire or police. I'm pro fire, pro police. But I think we have to be prudent -- prudent in -- in the future. Like we are taking these federal funds, but we have to -- we are going to have to pay for their retirement in the end. So, we have to look far out in the distance; right? The cost of maintaining the firefighters. I know we need them. The city asked -- we ask a lot of the city and we appreciate what you do really. We do love this city and I thank you for letting me go way over my time and for you engaging with me.

Strader: Yeah. Of course.

Schultz: That's more than a lot of cities would do and I appreciate all of you, even though I'm not making eye contact with all of you, but thank you. I mean I'm not coming down on the city and I apologize if it seems that I'm -- you know, I'm -- I'm hearing of all these increased expenses. We are going to be paying more now for sewer and water as well and, then, we ask ourselves as consumers, citizens, what's next. I think nothing is comfortable for us out here. Everywhere we go we see increase -- increased costs. Like you do. But all I'm saying is if there is anywhere that you can dig deep to manage -- and I'm sure you are managing the budget. I'm not questioning that. But to minimize -- do we have to go for foregone? Is that a necessity or is that something that all the cities are just trying to go for now, because they are permitted to do so because of legislation?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you, Mr. Schultz. Yeah.

Schultz: Thank you very much.

Strader: Thank you. I just -- I will make one -- one further comment which is -- and I -- and I think it's -- I think it's important that you hear from us. We understand what you are saying and we understand how painful this economy is for everyday -- all of us for everyday people. It's been really tough. This is the first budget I literally shed a tear over at one point in frustration. In terms of digging deep I feel like we have done that. The -- the important thing to I think recognize is that the foregone revenue is for the specific purpose of paying for the firefighters. I appreciated that we spelled that out for people. If we -- if we didn't take foregone revenue this year we would not be building

any source of ongoing revenue to pay for those salaries when they come on to our books. So, it's -- it's a tough situation. But I just -- I wanted to just chat with you back and forth a little bit and the -- the hardest thing I think for homeowners is the lack of visibility into what's going to happen with your property value from an assessment standpoint. That can become a huge source of frustration with no visibility as to whether it's going to go up, is it going to go down. You know, in this interest rate environment residential home values are going down overall, but that doesn't mean that's going to be the case for every individual home. So, I don't know, I just wanted to -- to -- to have a dialogue. So, I really appreciate you and I appreciate you caring and I appreciate you coming to talk to us. Thank you.

Simison: Mr. Clerk, did we have anybody else signed up to testify?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did not.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody else that would like to come forward and present testimony on the public hearing related to the foregone for fiscal year FY-25? If you are online you can use the raise your hand function. Seeing no one else coming forward, Council, I don't know if you want to talk before someone makes a motion or have a motion and, then, have conversation.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I -- I feel like between this meeting and our budget workshops we have talked about it a lot. I'm -- I'm open to hearing more comments from anybody. I will, you know, take accountability. In the past I had voted against foregone. I never imagined being in a position where we would have to take it. I always felt confident that our fund balance was large enough to -- to cover us, but I don't feel that way about these 18 firefighters and I think it's important -- it's an important priority for the city. It was a decision that we have made. I think we need to support it. It is an incredibly difficult decision, but I think it is the right decision for the city. I move that we approve the collection of foregone revenue associated with the fiscal year 2025 budget in the amount of 504,546 dollars.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve the request for foregone. Is there discussion?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Go ahead, Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thanks, Mr. Mayor. Appreciate the good comment, Council Member Vice -- Council Vice-President Strader, and I once worked with somebody and they said, you

know, there is a -- there is a lot of different roads to Vegas and I think that's where we are at right now is that different Council Members have different approaches on how they think that we can address the SAFER grant long term. I don't believe that now we need to use foregone to be able to accomplish that. Between our fund balance and forthcoming new revenue sources I think that we are in a strong position that we don't have to make this decision today and so I will be voting against the motion for foregone. I don't think that it is needed at this particular time.

Simison: Okay. Any additional comments? If I -- if I could just for a moment in a lot of ways I take responsibility for where we are today in the context of it was ultimately my decision, working along with Council, but to accept the SAFER grant and identifying a way to try to bring forward a way to help pay for this long term and that what this really is and I'm going to borrow something that Council Member Whitlock said to me when we were doing interviews for him coming in to take his position as Council Member and, you know, policy drives budget. You know, it -- that really struck -- struck me in that kind of -- sorry, if you were going to use that comment later in your comments, but this is really a -- this is a policy decision and Councilman Taylor alluded to this as well in his comments that, you know, that this -- this is a decision about whether not to increase the level of service to our -- our community that -- that's -- that's what this is. We -- we currently have firefighters on all of our fire engines and -- and they run. The additional firefighters that will allow them to do stuff that they can't do when they show up at the very first time in some situations. So, it is about enhanced level of service to our community and I think that's -- you know, it -- from my perspective when I proposed foregone for helping pay for that enhanced level of service is because if you look back over the last -- as Council Woman Strader pointed out -- the amounts that we requested over the last four years, we haven't taken the full three percent the last several years, despite what we have seen happen in our economy. We found ways to make it happen and I would like to have said that but for a few rather large bills that we received from the state of Idaho related to PERSI, you know, which was over 700,000 dollars, we may not have requested foregone. I can't say whether we would or wouldn't have, because there are still unmet needs in our police department and I know that they would have loved to have brought more of the positions that are necessary in their mind to achieve their mission. Several of our other departments did not -- we had to say, yeah, this is not the time for those positions either. Those were the -- the hard conversations we had as a leadership team on the executive side of the -- of the conversation in developing a budget that we felt could still move the ball forward for a growing community, as well as a way to fund enhanced level of service that actually is going to have a lot of ancillary benefits that I hope the chief and I are able to share with the community in the coming month or so, but it would be premature to say that because, I don't want to get the community's hopes too high. But they -- they -- they do have some good value to the -- the community and our homeowners and our business owners in ways that we hope will -- hopefully they will see that in different areas. So, that's why when we put together this budget we did assign these new positions into the foregone revenue. As was mentioned, we will have to look and see where things go over the next two years with -- as we see what the changes are, the impacts to sales tax and a lot of impacts that will help us drive that and are we able to achieve our goals through regular processes or is

foregone going to be a regular part or are there other ways. We are hopeful this additional revenue -- and it's -- Terry, I'm sorry it is federal revenue that we are hoping for from the state that will filter its way down to the communities, but it's a way to help pay for this in the future. But as of right now that's not materializing and we don't know if or when it will and if it will be enough to cover these costs. So, we are looking under every rock we have. We are looking, you know, on every horizon that we see for the opportunity, but it is a way to try to develop -- deliver the services to the community that they first and foremost expect and also hopefully they will be able to achieve greater results with the additional firefighters that this foregone is being directed towards long term. So, I know it's been a big conversation for all of us. We have all had many conversations through this process about what it means and how we would do it. This executive branch leader of the city -- I felt this was the only prudent way that we could work towards achieving a goal without just saying, well, maybe next year we hope the funds will be there from another source, that if we didn't take steps now, then, it may be too late and we wouldn't have even the option to consider if we want to keep those firefighters and not in three years when the grant runs out. So, I appreciate everybody not just on this issue, but on the base budget. It's been a fascinating six months of dialogue and conversation and I -- I think ultimately our community is going to be in a better place because of it and -- thank you. I'm sorry I don't have a great ending. Thank you in that context.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Since you gave my speech I had to come up with another one off -- off the top of my head and I guess my speech is probably to thank Terry and Rick for being here and providing your comments. This is not easy and I sense the frustration, I sense the emotion and we feel it, too, and -- and I -- I will be voting for this, but I want to commit to you and to anybody else that's meeting -- that's listening in on our meeting and to my fellow members on the City Council, that we will be vigilant. We will be watching your tax dollars very very carefully. We will be spending them with the utmost care and concern for the safety of this community and providing the services that you expect and keeping as much of that in your pocket as we possibly can. I will be vigilant and I want you to know that your testimony tonight, your thoughts and feelings have had a strong impact on -- on the newest member of the City Council. So, thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I move to vacate my previous motion.

Simison: Second agree?

Little Roberts: Yes.

Simison: Second agrees.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I neglected to close the public hearing. So, I move that we close the public hearing.

Simison: First on the motion to vacate, is there any opposition from Council? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Motion is vacated.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Simison: Have a new motion to close the public hearing on the foregone. Is there any discussion -- is there a second?

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion to close. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: My apologies for goofing up that one step. I move that we approve the collection of foregone revenue associated with fiscal year 2025 budget in the amount of 504,546 dollars.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second. Is there continued discussion on this topic? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

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

Simison: Four ayes. Two nays. And the item to approve the motion for foregone revenue is approved.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO NAYS.

Simison: Council, do we need to take a break or are we good to keep moving?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, if we could take five I would appreciate it.

Simison: Okay. We will go ahead and take a five minute break -- or reconvene at 7:15.

Cavener: Thank you.

(Recess: 7:09 p.m. to 7:16 p.m.)

4. Public Hearing for Proposed FY2025 Water/Sewer Rate Increase Schedule

Simison: All right. Council, we will go ahead and come back from our recess and the next item up the public hearing for proposed FY-25 water-sewer rate increase schedule. I will turn this over to Director McVey.

McVey: All right. Thanks, Mayor and Members of the Council. So, this is our public hearing for FY-25 rate increase. So, just as a reminder we presented to you and, then, we published in the utility bills for a month, also in the newspaper for two weeks. We did not receive any public comment in Public Works, but just a couple of things. Just a reminder this is actually -- will be a net decrease on the resident's bill, even though we are asking for a three percent increase, because the EPA fee is coming off, so the average customer will see a decrease of about \$1.90 per month and even with our, you know, three percent increase we continue to be some of the lowest rates in the valley and this increase is needed to maintain the solvency of the Enterprise Fund over the five year period. So, happy to stand for any questions and complete the public hearing.

Simison: All right. Thank you. Council, any questions for staff?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Not so much a question for Laurelei, but just maybe a comment. Yeah, I sat down with Laurelei probably a couple months ago and we looked at some of the rate increases and she showed me the -- the long-term projections and different scenarios and I just -- I want to put this on the record. I -- I think the City of Meridian is in really good shape when it comes to our infrastructure with water and wastewater. It's big, it's expensive, but it's critically important what we provide. Very happy to see we are going to have a small decrease. I think that's a recognition, though, too, that a lot of -- some of -- some of the costs we have to pass along are imposed upon the city from the EPA through DEQ and I -- I think it's -- it's -- it's -- it's good that we have some level of regulation in order to preserve high quality clean water. Sometimes it might be a little bit onerous, a little bit overboard -- actually quite a bit overboard, but I just want to commend the Public Works Department and all the staff, they do a really good job, but I think this is a -- is a -- it makes a lot of sense what we are doing tonight to -- to support this and I just want to make those comments here as -- as the liaison with Public Works.

Simison: Thank you, Mr. Taylor. Councilman Taylor. Okay. All right. Mr. Clerk, do we have anybody signed up on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did not.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody present that would like to provide testimony in this public hearing, either in person or online? If you are online you can use the raise your hand function. Seeing no one coming forward or raising their hand, do I have a motion to close the public hearing?

Strader: Mr. Mayor, I move that we close the public hearing.

Overton: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

5. Resolution No. 24-2466: A Resolution Adopting the FY2025 Water/Sewer Rate Increase Schedule; Authorizing the Public Works Department to Collect Such Fees; and Providing an Effective Date

Simison: The next item up is Resolution No. 24-2466, a resolution adopting FY-25 water-sewer rate increase schedule, authorizing Public Works Department to collect such fees and providing an effective date. Do I need to ask the clerk to read the motion -- read the resolution? Mr. Nary? Ask the clerk to read the resolution by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. This is a resolution adopting the Fiscal Year 2025 water/sewer rate increase schedule; authorizing the Public Works Department to collect such fees; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Thank you. Council, you have heard this resolution read by title. Is there anybody that would like it read in its entirety? If not, do I have a motion?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I move that we approve Resolution No. 24-2466, a resolution adopting the fiscal year 2025 water and sewer rate increase schedule.

Strader: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second approving Resolution No. 24-2466. Is there discussion on the motion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

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

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is agreed to. Thank you, Laurelei and your team and we will see you again soon.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

6. Public Hearing for Brundage Estates (TECC-2024-0002) by Engineering Solutions, LLP., generally located 1/4 mile south of W. Victory Rd. on the east side of S. Linder Rd. in the west half of Section 25, T.3N.,R.1W.

- A. Request: Time Extension for a two (2) year time extension on a preliminary plat to obtain the City Engineer's signature on the first phase of the final plat

7. Public Hearing for Brundage Estates MDA (H-2024-0031) by Engineering Solutions, LLP., generally located 1/4 mile south of W. Victory Rd. on the east side of S. Linder Rd. in the west half of Section 25, T.3N.,R.1W.

- A. Request: Modified Development Agreement for a new development agreement for Brundage Estates as required with annexation of the property (AZ-13-014, Ord. #14-1594)

Simison: Next item up is -- well, first question, Mr. Nary, can we open up Item 6 and 7 together? Any reason why --

Nary: You can do both. Yes.

Simison: Okay. Next we will open up the public hearing for Brundage Estates, TECC-2024-0002 and Brundage Estates MDA H-2024-0031 and we will open these public hearings with staff comments.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. I -- I will be presenting these separately, but I can do them back-to-back if you would like.

Simison: Yes.

Allen: Okay. The first application before you, Item No. 6, is a preliminary plat time extension. This site consists of 136.63 acres of land. It's zoned R-4 and is located at 3770 South Linder Road. This property was annexed back in 2014 and a preliminary

plat was approved in 2016. Two previous time extensions have been approved on the preliminary plat. The Comprehensive Plan land use designation on this is low density residential and medium density residential. The applicant is requesting a two year time extension on the preliminary plat in order to obtain the city engineer's signature on the first phase final plat. The preliminary plat entitles the property to develop with 366 building lots, 20 common lots and one other lot on 136 acres of land in the R-4 district. The reason for delay in moving forward with this development in the past is that the developer had been focused on development of the adjacent Biltmore Estates and Oakwood and Gray Cliff Estates Subdivisions. There were no new conditions of approval placed on the development with the previous time extensions as the project was determined to be in compliance with UDC standards in effect at that time, including open space and site amenity standards. The delay since the last time extension is due to improvements to Harris Street to the east being completed with Stapleton Subdivision and the City of Meridian extending sewer south in Linder Road from Fall Creek Subdivision. Since that time Stapleton Subdivision has been partially constructed and construction of surrounding developments have necessitated some design changes to match adjacent improvements. The applicant is currently in the design process of phases one and two of Brundage Estates. Completed plans are anticipated to be submitted to agencies for review in September of this year. Construction of the subdivision improvements is planned for November or December of this year, with paving in the spring and summer -- or summer of 2025. When the preliminary plat was approved a step down in density was approved with the southern portion of the property from medium to low density residential to match that on the northern portion of the property. The proposed development will provide larger lot sizes, on average 10,193 square foot lots, which is, like I mentioned, larger lot sizes than is typical these days with an overall gross density of 2.68 units per acre. The development includes private open space areas with playgrounds, picnic shelter and pathways. A ten foot wide multi-use pathway and landscaping is planned through the Williams Pipeline easement corridor and an eight acre city park is planned within the development. Services are available at the site for extension with development. Development of this subdivision will allow Harris Street, a mid-mile collector, to be extended from the east boundary through the site to Linder Road in accord with ACHD's master street map. Approval of the subject time extension will allow the applicant to move forward with development as entitled without having to go back through the preliminary plat process again and will extend the time in which to obtain the city engineer's signature on the first phase final plat to July 26th, 2026. Staff is recommending approval of the requested two year time extension with the following conditions: Ten foot wide sidewalks are constructed along South Linder Road and West Harris Street and internal local and collector streets shall align with stub streets to this property. No written testimony has been submitted on this application. The applicant is here tonight. Thank you.

Simison: Okay. Would the applicant like to come forward and present on this item?

Allen: Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Mayor, would you like me to go ahead with the second one?

Simison: If -- however you guys want to proceed. Is it easier for you for her to do -- her do both and you do one?

Allen: Okay. Sorry about that. Yeah. Sounds good. Okay. So -- yeah. Item No. 7 is a development agreement modification for the same subdivision. So, again, like I was saying earlier, this property was annexed back in 2014. It was annexed with the Victory South annexation, which was a Category B annexation of approximately 310 acres of land by the City of Meridian. A preliminary plat was later approved as shown in 2016 and, again, two previous time extensions have been approved on the preliminary plat and one is requested before you tonight. When this property was annexed one of the provisions of the declaration of consent to annexation was that the property owner may not develop or receive development approval until such time as the property owners and the city execute a development agreement. With this application the applicant proposes a new development agreement for Brundage Estates as required with annexation of the property. As noted a preliminary plat was previously approved for the property, as well as subsequent time extensions and the applicant is nearing submittal of a final plat application, which constitutes development and the necessity of executing a development agreement for the property. The preliminary plat entitles the property to develop with 366 building lots, 20 common lots and one other lot on 136 acres of land in the R-4 district. Staff recommends the proposed development agreement include provisions for future development of this property to be consistent with the approved preliminary, landscape plan and conceptual park master plan, as well as conditions associated with the concurrent time extension. Conceptual building elevations were approved for future homes within the development with a preliminary plat application as shown. These elevations incorporate a variety of field and accent materials, including stucco, a large number of windows and glazing, and lap board and batten and shake siding, with stone accents and architectural elements consisting of corbels to emphasize roof gables, masonry stone columns at the entries, trim around windows, et cetera. A variety of color changes are incorporated as well for interest in accents. Because the developer of this subdivision is different from the original developer, alternate elevations are proposed to be included in the new development agreement as shown. The proposed elevations lack the variety and materials, colors and architectural details and elements shared with the community, supported by City Council and memorialized in the original approvals. Many of these are elevation -- excuse me. Many of these elevations do not meet the minimum baseline standards in the Architectural Standards Manual pertaining to building form, architectural elements and materials, as noted in the staff report. Staff discussed these concerns with the applicant prior to application -- advise the applicant to heighten the design of their elevations. However, the developer preferred -- preferred to stay with their established product type. Although single family residential detached dwellings are not typically required to comply with the design standards in the Architectural Standards Manual, instead receiving higher level review typical with annexations and preliminary plats, the Unified Development Code does allow compliance to be required with a development agreement. Previous concepts proposed with the preliminary plat were in closer conformance to these standards. Therefore, compliance with the standards was not required. Staff finds the existing elevations to be of a higher quality of design in terms of baseline standards in building

form architectural elements, materials and colors. Therefore, staff is not in support of the proposed modification without changes to the elevation to comply with the design standards as noted in the report. Staff recommends the applicant make revisions to the elevations to comply prior to the Council hearing -- excuse me -- Council taking action on this application. Revised elevations have not been submitted prior to the hearing tonight as requested. Further -- and which is typical of developments along major roadways, because the rear and/or sides of homes facing South Linder Road, West Harris Street and South Oak Briar Way, will be highly visible, staff recommends revision in the development agreement that requires these elevations to incorporate articulation through changes in two or more of the following: Modulation. For example, projections, recesses, step backs, pop outs, base banding, porches and balconies, material types or other integrated architectural elements to break up monotonous wall planes and roof lines. Single story homes are exempt from this requirement. Staff is recommending the project is either continued to a later date in order for the applicant to make revisions to the elevations to comply with the minimum design standards in the Architectural Standards Manual or the portion of the development agreement request pertaining to changing the concept elevations is denied. No written testimony was received on this application. Staff will stand for any questions.

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

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Because we are kind of I guess maybe talking about these both, I guess just a quick question on the -- on the plat time extension. When is it set to expire?

Allen: Let me look at my staff report. Just a moment.

Cavener: I'm sorry, Sonya, I'm kind of multitasking with using my computer to prop up my iPad, so I'm -- I'm kind of looking at my phone and I wasn't able to find it, so apologies for the question.

Allen: Yeah. That's all right. Just a moment. July 26th of this year. The applicant submitted their request for extension prior to that date.

Cavener: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Thank you, Sonya. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: One other just quick follow up, then. If the -- if the DA is continued would staff, then, recommended decision on the plat to be continued as well?

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Council, no. I think Council should move -- move ahead with the time extension decision tonight.

Cavener: Okay. Thank you.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for staff?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: It always helps me to have an example. So, if we -- if we took maybe an example of like the modern farmhouse one here that's like in the top right-hand side, what changes to that elevation would -- if it's possible for you to sort of walk us through an example of like what changes would you expect to see to make that elevation acceptable?

Allen: Mr. Mayor Council, there is -- there is a lot of different ways that folks can go -- you know, meet the design standards. I mean some examples would be adding some design elements in the -- in the peaks, corbels, decorative vents. That elevation right there is pretty plain. I -- I would recommend adding some stone accents along the base of the structure, color variations, material variations, that -- just that -- that elevation is quite plain all the way around. So, really anything would help. Those are just some examples.

Strader: Okay.

Allen: If you look at the staff report there is -- there is examples in there of -- straight out of our design manual.

Strader: Okay. Thanks, Sonya.

Simison: All right. Would the applicant like to come forward?

McKay: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. I'm Becky McKay with Engineering Solutions. Business address 1029 North Rosario in Meridian. I'm representing the applicants in this -- on these applications. As Sonya indicated there are two applications before you this evening. One is a time extension. I kind of need to give you a little bit of history. Since there are new members on the Council they may not be aware of how this project -- you know, why was it annexed in 2014, why was it preliminary platted in 2016 and why are we here in 2024 and we haven't built it. So, just bear with me, I will kind of give you like a little quick history lesson on it. So, my client Lee Centers owned the subject property, lived on the subject property here. He also owned this property right here called Biltmore Estates and he owned the property here that's now called Gray Cliff Estates. We had gone to the city to talk to them about the possibility of sewer and water extending to this area and one of the problems that the city had was existing Kentucky Ridge and existing Meridian Heights were not in the city limits. They were approved under Ada county. Their sewage was accomplished through open lagoons and they had a community well system, which had failed, which

had high arsenic levels, which they had invested money in drilling a new well, which still had arsenic levels and the problem that the city had is they said, you know, we have a barrier of these county subdivisions that is keeping us from annexing south. At the same time the city of Kuna was expanding their sewer capacity and, obviously, looking at this area -- well, Meridian, if you can't sewer it, because you can't annex it and you can't get your sewer to it, then, maybe it should be Kuna. So, we worked diligently with your Public Works director, your city engineer, the Council at the time, the planning staff and we went to Mr. Hansen, who had this piece of property here, he was 94 years old and all he wanted to do was be left alone with his sheep and we said could we convince you to consent to annex your property and allow us to take Meridian sewer and water through your property. We will design a site plan for your parcel and you -- we will put it all back for your sheep and, then, we would -- that point of annexation was here at Bear Creek at Victory Road. This is a little squirrely for me today. So, Mr. Hansen said I will agree to that if you pay the additional taxes that I would pay being annexed and, then, we had the issue of Meridian Heights. They did not -- their HOA did not have the monies to pay for those Meridian hookup fees. So, I spent a year and a half -- my client Lee Centers paid for that year and a half and we had workshop after workshop. We finally came to an agreement that their HOA would pay the water hookup fees. That's all they could afford. That is not a wealthy neighborhood and Mr. Centers would pay the 750,000 dollars for all their sewer hookup fees. That would -- and, then, they would consent to the annexation into the city and elimination of their ponds, elimination of their community water system and they would connect to your system and they would pay your rates. It took us a little over a year and a half to come to that point. Hardest thing I ever did in the city of Meridian, but it was well worth it and we were granted an award by the city, Mr. Centers and myself and those other individuals that worked to solve this problem. So, that's where that 2014 annexation -- that Category B annexation took place. So, at the time we didn't have any site plans or anything, so they annexed approximately 310 acres and -- and, basically, what that allowed is the City of Meridian to get past those county subdivisions, get into this midsection and that has since allowed your sewer and your water to continue south and your annexation pathways to keep moving south, as planned in your area of city impact and your Comprehensive Plan. So, we were annexed in 2014 and, then, in 2016 we brought forth a preliminary plat on the project called Brundage Estates. Oh. I always have these issues. There we go. So, the plat that's before you was done in -- in 2016. We had stub streets. We had the Harris collector. We had -- we were all R-4. All lots met the minimum 8,000 square feet. We had detached walks. Eight foot buffers. We had about 10,193 square foot average lot size and our density was 2.68 dwelling units per acre and the city thought, you know, for this area that's appropriate. We had 366 single family lots. We had private open space. We had playgrounds, picnic shelters, pathways. Then we also had the Williams Pipeline that ran through the project and -- there we -- it's touchy time. I'm sorry. And so we had a multi-use pathway that we needed to construct along that Williams Pipeline. The other thing on the Comprehensive Plan was it showed that a neighborhood park should be built in the middle of this section. And so with Biltmore, with Gray Cliff and, then, with Brundage we allocated -- Mr. Center's allocated property for an eight plus acre neighborhood park that would serve this whole section. The other issue was the Meridian -- the South Meridian transportation plan. It was proposed that

Harris Street would be improved to a collector status from Highway 69 all the way to Linder and so we planned within this project extension of Harris all the way to Linder. So, you know, one of the things the Council looks at when they are -- when they are looking at these time extensions -- you know, one, does this project meet the UDC -- current UDC, because 2016 the standards were different. The answer is yes. We meet the open space requirements. We meet the amenity requirements. We comply with the Comprehensive Plan land use map, the South Meridian Transportation Plan and the Meridian Parks and Pathway Plan. So, everything that was designed in here has -- has basically satisfied the test of time, which is rare. A lot of times these projects over year -- few years, then, they don't meet your standards. As we started getting into the design of the project we were stopped and one of the things that -- that stopped us is my -- my client at the time's wife became terminally ill and her illness lasted a few years and we were told that we should just hold off and request a time extension and that's what we did. She has since passed away and now Mr. Centers is selling the project to Toll Brothers. They want to buy the entire project and build a fabulous community. So, we started working on our design. We looked at our timeline and we needed a time extension, because we have -- we have got, you know, like a month or two left on our design of phase one and two and one of the things that we realized -- and I just want to bring it to the Council's attention -- is we set the stub street locations, but as the projects developed around us they didn't match them, so the -- that's this kind of ugly little drawing that I have here in yellow. This stub street moved about 235 feet. This stub street moved over about 32 feet. So, I did have to make some adjustments to match these stub streets, because they are already in and I don't have a choice. So, I made some minor adjustments to those. The other thing we found out is the collector -- another engineer did this collector roadway and he dropped it south. One benefit was it, obviously, made a larger more usable area for the neighborhood park. The disadvantage was we had to make some changes here. Then Ada County Highway District has changed their standards on collector to local street intersections. At the time we did this plat they required only a 220 foot offset along a collector. They now require 330. So, we did come in and we basically eliminated some of those intersections with the collector. We now meet all ACHD standards. We matched all the stub streets to the north. We did not increase the number of lots. I did have to adjust my entrance -- my northerly entrance off of Linder, because we had it coming in at a Y and they don't allow that radius any longer coming off of an arterial. So, I had to make a few modifications. We have increased our open space. Toll Brothers had me take all these lots out here and in addition to the amenities that were originally proposed with the project they will be building a clubhouse and pool facility in addition to all the other amenities that we initially proposed. The multi-use pathways. The playgrounds. The pocket parks. The benches. The linear open space. The -- the Harris Street -- we -- we got that curve worked out, because we couldn't make that curve work based on where this was and now all of that meets ACHD standards. So, I did want Council to see that. I did have to make some minor changes, but it was due to comply with ACHD and to meet the stub street locations from my other adjoining projects. We are currently working on phase one right here and phase two at this location here. Oops. There is a copy -- or that's kind of the original neighborhood park layout that we had. It was a continuous connection of the multi-use pathway that runs along the Williams Pipeline.

The Williams Pipeline is being upgraded right now to urban standards. Originally it was a rural standard and now to meet federal guidelines it's all being upgraded to an urban standard. There are two pipelines there. When they put -- when they got in there they realized that the pipelines were not where they thought they were, so the other thing that I had to adjust was the pipeline easement moved 20 feet. So, now we are centered on those pipes. We have our 75 foot easement. I can plant shrubs. I can do the multi-use pathway. I can do turf and I can do shrubs. But I can't do trees. As far as the neighborhood park, we did take that before the Parks Commission. After receiving approval from City Council the Parks Commission said that they were supportive of a neighborhood park in this location. Mr. Centers did agree that he would install the irrigation and seed to green it up when we get over to this area for the city and it would be a donation to the city and Toll Brothers are aware of that -- those commitments that were made to the Parks Commission at the time and are willing to, obviously, abide by the previous commitments. When we submitted the preliminary plat, since we did not have a development agreement, the elevations were tied to our pre-plat. At the time Mr. Center's son was going to build all the homes in the subdivision and he built a lot of homes in the Biltmore Subdivision and, then, his youngest son decided he didn't want to be a builder anymore and I think that's what kind of prompted Mr. Centers to -- to rethink Brundage, because it was quite a large project. So, those -- the elevations I submitted with a preliminary plat were custom type homes. They were primarily Craftsman style, single story, two-story, a mixture. I didn't have a lot of elevations, but they were a very high quality. Toll Brothers -- they are more of a production builder, so the elevations that we have submitted, obviously, reflect -- if I could just finish here, Mr. Mayor, please. Obviously, one of the things that's changed since 2016 is styles. Farmhouse styles are in. Modern styles are in. And so Toll has a whole new line of homes and they gave me these elevations. We took them to the staff and the staff said, you know, we don't have problems with the farmhouse, we don't have problems with the modern elevations, we just want you to dress them up a little bit to, obviously, meet the standards in -- in which the project was initially approved for. Their design team was completely tied up with a project in Caldwell and they could not update these and I had to submit the DA mod when I submitted the time extension, obviously, so that I could present both of them to the Council. In my letter to Council we stated that we are in agreement to upgrade those elevations that I have submitted, send them to staff, so Bill and Sonya can review them and approve them, so that they meet their expectations and -- and I guess I would -- I would like the Council to approve the time extension this evening, approve the development agreement, but Sonya can't bring that development agreement to you guys for your approval until she gets the new elevations and the staff has approved them. So, there is a mechanism to keep me from moving forward and I can't submit my construction plans or my final plat until the development agreement is signed and approved by the City Council. So, we do have a mechanism to make sure that -- that the staff gets what they think they need on this particular project. Toll Brothers does a beautiful project. They have got their landscape architects working on the -- the designs for the frontage and the signage and the clubhouse and, then, I just wanted to bring some elevations -- this is that Windrow Subdivision that's just to the south of us. Those are 5,000 square foot homes and we have 9,500 square foot or 5,000 square foot lots. We have 9,500 square foot lots next to them. You know, these are just pretty pictures

that don't necessarily match what is constructed. Obviously, what -- what we are bringing is exactly what we are going to build and I guess, please, provide me the opportunity to -- to get through this evening and -- and, like I said, approve the time extension. We keep moving on our plans and, then, work with the staff bringing forth those modified elevations and, then, once they are satisfied, like I said, they will come forward as part of that development agreement as those exhibits. Thank you. Can I answer any questions? Sorry I took so long.

Simison: Thank you, Becky, for the informative history lesson for some Council, as well as information. Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Wow, Becky, so much could happen in a decade. That was an amazing history. I appreciate so many moving parts and I just want to compliment you personally for working through the issues in Meridian Heights Subdivision and some of the surrounding areas, because it improved our whole city by doing that. You helped to solve a very difficult intractable problem. My only question was feedback about the ten foot wide sidewalks on South Linder and Harris, if you were in agreement on that recommendation from staff.

McKay: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, yes, we are. In fact, we agreed to that at the pre-application conference and it is part of our Linder and Harris design. So, we -- we did widen out our landscape buffers along the collector. I didn't have to widen out my arterial buffer, because it was all -- already exceeded what the minimum was, but we will have ten foot on both sides of Harris and a ten foot along Linder, along with our ten foot multi-use pathway all along the Williams Pipeline.

Strader: Great. Thank you.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Becky, thank you for reminding me about history. I remember very well when Kentucky Ridge and they were failing and we were jumping in trying to find a solution.

McKay: It was a tough nut to crack, but we all did it.

Overton: It wouldn't have happened if it wasn't a group effort.

McKay: Yes.

Overton: Our police department code enforcement team was a major major force in that whole process trying to figure out from our side of the city what had to be done, but it was nice to hear the back story of what Lee Centers did as well to make it happen.

McKay: Yep. And, Mr. Nary, he played a great part in it, too. Thank him for -- for everything and -- and Mayor de Weerd and -- and every -- we kept the group together when -- when there were times we thought it was going to fall apart.

Overton: So, just to further follow up. On your path forward, as I understand it, if I'm correct, path forward is to approve the time extension this evening --

McKay: Yes, sir.

Overton: -- and not -- are we just going to delay the modification, Sonya?

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Council, staff is amenable to the applicant's request to work with staff to submit elevations. The only -- the only issue with that is you guys wouldn't see the revised elevations, but -- but, you know, you don't normally, so as long as they don't have any issues with complying with the minimum design standards in the Architectural Standards Manual and aren't requesting any waivers or anything from City Council or any design exceptions, staff is amenable to that request.

Overton: Thank you.

Allen: Otherwise it would have to come back before City Council.

McKay: And -- and those elevations will be an exhibit in that development agreement that will come before the City Council. So, you will be able to -- I guess see the work that my clients have -- the progress they made.

Simison: Any additional questions, Council?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Becky appreciate it. This is -- this one has kind of been fun for me. I'm -- I'm appreciating that I'm able to channel the spirit of the late great Keith Bird who could recall with vivid clarity applications ten years previous. I remember this is one of the very first applications I saw when I was brand new on the Council and so I don't necessarily have questions about what you are proposing, but more to get some feedback from you about time extension requests and I -- in my time doing this I have -- I have come to the conclusion that I don't think time extension requests -- multiples of them are in the best interest of our community, because what happens is our -- our public has a perception about what is and isn't occurring and we certainly -- I certainly saw this early on in Council. Past time extensions have been granted by previous councils. They, then, get approved alongside with annexations and our -- our community feels like a big chunk of residential pops up overnight and so as somebody who has been in this industry for a long time and has probably forgotten more about

land use than all of us will ever learn, what is the appropriate amount of time extension requests that a City Council should grant?

McKay: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, that's a -- that's a good question and I think all councils struggle with that. I think when the recession hit, obviously, all the rules went out the window as far as time extensions and I think my record was Spurwing patio homes, which had five time expenses. So, this one is -- is not to five. I think the big -- the key thing to look at is does the -- does the current preliminary plat still meet the intent as far as density, lot sizes, open space, amenities, current standards and the answer to that would be yes. So, in -- in this particular instance it's hard to put a hard fast rule on a time extension. I believe the last time I brought this project through for the time extension, Councilman Cavener, you indicated that you didn't have a problem with the time extension, because of the density.

Cavener: Yes. The density. I -- I remember the --

McKay: The density being at two point -- what is it? 2.68 you thought was appropriate for the area. So, that's why you were supportive of the time extension. You know, there may be other projects that are of significantly higher density that transportation issues may change over time, there may not be capacity for them. Obviously, this particular project is helping alleviate the situation by -- by doing the collector extension from where Harris ends to the west and over to Linder. So, everything -- you know, it's -- it's kind of on a case-by-case basis. I don't know if the Council should say you get two time extensions and that's it. No more. It -- each -- each project should be able to stand on its own and some projects -- you probably shouldn't do a time extension on if they are no longer the appropriate type development for a particular area --

Cavener: Yeah.

McKay: -- due to transportation changes, due to comp plan land use map changes or sewer capacity, water capacity. This particular project has sewer and water at its front door. We are in that sewer shed and we have -- we have already done a lot out there to -- to facilitate this. We have extended the fiber optic from Victory -- Amity to Victory to accommodate a future signal at Harris. We have also, you know, participated in rebuilding Harris. Widening it. So is Stapleton. And I'm working with ITD pushing for that light.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And, Becky, I agree with -- with everything that -- that you have said and I -- and while I -- I certainly agree that each application for a time extension request needs to be heard on its own merits, there is also a certain level of consistency that I think our City Council has had and -- and so that I -- I hope -- you know, this is not a gotcha question, this is really me trying to kind of learn from you all

about what is appropriate and -- and one of the pieces I think that you did take into account that I think that -- at least that -- where I'm coming from and that's where this question is coming from is perspective from our community and what they view is and isn't, you know, smart growth or appropriate growth or thoughtful growth and when they see, you know, a bunch of housing projects kind of pop up that have been planned for almost a decade, if not over a decade, pop up overnight -- and, again, I'm -- I'm a south side guy, but I moved to south Meridian after this annexation was heard, so trying to find the right balance of what our -- our neighbors are seeing, are experiencing, I think is also important. So, I -- I appreciate your feedback. I'm -- I'm supportive largely of -- of the time extension request tonight with the hope that -- just being upfront, I don't know I would be supportive with a future time extension request for this project in the future.

McKay: Mr. Mayor and Councilman Cavener, I -- I will not be back for another time extension once we get these -- these plans -- construction plans submitted, then, we will bring in successive phases within the guidelines under the UDC. It's just -- this project just had a slow start.

Cavener: Yep. I get it. Thank you.

McKay; Thank you.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for the applicant? Okay. Thank you very much. This is a public hearing. Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to provide testimony?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did not.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody present who would like to provide testimony on this item or if you are online you can use -- use the raise your hand feature? Seeing no one coming forward or raising their hand, would the applicant like to make any final closing comments or see if Council has any comments before they make final comments? Okay. So, the applicant has waived any final comments.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Seeing as there is no more public comments, I move we close the public hearing.

Simison: For both items? For both items?

Overton: For both items, yes.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to close the public hearing for Item 6 and Item 7. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Split these into two motions. The first motion on the first one after approving all staff, applicant, and public testimony I move to approve file number TEC-2024-0002.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Item 6. Is there discussion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, before taking action on the second one, just to make sure we are clear with staff, would the correct motion on the second one be to suggest a continuance?

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Council, that -- that is in your purview. That's one of your choices you could do. The applicant requested that they be able to work with staff, rather than a continuance and they would submit revised elevations to myself and I would review them for compliance with the design standards and Architectural Standards Manual. Once they are deemed in compliance with those standards they would be included in the development agreement, which would go before you for approval prior to recordation. Staff is okay with that option.

Overton: Thank you. With that, Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I make a motion that we take no action on the second project and we --

Simison: We do want to take action if you want staff to follow -- to do what Sonya said you will need to make a motion to approve with -- I don't know if it's a condition. Is there condition -- yeah.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony I move that we assigned the applicant to work with staff for follow up on --

Cavener: Mr. Mayor? Oh, sorry.

Overton: -- on H-2024-0031, development agreement modification.

Simison: Does your motion include to approve that, while they work with staff?

Overton: Yes.

Simison: Does -- do I have a second that agrees? Does it need to be restated in a different way?

Taylor: Can we just restate it? What I heard was we would approve file number H-2024-0031, but require city staff to approve the elevation as submitted by the applicant and assuming that -- yeah. That's what I understood that that -- and I'm supportive of that motion. So, if that's the motion I would be willing to offer my second to that.

Overton: I approve that motion. It's better than the one I actually stated.

Taylor: I will second that.

Simison: We have a motion and a second. Is there a discussion on the motion?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I don't -- I don't mean to -- to keep us going on this, it's been a late night, but I guess maybe a question for our legal staff is couldn't this -- the development agreement be continued to a date certain to once staff have approved the elevations that it could be scheduled for a future Council action?

Nary: So, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, I think that's really the -- the question, Councilman Cavener. If the Council wants to review the -- what the staff is going to approve, yes, you would, then, continue it. If -- if the comfort level and what has been requested by the applicant was that they meet the staff requirements and meet the -- the requirements of the design standards and the staff -- as long as the staff approves them you will, again, get back the development agreement with the modification for approval, but it wouldn't be for another hearing. So, you will still get the development agreement back, but it will already have been reviewed and the attachments of the new

drawings and the new elevations will be included, but there wouldn't be another hearing for it.

Cavener: Okay. Thank you.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I will just make a comment. I think kind of to what you are -- you are sort of suggesting, Luke, and what was said earlier, I'm not sure that -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- that Council necessarily would just make an action to approve an elevation. Usually that's part of a larger application. What we are saying is like I -- I think we have a certain level of confidence that they will comply with what the city staff is suggesting and if they don't they wouldn't be in compliance with the -- what we are -- we are suggesting here. So, I'm comfortable with moving ahead with improving it, knowing that they are going to get the requisite approvals from staff. If they don't submit appropriate level elevations I don't think that it would be moving forward as I am understanding it.

Simison: Correct. The development -- it would never come back to Council if they never get to a point where staff is in compliance -- in compliance with staff.

Taylor: Yeah. And it seems like the applicant, as I understood it, was okay with that approach, that they were just -- because of circumstances and timing weren't able to get those updated elevations to staff in time for tonight.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, just a quick response.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Yeah. And -- and thank you, Council Member Taylor, I -- I appreciate you kind of sharing some of your perspective. I think that's in line with what the applicant offered and being just upfront I'm not going to support the motion. It's not because I'm -- I'm against what the applicant is trying to achieve, I do think there is a certain level of subjectivity that comes from us as elected officials. Elevations I think is one that we often consider in an application. I have full faith that the applicant's going to bring forth what is appropriate. We certainly believe that staff will -- will make sure that this is in the community's best interest, but because this is an area of subjectivity that Council sometimes has an opportunity to weigh in on and was I believe discussed through the past public hearings about this particular application, I think it's just best that we would continue it to a date certain, that Council has an opportunity to review as well.

Simison: Is there further discussion on the motion?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. Maybe just provide some comments helpful for future applications as well. I -- I think it's important to have a level of consistency and a little bit of lenience when granting time extensions to make sure that business owners in our community have an expectation of consistency from us and I am open to -- in this case it's been several time extensions, but for the reason that the applicant is meeting all of our current requirements as a city that goes a long way for me in being supportive of a time extension. You know, the elevations -- you all know I'm such a control freak, but given that City Council doesn't always review the elevations, you know, prior to approval, in this situation I am comfortable -- because there is no waiver being requested, there is no request of any deviation from the standards, that makes me feel more confident in our staff's ability to direct an appropriate development agreement that will come out with elevations that are, you know, meeting our standards. So, that -- that's where I fall in this one.

Simison: Okay. Is there any further comments? If not, Clerk call the roll.

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

Simison: Five ayes. One nay. And the item is agreed to. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE NAY.

8. Public Hearing for Timbercreek Recycling (H-2024-0032) by Engineering Solutions, LLP., generally located at the northwest corner of S. Locust Grove Rd. and E. Columbia Rd.

- A. Request: Modified Development Agreement to the existing development agreement (H-2018-0042), Inst. #2019-053058) to further clarify the current and future permitted uses and timelines, create guidelines to allow for efficient and continued use of the property, and ensure the operation is meeting all State and Federal guidelines

Simison: So, with that move on to Item 8. Mr. Nary, do we want to open the public hearing?

Nary: Mr. Mayor, no, we would just continue it to the next date.

Simison: All right. Then, Council, do I have a motion to continue?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I move that we continue Item 8, Timbercreek Recycling, H-2024-0032, to September 17th, 2024.

Whitlock: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to continue Item 8 to September 17th, 2024. Do I have any discussion? If not --

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Oh. Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, if I recall correctly from our agenda this evening, this is being continued because of a noticing issue. I -- I assume we are -- or the applicant or the city, somebody is curing this noticing issue. Does it require reposting? Was this a mistake on the applicant's part and do we need to direct them to pay for renoticing? Just catching up to speed on that real quick before an action is taken.

Simison: My understanding is this was not deemed to be -- it was deemed to be a higher intensity and so it would need to be extended from a 500 foot noticing requirement to a thousand foot noticing requirement. So, I believe this was our need to make that change, not the applicant. So, there was deficiency in not notifying enough people in the area for the -- per our numbers based on the type of application that it was.

Cavener: Okay. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yes.

Cavener: Mr. President, I guess a quick follow up. So, we are going to notice people within a thousand, instead of 500. Will the folks that were noticed within 500 about tonight will they be re-noticed for the thousand or separate -- okay. And, then, is that an expensive that the city is going to be taking on since this was our error?

Simison: Yes.

Cavener: Okay. Thank you.

Simison: Is there further discussion on the motion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the public hearing is continued.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

Simison: Council, anything under future meeting topics or a motion to adjourn?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Cavener: No future meeting topics, I move that we adjourn the meeting.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:15 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON

_____/_____/_____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK