

Meridian City Council Work Session

February 7, 2023.

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 4:32 p.m., Tuesday, February 7, 2023, by Mayor Robert Simison.

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

Also present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Caleb Hood, Miranda Carson, Scott Colaiani, and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

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

Simison: Council, we will call the meeting to order. For the record it is February 7, 2023, at 4:32 p.m. We will begin this afternoon's work session with roll call attendance.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: Next item up is the adoption of the agenda.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: A couple of things on our Consent Agenda and before I make a motion -- Item No. 21 on your agenda, it should have the correct name on there. Stantec Consulting Services and so that's what we are approving tonight in Item 21. And, then, Item No. 23 -- have been asked to vacate this item per our purchasing manager. So, we are taking that one off the Consent Agenda. So, Mr. Mayor, with those changes I move approval of the Consent Agenda -- I'm sorry. I would move adoption of the agenda as published and corrected.

Borton: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second. Is there discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the agenda is adopted as reflected by Council President Hoaglund's comments.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

- 1. ACHD Facility at 2023 Franklin Rd. Water Main Easement**
- 2. Bountiful Commons East Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 1**
- 3. Bountiful Commons East Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 2**
- 4. Foxcroft Subdivision Water Main Easement No. 1**
- 5. Foxcroft Subdivision Water Main Easement No. 2**
- 6. Foxcroft Subdivision Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement**
- 7. Ten Mile Storage Water Main Easement**
- 8. Grocery Outlet LDIR-2022-0068 Water Main Easement**
- 9. Inglewood Subdivision No. 2 Water Main Easement**
- 10. The Oaks North Subdivision No. 12 Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 1**
- 11. The Oaks Subdivision No. 12 Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 2**
- 12. The Oaks Subdivision No. 12 Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 3**
- 13. Outer Banks Subdivision Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement**
- 14. Outer Banks Subdivision Pedestrian Pathway Easement**
- 15. Pine 43, Fairview Commercial Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement**
- 16. Settler's Crossing Partial Release of Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement**
- 17. Victory Commons Full Release of Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement**
- 18. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Modern Craftsman at Black Cat (H-2022- 0083) by Brandon Sheltrown, HB Architects, located at 4701 W. Caragana Ln.**

- 19. Approval of Task Order 10022.a and Purchase Order No. 23-0198 to Brown & Caldwell, Inc. for the Wastewater Resource Recovery Facility (WRRF) Facility Plan Update project for the Not-To-Exceed amount of \$490,923.00**
- 20. Approval of Task Order 11367 and Purchase Order No. 23-0202 to Keller Associates, Inc. for the Water Master Plan Update 2023 project for the Not-To-Exceed amount of \$348,750**
- 21. Approval of Task Order 11281.d and Purchase Order No. 23-0199 to Stantec Consulting Services for the Wastewater Resource Recovery Facility (WRRF) Tertiary Filter VE & Revised Preliminary Design project for the Not-To-Exceed amount of \$268,809**
- 22. Professional Services Agreement between Eventageous Idaho, LLC and the City of Meridian for 2023 Meridian Main Street Market Event Coordination Services**
- 24. Agreement Between the Between the City of Meridian and the State of Idaho for Use of Ada County Juvenile Services Juveniles for Community Service by Governmental Agencies**
- 25. Resolution 23-2370: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Meridian, Adopting the City of Meridian Parks and Recreation Master Plan; Authorizing the Parks and Recreation Staff to Implement the Master Plan; and Providing an Effective Date**
- 26. Resolution No. 23-2371: A Resolution of the Mayor and the City Council of the City of Meridian, Reappointing Patrick Grace to Seat 6 of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission; and Providing an Effective Date**
- 27. City of Meridian December 2022 Financial Report**

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: For the Consent Agenda, I move approval of the Consent Agenda, for the Mayor to sign and Clerk to attest the amended Consent Agenda.

Borton: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second. 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: ALL AYES.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

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

DEPARTMENT / COMMISSION REPORTS [Action Item]

28. Community Development: Ada County Highway District Integrated Five-Year Work Plan Priorities

Simison: So, we will go into Item 28, which is Community Development-Ada County Highway District integrated five year work plan priorities. And where -- oh, there she is. I will turn this over to Miranda.

Carson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Usually when I'm in a seat I'm saying Members of the Commission or Commissioners. So, I apologize in advance if muscle memory takes over. So, I sent out the prioritization draft with the change that was requested at the previous meeting to move Black Cat up to project number 20. I would also like to draw your attention to the description of that project. It has been expanded on -- I updated that description. It previously said install railroad crossing and I just made it more clear that we are looking for a gated railroad crossing and an enhanced pedestrian crossing at Aviator, which is the street for the Compass Charter School. Also included in your packet is the crash data from police on accidents -- pedestrian, bike, vehicle accidents within 2018 to 2022. I did not make any changes to the prioritization of the projects based on that information, but that information is shared for your reference as you decide what projects to move up and down. And at this point I can stand for any comments or suggestions on projects that need to be moved.

Simison: Council, questions, comments for the feedback?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you, Miranda. I really appreciate your work on it and the police department's work on it. I guess -- so, for a couple of these I see that you guys did some research and, then, kind of connected -- for example, okay, we have had four crashes at Walmart. In the five year work plan there is a request to do a bike way. It's number 50. The ones where there is no work plan request, was it that we did not identify any enhancements that we thought would have helped those incidents or is it that we are just not reflecting any requests at this time?

Carson: So, at this time there are no integrated five year work plan requests. As far as identifying improvements that need to be made, that would be a much larger effort than

we had the time for in the week that we had between getting this data -- this preliminary data and making any suggestions.

Strader: Okay. I will just rant, if you don't mind.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you. No. That makes sense and I understand that there isn't a large time frame -- hasn't been a large time frame to do that work. I guess my request would be that going forward -- and I think, you know, with other work that's going on we can integrate this in, but, you know, when we have kind of connected, okay, you know -- you know, if we have a frequency of crash data at one location, then, I think -- especially if it's had a count of three or more, I would think it would be appropriate to hopefully find time -- even if it's after we have to submit this to ACHD, to work with police to read the reports and see, you know, is there a project that we can identify that we think would have helped with the pedestrian safety in this location. So, I guess I'm just requesting kind of some follow up so that this good work doesn't sort of fall through the -- fall through the cracks and even I think it could be something good to share, if we haven't already, with the Transportation Commission as they do this work every year. So, those are just a few thoughts that I wanted to get your thoughts on how we could use this data.

Simison: Council Woman Strader, I was going to suggest that this be part of the work group that is being done with the school and -- you know. Because if you look at it, it was one of the areas where we had the most crash data. It is an area where there is like several intersections right there, Main, Cherry and Meridian. So, they would be evaluating that area, but what the crash data also doesn't say is what happens. You know, well, was -- was this someone coming out of I'm -- I'm going to guess the Main-Cherry there is one or two of those people coming out of the parking lot and someone walking across where the cars are entering in that area. I don't know for a fact, but I'm going to guess that that's what you are going to see. It's not necessarily a -- someone trying to cross and an issue of crossing even necessarily, from that standpoint. But they can look at that, they can -- they can pull the reports just like you suggest as they are looking at each of these areas to see what was -- you know, what occurred in that area, because it is right now just a dot on a map as we know.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you. Yeah. I think that's a great suggestion if we could do that going forward and, hopefully, we can, you know, fold this into that work. I would be really excited for us to do that and try to leverage the data. So, I appreciate you saying that. Thanks.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I have a couple questions for Miranda and, then, I would like to make three suggestions to move some of these within the top 25 and however you want to go through those. I will leave that up to you. First question I have is number 19, Miranda had stated that there is not currently a project on this list to widen Amity from Meridian Road to Locust Grove, but when there does become one, the city would like to make sure that there is pedestrian and bike facilities included. Am I appropriately stating that?

Carson: Yes.

Perreault: So, I would propose that that not be -- if they don't currently have a project on this list, that we not put it in -- in an area where we will get -- where they are giving points for this year.

Simison: Discussion?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I don't have a question, but a comment directed towards Miranda and I think particularly number 19 specifically, I think the reason that we want it on the list is to keep it on the radar of the -- of the highway district. So, it's not about necessarily funding for this year, it is about keeping it on their radar for funding and part of their integrated five year work plan for years to come. I think a good example is improvements that we are seeing at Locust Grove and Victory right now, we were in a similar spot two years ago. We moved it up to get it to the place that the highway district paid attention to it and, then, they, then, move it into their five year work plan and construction has commenced. So, I hear where you are coming from on this and I really appreciate the philosophy. It's a little bit of -- this is kind of the rules of engagement when it comes to the highway district and so I -- particularly for 19 I would be reluctant for us to move that down this year. Certainly next year if it makes it under their five year work plan we could maybe move the numbers then, but I would like to see 19 kind of stay where it is personally.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. I appreciate Councilman Cavener's points on that. I -- I -- I think there are other priorities that are possibly more likely to get funding sooner, so maybe I'm just not understanding how -- how they are going to, you know, give points to these. And in that -- in that same line of thinking Miranda had stated last time that they will weigh some of the priorities from the school district in addition to what the city has prioritized. So, I would propose that we move number 11 through 13 up to above eight

or nine. I understand that eight and nine are already in the CIP and that they possibly won't be moved, but they have not been designed yet. So, I don't know if -- I realize that the green ones are already in -- you know, in -- in ACHD's priority list, but they haven't been designed yet for another couple of years and I personally believe that 11 through 13 are a higher priority for us. That's just something I want to propose.

Simison: Comments?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I guess I -- I would like to hear some feedback on if -- you know, if it's in the programming design phase how does -- how do we impact that or do we impact that at all by kind of reprioritizing? Anything that's already in design I don't really want to move off if it's going to set something back, just because we know it takes so long to get funding and design for any of these projects, but -- I mean one thing I could see us doing would be maybe, you know -- not to like pit them up against each other, but an example might be Ten Mile and Cherry. That's not in design. I think a better conversation might be how does 11 compare to, you know, 13 and 14 or -- or something like that. But I just -- I'm a little hesitant to try to move something out of the top ten if it's already in design and getting funding, just because it takes so long to design and that's just some feedback.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. I appreciate that. Just for clarification, Miranda, if -- if it's not in -- none of the one -- none of the projects in seven, eight or nine are in design yet. They don't start until 2025. So, what does that mean? They haven't committed any funds yet or like -- I'm under the assumption that it's still movable if it's not -- if it's not in design until 2025.

Carson: Mr. Mayor, Council Member, that is a decision that ACHD makes when they set their budget. So, at the integrated five year work plan that they approved when they sent us this list, that was already programmed. How they decide to move things out of programming and move other projects in I'm -- I'm sorry, I don't have any answer for that.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: If I understand this correctly, we should be taking their programming into consideration, but this is really about Meridian's priority list and this is what we are

communicating to the public is our priority and I feel like that's a little bit more important than us trying to guess what ACHD is going to do -- ACHD is going to do with -- with their five year integrated work program. So, that's kind of -- that's where I'm coming from with it.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Yes. It is our priority list and that's why I would kind of like to keep them there, even though they don't have any dates by him yet. It goes back to Councilman Cavener's point about you get them there -- these are our priorities and this is what we want to see and now they have to work on that and decide, okay, how can they make that happen to our wishes and that's -- that's why they ask for this input. So, to change that and just do it for things that are funding I think is less -- it takes away the critical list that we see as a council and community for the top projects that we want to have funded.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, just some added context to --

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I think what Miranda is saying is that oftentimes -- like let's take, for instance, number nine, Victory, Meridian Road to Locust Grove. It says in there that it's designed at 2020 -- at 2025. Because of our placement it very well could come back next year based on decisions of the highway district and maybe it's going to be designed in 2024. Based on our priority list the highway district oftentimes will move the program years around based on our priority. So, by -- by leaving some of these things where we -- they are, even if they are showing as so far out into the future, because we have placed a higher priority on them in the past the highway district has accelerated their calendar to meet some of our needs. So, again, I kind of tend to agree with Council Member Hoaglund on kind of leaving the list as is.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Okay. So, I just want to make sure I'm understanding that McMillan is not a higher priority than the widening Locust Grove between Amity and Victory, Victory between Meridian and Locust Grove, which is not a very busy area. I just -- I guess I'm trying to understand -- like is there agreement from a transportation standpoint that -- and depending on what we are looking at. Are we looking at safety? Are we looking at traffic count? Are we looking at -- what is the -- what is the priority that we are -- that we are discussing? If we are discussing traffic count, my guess is that 11 through 13 have a higher count than the other. But I'm not a traffic specialist. So, if we are discussing safety, McMillan has a major safety problem. So, I guess -- I mean I don't know, I'm

looking at the map here and if it looks at those -- if I look at those in relationship to schools, you know, all of -- all of them are somewhat close to schools, but I guess -- I guess I just want to understand -- and forgive me if I'm speaking out of ignorance with this, but I just want to understand what is it about seven, eight and nine that are taking priority over what -- what is the -- what's the purpose from Meridian's standpoint? Is this -- is this trans -- is it because the transportation committee recommended it? Is it -- like is there something else that I'm not seeing that I should know about it?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Council Woman Perreault, I think the context that may be missing -- and as someone who is a huge advocate for McMillan, this is going to sound surprising coming from me, but the whole thought process I think in the last few years was to do the whole corridor of Locust Grove at -- in -- in a relatively compressed time frame. The transportation commission's feedback has always been if we just do parts of a whole corridor we are not going to move the needle on the traffic issues. If we treat the corridor at once, which you can see in the prioritization that Locust Grove is in almost all of these projects, that was the reasoning that I recall last year and the year before behind that was to try to do that whole corridor at once. I think McMillan is a huge priority, I just don't want to upset the applecart on a series of like ten projects that they seem to have in the queue. I would be more of a fan of -- you know, if there are a couple of these, like Ten Mile and Cherry, or Eagle and Overland we could have a discussion about, you know, McMillan versus those I think is a better discussion. But I -- I don't want to upset the whole -- the whole Locust Grove corridor just because -- unless the thinking of everyone has changed, but that definitely was the feedback that I remember all of us coalescing around.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. I appreciate that. I -- just leave that one for now. I -- I'm just one person. I'm not in agreement that Locust Grove is as high of a priority, but, like you said, it's too complicated to move on the list. So, this -- I had the same question about 21 through 23. I appreciate the parks looking forward to that section, but we don't have -- we don't have funding in place to my knowledge for Cherry Park yet and so I -- having those in the top 25 -- I think there is other possible projects that might be better placed.

Simison: Just on the park, I mean it is -- it is planned in the CIP, but it's also been planned for 20 years, you know, as the next park, but I think that with the timing of the sewer it is more viewed as likely in this time frame, so -- but just so you know, it is the next major thing on Park's radar to accomplish.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Council Member Perreault, do you have a recommendation as to what you would want to move up over 21, 22 and 23?

Perreault: Quick question before I answer that for Miranda.

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. Sorry, Mr. Mayor. Numbers 24 through 29 where they say defer, that's ACHD's deferment that -- in other words, they are saying this is operating appropriately and we don't need that in -- we are not prioritizing that at all or we are -- we would prioritize this less than -- is that their way of saying we will put this at the bottom?

Carson: Wouldn't speak for them -- Mr. Mayor, Council Members. I wouldn't speak for them to say it's at the bottom, but I will say deferring the improvement is -- it's not in their integrated five year work plan right now. It's being deferred until the level of service, which is the performance rating that they use is -- until it's not operating where it needs to be and right now as -- from when they wrote these notes -- traffic counts it was operating where it needed to be. I hope that answers your question.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: It does. Thank you. And the reason I asked that is because of number 28 and 29. I would think that we -- I would like to see those moved up, because the school is there and because they -- it's -- it's already in the -- in the CIP. So, I'm not sure I guess why -- why that's ranked lower than many of the other projects that are also in the CIP that -- that are higher priority for ACHD. Does that make sense?

Hood: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Hood,

Hood: Maybe hopefully add a little bit of value and maybe a recommendation. I think this is a good maybe sub topic for your joint meeting with ACHD in a couple of weeks, too. Council Woman Perreault, you even brought up, you know, different people look at things with different importance. What you see here and why ACHD is deferring these projects is the level of service primarily, not safety, not cost, just that it's functioning okay from whatever lens they are looking at that through. So, I think that's something, if Council wants to, you could have a better understanding from ACHD of all the things that go into their considerations when they scope a project and they go we are deferring this for now. It's not as simple as just level of service, by the way, but I think having an understanding that they do look at safety and they do look at cost, they do look at right of way impacts, they look at all those things and go right now this isn't the time, there are other things that score higher on the priority list. Just to better understand how they

factor in things. We don't have to do it that way; right? This list is a little more -- can be, if you choose it to be, a little more political. This can be, hey, we are factoring in things that aren't as black and white as cost or right of way impacts or whatever those things are. So, we could potentially reach out to ACHD and do a little bit of -- if -- if that's what Council wants to do, spend a few minutes at the joint meeting upcoming to get a little bit better understanding and, then, maybe even advocate for -- I know it's been a hot topic recently -- pedestrian safety and so we think that should be moved up on your hierarchy of things to consider when you scope a project and decide if it should be deferred or not. Traffic may be moving fine, but there is a bunch of crashes with pedestrians, isn't that more important than traffic moving fine? So, anyways, just -- some of your questions are very complex. There is -- there is a lot that goes into this, both at the city standpoint and from a technical review side that our transportation commission does. We can give you that information -- you asked a question earlier. We can give you the information that goes into how this list came about and the level of service they are looking at and the crash data and those types of things and you have already talked about some of that. From my perspective historically again some of this is -- is you looking at a higher level -- not getting into the weeds so much with the engineers and -- and that, but really just saying, hey, I know of this school and I know parents that have called me or e-mailed me and said this is a concern. I want to move this up. You know, it's not based on data necessarily, so -- but -- but ACHD is -- they have got to -- they have got to play, you know, fairly with all of the cities in some of their analysis. So, they do have a pretty rigid scorecard when they look at these things -- okay, there is capacity on that roadway. We aren't rebuilding it. Don't care about crashes as much. There is capacity. I'm oversimplifying that, but -- anyway, just -- just, again, saying we could potentially work with ACHD if there is room on that agenda, Mayor, and maybe get a ten or 15 minute thing on just their -- their programming and everything that goes in and, then, how we can do a better job of providing some of that insight into the highway district that really does -- I can't remember if it was Councilman Hoaglund or a couple of them. No, this is our -- is our priority list sort of absent all the ACHD stuff that they have to look at to do it; right? This is Meridian's priorities based on what we know and understand. How can we help that at ACHD.

Simison: Caleb, I like your suggestion even just how they have to view it and score it. So, Council and Commission would have that for next year. I do think there is room personally, but --

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I agree a hundred percent. Caleb, I think it's a great suggestion and part of the value of this process -- your comment about keeping it at a high level is an important one. This -- this priority ranking has some slow inertia to it year over year as we look at it and things purposely don't move wildly up and down. I also appreciate the process. I think process is key as to how it's created and maintained for the work of the Transportation Commission and our staff. The granular detail you have talked about for

me weighs very heavily in support of the recommendations presented. Also the reality that, you know, the things above 20 are somewhat academic, whether it's 30 versus 35 or 28, all of that for me goes into supporting the recommendation to the commission. The dialogue you have described would be extremely valuable to help understand how this moves and doesn't move year over year.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Thank you, Caleb. None of these get on this list without any discussion. I would hate to see us move anything that's already on the programmed list or something that we think is important right now. That's why they got on the list to begin with years ago. I would not be in favor of taking anything off the program list as it sits. But, again, I think we need a bigger explanation down the road on exactly how they get to be there, along with -- all of us can make it more clear. It's a good process with a lot of moving parts.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you, Councilman Overton. I -- you know, this is -- this is a list that is reflecting the city's priorities and if I'm a resident I'm asking the same -- I'm -- I'm not playing devil's advocate. I'm truly asking questions that I want to know the answer to, but also if -- if I'm trying to understand all the moving parts and all the things as we are making this decision, then, members of the public are going to ask the same question. So, I think it's good for us to have -- to have -- you know, as we have had this discussion last -- at the January meeting and now, I wouldn't have any idea why Meridian has these in the order that they have them if I'm a resident and so, you know, I think that's -- it's really good for us to discuss this on the dais and -- and for there to be clarity for us as a team to all be on the same page about how the decisions are made and, then, not sort of give the response of -- I understand that there is a process. I understand it's a multi-year process. And I understand not moving things to -- to not taking place markers out that we have been working on for a long time, but I also want to make sure that we are appropriately reflecting our priorities and that's not just left in the place that it's left in, because we think it will get -- how do I say this? We kind of go, you know, yeah, that needs to be done, too. Yes, these are -- this is all -- this is -- this is tough; right? And there is -- all of these have merit. I just want clarity for our public as to why we are choosing one or the other and to only have 20, maybe 25 to get to prioritize, that's tough.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: We have seen -- Caleb, we have seen -- or, Miranda, we have -- we have seen in prior years the ACHD -- right? This is a piece of their bigger puzzle and their bigger puzzle shows the objective matrix; right? The cost and the level of service and the -- trying to compile projects together and that -- that list of factors were one little piece of it. It's something that even if it's a prior one that you can send around to us again that at least shows us the measurements that they are looking at.

Carson: Mr. Mayor, Council Members, that is something I can send out. I will say as far as timeline, that this list is required back to ACHD by February 15th. They did update their methodology from the prior methodology. So, I can definitely send out the presentation of what their new methodology for scoring is when they scope these projects. Those projects, then, receive a score and, then, that score is one piece of the programming. So, then, the programming looks at grouping projects and doing things based on funds. But I can send you the information I have on their scoring for the scope and, then, we can ask them, as Caleb said, to speak on their actual programming process.

Hood: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Hood.

Hood: If I can take that just a step further. And, then, if we want to, after the joint meeting, after we get you their current scoring -- hear from them at the joint meeting and, then, if Council wants to say, well, we -- now we understand better how ACHD does their process. Transportation Commission next year when you do this will you, please, make this -- you know, ACHD does what they do with their points, but we value safety. Don't look at level of service as much, put more weight or value in -- when you send us your -- our list this is the hierarchy of things to consider for us. We could do that; right? I mean, again, ACHD is still going to have their spreadsheet with all the other things, but if we say, you know, number one concern is stop controlled intersection in our elementary schools, we want to see those signalized, the expectation is those are the top few -- we can do that; right? Now, ACHD factors that into their big -- to Councilman Borton's point, you know, it scores about this much. Our -- you know -- yeah, 15 percent of the overall score of a project, which doesn't easily move the needle too terribly much on stuff. You still got to have the technical merits to warrant them investing millions of dollars. But if we want to say this is more important and you aren't giving them enough points in our priorities -- to the public's question, how can this one be a higher priority than that one? We could at least explain it. Hey, this -- there is crashes here in our elementary schools and we don't like that idea.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I feel like there is a good opportunity in the community programs list as well; right? Because that's kind of a different -- they are aligned, but it's a little bit of a

different bucket and I would say it does make sense to look at -- you know, is there -- for example, are there -- is it appropriate to have a change in those priorities, you know, related to Owyhee High School as just one example or -- there are a couple of others that, you know, we could certainly discuss. I guess my -- my question for Council Woman Perreault would be, you know, are there any particular projects or any feedback that was specific to a school site that you think would be better reflected on the community programs list prioritization, as opposed to the wider corridor; right? Like if we widen the road we are going to do the pedestrian facilities, it's all going to be wrapped in together, so it's going to get done. But if it's in the top -- I assume it's similar that if it's in the top ranking of community programs that it's programmed, it's designed, is going to get funded. So, that might be another -- if you have a particular concern that might be another way to tackle it.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you, Council Woman Strader. Not other than the concern that we have -- have discussed with Compass at Black Cat and then -- and, then, clearly McMillan and -- and, you know, some of the sidewalks for McMillan are in the community programs, but it -- I agree that there doesn't necessarily seem to be a prioritization link between the two lists, so --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. And so I think like that -- that's a good example where maybe we -- we want to diverge a little bit, because of the logistical challenges with the canal seems to make it very difficult for ACHD to prioritize widening McMillan and that's just a physical reality. I'm assuming that is a cost component for them and so they have continuously said to us that's not happening until like the 2030s. So, maybe that's where there is an opportunity and we should take a look at the community programs and McMillan -- that touch McMillan and where they are listed here and see if moving them in priority makes more sense. If we think that those -- if we -- if we unfortunately think McMillan is not going to be widened for a long time because of the reality of the canal, if we just face that fact, we could keep it, it is still a priority. We think they should do it, but maybe those -- some of those community programs get accelerated up a little bit. So, that's maybe one thing to look at and, then, I guess the other -- the other piece would be, you know, with Owyhee High School I think that it just seems like a reality that that should be better prioritized within community programs, but I guess a question I have is unless there are specific changes identified now, does it make sense to have our joint meeting and, then, we can give them feedback where you want to tweak it or do we just have to submit it by the deadline. It is what it is. Live with it.

Carson: Mr. Mayor? So, to answer that question we -- we need to commit the list to be submitted to ACHD by February 15th to be scored in the scoping process. But there is an opportunity after they program the request to comment on the integrated five year work plan draft. So, then, if there is any drastic changes that the city saw needed at that point I would see that as Council's opportunity to comment on the integrated five year work plan draft before it's adopted by the commission.

Hood: Mr. Mayor, can I put maybe another finer point or an opportunity there as well. I think we could follow up as staff and -- in the meantime, because Miranda is right, the 15th is a pretty hard deadline. We don't want to miss that. We want whatever we send -- unless we are just not comfortable sending this. We can't wait longer. But we can in the coming weeks after that follow up with their staff and say, hey, you know what, since we sent you that list we are really hoping this project maybe is even higher. You know, if we get some of that feedback from Council after the joint meeting, we can supplement some of that. The initial draft, Miranda is right, we will bring that back to you and say, hey, this is where these -- this is how it's kind of shaking out. Do we want to -- but I will be honest, that is pretty late in the game, too, and they usually don't make drastic changes. So, if we are looking at -- we are going to have these focus areas, for lack of a better term right now, Owyhee High School and we are going to look at McMillan maybe a little differently than when we do the rest of the corridor -- even our community programs listed as a whole, we can follow up with their staff kind of, you know, off the record, if you will, or after the fact and just say, hey, as you are doing this maybe -- maybe -- maybe flip flop these a little bit or -- or, you know, something to that effect. So, I will just offer that as well, that if something comes up in the next couple of months we can -- we can supplement whatever list we send this week to them with some of those -- that follow up.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Understanding that we have got our deadline that we have to submit this, there is nothing -- we don't have to wait until next year to do this again. We can start next week working on what this list is going to look like next year and start reevaluating our priorities now for how we want this list to look the next time we submit it and when we have the new meetings we are going to have on intersection related safety and how we are going to do that, as well as our joint meetings coming up, I think there is a perfect opportunity for us to start now looking at what we are going to do next year. When we see this -- this not going to be changed other than what we just listed. We can take that opportunity with Miranda and start immediately putting that together. I think we can probably configure and attack this next year, instead of being in a position right now where we are trying to decide what we want to do.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I do think there will be impacts, like Owyhee High School is having -- if you go two years before that high school was approved and look at the list it was probably a little different than what you see now and we have had -- had growth. When Highway 16 opens that's going to change the dynamics quite a bit and we know our traffic is impacted by a lot of people who don't live in Meridian coming through Meridian going to their destinations. When Linder Road overpass opens down the road here a ways, that will have an impact that will influence this list. So, it's always going to morph I guess is the word I can use is it's going to be morphing as other things come into play and factor in. So, I just -- we will give it our best shot and hit those areas that we think need to be done and maybe we will have a couple of things that move up and down a little more quickly than -- than they typically do, but definitely know what these priorities, which have been put into place over time and input by a lot of people, and we just have to keep that ball moving forward and know how the rules work, so we can be in the ballgame on that.

Simison: Thank you. You know, my hope and I'm crossing my fingers and toes, but I'm thinking that our number one project is actually going to be what gets funded and put on the program. You know, it's currently not in the program. So, if our number one project gets in, pretty much nothing else is moving. You know, we may see something else a little bit, but that's an expensive project that's a challenge for ACHD to program that. So, if we are lucky our number one moves forward. Everything else it's good to have, but it's likely not going to see a lot of movement or a lot of change unless they are just trying to -- they have something that's so cost effective that it's the balance that it might get programmed otherwise, but that's what I'm hopeful outcome of this process we will see what they put into the five year work plan.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Is this list something to move and adopt today or is it a resolution next week?

Carson: Mr. Mayor -- sorry. It looks like Mr. Nary had something to say. I don't have a resolution to adopt. They do ask -- ACHD does ask that elected officials vote. So, I do ask for a movement to adopt this list and, then, we will submit a letter with the Mayor's signature as a cover letter that just kind of explains our priorities here and submit that to ACHD next week.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, I was going to say the same thing. They don't require a resolution, so I think just a voice vote.

Simison: So, with that do I have direction the Council would like to officially take?

Hoaglund: Yes, Mr. Mayor, I was going to ask is if -- do we want to do that tonight or did you want to wait -- I -- my preference is just to take care of it now. I think we have

hashed this out for this year of what we want, so we can move it forward and let staff get the letter prepared and signed and off to ACHD, so --

Simison: That would be my preference personally.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Then I would move that we adopt the 2023 ACHD roadway priorities and community program priorities as presented from the Planning -- excuse me -- from the Planning Department.

Overton: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second. Is there discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? They ayes have it and we will transmit this draft priorities to ACHD and we will get more information, have the workgroup that will help evaluate and also, Mr. Hood, Miranda, Councilman Borton had a good idea. As we move into this next year it might be good to bring the chair of the Transportation Commission or the subcommittee -- the chair who, you know, works on this next time it comes before Council, to help answer some of these questions, so they have that view. I know you do it, but sometimes it's also good to have them say it directly.

Carson: Okay.

29. Human Resources: Update to City Standard Operating Policy and Procedure 4.1 Holidays

Simison: All right. Thank you. With that we will move on to Item 29, which will be an update to the standard operating -- operating policy Procedure 4.1 holidays that Mr. Nary is going to present to the Council.

Nary: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. So, what I have before you is a change to the holiday policy and how it's been applied. So -- a little backstory. So, we have had the same holiday policy in place for a long time. I probably wrote it. I don't even remember it was that long ago. So, we had a fairly static policy of these are the holidays we have, these the holidays we recognize, these days off we have. A few times a year we have a glitch there. We have a Friday holiday. We have a midweek holiday for our Veterans Day. So, we have varying work schedules by varying workgroups for operational reasons. So, we have four tens, we have nine eights, we have shift work, we have a variety of different ones. So, most people have programmed their lives to deal with Monday holidays. That has never really been problematic to anybody and many of our work schedules that are varied incorporate into that and deal with that. Some people don't get those holidays off anyway. They don't get those days. The CLA deals with those separately for the Fire Department. The people that have to

work on the holiday because we have to have people in the police cars and we have to have people on call. We have to have people available on certain days after work and they get paid for it. So, that's how we have handled it. Back in 2011 our controller at the time Rita Cunningham crafted an e-mail that I am a hundred percent certain she consulted with me on it and I don't remember. It was 12 years ago. So, what that allowed is because we had a few limited people that worked in positions that weren't critical to working on the holiday day itself would -- wanted to shift their holiday. So, they weren't in emergency services, they weren't in a fire, they weren't in on call, they weren't treatment plant workers. They were folks that just have their work schedule where Friday was their normal holiday -- or their normal off day. So, they asked, in those limited circumstances, if the director could allow them to basically take their holiday on Thursday instead of Friday and, then, they are off on Friday. Financially this is how we handled it from the city's end. They worked ten hours on Monday, ten hours on Tuesday, ten hours on Wednesday, they get a holiday and they -- that's it. They get paid for 30 hours of work and ten hours a holiday. So, that's been going on for 12 years in some departments. We discovered that and we had a conversation with the departments to figure out why are we doing this -- and they had been referring to this as the Rita rule and I don't know if -- if Council Member Overton remembers this reference, but that's the Rita rule that they have been applying in some departments for the last 12 years to allow that. Here is the benefit to the city. If we don't do that, one, it -- two things. It makes people feel good. It makes them feel like they got a holiday. That their day off wasn't just their day off anyway, so everybody else got the day off, too. So, that was one -- one reason I think the question came up. Secondly, if we didn't do that, then, this is the way that would get paid, ten hours for Monday, ten hours for Tuesday, ten hours for Wednesday, they don't take -- they don't take ten hours on Thursday, so they work Thursday. They get paid ten extra hours on Friday, because they get paid for their holiday anyway. So, you get 50 hours of pay that week. All of it straight time. There is no overtime for that. But you get paid actually more. No one, to our knowledge, has gamed the system to do that. Most people either want the holiday or they don't care and so it hasn't been an issue. It is occasionally people that -- and it only normally is going to apply primarily to nonexempt employees. So, hourly employees. With the -- with the people that are already exempt it really doesn't make a lot of difference. They get paid the same no matter whether they had the day off or they don't have the day off. It doesn't really make any difference. So, anyway, we had a conversation and, basically, as we looked at the policy and the procedure, the discussion amongst the directors was they felt it was more appropriate to allow the departments to have that level of flexibility for those minimal amount of employees that this impacts, will allow them to have the holiday on a different day that same week. It has to be within the work week. It can't be flexed up to another day. It has to be within that work week. But managing it based on operational need is what they did. And one of the things that we put in there -- and we actually got a little bit of question back was on the procedure page under -- under Roman numeral two, it says department director approval and it's probably one of the few places in there that we didn't include designee and we didn't do that for a specific reason. What we didn't want is this supervisor says okay, that supervisor says no, that one says yes, you have -- or however many shifts the police department has and they say you can't, you can't, you can't, and, then, that's

just completely disjointed and nobody wanted to do that. Finance didn't want to do it. Tracking in a time card. Nobody wanted to do it that way. So, it's like, okay, the department director has to say, yes, they can for a discretionary reason like, again -- and, again, primarily this affects people that are in nonemergency positions. So, you don't get -- you know, again, police officers to get paid on holidays. Firefighters get paid on holidays. They just get paid. It's just part of the job. They get it. I don't recall we have ever had pushback from people in those positions saying I should get my holiday. They got paid for it. They had to work. That's the job they have. So, that's never been an issue. So, that's what we are proposing to you. As you know here -- you know, this was one of the procedures that when we went through this rewrite a year -- was it a year or two? A year. Yeah. A year ago that this was one that the Council asked specifically, hey, if we want to change it come back and ask. So, that's why we are here. We would like to change it and I will stand for any questions.

Simison: And if I could add, it was written in a way to allow this -- when we did the rewrite it got written in a way not to allow it and, you know, my direction to the -- you know, I'm -- I think policy is a good thing and like, no, we either need to get the policy changed or we are not going to have the practice, so --

Nary: And to follow that up, Mr. Mayor, part of the reason we are here now is we have a holiday this month. So, finance asked if -- if we are going to do this can we get this done in front of the holiday, so we don't run into this -- again with this -- people now having previously been allowed to do it, now not allowed to do it and, then, causing that sort of heartburn for a few people, so -- any other questions?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. Just one quick question under holiday and leave status 6-B. I just want to understand the thinking behind not providing holiday pay if there is an unpaid leave day before or after the holiday.

Nary: Oh. Great question, Council Member Perreault. So, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, that was one -- I do specifically recall that and it was to, again, not incentivize those weekends. If you wanted to take vacation you can take vacation. But what they didn't want is people building on that. We have had -- we have had situations over the years where employees have tried to take advantage of those situations, call in sick before holidays, you know, take a vacation so that you have a longer time period with a free one in the middle of it. So, that was the whole intent was just to make sure people understood that a holiday was a holiday. It's just a day and you get it. And, really, the conversation primarily over the years has been is a holiday of benefit or is a holiday a way to make sure your check remains whole? And I don't know that we have answered the question very well either way. I mean it does feel like a benefit, but, again, you don't get paid for it. I mean if you were to leave and you didn't take your holiday, you don't get paid for it. So, it isn't a benefit in that sense. Like -- like -- like leave time is.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: So, if there truly was a situation where an employee took unpaid leave for a legitimate reason, but they would have been able to return to work on the holiday, but the City Hall is closed let's say for example, does that person just lose another day of pay?

Nary: No. They would get paid for the holiday. They would get paid anyway for the holidays, because we -- we do have to pay them for that. It was, again, trying to avoid a system where people were trying to take advantage of the time off they were having.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I wanted to ask a question. Many workplaces now have a concept of a floating holiday and I think there is a lot of merit to that. Is there anything that would prohibit an employee from -- for just asking for department director approval as an accommodation to substitute holidays? For example, we have an employee that doesn't celebrate one of these holidays and has another holiday that they don't normally get off where they would be able to ask their director for approval to take a different day off instead?

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, Council Member Strader, that's a great question. That's never come up that I'm aware of. I think that's a great thing we should explore, because we are trying to be a much more inclusive workplace and you are right, not everybody celebrates these exact holidays. You know, we did delete, prior to my coming, the Columbus Day holiday, which is not frowned upon anyway. But also we used that to allow for a holiday for the day after Thanksgiving. But you are right. Yeah. We had never talked about that. Floating holidays can sometimes be difficult to manage from a management standpoint. We have done it very rarely. We did it the year -- we recognized Juneteenth, because it was done so quickly that we allowed that one to be a floater for some people, but I think we -- we can certainly begin that conversation about is that something we should reconsider, because you are right -- you know, the -- the question almost becomes problematic, because someone will say, well, I would work because I don't celebrate Christmas, but we are closed. So, there is nothing for you to do anyway. So, you know, I think that's going to probably go back to the same conversation. Again, is this paycheck -- is this a way to retain your paycheck or is this a way to give you a benefit of recognition? I don't think we have an answer today.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I would suggest this as a future topic to explore. Certainly I think you would have to have a lot of limitations around it. Where I have seen it be successful in workplaces is usually when it's limited to one or two or like a director -- like exception. But that being said, I think there is a lot of merit to looking at that, you know, and there are some -- there are some rules where I think where it could be accomplished, even if the office is closed, depending on whether someone's doing remote worker or what have you. Certainly in some cases it's not possible, but in some cases it might be. So, I don't know. I mean maybe a -- maybe a floating holiday citywide or something that would allow people to celebrate other holidays would it make sense. It was just a suggestion.

Nary: Sure.

Strader: It just prompted the thought in my mind reading the policy.

Nary: We have come a long way from when I first got here that the holiday practice prior to my coming in this position in '04 was if you had a ten hour shift, which some of our employees did -- not just public safety people, but some other types of people -- if you wanted to take a holiday and the City Hall is closed, and definitely for you to come to work, but you had a ten hour shift, they would give you eight hours of holiday and take two hours of your vacation and you couldn't come to work anyway. That never made sense to me, it didn't make sense to Mayor Tammy, and we changed it, because your day is whatever your day is. Whatever your schedule is is what it is.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I do you remember that, the Rita -- I also remember when we used to have all of our holidays banked and we used them as a rotating vacation time of 80 hours when we had fewer holidays back then. Now we have more. But that was I think one of the reasons that that was eliminated had to do with a staffing issue. Now we were piling on not only better -- just giving our employees more vacation -- when we had one or two weeks and that was it. Once we went through the system we have now that we have a lot more holiday time -- in the past few years we went away from banking the holidays, because it did become a staff -- especially employee services trying keep enough police on the road. Don't know again if that's something that wants to be discussed, but it's an issue if you start floating holidays on different parts of the city on staff and I would open it up to Captain Colaanni to say what he's got now on staffing at the police department and what kind of effect that would have on them.

Nary: And I will add to that, Councilman Overton, the -- in the CLA for the fire union employees it is a bank system, because they have to work whether it's a holiday or not. It doesn't make any difference. They change their schedule slightly on holidays and they operate a little bit different functionally, but they have to be there, so they just get it as a bank and they just use it as part of their bank like that old system used to be.

Simison: Captain.

Colaiani: I'm not sure if I want to throw another log on this fire. Since I have been here since 1996 it's been done a ton of ways. We used to -- you were just given eight, ten holidays a year in October and you used them whenever you want it to at your discretion. If you didn't use them and you left the city you didn't get paid for them. We used to do it that way. We used to have a system where it didn't matter if you worked ten, 12 hour shifts, you only got eight hours a holiday and we -- we moved through that. And, then, we moved into this format now and it's weird, because holidays are moved by the city. So, if Christmas is on a Sunday we moved the holiday to a Monday. So, the people that are working Christmas get the same amount of straight time is equal to the holiday, but they are actually working the holiday. So, there is -- there is that. I'm working the holiday. I'm working Christmas. I'm not with my family and the person that works Monday where the holiday is moved to gets the same amount of pay. They don't feel it's equitable. So, there is that issue. And, then, there is the issue that Council Woman Strader brought up -- or, excuse me, Council Woman Perreault brought up about if you are sick or taking vacations through no fault of your own and you have something planned, how does that compute when it comes down to calculating hours, because we have some people that are sick or do they lose it? Where does that -- there is -- there is just a lot of layers to it on how we do it. But we used to just get a bank of them and this is it and use it as you see fit.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I definitely wasn't recommending a whole bank of floating holidays. Where I have seen it be successful is it's typically limited to one or two and sometimes it's a religious accommodation, but not necessarily. So, that -- that would be the thing I would urge you to look into. Not necessarily a wholesale change in -- in moving to banking completely. I think that would be a big change that would be hard to implement and manage city wide.

Nary: I would agree. And one more thing I can add, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, was back to Council Member Perreault's question. We were having a problem for a period of time with some employees that didn't feel the necessity that they have to work 40 hours a week. They could afford to go with unpaid time. And so for a while we required to be a full-time employee you have to schedule 40 hours a week. This particular language here was also to address that. So, that you didn't have people saying I don't care if you pay me, I will take the day off. You don't have to pay me. That's fine. And, then, they -- and they are not using vacation. They are not using sick leave. They are using unpaid time that they chose to use and when I was the HR director I don't know how many times I said to the department just tell them no and some people were better at that than others and some had more groups -- it wasn't my -- it wasn't my person, so I don't know what their personalities were. But I think it's one of those things that we -- we have tried to address this as fairly as we can, we tried to

do it -- this particular one -- like I said, I think it was a great intention, because, again, I think people just felt like -- I felt like I lost something. Even if I get paid an extra ten hours, I don't feel like I got the day off like everybody else did. And so I think it was a way to address that and, then, when we looked at it from the math standpoint financially it actually cost us less to do that. But it would be just pay them extra. So, our intention was if -- if the Council is in favor of it I will put a resolution on for next week for approval so that we are in front of the next holiday and, then, we will just go from there and I think -- at least from the director team, I think generally they were in favor of it, because, again, it gives the level of flexibility when it's necessary and it doesn't -- like I said, it -- the ones that it probably comes up the most often are the employees who normal scheduled for off day is a Friday and the Friday is the holiday or it's a weird day, because it's a Tuesday or a Wednesday or a Thursday, which would have been their normal off day, depending on what shift they worked.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Bill, you touched on a couple of times, you know, kind of the conversations with the director, which I think is an appropriate place for this conversation to also emerge, but do you -- does the city have an employee engagement group that can also be shared with, recognizing that the perspective of a director may be different than an individual employee and I think we all -- these questions come as we are also trying to see it from both, you know, management, as well as rank and file and I don't know if that's something that has ever been explored to seek that perspective or how -- how we make sure that these changes are also in line with what our employees are looking for.

Nary: So, yeah, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, Council Member Cavener, great -- great question. And, no, we don't have an employee group like that. Again, these don't come up very much. So, you know, when we created the -- revised the policy manual last year we did create a process and the process does require how it gets initiated, who has to vet it before it comes to you folks to look at. So, we have built that in. We don't really -- I mean we have a benefits committee, which is probably one of our broadest based committees of varieties of workgroups, but they talk primarily about benefits and not about this particular -- particular type of policy. You know, we have a compensation committee. It's a little bit smaller and it's a little bit more management driven and it really drills on to compensation and not necessarily other things. So, yeah, we hadn't ever explored that. Certainly I don't have a problem with that. I don't think that's a bad thing to consider. How we would do it -- you know, whether or not -- again, we expand the benefits committee, because it already exists to looking at stuff like that, too. Because there is -- most workers are represented. I mean we have Police, Parks, Public Works, Legal, HR, Finance -- all are part of that. So, that might be a way to just do that, to make sure, like you said, if there is something else that we have just are missing. We hope -- again, most of the directors have vetted it somewhere in their department to get a sense of what makes sense for their folks and at least my

experience with the director team currently they do and so I do think it's out there, but, again, I don't think it's wrong to look at another way to do it.

Simison: And I would just add in this case I think this is here because employees came to their director and this is what they want in this specific instance. I don't know the directors are out there trying -- you know, advocating for this policy otherwise.

Nary: Correct. I would agree. I will go ahead and bring it back next week. Okay. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you, Bill. So, with that we have reached the end of our work session.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I move we adjourn the work session.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 5:36 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

_____ MAYOR ROBERT E. SIMISON	_____ DATE APPROVED
----------------------------------	------------------------

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK