

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:02 p.m., Tuesday, May 18, 2021, 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, Sonya Allen, Alan Tiefenbach, Kyle Radek, Jamie Leslie, Joe Bongiorno and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

☒ Liz Strader	☒ Joe Borton
☒ Brad Hoaglund	☒ Treg Bernt
☒ Jessica Perreault (left 7:52 pm)	☒ Luke Cavener
☒ Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Simison: Council, we will call this meeting to order. For the record it is Tuesday, May 18, 2021, at 6:02 p.m. We will begin this evening's regular City Council meeting agenda with roll call attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Simison: Our next item is the community invocation, which will be given by Pastor Drake of Calvary Chapel Meridian. If you would all, please, join us in the community invocation or take this as a moment of silence and reflection.

Drake: Council Members, Mr. Mayor, would you join me. Lord God in Heaven, just come before you here this evening in this great city and we just appreciate -- just remembering the privilege that we have here in this country of being given life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and we are grateful for those people who have gone before us to have the genius of that and, then, those who have defended it over the decades for us, the centuries, that we may live in a free place and so, God, we just want to acknowledge that and thank you for preserving that for us and we are just praying for the citizens of Meridian tonight, that they might be safe and -- and have a place to go if there is trouble or any needs -- poverty, hunger, homelessness, I just pray, Lord, that people can find their way to have their needs met and, Lord, we are also asking for a special protection over the safety of our citizens this evening. So important to all of us that people can -- can live

safely and so we pray for those servants who provide protection for them, the first responders, our paramedics and fire and police officers, please protect them, Lord. And lastly, God and not least I just want to pray for our City Council, all the people that work in this building, that you would give them just a lot of grace and encouragement and wisdom in how to handle the affairs of the city and we just appreciate them, God, and ask that you would bless them for what they do, in Jesus' name, amen.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: Thank you. Council, next item is the adoption of the agenda.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: No changes to the agenda, so 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? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the agenda is adopted.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

PUBLIC FORUM – Future Meeting Topics

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

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we do not.

ACTION ITEMS

1. **Public Hearing Continued from April 13, 2021 for Prescott Ridge (H-2020-0047) by Providence Properties, LLC, Located on the South Side of W. Chinden Blvd. and on the East Side of N. McDermott Rd.**
 - A. Annexation of 128.21 acres of land with R-8 (99.53 acres), R-15 (8.82 acres) and C-G (19.85 acres) zoning districts.
 - B. Preliminary Plat consisting of 371 buildable lots [single-family residential (215 detached/102 attached), townhome (38), multi-family residential (14), commercial (1) and school (1)], 42 common lots and 6 other (shared driveway) lots] on 124.81 acres of land in the R-8, R-15 and C-G zoning districts.

Simison: Okay. So, with that we will go right into our action items for this evening. Our first up is a public hearing convened from April 13, 2021, for Prescott Ridge, H-2020-0047. I will see if Sonya has any comments that she would like to make.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. Council heard this project on February 23rd and continued it to April 13th and, again, to tonight's meeting in order to determine the potential impacts of legislation pertaining to State Senate Bill 1108. So, Council's already heard staff's presentation on this, so I'm not going to go into that all again, I will just remind you that Council does need to make a determination in their motion in regard to the specific use standard for hospitals that provide emergency care. The location has to have a direct access onto an arterial street. However -- however, because the UDC prohibits new approaches directly accessing a state highway no other access is available, except for North Rustic Oak Way, the north-south collector street along the east boundary of the site, which connects to the highway. Council should determine if this meets the intent of the requirement. If so it should be memorialized in the development agreement. If not, Council may deny the emergency care component of the hospital use. ITD has denied the applicant's request for direct access to the state highway for the medical campus. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for staff? Is the applicant with us and make any additional comments?

Connor: Thank you. My name is Patrick Connor. Address is 701 South Allen Street, Meridian, Idaho. Perfect. Thank you. Thank you for having us tonight, Mr. Mayor and Council Members. It was nice sitting in on the workshop previous to this hearing and hearing the conversations that were happening -- happening about how do we grow, where do we grow, and how much do we grow and I fully agree that we need complete projects that are smartly designed and bring in all the components of the Comprehensive Plan and I truly believe that Prescott Ridge is that project. So, you have seen this a few times, but here is the overall layout. I'm just going to briefly go over the project, as you have heard it a couple times, and, then, talk a little bit about the economic impact of this project to the City of Meridian. Majority of the project is single family residential. We have a component of townhomes and multi-family in red. Medical campus is about 15 acres on the north side that abuts Chinden and, then, part of this application is the West Ada School parcel for a future middle school. It was part of an illegally subdivided lot before, so it's being part of this application and part of this preliminary plat. So, you have seen this before as well, but this is the site plan for the medical campus. Just a couple things I want to point out that I believe Stephanie did at the last hearing. The preferred emergency access per the city and the fire department is in the northwest corner. That connects to Serenity Lane. That is how we are showing on this plan. There also is an alternative backage road stub here on the center of the west side, which goes into an existing residence in the county. We also have an alternative 20 foot fire access to the south portion of the property through our cul-de-sac. So, there is multiple options for backage road and for emergency access. I think they are in the conditional use permit process. We can decide which one is most appropriate as we engage with this particular site plan further, but I wanted to point that out. Next I just want to talk about some of the

economic impacts of this project. First the residential piece. Each home in Prescott Ridge is going to bring in 857 dollars to Meridian in the form of property tax revenue. This is after the effects of House Bill 389 and assuming an average household value of 450,000 dollars. So, at build out for 355 homes it equals over 300,000 dollars in annual property tax revenue to the City of Meridian. For the 14 multi-family four-plex buildings, each of those is valued at about a million dollars, which would bring about 2,636 dollars in property taxes. All together, these 14 multi-family buildings would equal 30 -- over 36,000 dollars in annual property tax revenue to the city. So, total the residential impact of this project is 341,000 dollars and this is based on a conservative estimate of 450,000 dollars. Over time we assume that the properties will escalate. So, as I said, the average home in Prescott Ridge was 450, paying 857 dollars in property tax each year. If you look at the city overall, Meridian, the average value of a home there is 360,000 dollars and pays proportionally 690 dollars in property tax. So, even with the effects of House Bill 389 in reducing the amount of property -- amount of value you can levy for property tax, Prescott Ridge homes actually bring in 167 dollars more or 20 percent more revenue to the City of Meridian for the same level of public service that they would be needing from a residential standpoint. Next the medical campus. The best way I can describe this medical campus is it's a major tax benefit for the city. At build out the medical campus will be 180 million dollars in value. So, each year they will bring about 474,000 dollars to the Meridian property tax revenue. This is roughly the same as the value of 553 homes valued at 450,000 dollars. So, it's a significant tax benefit for the city on just 15 acres. Not only that, it will bring high earning jobs of over 300 employees. Seventy percent of those are either doctors or nurse or nurse practitioners and the annual payroll is expected to be over 24 million dollars. So, you can think about the economic benefit as more than just the property tax revenue, it also brings in jobs -- high paying good jobs and you think of the induced economic impact from that standpoint. So, we believe that the campus -- this medical campus is a big asset to this plat. It will be an anchor of economical activity, will support further economic development in the area, and with that the area of Chinden, 16, and being a new magnet for medical services, we think that's a -- a big net positive for this project and for the City of Meridian. So, as far as new information that's been presented since February, that wraps up what we wanted to talk about tonight and any questions you all have we can stand for them.

Simison: Council, any questions?

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: One question. Will these homes be owner occupied?

Connor: Yes. I will point out most of all them will be owner occupied. The exception is the -- the red multi-family you see in the northeast corner. Those are intended to be a rental product. They will sell as a single building of four units in the building and, then, they can lease or they can live there if they want, the owners. It will be maintained by a central property management company, but that -- the red portion is intended to be multi-

family in rental product.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor, follow up.

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: How many buildings are there in the red?

Connor: Fourteen. There is four units per building, so it's 56 units total.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you for your presentation this evening. I have a couple of questions for you. The first is did you take into account in your property tax estimates, which really appreciate you doing that analysis for us, exemptions -- homeowner's exemption, which just increased, and things like that, was that a part of your calculation? And, then, also I noticed from the original plan until now there has been some significant changes to the amount of townhomes and some of the multi-family that was estimated. Can you kind of go over for us -- it sounds like there was a decrease in the percentage of residential on the overall project and the increase in the commercial. Can you go over the reasons for that change and help us understand more what -- the thought process behind it?

Connor: Sure, Council Member Perreault. So, first, to answer your question, yes, we did take into account the 125,000 dollar homeowners exemption for this analysis. So, that is included in both what Prescott Ridge homes would be paying to the city in annual property tax revenue and when I compared it of the existing homes in Meridian that also received the 125,000 dollar property -- or homeowners exemption. So, thank you for asking that question. I can clarify. Also, your question about the changes in numbers of townhomes and multi-family. We -- when we first submitted this application last April we did change the layout of this townhome layout here. It didn't change since we presented it to you all. We changed this for this -- our second P&Z hearing. There is 46 total townhomes in this particular area, but we had not -- we have not changed that since we presented in February. The same with the layout here of the multi-family, we changed this layout a little bit and we added a park to be used by the multi-family area and we added a mail kiosk due to some -- some good suggestions from the Council on how to make that area better and more equitable for -- from a livability and recreational standpoint. So, that's the only changes that we made to the multi-family between now and the February presentation. The number of lots hadn't changed either and, then, the medical campus, the -- we did add retail and hospital -- or restaurant space to the bottom floor of the medical office building per suggestions of the Council. So, the whole bottom floor of the medical office building is the mixed use retail component and the top three stories are strictly the medical office use. So, that's the only thing that changed throughout this public hearing process, but the plan that I'm presenting tonight has not changed in the -- in the square footage count of commercial space or the number of lots per multi-family or for townhome.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you, Mr. Connor, and appreciate you bearing with us through so many meetings and apologies on the impact to your business from this legislation that we have been grappling with. Question for you. So, one of the things we really need to figure out tonight is the emergency care component of the hospital specifically and, you know, this is not the typical access that we would want for that and I know this is supposed to be outpatient. I'm trying to wrap my head around future uses of this hospital building and I guess a question I have that Council Woman Perreault brought up in I believe our last meeting was are you open to a limitation to some extent on your operating hours in order to get that emergency access? You know, that access that you need for the hospital component would be my question.

Connor: I am not the hospital operator, obviously. Perhaps Betsy Hunsicker can chime in. I think she is online or able to do it. But just a quick -- some flavor I can add. You are correct, it's -- it is designed to be outpatient operations, so they don't want to have too many people spend the time over there. They want to cater towards women's health, pediatric services. The actual freestanding emergency room that they have there is necessary per federal law, given the level of surgeries that they are going to be doing in the building, so it's not intended to be -- it's not a trauma hospital, they are not going to be bringing, you know, helicopters and critical things, they will go to St. Al's and St. Luke's. So, I -- is -- is Betsy online that she can chime in?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, I did admit Betsy. She should be able to unmute or turn her camera on if she chooses.

Hunsicker: Hi, can you all hear me?

Simison: Yes, we can.

Hunsicker: Okay. Great. Thank you. Hi, my name is Betsy Hunsicker, I am with HCA Healthcare -- emergency room is a really important part of our -- our campus and although we don't -- like Patrick said, you know, over the --

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor, I believe that -- hey, Betsy?

Hunsicker: Can you hear me?

Simison: Yeah. You are going in and out. It's speeding up, slowing down --

Hunsicker: Okay. I'm sorry, I'm -- okay. Well, I'm driving. See if I can change -- is this better? Can you hear me better now?

Bernt: Yes. Much better.

Simison: Yeah.

Bernt: And if you can start from the beginning, Betsy, I would appreciate it. Thank you.

Hunsicker: Hello? Can you hear me better now?

Simison: Not now.

Hunsicker: Now? I think you can hear me better now. Okay. Well, I don't -- how about I can pull over and see if that helps. I'm sorry let me just -- I'm trying to get my children to different places. Hold on one second.

Strader: That's okay, Betsy, be safe and maybe --

Cavener: At a later point in time.

Strader: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, maybe I can explain my questions more in the meantime?

Hunsicker: Yeah. No. No. I'm here --

Simison: Okay. Betsy. Well, we will come back to you. Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. Maybe just -- just to sort of flush it out a little more, I guess one of the concerns I would have for -- I understand that you're operating this for outpatient only and it's unusual, but hospital ownership does change, that can happen, and so one of the things I'm curious about is if a limitation in operating hours would fit with your business model and wouldn't be an undue burden to you if you are able to still conduct your business with a limitation in the operating hours, maybe that would be a good tradeoff to get the emergency vehicle access, you know, for the piece of this that you need for ambulances. That's all. So, maybe if you guys want to have your team visit with her and we will circle back, but please don't -- yeah, don't do anything dangerous while you are driving. Thank you.

Simison: Maybe for -- just to help in the conversation when she hears it, do you have hours of restriction in mind that you think are appropriate?

Strader: Sorry, Betsy, we still can't hear you. But I had, off the top of my head, something that would go along with what you would expect in terms of a noisy business. So, I was going to pick 9:00 p.m., 10:00 p.m. But I'm just guessing. I asked the planning staff if they have a suggestion and Councilwoman Perreault may have ideas, too. She had this concern as well in our last meeting.

Simison: Correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Nary, but for our commercial -- or our noise ordinance, 6:00 to 11:00?

Nary: Mr. Mayor, yes, that's -- that's the current noise ordinance for operations.

Simison: So, if those are the type of restrictions versus something more, I guess that would be just for flavor.

Connor: Mr. Mayor, is this a -- could this be a discussion during the conditional use permit process that we can talk about more and perhaps Betsy can have a better idea of how operating hours would affect her business?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I think the concern there is we need a decision from Council tonight on giving you your emergency vehicle access and City Council, from what I understand, is not part of the full CUP process, so I would be concerned that we are, you know, kind of making that decision without the agreement on your end. I'm only speaking for myself. I don't know if the other Council Members are thinking along the same lines or not. But I had that concern and Council Woman Perreault had mentioned it. I was just wondering if there is something that fits with your -- with Betty's and the team's business plan that that might help alleviate that concern.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you -- thank you, Council Woman Strader, for bringing that up as well. And part of the conversation last -- last meeting was about the hours in regard to not only the ambulatory services, but also, you know, basic hospital functioning, cafeteria, hours, loading and unloading and that kind of thing. My question, whether for Mr. Connor or for Betsy, help us understand -- so, it sounds like there is the requirement for there to be emergency services. This is going to be an emergency service room similar to other -- whether it's on a smaller scale than the other area hospitals where the public can come in at any point and receive service, so -- or are you saying that this is specific to the patients that are being treated there and it's that -- that emergency services is only for those people that are currently under the hospital's care. If this is a public emergency room, which my understanding is there is intended to be one that's just to the north on the hospital project that's designated on the north side of Chinden, then, that, in my opinion, is a really important part of this conversation as far as access goes, because that means, then, you know, that ambulatory services need to be available 24 hours a day. So, if you could give us clarity and understanding of how that is actually going to operate that might be helpful.

Connor: Yes, Council Member Perreault, Council Woman Strader, she does -- we are text messaging with her trying to get information, but she's trying to call back in. Definitely want her to be safe. So, she absolutely needs emergency services in order to provide,

like we have established. We are trying to figure out if it needs to be 24 hour. My understanding is that it would function similar like a primary health. So, it would be open for someone to get stitches on their finger if they need to, someone -- it's not strictly for patrons of the hospital, it's for the general public. So, it would function as -- similar to a primary health or a doc-in-the-box in that effect. My thinking is she probably will likely need 24 hour services. I don't know. We are getting clarification. Because there may be a situation where someone needs to stay overnight, especially if they need to stay overnight they need to have emergency service there. I do know from -- I guess just a nuisance standpoint for ambulances coming in and out of the hospital, they do have a no lights, no sirens policy within a certain distance of the hospital. So, that's something they can abide by. I know they do it nationally. If that's a concern of -- of, you know, bothering neighbors or having that sort of issue there. We do have significant buffers of our hospital from the neighboring properties. We have an eight foot high masonry wall to help dial back on any sort of impact the hospital will have and, like she said before, typical office hour -- or hospital hours between 7:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. is when they schedule the surgeries and so the ambulatory care is pretty limited. So, hopefully, we hear back soon if she absolutely needs 24 hours. I think she's on the --

Hunsicker: Hi. This is -- this is Betsy again. I was driving by my office and I pulled in and I -- can you all hear me now?

Simison: Yes, we can.

Hunsicker: Okay. So, I'm really sorry that I wasn't able to wait -- you know, my phone signal was not working very well. So, I -- unfortunately, we absolutely have to have 24 hour access. That is the critical part of the business plan. It's a critical part of the operation. It's a critical part of the access. Like Patrick said, the -- you know, it's not going to be a trauma center, it's -- we are not going to have a heli-pad, we are not going to have -- you know, we are not going to be receiving helicopters, obviously, without a helicopter pad and we -- we often in other -- in other places we often work with ambulance companies to not use lights and sirens coming into the facility within a certain radius and so we do work with the -- the EMS providers to minimize the noise and the nuisance. I guess I'm a little confused. You know, I -- I didn't realize -- you know, I thought we were planning to use the ambulance -- we designed the emergency service, the emergency room area, to have the main access point off of the Levi Lane Road. I know it has a new name, but I can't remember what that -- Rustic Oak I think is what that's called. So, that's how we designed all the ambulance traffic to come in and out and my understanding was that the other access on the frontage road would only be for emergency -- like city emergency vehicles, not for ambulances and other emergency vehicles that are accessing our facility.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. Betsy, so, you know, our -- one of our transportation departments here

denied access off of the main highway there, so you're asking for access off of Rustic Oak, this doesn't meet the standard on an arterial, this is a collector, and so that's why the planning staff was directing City Council to look at this and I guess my question to you would be if you could explain how this is different than a trauma center and if you have a way to help us understand if there is something in your development agreement that could give us some comfort in the future that this wouldn't become a future trauma center if the ownership were to change or the business were to change. You know, maybe it's -- that you need the ambulance access 24 hours a day, but that you're going to schedule surgeries during certain hours or maybe that you're not -- you know, tell me what the difference is with the trauma center, maybe we can wrap our heads around it. My only concern, really, is just -- if this turns into ambulances running through here really frequently and they are very noisy and it sounds like you can mitigate that, but give me a flavor for how this is different from a trauma center and how we could feel better about it, I guess.

Hunsicker: Well, I mean I guess if you look at -- like let's just use West Valley as an example and I think this would be a -- you know, a smaller emergency room than what West Valley has currently and we see around 70 patients a day and I think we have about ten ambulances a day here and what we have -- what we are expecting in this -- what we are thinking in this location will be a volume, you know, kind of closer in the 20s and the 30s per day, so -- and -- and, typically, you don't have emergency -- emergency EMS -- so, you know, Ada County Paramedics typically doesn't bring patients to kind of smaller facilities that don't have as many services, because -- because typically they end up having to transfer them again. So, they tend to avoid -- you know, they have -- so they tend to avoid kind of facilities to have more scaled back services from an emergency standpoint. You know, I can't guarantee -- I can't, you know, sort of -- there is no documentation of that or, you know, policy around that, but that's typically what you see. But just to put it in perspective, so if we are seeing 70 patients here with ten ambulances and we are talking, you know, a third of the volume, you know, best -- you know, best case, three ambulances a day and that would be, you know, more of a steady state kind of that they are -- you know, there will be some ramp to get to that point. You know, certainly -- so, a trauma center is actually a designated thing. So, you actually go out and get designated as a trauma center. The state has a trauma committee or trauma -- that's not the right -- they are a -- well, yeah, they have a state committee that sort of evaluates different hospitals and kind of gives them a trauma level status. So, we don't anticipate, you know, pursuing that for this project and that has certain requirements. So, there is certain requirements that go with that. Like you have to have different specialties on hand, you have to be able to accommodate, you know, blood bank and other things that go with being a trauma center. But at the same time if you have someone that lives in that area and their child falls at 8:00 p.m. and they fall on their elbow and they need to have surgery and get a pin put in that elbow, they may potentially go to the operating room and have the pin placed, you know, at 9:00 p.m. in a facility of this type if there was -- if there were ORs and an emergency room, because that's a fairly minor -- you know, that's not a major procedure and, you know, it would be kind of a disservice to that family to transfer them somewhere else for something that could be done there. So, I think there is scenarios where that actually benefits the community by being able to take care of that

patient kind of locally and close to home. So, I don't know that I'm totally answering your question. I think -- I certainly think that, you know, it's not our intention to make this a -- kind of a regional emergency hub, but I think that there is -- there -- there is a lot of growth in this area, you know, at least there has been up to date and -- you know. So, there -- there is a need for those services, you know, for -- for that kind of care and I think it's a service to the community versus a detriment to the community.

Strader: Thank you, Betsy. I think you -- you answered my question and I appreciate it. I guess it sounds -- if you could just explain if it's the size of your facility that by definition you are looking at three ambulances -- like what aspect of your facility is the limitation? Is it the size and services you provide?

Hunsicker: Yeah. Uh-huh.

Strader: I guess -- okay.

Hunsicker: Yeah. I think. Yes.

Strader: Are you okay with saying that you're not going to pursue becoming a trauma hospital in the future, since that's within your control, would be my question.

Hunsicker: I think we could say that. I mean I guess I would like to have the ability -- I mean, you know, like picture this area in 20 years, you know, is it going to be a different story or 30 years or 40 years? So, I guess as long as there is some ability to kind of revisit that if -- if there is a need in that area, then, I think that that's okay. You know, I hate to do something today, because it doesn't seem necessary, but in 25 or 30 years, you know, it is something that really the community needs and deserves. So, I don't see that being an issue at all right now or even in the near future, but I guess I would just want to have some ability to leave that door open down the road or some process to be able to open that door back up down the road.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader, are you done?

Strader: Yes.

Simison: Okay. Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Oh, I'm sorry. There is a little delay sometimes. Thank you, Betsy. Thank you very much, by the way, for pulling over and taking time to answer our questions. It is a really critical part of the conversation.

Hunsicker: Well, it's important to us -- to me, too, so I -- so, I'm glad I was able to do it.

Perreault: So, just -- just to clarify a couple of things. First of all, I don't know that -- that

our Council is -- is questioning the merits of the hospital or questioning that there is a need for hospitals in this area, it more goes back to this road -- the road not having the capacity for ambulatory services to the code that's currently required for it to exist. So, we are not --

Hunsicker: Right.

Perreault: -- at what I'm hearing from my fellow Council Members -- give me just a second, let me finish. What I'm hearing from my fellow Council Members is -- is not that -- that we are, you know, needing -- needing you to -- to convince us that a hospital is -- is a good thing in this area, but this is really more about some technicalities regarding what is typically permissible for ambulatory services on a road this size and if you would like to leave that -- the option open for this to become a trauma center, that's not going to be a feasible possibility for you if this road stays at the size. Now, I don't know if you -- your design team, your engineering team, has considered the possibility of -- I don't think actually ITD is going to allow an arterial off of this, is that the reason why we are -- this is set up as a collector? Maybe staff can answer that in a moment. But the other thing I wanted to state is that -- is that this -- as you mentioned this area is growing and we have two highways -- two state highways at this intersection and we also have a city that's north of here, Emmett, that has almost no medical services whatsoever. They have very small hospital, they have very limited -- and I would guess that this is going to become a main location for them for ambulatory services. So, if there is an accident on Highway 16 this is the place that they are going to be bringing somebody who is -- who is rapidly bleeding; right? I don't think they are going to drive them into Boise or drive them into south Meridian and that's just my guess. So, that's the kind of things to look forward -- forward looking, future looking that I think myself and Council Woman Strader are -- that's kind of the point we are trying to get at.

Hunsicker: Well, I would -- I would say, you know, out here where I am in Caldwell, you know, we have some pretty significant accidents on some of the major highways out here, you know, fatal accidents or, you know, near fatal and in those situations those ambulances bypass West Valley and they go into Boise to St. Al's. So, just speaking from, you know, actual -- the actual experience out here, they do bypass. So, I think it does depend -- because those -- because we are not able to meet the needs of those patients here, so -- and so -- so, just as a -- as a point of, you know, an anecdotal -- an anecdotal point, so --

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Just -- just to weigh on -- weigh in on this a little bit and maybe, hopefully, provide some information through my previous job that I had with one of the regional medical centers, yes, the time sensitive emergency system in Idaho is administered by the Department of Health and Welfare and they can designate trauma centers based on criteria and different -- the requirements -- if you meet the requirements and so it is some

-- and so the -- St. Alphonsus Regional Medical Center in Boise is a level two, the highest that we have in the state of Idaho. Level One is -- has an academic research component to it and those types of things, which won't happen anytime soon in our state, but -- and I think Ms. Hunsicker was -- was correct, you know, you can start out and have an emergency center and meet some of those -- those smaller, less critical -- important, but, you know, less -- less critical things that require transportation to a trauma center and there are different designations for traumas, too. You can have heart, stroke, those types of things and -- and she also talked about it -- and, again, I think she's accurate, you could start out at this level, but you can eventually say, hey, we -- we want to be a level three trauma center and be designated by that by the state of Idaho and be able to take these certain things and I think as our population grows and their location, that very well could be the -- be the case, it's just a matter of the timing and if you say, okay, you can only do this much at this level and that changes and, then, what's the process -- process for that? So, that's -- that's kind of the difficulties is that -- that limitation now is fine, but, then, the future how does that move forward? I guess -- and, Mr. Mayor, if I can ask a question of staff and Bill or Sonya, I'm not sure, because we have this whole package here before us and it involves residential of varying zonings. We have, you know, the C-G, of course, which is -- which is the hospital and I think the -- some other -- and the medical office building and I know the conditional use process comes into play for the C-G here and I'm trying to figure out -- and one aspect of that is the standard that we have to decide for that road, because our -- our UDC says you got to have an arterial, this is a collector, so if we decide that component now, is everything else just going to be under the CUP and go through that process or can we move that whole thing -- we can designate C-G, that means it could be anything that meets that designation, but not -- not necessarily a hospital. I mean trying to figure out -- if we designate it C-G, your site plan does include the medical campus, so that's what we are approving if we were to approve this tonight. Is that -- am I on the right track with that?

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglun, yes, if I may respond. This is Sonya. Staff. Yes, if you are approving this tonight with the zoning, this is the concept plan that is presented for your approval. It would require a conditional use permit, which only goes before the Planning and Zoning Commission, not City Council. So, that's why if you do approve the access, that that needs to go tonight and be included in the development agreement. Rustic Oak, just to respond to Council Woman Perreault's comment earlier, Rustic Oak needs to be a collector street consistent with the master street map. So, it can't be an arterial street. Thank you.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Then -- so, Sonya, if we hammer out the issue with the street, whether we approve that or not, we probably need to give guidance on some of these other things related to the emergency center usage, because that's what the hospital will have, that's what their plan is, and would be part of the conditional use permitting process, which, as you know, doesn't -- doesn't come back before Council. So, we need to hammer out

some of those details; is that correct?

Allen: Well, Mr. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglund, my stance on it would have been -- and Legal may have another opinion, but my stance on it would be everything, other than the access, would need to be handled through the conditional use permit associated with it.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, Kristy Inselman was indicating she wished to speak from ACHD.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. Maybe just a quick comment. I'm -- I would think we could put a DA provision that they will not seek to become designated as a trauma center. I don't know what level that -- if there is -- I mean I don't know enough about that to know if there should be a level or just a blanket statement, but they can certainly come back before us at any time, if the community's needs are different, and what's going on on this road is different, I think they could come back to us and modify that in the future. But that's kind of what I'm leaning toward is we are making an exception for something that we normally would not. I think that there should be a compromise here and that we wouldn't want to see a trauma center, but I would love to hear from ACHD. I'm sure others do.

Simison: Kristy, you are recognized.

Inselman: Mr. Mayor, thank you. There was just a question raised as to why this was a collector and not an arterial roadway and I just wanted to briefly discuss that, because it's based on the function and volume of a road. This one happens to be -- your arterials happen to be McDermott and Chinden and this functions as a mid mile collector between those arterial roadways and its function is to collect the interior traffic and funnel it to those arterial networks that are a higher volume roadway and typically what you will see with mid mile collectors is those typically tend to be -- end up being signalized for additional access, so the function eventually would be for this to go all the way down to McMillan Road. But that's -- that's the function. I just wanted to throw that in there.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. I suppose this is probably a question for the applicant. So, I'm sure you are all familiar with St. Luke's in Meridian and they have a similar situation where they have this collector road that -- that comes in on the north side of the main hospital and it seems to frequently be backed up, because they all -- that's also an access that people use to get to medical offices, but there is also a lot of retail and various types of businesses that are there as they have kind of become this bypass street. Is there any information or data or anything that you might be able to use that will help us with hospitals that have similar situations where they are accessing off of a two lane road and whether their ambulances have had any challenges getting -- you know, I know that's not necessarily our purview in terms of -- like it's not our job to determine whether the

ambulances are going to get to your hospital on time and those kinds of things, but, really, I think we need to take very seriously what this will look like in ten years or 20 years and it -- with the intention of this being a collector to go through McMillan, the anticipation is there is going to be a lot of people using this road that are not -- that are not accessing hospital services and -- and so the same thing with -- with St. Luke's, I think when that -- when that street that they have that accesses the -- the emergency room was first built it didn't go all the way through and wrap around to all that retail that it -- it now has access to and it's causing problems with traffic there. Are you -- just want to make sure my question is clear. Is there any way to get information that might help us from a more empirical standpoint to help this decision, other than just -- not that we are -- we understand what you are saying, we just -- it's our job to make sure that we are having some foresight with this.

Simison: If I wouldn't mind, just -- I just want to put this in -- in all of Council's minds, since we are all trying to figure this out. Think about St. Luke's downtown Boise, St. Al's off of Curtis, St. Luke's off of Eagle, all completely different, all -- at least all three of those can take trauma level things coming in. Some got a collector, some have a two road arterial, some are in a downtown space that don't have anything but a very simple road structure and yet they all function. So, I understand Council is trying to get to certain areas of comfort with something, I'm not exactly sure what. Just think about the hospitals which are in our valley and what the road network is around them and what else is around them as you consider looking at this. I don't think you can design the perfect hospital situation. Otherwise, we should take St. Luke's Meridian out from where it is, because it creates all sorts of problems for everybody in the valley with its location near the -- near Eagle Road. So, food for thought. Now, if anyone wants to take a shot at answering.

Connor: Mr. Mayor, I'm sure Betsy can also provide some color, but I completely agree with you, you know, St. Luke's in Meridian -- our office is right by there and I see kind of the -- the way that interchange works. I don't think it's completely dysfunctional, it's just part of the -- kind of the road network and kind of the environment in that area. I haven't personally experienced any congestion there that seemed like it was emergency and that's on the busiest road in my -- in my opinion in this area, Eagle Road. Same thing with St. Luke's downtown. I -- I am around there quite a bit and it is a bunch of local roads all kind of wrapped around a building and it's -- and it does function as you said. Again, this hospital, as Betsy said, she only expects, you know, three to five ambulances a day. So, from that standpoint it's a very very light load as far as from an ambulance -- ambulance emergency standpoint. Their operating hours are more during the day. Betsy, I don't know if you can add some more color.

Hunsicker: Yeah. I mean I don't have -- can you all hear me okay?

Simison: Yes.

Hunsicker: Okay. Great. Yeah, I don't have anything empirical and I could maybe see if I could find something, but I -- like someone said, you know, there is -- every hospital is different, you know, there is no kind of mold that is consistently applied and -- but I know,

you know, again, West Valley is on two two lane roads and the hospital at Denver was on, you know, a two lane road and set off a main road and, you know, that was kind of how all that -- so, I think that there is just -- there is a lot of -- I don't have anything empirical. I guess what I would say is I don't think that I have any concerns about committing to not pursue a trauma designation in the -- you know, in the -- for this project and, you know, if there is a way to come back down the road when the -- at that point revisit it, but -- so, I don't -- I don't have any concerns about that --

Simison: Betsy, we are missing you again. I'm sorry.

Hunsicker: Oh, I'm sorry. Can you -- how about now?

Simison: Yes.

Hunsicker: Okay. I just said that I would have no issue with committing to not pursuing trauma level designation, if that helps alleviate some concerns.

Simison: Thank you.

Nary: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Nary.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, kind of to piggyback the answer to Council Woman Strader's question, we can definitely put it into the development agreement. What it asks is if -- Council Member Hoaglund, I heard you say that the centers, such as St. Luke's or St. Al's, are currently level two. St. Al's, anyways, is level two. So, would this hospital be considered a level three or some other designation? Because we could designate in the development agreement that this is going to be designated as a level whatever and that any future upgrade of a level would require a modification to the development agreement and that way it's clear to upscale from what you are currently going to do, it would just require another, again, public hearing with the City Council.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: If I might respond to that, Bill, just to -- for information. The trauma designations are only issued by the time sensitive emergency system of the state of Idaho. So, they are the only ones who can give that designation. So, we could put a limit on that, but it does change. Where I was involved and how I got my knowledge base of this was the Nampa St. Alphonsus decided, hey, we are going to go to a level -- we want to be a level three trauma center. So, then, they went to work and they have to, then, present all their information and the case to -- to this committee and, then, they can be designated to that. So, if Ms. Hunsicker says, well, we are not going to seek any, that -- you know, then -- then they don't have to do that. If they are just a regular emergency care for the hospital

and for whatever -- those other emergencies come in and they don't have any trauma designation, then, they can -- they can remain that way for -- for as long as they -- they want to. It does -- where I want to make sure we don't get things into a knot here is the fact that this is going to be a burgeoning area. I mean this is -- we -- you put a hospital in there, there is no medical services, there is going to be the need as that area grows and, then, traffic makes it harder to get to, whether it's St. Al's over here on Garrity or St. Luke's on Eagle, you know, I don't want to make it impossible for them to not become a trauma center of whatever designation they desire or think they could meet at the time. So, that's -- that's my only concern and if I might -- now that I have the floor, Mr. Mayor, can I ask a question?

Simison: Absolutely.

Hoaglund: Okay. And -- and Bill or Sonya, we talk about the DA and, of course, we have the annexation request with the different zoning and those types of things. Is the DA part of the CUP process or are we doing a DA as well with this annexation process; correct?

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, Council Member Hoaglund, the DA is absolutely part of the annexation process. So, my only thought process is -- and I would still -- still suggest it, because it sounds to me that to move to a level requires some -- some work on the part of the hospital. So, if it's in the development agreement that this is being approved as a level -- whatever and they would like to go higher than that, before they go to the work of doing it they would come to the City Council and say would we be able to go apply for this, depending on the circumstances, their evidence of why that's necessary, why it's appropriate, what the conditions are, the Council just says that's fine. It's not approving them for that, it's just saying you can go ask and now you have the ability to go get it. I'm assuming there is a long enough process that that's not going to be a great impediment to it.

Simison: And -- and not to be the Debbie Downer, but I view that as like -- can you, please, remember to take down your billboard in ten years. I mean they don't -- unless they have to come back and do building modifications that would require approval from our Community Development Department, who will remember that there is a DA that they have to go ask for in order to do that. Maybe Betsy will, but I think it's just an eyes wide open. I mean I don't disagree if that's what Council wants to do, if that's where your comfort level is, but this is someone who wants to put a medical facility in our community that is in an area where there is none. I would hate to hamstring them too much. But if a DA is what Council wants to do, there is a process to change that.

Nary: And, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, the only reason we use the DA is because it's recorded. So, it's always available for them. They would likely have to go to Planning. I mean, again, I can't -- I hopefully won't be here ten years in the future where they want to do this, but they are going to likely go to Planning, have a process, they can always pull the DA, are they allowed? That's going to come up.

Simison: If they have to do modifications to their building or something like that, yes.

Nary: Right.

Simison: Council, any further questions for the applicant before we move onto the public? Okay. Thank you. Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to provide testing on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, none in advance, but there are several people online who may wish to testify.

Simison: Okay. Well, if there is anybody in the audience -- anybody in the audience that would like to provide testimony?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we have Val Stack.

Simison: You want to bring Val in and anybody else that would like to provide testimony, you can use the raise your hand feature on Zoom or if you're in the audience and would like to come forward and provide testimony, you can just come up to the podium and do so.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, Val is able to speak.

Simison: Val, you are recognized for three minutes. If you would state your name and address for the record. Mr. Clerk, do they need to be brought in as a panelist? I show them --

Johnson: We -- we stopped doing that, because of the time constraints, but she does have -- she is unmuted and has the ability to talk. I don't see any movement on the microphone, so she is raising her hand. I can try to bring her in, but that shouldn't change anything.

Simison: Val, if you are speaking we can't hear you. Mr. Clerk, perhaps we can provide a phone number for Val to call in on.

Johnson: I will get that on the screen. It did not allow her to speak either way. One moment.

Simison: Is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony on this item while we try to get a phone number for Val to call in on? Seeing nobody in the audience wishing to come forward.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, Val is unmuted again. I see her microphone is on, but we are hearing no sound. Val, if you can hear me there is a phone number on the screen with a webinar ID. I recommend calling that number and trying to speak that way.

Stack: Okay.

Simison: Oh, there we are, Val.

Stack: Oh, you got it? Thank you.

Simison: Yep.

Stack: Okay. So, this is Val Stack. I'm at 6072 North Serenity Lane and we are abutting the Hubble Homes. I just wanted to correct something that came up -- a question that was asked right at the end of Patrick's presentation and the question was whether or not there were all owner occupied homes, other than the townhouse, in the subdivision and I think maybe the question was misunderstood potentially by Patrick, because they had told us that 20 percent of the single family homes were designated as rentals. So, they are not all owner occupied homes. So, I wanted to be sure that, you know, you knew what they were saying there. Okay on that part?

Simison: Okay. Thank you.

Stack: All right. And, then, we hear wrecks all the time on Highway 16 and I think it's kind of silly to assume that somebody is going to go all the way downtown Meridian out to the highway, the freeway or clear downtown Boise in order to get care if there is some sort of facility here, because they will go to a doc-in-the-box if they need to if somebody is on that road. So, I think that we should make that assumption that there is going to be a lot of volume of people coming in off of that road. And the final thing that I would just comment on is that although, you know, we all know that there are some real issues with access with every hospital in the valley, so let's not repeat it. We don't have to do it exactly the same way and -- and -- or let things go through that are bad just because the other hospitals are screwed up as well. I mean it's kind of a -- it seems like a faulty argument to me. I would like to see what we can do to keep all the neighbors safe and traffic reasonable. And -- and know -- you know, this is coming with the growth, you know, for them to say that, well, there really won't be that, only three ambulances a day. When you've got three times the volume of that over at West Valley Medical Center with the explosive growth in this area, I think that's -- that's just kind of a -- it seems like a ridiculous lowball. So, anyway, we are hoping that you guys work through this further and be able to look at the legal side of all of this and find some other access points for them to be able to do the limited version and check with ITD and ACHD. So, that's all I have. Thank you for your time.

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

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Did -- Val, did you mention that 20 percent of the homes are going to be rentals?

Stack: Yes. That's what -- that's what Patrick had told us before. Patrick could answer

that easily.

Bernt: Okay.

Simison: I think we will let him address that.

Stack: I believe it -- I believe it could be -- it's probably in one of the earlier documents, because we heard it in a couple of the meetings that they were allowing up to 20 percent of those single family homes to be rented, which isn't great. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Mr. Clerk, anybody else raise their hand to provide testimony?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we -- sorry. Mr. Mayor, we did not.

Simison: Okay. And seeing nobody else in the audience that would like to provide testimony, I will ask the applicant to come back up for final comments.

Connor: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Yes, just to clarify, the 20 percent per the CC&Rs -- and it's pretty typical valleywide on subdivisions, CC&Rs cap the amount of rental units at 20 percent. So, our business model is a for sale product, but if someone owns a home, gets a good job somewhere else, or, you know, maybe want to rent out their home, they are allowed to do. The CC&Rs regulate the number of units in our overall community at that 20 percent number. Now, as I said, that's pretty typical valleywide in masterplans.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council President Bernt.

Bernt: So, that -- that makes sense. I get that. I just want to clarify, so what you're saying is there will not be, you know, investors coming in and buying swathes of homes and turning around and renting them out to people?

Connor: That is not the intent. We sell all of our homes -- like I say, we have a for sale business model. We can't -- if -- if, you know, a family comes in and buys a house and, then, chooses to rent it out, that's --

Bernt: Mr. Mayor. I'm not talking about families and whether or not they are -- they have the -- the autonomy to choose how they -- whether they choose to live in the home or if they choose to rent it out. That's not what I'm talking about. What I want to know, like, frankly, like crystal clear, is if you will have investors come in and buy multiple homes at a time and keep these homes for themselves and rent them out to other people.

Connor: Let me check with that.

Bernt: Thank you.

Connor: It's -- that's not something we do. It's not something that we have ever done. We have never seen it. It's -- we are not going to do it. Other than that I can't really tell you -- it's never happened to us before. We don't intend to do it. We build homes for families. It's how we have always done it. It's how we intend to do it. We don't -- we don't necessarily want that to happen. So, that's -- we can't do that. So, we won't do that. I just want to clarify another comment that was made by Ms. Stack. So, when Betsy was describing the operations of this hospital and compared to West Valley, this hospital is compared to be half or less than half the size of West Valley Medical in Caldwell and so that's how she arrived at that ambulance number. That's also how we arrived at the 300 employees for this hospital. At West Valley they have 600. So, we -- that's how we -- they have been modeling and doing the analysis of this new hospital based on West Valley about half or about less than half from an operation standpoint. So, that's how they kind of arrived at that number. Again, Rustic Oak Way, there is going to be a light at that intersection at Chinden, so it really kind of will function like an arterial road. So, it was designed that way as a suitable width. It's aligning to Rustic Oak north of Chinden as well, so we have worked with ITD and with ACHD to ensure that that's appropriate. Also we have worked with the developer Brighton to the north of us to ensure that the roads are aligned correctly and that it's being built so it functions correctly.

Simison: Thank you. Council, anymore questions for the applicant? Councilman Borton.

Borton: -- come back. Skedaddle pretty quick.

Simison: Yes.

Borton: So, in light of all the -- all of the discussion, if this were to be a level two trauma hospital, how would the layout be designed differently?

Connor: I cannot answer that question. Betsy, are you still on the line? If it was a level two trauma hospital how would the layout be different?

Hunsicker: How would the layout be different? Well, a level two trauma center -- you know, really the -- the level -- the trauma center level really boils down more to the services versus the -- the layout and the design. But we are certainly not -- you know, we are certainly not scoping this out to be kind of a -- you know, have a lot of ORs and, you know, a really just high level -- the high level of care and acuity that goes with a level two trauma center, so -- so, I don't know that the layout would be different, but I -- you know, I can't remember how many ORs we -- we scoped in this. I think it was six. I think a level two trauma center would probably need more than six ORs. And, you know, other -- you know, other services that, you know, at this point in time haven't really been scoped out in kind of the project that we are contemplating here, but typically it does kind of come more down to the level of services versus the layout and the kind of building size.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: The line of questioning comes -- it comes from me wondering why there would be an agreement to limit the type of services. For example, trauma level. Councilman Hoaglund brought up good -- good points with regards to the demand of this area and what the use likely might be and -- and there is concern about intensity of use in light of that demand and if the design -- it sounds like is designed to incorporate a lower intense use, but if a more intense use doesn't alter the design in any way, why would you agree to limit yourself? I thought it was just the opposite, that -- that if there was a more intense use that would be requested down the road, it would require basically a different site layout, perhaps different access. The access issue might be more concerning. The density of paramedic visits, disturbances, et cetera, things like that, would be much more intense. You are not contemplating it now, but that's why I was surprised.

Hunsicker: So, probably the main thing you would need for a level two trauma center is the helicopter pad and we are not planning to -- to do that in this location. Truthfully, the reason why, in my opinion, it's not -- the -- we are just getting this off the ground and getting this going. Trauma is not really part of the conversation around this location and as it was described, it's a very complex process to become trauma designated. It takes a lot of specialties, it takes a lot of -- it just takes a lot of stuff. That is -- is not -- it's a -- it's a very heavy lift, so -- and the truth is by having no trauma designation, you know, that -- that's -- that's the most -- that's the simplest way to do business, at least at the outset, just because you are not having to kind of commit to all these different specialties and all these different services that -- that you may not have out of the gate and for several years, so it's a -- it's a very heavy lift to become a trauma center. To become a trauma level two center is an extraordinarily heavy lift. So, I think that the reason why it's -- it's not hard for me to say, you know, we are okay with, you know, kind of having some limitation on our -- our trauma plan is because we don't really have any trauma plan. So -- so, I think that's -- that's why -- I mean I -- and like I said before and like you all have said, I don't want to limit ourselves for, you know, 20, you know, when this community -- this area does -- you know, if it does change -- the needs change. But in -- in the foreseeable future that's just -- it's just not something we are contemplating and it is a significant -- it is -- it is not just -- you can just become a trauma center, it's very hard and so that's why from an operational standpoint, it's -- it's not a major ask to not do it and maybe we could put a limitation on it, maybe it could be, you know, for ten years and we would have to come back -- you know, I don't know what the -- if there is some way -- like it sunsets in ten years or 20 years or whatever that is, but -- because you're right, like it may not require some kind of permitting to go back, because you may not have to change your facility level -- certainly not to go to level three. To go to a level two, you know, maybe you would have to add a helicopter pad or something like that. So, hopefully, that answers the question.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: There will be robots performing the surgery by that point in time, more than likely.

Hunsicker: Right. They can do it from home. Yeah. They can just stay at home and the

robot will come over and fix it. Drone surgery.

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I really appreciate the time that -- that the applicant is investing in answering our many questions. This is very helpful information to have now and in the future. What keeps coming across my mind, though, is -- is, honestly, really how many of your -- how many ambulance, you know, visits to any hospital are really that truly -- the level that need trauma. I'm going to guess that it's not as high as we think maybe on a daily basis and so for me it's not just about the intensity of the -- the type of care that you're getting, but it's about -- in my mind this is just about the traffic that's coming down this collector road and whether that -- you know, -- if -- if 15 percent of your -- of any ambulance services that are provided are for trauma and 85 percent aren't, I mean like, you know, that it's -- it's not critical care, it's not ICU, then, we are still talking about a traffic -- potential traffic issue on a collector road that's intended to service residential, all the way down a mile south. So, that really, for me, is kind of where I'm trying to, you know, I'm trying to rectify that.

Hunsicker: Would you like me to respond to that?

Perreault: Yes, please.

Hunsicker: Okay. You know, you're right and I would say probably the biggest -- one of the biggest ambulance transports is sort of elderly people that are -- you know, they -- that's probably our number one is an elderly person that is at home and calls the ambulance and, typically, those are not coming in, you know, lights and sirens and we would -- we would, you know, have that agreement anyway. But those are typically not -- not necessarily emergent transports, they are coming in an ambulance, but they are not necessarily emergent. So -- you know. So, you're right, there is a fair number of those. You know. And I will just point out -- so, we had been working with -- with BVA and Brighton on that -- that property on the north side and I believe -- you know, I don't really understand all the different roads and the -- and the collectors and arterials, that's not my -- we can talk about trauma, but arterials and collectors are a little harder for me. But I believe that was the same collector that had access into there. So, I don't know if that -- something's changed since that was approved or what the difference is, but I -- you know, yeah, you're right, there is -- there is -- there is ambulances that are not for trauma, but they are for, you know, kind of nonemergent transport and, yeah, that's -- that's definitely -- but that -- that's in the number I gave you, too, for here at West Valley and kind of a comparison to what we are projecting for the volume out there.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor, if I may respond to her statement about the hospital to the north.

Simison: Yes. Go ahead, Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. I remember that very clearly and we had a very similar conversation about this and what ended up happening is that although it couldn't be

designated as an arterial, it -- they are designing it with the width similar to it. So, they actually -- it's my understanding, unless something's changed, that it's going to kind of have like a boulevard, kind of a parkway type of -- really a more significant entrance and the street width is going to be wider than at least I'm understanding this application to be. The other element of that is that street stops there, it doesn't go on into another arterial road to the south, so that is -- that -- their entrance is essentially just for their project. There isn't a through street that goes -- and it connects another part of the city.

Simison: Betsy, just a quick question. Will you have an ambulance that runs out of this facility for transport?

Hunsicker: No. No, we don't have any ambulance company that like lives at the hospital. So, no. But we would --

Simison: So, this facility will -- will be served by the Ada County Paramedics, which has one ambulance that covers a large portion. So, just, again, for -- you know, there is only one ambulance --

Hunsicker: Well, we --

Simison: -- in this area. I -- I'm just trying to put it in perspective. You're not going to have ambulances streaming in nonstop, because there is only one ambulance that takes an hour to go between places more than likely anyways.

Hunsicker: Yeah. I mean there are some private ambulance companies that will work -- that will work with -- for transport but that -- again, they are not really emergency. They are -- I mean they are -- they are nonemergent transfer -- transport kinds of vehicles.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for the applicant? Thank you. Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Mr. Mayor, I feel comfortable maybe starting a discussion and I know if we want to go ahead and close the public hearing, we have had this happen to us so many times where we have to open it up. So, I will just say I think, to me, overall, I was happy with some of the changes made to the project. Was very happy that the -- the playground amenity was added to the multi-family portion of the property. I think, for me, it was obvious -- probably obvious for my comments, I -- I think there is -- there is a reason that it not being a trauma center is advertised throughout the presentation to us, because it's a less intense use and I think we should try to hold them to that in the DA, for them to agree not to pursue being designated as a trauma center. I think there is a big difference if there is a future helicopter flying over this neighborhood to the land there down the road, I think that that would -- should require coming to us for modification. This is much more intense. So that -- that's where I'm at on this one. I'm in support if we have that -- that restriction in the DA.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Just to weigh in a bit. You know, we focus a lot on -- on the medical center and, you know, the promise you -- there have been good changes to the development and how it circulates and the impacts and the layout and some of the amenities that -- that have been added since we first began with this process. Just to talk further about the common center and those types of things, one thing you have to remember that was mentioned, you know, and you have a highway -- Highway 16 there and there is a major accident, those -- where they are sent to are triaged by -- by trained medical professionals and those -- whether they are the paramedics, the ambulance, however -- however their triaged, they make that determination of where they are going to go to. So, they would bypass this facility that has basic emergency level services -- you know, if it's a head injury, they will be shipped to St. Al's in Boise. If it's a child with major injuries, they are going to head to St. Luke's. So, they make those determinations. They are not going to make a stop there and then -- then move on. So, those things are done right there. The trauma designations are a significant decision for any facility, whether nonprofit, for profit, it doesn't matter, to get to those designations, because of the specialties that you are -- that you might need, which requires medical professionals and also equipment and so it -- it is a major decision and those decisions are really driven by the marketplace and if -- and to me, if that area grows significantly and that need presents itself, I -- if that's the case I doubt Serenity Lane will exist in the way it is now, because of the growth that happens and there will be expansion and those types of things. I tried to give you some idea of a level two trauma center and the only best example I can give is if the President is in the area and he needs emergency services, he is going to level two. I mean it has everything that is needed, except for the teaching component, so -- and that is a significant amount of money. You wonder why healthcare is so expensive, when you use a machine once a year and it costs millions of dollars, they got to pay for it somehow. So, it's -- it's just a -- one of those things that -- it -- to me it's a market decision and it will be driven as -- as that area develops and -- and it's unfortunate, I completely understand how the residents of Serenity Lane feels having gone through a change like that myself from our rural area to -- to the middle of a subdivision and those -- those are difficult, but with the extension of Highway 16 to the freeway and the things that are happening, this is a process and, of course, we do have to make the decision, so just how it's lined out, the ins and outs of it, how the homes are situated, the development, all those typical things that we do. So, I don't have any heartburn of not putting any time frame on having -- you know, when they can go to a trauma center level or not. That will just work itself out over time through the market. So, I'm good with moving forward without that -- that type of restriction, but it's -- you know, if that's what the Council wants, that's fine.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: First -- thank you, Mr. Mayor. First, it's great having Council Member Hoaglund's, you know, industry expertise here tonight. Thank you. I have had a lot of time to kind of noodle this one and I went back and forth kind of where Council Member Strader has

been and I think that the big concern always for me is about that piece of boundary. If I lived over there I wouldn't love the idea of the helicopter flying over my house, you know, every night, if there is an emergency, something like that. That part would give me some pause and some concern. I think Council Member Hoaglund spot's on again that if the hospital is going to change those types of designations for more intense use, that's going to be a much longer process. In addition -- and I appreciate our good city attorney confirming for me -- if they were ever going to want to put in a helipad they would have to come back for a CU anyway. So, I -- I feel I have greater comfort that if those more intense uses expand because of the marketplace, that future city council's, future residents, will have the opportunity to weigh in on their thoughts about that before those changes would be made. So, again, if that's the direction Council wants to go, no issues for me, but I'm also supportive moving forward.

Nary: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Nary.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, Council Member Strader, to add to what Council Member Cavener said, so I was here when we approved the helicopter pad for St. Luke's. They had to build the building to have a helicopter pad to be able to do it in the future. Otherwise, it's a major expense to try to retrofit a building. They had to have the CU because they also have to have an exterior pad, because the FAA requires that they have to alternative sites to land. That isn't likely to change in the future and the FAA also required that they fly over major roadways, so that they don't fly over homes. So, I would anticipate if you had this in the future you're still going to -- the FAA is still going to require that they fly over Chinden, over Highway 16, and not say over homes. But you are going to have to have a CU, because to have an exterior site on the property is going to require a major change to the layout of the property. So, I think you would be covered, but certainly if that's what the Council's desire is, we could build that into the DA.

Simison: It's to the point that was made, I don't see where you're putting a heli-pad on this property and you're going have to buy out neighbors to even consider that in the future. But anyways.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Borton.

Borton: So, I think what we are trying to capture is -- and we are using trauma centers as one metric. We are just trying to capture expansions of use -- more intense uses, so said another way, I think the DA provision that presents uses of the property beyond which the applicant may manifest itself in a trauma designation request, but probably not the trauma designation that we are concerned about, it's the heli-pad example or the ambulance services or more intense demand that necessitates totally different access or layout. It doesn't sound like that is the case, but -- I like that provision. Even if the CUP would capture it, I like the DA to include it all, even if it duplicates somewhat, as the county

would have the ability -- or a future Council would have the ability to address it and on a nonissue, no concern with it. The applicant, to the applicant's credit, proposed that cooperative agreement to do so and to limit itself and as circumstances change and there is a desire for more intense use and they can apply to modify the DA, make the case the public will hear and it's not a trauma designation that we are prohibiting, it would be the uses that go with that -- that type of patient -- somehow gets captured into the DA.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I'd like to -- to actually make a request that the applicant take us in a little bit different direction. We have had many applications in the last four years -- four or five years along Chinden that have really caused challenges in our community, among neighbors, with traffic. Chinden has just -- for whatever reason it seems like every large application we get we just grapple with it and I -- so, what we have learned from some of our past large projects off of Chinden in the last few years is that when you have this multi-use development and you have got residential, you have got commercial, that the developer -- the developer -- some developers have done an amazing job of -- of identifying for the public and for the future homebuyers -- homeowners what -- what is going to happen on that property and some developers haven't and so I just would like to make a suggestion, being a real estate broker and understanding this industry and also just from our experience with some large projects along Chinden, that your project be well signed, be well -- what am I trying to say -- that -- that the uses be identified, so that as people are coming along and making the decisions about where they want to live, where they want to recreate, you know, obviously, the hospital is part of phase one, so that's going to be something that -- that most individuals will know, but I just make a request if -- if -- if we end up approving -- if Council ends up approving this this evening, as you move forward, please, provide a wonderful service to our community and make sure that what is going to transpire there is really -- that there is signage, that it's well known, and that it's easily accessible to the public to find out what's going on and the time frames and whatnot, because it just -- I feel like we are kind of repeating history here a little bit with these large projects -- projects on Chinden and we seem to come back to a lot of these same conversations and I would love to see us make those recommendations and improve every time that we go through this process on behalf of our public.

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I think we have -- at least for me there has been enough discussion in regard to level of use, if -- whether or not this is a trauma designation or whatever. So, by stating that, the one concern that I have, after reading over my notes from our previous discussions, and, you know, going over the -- our packet and reading and thinking, the one thing that comes to mind is our city services and what that looks like and my -- my major concern is specifically fire and so albeit a great project, a nice project, it's a dense project. There is going to be a lot of people in this -- in this subdivision, in this project, and I think it's well known from previous -- previous discussions that we are

planning on two fire stations -- Fire Station 7 in the south and Fire Station 8 in the north and I think it's pretty evident that Fire Station 7 is going to be in the south for sure. I think that's a well known item of discussion. What isn't quite unknown is whether or not this fire station up north is going to be realized in this budget -- or in future budgets. It's a discussion that we need to have and I don't want to get in the minutiae of whether or not it's going to happen or not, but relating to this particular application it -- unless -- maybe the applicant can speak to this, but unless something comes up in discussion, I -- it's difficult for me to approve this large and as dense of a subdivision, not knowing for sure what -- what Fire Station 8 looks like and so those are my thoughts.

Simison: Well, I will go ahead and give you my thoughts. I know what your thoughts are. Well, I think it's twofold, from some very practical elements. You know, I -- I know this is -- this is the first step. There is still other steps in the development process and if we just want to talk the hospital, there is just the hospital on that, I assume that that's a 24 month build, to complete that and maybe a little less. Even if we followed our normal process with where we have the second fire station in 2025, a lot of this isn't going to come online before then. It may be a little bit, but not much. That's if we made no changes to the CFP and just left things as -- as they are currently planned for this area. I mean you all can -- the development team can tell me whether or not two to three years from now is the quickest that this is likely to see any occupancy in this area. So, to that point -- I mean that's -- from where that -- you know, I will be making the request to Council to do both in this upcoming year and that will be the time for that conversation. As to the project, I love this project. I have always liked this project since I first saw it. I think it's got a great integration of uses and how it flows, the open space, the elements, the -- the density, the interaction with the adjacent neighborhoods, the connection that comes all the way through to create that connectivity. I think it's got a lot of pluses. I think that the commercial with the hospital is a great asset for this part of the city. I view this very similar to what Saltzer just put in up by Ten Mile, you know, same -- maybe a little bit more than that, but probably not that much different from all aspects. Again, just look at the roadway, how -- you know, not on Ten Mile, you actually got to go pretty far back in. You know, they can take ambulances there, too. Not residential right next to it, but the level of road, the type of road, what it is. All very similar from that standpoint and I don't want my comments to be mistaken from earlier. You know, we don't want to create a problem. My point was that every hospital in our area has different circumstances, which makes it unique in how it's accessed. The roads that are around it, the congestion from other things, not from their doing -- you know, some of it is, but, you know, I don't know that you go downtown and you go like, oh, St. Luke's, man, I can't believe they are letting those ambulances run through -- you know, you never hear about that. But Ten Mile -- or, I'm sorry, Eagle Road, we hear about it, because it creates traffic issues in that area, because it's so -- so much congestion. So, there are lessons learned that we can take from other places. But from my perspective I feel like we will be able to provide the services to this area based upon our projections that we have seen, our ability to build stations and have them in place, whether it's 2023 or 2025 and if that's what Council is concerned about is the date, I would encourage you to take that up with the -- with those -- with the applicant if you feel like there is a need that you want to put a limitation on when this could be involved, but I'm -- it's my intention to put -- and our fire chief's intention to bring forward a plan to develop

this -- to provide a service in this area by October of 2023. Whether you agree with that that remains to be seen.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I know in the staff report it talked about that the subdivision is proposed to develop the nine phases over a period of four to five years. I would like to hear from the applicant to kind of -- if we can get a little better time frame of that how this master plan will -- will play out, among other things.

Connor: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Hoaglund, yeah, so we typically -- the way that most developers work is we try to pave once in the summertime and, then, once in late fall, just given the issues of wintertime, you can't pave during that time, so -- and we took a look between 40 and 60 lot phases and so with a nine or ten phased project we are looking at about a five year build out. We are -- as soon as we can we want to start our engineering plans, hoping to have those go through and we anticipate to start construction potentially as early as the end of this year or early next year in hopes to bring lots on in '20 -- summer of 2022. You know, potentially maybe our first homeowners move in beginning of 2023. So, that's kind of the standpoint. So, if we are able to deliver our first homes in 2023, you can move out maybe five and a half years from that when the final homes will be built in -- you know, assuming that this market continues as we have seen it. So, that's -- that's kind of what we are looking for is -- is our timing there. The question about the fire service ability for this particular project, I believe it was at our February hearing Chief Bongiorno had a -- a really great -- I don't know if he's on the line or not, but he had a map that showed that current service area for this particular area and the line went down the current extent of Levi Lane and, then, it went all the way down Trinity Lane. He showed that that line was constricted, because there is no other roads that exist in that current area. But as soon as Levi Lane or Rustic Oak goes in in the first phase, which we are committing to build that in the first phase, particularly for this reason, for fire access and safety, almost the whole project is within the current service area with the current facilities that you all have. Another part of that commitment to the fire chief and to the city is building that first -- Rustic Oak all the way through the project is it helps with fire connection to our neighbors to our south, Oaks North, and while they are a different builder from us, we think that is a net positive for the community overall. Those new homeowners in phase eight, I believe, of Oaks North, will have quicker access -- emergency access because of the road that we are going to be putting in in our first phase and so that's something that I advocated for, that we advocated for, with the city in hopes that it would help our project be more attractive from a -- from the question of fire and emergency response. Lastly, the hospital -- and we have had conversations with the fire chief about this and he said, essentially, hospitals could stand on their own merit for fire response. All the buildings are fully sprinklered. They are emergency ready if there is an issue with -- with fire or anything like that, it's on a major intersection, so from a fire standpoint hospitals really can kind of run their own show. Obviously, all of our homes, you know, would need the fire services and our multi-family complexes we require those to be sprinklered. Again,

those are the closest units that we have to Chinden. So, they are sprinklered and they have the quickest access for our services, but I just want to end with that, that we spent a lot of time and we are spending a considerable amount of investment in putting in that full road to make that full connection from our neighbors to the south, all the way to the north, extending the services from our neighbors from the south, which have an agreement on that we are going to extend those services to our property line, all the way through our property to the hospital in that first phase. So, it's a big investment, big expense, we think it's the right thing to do to help support development along Chinden in the future and I hope that kind of alleviates any questions or anything you had. Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I'm going to take a crack at it. Move that we close the public hearing.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: Motion and second to close the public hearing. Any discussion on the motion? If not, all in favor signify by aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I will take a crack at a motion and maybe we will see where we shake out and if there is discussion -- I have tried to keep track of who I thought was on each side and maybe there is enough of a consensus, so I will give it a try. After considering staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to approve file number H-2020-0047, as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of May 18th, 2021, with the addition memorialized in the DA agreement that City Council believes the North Rustic Oak Way emergency care access is sufficient for a less intense hospital use and that the DA should include an agreement for the applicant and the hospital to agree not to pursue being designated as a trauma center.

Allen: Mr. Mayor, excuse me. May I clarify the motion, please?

Borton: Mr. Mayor, I will second it, so we can get there.

Simison: We have a second, but, yes, Sonya, if you would like to ask a clarifying question.

Allen: Does -- does the motion mean that you're approving an emergency room? Trauma center is not language that's used in our code. It's the emergency room is the

key words. So, please, include whichever way you -- you're proposing in your motion. Thank you.

Strader: Thank you. I will amend my motion to clarify that we will approve the emergency room use, but there would be a modification -- or an addition to the DA that the applicant would agree not to pursue becoming designated as a trauma center, because that is within their control whether or not they pursue that business plan.

Simison: Does the second agree?

Borton: Yes.

Simison: Second agrees. Is there discussion on the motion?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Member Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Just as an option for Council Woman Strader. Is there a time frame on that or is that just flat -- or a request -- if they ever do want to pursue that, the request would come back to -- to Council was that --

Strader: Yeah. Well, my understanding -- Mr. Mayor, I apologize, I should have gone through you. My understanding is that they -- they would need to come before Council to modify the development agreement in the future and I don't foresee a certain date we could choose, I just think that's a more intense use and at that time they will come before us -- or a future Council and the needs of the community would be considered at that time.

Nary: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Nary.

Nary: Members of the Council, maybe Sonya could answer this question. What would trigger planners to review a change in the use? Because we wouldn't use -- again, if we don't have trauma center in our code that's not going to trigger anything. I know more intense use would be what we normally would, but what specific language, Sonya, if any, do you think would trigger what the Council is requesting -- essentially a planning review that this is going to need to go back for modification to the development agreement?

Allen: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, Councilmen, Mr. Nary, that -- that was kind of the basis of my concern is that we -- we don't have trauma center outlined in our specific use standards. You could certainly add it as a DA provision. You can add anything. We would always be looking at the development agreement, though, when we approve any land use applications out there. So, we could just simply carry over that restriction into the certificate of zoning compliance approval and the conditional use permit approval, that

they not pursue being designated as a trauma center.

Nary: I think we will be okay if we put those words in there. I just wanted to be sure it would trigger someone to make that review.

Simison: And, unfortunately, I believe there will be nothing that would trigger it, unless they put in the helicopter pad or expand their building, because they don't have to ask the city to become a trauma center as part of the process.

Nary: But if they did any change within the building itself, like even just a tenant improvement, they would have to come back.

Allen: Mr. Nary, if tenant improvement -- we are getting on a little slippery slope period. We may or may not be able to catch it in something in a situation like that, so -- typically, we don't look at tenant improvements.

Simison: They are going to be really good neighbors. They are going to be good neighbors and know that they got to come back, if that's what we are going to rely upon.

Allen: Yes.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Yeah. That's -- that's what makes it difficult. Like, you know, Ms. Hunsicker, if she's still there, you know, she may recall, you know, and make that happen, but, you know, it's often the case with CEOs of hospitals, they -- they may move on. And I was trying to fit -- this is just one designation, one issue, and as I was listening to Councilman Borton, he was talking about anything that was related to more intensive use. Types of areas that are going to be utilized -- I don't know. I mean it's just -- do we have that covered with just the trauma designation? Is that our biggest concern? And it might be. And that if they add more doctors and maybe they want to have a pediatric specialty and add -- add to a children's wing or something, that falls under the expansion in a whole different area, but -- and it would come back to Council, I would assume, because if they are going to -- especially if they seek a building permit, of course, but, you know, just -- does this -- are we -- are we covering the basis that -- that you expressed earlier that needed to be covered?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I tried to limit the provision in the DA agreement not to be more expansive, because I believe that would further limit their business plan and attempted to tie it to something somewhat objective that doesn't involve us opining on their specialties or

whether the use is more intense or not. This seems like it fit -- was a good compromise and fit with their business plan. So, that's why I tried to make the motion that way.

Simison: Council, further discussion?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: It's tricky to define the metrics, but it's something. Again, the applicant proposed it and offered it and I think Council Woman Strader's concern is spot on. Provides some sideboards. One of the things that -- that late in the game I found compelling was the remarks from the Mayor and from the applicant that Station 8 is not critical for this project to be successful. There is service levels available for it. That in my mind it's no secret that Station 7 in the south we should amend the budget and do it tomorrow, but Station 8 to me is a distant second part, which is no surprise. So, the fact that -- that your remarks, Mayor, and the applicant's remarks at Station 8 is not a critical component, that could come later, if it's 2025, I think that was -- that's an important part for me to get some comfort that this project is successful and safe.

Simison: Not that -- just so we are clear, I think that it's just from a timing standpoint, how long it will take to build it, but there could be a time where even -- I'm going to leave it to the Fire Department to determine whether or not they think there is adequate coverage over time. I think another station up here makes a lot of sense for a lot of different reasons all together, but the timing is the issue. We know it's not going to show up tomorrow. We have got a couple years before there will be a nexus. Just like in the south. We got homes right now, been there a couple years by the time we get serviced, so, you know, it doesn't always come at the one hundred percent time. Council, further deliberations on the motion? All right. Question has been called. Clerk will call the roll.

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

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is passed.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Simison: Council, we are going to take a ten minute break and reconvene at 8:00 o'clock.

(Recess: 7:50 p.m. to 8:02 p.m.)

- 2. Public Hearing Continued from April 13, 2021 for Shafer View Terrace (H-2020-0117) by Breckon Land Design, Located on the East Side of S. Meridian Rd./SH 69, Midway Between E. Amity Rd. and E. Lake Hazel Rd.**

- A. Request: Annexation of a total of 40.48 acres of land with R-2 (10.66 acres) and R-4 (29.82 acres) zoning districts.
- B. Request: A Preliminary Plat consisting of 50 buildable lots and 10 common lots on 39.01 acres of land in the R-2 and R-4 zoning districts

Simison: All right. We will go ahead and come out of recess and move on to our second public hearing tonight, which was continued from April 13th, 2021, for Shafer View Terrace, H-2020-0117. I will ask Sonya to make any opening comments.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. This application was heard by City Council previously on March 9th and it was continued to the April 13th hearing in order to get more information from the Idaho Transportation Department in regard to future plans pertaining to widening of Meridian Road and when the turn lane would be constructed if funds were allocated for the improvement. A letter was submitted from ITD. You should have it in your packets tonight. It's also included in the public record. The project was continued again to tonight's meeting because of the legislation that was in process. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Is the applicant with us? Would they like to make any comments?

Breckon: Mr. Mayor, Council Members, I did include the presentation that you saw previously and I would be glad to run through that if you would like to see it again.

Simison: Council, would you like to see anything else from -- any refresher from the presentation? It looks like that's a no, so I think we're good.

Breckon: Okay. Very good. I will stand for questions.

Simison: Council, any questions for the applicant?

Bernt: Yes.

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Mr. Breckon -- let me read my notes here. Did you hear from ITD about -- we are getting feedback with regard to the visibility issues at the entrance of your project.

Breckon: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Bernt, we did not get any specifics from ITD regarding the visibility or what they would like to see there. I did bring some additional visuals if -- if I could I can share my screen and show some of that information.

Allen: Mr. Mayor, this is Sonya. Just while we are waiting here, I did fail to mention a reminder to City Council that they should act on the applicant's request for waiver to allow Block 3 to exceed 1,200 feet due to the reasons noted in the staff report. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you, Sonya.

Breckon: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Bernt, you can see the photo here. This is at the intersection of Meridian Road and Shafer View Drive facing south towards Kuna. Existing condition shows existing landscape, large trees and the grade change as it slopes up from Meridian Road into the subdivision. Here is a photo looking the other direction and you can see some of the large trees here. Here is another photo looking out of Shafer View Drive towards Meridian Road and what this photo shows that's highlighted here with the red and the green -- the red area are -- is the existing landscape that we plan to remove, as is depicted on the proposed landscape improvements to help increase the visibility and the green shows essentially location of where the new landscaping will be installed. This is the other side of the street. Again, similar removal of existing landscape and walls and if you recall when we were talking about this previously, the plan is to remove this landscaping, as well as regrade this slope, so that it cuts it back and minimizes the protrusion and any visible barrier at that location and this is the plan view kind of cleaned up. It shows Shafer View Drive, Meridian Road, and you can see here where -- this is the new proposed sidewalk, actually ten foot pathway and landscape berm as is shown on the landscape plan and so, essentially, this area here, as well as over here, would be cleared out and provide better visibility further back into the site as you drive out of Shafer View Drive and look to make a turning movement either way out to traffic. ITD did not give us any specifics here. This was purely our effort to improve the situation and -- and make it safe.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Thank you, John. One question before I forget is -- is did ITD talk to you about whether that is just -- is that going to be right-in, right-out only in that entrance or any other details?

Breckon: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Bernt, we did have -- after -- after our last meeting and Council's request for us to work with ITD, we had a conference call with ITD, Erika Bowen there, in an effort to find things -- or obtain some specific direction and answers to questions and it was a rather unfruitful conversation. The -- they said they think it's -- ITD, if you see it in the letter, I think it's -- it's -- it explains it there more specifically, but ITD requested that this area be a condition of approval by the Council and that they would like the developer to participate by donating money for their future improvements. In short, they are -- they are working on the designs and they don't have a clear path as to what they want to do in the future is what I got out of it.

Bernt: Well, Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: So -- so, ITD, just to clarify, didn't give you a path forward or a recommendation in

regard to what that entrance looks like, specifically if it's in the meantime -- I guess until they get a right lane configured, you know, into this subdivision, in the meantime wanting to know if it's going to be right-in or right-out only.

Breckon: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Bernt, no, they did not. I might -- I might add that, you know, this access is existing. It's full access right now for the existing homes and the -- what we are proposing -- go back to the overall plan. It's really -- you know, the addition of these three lots here previously. We had four lots and we removed one lot in an effort to blend in better as -- as was requested by Council and so the existing entrance and drive and functionality of this would remain as is, other than what we are proposing for improvements.

Simison: Council, any further questions?

Bongiorno: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: One second, Joe.

Bongiorno: Okay.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: John, I think we clarified this at the -- one of our other meetings, but those lots, Lots 2 and 3, I think they were at the top of the hill and there was some concern about vehicles coming out of driveways onto that road and visibility and I think we established that those would be -- forward facing cars would be pulling out, not backing out from -- in that area and should be able to see it decently for direct; is that right?

Breckon: Yes, Mr. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglund. Yes, these -- these are substantially sized lots and what we did discuss previously was that -- that expectation here is that these are going to be large estate homes, very similar to what is existing adjacent here and if you look at it you can see that a majority of these have a very large turnaround driveway and all of them have substantial drives with adequate turnaround on site and that is the plan for these three lots as well.

Simison: Council, any further questions for the applicant? Okay. Deputy Chief.

Bongiorno: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. John, I had a quick question. It just popped in my mind about this project. Is there fire hydrants on Shafer View? I haven't been out there in a while.

Breckon: Mr. Bongiorno, I do not believe there are. These -- these are within the county and have on site septic and water wells and so I do not believe that they have fire hydrants.

Bongiorno: Okay. I was just -- I had one of those oh moments, because we do have a drafting site out there that I just reminded myself of and so I just need to make sure that we talk about that drafting site at some point. There is a large tank in the ground in your first lot there on the right.

Breckon: Yes.

Bongiorno: So, that's our water supply for that subdivision, so we need to make sure we talk.

Breckon: Okay. Very good.

Simison: Council, anything else for the applicant right now? I don't know -- Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to provide testimony on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did not.

Simison: Okay. We do have some people who are watching. If you would like to provide testimony on this item, you can use the raise your hand feature at the bottom of Zoom and we can unmute you to provide comments. It looks like we have no one that would like to provide testimony, so would the applicant like to make any final comments?

Breckon: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, just -- maybe just like to reiterate -- I think this is a great in-fill type of subdivision that we are proposing here. It provides a very nice transition between the large estate homes and the smaller lots to the north. Even though we are asking for some exceptions here, I don't think that they are unreasonable in any way and this will be a nice addition to the community, particularly with all the amenities that we are proposing. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you very much.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Question for staff. I might have missed it, but the report that speaks to the northbound right turn lane and the cost share, needing to clarify and insert into the DA what the solution to that is. Is the contribution of their proportionate share within the DA the -- staff's recommended solution?

Simison: If I could just -- we don't have any proportionate share agreements with ITD. So, I don't know what you would be -- what we would be requiring the developer to enter into an agreement with from that standpoint.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I'm not sure if it's economically viable, but there was a comment under outstanding issues that ITD recommends the city require the developer to actually go ahead and install the northbound right turn lane. Not sure what the cost of that would be and what that would look like, but that was their recommendation.

Simison: Speaking of other areas in the city where we have had very similar issues come up, really, the only way you're going to get an improvement is through conditions at the annexation on the developer. We have an issue up in Black Cat where there is no right-hand turn lane and absent development putting that in, it is likely -- it's not a priority and even if we did a proportionate share agreement with ITD where would this right hand turn lane rise to the level of this is needed improvements on this road. Those are the types of things where -- it may or may not ever be used for this purpose, because you can't -- you're not going to collect the monies to do this project as -- so --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I'd love it if the applicant would react to the suggestion from ITD that we go ahead and require the developer to build the right turn lane. If you have explored that and if that's something you are prepared to do.

Breckon: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader -- Strader, I believe the ITD had recommended either -- either/or -- either/or -- the right turn lane or the cost share and we think we would much prefer to do the cost share, since ITD is working on a plan and we will be -- you know, they are working on the design and that will be coming forward soon and, then, they will be improving the whole -- most likely the whole street, the whole highway there.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I think the challenge that the Mayor just outlined for us is that we don't -- we don't have a mechanism in place to do that and so if we don't require this improvement now, there is a very real possibility that it wouldn't happen in the future. I guess I'm just thinking through that personally as I'm making the decision.

Breckon: Mr. Mayor, City Councilman Strader, I guess -- yeah, if you could maybe -- I guess we are wondering what the cost differential would be there, if that would truly be a benefit and maybe we could follow up with ITD to verify that would be beneficial versus -- versus the cost share, but I'm not quite clear how to proceed here.

Strader: Yeah. It's about as clear as mud. Unfortunately, with ITD we feel for you. Mr.

Mayor, question for staff.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Do we have any example of a right turn lane and have we required that before in previous developments and do we have any idea what -- maybe just in our -- not that this would cost a certain amount, but from our past experience like what -- what that cost could be or an example?

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, actually, I was just reading the letter from ITD that was submitted that you guys should have, dated March 30th. The e-mail. And it says attached is a draft transportation mitigation agreement. Please reach out to me with any questions. I put in there that the monetary contribution of 59,358 dollars prior to the Meridian city clerk signing the first final plat. I think that that's what that was for. To answer your question, I'm not aware of any other situation. Doesn't mean there hasn't been, I'm just not aware of it.

Simison: I mean are you asking if there has been areas on state facilities where right hand turn lanes have been required and paid for by development?

Strader: Yeah.

Simison: Absolutely.

Strader: Okay.

Simison: As to what level -- The Village.

Strader: Yeah. Okay.

Simison: So -- that was the STAR agreement, but they were still required to put in right hand turn lanes. How you pay for them is one thing. Whether they are required or not is the other.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Sonya, can -- so, if -- if you go down that path, walk us through what happens. If, for example, that agreement is done and there is a -- the developer pays a proportional share what happens in it culminating and it ultimately getting built?

Allen: Yeah. I can't answer that, Councilman Borton, Mr. Mayor. I'm not sure.

Simison: This is -- this is -- Councilman Borton, this is part of the challenges with this, because, really, there is no guarantee that this would ever be built under a proportionate

share agreement.

Allen: Yeah. So --

Simison: They -- they would come to us and say where do you want to see these funds expended that you collect and they -- for example, if they wanted developers on Locust Grove to contribute to improvements on Meridian Road, ITD really is trying to create an impact fee when they don't have the ability to create impact fees and they are relying upon cities to -- I'm going to use the word again -- extract contributions from developers to pay for their facilities that they don't have a mechanism to really adequately improve. So, it's -- quite frankly, I don't consider these reimbursement agreements to be, frankly, legal in terms of -- if you really think about it, the fact that a developer can pay for something that they may not get what they are actually paying for. They are contributing to systemwide improvements and places, but the only way you can ever guarantee you are going to get right hand turn lane here is if the developer puts it. Even if ITD does the road, they may or may not choose to put it in. If they don't want --

Allen: Yes. Or -- excuse me, Mr. Mayor. If I could just add to that. That's absolutely correct. In their letter that they submitted to the city -- again, you have -- in your packets in front of you you should have -- dated April 7th, ITD is saying they are not sure when the turn lane will be constructed if funds are allocated for the improvement. Their goal is to collect proportionate share contributions from all developments along State Highway 69 corridor. Collected funds will be prioritized to be applied to projects on State Highway 69 in alignment with a corridor plan. ITD must expend the funds within ten years and they currently don't have a program project to widen this area. Bill Parsons messaged me a bit ago and said that Victory Commons was another example on Victory and Meridian Road.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor, we have examples of where we haven't done it and currently it's a big problem and so, in my opinion, I get that -- you know. And I feel for those who come before us. I know that they don't have the intent of not providing sufficient level of public safety for those with whom, you know, would be going in and out of their subdivisions, whether visitors or homeowners. I know that that's not the intent at all, but I think that we have one shot to get this right and Meridian Road is a really busy road. People are flying down -- I believe that -- I believe it's 50 or 55 miles per hour and it's extremely important that we have a right turn lane and we don't wait up to ten years to have this done. I'm only in support of this unless it's -- the developer is willing to build it. If they are not I'm not supportive of it, because of public safety concerns.

Breckon: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, if I could I would like to screen share here one more time. There is -- I guess I would like to -- to cut things. So, this is a plan that we were able to obtain off the ITD website. Now, that's not an official plan, but it does depict -- you can see this is Meridian Road. This is Shafer View Drive. So, the three lots will be going in here and also this -- this is a little bit dated aerial photo. We have the Prevail Subdivision that's being built in this area right now and I guess what I will say is, you know, it's not that we are completely against building this right hand turn lane, I guess

what we are a little bit -- a reason we are hesitant here is that, you know, we are asked by ITD to spend this -- or contribute to their fund and, you know -- you know, the bigger question, too, is if we agree to the right hand turn lane what are the parameters of that? Where does it go exactly? How far does it need to go? It just needs to be better defined. As we see it this right hand turn lane actually is a bigger picture that should be shared in by the adjacent developers, particularly Prevail, as well as Brighton, since this road is on the half mile and if ITD already has some plans here that they are working on to completely revamp and -- and rework Meridian Road, it's just -- it seems like a waste for us to go through this effort to put in a right hand turn lane that's just going to get torn out in a few years and if -- you know, there would be something we would have to work directly with ITD with to determine what that right hand turn lane is, is it -- you know, what distance does it go? Does it go on past? I mean that just seems like a substantial burden for just one developer to -- to bear when there is quite a bit more going on in this area and so, like I said, not that we are against building a right hand turn lane, but more we don't want to be building a -- you know, a mile of right hand turn lane that's -- when some other folks should be sharing in that I guess.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: John, I don't -- I don't disagree with -- with your -- with what you're saying and I believe that your thoughts and your -- your concerns are valid. I'm not trying to invalidate anything that -- what you just said. Do you want to -- do want us to continue this and so you can get some answers from your neighboring partners and ITD?

Breckon: Well --

Bernt: Because I think that your questions you are answering are very -- are important and valid and questions that cannot be answered this evening, because we are not ITD and -- and we are not Brighton and we are not -- you know, we don't own land next to what you're talking about, so do you need to -- do you need time to go take care of these issues before we make a decision?

Simison: Councilman Bernt, if I could just follow up. Sometimes the first one in does bear the disproportionate share of costs and just like the last one in can sometimes not have to bear any of the costs, but in -- as Councilman Bernt said, working with your neighbors to create a plan together where those costs can be shared, if that's the appropriate solution, then, it may take time, as compared to moving this project forward now or even -- I don't have any idea what Brian's plans are for this area or timing. Is this --

Bernt: And, Mr. Mayor, it's not our purview.

Simison: Correct.

Bernt: That's not -- it's not something that we get involved with. We just want to get it right. However this works out is -- go make it happen, you know. That's -- I guess that's all I can say is it needs to happen. What it looks like is up to you and your neighbor developers and ITD and those questions need to be set in stone before I can make a -- before I can a -- I want a six, but I need those answers before I can vote on this or the answer is going to be no for me.

Breckon: So, if you're telling us -- and I want -- that you're not going to approve this -- Mr. Mayor, Councilman Bernt, we will agree to build the right hand turn lane. However, I would like to reiterate that we have -- on several occasions I had multiple conversations with ITD in an effort to find out what they would like us to do for road frontage improvements and every time we have gotten the same answer, which is really no answer at all -- that they don't know what they would like built and that they -- they really don't want us to do anything there right now. So, I would guess concede that we will build the right hand turn lane at ITD's direction.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: You know, maybe part of ITD's thought process was laying out the two paths -- the proportional share path, which doesn't work, and this other path and if City Council's direction is for you to build a right hand turn lane, you know, I would think that they would like to take advantage of that resource and work with you to do something that will work longer term. Certainly I would think, personally speaking, for future developments along this corridor, if the same dilemma existed for me, I wouldn't be hung up about that, too. So, you could tell your, you know, neighboring developers that this will be an issue for them possibly in the future maybe you can work something out. But it's hard -- it's tough. I mean I -- I feel for you, but I'm in the same camp as Councilman Bernt right now. We got the situation off Black Cat, I have had a lot of complaints about it. I don't live far from it and we can't undo that now. Undoing that -- unfortunately, we can't rewind the tape and -- and so, you know, fixing these problems later is like almost impossible and that's why we are in this tough spot.

Breckon: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, I guess one -- some points of clarification. Do -- do you want us to build a right turn lane out of Shafer View for the three lots that we are adding or should it be further up here where the -- our main entry into the subdivision will be? Would be happy to do that.

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor. And that's the situation I can't figure out is what are they asking when they say a right hand turn lane. Right hand in at Shafer View or the new intersection and an acceleration right hand -- right turn acceleration lane from Shafer and the other local road that will be coming out, the new road. I mean that can be very extensive, but we just don't have any direction from what ITD gives us here and that's -- and they have

to expend the funds within ten years, so you think there would be some sort of preliminary plan out there and, you know, I feel for the developer on this, it's just -- it's very frustrating trying to figure out what to do, who is all going to be participating -- and the fact that we just don't have any idea and the developer doesn't have an idea how much is that going to cost and what does ITD really want to have? You know, it's -- I don't know, just -- it's frustrating.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I completely agree with what Councilman Hoaglund just said. Is there any way that we can help the developer in his -- in their communication with ITD to expedite this process?

Simison: Yes, I think we can from a practical standpoint, because these are all the similar questions that we have had with -- on Black Cat from that standpoint. I -- I -- you know, my -- the short answer is, you know, to me ITD's direction -- but, unfortunately, ITD's direction has not been great, even on Black Cat. So, that's why I don't want to just leave it to them. I think we should all have a comfort level about what the expectations are in this.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: You're exactly right. Comfort level. We are talking about a comfort level, but I think that we are all looking for -- I think it's -- I think that that's where we are all -- I think we are all in agreement that we don't have that comfort level right now and because we don't have that comfort level it's very difficult for us to make a decision tonight. Maybe we can, but, you know -- I feel for -- for John and his team and I get what he's saying. I get what -- what he's asking. It's just everyone's scratching their heads and -- and when you're talking about a corridor, like Meridian -- with like this highway, gosh, this is just the wrong place and the wrong time to be scratching our heads and making decisions. That's just -- I mean that's all I'm saying.

Simison: So, Mr. Breckon, I don't know that we have any of our transportation people on here, but perhaps if we could continue it to the -- we have a special meeting in two weeks on the 26th. We can see if -- what our -- our staff can do to work with you and ITD to get some clarification on this and if -- if you want to reach out to other neighborhood and developers and find out what their plans are, because they probably will care as well. I would leave that up to you. But if that would work we could at least see what we can accomplish in two weeks. Maybe that's a little quick. Maybe the first -- first meeting in June.

Breckon: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, I guess if we have to we have to. However,

I -- you know, I think something to bear in mind here is our proportion of this contribution is one percent of these road improvements. I feel that, you know, putting the brunt of this burden on this one developer is a bit lopsided. You know, these improvements encompass this corridor and, you know, while we are glad to participate and do our part and work with adjacent developers and so forth, that is just a lot of work to try to -- well, one, to coordinate with all these adjacent developments that are going in. I know there is -- for a fact there is things in the works -- I'm sure the city knows better than I do what -- the details of these other developments and I guess it is what it is, but I hope that the Council will take that into consideration.

Simison: Mr. Breckon, just to speak from conversations that we have -- that I have had personally with ITD on other areas, a right hand turn lane to them can be throwing down some blacktop pavement on some already compacted dirt. So, quite frankly, to get a right hand turn lane could cost you a fraction of what a proportional share agreement could be if it meets -- if there is -- if there is property there, if it's -- so, it's -- if there is additional -- if there is currently any sort of shoulder, that's what I'm saying. So, it could mean a lot of different things from this -- from this standpoint and that's why at least find out what the immediate is versus the long term and, you're right, one percent for a lot more than just the right -- but a right hand turn lane -- what I have heard from ITD about 50,000 dollars is about appropriate for a right hand turn lane based on Black Cat, because, really, the costs are in the signals and other things. So, I think there is some good conversations to have that are not that far different, personally, but it depends upon what ultimately is needed.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Mr. Breckon, what date do you want this continued to?

Breckon: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Bernt, just the next available option would be fantastic. No. Staff has the dates available.

Allen: Mr. Mayor, June 1st would be the first available, because today would be the deadline -- or tomorrow morning would be the deadline for the 25th hearing to get this information turned around.

Simison: Sonya, whatever date is selected I am assuming you can get with Miranda tomorrow?

Allen: Yes.

Bernt: So, Mr. Mayor, the quickest date -- if they are asking for the quickest date, the quickest date would be the 26th. If they think they can hammer this out in two days, so that it's on the agenda for the 26th, I have no problem doing that, but -- I mean it's -- I don't -- I -- I'm -- I'm not a developer and so I have no idea what that process looks like.

Simison: We have no idea what ITD's availability is to even engaged in conversation. Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: If Mr. Breckon is saying as soon as possible, well, then, we can put it on the 26th. If the applicant is unable to get the information they need, they can have the top score for most continuances in 2021 and we can continue it again.

Allen: Mr. Mayor, I believe that meeting date is May 25th, which is Tuesday.

Simison: There is a special one on the -- the next day, the 26th?

Allen: Thank you. Sorry. I didn't know that. Okay.

Breckon: Mr. Mayor and Members of the Council, I would like to request the June 1st for a hearing for the continuance, please.

Simison: You have heard the request. Do I have a motion? Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor. I move we continue Item 2, public hearing for H-2020-0117 to June 1st.

Borton: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to continue this public hearing until June 1st. Is there any discussion? If not, all favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it and the item is continued.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

3. Public Hearing for Roberts Annexation (H-2021-0013) by Rodney Evans + Partners, PLLC, Located at 1630 E. Paradise Ln.

- A. Request: Annexation of 2.15 acres of land with the R-2 zoning district.

Simison: Next item up is a public hearing for Roberts Annexation, H-2021-0013. I will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Tiefenbach: We are getting the presentation loaded up here, sir. Good evening, Mayor, Members of the Council. This is a proposal for an annexation of 1.7 acres of land with an R-2 zone district. The site, like I said, about 1.7 acres of land. It's zoned R-1. It's located at 1630 East Paradise Lane. That is the southeast quadrant of McMillan and Locust

Grove. Very rural area of the county. The property is comprised of two lots that are presently zoned R-1 IN unincorporated Ada county. The southern lot -- so, again, two lots. The southern lot, until just recently, had a 4,000 square foot residence on it. The applicant demolished the single family residence in anticipation of building a newer 6,000 square foot house with a detached shop and garage. The applicant contacted Ada county to merge the lots to get the larger home and they were told that because the property directly abutted the city limits it would need to be annexed. Here is a picture. On the right there you can -- sort of give you an idea of where the project site is and on the left this is a site plan showing the proposed house that's going to be constructed. The nearest available sewer is located in North Locust Grove, which is about 1,400 feet north of the subject property. The applicant's received the city engineering and Public Works approval for our utilities waivers. So, under our code you would actually have to connect into the sewer, but because the sewer is 1,400 feet from the property it doesn't make a lot of sense for one single family residence. City understands that. We are okay with the waiver. There would be a requirement in the conditional -- or sorry. There would be a requirement in the development agreement that when services become available the applicant would have to tie into the sewer. So, again, we are okay with that. There is a second waiver that the applicant was required -- was requiring. Presently there is water that's available at the intersection of Locust Grove and East Paradise Lane. Per our code the applicant's required to extend a water main from that intersection east to the adjacent properties. The applicant is -- asked for a waiver from that. The city engineer actually denied that particular waiver. The applicant is now appealing that waiver to the Council. The applicant believes that that is somewhat costly to have to extend that water main. City engineer's opinion is that they should. What the applicant wants to do instead is to be able to just have a service line tied directly in -- shortest distance and save the money. There is existing sidewalk on the east side of North Locust Grove, but, otherwise, the Heritage Subdivision, which is where this property is located, the entire area is very rural. It is -- there is no sidewalk the staff has been able to find in this subdivision. However, the UDC does require sidewalks along both sides of the street. Staff has gone out there and taken a look at the property. We don't have strong opinions about it. Again, we would leave that to the Council to decide whether they would want only this particular property for a single family residence to have to build the sidewalk. This one in front of the Planning Commission -- and I will talk about that in just a second. So, on April 15th this went to the Planning Commission. There were four citizens that were there. The primary concerns of the citizens were why was this being annexed. Was R-2 a zone district that would allow more than one particular house. I think there was just a lot of concern, because it's a very rural neighborhood. They like being in the county. They don't want development, basically, creeping into their neighborhood. If -- if water or sewer mains are connected and extended into the neighborhood it could facilitate additional property owners selling their properties and developing. So, that's really their concern. The applicant agrees with them. Unfortunately, in regard to the applicant, they are in a rock and a hard place. They can't get a building permit. The county sent them to us and, really, their only option now to be able to annex is to get the water and sewer. The Planning Commission did approve -- recommend approval. The Planning Commission also did agree that the applicant should not have to extend that water main from Locust Grove up Paradise. The Planning Commission did not believe that they should have to build the sidewalk and the Planning

Commission agreed with staff that they should not have to connect into the sewer until at such time that there is a closer connection. Again, I want to mention, because I know there is at least several neighbors that have -- that are probably listening in, that the development agreement will say only one house can get built on this property. That's -- that's the point of this. One single family 6,000 square foot house. If the applicant ever wants to build anything else other than one house or subdivide any of the additional lots, not only would they have to come in front of you to amend the development agreement, but there would be a public hearing, there would probably be a plat. So, all of the public would be notified and, once again, they would have any chance to be able to weigh in on this. With that, the staff recommends approval. Staff's only comment would be if the -- if this Council is supportive of this and they are supportive that they should not have to extend the water main or build the sidewalk, those were two conditions that -- that this -- the Council should include into their -- into their approvals. And that I will accept any questions if there are any.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Under the current -- I know you take the two lots, make them into one. The designation we would have for zoning for those parcels, they could request, what, up to three units per property. So, a total of six if they had wanted to do that, instead of just the one.

Tiefenbach: That is correct. The R-2 is our lowest zone district. We don't have a lower density zone district. With that -- but, again, the development agreement will control that. So, the development agreement will say one lot, one house.

Hoaglun: So, Mr. Mayor, just to follow up. So, he's going in a direction that should be in the neighbor's favor, as opposed to going the other direction that would increase housing there.

Tiefenbach: I guess that depends on your perspective, sir. The concerns of the neighbors are incorporating into the city and extending any kind of water sewer is going to make it easier to develop in the future.

Simison: Alan, to that point, do we know when -- where is this section of roadway in an ACHD five year work plan or not?

Tiefenbach: I know that there is going to be some widening done to Locust Grove, which would include sidewalk. Off the top of my head I can't remember how many lanes. There is not any proposed improvements that I know that are going to be to Paradise. But, yes, they -- or ACHD is eventually going to expand Locust Grove in the near future.

Simison: Right. And that's what I'm trying to find out. What is the near future? Any ideas? In the five year work plan? Is it not in the five year work plan?

Tiefenbach: I believe it's in the five year work plan. Correct.

Simison: Oh. Can you pull back up the map that shows --

Tiefenbach: That one?

Simison: Don't we normally have a vicinity map that shows improvements, what's your plan for the area in the future?

Tiefenbach: I could get one, but I don't have one.

Nary: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Nary.

Nary: Mr. Mayor. I'm looking at the motion that was made by Planning and Zoning and I -- I didn't see a current comment or a new comment from Public Works on the section regarding the waterline waiver. I cannot recall -- and I'm not saying we never, but I cannot recall us ever waving to and through and that's what this is to and through. But -- but the -- the motion is only requiring stubs to the infrastructure that's in Locust Grove, but not even an easement through the property. So, if you're -- if you're going to do this you are waiving something -- we have -- I can't recall we have ever waived, that you're going to have to require at least an easement through this property for the rear property to be able to connect to the -- to the water line in Locust Grove, if that's what you choose to do. My only caution to -- to the Council is when this Council has chosen to waive something like that for one developer, even if it's just a single family homeowner, we will get numerous requests to waive it for somebody else. So, it's not just one homeowner, it is -- it is really a precedent setting type of direction that will affect other people, even smaller developers have the one or two lots up. So, just something to consider if you want to consider that request.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Just -- just one question to Bill. When you're talking about to and through, you're talking about the water, the sewer, or both?

Nary: Well, our code requires both, it requires that they take them both through, so that the next property can get to it, otherwise, they have no access to it. Now, we have held off requiring them hooking up to sewer services until they were available. So, until they run in front of the property we haven't required people bring it to them unless they want to do that. Clearly a single lot development like this, it is cost prohibitive to do that. So,

that's not problematic, we will create that in the development agreement that they will do it and we will have a way to trigger that in the future. But my guess is if it's in the five year work plan to widen Locust Grove, they are not going to build that sewer line until the road is widened, because that's where the sewer line is going to go. I'm talking about the water. The water, if it's available now, since I believe it is, we would normally require they take the water all the way through.

Tiefenbach: Correct. The sewer, again, is 1,400 feet, but the water is directly in that intersection now. So, there is much shorter distance for the water than there is for the sewer. It really isn't reasonable to expect them to extend a sewer line a quarter mile. I see Kristy is there to tell us when this road is planned or not planned to be built.

Inselman: Mr. Mayor, yes. This is Kristy Inselman with ACHD. Again, we currently do not have this segment of Locust Grove planned in the '21 -- the adopted 21-25 integrated five year work plan. It is planned to go to three lanes. We are in the process of developing the '22 to '26 integrated five year work plan and this is one that we are hoping to at least move into the plan. Likely we wouldn't have the construction year identified, but currently it is not in an integrated five year work plan.

Simison: Thank you, Kristy. So, just my two cents from a practical standpoint is, you know, trying to make -- make the connections is important, but in this case you're really not going to connect through the next properties more than likely and so while knowing that this road will either be built in five to six years when -- and that will produce the sidewalks, I don't know that makes sense to have them do one, so I would be in supportive of not making this connection, because it's not going to connect to anything else that will likely redevelop before then.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Do you feel that way about Locust Grove and Paradise?

Simison: I'm just looking at Locust Grove. I'm looking at -- I'm thinking more along that element. Paradise not necessarily.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, I think you and I have kind of drawn the same conclusion. I think I can get on board with no sidewalks on Locust Grove, but what I envision is 30 years from now, those county folks who didn't want to have the city come have said, oh, we want to go someplace else, redevelopment occurs, and, then, we get little -- a little spot of sidewalk along Paradise that -- that will never be built, because we didn't require it on Paradise. So, I think I can get there on Locust Grove, but I think we have got to have the sidewalk on Paradise.

Simison: From a practical standpoint with the sewer and water, would it not go down Paradise if this area was likely to ever -- I'm just looking to the to and through, what makes

sense. From our standpoint I see this more being a -- not the same, but Meridian Heights style where we are going to go through -- you know, you are not taking it through people's property, but you're taking into it to connect on the street.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, yeah, so it definitely would have to go in the right of way -- normally is where it would go. So, Kyle is on the call, so he would probably be better suited, but I -- I was just concerned about waiving the two and through requirement.

Simison: Kyle, would you like to speak?

Radek: I think -- I think Bill has enumerated fairly well, Mr. Mayor, Council, and, obviously, Warren's concern, if -- if this property doesn't build to and through, then, what will happen when the next properties need water, then, they will get a waiver, because water isn't to them and properties that really need to get off wells and septic will never get off wells and septic. So, it -- without -- without enforcing the to and through you -- you lose the opportunities in the future, which will be there and the well and septic concept is just not sustainable on these size lots for -- forever.

Bongiorno: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Deputy Chief.

Bongiorno: If I can also follow up with what Kyle said. I think the to and through would be important for the fire department as well. As -- as we know this whole area is rural, so we don't have fire hydrants in that area and if they're building a 6,000 square foot house, a fire hydrant -- the near -- the closest fire hydrant is down -- down the street, quite a distance. So, if we did the to and through we could to least get a fire hydrant out either on that corner or in on the other property -- the east corner of the property that would help us down Paradise Lane in case we did get a structure fire, which we have had fires down in that area before, so I follow what Kyle says as well. Thank you.

Simison: Council, any further questions? Okay. Is the applicant --

Semple: Mr. Mayor, Members of City Council, Ben Semple with Rodney Evans & Partners. 1014 South Lapointe Street, Suite 3, Boise, Idaho. I'm representing the owner of these two parcels and I guess first and foremost I want to thank Alan for the presentation, as well as his assistance during the process. It's been a long process, almost two years for the property owner. I want to give a little bit of background. Initially when they purchased this property they were informed by Ada county that they could consolidate within the county, because they did have a mechanism for that. When they went to apply for that the county apparently had removed that mechanism from their code and required the owner to submit a subdivision application to consolidate the two parcels within the county. When that subdivision application was submitted to the county, obviously, it was transmitted to the city, because it's within the area of impact and the city, then, identified a single point of connection to an annexed piece of property. The extension of the northern property boundary of the overall two parcels when it hits Locust

Grove meets a single point of the extension of the south property line of the subdivision that you can see to the northwest -- I believe that is Alexandria Subdivision. There is a single point of connection at the centerline of Locust Grove. That is their path for annexation. Every other parcel north, south, east and west of these parcels are in the county. Nothing else is in the city. I just want to clarify that. The process it's been a very back and forth process for this owner. Again, they have gone through about two years of the process now to get to this point to consolidate these two parcels into one for them to build their single family residential home. They are in agreement with the terms and conditions of the staff report, including a development agreement that limits this parcel to a single home. Construction. The reason that the owner bought this parcel was because it is in the county and they intended to build a single family home for themselves and their family. They wanted to be in the county to be a part of this small county subdivision that does fall within the boundaries of City of Meridian. Ultimately, their -- their combined parcel would be larger than any of the other parcels in here and contain home -- a home that is similar in size to some other ones within that subdivision in the county. We did request a waiver as was indicated by Public Works for -- that we could apply for a waiver for not only the sewer extension, but the water main extension, due to the limited nature of this project. They did grant us our waiver of the sewer extension for a 1,400 foot extension of a sewer main. The owner of this property did indicate that they would be -- they would hook into the sewer -- the water main that exists in Locust Grove in front of the property to service their home. Obviously, the -- the city engineer denied the waiver of that extension. That water main extension consists of about 280 linear feet of mainline to run down Paradise, so the eastern property boundary, and I guess it sounds like also the installation of a fire hydrant. So, that is fairly cost prohibitive when building a single family residential home. If this was a true redevelopment or something that approached additional density, then, I don't think we would be having the same conversation, because that is, you know, apparent when you redevelop to increase density that any utilities and other infrastructure are improved in that area. Additionally, sidewalk in this area, just for context, the total length along Locust Grove, as well as Paradise, would be 560 linear feet of sidewalk that currently would connect to a buffered asphalt pathway along the east side of Locust Grove to the north and connect to nothing to the east. There is no sidewalks anywhere within this subdivision and our opinion is that the installation of sidewalk on the north side of Paradise Lane is going to create some issues with drainage. There is some drainage facilities on Locust Grove, but when you install curb, gutter, sidewalk along a portion of a roadway that is a rural road section and currently utilizes, you know, a roadside swale effectively to handle the drainage, when you're concentrating that into a gutter it needs to go somewhere. So, it's not just the sidewalk installation, it would, then, be potentially a stormwater facility consisting of an underground seepage bed, something along those lines that would substantially increase the cost of the development of a single family home. We did have some conversations with the fire department and are in agreement with building the driveway to extra specifications to hold fire apparatus in the event that there is a fire. Ultimately, if it is the decision of the Council to require a water main extension, obviously, we would have to agree to something along those lines, because the -- the owner wants to just build his house for his family and we have to have this completed prior to being able to apply for a building permit. There, again, I just want to reiterate there is a water main in Locust Grove that we could theoretically connect to

that's out there to service this home and we -- part of the development agreement is that when sewer is extended past your Locust Grove that we take the -- the future home off of septic and connect it to that sewer main. You know, we are -- we are not proposing any further development or redevelopment of this lot. During the public hearings, as well as the neighborhood meetings that we held, multiple of the neighbors are very leery of any annexation here. They worry about forced annexation. They are worried about additional density out here or commercial uses -- any of that stuff that we are willing to enter into the development agreement that restricts this property from being developed that way by this current developer, because, again, not anything that he wishes to do, plans to do, or anything having to do with the project. So, I guess our hope was that we could get the annexation approved in order to, then, consolidate the two lots into a single lot to build a single family residence without the added expense of sidewalk and water main extension for ultimately the service to a single lot with no, again, cost share by anyone to the east. I guess if they eventually redeveloped, then, I don't know if there is a -- a payback type of situation where this owner would be able to recoup some of those costs and I do understand that typically in development the developer is required -- you know, first in pays for improvements that they don't necessarily recoup costs on, but this isn't a typical development of the property. It's a consolidation and really a reduction in what could be done here. So, that's kind of our stance and I would be happy to stand for questions. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you, Mr. Semple. Just one thing as we look at this, when we talk about the curb, gutter, sidewalk on Paradise, I don't -- at least from my perspective I don't know that you're talking about a full curb, gutter, sidewalk, but, you know, an asphalt five foot pathway, similar to what I have seen in other places -- yes. At least from a -- and I would love for the applicant to talk about that after opportunity for additional questions. Council, any additional questions for the applicant?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Question I think for the applicant, but maybe staff will want to weigh in. I'm sympathetic as to kind of the predicament you're in where the county is sending you our way. That's what we want the county to do, but I recognize that it's -- it's caused kind of a challenge for your client. From your perspective, if the -- if the City Council were to deny this application, does that open the door for you to go back to the county at that point?

Semple: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Cavener, the county does not currently in their code have a mechanism for the consolidation of these two lots. They are two lots within a platted subdivision in the county. The only mechanism that they have currently in their code is a subdivision process to consolidate, but when a subdivision application goes to the county, it, then, goes to the city of which they fall within the area of impact. So, we have kind of done this back and forth with the county before we have had multiple meetings with the city as well and this is really the only avenue we have to accomplish

this and, unfortunately, that got us to this point, you know, and we have even looked at a redesign where there is not a consolidation of the parcels. Unfortunately, having a home on one lot precludes having an accessory dwelling -- or an accessory structure, such as what the -- my client is proposing with an RV shop -- or basically large detached garage on the northeast portion of the property that can exist on a separate lot without a primary structure as well, which would, then, defeat the purpose of building a single family home and an RV structure. I think that might answer your question.

Cavener: It did. Thank you.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Question -- well, comment first. I think, Mr. Semple, you -- I wouldn't be surprised if your clients were regretting that they just didn't call this a remodel, keep a wall of the house and build a whole new house behind it and be done with it, as many hoops as they have had to jump through so far and not done yet. I want to make sure I understand the water issue and you talked about connecting to sewer as well in the future, but that is -- both of those would be coming off of North -- North Locust Grove directly to the house, as opposed to coming up Paradise Lane, especially the water. We have talked about in the future someday there might be a sewer line coming up Paradise and they would have to tie into that once that's there. But right now -- and staff -- Kyle might weigh in on this if we need him to. Instead of running the water line up Paradise and, then, over to the house, you're saying there is a line already -- I think there is a line in North Locust Grove -- of just going directly from North -- North Locust Grove is -- do I understand that correctly?

Tiefenbach: Sir, he would want to run a service line directly -- basically from Point A to Point B. There -- there is a line -- if you look at the map I have up here, basically stubs right there I believe at that intersection. I can let Kyle to weigh in. Rather than having to run a main line up Paradise, they want to get a service line and just directly Point A to Point B right to that house. Basically, where we are standing right here on Google Maps.

Radek: Mr. Mayor, yeah, if I could -- if I could just clarify, the waiver that the city engineer denied was their request to just access the water main that is in Locust Grove and so what the city engineer is saying is this -- this property needs to bring the water from Locust Grove along its frontage along Paradise Lane to the eastern most portion of its lot, like any other subdivision in the city would do and any other house in the city would pay for if it was a new house. It's all baked into the cost of a new house. I don't agree that this is a cost prohibitive feature to ask for. It probably will cost less than the -- than the new counters in this house.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglund: Kyle, if I -- and to follow up on that, I would understand a service line would be much smaller and less costlier, as opposed to running -- I don't think the term is main line, that's more of a sewer term, but a main water line to the easternmost part of the property. Any idea -- I don't recall a distance of that frontage -- what that might cost, as opposed to just a service line.

Radek: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglund, I would estimate about 50 dollars a foot. So, 280 linear feet, somewhere around 14,000 dollars and, then, throw in 5,000 dollars for a hydrant. So, again, I think it's -- I think it's well -- well under the cost that this -- that lots of features in this house are going to cost and if -- if a water main and on top of that a hydrant is not put in, you -- you're allowing a -- I don't know what the square footage of this house would be. I'm sure it's over 5,000 square feet. You're going to have a house -- a new house in the city that's built without a fire hydrant within spitting distance of anywhere, I just think that's probably not a good precedent.

Tiefenbach: It would be a 6,000 square foot house, for clarification.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I think if you're building what I would consider to be a country estate, it's quite -- sounds like quite a large house. I'm imagining that the cost to build that house is -- is fairly expensive and now that this property will be part of the city, the -- if there is an emergency, the fire department will have to respond and they need something to hook up to and to me I understand the sewer, I kind of consider that one thing. To me the -- the water main is important. Maybe there is some wiggle room on the sidewalk. I don't care about Locust Grove, if that's going to happen already a different way, but on Paradise maybe just an asphalt sidewalk. I don't know if I have as much energy around the sidewalk piece, but, you know, the fire department has got to respond if there is an emergency and, you know, like it or not, it sounds like they are going to become part of the city. Welcome to Meridian and now that you're part of this -- you are going to become part of the city we are going to have to serve you and that includes emergency services and we have had a lot of incidents with people that have had their own septic and they have maintained them and they have had their own water and, then, they have had problems down the road in other subdivisions where they have had to join the city later. So, we should just set this thing up for success in the first place.

Semple: Mr. Mayor -- and I guess multiple Members of Council, I'm not necessarily disagreeing with what you're saying, I, again, do this a lot and understand the to and through requirements for redevelopment of properties. We were just told that we could appeal the denial of the waiver to extend the water main line from the intersection of Locust Grove down Paradise Lane to the eastern property boundary of the property and, then, pull a service line off of that. For my client I had to go through that process, because it was indicated as a process that was allowable within code to request that waiver. Ultimately, yes, we will comply with the conditions that City Council places on the

redevelopment of the property. We were very happy to see a waiver for a 1,400 linear foot extension of a main line, knowing that we would still enter into a development agreement to run a service line to that line when it -- when the main line runs past here. We are not debating that aspect of it. Going back kind of touching on sidewalk, if a sidewalk consists of a five foot asphalt path that's detached from the road, still falling within the right of way and it doesn't create drainage issues for ACHD or something along those lines that would require substantially more work and expense -- yes, this isn't a small house, but, ultimately, it's also not an apartment complex that can be built here that would, then, be spread out over multiple users or even multi-family townhomes, something like that that could be spread out. It's ultimately one individual family that's paying for all of that, including the construction of the house that will be a nice, larger home. So, I guess we are not necessarily here debating, I guess, kind of what your decision would be, just wanting to lay out a case for -- that this is not ultimately what could have been brought forth in terms of a redevelopment of the property. Just some food for thought for the Council. Thank you.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for the applicant at this time? I don't know if we even have anybody online who -- this is a public hearing. If there is anybody that would like to provide testimony on this item you can use the raise your hand function at the bottom of the Zoom platform and we can bring you. Mr. Clerk, I assume -- did we have anybody sign up?

Johnson: Nobody's signed up and we have had one or two people in and out since then.

Simison: Okay. I'm not seeing anybody raise their hand wishing to testify. So, Mr. Semple, would you like to make any final comments?

Semple: Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, I guess, you know, we look forward to -- or my client looks forward to ultimately building a home for his family and I think that we have kind of laid out what our requests would be and that, ultimately, we are in agreement with the way the staff report is written and look forward to your decision. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I do have a question for Kyle regarding the water. You know, this -- the properties behind this being, you know, rural, we don't see them developing anytime soon. They could stay that way for quite some time. That water line that goes to the eastern edge of the property, it has a fire hydrant, they run a service line off of that. I know in the past there has been discussions about making sure water circulates. Is that going to be an issue here where it just comes to a dead end? And, of course, it goes to the house, but there is no circular motion to that tying in elsewhere and flowing through and whatnot. Can you comment on that?

Radek: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglund, that -- that could actually be an issue. It may be that although we require the -- the main to -- to go to and through to the eastern portion of the property, we could solve that problem by allowing them to put their service tap on Locust Grove and that would keep -- keep their service tap where there is water flowing. So, it's not unsolvable, but good -- very good point.

Bongiorno: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Deputy Chief.

Bongiorno: It does -- it does state in the -- sorry. Mr. Mayor and Council, it does state in the fire code that if a building is brought into an area that -- and there is no hydrants nearby, then, we do need to add a hydrant in. I was just looking -- I have the code. It says where a portion of facility or a building hereafter constructed or moved into or within the jurisdiction is more than 400 feet from a fire hydrant or on a fire apparatus access road and approved route -- let's see. No, that's not the one. Oh. Hydrants and main shall be provided where required by the fire code official. So, if we are not going to do the extension down Paradise, then, we at least need a fire hydrant on the corner of the property and, then, we will have to work with Kyle on the modeling to see what the fire flow is going to be for that particular house. At 6,000 square feet we are going to need at least 2,000 gallons a minute for two hours. So, we would just need to make sure that we can meet that requirement, so --

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Bongiorno: -- thank you.

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Yeah. Thanks for that, Deputy Chief. I was wondering about that as we were talking to this, is if -- if finding out what the width would be when ACHD expands Locust Grove and where the corner would -- would likely be and having something there as -- and, then, running the service line from that, as opposed to going clear down and, then, waiting maybe forever for development, still having that fire hydrant, and I'm sure Mr. Semple could sell his client on the fact that there will be insurance -- you know, house insurance savings over time that, yeah, I wouldn't pay for that. But it was -- it was a -- it was a shot. Mr. Semple is -- you know, just your thoughts on something like that.

Semple: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Hoaglund, yeah, I -- I believe that my client would be in agreement with constructing a fire hydrant at that corner off the main line that currently exists in Locust Grove, assuming that the modeling comes back that supports the fire flows as required by code, as well as installing their service line to their home off of that same main line. I can't imagine that they would be opposed to that.

Hoaglund: Thank you then. And, Mr. Mayor, follow up question for Joe.

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Deputy Chief, how do they determine the fire flow? What does that take to know that there is going to be enough -- enough pressure on that? Could you walk me through that?

Bongiorno: Sure. Typically -- sorry. Mr. Mayor and Council -- Allen, can I share a map real quick?

Tiefenbach: There you go, Joe.

Bongiorno: Thank you. I was going to share Kyle's map. So, this kind of shows you where the closest hydrant is, so -- you're welcome, Kyle. Sorry. Mr. Mayor and Council, so to -- when we find out how big a house is going to be typically what we do is in Appendix B of the Fire Code it lists what the fire flow requirements are for a particular size of a structure. So, depending on the house and what it is is, basically, it's everything underneath the eaves of the house. So, the house itself may be 6,000 square feet, but if they have 1,000 square foot patio cover and 500 square foot porch now the house is 7,500 square feet and so we have to calculate the fire flow off of that. And, again, there is a table in the back in Appendix B of the Fire Code that covers what the fire flow is required to be and, then, typically, I will work with Kyle and I will say, hey, Kyle, I have got this project, it's on the corner of Paradise and Locust Grove, what's our fire flows in that area and, then, we can determine whether or not we have adequate fire flow, either by the -- the hydrants that are in the area -- is typically what he goes by, with his pressure zones, you know, he's got all his magic that he runs and -- and, then, he can determine whether or not we have adequate fire flow for what's there. If for some reason we do not have adequate fire flow, which we have had some 10,000 square foot houses and some 14,000 square foot houses pop up, then, the only requirement after that point is they will have to put fire sprinklers in their house to lower the requirement for fire flow.

Hoaglund: Thank you, Chief.

Simison: Council, further discussion or is there a motion?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Move that we close the public hearing on the Roberts Annexation, H-2021-0013.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Question for -- for Alan. Sidewalk requirement. Mr. Mayor brought up, you know, a pathway of some sort. Is an -- is an approval of a pathway in place of curb, gutter, sidewalk within code? Is that something that we can -- we can do?

Tiefenbach: I would need to leave it to Public Works for the curb and gutter, but you have the option of an attached or a detached sidewalk.

Simison: Councilman Cavener, I turn your attention to the corner of Victory and Locust Grove, which has -- has a black asphalt detached sidewalk type facility on it and I think it's temporary, but I think this is temporary, too.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I will take a crack at this and -- for discussion. After considering all the staff and applicant testimony I move that we approve file H-2021-0013 as presented on the staff report of a hearing date of May 18th, denying the waiver to connect the water main and requiring a detached asphalt pathway along Paradise. And, Mr. Mayor, I will provide clarification if staff needs that, because I realized I may have said I denied the sidewalk -- or the pathway along Paradise, but I'm -- I'm in support of the pathway along Paradise, but denying the waiver on -- on the water connection -- requested waiver.

Radek: If we could maybe clarify it and say denying the waiver to the to and through requirement for water and it would be more clear.

Cavener: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, as Kyle much more eloquently put it, also denying the waiver on the to and through element.

Borton: Second.

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

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Do we need to discuss -- I mean the fire hydrant issue or is that going to just come along with the water?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: It's my understanding is, yeah, that the fire hydrant would come along with water.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Question for maker of the motion. Would that -- so, that would go to the eastern part of the property as required and, then, pulling the line off of that and the purpose of the paved sidewalk, for lack of a better term, paved path, that is going to go to where?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thank you, Mr. Hoaglund, for giving me an opportunity to talk about a pathway to nowhere. As -- as we have discussed tonight -- well, that will be the only piece that will be annexed into the city and likely that pathway will exist in its current format for quite a long time, I'm supportive of the flexibility to at least get some piece of connectivity should we have some piece of infrastructure in place in case a future neighborhood to the east develops. If the Council is more supportive with requiring a traditional sidewalk and curb and gutter, I'm -- I'm happy to have that conversation. I think I was just trying to find a happy balance.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Yeah. I guess my happy balance was -- I can go along with the required water and hydrant, even though there -- there could be issues with -- with the water quality, but -- but the pathway, if there is development in that area in the future, I think the road would be widened, there will be traditional sidewalk, curb, gutter, type of thing. So, I don't see a need for the pathway yet at all. That's where I'm coming from. I'm not requiring even more, I just -- this is -- we are taking a rural area that has existed for quite a while, likely will exist for a while, until that point comes when a developer comes in and makes them an offer they can't refuse and, then, it has a new vision, a new plan. But that's -- you know, that's just my thinking on it, so --

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Council Member Hoaglund, I completely get where you're at and I think that we have seen enough applications where I have been on the Council saying, man, I wish -- I wish the previous Council would have required at least that piece there, because now you have got -- it's a little bit of patchwork and I figured at least having most likely to wear like the trail head beginning for what maybe later come, makes more sense than to try and fix it at a later point in time.

Hoaglund: And Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: And to that point, if you take the Five Mile path, go up Bellano -- towards Bellano Creek, you will see this nice ten foot wide sidewalk coming down from -- along Ten Mile, make the turn, and, then, you have 40 feet of grass not connected to anything. So, we don't know the future. That's the problem. I mean we try and do our best here and sometimes, okay, if it's not there, what's the loss, as opposed to they expend the money and do it and it's -- it's torn up in the future, I -- you know, I don't know. Your -- you know, your -- your motion is a good one and there is validity behind it, I just -- there is just -- yeah, I struggle with -- with that portion of it, so --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I would rather error on the side of having something than having nothing in the future if the rest of this develops. I feel like we have had enough examples of more annexations and neighborhoods like this and I wouldn't want to have a piece that doesn't have some sort of connectivity. I feel like this kind of comes along with the territory, like you're joining the city, we expect sidewalks and pathways and it's incongruous with the rest of the neighbors and it's unfortunate Ada county doesn't have their own process for figuring this out, but they don't and I would rather -- I personally would rather have -- have something than not have anything.

Simison: And like it or not, I think the subdivision is going to be a one by one process for the city over time, because Ada county likely is not going to have a great -- don't want to provide services to this in-fill component with the current commission I believe.

Cavener: Call the question.

Simison: The question has been called. Clerk will call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

ORDINANCES [Action Item]

4. **Ordinance No. 21-1928: An Ordinance (H-2021-0008 – Meridian South Fire Station) for Annexation of a Parcel of Land Situated in a Portion of Government Lot 3 of Section 5, Township 2 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, and Being More Particularly 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 4.00 Acres of Land From RUT to R-8 (Medium 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, everyone, for their time and attention this evening. Next item is ordinances. First up is our only ordinance number 21-1920. Ask the clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's an ordinance related to H-2021-0008, Meridian South Fire Station, for annexation of a parcel of land situated in a portion of Government Lot 3 of Section 5, Township 2 North, Range 1 East, Boise meridian, Ada county, Idaho, and being more particularly 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 4.00 acres of land from RUT to R-8 (Medium 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: Council, you have head this ordinance read by title. Was there anybody that would like it read in it's entirety? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. No. Do we need to do roll call --no --

Bernt: We need a motion.

Simison: Sorry.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, I move we approve Ordinance No. 21-1928 with suspension of rules.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve the item under suspension of the rules. All those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it. The ordinance is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

Simison: Council, anything under future meeting topics?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Not a future meeting topic, just a moment of privilege if I can. I just want to recognize the passing of a really, really remarkable city employee. You know, we here at the City of Meridian are so lucky to have such amazing staff that work here and when -- when Barb Hohler passed away this week and I was really lucky to work with her as an employee and she just was such a champion for our city, our staff, for our Mayor and Council, both when she was here as an employee and when she left. So, I just wanted to take a moment to recognize her and thank her posthumously and her family.

Simison: And for those who are interested, there is a service memorial tomorrow at 11:30 at Cloverdale Funeral Home. It's either virtual or in person, if you are interested in attending. So, appreciate your comments. So, with that do I have a motion?

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I move that we adjourn the meeting.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:37 P. M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON

_____/_____/_____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK