

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:02 p.m., Tuesday, September 8, 2020, by Mayor Robert Simison.

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

Also present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Alan Tiefenbach, Jeff Brown, Joe Bongiorno and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE:

☒ Liz Strader	☒ Joe Borton
☒ Brad Hoaglund	☒ Treg Bernt
☒ Jessica Perreault	☒ Luke Cavener
☒ Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Simison: Okay. Council, I will go ahead and call this meeting to order. For the record it is Tuesday, September 8th. It's 6:02 p.m. We will begin tonight's meeting with roll call attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Simison: I do not see anyone here for the community invocation at this point in time.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

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

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

- 1. Approve Minutes of the August 25, 2020 City Council Work Session**
- 2. Approve Minutes of the August 25, 2020 City Council Regular Meeting**
- 3. Bainbridge Subdivision No. 11 Pedestrian Pathway Easement**
- 4. Baraya Subdivision No. 5 Pedestrian Pathway Easement**
- 5. Edgehill Subdivision No. 2 Pedestrian Pathway Easement**
- 6. Jump Creek Subdivision Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 1**
- 7. Jump Creek Subdivision No. 4 Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 1**
- 8. Rackham Subdivision Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement**
- 9. Shelburne East Subdivision No. 1 Sanitary Sewer Easement No. 1**
- 10. Shelburne East Subdivision No. 1 Water Main Easement No. 3**
- 11. Shelburne East Subdivision No. 1 Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 2**
- 12. Final Plat for Victory Commons (H-2020-0086) by BVA Development, Located at 130 E. Victory Rd.**
- 13. Final Order for Aegean Estates No. 2 (H-2020-0084) by Becky McKay, Engineering Solutions, LLP, Generally Located South of the Five Mile Creek, East of N. McDermott Rd.**
- 14. Final Order for Brundage Estates (TECC-2020-0001) by LC Development, Generally Located East of S. Linder Rd. Between W. Victory Rd. and W. Amity Rd.**
- 15. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Paramount Point (H-2020-0082) by Brighton Development, Inc., Located at 6357 N. Fox Run Way**

- 16. Revised Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Brody Square (H-2020-0032) by Pinnacle Land Development, LLC, Located on the Northeast and Southeast Corners of N. Black Cat Rd. and W. Daphne St.**
 - 17. Revised Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Quartet Northeast (H-2020-0017) and Quartet Southeast (H-2020-0018) by Brighton Development, Located at 4020 & 2430 N. Black Cat Rd.**
 - 18. Development Agreement Between the City of Meridian and Compass Public Charter School (Owner) and Bouma USA Management, LLC (Developer) for COMPASS Charter School East Expansion (H-2020-0042)**
 - 19. Development Agreement between the City of Meridian and Gem Prep: Meridian North, LLC (Owners) and Bouma, USA (Developer) for Gem Innovation School (H-2020-0043)**
 - 20. Fourth Addendum to Development Agreement Between the City of Meridian and Martin L. Hill & Hill Properties, L.P. (Owner/Developer) for Hill's Century Farm North (H-2020-0080)**
 - 21. License and Service Agreement for Budget Software to Questica, Ltd for the Not-To-Exceed amount of \$271,112**
 - 22. Resolution No. 20-2227: A Resolution Adopting the Fiscal Year 2020 Rate Schedule of Solid Waste Collection Services; Authorizing the Finance Department to Collect Such Fees; and Providing an Effective Date**
 - 23. Resolution No. 20-2228: A Resolution Authorizing The Sixth Continuance of a Local Disaster Emergency Declaration and its Terms for an Additional Thirty (30) Days; Authorizing the Continued Immediate Expenditure of Public Money to Safeguard Life, Health and Property; and Providing an Effective Date**
- 24. AP Invoices for Payment - 09-09-20 - \$386,460.25**

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, just wanted to let you know Council Woman Perreault has joined us.

Simison: Okay. Thank you. For the record 6:03. Next item on the agenda is the Consent Agenda.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

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

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

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

PUBLIC FORUM – Future Meeting Topics

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

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we do have one sign up.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Bernt: Mr. Mayor, it sounds like -- sorry to interrupt, Mayor. You're going in and out. We can't hear you consistently.

Simison: Okay.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we had one sign up. Austin Walkins.

Simison: Okay.

Johnson: It looks like he may not be here, but the discussion topic says thank you for clean energy resolution and pursuing an electric fire truck.

Simison: I can tell you Mr. Walkins is in the attendee room.

Johnson: My apologies, Mr. Walkins. I will fix that right now. Mr. Walkins, if you can hear me, you are going to be able to unmute yourself in two or three seconds.

Simison: And if you would state your name and address for the record and you will be recognized for 30 -- or three minutes.

Walkins: Hi. My name is Austin Walkins. I -- can everyone hear me okay? Perfect. Thank you. Yeah. I don't want to take too much of your time. So, I'm here on behalf of my organization, the Idaho Conservation League and I really just wanted to thank you all

for -- I watched the recording of last week's meeting where you talked about the resolution supporting Idaho Power's commitment to clean energy and, then, there was the discussion around the electric fire truck and this is all really exciting news. ICL, we have about 30,000 members. A lot of them live within the Treasure Valley, Boise, Meridian area and we are really excited to share the initiatives that all the cities are doing, but firstly exciting to share this with some of our Meridian folks and just wanted to thank you all for doing it and really appreciate it. Also just to introduce myself, put a face to the name. You know, if there is ever anything we can do to help out with some of the stuff you guys are working on, we are always more than happy to -- to help out and help push these initiatives. So, with that I'm happy to answer any questions if folks have them or I can let you get on to your business as well. But I really appreciate the time to talk today. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you, Austin. This is not a time for Q&A, but we appreciate the conversation and the information provided. All right. If there is -- if that was our last item, Mr. Clerk.

Johnson: Yes. That was the only sign in.

ACTION ITEMS

25. Public Hearing for 1625 E. Bentley Drive (H-2020-0078) by Clint Hansen of Land Solutions, Located at 1625 E. Bentley Dr.

- A. Request: Annexation of 1.03 acres of land with the C-C zoning district.

Simison: Okay. Then with that we will move on to the action part of our agenda. Item 25 is a public hearing for 1625 East Bentley Drive, H-2020-0078. I will open this public hearing with staff comment from Alan.

Tiefenbach: Good evening, Council, Mr. Mayor. Alan Tiefenbach, associate planner with the City of Meridian. Good evening. This is a proposal for an annexation and a zoning to allow a 4,800 square foot office building and a commercial lot. Here are the zoning maps, the future land use map, and the aerial. The property is currently within the unincorporated Ada county, zoned RUT. You can see here on our future land use map that this property is recommended for commercial uses and this is an aerial map. As I talk I have put together this sitemap to sort of help describe this. So, again, the subject property is at the southeast quadrant of South Locust Grove and East Bentley Drive. It presently contains a 2,100 square foot house, which is what you see here. South Truss Place and East Bentley from South Locust is the only way in and out of this property. So, all of have these are kind of ending cul-de-sacs and dead ends. This is the only way in and out. There is an unused spur of East Bentley that runs along the north property line and terminates just before South Locust Grove. So, this here is kind of this unused spur. Immediately to the north, south and east of this property is low density residential, although over to the west on the other side of South Locust Grove is highly intensive

nonresidential uses. This includes the Renaissance High School and the Idaho College of Osteopathic -- Osteopathic Medicine, which is across South Locust Grove. If you go to the south you have pretty intense commercial uses, such as a movie theater, some gas stations, your typical commercial and retail. As I mentioned, the Comprehensive Plan recommends the subject property for commercial uses and it recommends mixed use on -- to the east of this property. This is to sort of provide a transition for the residential areas to more of a nonresidential area and, then, to eventually the higher intensity commercial. Sidewalks already exist on this side of South Locust here, although the applicant will be required to install a 25 foot landscape buffer. I have provided some pictures to help describe this a little better. So, here is the site looking down South Locust Grove to the south and this is the subject property here. The adjacent property is over here. That's right across the street to the east of this and we are looking down Bentley right now and this right here is that stub street that I was talking about, sort of a no man's land and, again, this here is the subject property. So, the business proposed with this annexation is presently located at 213 East 5th Avenue in Meridian in a 3,800 square foot building. They share space with several other tenants. The existing business leases about 1,300 square foot of available space. The applicant stated the size and configuration of the present building does not lend itself to the existing operations and there is no use for -- or no room for expansion. The applicant intends to construct and own a larger building designed for these particular operations, which is an engineering and a survey firm. They -- again, they want to be able to have a larger building that's built for the particular operation. It would allow more flexibility and workspaces. As single family residential is not allowed in the C-C zone district, they would have to remove this existing house as part of a condition -- of the conditional use. In addition to the -- this is the original building that they wanted to build and this is that 1,400 square feet. In addition to this building, there was some discussion from the applicant to eventually build a second commercial building to the north. We have worked with the applicant a bit to get a site plan that is the most efficient design for this, so the parking would be wrapped in the middle, buildings are pushed closer to South Locust Grove, so you are looking -- it's got more of a view of the buildings than of the parking. The applicant is also -- in addition to the site plan, the applicant has also provided elevations, which you see to the east. Now, these are only conceptual. Staff has already expressed -- we do have some concerns with the -- the types of materials that are being proposed with these. They are showing sort of -- more of a metal and metal can't be allowed as a primary material per our architectural standards manual, but this at least sort of describes what they are going to look like in general. I think it's important to mention that these buildings are shown as one story. If they develop this site they will have to -- part of the requirement will be a development agreement as part of the annexation and if you look at one of the conditions of approval it talks about that the site and the elevations will generally conform with what is being shown in the hearing. So, if they are showing a one story building they can't build a five story building or do something that's vastly different than what's being applied to here tonight for you. One of the concerns that staff had was this area. Eventually -- before they can build this building -- before they can develop the lot, as I said, they are going to have to remove this house here to the north. When they remove this house -- this house, staff had concerns with this sort of sitting empty and vacant and becoming overgrown and sort of a no man's land. So, one of our requirements is that the applicant will have to seed this -- this

particular area and they will have to maintain this until such time as they build this second property. This applicant was heard at the August 8th, 2020, P&Z meeting. Nobody showed up to testify on this, but we have received several letters. We received -- we received the one before the Planning Commission hearing and we have received several more. Most of the concerns are related to traffic. That there -- there has been some opposition to the -- to the Comprehensive Plan recommendations for commercial in this area. There has been some concern about what the potential height of these buildings are and the potential use and -- and I think I did mention that the -- the use at hand right now -- the reason why the applicant is -- is in this process is that they want to move their -- their building, which right now is an engineering firm, so we are talking about -- I think they said 12 employees, your typical 8:00 to 5:00 type jobs. It's a -- it's a pretty low intensity commercial, professional type office. With that the Planning Commission recommended approval, as does staff recommends approval with the conditions as are listed in the staff report.

Simison: Thank you, Alan. Council, any questions for staff at this point?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I understand, Alan, that the applicant will be required to install a 25 foot landscape buffer along South Locust Grove. I was just curious some of the concerns expressed in the letter talked about having landscaping and access points, curb, gutter, sidewalk on Truss. Is that -- what's going to be required for Truss?

Tiefenbach: Yes, sir. So, the applicant will be required -- so, the sidewalk and the curb and gutter already exist right now on South Locust Grove. They don't have the landscape, so they will have to apply a 25 foot landscape buffer and also along Truss -- and this is one of the requirements of ACHD, they are going to have to do a ten foot buffer, a curb and gutter and sidewalk along South Truss Place as well. They will also have to do a 25 foot wide buffer to the south directly adjacent to the residential.

Hoaglund: Okay. Thank you, Alan.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you, Alan. I guess the one thing I would like to understand -- I understand they are building one building right now and we are being asked to approve this annexation. What future approvals would happen before a second building is built? Would that just be an administrative matter? There is a lot of sensitivity about the future use given the neighbors' concern.

Tiefenbach: That -- that is correct. If this were approved now, then, the second building, as long as they stayed within what the -- the requirements of the UDC are in the zone district, it would be a certificate of zoning compliance, which is an administrative process. Again, they would have to generally follow the development agreement. So, they couldn't get a one story building approved and, then, build a five story building and their -- their site would have to generally conform with the site plan that you are looking at this evening as a Council person. The use -- I would have to turn that to the applicant. I'm not sure if they know at this point what use. My understanding when talking to them is they are looking at some kind of professional office type uses.

Bongiorno: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: One second, Deputy Chief. Council, any further questions for staff at this time? Deputy Chief.

Bongiorno: Sorry, Mayor and City Council. Alan, just a quick comment. I have never seen the site plan before. It doesn't meet the fire code. So, we need to make sure that gets addressed before it gets approved.

Tiefenbach: Of course. That would come to you, Mr. Bongiorno. It's -- it's very conceptual at this point. So, I wouldn't be surprised if it doesn't meet all the fire code. We would just make sure that generally the configuration and the orientation and the parking complied with this.

Simison: Okay. Council, any questions for the Deputy Chief based on that comment? Okay. Then is the applicant here with us? If you would like to come forward and be recognized for 15 minutes. Just state your name and address. Are we doing it here, Chris, or in the room?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we can do that at the podium, unless we run into trouble.

Simison: Okay. All right.

Hansen: My name is Clint Hansen. 231 East 5th Street in Meridian, Idaho. We are proposing this for a flex space office space for -- we do land surveying, which is hand in hand with civil engineering. So, we would need the garage spaces for field crews, survey trucks, and stuff and, then, the office space for our drafting and more technical things that we do. It's ideal for us to do this, because we have -- we have looked, you know, in the area. We would really like to stay in Meridian. We have looked in the area for a lot of flex space in the past and just haven't found much that's conducive to our type of business. So, we finally decided to try to purchase property and build something that would -- would be good for us and splitting the lot will allow us to recoup some of the cost of the purchase of the property. So, for the north lot we are not -- we are not sure what the use will be, but like Alan said, it would be conducive to the development agreement that we will have to agree upon business use and conducive to the C-C zoning that we are proposing. We do -- basically, yeah, just day-to-day, 8:00 to 5:00 or, you know, 6:00 to 3:00 type hours

for our guys. We don't have guys coming and going on all day and night and weekends we are usually closed. So, that's pretty conducive to the neighborhood. When we had our neighborhood meeting they expressed a lot of concern, mainly just with the Comprehensive Plan that the city has, not necessarily towards our business. They weren't opposed to what we were doing. If we didn't have to go through the annexation process. They just don't want -- or don't like the annexation coming closer and closer to their area I think it was their concern. Do you have any questions for us regarding this? Like I said, it was -- or Alan said, it's really conceptual at this point, but we are -- this is what we have landed on for -- for now to -- what -- what the city would like to see with it closer to Locust Grove and the orientations and everything. But we will have to certainly review for the fire code if we have to do a turnaround or what we need to do -- to do there, so -- that wasn't part of our process yet, so --

Simison: Council, any questions for the applicant?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Hoaglund: Mr. Hansen, I have a quick question. This is a flex space. You do have trucks coming in and out. Approximately how many trucks and vehicles that people will commute in are going to be at this -- at this office?

Hansen: We plan for -- for three field trucks and we have presently ten employees. So, there is usually three or four of us that are at the office all day and the rest of them are out in the field just -- you know, leave in the morning and come back in the afternoon and are done for the day.

Hoaglund: Thank you.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you, Clint, for your presentation. I wanted to just get clarity. Is the intention that each of these facilities or each of these businesses just be one individual single user? There is not an intention that it will be divided into multiple types of businesses?

Hansen: Correct. For this -- the building that we are proposing on the south will just be our business and not any lease space or anything, just us occupying the whole thing. And, then, if we either sell the lot to the north or develop the lot to the north, we are not sure if it would be like a multi-use commercial or -- or what it would be at this point. We don't -- we don't have that nailed down yet.

Simison: Any further questions for the applicant?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I guess a clarifying question. In your testimony, sir, you indicated, you know -- and I think you touched on this at Planning and Zoning about 8:00 to 6:00, 6:00 to 3:00, maybe, you know, ended the week early on Friday. Can you share for the Council kind of like what that use would be? My -- my assumption is that use is happening within the -- the four walls of your building. I am somewhat sensitive to working at 6:00 a.m. and creating a noise or disturbance for -- for your neighbors. So, if you could just kind of articulate what that use would be it be helpful for me as well.

Hansen: Okay. Yeah. Typically for the normal day that -- you know, the ones that are arriving at 6:00 are just trying to get out and do the field work before it gets too hot. So, that would be summer hours and they just come and upload information into their survey equipment, the data collectors and stuff, and just load the trucks up and leave. So, we are not doing a lot of maintenance or any kind of noise type stuff, it would just be parking, going in the office, loading the stuff up and, then, driving away and same when they return, they just come and park and, then, download the stuff into the computers and, then, leave for the day as well.

Simison: All right. Thank you very much.

Hansen: Thank you.

Simison: This is a public hearing. Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone that's signed up to testify on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we only had one online sign in and they didn't indicate wishing to testify, but they are in the meeting. So, I would say when you ask if there is anyone else they can choose.

Simison: Yes. So, if -- if you would like to testify on this item you can, please, come forward and testify. If you are online and would like to provide testimony if you can just use the raise your hand function at the bottom of Zoom and we can bring you in to testify on this application. Seeing no one who would like to testify, I would ask the applicant if they would like to make any final remarks on this application? Okay. I'm seeing no requests. So, Council, I'm going to go ahead and throw it back over to any further conversation or actions on this item? And I guess the one question I would have for Alan is what is the long-term intention -- if you could go back a couple slides -- with the -- with the road -- kind of -- kind of -- that one is a great example. Is that road right now on the property intend to be vacated and that segment between there and the proposed roundabout to be developed or what is intended with that section of the property in this area? What's going to be done?

Tiefenbach: Sir, are you talking about this area here?

Simison: Yes. And north up to the roadway.

Tiefenbach: So, what we do know is that ACHD is working on putting in a roundabout here. I do not believe that they are going to widen Bentley anymore than it already is. We have talked to the applicant about whether or not they wanted to vacate this portion. We talked to ACHD about that. ACHD did not really express any concerns whether or not it was vacated. My understanding is the applicant at this time doesn't want to vacate it. Certainly if somebody -- we actually even approached them about whether they wanted to annex the entire thing and just take the whole property, but they weren't interested and ACHD didn't express any concerns either. So, at this point we don't know what's going to happen with that northern road. All we know is that it won't be used for the access for this particular one. The access is going to come in off of Truss Place from the east -- or, sorry, from the east side of the property.

Simison: I want to mention that, you know, not knowing where the Deputy Chief and the fire code issues go, but if you are going to put two buildings on this site with a drive through space, it would seem a lot more practical to orient the buildings to be parallel with Locust Grove in this location, rather than horizontal and go through that vacation for the other property. That's just my non-planner looking at what this is going to do and with that roundabout being proposed in that location I'm really -- I don't know or have any concept for what that's going to do to this property. I didn't realize there was a roundabout that was proposed here, but it makes it really weird thinking about where and how this eventually gets access under this proposal.

Tiefenbach: I do know with some -- some discussion that occurred a little later this afternoon that there has never been any concern for any other road to be punched in directly to South Locust Grove. The access to this area is going to continue to occur from where it is now. They are not going to be providing another road into Locust Grove.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Borton: On that point is there cross-access required to the property to the north from this parcel?

Tiefenbach: There will be. At this point we are just getting the annexation and the rezoning, but when the applicant comes in to do a CZC that will be one of the requirements, is that they will have to provide access to the northern property.

Borton: Okay. And, Mr. Mayor, a follow up.

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: To the Mayor's point on the layout and design, I think just whatever might facilitate the only access, if anything goes on the north, will be through the cross-access on this parcel, so the parking and layout hopefully can facilitate that, because there is no other way to get to that parcel long term. It doesn't look like it at least.

Tiefenbach: Two accesses on the east side, both coming off of South Truss Place. I do not believe that there is any proposal to do the access to the no man's land road.

Borton: Right. But my point being that this would need to facilitate cross-access whether it's drive aisle or some mechanism to allow the northern parcel to be utilized.

Tiefenbach: That is correct. When they came -- when they -- when they -- so right now the way that it works is there is one large lot and, then, there is a teeny tiny little -- I don't want to call it a spite strip, but there is a -- sort of a second little teeny piece. When they come in to do the boundary alignment adjustment, which would divide these into two pieces, part of that -- that's technically a plat process and part of that plat process would be requiring them to actually provide a cross-access easement. They would have to do that, so when they sell -- and when they sell off that lot in the future that both people will be able to have the same -- same access to either a lot.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Maybe a follow up for Alan. So, if we approve the annexation now, you know, would the development agreement give us any type of assurance that the second building would be a professional office or as to what types of use would -- would be allowed there? I guess I'm just -- I'm concerned about the potential for a heavier use that might not be appropriate and we only have one bite at the apple with the annexation.

Tiefenbach: Mr. Mayor, Council Person Strader, there is not right now a restriction on that being only professional office, but certainly that is within your purview to add that to the development agreement if that is your desire.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I apologize, I had an interaction here at my home and I did have an additional question for the applicant and since we haven't closed the public hearing I wanted to request if I might be able to ask that question.

Simison: Absolutely. If the applicant would like to come back forward.

Perreault: Thank you very much. You had mentioned the public testimony that we received in writing. I have read through that as well and I was hoping that you could comment on some of the -- the concerns by the neighbors about pedestrian safety along Truss and there being a lot of people who walk and -- and children who bike on that street from the residents that are to the east. I thought maybe you could help give some reassurance about -- I know we talked about how many vehicles are entering and leaving, but, you know, I understand -- I understand the concern about that being a different capacity of vehicle coming and going than there would be a single residence there. I mean if you -- even if you have -- let's say 20 employees total, if you have two businesses there, just as an example, and still quite a bit more traffic than just a single home that's there. So, if you wouldn't mind sharing your thoughts on that.

Hansen: Yes. Certainly. Truss Place currently just goes south to a dead end cul-de-sac, so there is not a -- I mean not a lot of traffic as far as pedestrian traffic that I could imagine, but ACHD is going to require us to put in sidewalk on the -- on our side and additional landscape buffer. So, they will have, you know, sidewalk there, so there they can walk on the sidewalk instead of in the road and, plus, we will have 25 feet from the current centerline to the -- to the right of way. So, we will be -- Truss will be a little bit wider and safer. The edge of pavement where it is currently we will be about the lip of the gutter for our new gutter line and, then, the sidewalk will be a five foot sidewalk behind that. So, it will be about seven additional feet of sidewalk and curb and gutter that they will have access for -- to be on that portion of the property to -- for pedestrian traffic. Does that answer your question?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Mostly. I know -- I know you can't project exactly what that pedestrian traffic is going to look like, but just -- this is a unique -- this is a unique location and I know that the Comprehensive Plan shows this as C-C, but it is -- it's just a -- an interesting situation when you -- when you put this type of business and that large of a building into an entirely residential place and so, yeah, I -- I -- I don't have anymore questions. Trying to just gather my thoughts about it. Thank you.

Simison: Okay. Thank you.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: While you are here I guess I will ask you to comment on -- Council Woman Strader made a reference to possibly limiting some of the uses for the property to the retail office uses only within a DA. Is that something that you have any comments on?

Hansen: Well, for us personally we would like to keep, you know, that northern lot as open as we can for potential development and -- and purchase, because, ideally, we would like to -- to sell it if we can and that gives whoever would come in to develop that the option to -- to meet with the city and develop it, you know, and have a lot of different options than just strictly professional or -- I mean with the development agreement we are already limiting a lot of the potential for this property that I know the city has -- in talking with development services and the city -- the planners, they have a lot of -- I mean they really are excited about this property and becoming a really nice property for the surrounding area and development. So, I guess -- I mean we are trying to be as conducive as we can to the requests made already for the layout and everything. This is -- originally -- this is like the third layout we have come up with for -- for this after working with the planning. Originally we didn't have it laid out like this at all, but we are trying to do what we can to be conducive to what the city wants and that's what to do.

Borton: So -- Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Here is -- here is the rub on that. I don't disagree. I -- you know. And the challenge becomes with a -- with this type of zoning, which could allow some more intense uses. The city could be in a situation where they maybe take pause and say for that type of commercial use I don't know if this annexation is appropriate. I don't think that's maybe the best transition, even though it -- it could be zoned for that. So, this is really the one and only time that the city has to -- if it's going to approve a zoning and bring this in that this is the only opportunity to constrict those uses within that C-G zone. I think that's why you are getting the question and perhaps some hesitancy if there is any scenario where the parcel to the north could be used for something much more intense in scale or more traffic, for example, then, we get -- we grow in our concern for the transition issues and compatibility with the neighborhood, so --

Hansen: Right.

Borton: -- I think that's why the middle ground might be -- if this goes forward let's ensure that we have got some limitations on the scale of what might occur in use in intensity.

Hansen: Uh-huh.

Borton: So, is that -- in light of that explanation and concern does it still seem like -- would you be able to agree to constrict those uses in the north or are you adamant that it needs to be potentially anything and everything to the north?

Hansen: Well, I don't think it needs to be anything and everything. I think we are already constricted already with this layout. My understanding is it has to be pretty much conceptual with the layout that we have. So, I don't know what other uses would be a potential problem with the C-C zone with this type of layout. The building would have to certainly conform with this -- with this layout and other than professional use I don't know

what else -- what use would be a concern that would fit this conceptual layout I guess. I mean to say only strictly professional, I would have to look and see what -- what that really involves to be only strictly professional and that -- again, that's putting a huge limitation on the property for potential development that the C-C zone already has a lot of limitations already and so is this conceptual layout. So, I guess I would have to meet with the city and discuss that further I guess.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Maybe for -- to clarify the example. And, Alan or Mr. Nary, you guys can -- can comment. If, for example, of a restaurant use wanted to go in there, which is a much different type of user. I don't know if there is a good example of the unanticipated scenario where an end user comes and offers an ungodly sum and you want to sell and they can use it now in a way that we didn't envision.

Simison: Gyro Shack.

Borton: Gyro Shack. Something like that; right? And it's not your fault, you're gone, but in the scenario that it's sold to somebody that we don't want to miss that opportunity. I think that's where the question came from. So, I don't know if there is an example of kind of a parade of horrors that could occur.

Nary: Well, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, Council Member Borton, I mean what's not uncommon of the use of flex space in Meridian at least has seen -- besides storage and some of the industrial places that we have like along Franklin -- is dance studios and gymnastics academies and those tend to have a lot more intensive use of traffic and it's fairly common. There is -- Danik Gym is right down the street. There is -- Meridian Gymnastics Academy is also down Locust Grove as well. So, I mean that's a -- that's not an uncommon use of that large of a flex space is that type of thing, so -- that would have -- probably have more of an impact on the neighborhood because of traffic.

Hansen: Our building to the south is -- I mean going to be occupied just by our company. We -- I mean I will be there until I retire. I'm -- you know, for 20 years at least. So, as far as on the north, yeah, I guess that could be a potential problem if it was flex space and it's not desirable for -- is what the city would want in that use I guess.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Is there a -- and maybe this is a question for Mr. Nary. Is there a way in which we can put assurances in the development agreement -- not necessarily limiting what goes in there, but moving what may or may not go in the future?

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, certainly as Council Member Borton stated -- I mean this is the opportunity to limit the types of uses on that property that you would require they had to come back for an amendment to the development agreement to put that in. So, whether you -- I don't know that you want to get too granular in that, but certainly limiting the type to whatever type of uses that you don't want, like restaurants or if you don't want gymnastic studios there, without at least another conversation with the Council in the future if that's -- again, it's kind of hard to envision all the potentials that could impact. I don't know with a roundabout there at some point in the future if that will also have an impact on the type of businesses that want to locate there as well, but -- but, yeah, this would be your opportunity now at the development agreement stage.

Bernt: Well, I -- Mr. Mayor, follow up, please.

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I totally get that and I understand how important this could be, but my question to you is instead of laying out all of the things that we want or potentially want at this space, could we just say, you know, a future Council would have to approve -- or whoever buys that lot from this gentleman would have to come to Council to get -- you know, for our approval I guess is what I'm saying.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, Council Member Bernt, yes, I mean certainly can limit the uses and exclude uses that are allowed in a C-C zone and, then, require a development agreement amendment to allow it in the future.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I think that's kind of where the question started was if -- for the purpose of proceeding today it may be limited and a future user who comes in and wants to do something that's principally permitted in a C-C zone, but the Council wants to require that future user to come and ask to amend the DA to allow that use, because that would be the one time where -- and that future Council could take a look and say, oh, that makes sense or maybe it doesn't. That -- so, that might be the -- the way that allows you to proceed, but also gives that future user, you know, a chance to come to the -- to the electeds and make a request to expand that restriction.

Hansen: Yeah. That certainly makes sense to me.

Borton: Okay.

Simison: Yes, Alan.

Tiefenbach: Mr. Mayor, from what I'm hearing in general it sounds like what you are doing is suggesting that you would be allowing office uses by right, but anything else would be

subject to a conditional use. The only drawback with that is that conditional uses go to the Planning Commission for approval, not the City Council.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I think the idea might be that the DA would limit it and, then, it would be a DA modification back to Council to expand that use in order to do -- because you are exactly right, in order to allow this body to make that future review --

Tiefenbach: Correct.

Borton: Correct? Okay.

Tiefenbach: Correct. Yeah. It would either -- if -- if -- yeah. Correct. It would either be a conditional use permit or be a requirement of a DA where you would have to do a modification. If you did a modification of the DA, then, it would have to go to a neighborhood meeting as well.

Borton: Okay. Thanks.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I also have a question for Deputy Chief Bongiorno and maybe the applicant can answer some of his questions. You mentioned earlier that it isn't -- this project doesn't meet code. Are there certain specifics that he could elaborate to help us understand what's missing or what needs to change?

Bongiorno: Yeah. Mr. Mayor and Council Member Bernt, it's an easy fix. It just -- the driveway is too long. It just needs to turn around and so they can just make a circle drive out of it and it will be fine. Make a horseshoe out of it or something. Right now as it sits it's more than 150 feet deep. So, we would have to back all the way out of that and so they can just fix the parking lot layout. If the Mayor is looking at rearranging the building locations, then, that would -- that would fix it. It's a simple fix.

Hansen: And we have more than adequate parking that we could eliminate some of those spaces to do a horseshoe as well.

Simison: Council, any further questions or comments?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Just a closing comment. I appreciate your concerns. I know we all -- we also appreciate your desire to stay in Meridian. For having your business here and there is a lot of hoops to jump through to try and make that happen. So, thank you for -- for sticking with us and being patient through this process and I think it sounds like there is some common ground on a way -- that this project can go forward and be successful. One of the things that I think that makes it appealing is the type of use you are doing in the south portion of this is a lower intense, lower traffic -- it seems to fit here better as a type of transition and so the -- the desire to limit it via a condition to office on the north tries to capture that same good thing that you are doing with your -- with your business relocation. So, much appreciated.

Hansen: All right. Thank you.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I don't know if this is a question for staff, I assume it would be, but let's say at some point in time they decided to sell their property and another user came in and wanted to divide that space, I just have a lot of concerns about, you know, the possibility of that almost 5,000 square foot building now becoming a space for multiple businesses. Is the DA limiting that to an individual user or what's -- is there anything we can do to make sure that that doesn't get converted into three different flex spaces and, then, now you have multiple businesses in here and it becomes sort of a small business park, instead of individual users?

Tiefenbach: Council Person, at this point there is nothing in the DA that limits it to just one user for either one of the buildings.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Borton: Question for Alan for Land Solutions are buildings 4,835 square feet and the -- what is the required parking -- number of parking spaces for that?

Tiefenbach: It's one per 500. So, one parking space for every 500 square feet. They are significantly over. I think -- I think we came up with it being ten parking spaces for each building and I think they have 17 for each building.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor, a follow up.

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Just a comment on that. I think that might be the limiting factor is how much -- if there is a change in the future I would like to think Mr. Hansen will be there for a very

long time and be very successful, but parking -- you know, if someone wanted to construct a two story or three story building on the north side, for example, parking may limit that. So, we do -- we do have some built-in constraints there for any massive structure that -- that might be proposed down the road and -- and same for -- for the Land Solutions building, if that ever were to be sold, as long as it can be subdivided, but as long as there is enough parking for that, you know, you can have three offices, instead of one, but that's my thinking on that.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: To that end is there a possibility that that property to the north could be purchased and converted into parking? I don't know who -- I thought I had read that ACHD owned that piece, but --

Hansen: I can comment on the owner to the north. The owner to the north is Sydney Blackman. She is on the other side of that vacated right of way there and she's just held onto the piece and ACHD -- they kind of divided around her with the new orientation of Bentley and removed her house and so she had to move, but she's held onto the property for future potential, you know, sale for her. So, ACHD only -- still owns that 55 foot strip there is all. So, her access is off of Bentley. They have a curb cut coming off of Bentley for access for -- for her property there and we -- to comment on the vacation of Bentley, it just isn't conducive for us to try to vacate that where power lines and all the utilities that are in there -- it would just be encumbered by easements anyways if we tried to vacate it. So, that's why we chose not to include it in our application for the vacation, because it's just -- it would be encumbered by Idaho Power easement with the overhead power lines that are running through there right now.

Simison: So, Council, I -- as we head into this next phase I think this is why it -- even simple in-fill projects create challenges with transition and everything else, so that's why in-fill is a little harder, but, you know, from my perspective I don't think anyone -- you know, despite -- we did look at the changes to the comp plan. Having a residence next to this road does not make sense. Commercial does make more sense. Business. I am concerned long term about the impacts of the roundabout on these properties, access, those elements. I think that there is -- always trying to figure out where is the right place in the process to actually get something that, you know, everyone feels comfortable with in terms of layouts and other elements and, you know, from that perspective I wish I personally was more comfortable that we had the right layout with the right fire issues addressed by that will come. I get it. But when you are annexing in and you are, you know, putting this up next to other homes, while not in the city today, maybe someday will be, you want to get it right from that standpoint. So, I think at least for now it's as good as we maybe can hope for until it gets a little further along. But there is still a lot of questions in this area that transitions and develops.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: If there are no further questions for the applicant or staff, I will go ahead and move that we close the public hearing on H-2020-0078.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Hansen: Thank you.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I make a motion that we approve H-2020-0078 after considering all staff, applicant comment and the testimony we received in writing in preparation for today. It's -- your comments on in-fill are spot on, Mr. Mayor, that there are going to be some kinks and wrinkles when we try and do it, but I think this project does a great job and it's appropriate. Appreciate the staff doing the good work to facilitate what can be a good project transition here. I think the -- the DA that goes along with this should limit the use to office uses, understanding that a future -- current or future owner might come to the Council and request to modify that at some future point. But for the purposes now that limitation seems to be acceptable to the applicant and appropriate as part of the admission of this -- of this project.

Hoaglund: Second the motion, Mr. Mayor.

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

Borton: It was kind of a motion blended with some discussions.

Simison: Yeah. Yeah. It sounded like you were inserting the DA provision --

Borton: Yes.

Simison: -- without officially saying it, but I think the second --

Hoaglund: That was my understanding, that the DA was inserted into that motion.

Borton: Correct. Correct. With that limitation.

Hoaglund: Yes. And Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, I appreciate Mr. Hansen working through the city with this process. It's true, being the first one is a little bit harder sometimes. There is lots of concerns by the neighborhood. They weren't overly happy about the changes that were made to begin with. But that's why we want to make sure we get it right the first time and -- and have a quality place that works well with the neighbors and the access and everything else that's there and, of course, hopefully, the neighborhood understands the roundabout and that is a future issue and that is an Ada County Highway District item that we don't have that control over, but that is certainly something that they need to be aware of and deal with if that comes about in the -- in the near future.

Simison: Is there any further discussion on the motion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

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

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is agreed to. Thank you very much for being here. Appreciate it very much and good luck.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

DEPARTMENT/COMMISSION REPORTS [Action Item]

26. Mayor's Office: Presentation and Discussion of City Survey Results

Simison: Council, next item is Item 26 under Department/Commission Reports. It will be a presentation on the city survey results and I am going to turn this over to Mr. Miles.

Miles: Good evening, Mayor and Council Members. Can you all hear me first of all? Good. So, we are good to go and, hopefully, you can see the screen. I will try and put it in the slideshow presentation and see what happens. Still visible? All right. Well, I have got the pleasure this evening of presenting the 2020 community survey results from our most recent survey, which, hopefully, we -- we shared this with you last week. You have had time to read through it. I think one of the things to take away from this is there is a ton of data inside of this, so feel free -- we will have a discussion, answer any of the questions that you might have, but sort of my motto in looking through this overall is that citizens are very pleased with the City of Meridian and what I like to say is -- and there is work to do. So, I think that's just common knowledge. So, we will run through the survey today that was administered by HEC, same company that's done it for the last two years. Their project manager wasn't available this week to present, so I will be doing that for you. We will go over the purpose and methodology quickly. Talk about the high level bottom line up front. Get into some major findings that we see. Sort of go through a summary and, then, have some discussion and questions that you all might have. So,

our purpose is pretty straightforward. To assess the satisfaction of the citizens and help us look for priorities across the community. We also like to look at the previous surveys that we have done and look at the trends and how we compare to prior years, engage our performance nationally and regionally, and so, again, pretty straightforward. So, for some of you this may be a repeat and for some it may be new, but the methodology of the survey it is a statistically valid survey. It was allotted to be a seven page survey that the directors team and city team and leadership and you all had a chance to review it when it went out. Again, it's the third one we have conducted. It's a mail in survey that HEC -- that the consultant had sent out by mail and, then, once people engage in that mailing they had the option of doing it by mail or online. We got back over 700 surveys, which exceeded our goal of 500, and if you get into the statistical conversation of survey sizes per population base, the 700 responses is far and above what we were looking for as the City of Meridian size dictates at a 95 percent confidence interval in the survey, with a plus or minus 3.7 percent margin of error, which was very good overall. We were targeting a 95 percent confidence interval with a margin of error of five percent. So, it was within those thresholds as well. Location. For your purposes a quick map of the location of the survey respondents. It's really -- this represents the -- the survey respondents had a good representation across the city. There are certainly areas that maybe they didn't fill it out as many -- or as much as in some areas, but the map clearly shows good distribution across the city. So, I think that's a good representation. Demographics wise, if you had a chance to review pretty balanced across the range of demographics. So, gender was balanced. Age of respondents. We had five categories, ten year -- ten to 20 year demarcations, nearly 20 percent for everyone. So, very balanced for respondent age. Most -- which is not surprising I'm sure. Most live in a single family residence and most of those folks own a single family residence, just based on our demographics in Meridian that is not too surprising. What is surprising is the length of time that folks have lived in Meridian. I think as we start to see surveys continue, over half of the people that took the survey have been here for ten years or less in Meridian. I think that's something to maybe put in -- into your mind and think about as you think about actions and desires and expectations of people moving forward. And the income levels were pretty broad. Sixty-two percent were between 35,000 and 150,000 of annual income. Again, a pretty broad distribution in the demographics in that category. So, the bottom line up front. I think there is sort of two takeaways. One, residents -- very positive perception of the city overall. You can see there 91 percent rated Meridian as an excellent or good place to raise a family and to live. At the high level those are two good returns and metrics. Skipping one. Dissatisfaction so also much higher in Meridian than it is in other communities, whether regionally or nationally, and so those two things are very positive. The next two points, talking about the work to do. The opinion that the city is headed in the right direction. That was something that stood out to our office. There was a ten percent reduction. That's -- from people who said, yes, the city's headed in the right direction and I think you will see the priorities throughout the survey sort of drive that. But there was a ten percent reduction from the last time that we had the survey in 2017 and, again, the top priorities at the bottom of the slide here to work on over the next three years, nothing that I don't think you have all heard. Roads, transportation, education and schools, growth and development. And to some degree I believe that that -- those three things play directly into people's opinions whether or not the city's headed in the right

direction. Now, as growth has been so fast, you have heard it, you hear it at Council discussions when it comes to planning applications, there is a definitely a nexus there. So, digging a little deeper into the first finding of that positive perception -- and, again, we won't touch on every single detail in the survey. Again, there is a lot of data. But if you have got questions feel free to ask and we will -- we can address those as well. But overall the perception and -- of the community in various factors, very positive ratings for, again, place to raise a family, place to live, ensuring public safety, communications -- the list goes down and we can compare ourselves if we want to drill down into the data nationally and regionally as well. I think it's just a good summary overall that the city is doing good work and is doing work that the community values. This is one that I always like to highlight, because it really touches on a key component of how we are able to provide that great service and it's really from the employees. You know, 85 percent satisfaction rating for greatly exceeds or exceeds expectations on the customer service from city employees speaks volumes to the quality and the care that the city employees provide to the customers. I think that's something to highlight every chance we get. And, again, additionally, overall quality of life rates very high. Overall quality of city services. These are all north of 80 percent and as an ideal place to live right at 80 percent. So, very good comparative for how Meridian does. This metric related to the tax dollars and how the city uses its tax dollars, right in line with the past two cycles of surveys. I think we have been plus or minus one percent of the rating, roughly 74 percent are in that category of ten to seven rating. So, again, a very good, very consistent acknowledgement that the city and the Council Members and the Mayor involved with the budget process using taxpayer dollars wisely. So, I think that's a good accreditation to you all and to the leadership team and to the staff who do the work day to day. Here is just some very specifics on overall ratings of city services. You can see fire rescue, city parks, police department rating right up there at the top, well over 80 percent, pushing 90 percent on some of those as well. Ninety-five percent in fire's case and, then, walking down the line, again, our core services are very well received and very well delivered I think and so that's all the good stuff here that -- just a distribution map that shows generally across the city everybody believes, of those who took it, that the quality of services are exceeding expectations. As a place to live, here is another pictorial map that sort of -- sort of shows the same thing. Excellent to good response as a place to live across the board in the City of Meridian. But sort of validation -- continued validation that things are well delivered in Meridian. Then we move into maybe some action items and major finding number two about the city headed in the right direction and I want to highlight these, because I think -- again, I touched on this, but I believe that many of these are related. So, what I did here was we captured with the red arrow those that are significant decreases since 2017 and you can see generally those are things that have fallen roughly in the ten percent drop range. The city headed in the right direction, a ten percent drop. City managing growth wisely, a 14 percent drop, and the three at the top, quality of housing, sense of community, and enhancing quality of life. Really looking through the data, looking through cross-tabulations, looking through information and responses, they seem all inter -- intertwined and they seem like the big standout category of things for the city to work on over the next few years. So, that's a key takeaway in my mind looking through this data and these responses. This is a little bit of a breakdown of those responses. I think you can see certainly there are some that have increased in rating significantly. Police, law

enforcement services, sewer service, water services, code enforcement, communication and, then, you -- you see some significant decreases drilling down a little bit into building permits, services, planning and zoning, recycling services. I know -- and I think there is a lot of discussion to be had around these. We may have some of these questions come up. We will take a stab at the fact that the recycling alone, is there more that can be done? Likely. Have we done a lot in the last few years? Yes. Also the recycling markets overall have been in turmoil for the last three years and so that may just be some of that frustration about the -- the services that people really want versus what's currently available nationwide. Building and permit and planning and zoning services. Again, I think a good follow-up question to this might be of those who have used planning services and building services directly -- I think you might get a different reaction. Whereas some people might be keying on the fact that growth is a driver of their dissatisfaction or -- or decrease in action and they may just look at Planning and Zoning and by nexus say, yeah, I don't like that either. So, something to consider as we look at that a little more deeply. Additionally trends. You know, we have increased in over half of the 84 areas that we measure, which is a great -- great statistic. Stayed the same in about six of them and decrease in 31 of them, which we have touched on a handful of them briefly. So, you know, this is a summary of some of those notable areas. Enforcement in dilapidated housings. Cleanup of litter. Those things have all improved. Quality and number of pathways and -- for walking and biking. Although I think there is still work to be done, people see good increases across the board, across the city. Code enforcement, abandoned vehicles, all that is good stuff and as we mentioned that notable decreases and the notable -- noticeable satisfaction decreases, managing growth -- growth and development, sustainable conscious environment, enhancing the quality of life and housing, variety of options across the city. So, we have touched on all those. It's just a summary of that trend analysis and I'm sure you will have discussion on some of these as well. Maybe you are finding number three and I do -- I go through some of this quickly, because it is across the board with one comparing ourselves to other cities regionally and nationally Meridian consistently comes out well above others. So, here is a place to raise a family. We are at 91 percent compared to the mountain region and the U.S. We are significantly higher. Same with a place to live. Place to work is also higher significantly. And even as we talk about growth as a major area of decrease since 2017, we are still consistently higher than -- than regional areas and nationally. I think that's -- that's something to remember. Quality of life items that relate Meridian to regional and national standards. Again, customer service from city employees. That's a very drastic difference in our city employees in the customer service that they provide compared to the national and regional metrics, which is great. Speaks volumes to the work that they do. Overall quality in life is higher. Quality of city services. Again, significantly higher. And the value received for the taxes I think, again, testament to you all in the leadership putting together budgets and expanding them. Significantly higher than the national and regional trends. And, again, you know, we touched on the city moving in the right direction. Yes, we had a ten percent drop. But, again, we are still consistently above the national and regional averages for that. Again here is some core services. They are all consistently higher for the most part. Again, you can see recycling services at the bottom. Fairly close. So, you know, again, to me that sort of says recycling markets overall. Recycling practices overall. Probably some nexus and consistency in the challenges that the recycling markets have

been facing. But other areas -- traffic enforcement, code enforcement, communication, consistently higher. And the trash and garbage services as you dissect that from recycling services specifically. Ratings of Parks and Recreation services. Again, many are consistently higher as you go down through into insert through -- excuse me -- number of pathways and walking and biking. A little lower than the national and regional trends. I think we have got some work to do there. But I also think to some degree that sort of -- some of the challenges that the Meridian City and the geology just play into, that we have challenges to overcome in that regard. But, again, very good ratings compared to ourselves nationally and regionally. Public safety ratings consistently above the national and regional averages from EMS, fire response, police response times, overall feeling of safety, which is a very important metric for our community, 92 percent compared to the regional and national averages of roughly 65 to 70 percent and very -- very positive ratings. Visibility of neighbor -- police and neighborhoods as well is above the national average and in the regional averages. We get it a little further down into code enforcement satisfaction ratings. Again, specified abandoned junk and abandoned vehicle removal, cleanup of litter and debris, weed abatement, consistently higher than those averages. So, you can see these trends, again, with communications continue to show very positive ratings as we walk through these slides. And, then, we move on to the top community priorities, which I think sort of take into play the -- the action items of where we go over the next few years as a city as we head into the next cycle of survey respondents and no surprise, roads far outweigh the number one choice of anything else, but really roads, transportation, growth and development, and education and schools. Those three things far outweigh in people's mind the rest of the items that we asked about, starting with affordable housing and walking on down. So, I think that gives us pretty clear guiding light. Some of these things you all and the city staff are already engaging on. If we talk about education in schools, we will get into some summary slides talking about the efforts with the staff position that was recently hired in the Planning Department, conversations with the schools and the transportation agencies. Again, this is -- if we look at an important satisfaction rating, which the consultant did put together for us, sort of takes the importance rating and the satisfaction rating, runs them through a mathematical calculation to give us an important satisfaction ratio. Planning and Zoning zoning services clearly out -- out at number one. Again, I will say that, you know, I think a curious question would be of those who have used the Planning and Zoning services what's their satisfaction level and I bet we would see a different rating. So, something to keep in mind. But that was rated number one, an important satisfaction rating and something that we can certainly look at and I think we already -- this body is -- in 2020 has already taken action on and, then, some medium priorities which follow down much lower than the Planning and Zoning services that are cited up there, but you can see the remaining services, some in traffic enforcement, recycling services, department of law -- law enforcement department services. So, the list is there as well. So, the transportation improvements that we touched on is one of the top three. Clearly roadway widening is something that the community is looking for. It outweighs many other things. Intersection improvements is the next category at 52 percent. But clearly you can see roadway widening in people's minds is the number one thing that they want to see in the community for the next few years. Just diving down a little deeper, we asked about future roadway construction projects related to that last question and we offered up five categories or five

specific projects, whether it's widening Locust Grove from Fairview to Ustick, you can see there. Widening Linder Road. Widening Ustick Road. Constructing the overpass or widening Victory Road and, really, I think in my mind the first four are very close, I think within five percentage points of each other, 60 -- probably 69 percent to 74 percent for those in the high priority to next highest priority. Certainly you can dissect each of those four and what people are looking for. You know, if you look at Linder Road overpass -- well, that's the majority of people's high priority. But widening Locust Grove is the majority of the high priority to the next level. So, lots of room for discussion. I think any action taken on any four of those really drives -- and would show progress I think over the next two years. This was an interesting question I think for you all to consider. You know, we asked the question if a bond measure were placed on a ballot would there be support. Fifty percent of the people said yes. Twenty-one percent said no. But 29 percent said they don't know and in my mind is you have to work to provide them more facts on what that means and you will have some mix of that 29 percent going one way or the other. We didn't identify this as a Meridian ballot question. We identified it generally as a bond question. I think this is helpful information for our agency partners, as well as the highway district and the state as well. So, curious piece of information to share with you. And, then, some other findings in general. Communications wise, I think we -- we continue to look at communications as a component of getting information out to people, but also looking at the communication and the feedback we do receive as ways to help push new information and also as a way to help guide what sources work for us as a community. Where are people getting their information. You can see the majority of people are getting their information from social media and the website. Even e-mail. Those are up pretty significantly from past years. In fact, we look at e-mails from the city. That's a 25 percent increase from 2017 in where people are getting their information by e-mail. That's -- that's a big jump. If you look at utility bill flyer information, overall since 2014 that's been a 15 percent decrease from 2014 with an eight percent decrease since 2017. So, we start to look at overall as a community how do we continue to provide information to those that get their information in the various ways, but also get the biggest bang for our buck. We have looked at cross-sectional data and there is not too much of a variance across the age demographic. There are some, but not a dramatic amount of who gets utility bill information compared to city website or e-mail data. The majority of the cross-tab, cross-section of the survey respondents, they drive -- they get their information -- information from websites, social media and e-mails and that's just the trend that we will notice and -- and look to take action to and recommendations on how we get information out there in the future. This is something that we have asked in the past three years. It's something that always comes up -- seems to come up at the legislature in conversations with the Association of Cities, so we figured that we would share this. Not much change from past years in terms of who we support and who would we -- in fact, it's essentially the same. In 2017 we had 42 percent, 37 percent and 21 percent. So, pretty close -- pretty -- pretty consistent. So, I think in summary, you know, again, you can see very positive perception of the city overall and the city services and the customer service that they are getting. But I think we have a good opportunity to make active work now and ensure that the city is heading in the right direction for the citizens and we have got work that we can show to bring those -- those numbers back up and increase them. Overall satisfaction ratings are slightly higher than 2017 as a generality and significantly higher -- and significantly higher

than 2014, which is great. Again, I don't need to -- to drill into the fact that we are much higher than other communities regionally and nationally, but I think the top priority is probably the key takeaway there in terms of things to work on. Roads. Transportation. Growth. Development. Education and school. So, I think overall a few areas of action based on those. Maybe we look at areas of traffic enforcement and goals and action. There was some information in the survey that touched on a few of those. Jobs and economic development, communications evolution and, then, the response to growth and development. What are we going to do. I think you will see some nexus with our proposed strategic plan, which will be coming to you again in the next couple of weeks. We will be talking about the new strategic plan, as well as a follow up after that to wrap up the existing strategic plan as we close out the calendar year. But we are already making some efforts with the Planning Department and the Unified Development work groups -- Unified Development Code work groups that we are putting together through Planning and the open space discussion. Again, I mentioned the new transportation school board coordination position and Miranda already engaging on some of these and already engaging with transportation solutions and partnerships. You have a joint meeting coming up with the highway district very soon. So, that's another way to engage on that and opening up the dialogue on education and schools and I would be remiss if I didn't point out, again, the customer service in Meridian is one to be proud of. Again, 44 percent above the national average with our customer service that the employees deliver day to day, something to be very proud of I think. That's it. I will stop there and let you guys have questions, comments, dialog. Happy to address any questions that you do have.

Simison: Thank you, Mr. Miles. Council, do you have any questions that we can attempt to answer without the assistance of our provider of the survey?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Member Perreault.

Perreault: Excuse me. Dave, I just was curious about the -- the population that was mailed the surveys or sent the surveys. Did -- did they look at or take into account the residence or type of property in which the resident lives? So, I notice that what I thought was a very high percentage of individuals that -- that owned homes in comparison to the actual demographic within the city. So, I don't know if it's just because those individuals were the ones that answered the surveys, but the surveys were really sent out to a greater variety, but I think it -- you know, I would like to have maybe seen a little bit more commentary from individuals who lived in maybe townhomes or apartments or -- and not that -- not that one is better than the other, it's just like I really would like to see a good sampling of the different types of property owners and renters, because so many of these questions are related to growth and that usually means housing and walkability, transportation, that kind of thing. And, then, my second question is when they are -- in the survey was there any kind of disclaimers made in the questions regarding transportation and schools to clarify with the participants that the city -- that, you know, ACHD and West Ada are -- are the primary entities? Was that clarified or was there a disclaimer made? We oftentimes receive public comment and e-mails and whatnot about

transportation and we generally, then, redirect those individuals to ACHD. So, I just was curious if we thought some of these answers were made with the -- maybe misunderstanding by the respondents that -- that we have more control over it than we do.

Miles: Yeah. Very good questions. Thank you for -- for those, Mr. Mayor and Council Woman Perreault. I will take the second one first, clarifying which agencies operate or construct road projects, yes. For instance, in question ten where we asked folks to prioritize which project of the four or five that they would rather see. We asked: Meridian prioritizes roadway projects that the Ada County Highway District does not currently have. So, I don't think every single question we made a point of saying roads are controlled by ACHD or ITD. However, what's your opinion on -- we did have general questions that do talk about what's your satisfaction with our partners and their relationships in terms of offering the services that they offer. ACHD and roads. ITD and roads. So, overall as a survey body it was clarified, but we didn't ask on a specific question by question basis in all cases. To your first question on housing, we do ask the questions of the demographics across whether you rent or you own, whether you live in a single family home, a triplex, multi-family apartment, trailer home and just by nature I think that -- I could get some statistics for you from our Finance Department on the percentage of single family housing ownership and residency versus other types, but it is fairly consistent with prior years and fairly consistent with our demographics that generally we have more folks that live in and own single family residences. The survey instrument was mailed out over 3,500 copies and, then, the way -- my understanding of the way the consultant operates is that as they get people to respond that's how they start admitted steam -- do we have a complete survey, is it a valid survey, and, then, we start to take that count and they look at the demographics as they start receiving those surveys and, again, they try to get a broad scope, but if we have the majority of property owners -- or property -- or residents who take the survey are property owners or single family property owners, by nature there is going to be more of those. So, I hope that addresses your question, but happy for any clarification.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Yes, it does. I just -- so, what you are saying is that if -- if responses start to come in, if -- if we notice -- or if the -- the consultants notice that there was one demographic that was much -- much higher than the others then possibly they would have sent out more surveys and increase their overall population of surveys until -- until we felt like we got an appropriate sampling and at this point they felt like 94 -- was it 94 percent of the respondents living in and a majority owning a single family home was representative of our housing?

Miles: That's correct.

Perreault: Okay.

Simison: And if I could add -- I don't know that we have ever asked them specifically to hit -- it's been more about the geographic representation for percentage of where people live, not necessarily their housing type. That would probably have to be something else that we would ask them to specifically focus on in the future if that's what we wanted was something to that level.

Perreault: Okay. Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. Thanks very much, Dave, for giving us an overview. It's a complicated survey, so I appreciate you going into the key conclusions. The recycling one kind of puzzled me, because we have expanded our services so much, but, then, I started looking at what I -- what I'm wondering about, if we can do -- is when we get a theme in the survey, if we want to go back and kind of compare that to the perception heat map that we get from different parts of the city. Like I'm looking at -- at page 119. I guess I would be curious to follow up on recycling and services. It seems like from what I know of the area in Meridian that has a neutral perception, I think that area may contain a lot more rental apartments and I know that recycling services are not as widely available for multi-family units and so that makes me wonder is there some kind of specific follow up we can do sort of looking at the map and maybe talking with area residents or trying to drill down into what's changed or if certain areas have specific concern. So, that's just one example where I sort of thought it's interesting looking at the map, you know, there seems to be one area maybe where there -- maybe they don't have adequate recycling services.

Miles: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, I think that's a great point. That's the benefit of these maps that are in the survey. It allows us to look at key topics or topics that we so choose to look at and find out is there any cross-tabular relation in -- in this case in a geographical location or other scenarios. So, that's a good observation and one that we can, you know, pass onto the subject matter experts and say here is an area to consider and look into this area.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Dave, thanks. I love this stuff. This has been a lot of fun for me to kind of dig into this and there were a couple of pieces I pulled away that I think are worth celebrating today. One is the ongoing tremendous work by our communication staff at all levels, seeing gains in that area. That was something to be really applauded. But the biggest takeaway for me was the increase of our public's view on law enforcement, especially taking into account when this survey was conducted in the midst of a lot of civil unrest. I expected to see those numbers fall and to see them actually gain a little bit to me speaks to what we have got going on in our community. I think that piece is -- is worth celebrating.

Dave, you kind of started talking a little bit about there was some work to be done and, clearly, I think in the -- the Building Services, Planning Department, we have got to figure out a piece that we can meet our citizens expectations there. Clearly I think our employees are doing a good job and -- and you touched on that. It would be interesting to know how those people are responding and I'm -- I'm curious if you and the -- the department heads kind of touched on -- there is work to be done and I'm curious if this is a piece that you guys have discussed and if there is any preview of things to come that you are looking to do to kind of approach this issue?

Miles: Mr. Mayor and Councilman Cavener, great question. We have -- we have talked at the director level about the initial results, because, again, we just got them a week or so ago. So, I think there is follow-up discussion on what does it actually mean for the next steps. What types of improvements, what types of areas should each department look at and are there actions to come out of those. Are we at a high level discussion about the general results, again, being positive, but there are these areas to work at and so that's something that, you know, I look to the directors and to the Mayor and say, you know, okay, what's our next steps and what are our action items out of each.

Simison: And, Councilman Cavener, if I could add in, I think Dave -- it's been a long day for him, because we actually just shared this with the directors this morning, where they -- where they got the -- at least a little -- the -- a brief conversation on this topic and kind of to your -- to the point, when I -- when I look at this, you know, and the history of the survey, they love our services that we are primarily responsible for. I do take -- I do cross out the key development one as not -- I think people just view that as growth. That -- that's not about their interactions with the department in my view, because we probably need to find a better way to really get into that information in future surveys to determine what their perception is of the work there. But the challenge I gave to the departments today is, you know, I don't know that we want to -- you know, can you keep going up in police and fire or do we need to be focused on roads and schools and growth and what can the departments do to help be part of that conversation moving forward. And so that's really what I challenged them with today is looking at these results and looking at the areas that are not our core responsibilities, but they are part of when this -- when the citizens ask the question are we heading in the right direction, I think that, you know, that's what they are looking at as much as anything else. That's not -- that's not based on -- to your point, our -- our Police Department, it's not based on the results of the Parks and it's not based on the results of our Fire, then, you know, those are three public facing ones. The results don't -- the results of the survey don't lead to that conclusion that that's where the focus and concerns are with the community. So, it was just the first conversation. We will have more. But I guess I would challenge all the Council, because it's not the first time you have heard it either. For three of us that were knocking doors this last -- I guess about a year ago, we have heard this. Roads. Schools. Growth. You have heard of roads, schools, growth. So, I'm going to challenge this Council, what are you going to do about roads, schools, and growth and I'm going to challenge myself, my staff, what are we going to do about roads, schools, and growth.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I appreciate that comment. What -- you know, one thing I -- I think I would be curious to see us all do some research on -- clearly there is a growth theme and the frustration in the community and I think I would appreciate just a comprehensive look at what other municipalities have done to -- that have dealt with large amounts of growth and if there was a way that they managed it differently and to sort of pull back like this is a macro level frustration. Are there things we need to take a look at? You know, I'm thinking there -- there are places like Boulder and other cities that have taken different approaches to managing their growth. It doesn't mean that's a good fit for us, but it would be good I think to make sure we are looking to set a really high level at all the possible tools.

Simison: And the one thing I would point out just -- again, this is relative. You saw where this -- where nationwide. This is one area where we are in that nationwide and intermountain west is in growth in terms of people's viewpoint on it. It just happens to be so far out of whack of everything else in the survey, but it stands out.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I mean I think that's important context; right? But at the same time I -- I -- I share your feedback that, you know, door knocking a year ago -- I heard a lot of frustration and I think a lot of the comments about maybe the Planning and Zoning function could just be, you know, kind of general frustration at things changing quickly. That's all.

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, I was just -- I was interested in seeing how -- how many people that filled out the survey that were here less than ten years -- ten years or less and that was -- that was surprising. For those of us that lived here a long time, you know, you can kind of sometimes talk to them and there is that nostalgia, I wish it was the way it used to be, and I used to travel from here to there in this amount of time and -- and -- but it's just interesting to see how many -- that that had to weigh into that, that they have been here less than ten years and they are expressing that. Now, I don't know -- I -- it's hard to read into that whether it's -- it is true, things like widening the roads, it lags behind the growth and the school infrastructure lags behind the growth, but also it could be a part of -- it's a phenomenon that happens anywhere -- is it's -- I'm aboard, pull up the gang plank mentality, too. Now that I'm here don't change anything. Just like some of us old timers. Why are you changing it, you know. So, it's -- it's an interesting -- interesting dichotomy that's out there. How do you -- how do you handle that and -- and -- because on the campaign trail, you know, people talked about some frustrations, but glad about certain things and glad this door opened up and glad that we have this now and we didn't used to have that. So, it's just kind of working through that and seeing what -- in a more tact

-- at a tactical level what is it those things are and we really need to work on, because the frustration sometimes is expressed generally on some things and, then, we can focus more granularly on those real items that really need to be fixed. So, that's -- that's a little harder, because you can't get all -- to all of that in a survey like this.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: And to that end, in the questions that did talk about our prioritizations, the top one was transportation, essentially, that they thought was the highest need and so I think that is a good indication that -- when people say they are unhappy with growth, that's, you know, those top -- that top item is really what it is that they are -- they are pointing at. I mean I think statistically that shows us that, not just kind of a guess that that's -- that's what they mean when they say they are unhappy with the planning, which is why I was asking the specific questions of Dave -- Dave about how those were -- how the questions were phrased to the respondents. But what I would say is that, you know, there is -- there is -- there is two things. There is -- either a really legitimate need for widening and additional roads based on traffic counts, based on safety, and, then, there is just a convenience factor and truthfully, yeah, it is definitely -- I have lived in Meridian for 11 years. It is a lot less convenient to get from one place to another than it used to be, but it's also made me have to be more purposeful about when -- when I go places and where I go places and what time and to make -- it makes me have to be more efficient with, you know, I'm not going to drive down the road and go to the grocery store twice in one day, I'm going to do it once a week, you know, that kind of thing and I don't think that that's bad. I think that's actually a really good thing for people to get in the habit of having to plan better and think more -- you know, think farther in advance about how they move around our city. I think that is something that's good and it's -- I think there is some resistance to it, because people will be -- want to be able to drive where they want when they want and I do, too, but it's not a bad thing for people to have to kind of get into some different habits with that and so the question really is do we really have a problem with roads, do we really have a safety factor, do we really have, you know, issues that are legitimate things that cause us to invest in widening a road or is this more about, you know, convenience I guess, and I don't know how to answer that question. I'm just saying I think that's part of what we are seeing in the responses.

Simison: Council, any further comments or questions at this time or, if not, we can take this and digest it and would love to have future conversations, either as we move into the strategic planning conversation or offline with Mr. Miles or myself at any point in time on what you may have seen or heard or think might be a good output. Okay. Perfect. Thank you, Mr. Miles.

Miles: Thank you all. Appreciate it.

ORDINANCES [Action Item]

- 27. Ordinance No. 20-1895: An Ordinance (H-2020-0042 – Compass Charter School East Expansion) for Annexation of a Parcel of Land Within the Southwest Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of Section 10, Township 3 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, as Described in Attachment “A” and Annexing Certain Lands and Territory, Situated in Ada County, Idaho, and Adjacent and Contiguous to the Corporate Limits of the City of Meridian as Requested by the City of Meridian; Establishing and Determining the Land Use Zoning Classification of 10.501 Acres of Land From RUT to R-15 (Medium-High Density Residential) Zoning District in the Meridian City Code; Providing That Copies of This Ordinance Shall be Filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, And the Idaho State Tax Commission, as Required by Law; and Providing for a Summary of the Ordinance; and Providing for a Waiver of the Reading Rules; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: Okay. Moving on to Ordinances, Item 27 -- Item 27, Ordinance No. 20-1895. Ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. This is an ordinance related to H-2020-0042 Compass Charter School East Expansion for annexation of a parcel of land within the Southwest Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of Section 10, Township 3 North, Range 1 West, Boise meridian, Ada county, Idaho, as described in Attachment “A” and annexing certain lands and territory, situated in Ada county, Idaho, and adjacent and contiguous to the corporate limits of the City of Meridian as requested by the City of Meridian; establishing and determining the land use zoning classification of 10.501 acres of land from RUT to R-15 (Medium-High Density Residential) zoning district in the Meridian City Code; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; and providing for a summary of the ordinance; and providing for a waiver of the reading rules; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. You have heard this ordinance read by title. Is there anybody who would like it read in its entirety? Seeing and hearing none, do I have a motion?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: My apologies for the dog. I move that we approve Ordinance No. 20-1895 with the suspension of rules.

Strader: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second that's not the dog. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed no. The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

- 28. Ordinance No. 20-1894: An Ordinance (H-2020-0043 – Gem Innovation School) for Annexation of a Parcel of Land Within The Southwest ¼ of the Northwest ¼ of the Southwest ¼ of Section 28, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, as Described in Attachment “A” and Annexing Certain Lands and Territory, Situated in Ada County, Idaho, and Adjacent and Contiguous to the Corporate Limits of the City of Meridian as Requested by the City of Meridian; Establishing and Determining the Land Use Zoning Classification of 8.00 Acres of Land from RUT to R-15 (Medium-High Density Residential) Zoning District in the Meridian City Code; Providing That Copies of This Ordinance Shall be Filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as Required by Law; and Providing for a Summary of the Ordinance; and Providing for a Waiver of the Reading Rules; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: Item 28 is Ordinance No. 20-1894. Ask the clerk to read this title -- or read this ordinance by title only.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. This is an ordinance related to H-2020-0043, Gem Innovation School for annexation of a parcel of land within the Southwest ¼ of the Northwest ¼ of the Southwest ¼ of Section 28, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Boise meridian, Ada county, Idaho, as described in Attachment “A” and annexing certain lands and territory, situated in Ada county, Idaho, and adjacent and contiguous to the corporate limits of the City of Meridian as requested by the City of Meridian; establishing and determining the land use zoning classification of 8.00 acres of land from RUT to R-15 (Medium-High Density Residential) zoning district in the Meridian City Code; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; and providing for a summary of the ordinance; and providing for a waiver of the reading rules; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. You have -- Council, you have heard this item read by title. Is there anybody that would like it read its entirety? See none, do I have a motion?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 20-1894 with the suspension of rules.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve the ordinance under suspension of the rules. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Oppose no. The ayes have it. The ordinance is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

Simison: Do we have anything under future meeting topics?

EXECUTIVE SESSION

- 29. Per Idaho Code 74-206A(1)(a) To deliberate on a labor contract offer or to formulate a counteroffer; and (f) To communicate with legal counsel for the public agency to discuss the legal ramifications of and legal options for pending litigation, or controversies not yet being litigated but imminently likely to be litigated.**

Simison: Okay. Do I have a motion?

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I move that we go into Executive Session per Idaho Code 74-206A(1)(a) and (f).

Hoaglun: Second the motion.

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

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

Simison: All ayes. We adjourn into Executive Session.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: (7:41 p.m. to 8:27 p.m.)

Bernt: Move we come out of Executive Session.

Hoaglun: Second the motion.

Simison: All in favor? All ayes.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Bernt: Move we adjourn.

Hoaglund: Second.

Simison: All in favor. We are adjourned.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:27 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON

_____/_____/_____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK