

## **Meridian City Council Work Session**

**June 10, 2025.**

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 4:31 p.m. Tuesday, June 10, 2025, by Mayor Robert Simison.

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

Members Absent: Luke Cavener and Doug Taylor.

Other Present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Kurt Starman, Todd Lavoie, Laurelei McVey, Debbie Hooper, Shawn Harper, Steve Taulbee and Dean Willis.

### **ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE**

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

Simison: Council, we will call this meeting to order. For the record it is June 10th, 2025, at 4:31 p.m. We will begin this work session with roll call attendance.

### **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

Simison: Next item up is adoption of the agenda.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I don't see any changes needed, so I move that we adopt the agenda as published.

Overton: Second.

Simison: 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 agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

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

- 1. Western States Equipment Water Main Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2025-0056)**

- 2. Apex Phenomenal Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement (ESMT-2025-0059)**
- 3. Final Plat for Addison Circle Subdivision (FP-2025-0004) by Tamee Crawford, Centurion Engineers, Inc., located at 4535 N. Black Cat Rd.**
- 4. Pathway License Agreement Amendment for Lennon Pointe Subdivision – Time Extension Request Between the Nampa & Meridian Irrigation District and the City of Meridian**

Simison: First up is the Consent Agenda.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I move that we approve the Consent Agenda. For the Mayor to sign and Clerk to attest.

Little Roberts: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

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

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

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

- 5. Fiscal Year 2025 Budget Amendment in the amount of \$2,500,000 for the construction phase of the Aeration Basin 1-4 retrofit and 9 & 10 upgrades at the Wastewater Resource Recovery Facility**

Simison: So, we will move on to Department/Commission Reports. First item up is Item 5, Fiscal Year 2025 Budget Amendment the amount of 2.5 million dollars for the construction phase of aeration basin one through four retrofit and 9 & 10 upgrades at the Wastewater Resource Recovery Facility or treatment plant.

McVey: All right. Good afternoon. We made sure to make it an extra long title that's fun to say. But thanks for your time. This is a budget amendment in the amount of 2.5 million dollars for our permit required projects. That retrofits four of our old basins and builds two new basins. This is in our permit and is required to meet the upcoming 2027

limits. So, this project is already underway and we usually do our best on these multi-year, multi-million dollar projects to know what year the funding is going to be needed in. However, our contractor is ahead of schedule, which doesn't happen too often, but we are pretty excited about that and so what we are asking to do is move 2.5 million dollars from what we were going to request in FY-26 and just move that up into FY-25. So, no increase to the total project budget, just moving that money up and, then, reducing the FY-26 request. So, with that I can stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I think everybody got the memo and it's straightforward. Glad that that timeline is accelerating. So, with that I move that we approve the fiscal year 2025 budget amendment in the amount of 2.5 million for Item 5.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Item 5. Is there any discussion? If not Clerk call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

## **6. Discussion of Meridian Standard Operating Policy 4.5, Regarding Bereavement Leave**

Simison: Next item up is Item 6, discussion on Meridian Standard Operating Policy 4.5 regarding bereavement leave and turn this over to Director Hoopes.

Hoopes: Good afternoon, Mayor and Council Members. I want to thank you for the opportunity to talk today about the bereavement policy. So, the update that we are requesting is designed to ensure equity, reflect modern HR practices and simplify administration for both HR and supervisors. Our current policy allows up to five consecutive work days bereavement leave, but this can result in an unequal time off depending on the employee schedule. An example of that would be people that are on a 4/10 schedule would receive 50 hours off. People that are on a 4/10 -- or a 4 -- 5/8 -- sorry -- schedule would receive 40 hours off. So, you can see that -- the inequity with the policy. So, we recommend updating the policy to state 40 hours, creating equity between scheduled hours worked. This change ensures equal time off for all full-time

employees regardless of their work schedule. We are also proposing in the policy to change the 40 hours to be used in two segments within six months -- six months of the date of loss. This recognizes that grief and family obligations may extend beyond the immediate loss and allows for people to attend memorial services or to be able to take care of family issues that don't happen immediately after the loss. The reason for this it will promote fairness, equity across all department work schedules. It simplifies administration and aligns with HR best practices. It also supports our care values, which by providing compassionate consistent employee focused approach. We are also updating the definition of immediate family to make the language clearer and more inclusive, while maintaining the original intent. The policy update is practical, creates equity across, like I said, all work schedules and so I would ask that we -- you approve the changes in the policy and with that I will stand for questions.

Simison: Thank you, Debbie. Council, any questions?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. My first question -- and you could come back to us, but I was curious if there is alignment in the CLA with the same approach regarding the fire union, if we intend to try to match those up or how this would impact that group.

Hoopes: That I will have to get back with you on. This is for the general employees. The policy has been reviewed by the CLA and given approval before it came to Council.

Strader: So, I would -- Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yep. So, I am referring to the collective labor agreement. Yeah. Just making sure -- so, you could come back to me I would just be curious -- because, obviously, we would like to have as much consistency across employee groups as possible to your point, so that that was one question that I had and, then, I was just going to ask you did you want to have us discuss this and, then, take action at a later point or how did you guys kind of want to navigate this today?

Hoopes: Typically they have been done on a Consent Agenda. So, it's gone through the process. Directors have reviewed it. It's gone before the -- the collective bargaining group and so this is the last step before it -- the change is made. But I can review the CLA and -- and respond back to you via e-mail if that works or a phone call.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. That's fine. I think what it is is I just like us to try when we get into the CLA the next time to get as much consistency as we can and, then, I guess the -- the only other thing I was curious about was just -- did this go through the compensation committee? Is that something -- do benefits discussions go through the compensation committee as well or just compensation? Just wanted to know if they had involvement as well.

Hoopes: The compensation committee discussed it. HR has reviewed it. I'm not a hundred percent sure we took it to the benefits committee.

Strader: Okay. Got it. Okay.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Debbie, how many employee groups within the city outside of police officers are affected by this change?

Hoopes: This would be the general employees. So, general employees, as well as the police department group. So, roughly 400.

Overton: Okay. Mr. Mayor, follow up? Let me ask it a little different way. Police are working the 4/10 shifts right now. Are there any other groups within the city in the general employee category also working the 4/10 shifts that this would directly affect?

Hoopes: Yes. We have people in wastewater. We have people throughout the city that are on 4/10 schedules.

Simison: Probably every department has people who are working 4/10s of some sort.

Overton: Thank you.

Nary: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Nary.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, Council Member Strader, I can tell you at least from the CLA we did negotiate this in the last one. This doesn't change the amount of time that employees are given, but we did negotiate that. I don't have the contract in front of me, so I can't tell you what the exact amount is, but we had this conversation with the CLA group and so this was -- it contemplated in their agreement, which is, again, why we send them the policy to see if they have any other comment and they didn't. If there is any gap certainly I'm sure that I will come up with the next one, but we did incorporate the basics of what existed previously in the current agreement.

Strader: Got it.

Simison: Council, any additional questions or comments? And so would you like this to come back again separately or is on consent for next steps?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I think my only remaining question would just be -- did you get any feedback from Council President Cavener before he left town on this policy?

Hoopes: Council Member Strader, I did not. He -- I didn't hear from him.

Strader: Councilman Taylor, has he looked at this at all?

Hoopes: Council Member Strader, I sent out the memo. So, yeah, I didn't hear back from anyone and, like I said, we had taken it to -- HR had vetted it, kind of looked at how it incorporates with the work day and typically you go by hours versus days off, because, then, you run into the -- if I'm five -- or 4/10s I get 50 hours versus a 5/8 schedule only getting 40 hours of leave. It creates inequity. And so it's kind of a standard in the industry. HR vetted it, then, it went before the directors for review.

Strader: Right. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. That's perfect. I would suggest that what we do is go ahead and put it on the Consent Agenda for next week and, then, that would give our two other council members an opportunity in the next week, if they do have issues or questions, we will give them a heads up and they can reach out to you and they could always pull it off the consent agenda. It's a big enough policy, it affects so many people in the city, that we probably do want everybody's eyes on it. So, let's just put it on the consent next time and -- and tackle it that way.

Simison: We will do that. And I do know I did share the information with Councilman Cavener. I can't say that he read it or if we just discussed the change in its concept. I did not do that with Councilman Taylor. I know that. So -- okay. All right.

Hoopes: Thank you.

## **7. Public Safety Levy Informational Presentation**

Simison: Thank you. With that we will move on to Item 7, which is public safety levy information presentation. Turn this over to Mr. Starman.

Starman: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council. Happy to be here tonight to chat with you about a potential ballot measure or levy measure to deal with public safety related topics and I will get into that in a moment. This is a follow up to the Mayor's announcement and some of the comments he made at the State of the City last week and I know the Council is aware that the purpose of the presentation tonight is just to -- for information. There will be additional meetings later -- initially for the Council next week to have some more in-depth discussion and ultimately to the extent the Council decides to proceed we will have public hearings to hear from the public in general and receive input from -- from your constituents and get to get a feel from the community how they feel about this. So, this is just an initial step, a sort of educational step is for information purposes only and I will go ahead and proceed with that sort of as the basis for today. I will start with -- we fall -- this particular levy would fall under Idaho Code Section 63-802(1)(g). This is kind of a very narrow provision that really only applies to cities, number one, and, secondly, only applies to low property tax cities, which Meridian is one of those low property tax cities and what I mean by that, as you will see in the language on the slide before you, is that this -- so, it's not available to other districts, buyer districts or other special districts or the county for that matter, it's only available for cities and it's only available for low property tax cities, meaning that the current levy rate is at 0.004 or less and just to provide context, the city's current levy rate is about one half of that amount. We are just over 0.002 and change. So, we have lots of head room to use that expression. So, we certainly qualify for this provision as a low property tax city and, then, the other important distinction of this provision, if you qualify for this subsection G, is that the threshold for approval is 60 percent. For those jurisdictions that don't qualify for this subsection G, you fall into the next subsection, which is H and you see those on the ballot quite often where it requires a super majority of the voters, 66 and 2/3rds percent. So, this is specific to our city, because we have a low property tax rate today and it has a threshold of 60 percent. That's the gist of what's going on there and I recognize this is going to be a lot of information. We will certainly provide the slides to you to have as a reference on a going forward basis as well, so -- and please do, you know, ask questions or pause me at any time. So, there is a lot of material here. I guess -- let me just take a look at my notes to make sure I didn't miss anything important. I think we covered -- covered everything. The next section of state law I want to chat with you about is 34-914(1) and this is -- this 34-914 in total, subsection one, but subsequent sections also require particular disclosure requirements with a levy measure of this nature and so this is sort of the preamble or the introductory paragraph that talks about that, you know, we have to provide disclosures to the public and to the voters that ultimately will vote upon this measure, you know, information that's in a simple, understandable language about the proposal, so -- and you will see later as we talk about potential ballot language we have -- have tried to make this as straightforward and understandable, no twist or advocacy. We try to make it very -- just objective and so, you know, people can make their own decisions as to whether this is a -- something that's of value to the community and worth pursuing or not without putting any gloss on it or anything of that nature. Those disclosures are somewhat numerous. That might be a bit too strong, but there are a number of disclosures required by state law that -- that we need to provide to the voters and to the public in general. Those are listed here on the next couple slides as well. The first is that the -- we need to describe,

again, in simple understandable terms -- terms the purpose for which the levy is to be used, the date of the election, which in this instance will be the November 4 -- to the extent the Council decides to proceed -- would be the November 4, 2025, general election. The dollar amount estimated to be collected each year from the levy and then -- let me just go back and say parenthetically that the precursor to all this language is is that the disclosures have to be substantially similar to what you are reading here on the screen. The one exception is the fourth bullet point, which is we must use the exact language with regard to -- you will see the information in quotes -- that we have to provide the estimated average annual cost to the taxpayer and it has to be in this particular form, so we have to use these exact -- exact words that are in quotations, a tax of so much per one hundred thousand dollars of taxable assessed value and I will talk about that more in a moment or two. The length of time reflected in months or years in which the proposed levy will be assessed. In this instance we are discussing the possibility of a permanent levy increase. So, it will be on a permanent basis on a going forward basis, but also this language is also intended to cover temporary supplemental levies as well on a temporary basis. The disclosures that we just talked about they have to be provided on the ballot and they need to be right -- located right immediately above the box where the voter checks the box it says or whatever the technology provides for. Yes, I'm in favor of this levy or, no, I oppose this levy. So, the disclosures are placed immediately above where the voter casts his or her vote. The next piece is -- the next bullet point there in order for the levy measure to be binding the ballot question and official statement have to include the language or the disclosures I talked about. So, that's mandatory. There is some provisions later that say if you don't do it a court can invalidate the outcome of the election. So, we want to, obviously, play by Hoyle and follow the rules, as we would regardless. And, then, also within that same bullet point of discussion is that it limits what you can talk about. So, it talks -- that last -- the second sentence in that second bullet point talks about that the -- the question may not include other information about other levies or other matters for that matter that are not expressly described within the statute. So, put some -- some parameters around -- around what language can be used to bring the matter forward to the -- to the voter. Next bullet point is important really from this point going forward, but particularly, just to be cautious, but particularly if the Council does choose to put a measure on the upcoming ballot. This is an important rule that all of us collectively need to follow when we are talking about public resources and acting in your official capacity as a Council Member. But for the city in general any mass communication -- and that's broadly defined as you can see in the language here that goes to 20 or more voters, needs to include all that disclosure information we just discussed. So, that has to be included in any form of mass communication and, importantly, mass communication is defined as things like websites and social media. So, anything we do on the city's website, the city's social media accounts, anything of that nature all need to include disclosures that we just talked about a slide or two earlier. So, with that as background we have -- the city attorney's office, in cooperation with -- and consultation with the -- the Mayor's Office and other city departments have -- have, you know, put sort of pen to paper and provided a potential ballot question and also in the next slide we will talk about a potential official statement. So, these are not locked in -- not written in stone. There is some room for movement here. But in general we need to follow this basic template



and the information -- we can change a word or two or structure things differently, but we need to essentially follow this basic format, both for the question as well as for the official statement. So, the question is -- we have drafted it currently, but subject to change, so, obviously, this is still a work in progress and the Council may or may not decide to proceed, but as a form -- in form of a question to the voter -- shall the City Council of the City of Meridian be authorized and empowered to increase the city's budget and levy pursuant to that code section I talked about earlier by five million dollars and I will just I guess read the entire thing to be precise -- \$5,018,125.71, which is a very precise number and I will talk about that in a minute as well -- to provide funding for firefighters, police officers and a prosecution unit. So, that number of 5,018,000 and change is calculated by your outstanding finance team here at the city and they are available, you know, before we conclude tonight to tell you more about how that number was calculated, what it includes and how it -- how it was generated. Oftentimes you will see within -- you know, when you -- as a voter as you see items on the ballot you often see jurisdictions will round numbers to five million or 5.1 million. I think there was some desire upon the management team and leadership team here is to say this is not an arbitrary number, this is a real number attached to real proposals and it has -- it comes out to a precise number and so the idea was, you know, we are not just sort of pulling a number out of air, there is -- there is calculations behind this, there is really substance behind this and so that's the reason for the very precise number. It doesn't have to be that way and certainly we can round down or round to the nearest dollar, but right now that's sort of the impetus for -- or the reasoning for having that sort of precise number that's in front of you right here. The official statement, which will accompany -- would accompany the question on the ballot and it really includes -- that's the -- I will say the sole purpose, but primarily the sole purpose is to contain all those disclosures I referred to earlier and so this is in a sort of concise way in a paragraph covers all those disclosure items that I had referenced earlier. So, the levy would be used to do three things, retain 13 firefighter positions, following the exhaustion of grant funds, meaning the SAFER grant that you are all well familiar with. Number two to increase police officer wages to better recruit and retain officers. And, number three, to find a prosecution unit to prosecute crimes within our community. You are aware that currently we contract with Boise city for that service and have done so for some years. To the extent this goes forward and it's approved by the voters that would bring that function within the City of Meridian and provide some additional control and immediate direction, you know, from the city's leadership team under that -- for that purpose. The city will collect -- I won't read the whole number again -- five million dollars and a bit more from the levy and beyond any amount other -- otherwise allowed by law, meaning we collect the amount that's allowed by law today, including the three percent increase. Well, historically we have done three percent or less and you will make your decision later what you want to do for the upcoming fiscal year. But the -- in addition to whatever is allowed by law this would be in addition to that number and because the voters are going to consider this -- if you decide to proceed the voters are going to consider this in November and the city would have already adopted this budget for the upcoming fiscal year and the levy rate would have been established. The new levy would become effective on -- for the fiscal year beginning October 1, 2026, and, then, to answer that question how long -- continuing each fiscal year thereafter. In other words, would go

forward on a -- be a permanent levy and would go forward on a continual basis each fiscal year thereafter. That last sentence is the verbiage required by the state statute I talked about that is -- we need to use precisely, at least a portion that says a tax of, which is part of that sentence. So, the estimated average annual cost to the taxpayer will be a tax of \$20.11 per one hundred thousand dollars of taxable assessed value per year based on current conditions. So, that number, undoubtedly will be a little different if -- to the extent we proceed as a city and the voters approve, that number will -- you know, we don't know the numbers for the next fiscal year yet and so -- and particularly the fiscal year starting October 1, 2026. So, that number is the best information we have based upon the best -- it's the best number we have based upon the information we have today. That's how the law says it has to be calculated on the most current information. So, that's where that comes from. So, that's what that is about. In terms of timelines -- I'm kind of skipping to the end here in terms of the deadline to forward the proposed ballot measure to the county clerk for the Idaho election calendar that's published by the Idaho Secretary of State. Our deadline is -- or any jurisdiction, cities and otherwise, that intend to put a levy measure on the November 4, 2025, ballot, the deadline is October 29th. So, I guess I would like to sort of reinforce now and, then, on a going forward basis that is our deadline -- probably not the date we ought to strive for. I recommend we back that up a couple three weeks at a minimum just so we have a little bit of buffer. Sometimes things happen, we have to make a correction or, you know, something needs to happen. So, I would say, you know, that's -- that is the last possible date, but, really, for prudent planning I would back that number -- that date up at least two or three weeks, so that we have some -- some room for changes that -- you know, somebody catches something at the last minute we are not put in a bind. But that's your -- that's your drop dead date or deadline for communicating or transmitting the proposed measure to the county clerk that would be in charge of the election and the official notice that gets published to the -- to the community in our recognized newspaper, the Idaho Press. Last thing I have -- a slide for you this evening -- happy to answer questions after that -- is I just want to just -- I think you are all well familiar with this, but for election items in particular that they fall under in terms of advocacy or what the city can or can't do or as individual public officials can't or cannot do with pub -- with public resources, not on your own, but with public resources that all falls under the Public Integrity and Elections Act, which is found in Title 74 of Idaho Code and these two subsections here in particular were relevant and so without reading them in their totality, you know, basically they both say the same thing, but with a different emphasis. The first bullet point, which is subsection one, basically says we cannot use public funds to advocate for or against a ballot measure and the second bullet point, which is -- relates to subsection two, same concept, but that's talking about we cannot use public property or resources. So, not just money, but property resources, which includes things like social media or things like websites or staff time or anything of that nature. So, we -- cities -- we would not be allowed to advocate for or against a ballot measure using public funds or public resources as outlined there on your slide before you. So, that's what we have for you this evening. I will -- I mentioned earlier that, you know, in terms of the amount of -- the amount to be levied to provide for the three focus areas, public safety focus areas, those numbers were generated by your finance team that do top notch work. They are here to answer questions if you have -- if you want to dig

deeper into how those numbers were generated or what's behind those numbers my colleagues from finance are here to answer that. Of course Bill and I are here to answer any additional legal questions you might want this evening and in terms of a plan going forward I alluded to earlier the idea is information tonight, an opportunity for in-depth discussion in a week and, then, to the extent the City Council decides to continue with that process public hearings that would allow for you all to receive direct input from the citizens and voters of Meridian as to whether this is a good idea to bring forward or not or in what form or, you know, should it be reshaped or whatever input you may get from your constituents. With that I'm happy to answer any questions you may have and my colleagues are available as well.

Simison: Thank you, Kurt. Council, any questions?

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Thank you, Kurt. Appreciate the presentation and the overview and look forward to further discussions on this important topic. Have kind of a chicken and an egg question and it may be finance that has to answer it. Is the levy the five million and change, is that what we are talking about or is it the \$20.11 on assessed value. So, at some point the assessed value on my home is going to change. Does it change the 20 -- \$20.11 or does it change the five million and --

Starman: Thank you -- thank you, Mr. Mayor, Council Member Whitlock. So, the -- I will start at the ten thousand foot level and, then, Todd will correct me and get me on the right track again. But, really, the -- what -- the way that section of code reads is that we are in -- we are -- the levy essentially allows to increase our property tax revenue budget by a number, which is that five million dollar number. I'm just going to use that for ease of discussion tonight. I'm going to truncate it at five million just to -- for ease of discussion. So, the five -- to answer your question, the levy is at five million dollars. The actual levy rate in terms of what does that look like it -- does the .002 go to .002 -- 1-2-3-4-5? That's a calculation that takes place once the assessed valuation is known for that particular fiscal year and there is a -- a simple math calculation that divide -- you know, the levy in the form of dollars divided by your taxable assessed valuation generates a number and, then, the calculation is done. So, again, those -- we -- Todd and his team generated the number based upon the best information we have available. That's the \$20.11. That will be updated when better information becomes available. Todd correct me. What is it?

Lavoie: He was accurate in everything. So, the five million dollars is the driving factor. 20.11 is just a function of math.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: While we have Todd here, I did have a couple quick -- quick ones. Understanding things are moving around, we have got a budget coming up, all those processes, do we have an estimate on what our pro forma levy rate would be if this was approved?

Lavoie: If it were approved?

Strader: Yeah. Like our levy rate today is 0.0027. If this was approved and understanding it would be a forward looking estimate, but pro forma for an approval of the levy what would our new levy rate be?

Lavoie: Fair question. We did not do a calculation utilizing the potential 2026 budget data yet, because it hasn't been approved. So, I'm only working with 2025 current budget approved situation. So, that's going to be a problem in this mathematics. So, I did calculate if '26 did not occur from a budgetary standpoint you would end up with a .02033.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you. I would love to see -- you know, we have that chart that compares the City of Meridian with our sister cities around us. I would love to see that chart with where our levy is today and whatever assumptions you need to make, whether it's pro forma for a new budget or whether it's using our existing budget, if this levy were to pass what our resulting levy rate would be and put it in that chart. I would just like to see how -- how we would stack up. Does that change our ranking, you know, kind of relative to the others? That was one question and that could be a follow up. Mr. Mayor, I have one more.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: If you could provide a breakdown of the financial components of all three components that would be super. PD wages. SAFER grant. All three. Thank you.

Lavoie: No problem. So, the proposal that you have in front of you does include three components. The first one is the fire component. That -- do you want exact numbers or rough numbers?

Strader: Rough numbers would be okay.

Lavoie: 2.3 million would be allocated to the fire public service. The prosecution services 498,000. The police services 2.1 million. And that should come too close to five million.

Strader: Thank you.

Lavoie: You are welcome.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor and Kurt, probably because -- more toward the prosecution or Bill, how much of a full prosecution team does that almost half a million dollars fund? Because I thought it was going to cost us more annually than that. Or Todd. Whoever wants that.

Starman: I think I will defer to my colleague Mr. Lavoie.

Lavoie: Bill, from a numbers standpoint?

Nary: Sure.

Lavoie: I will just clarify from a numbers standpoint. The half a million you are correct that would not provide the funding for the full thing. What we would do is we would get funding offset from a current contract that would, then, in theory not be needed. So, the total then -- when you add those two numbers up that would get billed into a process. .3. Yep. We are there.

Little Roberts: Clarification?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: So, retaining the money that's going for the Boise contract, plus this, would equal a full -- cover the full cost?

Nary: Yes.

Lavoie: Correct.

Little Roberts: Thank you.

Lavoie: And the follow up it is 1.3, 1.4 million.

Little Roberts: Thank you.

Simison: Council, any additional questions at this time as you -- I know you will be thinking long and hard about it over the next week for your own conversation, but anything else that you would -- even would like them to look at and be -- come back to be part of the conversation next week and if not now you can obviously follow up with them.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I think that it would be helpful to just get some follow-up information from Bill about his -- if this were to occur kind of what his game plan would be generally in terms of hiring cadence. It sounded like misdemeanors might be a focus initially. I don't know if I misinterpreted that, but -- or would it be going -- just kind of -- you could come back to us, but I would like to see kind of -- just a game plan in terms of how you would staff this, what kind of timeline you would be looking at, how you would sort of resource your team on the prosecution piece specifically. Thank you.

Simison: Okay. With that we will say thank you for the initial information and we will take that and, you know -- I guess, you know, some of this is like -- like the disclosure statements, at what point in time do disclosures become practical if this is being streamed right now, but there is not an official levy, do we need to disclose that we might have a levy? Maybe it will get a little conversation just so we make sure we cross all boxes and don't be afoul of the law, so -- thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Just worth noting, yeah, we have obviously two of our team members that aren't here, but they are aware of this and I think they are planning to watch the recap, so they will be ready for the discussion next week and we will all be together, so we will have a good discussion then.

Starman: Thank you.

Strader: Thanks.

Simison: Thank you. And like I say, unfortunately, I will not be here, but I have no doubt in your full faith and ability to have a robust conversation with yourselves on this topic and I look forward to watching that presentation when I return, so -- with that we are at the end of our agenda. Do I have a motion?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I move that we adjourn the meeting.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to adjourn. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it, we are adjourned.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 5:07 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

_____ MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON	_____ DATE APPROVED
-------------------------------	------------------------

ATTEST:

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